FEAR IN PRISONS: ITS INCIDENCE AND CONTROL

THESIS SUBMITTED FOR EXAMINATION FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

1994

JOANNA ADLER

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

UNIVERSITY OF KENT AT CANTERBURY

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

FEAR IN PRISONS: ITS INCIDENCE AND CONTROL

Thesis submitted for examination for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Joanna Adler, Department of Psychology, University of Kent at Canterbury

This thesis reports findings from three studies. It begins with a summary of the previous conflicting literature into the psychological effects of imprisonment. In an attempt to allow prisoners to speak for themselves and to identify research areas, the studies reported in the second chapter present illustrative quotations from interviews conducted with forty prisoners in low and medium security prisons. Following issues raised by these participants, chapters three to seven report findings from the first survey of fear in the Prison Service. Fifty-one per cent of prisoners and 67% of officers reported feeling afraid. More life sentence prisoners towards the beginning of their sentence and "vulnerable prisoners" not held in a Vulnerable Prisoner Unit report feeling fear. Seven per cent of the prisoners were afraid all of the time. The most common area in which prisoners felt fear was in their cell. Officers felt fearful in the context of situations in which control may be at risk. Officers also demonstrated a limited awareness of the fears felt by prisoners. However, they felt that prisoners would fear intimidation, bullying and being in debt whereas the prisoners themselves did not use any of these labels for their fears. Research reported in chapters eight to thirteen derived more information about the levels of fear and means of control utilised by officers. It particularly assessed the impact of female officers on male prison wings and their reception by the prisoners and their colleagues. Relationships between officers and prisoners are better than typically predicted and male and female officers do not favour different means of control, contrary to predictions. Chapter fourteen presents findings from a control group of police officers. The general conclusion is that fear in prisons is real, based on experience and both can and ought to be managed better.

FEAR IN PRISONS: ITS INCIDENCE AND CONTROL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FEAR IN PRISONS

PREFACE AND METHODOLOGICAL OVERVIEW

Prisons encapsulate and inculcate fear. In society at large, fear, crime and punishment are inextricably entwined within public consciousness. The Home Secretary reassures victims that fear of crime is excessive and unreasonable yet he simultaneously plays upon our fears as he attempts to win votes by "cracking down hard on crime". The imposing façades of Victorian gaols loom over our cities as symbols of deterrence and means of social control. Society may be reassured by the knowledge that prisons protect us from dangerous deviants. However, our prisons hold a motley assortment of the dangerous and the dispossessed. From "innocent" remand prisoners to fine defaulters to serial rapists and killers.

Despite differences in their classifications, all prisoners share one experience, namely, their removal from normal society. A few prisoners may find it preferable to be denied autonomy and responsibility within an institution but for most, the function of punishment is fulfilled by the deprivation of liberty. But, this is not where punishment stops. According to Sykes (1958), prisons punish in five ways: they produce a sense of rejection in prisoners; prisoners suffer from extreme material deprivation; deprivation of heterosexual relationships; deprivation of autonomy and they are forced to associate with other criminals. Sykes identified fear as one of the intrinsic "pains of imprisonment". This thesis is concerned with that fear.

The research reported in this thesis was a direct result of asking a naive question regarding the effects of imprisonment--"what are they?" The answer was that, "it depends on whom you ask". This is common to much of psychology. However, in this case, the degree of difference between psychologists, sociologists, lawyers and reformers was marked. The vitriol within debates about "law and order" and imprisonment has not been limited to politicians. The work published in the past thirty years has concentrated almost as much on the flaws and limitations of other people's research as on presenting findings. Given the radically different techniques adopted and concomitant conflicting findings, this is not surprising. Unfortunately, it has meant that over half a century after Clemmer's, 1940 theory of "prisonization" was proffered, we still do not know the mechanisms involved. We have not agreed on what is meant by "prisonization" or even if the process exists.

The debates within the field of prison research have been fuelled partially by differences between sociological and psychological methodologies. As chapter one demonstrates, those working within a qualitative, sociological paradigm have found prison to be harmful and "tomb like" (Cohen & Taylor, 1981). In contrast, those working with standardised psychological measures have felt able to conclude that prison may be "conducive to good health" (Bonta & Gendreau, 1991).

To begin to answer the naive question about the effects of imprisonment, a decision was taken to draw upon both research traditions. It was hoped that a researcher with a psychological training who used qualitative and quantitative measures would be able to add useful information to

correctional literature. However, because of the degree of discordance within research into imprisonment, it was difficult to know where to begin. Therefore, the first research reported was originally conceived as an exercise to investigate areas of importance to prisoners themselves. Rather than testing predictions about the psychological impact of prison using standardised measures, the research question was one stage further back: "what are the issues about which we should be making predictions?"

As part of the attempt to allow participants to determine the areas of investigation for more detailed study, two studies were conducted in which prisoners were asked to identify areas of psychological need (Adler, 1993, 1995a). The emphasis in both studies was on qualitative, participant directed research. This was not as part of a crusade against "spurious objectivity" (Roberts & Jackson, 1991) but was part of an attempt to find a way through the theoretical morass of literature regarding "correctional facilities".

The first study (previously presented as the author's MPhil thesis) contained the findings from detailed, free ranging interviews and a series of semantic differential tasks completed with twenty-four adult, male prisoners. The prisoners raised a number of concerns that could have been investigated further through a psychological paradigm. These included the effects of prison on families, the effects of substance abuse on offending behaviour, the effects of loss of autonomy and the social interactions within prisons. Participants also mentioned "mugging", "taxing" and a number of violent situations that they had experienced. These issues were raised despite the fact that the researcher was a young female, that prisons are notoriously "macho" environments and that prisoners were not asked about such events specifically.

Shortly thereafter, the Prison Service launched its strategy of "Anti Bullying". As part of that strategy, the Prison Service sought more information that might lead to an understanding of intimidation in prisons and how to control it. Although there is (and was) a fair amount of literature pertaining to violence, aggression and intimidation (both within and outside prisons), there is practically nothing that relates to their psychological effects on prisoners. We do not know much about avoidance strategies, coping measures or even personal awareness about hazards in general yet it would not be unreasonable to assume that in an environment that can be as violent as a prison, all three psychological processes will exist. Such processes would probably be born out of fear of that violent environment. However, we also know very little about people's qualitative experiences of fear. Thus, it was decided to conduct the first investigations of fear within the Prison Service.

The research into fear was conducted in the summer of 1993 and was partially funded by the Prison Reform Trust. It incorporated interviews with over two hundred and fifty prisoners and officers from five wings of three prisons. The study was designed to be reported in two ways: as a discussion paper (Adler, 1994) and as part of a PhD thesis. In October, 1993, the researcher took up a teaching assistant's position at the University of Kent. There, it was decided that there was a need to replicate the findings of the MPhil thesis using a slightly different methodology. Hence, during the

winter of 1993/1994, a series of unstructured interviews and brainstorming sessions were conducted with prisoners held in another gaol.

In the (pre-doctoral) MPhil study and in its replication, participants adopted an apparently blasé manner when talking about cell fires or reporting muggings, taxing and intimidation. Such comments pointed towards the research that is featured in this thesis and examples of the remarks are given in chapter two. Subsequent chapters show how the research into fear was designed and developed. Following a review of the limited literature available (and presented in chapter three), a survey of fear was designed (as is reported in chapter four). The findings from the interviews that were conducted are presented in a number of chapters that are described below.

The first of the chapters reporting results from the survey of fear (chapter five) presents the responses relating to participants' adjustment to life within prison and their ratings of "routines". There were two main reasons why they had been asked about custodial adjustment and assessments: Cohen and Taylor (1981) and other researchers have emphasised the need for contextual research saying that any findings need to be reported within their appropriate milieu. More support for the provision of such context stems from the group of researchers including Dobash and Dobash. They argue that violent incidents are not isolated events. They are interactions that can be mapped out in terms of other events that lead to them and result from them. Violence can only be understood within its appropriate context (e.g. Dobash & Dobash 1984). If violence is associated with fear, then fear too needs be set within its context. This context is provided in chapter five which gives information that is vital for interpretation of later results.

Having set the scene within chapter five, chapter six reports on fear itself. The findings presented in chapter six give information about the extent, prevalence and nature of fears in prisons. Both officers and prisoners were asked about other people's concerns and their own. If fear is real, then it can have real effects. These effects may be relatively benign, taking the form of avoidance procedures adopted to manage fear successfully. Unfortunately, the effects of fear may also include an inability to function "normally" due to feelings of profound, all-pervading fear. Therefore, coping procedures and suggestions for managing fear were assessed. Chapter seven presents the effects of fear in terms of coping procedures that might minimise its potential for harm and maximise prisoners' and officers' control of fear. Chapter seven concludes discussion of the findings of the survey of fear.

The following chapter, (eight) begins to report the second major study that was conducted as part of this doctoral research. Namely, an investigation of the ways in which the deployment of female officers in male prisons effects fear and its control. One hundred and twenty prisoners and one hundred and twenty officers from eight wings of two, medium-to-high security prisons participated in this study. One theme running through the study (reported in chapters eight to thirteen) is that of the debate between proponents and opponents of cross gender postings. Essentially, previous literature had concluded that female officers in male prisons might calm the environment (thereby reducing fear) or might be unable to maintain control (thereby increasing fear). Both conclusions

are based on assumptions that women act in ways that are different to those in which men act. Such assumptions are systematically tested within the design.

Again, the first chapter dealing with findings (chapter nine) provides an account of prisoners' assessments of and adjustments to their environments. The following chapter (ten) portrays their reactions to being supervised by officers of the opposite sex. After this, the officers' views are presented. The first chapter depicting officers' responses (chapter eleven) is again one of context. This time, the context includes officers' feelings of team affiliation and incorporation within the environment as well as their assessments of regimes. Chapter twelve is the last that presents findings from this study. It concentrates on officers' fears, their management and minimisation of fear in prisoners and in each other. In chapter thirteen, all of the findings from the cross gender supervision study are assessed in terms of the previous literature and the predictions that are presented within chapter eight.

The final piece of research that is reported in this doctoral thesis was conducted with probationary police constables. A group of thirty-five constables from an inner city area participated in a survey of the incidence and management of their fears. The study was conducted to gather data from professionals who could act as a control group for the prison officers. Both prison and police officers deal with the same "clientele" and have been characterised as sharing a number of occupational experiences. It has been assumed that prison and police officers are in similar positions of power, enjoy similar privileges and are exposed to similar risks (Toch, 1976). However, if there is something intrinsically different about the institution that incarcerates offenders, then the nature of any fears expressed by police officers should be different to those expressed by prison officers. The police research is reported in chapter fourteen and concluding remarks are made in chapter fifteen.

Throughout the thesis, when reporting results, attempts have been made to elucidate marked differences between individual and institutional characteristics. Also, non significant findings are highlighted when those null findings contradict predictions based on previous literature. Selected, representative extracts from interviews are presented with minimal interpretation. Participants' quotations are complemented by statistical analyses that have been conducted to allow the reader to interpret the relative significance of any such remarks. It is hoped that by permitting participants to "speak for themselves", whilst providing a quantified framework for their remarks, this thesis will give a fair reflection of the experiences of groups of offenders and those who work with them.

This thesis presents a picture of fear in prison, but before the picture is revealed, it may be helpful to repeat a point made by Ward (1986): "Judges, lawyers, newspaper reporters, and criminologists should not, by imagining themselves in the place of inmates in a high-security prison, conclude that the inmates will be psychologically damaged by the experience. The inmates of high-security prisons are experienced and better prepared to do time than the judges and citizens." (Ward, p 31-32 cited in Fleisher, p 131). It is the contention of this author that such preparation will include developing ways of coping with fear.

SOME ISSUES OF DATA PRESENTATION

There are a number of issues surrounding any use of qualitative data and attempts to evaluate such information statistically. Most pertinent to this thesis, are those associated with the selective use of representative quotations and with the definition of categories used to organise and to statistically evaluate such material.

Representative quotations

In reporting each of the studies that were conducted, this thesis presents numerous selected quotations. The author has taken care to ensure that such quotations are presented in their appropriate context and with the minimum possible interpretation. This style of reporting was adopted to allow participants to "speak for themselves". However, it is recognised that the reader may wish for reassurance as to whether any such quotations are representative of the sample as a whole. For this reason, the main studies reported (into fear and cross gender supervision) present quotations as well as frequency tables in illustration of answers to particular questions. For example, when asked whether prisoners felt that the employment of female officers on male prisoner wings was a "good idea", the numbers of prisoners who felt that it was, was not and who were ambivalent are presented as are quotations to illustrate each of these views.

Enough information has been presented so that the reader can judge for him or her self as to the numbers of participants who would concur with the quotations presented. It is also relevant to state that on receipt of copies of the research, (both summary and full), the only responses from participants to the author and to the Prison Reform Trust have been positive. Indeed a number of prisoners took pains to contact the author to thank her for presenting their views and two of the prisons have independently replicated findings.

However, it was felt that the research would be more powerful and effective if it was presented in both a qualitative and quantitative manner. In other words, to allow generalisations to be made and to produce some predictive models, it was necessary to analyse quantitatively the data collected. To conduct such analyses, it was necessary to define categories to fit qualitative data into quantitative paradigms.

Descriptive presentation of qualitative data

As can be seen from the coding sheets, much qualitative information was assigned numbers in order to construct frequency tables. For example, in response to questions about female officers, a number of prisoners made unsolicited comments. In total, they made comments about 30 different aspects of the employment of female officers in male prisons. They made 41 different types of remark in response to the question relating to whether they wanted to add anything at the end of the interview whereas the officers made 10 different sorts of remark. Apart from the variable relating to types of problem experienced by officers with prisoners, the variables that generated so many responses could not be further categorised. Accordingly, they were not used in statistical tests.

Defining categories for statistical tests

The appendices include copies of the complete coding sheets used in the research presented in this thesis. They demonstrate that in addition to straightforward biographical information, there were three broad types of category into which qualitative information was placed.

Pre-established low inference categories

Examples include whether or not a participant ever experiences problems with other people, whether or not they ever feel fearful, and other such dichotomous categorical information. Examples also include frequency of events experienced. When participants refer to problems being "daily", "weekly" or "monthly", etc., it is safe to assume that they are sharing definitions common to us all.

Emergent low inference categories

Categories of this type had not been fully defined at the outset of the research. However, during the conduct of studies and, more importantly, whilst looking through all of the interviews, they become obvious. For example, in the study investigating cross gender supervision, participants were not only asked whether they ever felt afraid but also how fearful. They were provided with no standardised scales yet used very similar language that was not difficult to arrange as a scale. At the low end (1) appear "apprehensive" or "wary" whereas at the high end (5) appears "terrified".

Another example drawn from both the general survey of fear and the cross gender research is that of the prisoners' ratings of officers. Before the research began, it was felt likely that most prisoners would be very negative about officers. However, it became apparent that they judged them as they would other groups of people. Some prisoners were positive about some officers and negative about others. Other prisoners were either positive or negative about all officers. As they used language such as "brilliant", "good", "pretty bad" and "terrible", it was clear whether they felt positive, very positive, negative or very negative. Prisoners who were ambivalent, said that some were good and some bad, that officers were okay or "not bad" were categorised as feeling neutral. Thus a five point scale was constructed and interview scripts coded accordingly.

High inference categories

These involve a high degree of inference when coding. Only one such variable was used in statistical tests. Officers in the cross gender supervision study experienced problems with the prisoners and with their peers. To permit analyses to be conducted and interpreted, it was necessary to collapse data about the prisoners. There were 21 different examples given by the officers ranging from "food" to "unwanted physical contact". All 21 are shown in the appendices next to one of four categories into which they were collapsed. Prison officers face problems caused by the *system* in which they work and by the ways in which they work and interact with other *people* within that system. Therefore, it was appropriate to divide the type of problem faced into those

which were interpersonal and those that were system based. Within each of these two categories, it was felt that there were examples that resulted in *direct* or immediate repercussions, and others which were *indirect*. Accordingly, the 21 original examples were collapsed into four categories that were used in χ^2 comparisons: "Indirect System; Direct System; Indirect Interpersonal and Direct Interpersonal". Three different coders divided up the 21 examples into these four categories and in discussion, all concurred as to which example to place in which category.

Most of the data presented in this thesis incorporate pre-established and emergent low inference categories. High inference categories were used in the study of the effects of cross gender officer postings in male prisons. Formal tests of the reliability of coding were not conducted but three different people were involved in data coding and entry of the cross gender supervision interviews. If there was doubt about the intention of a participant, then the neutral point of a scale was used. Where accord was not reached or the intention was very unclear, then the cell was left blank for that particular item. Where statistical tests have been conducted, most of the information was analysed using non parametric techniques that are particularly well suited for such qualitative data.

CHAPTER ONE

THE EFFECTS OF IMPRISONMENT: PSYCHOLOGICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL TRADITIONS

The English and Welsh Prison Service has a mission statement that includes duties of custody, care and preparation for decarceration. However, in January 1995, the Home Secretary stated that maintenance of security was the main task of prisons. In support of this statement, the then Director General of the Prison Service revealed that resources were to be directed towards security improvements and that training and facilities were to be curtailed. Since December 1995, similar statements have been made by the Prison Governors' Association, The Prison Officers' Association and the current Director General of the Prison Service. Such changes have been made in conjunction with 13% budgetary cuts imposed last year. The cuts to funding came despite declarations from both our Home Secretary and Prime Minister that "prison works" (Media reports and Penal Affairs Consortium, 1996). Prison is so efficient that we currently have the highest ever incarcerated population in England and Wales. In the three and a half years between December 1992 and June 1996, the population rose by 36% from 40,606 to 55,028 (Howard league, 1996). Over demand for facilities, increased pressure on staff and sheer lack of space are likely to follow such a rapid rise in the numbers of people within any institution.

A prison's institutional characteristics are determined by those who work in it and by those who are incarcerated within it. In a seminal work, Clemmer (1940) described the process of "prisonization" as the transition of an offender from an outsider to a member of the prisoner culture. When prisoners first enter prison, they are disorientated but they react and learn how to operate in the prison culture. Toch (1992) tells us that a "stress free transition (into a new culture) presupposes (a) that the information one needs to deal with new settings can be readily obtained, (b) that one encounters no major problems before one has acquired sufficient familiarity to respond to them, and (c) that one sees oneself as still able to reach ones currently important life goals" (p 193). As any or all of these assumptions may not be fulfilled, prisonization is neither a simple process nor will it necessarily be complete. A degree of dissonance and dis-harmony might be expected yet for most of the time, prisons function uneventfully.

Although most prisons run relatively smoothly, Sykes (1958) points out that prisoners have no stake in obeying the rules hence prison officers use informal rewards and incentives as means of maintaining order. Sykes has been heavily criticised by Mathiesen (1965) for not presenting a valid picture of custodial security, self maintenance or the ways in which order is maintained. Mathiesen presents a picture of staff in a 'no win' situation and of prisoners as an "atomised and depressed mass". The prisoners are "censorious" of officers who bend the rules seeing them as staff who fail to do their job properly. They are equally disdainful of those officers who implement rules rigidly, characterising them as "petty". The English and Welsh National Prison Survey revealed a similar picture (Walmsley, Howard & White, 1992). The three most frequently mentioned aspects of the

regime that annoyed prisoners were: their treatment by officers; the bureaucracy; the way that rules are implemented and the amount of time that prisoners spend within their cells.

Irwin (1980) concluded that prisons degrade, embitter, cripple and dehumanise prisoners and are characterised by "dope fiends", "pimps", "bikers", and "street gang members" competing for power and respect that can be gained and maintained through violent intimidation. In such circumstances, it is hard to imagine that anyone can emerge from prison untouched by their experience. However, prison has also been presented as a warehouse that does little other than restrain people for a time (McAllister & Little, 1989). There are at least two possible interpretations of such a typical and wide discrepancy in conclusions. The first is that there are individual differences at play where the "individual" may be a person's or an institution's characteristics. The second is that something is wrong with someone's methodology.

Psychological research about the effects of imprisonment has a background of mixed repute. It is tempting to decry various studies for being simplistic and using wholly inappropriate research tools. Unfortunately, it is not possible to reject all studies that seem counter intuitive and that have generated conflicting results as it is difficult to judge the merits of one study against the next. As Porporino (1983) and Bukstel & Kilmann (1980) have stated, reviews are hard to carry out when different operational definitions of theoretical concepts are used and even harder to carry out when the theoretical concepts are defined differently. Contradictory findings are probably inevitable under such research conditions. It is to some of these findings, that this chapter now turns. (For a more complete review of literature, see Adler, 1993.)

Despite the methodological shortcomings to which Bukstel and Kilmann (1980) make reference, they do draw some conclusions from a review of psychological literature. The main one is that people react as individuals showing deterioration, improvement or no changes at all. Institutional effects like crowding play a part as does the stage of the sentence. Outside factors also play a role, particularly regarding prisoners' expectations of their release and their degree of contact with the outside. Bukstel and Kilmann conclude (somewhat unoriginally) that a prisoner's response to incarceration is determined by an interaction of variables.

If one turns to possible individual differences within the person, the main variable found to affect prisoners' reactions to the stresses of imprisonment is their age. Silverman and Vega (1990) examined the effects of age, race, gender, marital status and education on stress, anger, curiosity, perception of institutional stresses and reactions to institutional variables shown by 783 prisoners of young, middle and old age. At the start of incarceration, they found that personal traits affect the ways that different staff and prisoners inter-relate. As age increased, the intensity of anger related emotions decreased and the suppression or control of such feelings and actions increased. Gallagher (1990) found that older prisoners had more contacts with friends and family, more friends in prison, and experienced less stress than the younger prisoners thereby reaffirming the influence of social support networks on people's success at coping with adversity.

Working within a largely positivist framework, Porporino (1983) concluded that it is possible to portray differences in adaptation to imprisonment from the perspective of a cognitive model of the

coping process. His model includes conclusions that coping ability and cognitive appraisals interact to help to determine the effects that prison has on prisoners. He also concludes that background factors have little to do with differences in how individuals react to imprisonment but coping differences could account for considerable variation in the outcome. In a chapter entitled "What Prisons Do and Don't Do", Zamble and Porporino (1988) conclude that the way people cope is an interaction between internal and external factors. They suggest that the way people coped inside prison depended upon the way that they coped on the outside.

In the following year, Bondeson (1989) stated that rebellion is not the only reaction to adverse conditions. Over adjustment to the demands of prison is also possible. Bondeson enlarged on Goffman's (1961) ideas of institutionalisation and found that loss of liberty was the greatest sufferance on a "scale of suffering". Not meeting people of the opposite sex and social isolation came second as did experience of monotony. Lost autonomy weighed heavier with prisoners than lost possessions and services. Again, too many rules and no clear decisions were cited as problems by 91% and 90% of prisoners respectively. Not having money also scored highly. Bondeson concluded that prison causes stigmatisation, neuroticism, institutionalisation, infantilisation and mortification.

As can be seen, different people react differently to imprisonment. It is not unreasonable to assume that individual reactions will be affected by differences between institutions. Gibbs (1991) found that prisoners who had been contacted within 72 hours of confinement not only had explicable needs but were within environments that differed in a number of ways. After following up, it was found that prisoners in situations with low environmental congruence suffered from more extreme symptoms of psychological distress than did their counterparts who enjoyed relatively high congruence. In this context, "environmental congruence" is when prisoners' needs are met by their environment. It is possible that the experiment may have raised expectations, but the finding stands that if needs are not met by the environment, the prisoners may be more vulnerable.

This is supported by Pelissier's (1991) findings that were contrary to prison crowding work. Previous research into crowding had implied inevitable stress on rapid increase in the size of the prisoner population. In Pelissier's work, a doubling in size of the imprisoned population within one institution resulted in no overall increase in rule infraction rates or illness. This is explained by the particular prison's very clear and effective management yet the finding could equally well be expressed in terms of environmental congruence. The reason that the management was effective could be that managerial decisions resulted in most of the prisoners' needs being met by their environment.

It is important to bear in mind that despite the degree of congruity expressed in the tentative conclusions above, one is still forced to concur with Porporino (1983) that the clearest finding from past research is the "discrepancy between personal and phenomenological analyses of the experience, on the one hand, and data-based research describing it, on the other." This applies even when institutional characteristics are taken on board. The difference is probably best

demonstrated by the debate between Cohen & Taylor and Smith, Heskin, Banister & Bolton in the late 1970's and that between Bonta & Gendreau and Roberts & Jackson in 1991.

One of the most influential sociological studies of long term imprisonment was carried out in Durham prison by Cohen and Taylor in the late 1960's. They described the maximum security wing as being "tomb-like" with a lack of interaction between the prisoners. They cite Sykes (1958) who said that "While it is true that every prisoner does not live in the constant fear of being robbed or beaten, the constant companionship of thieves, rapists, murderers and aggressive homosexuals is far from reassuring." They found that the only type of offender from whom others feared "contamination" was the sex offender and they reported that the average short term prisoner can find "friends" from amongst his cell mates, or from the hundreds within the same wing or house-block, whereas high security prisoners do not have that luxury. For the long term prisoner, when friendships were made, they were unvarying. This is in contrast to "normal" life where we tell A this and B that and we go out with C or D. Our friends fulfil different social needs and intricate networks are established. Yet in prison, one does not have the luxury of a multi-layered network of friends.

Sykes (1958) had concluded that officers and prisoners differed very little from one another. Cohen and Taylor (1981) present a slightly different picture. They found that although officers and prisoners may have had common roots, their experiences were very different and the prisoners consciously tried to differentiate themselves, feeling both "intellectually superior" and "culturally distinct". Essentially, Cohen and Taylor reported a bleak picture of men who were very afraid of psychological deterioration. Men who adopted various methods with which to cope with their feared degeneration and who were at odds with those who were charged with caring for them.

At the same time as Cohen and Taylor were working with the men on E wing in Durham, another, psychological, study was being undertaken by Smith, Heskin, Banister and Bolton in the same prison. The psychological projects were Home Office funded and used a battery of standardised tests. The cross sectional analyses did not demonstrate a significant correlation between length of imprisonment and intellectual deterioration. Tests of personality showed increasing introversion and intro-punitive hostility. However, among the longitudinal analyses, findings from long term prisoners showed significantly greater improvement in full scale and verbal IQ than the group of comparison subjects. The research also showed significant differences between the comparison group and the total prison sample in self-criticism, total hostility and intro-punitive hostility. The prisoners' behaviours on these scales seemed to improve whereas the control group's did not. Although the findings also suggest that "emotional maturity declines with increasing length of imprisonment", they conclude that the tests "revealed no evidence of psychological deterioration" (e.g. Heskin; Bolton & Smith, 1973 and Bolton; Smith; Heskin & Bannister, 1976). Thus two studies conducted in the same prison at the same time yet adopting opposing theoretical justifications for their methodologies resulted in diametrically opposed conclusions.

Cohen and Taylor (1981) include an updated critique of the Bolton et al. studies, without mentioning them by name. Cohen and Taylor describe the design as a sample of two hundred men serving determinate sentences of ten years or life imprisonment. They narrate how, on arrival at Durham,

the psychological researchers were met with a partial boycott and asked to try different prisoners as some did not approve of their research methods. Rather than adopting a different approach with the original sample that had been selected, the researchers allowed prisoners to self-select themselves out of the research and switched sample sets. Four groups participated in a cross sectional design: new prisoners; those who had served three years; those who had served 5 years and those who had served seven years. They used cognitive, personality and attitude tests but all were unmodified and therefore probably not ideal for use with prisoners.

To demonstrate the methodological inadequacies of relying on measures such as the E.P.Q., Cohen and Taylor quote Eysenck's definition of an extrovert: "He is more likely to change his work, his profession, move from one company to another, or change departments within one company. He is more liable to change house, to move from one part of the town to another, or even from one city to somewhere else. He is more likely to change his food preferences from day to day, or even his clothes. He is more likely to change girl friends or, at a later stage, to get divorced and change wives. He is less likely to stick to one and the same career for a long period of time, or to the same colour scheme in his house, or even to the same furniture." Cohen and Taylor commend the design for also using longitudinal data, but say that the time span used by Heskin et al. was too short. They continue that although Bolton et al. (1976) took note of times, they failed to place the findings in the context of the current gaol environment.

Cohen and Taylor are uncompromising in their criticism of Bannister, Bolton, Heskin and Smith. The pair of sociologists berate the group of psychologists for their use of inappropriate measures and claim that the function of such research is merely to reassure the public that scientific approaches are being taken. Whilst one has a certain amount of sympathy for the views of Cohen and Taylor, a healthy degree of scepticism is also necessary. Cohen and Taylor report merely that Heskin et al. were met with a boycott. It seems unlikely that such a boycott would spontaneously erupt. It also seems unlikely that prisoners would be better informed than other lay groups about the validity, reliability and probity of particular psychological tests. An almost inevitable conclusion is that although there were discrepant findings, the chasm portrayed may have been increased in size by social scientific division, dogma and diversionary tactics. However, more recent comparisons between psychological and sociological studies of imprisonment seem to shed little more light.

To some extent, Sapsford (1983) bridges the gap between psychology and sociology. He first uses sociological studies that tend to report selected quotations to support their arguments. He then reports on studies that reflect psychological researchers' penchant for statistical evidence. Sapsford writes about the overwhelming fear of deterioration found by Cohen and Taylor and continues to report work showing that 62% of a sample of lifers experienced fears of going insane at some time during the sentence. Sapsford goes on to cite the psychological Durham studies and a twenty year longitudinal study that found no observable deterioration. After summarising the preceding research, Sapsford's introduction concludes that, the group of researchers with no deleterious findings are more convincing and the case for deleterious findings had not been demonstrated.

In another attempt to settle the matter, Bonta and Gendreau (1990) also carried out a review of the psychological evidence. The common independent variable that they used was imprisonment. They limited dependent variables to "psychological and behavioural" observations. These, they decided, did not include studies on self esteem and attitude change. Negative effects were defined as those that threatened physical welfare and were indicators of physiological and psychological stress. They looked at confinement, crowding, long term imprisonment, solitary confinement, short term detention and death row.

They concluded that:

1. Crowding may cause physiological and psychological stress among many prisoners but that it is moderated by their coping abilities.

2. Health risks were not a problem and, "imprisonment may have the fortuitous benefit of isolating the offender from a highly risky lifestyle in the community" (p 357).

3. There was, "Little to support the conclusion that long term imprisonment necessarily has detrimental effects" (p 359).

They concede that there may be changes in other dimensions that had yet to be measured but are steadfast in their denial of evidence of deterioration at present. For example, they say that solitary confinement is not the "real culprit". That, is the means by which it is implemented. They conclude that the "limited data are a testimony to the ability of men to cope with the worst of consequences."

Roberts and Jackson (1991 p 557) heavily criticise Bonta and Gendreau. They have difficulty in concurring with the "upbeat assessment of the effects of incarceration... before rejecting the view that imprisonment is intrinsically destructive, we would require evidence more compelling than that generated by contemporary social science research." They base their discussion on "sworn testimony" and their reading of the literature. Their main criticisms of Bonta and Gendreau are that:

1. Bonta and Gendreau assume that prison is punitive but otherwise is no different to other sanctions. They ignore the significance of prison within society and its difference from normal society.

2. As already reported, Bonta and Gendreau (p 359) stated, "from the available evidence and on the dimensions measured there is little to support the conclusion that long-term imprisonment necessarily has detrimental effects." The point that Roberts and Jackson make is that the available evidence is insufficient to allow conclusions that contradict "centuries of human experience".

3. Roberts and Jackson state that Bonta and Gendreau looked in the wrong place to draw conclusions about post release effects of prison. Roberts and Jackson cite the unusual case of a man who was released after 37 years. Under Bonta and Gendreau's "objective scales", he has been well served by prison as "behaviours which threaten the physical welfare of the offender... physiological stress levels... and psychological stress" are all improved. However, put that in the context that the man,

"Finds himself separated by an unbridgeable gap of social experience from his peers in the free community. The generation of free men and women with whom he lost contact 37 years earlier are now thinking about retirement. For his part, [the man] has to think about starting a new life. While his peers reap the rewards associated with parenthood (and grand parenthood), he must confront the isolation accumulated over 37 years of separation from society" (p 558 () are in the original).

4. They recognise that compared to Bonta and Gendreau they have "substituted rhetoric for science" (p 558). However, in their opinion, Bonta and Gendreau have substituted "a spurious objectivity for the human dimension of punishment as it is experienced by prisoners" (p 559).

5. Regarding the minimal health risks reported by Bonta and Gendreau, Roberts and Jackson criticise suicide research for complacently ignoring the a priori proneness to suicide that should make prisoners a particularly unsusceptible group. They conclude that if a priori rates were fully assessed, suicide problems would be seen in their true much bleaker light.

6. They cite Suedfeld who has worked in the same fields as Bonta and Gendreau and concluded that it is possible to "seriously overstate" what their kind of empirical research can tell us about the effects of solitary confinement.

7. Bonta and Gendreau narrow the realm of what is objectively measurable then say that no negative conclusions can be drawn from their self defined, ill conceived measurements.

The critique of Bonta and Gendreau is damning but may be overstated. In their rebuttal, Bonta and Gendreau (1991) characterise Roberts and Jackson in terms of the knowledge destruction debate. Roberts and Jackson are depicted within a framework where "knowledge is political, partial, relative, socially constructed, and accepted according to its personal value" (p 563). It may not have been Bonta and Gendreau's intention, but such a statement seems to cast Roberts and Jackson in an appealing light. Roberts and Jackson have recognised the inherent impossibility of conclusive proof so honestly rely on non objective measures. Whilst Bonta and Gendreau may have objectively asserted that, "there is simply no conclusive evidence at the present time to sort out this issue" (p 563), their stance of objective researchers untouched by the social milieu in which they work seems naive or deliberately disingenuous. To date, most psychologists have focused on individual differences which they have tended to assess using standardised tests. These tests were "objectively" chosen to assess the predicted effects of imprisonment. Unfortunately, such effects were not found very often.

To summarise those effects that have been found: the negative effects of imprisonment may include overcrowding and lack of family contact that can lead to breakdown of relationships, uncertainty and prisonization. One of the problems with psychological studies has been poor operationalisation of deterioration. In a complex environment it has been assumed that effects are curvilinear and long term (Liebling, 1993). The finding that there are no deleterious effects of imprisonment does not account for the high rates of suicides or maladaptive behaviour and leaves outstanding issues in areas where research has been inconclusive. Such areas include: prisoner culture; differentiated understanding of imprisonment in different groups; protecting agents; links

between, before, during and after prison coping and experience of imprisonment; social consequences; the nature of staff prisoner interaction and staff culture; the effects of control and restraint; the use of strip cells or the effects on prisoners' families.

The days of the stranglehold of positivist paradigms on psychology are all but over and the following chapter includes some of the pertinent findings from two psychological studies that were participant directed (Adler, 1993, 1995a). These studies were referred to in the preface. The first was a pre-doctoral project submitted as a thesis that comprised part of the author's MPhil in Criminology. The second study was a replication of that thesis. The aim of both studies was to examine whether listening to the people most directly affected by gaols makes researchers better able to understand the processes involved. Through allowing prisoners to determine the direction of interviews and concentrating upon their qualitative experiences, a picture of psychological effects of imprisonment began to emerge. A large part of chapter two is devoted to a series of selected quotations from these two studies. The quotations demonstrate prisoners' erudition and the value of qualitative analysis. They also illustrate why the decision was taken to conduct further investigation into prisoners' fears and the nature of staff prisoner relationships.

CHAPTER TWO

"ASKING THE TURTLE": TWO STUDIES OF PRISONERS' VIEWS REGARDING IMPRISONMENT

As mentioned in the previous chapter, two studies were conducted that attempted to use participant directed research techniques to identify possible psychological effects of imprisonment. The impetus behind such research comes from a tradition that is influenced by allegorical tales like that referred to in the title of this chapter:

A story is told of a turtle who lays her eggs in the same spot every year. One year, she comes up from the sea. To get to "her" space, she has to laboriously heave herself across a highway. Just as she has painstakingly crossed the busy road, she is spotted by a well meaning person. "Oh no, look at that poor turtle, the sea is all the way over there and the turtle is stuck on the edge of the highway. I'd better move it back to the water, poor thing." Accordingly, the turtle is dislodged and she has to re-cross that busy road. Had the sincere yet inept person asked the turtle whether she had a problem (and had the she been able to reply) the turtle could have answered that no, she didn't want to be put back, right then, but could she have a hand in a little while, after laying her eggs? No matter how well meaning or reforming, nor how objective a researcher attempts to be, if (s)he has failed to take note of participants' perceptions of their situation, (s)he has failed to account for his/her findings.

The two studies that were conducted are briefly outlined below.

Pre-doctoral study

A series of two part interviews was carried out at a category C[1] (medium to low security) training prison. Twenty four prisoners participated in wide ranging, in depth interviews. Each session opened with a series of Semantic Differential tasks that were followed by open ended interviews. The interviews were largely unstructured. A protocol was loosely followed to promote interaction. For most of the time, topics were chosen by the prisoners. To this extent, the research was participant directed (Adler 1993).

---

[1] The categories used for prisoners were drawn up by the Mountbatten committee that reported in 1966. They defined the following four categories:

Category A   prisoners whose escape would be highly dangerous to the public or the police or the security of the state, no matter how unlikely the escape might be; and for whom the aim must be to make escape impossible.
Category B   prisoners for whom the very highest conditions of security are not necessary but for whom escape must be made very difficult.
Category C   prisoners who cannot be trusted in open conditions but who do not have the resources and will to make a determined escape attempt.
Category D   prisoners who can reasonably be trusted in open conditions.

Replication study

The prisoners in study one seemed to have spoken freely and they touched upon a number of issues that required more detailed investigation. Accordingly, 16 more prisoners took part in intensive interviewing. Four prisoners came from each of the following wings in a Victorian prison: A "lifer" wing where they were serving the early to middle parts of their sentences, i.e. from about the third year of the sentence; a Vulnerable Prisoner Unit[2]; a category B and a category C wing. Each participant took part in a half hour long individual interview that was completely unstructured and in a brainstorming session with his peers. The main instruction given to them was: "Please tell me what prison means to you" (Adler 1995a).

Interviews in the first study were recorded using pencil and paper and in the second, they were recorded on audio cassette. Selected, representative quotes from both studies are presented below. The quotations given are those that relate to the work presented later in this thesis. The quotations were selected because they were relevant to the central themes presented here. They concern aspects of custodial adjustment and assessment that might be associated with possible feelings of fear. They represent a relatively small number of the issues raised by prisoners who participated in the studies but the other concerns have been presented and discussed in much greater depth within Adler, 1993.

The first series of quotations pertains to life inside prison. It provides the reader with the necessary context for understanding fear and examples of prisoners' perceptions of their milieu.

"It's the biggest college of criminal learning. Teaches people with trivial offences enough to get them six or seven years... Young offenders' institutions rely on bullying, you have to fight your way through. You survive by proving your worth." A first time sentence server (who was also chemically dependant) summed up prison, "It stinks, people are in prison for different reasons and people who are put in prison for problems should be given help like group therapy, all together but we are all thrown in together. People are just killing time, not dealing with anything. It's a basic survival, not really living at all." "Everybody's abusing everybody else's respect. The prison officers let the whole system turn over this way because it seems to work with the least path of resistance."

As mentioned in the sociological studies, the loss of autonomy seems to have been felt keenly. "You come in prison and it's a totally different world. It doesn't help to strip you of everything. They don't deal with people, they deal with numbers." "We're treated like children, because some people act like them." "The main thing is the loss of freedom, no choice." "You're like a robot, follow everyone else. If you think, you act... if you feel you're in the right and you say something or speak

---

[2] Vulnerable Prisoner Units are relatively new to the prison service. They were phased in to cope with the increasing numbers of prisoners who were at risk on "normal" location. Such prisoners are often referred to as "Rule 43's" as they can be segregated under this rule. They are most likely to include sex offenders, informants, people in debt and ex-police or prison officers. In prison, "wages" are on average 6-8 pounds per week. Out of this amount, the prisoners have to buy all additional items of "canteen". These include phonecards for their calls home and tobacco. Debt is a very real problem, particularly as the "creditors" can pass on debts to other people. Thus if either the debtor or creditor are moved, the debt(s) may still be problematic.

up, they see you as a threat to their authority because you're countermanding prison which does your mind as well as your body."

The lack of autonomy that was reported by the prisoners can hardly be conducive to appropriate behaviour after release nor to facilitating a shift in locus of control towards personal responsibility. Goodstein and Wright (1989) found that "identity-stripping and control-limiting mechanisms" in prisons undermine prisoners' capabilities for coping with their environments, during and after prison. The effects of reduced control include depression, anxiety and increased health risks. Meisenhelder (1985), like Cohen and Taylor (1981) demonstrated that many prisoners fear the prospect of becoming institutionally dependent or institutionalised (Goffman, 1961 & Sapsford, 1983).

Under such conditions, it seems unlikely that people will find it easy to cope with the brutality also reported by the prisoners. However, "Some people thrive on it, they love it. But, I can't get to grips with it, I have to but... if you let it, it'll institutionalise you and you won't be able to cope on the outside." Two ways proffered to cope successfully with imprisonment are to "do it from day to day... if you see people going out, it's not nice." "You've got to have a laugh or it does your head in. You think about things on the out, it's hard, especially on bang up."

Another way of "doing time" is to play the system. This is often mentioned and the following quote illustrates it well. "There are three ways of doing time and parole. One, you play the game, you kick off then you see the light and you get parole. Two, you kick off all the time and you get nothing. Three, you be level headed all the time and you get nothing." Prison "has made me anti-establishment and therefore I protest as much as possible... scream for my rights and it carries on outside. Prison has taught me how to go on and on and get what I want." Such an attitude is common but is not appreciated by all prisoners. "Some of us, we're allowed things and accept it. Others, if they are allowed things, they want more and if they don't get them, they get abusive. And there is no point, they won't get it. Sometimes, the discipline, it's pathetic."

Prisoners who "kick off" frequently manage to gain extra privileges. Understandably, this results in other prisoners feeling ill served. As mentioned by Mathieson, (1965) flexibility is unappreciated. "At Wandsworth, they are all rules. You know they're right bastards. Here, you ask 15 screws 1 question and get 15 answers. We don't know and they don't know what's going on." One group who are particularly liable to suffer when others cause problems, are the Foreign Nationals held in prison. Not only are outside ties hard to maintain, inside relationships are fraught with cultural and linguistic difficulty. "I learnt English in prison, it took three years. Before I learnt, very difficult, can't speak, can't cope, very depressed. I dealt with it with great difficulty. My English is still broken, never been to school, grammatical English is very difficult to speak. Very hard. Sometimes I can't understand people, they speak too fast and posh. I can't spell, I can't write much, I get someone to fill my applications in." "It's changed my life, I don't know who I am. I can't sleep or communicate, they can't understand me."

Relationships with staff were frequently mentioned as well. The use of officers' first names seemed to be generally unappealing and some prisoners had strong ideas about what makes a good officer.

These ranged from the apparently positive to the cynical and fearful: "If I'm civil, I expect to be treated civilly and I am. I can't see gain in trying to belittle someone." "They leave you alone as long as you ain't no trouble to them or the inmates... they are good as gold, that is the way it should be run." "Things are changing but behind the lines, it's still the same." "I'm your friend, clang, it's not possible." "How can one guy be responsible and get to know half a dozen when he's got security, fires and other things?" "You can't suck up to them because you wouldn't survive. You wouldn't survive in gaol if you did that, there's a lot of violence."

Indeed, violence was mentioned as a banal addition to the conversations. The quotes that follow were not delivered as anything sensational: "The first day I was in this gaol, there were three stabbings in one night." The following quotations all relate to "burnouts" where a cell is set on fire to remove the occupant, often a "vulnerable prisoner". "All it is is normally, a bit of liquid on a mattress and some smoke. It's saying, we don't want you, get out." "It doesn't sound benign but it is--less bloodshed at the end of it. He's somewhere where he won't get hurt." "It's a means to an end, it helps him out." "It's not the way it should be, but it's the way it is." As will be seen in later chapters, prison violence frequently erupts over seemingly trivial events (Woolf, 1991) yet there are a number of areas of concern that would seem to be potentially volatile in many situations. Predictable problems would include race related incidents, those affected by drugs use and, as mentioned above, scenarios involving vulnerable prisoners such as sex offenders.

However even when steps are taken to minimise potential discord, relatively trivial events can still take over. For example, despite Prison Service policies designed to address problems of racial misunderstanding, a confrontational situation seems to be able to occur over next to nothing. "Blacks can buy curry but we can't buy pepper. What's the difference? We ask and they say "they don't throw it" and we say, but we don't. But one did, eventually they got the governor down and eventually he said no one allowed either but they kicked off." Although such a situation seems trivial to the free person. It is necessary to note that in an environment with little personal autonomy, food is of great importance.

Representation of prison relationships would not be complete without further examination of the vehement statements made in relation to sex offenders and those made by them. Within the prison hierarchy, sex offenders are at the lowest echelons. "People who rape and that, they deserve to be dead. There's nothing wronger than that." Unsurprisingly, sex offenders are aware of their predicament and, as mentioned above, many seek segregation. However, even when separated from the "main" prison, they are not immune. "People spike the food so we said "give it to us to prepare", and the wing officers were up for it but the governor said that the main would kick off." "I'm not saying we're better, we're no worse. The people out there, they think it's better to have a murderer on a street than a rapist. A criminal's a criminal." "You can't go on home leave or on parole because of the kids. But why not let them when you can keep an eye on him rather than at the end of his sentence?"

As with life outside prison, behaviour may be influenced by alcohol or drugs. Their absence may result in problems concomitant to withdrawal and their presence may influence behaviour directly or

indirectly through debt related action but prison can also provide a necessary reprieve from an addictive lifestyle. "Prison takes you out of your self and you go back and you've got no way of doing anything so you fall back into it all. Drugs, heroin, etc.." "I miss them [his family] but if I'd been getting regular visits I don't think I'd have left the drugs". The ambivalence towards drugs is demonstrated when prisoners speak of the calming influence of class B drugs and the difficulties associated with class A drugs. "We were talking about the Strangeways riot. They cancelled the visits. You cancel visits, there is no puff coming in, it causes problems." "I've found it very hard to find space for my meditation because the vast majority of this wing are into heroin, they're into coke." "The junkies are running around, looking for foil. They've got powder but no foil on the wing." "With privatised staff, they get less money and ignore things. Drugs will be rife and with the low money, there will be back handers."

Another environment in which tension is bound to be high is in segregation units where prisoners are held pending punishment. About one third of the prisoners in study one had experienced segregation. Several of the stays were short and only lasted until an adjudication. However, those who had experienced more than a couple of days in segregation were quite vehement that, "It's inhuman... you never knew of anyone who didn't get beaten up down there." Alternatively, "I had a job in the segregation unit... they were totally out of order... You can't really talk about things like that... People just won't believe you."

Thus, brutality is banal and prisoners live with violence as a matter of routine. In so doing, most people believed that if they had problems, they could talk to one of the officers or else to some of the other prisoners. All but 2 of the participants in the pre-doctoral study said that they had "latched on" to other prisoners, or "relied on the group." However, several people said that weaker prisoners suffer at the hands of the other prisoners and the officers. This is probably not aided by an understanding that, "You can't talk to people inside... [but] you need to show your feelings every now and again because it can get too much."

The majority of prisoners said that they believed that prison had made them "harder" or less likely to self disclose. Heroin dependant B from the first study said that you "just plod along through each day." One middle aged prisoner with a number of convictions believed that prison teaches people to "put on a front on the outside." First timer B believed that prison had made him more tenacious and has "hardened me up to my friends... I don't want friends now." First timer C had been a charity fieldworker. After imprisonment, he felt hardened because "here you can't be caring and gentle as people want to take advantage of you". Another prisoner said, "Sometimes, you want to help but you don't, you have to go with the flow, can't show any feelings... (But, outside prison it)... makes me more likely to help someone as it goes along with the liberty."

Nearly all the prisoners said that they were guarded both in and outside prison, in close relationships and with mere acquaintances. The expression "I put up a wall" was often used. When pressed, a common response was that this was definitely one of the ways that they reacted to prison: "Don't tell anybody anything. Don't tell the officers. They hear it all every day. I don't ask for nothing and I don't get nothing from the officers."

In 1983, Porporino concluded that, "the development of human environments that aid rather than hinder coping, and the achievement of coping competence among inmates, are important goals to which all correctional staff can subscribe and contribute." The following year, Porporino and Zamble (1984) concluded that there is a need for examination of the social/interpersonal dynamics of imprisonment. The process of adaptation and change needed to be measured alongside prisoners' appraisals of their experiences of prison. There was also a need to develop skills training programmes; a need to predict those who would be unable to cope; and to develop environments that help coping, not hinder it. In an attempt to provide some more information towards meeting these needs, it was decided to follow up issues relating to the reality of violence within the context of the interpersonal relationships involved.

After the pre-doctoral study had been completed, issues of interest to the researcher were discussed with the Prison Reform Trust, Dr Alison Liebling, and Graham Towl (a Senior Prison Service Psychologist). Given the normal nature of violence, and the Prison Service's then current plans to address it, this was an obvious area to pursue. If living and working within a violent environment, it might be predicted that a person would be fearful. Accordingly, a search of previous literature was undertaken. The nature of fear in prison seemed to have been of little concern to anybody else. Although there was much research into violence and aggression, when searching the psychological literature for fear and avoidance, studies appeared on guppies, sticklebacks and other fresh water fish. Cognitive appraisals of anxiety were found but there was little applied work. Thus it appeared that attempting to measure the incidence and nature of fear in prisons might be a useful area of research with both policy and theoretical implications. The following five chapters report on a survey of officers and prisoners into whether they were afraid and how they coped with worries and concerns for safety. As with all of the subsequent work, the methods used attempted to combine the best of phenomenological and data based designs. Although structured interview protocols were utilised, all of the questions asked were open ended and participants were encouraged to enlarge on their answers. Such an approach has resulted in a composite picture of the incidence, nature and prevalence of fear in prisons amongst officers and prisoners and has provided more information about the interplay between personal experience and feelings of fear.

CHAPTER THREE

FEAR AND VIOLENCE IN PRISONS: A LITERATURE REVIEW

As numerous authors have pointed out, prisons are not pleasant. At their worst, they are threatening, dangerous places (Toch 1976, 1977; Jacobs, 1977; Irwin, 1980 and Fleisher 1989). In the late 1980's, there were a series of riots culminating in the Woolf report and subsequent recommendations for reform (1991). Since that time, there have been a number of changes to the control and running of prisons. The most major upheaval resulted in agency status. The transition to which left a number of employees wondering about their role within the service and a number of prisoners wondering about their rights.

In an atmosphere of change and confusion, the potential for discord has been high. Unfortunately, the previous research literature did not provide enough information to properly prepare for the effects of such upheaval. For example, when trying to assess the psychological ramifications of living or working within such an environment, fear has not really been on the research agenda. Apart from Toch in America, previous researchers who have written about violence and aggression in prisons either ignored fear or asserted that it exists without giving systematic evaluation of the incidence or nature of any such fear. In this country, the closest applicable research was carried out by Walmsley, Howard and White (1992) and by Liebling and Krarup (1992). Respectively, they asked prisoners whether they felt safe or whether they had "problems" with other prisoners.

The four chapters after this one report on the first English survey of fear in prisons.[1] This chapter presents a review of some of the literature concerned with violence in prisons. It was an interest in the effects of such violence that had led to the original focus on fear. The review is limited to such research because although this author recognises that fear may well be associated with factors other than direct intimidation, the previous literature on imprisonment suggests that violence and any associated fear is the type of fear of the most (not to say only) concern. The next chapter presents the design of the study undertaken. In total, one hundred and sixty eight adult, male prisoners and fifty officers participated in this study (including pilot subjects). Chapters five, six and seven present the results from one hundred and fifty prisoners and fifty officers.

There were methodological concerns that the female researcher would be unable to gain any responses regarding fear from any participants. However, there was a very low refusal rate and a surprising number of prisoners and officers reported that they had felt afraid whilst in prison. The nature of the fears, the places in which they were experienced and the measures taken to cope with them are also reported in subsequent chapters. These findings were of practical use as well as theoretical interest. Shortly after the interviews had been completed, a number of recommendations were made to the governing governors of the prisons concerned. On the day of

---

[1] The researcher is grateful to the Prison Reform Trust for funding the expenses associated with this part of the thesis.

publication of the report, (Adler, 1994) one of the prisons also held a press conference to indicate the changes that they had made. One of the other prisons subsequently replicated some of the more disconcerting findings and acted upon them accordingly.

INTRODUCTION

From the work described in the previous chapter, it seemed clear that violence and fear were normal to prisoners. Given the machismo culture in prison and that the interviews were completely free ranging, it was surprising to find that participants were willing to reveal any amount of fear to a young, female researcher. The experiences of the participants were important when interpreting demonstrations of fear. For example, one of the prisoners displayed a number of symptoms of mental disorder and the fears that he expressed could, in all fairness, have been attributed to paranoia. However, personal characteristics do not completely account for the findings. Other contextual explanations may be more appropriate. One such account relates to prisoner movement around the institution. If prisoners move about a prison unescorted, then there are likely to be more opportunities for self "regulation". In another vein, changes imposed by the Prison Service can have serious side effects on the daily running of establishments. For example, some time after the completion of this study, it was predicted that the reduction in eligibility for temporary releases imposed in 1995 would raise tension and result in a degree of loss of control.

The survey of fear was carried out in 1993. As already mentioned, this was a time of change. It was in this year that the Director General of the Prison Service introduced key performance indicators to the new look Prison Service "agency". One of the most important K.P.I.'s was that of time out of cell. It was a stated aim of the Service that prisoners' time out of cell should be radically increased (although the original minimum level has now been re-set as the maximum). In some cases, time out of cell was increased from one hour a day to 13 hours a day. However, this K.P.I. was implemented without an increase in facilities or resources for training, education, etc.. In fact, by January 1995, the stated aim was to cut rehabilitative programmes. This meant that prisoners could "associate" for longer but what they did during association seems to have been of little concern. Until this year, there was no assessment of "purposive activity".

One need not be particularly cynical to believe that an increase in association between prisoners might well be related to increases in fearful encounters. "Might is right" is a phrase that has been used to describe the rules of prison and fear may be expected to pervade the atmosphere (McVicar's preface to Cohen & Taylor, 1981 and Sapsford 1983). As an attempt to combat some of the potential harm linked to violence, the Home Office also launched an anti-bullying campaign in the autumn of 1993. They sent out information packs that detailed the signs of bullying and how to tackle it. The packs stated that levels of bullying and violence in prisons were not really known. It is uncertain whether we can ever be sure of the actual levels of intimidation, extortion and violence that exist in a prison. The stigma of being marked as a "grass" is very real and has tangible, often violent, repercussions. This may result in reluctance from those most at risk to articulate their fears

to anyone connected with the Prison Service. Yet, a number of prison psychologists were given the task of measuring bullying rates, etc..

Increased rates of assault and general victimisation are likely within an increasingly crowded environment. The foreseeable problems associated with the ever rising numbers of prisoners may be worse than those experienced through the 1980's as prisoner demographics are shifting. With continuing "bifurcation" (Bottoms 1977), there is likely to be a growth in the proportion of long term prisoners. It is worth noting that the population profile of such prisoners is also changing. The average age of prisoners in "lifer" assessment centres may be falling (internal memorandum from "Pluto"). This is partly because fewer people are being convicted of domestic murders. At the same time, there seems to be an increase in the numbers of younger individuals being sentenced for non-domestic murders. Younger prisoners are usually harder to control than older ones. The changes in parole, limits placed on temporary release, reduction in wages, implementation of "volumetric control" (to say nothing of Mandatory Drugs Testing) and growing realisation that tariffs are frequently ignored mean that the number of malcontent prisoners may rise. As ever, control is a "hot topic" for the Prison Service.

In 1977, Toch outlined practical and theoretical reasons why loss of control and prison violence are important. Firstly, the prisons reflect a society's codes of behaviour as they are a public agency. However, secondly the violence that occurs within them is often not made public nor is it subject to outside control. This is exacerbated by the powers of prison officers. Toch's fourth point is that if the violence becomes excessive, then it will result in public opinion repercussions that may destroy faith in a government. He continues: "Jails and prisons, moreover, have a climate of violence which has no free world counterpart. Inmates are terrorised by other inmates and spend years in fear of harm. Some inmates request segregation, others lock themselves in and some are hermits by choice. Many inmates injure themselves" (p 53).

Cooley (1993) cites Fattah (1991) who states that prisoners are "disposable or expendable" victims because they are viewed by non-criminals with hostility and antagonism: "Whatever victimization they suffer, especially while they are behind bars, causes no uproar or even concern among the general public, who couldn't care less what happens to them." It is fair to conclude that the level of violence would need to be extremely high to be of concern to the general public. Even then, concern may well be driven by budgetary constraints rather than an interest in welfare.

The types of violence that might actually result in societal concerns have also been identified by Toch (1976). He stated that prison conflict management has four core issues: prisoner riots; force used by custodial staff; prisoner assaults on other prisoners and violence committed by ex-prisoners after release. During the late 1980's, British television pictures of prisoners dancing on roofs and setting fires added to the pressure for changes within our system. Riots have previously been triggered by poor food, supervision, classification or medical care. Riots also reveal staff powerlessness, because they force staff to resort to violence (Toch, 1976 and Woolf, 1991).

Grievance procedures and the prison ombudsman may be able to diffuse violence and it is a good idea to build problem solving procedures in to the system. However, resolution of problems within

the Prison Service requires radical shifts in officer and prisoner roles. Such new roles can be hard to incorporate within any prison environment be they "played" by the officers or the prisoners. Both groups have been characterised previously as displaying intransigence towards one another (Mathieson, 1965 and Cohen & Taylor, 1981) yet they each rely on the other to maintain a level of order that enables smooth functioning of the prison environment. If order is lost completely, then riots ensue. However, a certain degree of disruption is probably inevitable as violence affects and is affected by staff and prisoners. It is to the perceptions of these two groups that the chapter now turns.

Prisoners' perspectives on violence

The two main physiological and psychological responses to a threat are to fight it or to flee from it. If a prisoner faces a threat and fights, the fight may lead to retaliation, potential loss of self control, or a response from the staff or from other prisoners relating to safety and status. The flight option would almost certainly result in loss of status and may lead to continued victimisation. It is regarded as unmanly and requires further testing. Yet, prisoners do exercise the flight option in a number of ways. A prisoner can seek protection from a low pressure peer group, can "keep his/her head down" while (s)he "does her/his time" thereby restricting social contact or can limit such contact to completely superficial interactions. Toch, 1992 concludes that the prison subculture of violence is maintained by anomie and alienation. The majority of prisoners ignore the violence that is perpetuated by the minority.

Irwin (1980) and Fleisher (1989) both report on invidious gang violence. This had been foretold by Toch (1976) who stated that we could not predict how much future violence would consist of group membership based incidents but we did know that they would occur because of the values "engendered by prison". He listed reasons for prison violence. Violence can be sex related, both to prevent and to get sex; it may also be used to regulate contracts or to exploit the weak in personal situations. The decisions to avenge and in how much proportion to the "offence" are private and can result in loss of respect whether taken or not. For example, if too much retribution is taken, then fear but not respect will be incurred. Fleisher (1989) tells us that the most common reason for assault is sex, the second is debt. As Toch concludes:

> "There is a two-fold tragedy here. First, inmates who are most susceptible to victimization are the most inviting targets for it; and the more obviously a man suffers, the less he is able to defend himself, the more likely he is to be pursued. Second, the norms of the game--those of manliness--protect the aggressor. Since the aggressors conform to the dominant manly concerns of prisons, their victims are unlikely to find solace or aid among peers, or among staff... Prison violence, like other violence, affects more than its victims. The typical aggressors--mostly, hard-core offenders, reinforce the worst in themselves. Their success strengthens their premise that violence is the means to life's goals, that toughness buys status, and that terror "sells." Aggression makes the abuse of others the measure of pride; it cements membership in retaliatory or predatory groups. It confirms staff stereotypes of clients, which translate into fear, suppression and disdain... Staff demand public pretense and private cynicism. It brings increasingly indiscriminate enforcement and scapegoating. Inmates who are punished--those caught clinging to the iceberg's tip--are embittered. They may react with hate. Others continue to "do their own time." To do so means to close one's eye, one's heart, and one's mind. It means self-centered values, parochial loyalties, noncommunity. It insures psychological survival, but at the expense of dehumanization" (Toch, 1976, p 64).

In attempting to assess the extent of systematic violent encounters, Cooley (1993) implemented a criminal victimisation survey in five federal Canadian prisons to 117 prisoners. Forty seven per cent of the sample reported 107 separate incidents of victimisation. Personal attacks and their threat (robbery, sexual assault, assault, threats and extortion) were more frequently reported than property victimisations (theft and vandalism). The most serious types of incidents accounted for the smallest percentage of reported incidents. The most common type of incident was assault. It was reported in 46% of personal incidents and 28% of all victimisation (thereby demonstrating the variance in possible definitions of "assault"). Those who did not report assault reported the threat of it during the incidents recalled. Weapons were present in 22 out of 65 personal victimisations and were used in fifteen assaults. Thirty-two of the 55 victims reported one victimisation incident, whereas 23 of the 55 reported more than one incident during the 12 month period including 6 victims who reported four or more victimisation incidents.

Although violence may not be manifested daily, the threat of it is to be expected and the ways that prisoners react to violence and cope with it will be associated with how they react to incarceration in general. McCorkle (1992) found that older men in a maximum security prison displayed distinct avoidance behaviours when fearful. In contrast, younger men used the prison culture as a source of status and employed more aggressive or violent means to deter attacks. Wright (1991) examined 942 prisoners who had been classified either as violent or as victimised. Two types of "predatory inmates" were identified: those who have trouble relating to other people and those who are likely to assault another person. Victimised prisoners were found to lack the necessary experience to cope with the predatory environment. In addition to these findings, the above studies also demonstrate that violence can be used as a tool to progress through a prisoner hierarchy as well as a means of protection against the violence of others.

In such an environment, it is not unreasonable to assume that people will feel fear. Indeed, a certain level of fear may be necessary to maintain a sufficient degree of awareness to provide self protection. In the National Prison Survey conducted in English and Welsh prisons, Walmsley, Howard and White (1992) found that, when asked, 18% of prisoners said that they did not feel safe. Nine per cent said that they had been assaulted by another prisoner in the previous six months. Thirty-five per cent of those who were afraid, were afraid everywhere but particularly in showers and toilets. A higher proportion of Asians than of White or Black prisoners said that they had been assaulted but the difference was not statistically significant. Thirty-two per cent said that prison officers did not do enough to protect them. Those who felt safe were, unsurprisingly, those who thought that the prison officers provided security. Of those who felt scared, 33% said that they felt at risk all the time; 17% said they were scared during association and 15% said that they were fearful when they were out of sight of officers. Besides racial fears, 10% of prisoners who did not feel safe were scared of "those who think they run the prison" and "unbalanced (or) mental cases."

Earlier work had tried to identify prisoners in the same position as those who were always afraid. Toch (1992 (originally 1976)) adopted a traditional individual differences approach and concluded that certain types of prisoner will be more affected by fear than others and that some prisoners become "obsessed" by fear. "The high safety person lives in a world of low trust, high vigilance,

uncertainty and discomfort. Danger occupies his mind, circumscribes his actions and governs his awareness" (p 56). The implication is that such an obsession reveals more about the fearful prisoner than it does about prison. The author of this thesis recognises the differences in the personal implications of a fearful environment yet contends that prisons are inherently fearful places. Further, the rules and norms of society outside prisons are so different that imprisonment itself induces the high need for safety. "The high safety person" could not be identified were it not for incarcerative conditions.

Officers' perspectives on violence

Prison officers have to be able to manage violence directed at themselves, each other, non uniformed staff and, of course, at the prisoners. Cooke, Baldwin and Howison (1990) give advice to officers on reasons for aggression within prison. As they say, aggression may be for gain, it may be related to a prisoner's internal state, it may be associated with discomfort in their surroundings and may be exacerbated or calmed by others' responses to expressed aggression. Within a prison, the factors that may also raise internal tension have been mentioned before. These would include loss of autonomy, loss of control over outside scenarios, enforced unemployment or lack of meaningful employment. Cooke et al. also recognise the stresses that impinge upon staff. Based on research from America, they conclude that: "The rate of stress disorders does appear to be higher in prison employees" (p 127).

In 1994, the Prison service produced a report that stated that 58% of prison officers had worried about their safety at some time (Prison Service, 1994). Fleisher (1989) paints graphic illustrations of American prison violence. "It is the responsibility of all male employees to respond to emergencies, women never respond and [officers or] guards directly supervising prisoners do not leave them" (p 202). (The quotations below are drawn from throughout Fleisher's book. As its title suggests, the book depicts extreme violence as normal and catalogues its banality.)

"In my experience at scenes of violence, I found that whatever the degree of an inmate's injuries [from cuts to fatal stabbing], staffers' reactions are fundamentally the same: faces are exemplars of dispassionate concern, expressionless with eyes open wide; they efficiently assist injured inmates; they effectively manage inmates who are hanging around watching. They never panic, raise their voices, or lose control" (p 202). Later on in the chapter, Fleisher describes a killing that was associated with establishing the hierarchy within a gang: "If an outsider had walked in and watched us, he never would have guessed that this was a murder scene and that we had just been involved in a murder investigation... There was no sense of violence or killing or death at the scene... Inmates milling around outside the cellblock knew there had been a killing. Their mood was light, excited, cheerful, airy, and friendly, almost as if to express a sense of relief, knowing that now a murder might not happen again for quite some time" (p 208).

As in police services, there may be the systematic exclusion of outsiders and culture creation amongst staff. The staff have to prove themselves and are united. They often feel that they can not share their lives and stresses with people who are not prison based. "Wives don't understand...

They don't know what a triple duce is or a body alarm; forget about the shank that's got your name on it. As wives grow older, they begin to understand. New hacks' wives don't understand anything" (p 209). The culture also prevents them from sharing with one another. Like the prisoners, staff have to "do their own time". "Trust in fellow officers is a fragile thing. You're trusting them with your life. I know that two men here are cowards. I've seen them back off... Experience trusts experience. If you've got seven or eight years with years in federal institutions, it follows you along. Rookies have to prove that you can trust them: his actions, his willingness to work; he isn't bashful, he'll give orders; how he looks and how he acts when inmates are around" (p 209). "I don't respond to (new) guys until I see blood on them--his or an inmate's. I want to see blood" (p 210). "Formal records don't show who acted at scenes of violence, but that doesn't matter since everyone remembers. Staffers who ran quickly, and those who ran slowly; those who arrived first, and those who arrived last; those who got involved, and those who backed away, are all included in hacks' stories" (Fleisher, 1989, p 221).

Fleisher reports that attacks on staff are rarer than those on prisoners and that officers are more likely to intervene to prevent attacks than to be causing them. Despite this, Fleisher presents us with a view of two extremely antagonistic groups, the officers and prisoners. "Thug is the neutral term for "con" over here. [Of course], it is more difficult to have a personal relationship with a thug than with John Smith from L.A. who has a wife and two children. Thugs are not human beings. If you start thinking about inmates as humans, you can get killed. Fucking thugs aren't human beings" (p 230).

Earlier, Toch (1976) had reviewed the manuals given to American correctional guards. He reports that there is only one section (in them all) that refers to a prisoner officer relationship in any terms other than adversarial or supervisory. The codes prohibited the development of interactive relationships between prisoners and officers. In quoting from the New York state manual, he reports that "no employee shall engage in any conversation, communication, dealing, transaction, association, or relationships with any inmate or former inmate or any visitor, friends or relative of any inmate or former inmate in any manner or form which is not necessary or proper for the discharge of the employee's duties". Even if such rules are liberally applied, they translate into subcultural norms which promote the "trench warfare climate in the prison yard" (p 60).

In Fleisher's study, one "guard" who had worked for twenty years is quoted as saying "Violence bothers you. No one likes to see the mess or stand in the blood, but you can't talk about it that way. You have to act like it doesn't bother you" (p 231). Hughes and Zamble (1993) report that previous studies have linked the job of prison officer with high rates of heart attacks, suicides, alcoholism, divorce, physical assault, tension-related illness, and significantly lower average age of deaths. However they conclude that Canadian correctional workers do not fit the old stereotype. The Canadian service is not paramilitary and has implemented detailed support services for their staff. The result has been that the officers cope with a number of stresses and are generally satisfied in their working lives.

The literature presented above supports the contention that violence is a usual part of prison life. It also allows one to predict that fear is likely to be present. Fear may be alleviated if the proper support services are in place, however without successful strategies for coping with fear, it may become unmanageable. The following four chapters report the design of and findings from a study designed to test for the presence of fear within the Prison Service and the means of coping with any fears that may be expressed. Chapter four presents the design of the study, chapter five provides the contextual framework that is necessary to interpret the findings of fear presented in chapter six and chapter seven discusses means of managing fear in prisoners and prison officers.

CHAPTER FOUR

DESIGNING A SURVEY OF FEAR

There is a large body of literature assessing aggression and violence. There is also physiological evidence relating to pain and cognitive psychological material on anxiety. However, there is a dearth of experiential research into fear. Keane (1995) reports that both "formless" and "concrete" fear (Figgie, 1980) share many characteristics and are affected by psychological intimidation. That such intimidation takes place in prisons is undisputed but little is known about its effects. One likely effect could be the widespread manifestation of fear. In order to establish if fear does permeate the prison environment, there was a need to systematically test for its existence in prisons. Thereafter, any fears reported, could be investigated further in terms of quality, severity and impact. In other words, the primary purposes of the research presented in chapters four to seven were to see whether people in prison did feel fearful, whether they would admit it, the extent of any fears and how they coped with such fears.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Much has been written about the nature of violence, and in particular, violent offenders (e.g. Box, 1971; Toch, 1972 and Dobash & Dobash, 1984.) As there is much less published material relating to the implications of living with and perpetuating institutional violence, it was decided to focus on its ramifications and associated variables such as the incidence and nature of fear in prisons. As mentioned above, within a prison, there are factors which can increase the risk of violence and those which can decrease it. Megargee (1982) points to the level of petty frustrations within prisons as an example of a situational variable that might be associated with violence. Alternatively, good relationships between officers and prisoners are proffered as means of reducing the potential for violence. However, as Cooke (1989) concludes, an improvement in relationships between staff and prisoners relies on initiatives being taken by members of both groups.

As well as situational variables, research has assessed individual differences. As part of the survey of victimisation in Canadian prisons, Cooley (1993) compared non-victims with victims. The people who were victims were younger, housed in higher security settings, and in the early stages of their sentences. In common with many victims surveys, the findings suggested that there is a degree of homogeneity between prisoners as victims and prisoners as aggressors and lend support to Bowker's description of the aggressor-victim relationship as a "macabre version of the game of musical chairs in which today's aggressor may become tomorrow's victim" (1980, p 31). Therefore, situational variables such as those mentioned above must be important.

Other relevant findings from Cooley include that the survey rate of assaults was 5 times higher than the official records. Even when fights were added, the incidents were being underestimated. This is matched by the finding that staff awareness was patchy, only 2% of property and 36% of personal violence incidents came to light. (Still leaving 62% undetected.) When compared with a matched

sample from outside prison, prison rates of criminal victimisation were higher. However, there is a twist to this as Cooley found that more prisoners are likely to be assaulted but victims outside the prisons are assaulted more often. The main conclusion was that violence permeates the environment causing "physical, emotional and monetary loss not reflected in official figures."

Two common methodologies that could be adopted to assess fear (rather than actual incident rates) in prisons are the use of an anonymous questionnaire or a confidential interview. It is to be expected that participants will be reticent about discussing such matters. Despite this, Walmsley, Howard and White (1992) received answers to questions asked about safety as part of the Home Office's National Prison Survey. They found that eighteen per cent of prisoners said that they did not feel safe. Nine per cent said that they had been assaulted by another prisoner in the previous six months. Thirty-three per cent of those who were afraid, were afraid everywhere but particularly in showers and toilets.

Liebling and Krarup (1992) found that two thirds of vulnerable prisoners reported difficulties interacting with other prisoners. Forty-three per cent of the comparison group of prisoners who were not classed as vulnerable also reported problems. They found that younger prisoners and those "on Rule 43" experienced the most problems. Over one quarter of suicide attempts were related to pressures from other prisoners. Thus it would be consistent with these findings for younger and more vulnerable prisoners to be more likely to experience violence within English prisons and for the scale of the problem to be underestimated by both the official figures and staff predictions.

An approach relying on questionnaires was not favoured for three main reasons. Firstly, it is much harder to elicit detailed qualitative answers. Secondly, if literacy is a problem, then there will be a group of prisoners who are excluded from participating and thirdly, the response rate to questionnaire studies tends to be lower than in face to face interactions. Therefore, it was decided that an interview design could be successfully adopted. The paradigm is outlined in the rest of this chapter.

The study

The project was designed to provide an overview of prisoner and staff fears. It was not intended to be a definitive piece of research. The aim was to add to the limited evidence that is available to date and, what is more important, to identify those questions that have yet to be asked. It was predicted that fear is affected by a number of different variables. These could include: the age of the prisoners; the race of the prisoners; the gender of the prisoners; whether they have been sentenced or are on remand; the classification and structure of the prison; prisoners' accommodation; prisoners' opportunities for work and the type of work on offer; the type of offence committed; the type of previous employment of the prisoners; the ways that the staff interact with prisoners; staff:prisoner ratios and the ways that staff and prisoner levels of fear interact. The research attempted to address most of these variables but it was not possible to control for them all

in the time available. The study is concerned with prisoners and officers drawn from category B and C male prisons.

Interviews were carried out in three prisons: A life sentence assessment centre at "Pluto", two wings at "Uranus", the remand wing and the Vulnerable Prisoner Unit. The third prison was "Jupiter". Participants there came from two wings. These wings are identical in structure but A wing is for the most vulnerable prisoners and those who requested extra help in coping with imprisonment and D wing, is a category C prisoner wing with a higher than normal proportion of "Rule 43" prisoners.

On each wing, at least 30 prisoners and 5 officers were interviewed using one of two structured, open ended interview schedules. The participant samples from each wing were matched for age. At least fifteen prisoners under 30 and fifteen prisoners over 40 were interviewed on each wing. The samples chosen reflected the racial make up of each wing at both of the age groups.

The two main independent variables were the prison wing and the category of offence. The main dependent variables were levels of fear and worry in prisoners and officers. These were assessed from responses gathered in interviews. The same researcher conducted all interviews between June and August 1993. Each interview lasted about 30 minutes but there were exceptions. The shortest interview took 10 minutes and the longest took over 2 hours.

METHODS

Participants

The selection of officers was opportunistic. Those officers who were on the shift rotations that coincided with the researcher's visits were asked if they would like to participate. The selection of the prisoners was more "scientifically" random. Two age groups of under 30 and over 40 were selected as representing "older" and "younger". Past research has shown that violence seems to be more prevalent among younger prisoners than older (for example McCorkle 1992). Thus there may be differences in the incidence of fear among younger and older groups. On piloting the project, it was found that the most convenient age groups would be under thirty as "younger" and over "forty" as older.

In Uranus and Pluto, lists of all the prisoners on the selected wings were obtained using "LIDDS" the Prison Service's computer system. These lists contained at least the following information: Prisoners' numbers; names; ages; offences and racial classification. The lists were used to compile a racial profile of the prisoners under 30 and over 40 on each wing. The racial profiles were then used to calculate the proportions of people of each ethnic group that should be selected from those on the wing. The desired numbers were ascertained and prisoner participants were randomly selected from each age group to compile a racially representative group of 15 prisoners under 30 and 15 prisoners over 40 from each wing.

In Jupiter, the Governors would not permit the unmodified use of the method of recruitment. Before selecting any prisoners, the researcher gave a presentation of 15 minutes followed by 15 minutes of

questions on each of the wings. Only 15 prisoners came to these presentations and it was hoped that 60 prisoners would participate. However, all of those who attended the presentation, volunteered to take part. Of these prisoners, 7 had also "come up" on the random selection and 4 of them fell out of the age range. It proved to be impossible to schedule an interview with one of the remaining 4 volunteers. However, all the rest of the volunteers were interviewed. The 4 who were in the "wrong" age range have not been included in the statistical analyses. The three volunteers who were in the correct age ranges and did not come up by random selection have been included in the analyses as their custodial adjustment did not seem to be better than that of the other 57 participants, indeed, one of them was markedly poor at coping.

Having been selected, participation in the project was voluntary. Before each interview, diary bookings were made with the relevant wing office. At the scheduled time, the prisoners were brought to the interview room (category B) or made their own way there (category C). Before they went in, the interviewer told them that the study was being conducted with the Prison Reform Trust and that it was about everyday life in prison, day to day routines, problems and fears. They were told that the interviews were confidential and that participation was voluntary. They were then asked whether they wanted to take part.

Three prisoners refused to take part in Pluto and one in Uranus. All said that they were more concerned with forthcoming appeals. One refused in Jupiter but then changed his mind and took part. One prisoner died the night before he was due to be interviewed. Those who took part in the project received a more detailed explanation before their interview began (see below). Prisoners who did not take part were replaced with prisoners of the same age and racial group, also randomly selected from the lists. In total, 168 prisoners participated in the study (18 took part as pilot participants or those who were in the wrong age range).

Fifty officers participated. Of these officers, 4 were women, 49 were white. Wherever possible, female officers and those, of either gender who were not white Caucasian, were interviewed. At least one senior officer was interviewed from each wing. The time that the participants had been an officer ranged from 1 year to 27 years. The modal time that they had been officers was 18 months. Details of the sentences and ethnicity of the prisoner participants are shown in Tables 1-3. The classifications used are those employed by the prison service computerised system LIDDS.

Table 4.1 Numbers of prisoners serving different lengths of sentence.

Awaiting Deportation	Remand or Unsentenced	1.49 years or under.	1.5-3.49 years	3.5-7.49 years	7.5-17 years	Life
2	30	4	23	48	15	41

Table 4.2 Types of offence of sample.[1]

Property, etc.	Violence	Murder	"43 Type"
34	14	33	65

Table 4.3 Ethnic breakdown of sample.[2]

WH	BA	BC	BO	AB	AI	AP	AO	OT
117	3	18	3	8	1	2	7	9

Data collection

Twenty-five to 35 minute long interviews were carried out with each participant. Having obtained his or her consent, the participant was shown into the interview room. The preliminary introduction given was as follows: "Hi, my name's Joanna, I am carrying out some research, with the Prison Reform Trust, into life in prison. We're looking at everyday life, problems and any fears that you might have. Your name has been selected at random and if you choose to take part in the interview, your confidentiality will be assured. Participation is voluntary and the interview will take about half an hour. Would you like to take part?" Any preliminary questions were answered and the participant was shown in to the room. The interviews were usually conducted in the interview room on the wing. Occasionally, participants were interviewed at their place of work or in the education department.

The first part of each prisoner interview was used to explain the nature of the research and to introduce more fully the researcher to the participant. Then, the protocol used was as follows: "As I said, I'm Joanna and I'm working with the help of the Prison Reform Trust. This research is about life and fears in prison. If you don't have any, great. If you do, then maybe we can talk about them. I don't work for the Prison Service and I can guarantee your confidentiality. However, that confidentiality is obviously limited. If, for example, you were to tell me something that was a breach of security like you're planning on taking a hostage, or killing someone or killing yourself, or something like that, then I'm going to do something about it! If you want to see what I'm writing, please ask, if you can't work out my scrawl, I'll read it back to you, should you ask. If at any time, I say something that you think doesn't make sense, say something to me. It's likely that it is because

---

[1] It is not possible to list all of the offences of which the participants were accused or convicted. This is because some of them did not disclose the information to the researcher and they were listed in the records as simply being held on a holding warrant.

[2] The following classifications have been adopted from those used by the Prison service. They reflect the racial mix of the prisoners on the wings that participated.

WH=White, BA= Black African, BC= Black Carribean, BO=Black Other, AB=Asian Bangladeshi, AI=Asian Indian, AP=Asian Pakistani, AO=Asian Other, OT=Other.

whatever I said didn't make sense. What I said may have been confusing. If you want to stop at any time and add anything to what you've said so far, then please stop me and say that you want to go back. If at any time, you want to ask me anything, please do. That includes now, is there anything that you want to ask me before we begin?"

The most common question asked related to where the results would go and who would see them. To avoid any literacy problems, the questions were read out by the researcher. The responses were recorded by the researcher and the participants jointly. Periodically, the interviewer read back answers to the participants. None of them asked to read through the scripts. One participant was deaf and dumb but did not want to write his answers. The interview was carried out in a mixture of mime, lip-reading and notebook and pencil. This prisoner was the only one who checked everything written by the interviewer. All the data was recorded by means of "paper and pencil".

When opening the interviews with the officers, most already knew what was going on and the introduction was less formal. Still, all officers were assured of (their limited) confidentiality and voluntary participation was also stressed. After the results had been analysed, all participants received a summary with contact details so that they could obtain a full copy should they be interested.

During the actual interviews the following procedure was adopted: participants all had a copy of the protocol as did the researcher. If monosyllabic responses were given, then the first approach adopted was to wait. Many participants then filled the silence. If they did not, they were asked if they wanted to add anything to that which they had stated or to enlarge upon it. Some of them did, others did not. Those who did not were asked if they were sure, or if they were happy to go on. In some cases, the researcher was not convinced that the participant had understood the question asked so it was rephrased. On other occasions, the researcher offered to read back that which had been recorded already then said something along the lines of "now, where were we?" In the majority of cases, participants spoke quite freely. Natural pauses occurred at the end of each question whilst the researcher was (sometimes frenetically) writing down the response. This probably encouraged longer answers. The most difficulty was encountered with about ten participants who all had extremely large amounts to say. Often the material was tangentially relevant to the questions asked thus some very long scripts are now lurking in a filing cabinet. Where the material was not at all relevant, participants were gently encouraged to return to the subject when their discursions became or threatened to become exhaustive.

Materials

The interview protocols that were used are shown below. One was used with officers and one with prisoners. Fear is an intangible construct and it is unclear how many of the fears that a person has will ever be communicated to another person or even admitted by the scared person to him/herself. It would therefore seem best to adopt as sensitive a questioning manner as possible when investigating fears. The National Prison survey results were obtained by means of questions thrown in as part of a barrage of fact gathering. Nevertheless, Walmsley, Howard and White received both affirmative and negative responses to questions about fear. Liebling and Krarup's (1992) relevant index was based on questions to prisoners about whether they had "problems" with other prisoners or with staff.

The interview protocols used in this research were constructed with both of these approaches in mind. They were also designed to take into account the work of Figgie, 1980 who referred to two types of fear: "formless fear" and "concrete fear". Formless fear relates to a general feeling of vulnerability whereas concrete fear is more specific. For example, by asking whether a person feels afraid at work, one may be tapping into formless fear. Whereas by asking whether a specific area has been associated with previous incidents, the participant may be given a chance to report more concrete fear. The first few questions on each protocol were biographical but not necessarily contentious. The next section of the interviews included questions about daily interactions, then built up to questions about others' fears before dealing with the possible worries, then fears of the participant him/herself. For example, question 17 on the prisoner questionnaire allowed participants to talk about areas that may be insecure for other people. It was included as part of the attempt to deal with these matters sensitively. The last section was designed to ensure that the participant was not left feeling uncomfortable by the matters under discussion.

As can be seen below, question one on the prisoner protocol provided background information and served as a somewhat crude measure of validity. Question two was to check for institutionalisation of the participant. Question three pertained to the participant's assessment of the regime. Questions four to eight were designed to examine interactions in the context of various aspects of incarcerative life. Canteen and gym were thought of as being particularly prone to potential intimidation. The resources in any prison cannot permit every prisoner to exercise at once, least of all in the gymnasium (should there be one). Given the mundane nature of most of the alternative pursuits during "time out of cell" and the power of "might", it is perhaps not surprising that bigger and slower men may be seen to be using the equipment more frequently than their faster, smaller peers. Prisoner canteen is much more than a trip to the school tuck shop. Using their limited wages (approximately £6-8 per week), the prisoners purchase phone cards, tobacco, extra foodstuffs, cards for family, etc..

Having attempted to assess various contexts of fear, the next section of questions (7-17) relates to the nature of interpersonal reactions. There are two sets of people of whom prisoners might be afraid, their peers and the staff. By asking about any problems experienced and degree of contact,

it was hoped to add to any understanding of the nature of fear and any avoidance techniques employed. The last question of this section asked prisoners whether there were any areas that other prisoners might find to be unsafe. This question was designed to elicit information that prisoners may feel uncomfortable revealing if asked directly about themselves. By question eighteen, it was hoped that a degree of confidence in the researcher would have been established and that prisoners could be asked directly about their concerns and how they coped with such worries. Having spent time on those worries, the final research question on fear was asked. The rest of the questions were not only good practice but allow for extra relevant material to be elicited.

The officer questionnaires were designed around the same model. First a measure of their experience was taken, then their adjustment to working in a custody setting and assessments of the routines were noted. Again, the next section was concerned with their interpersonal relationships and, like the prisoners, began with the out group. It was felt that officers would be more favourably disposed to discuss their peers had they previously discussed members of the "other side" thus questions about colleagues followed the questions about prisoners. No assessment was made of where officers felt other officers might feel unsafe however, officers were asked where they felt that prisoners would feel unsafe. This not only fulfilled a similar role to question seventeen on the prisoner questionnaire, it allowed an assessment of officers' awareness of the concerns of those prisoners in their charge. Again, questions on the nature of any worries and fears, their severity, frequency and management were followed by the closure section.

After the interviews had been conducted, they were coded and entered into SPSSPC+ for limited statistical analysis. The questionnaires used are shown below. The coding sheets and examples of coded transcripts are presented in appendix 1 at the end of the thesis. The three chapters following this one present and discuss the results obtained. Chapter five provides the context for fear. It is concerned with custodial adjustment and assessment of prisoners and officers. Chapter six outlines the findings directly related to the incidence and nature of fear in prisons and chapter seven reports on how participants cope with their fears and their suggestions for improvements. The importance of interpersonal relationships to the management of fear are discussed and some tentative conclusions drawn that are tested in subsequent chapters.

Prisoner questionnaire

1)   Sentence length and type, any prior sentences?

2)   Do you feel that prison life is different to life outside? Y. (How so?) N. Straight to 3.

3)   What's the overall routine like in here?

4)   Do you go to the gym?   (N->6)

5
- a) How often do you go?
- b) Who decides how often you go there?
- c) Are there set amounts of time that you can spend in the gym or can anyone go there at any time?
- d) Why do think that it is organised in this way?

{6)
- a) How often do you go to canteen?
- b) When you go, do you go with anyone else?
- [c) How often do you see him/her/them?
- d) When?]}

7)
- a) Do you do any work in the prison?
- [b) How do you get on with the people there?
- c) Would you describe them as friendly?]

8)
- a) Are you doing any training/education?
- [b) How do you get on with the people there?
- c) Would you describe them as friendly?]

9)   What do you think of the staff on the wing?

10)   Do you generally get on with them?

11)   Do you have any problems with them?
- [a) What sort?
- b) Do they happen regularly?]

12)   What do you feel about the officers?

13)   Overall, how much time do you spend with other prisoners?

14)   What do you think of them?

15)   Do you generally get on with them?

16)   Do you have any problems with them?
- [a) What sort?
- b) Do they happen regularly?]

17)   What areas of the prison do you think that other prisoners find to be unsafe?

18)   Do you ever feel worried about going anywhere or doing something in prison?
- [a) What worries you?
- b) When?
- c) When is it worst?
- d) Where are you the most worried?
- e) What do you do to feel less worried?
- f) Is there anything that could be done to make you feel less worried?]

19)   Do you ever feel scared?
- [a) What scares you?
- b) Do you feel generally fearful, or is it more specific?
- c) When?
- d) When is it worst?
- e) Where are you the most scared?

f)   What do you do to feel less scared?

g)   Is there anything that could be done to make you feel less scared?]

20)   How do you feel about talking about things like this?

21)   Do you want to add anything to what you've said so far?

22)   Is there anything that you want to ask me?

Closing.

Officer questionnaire

1)   How long have you been an officer?

2)   Do you feel that prison life is different to life outside? Y. (How so?) N. Straight to 3.

3)   What do you feel that the overall routine is like?

4)   What do you feel about the prisoners?

5)   What do you think of them?

6)   Do you generally get on with them?

7)   Do you have any problems with them?

[a)   What sort?

b)   Do they happen regularly?]

8)   Do you think that prisoners ever feel worried about going anywhere or doing something in prison?

[a)   What worries them?

b)   When?

c)   When is it worst?

d)   Where are they the most worried?

e)   What do they do to feel less worried?

f)   Is there anything that could be done to make them feel less worried?]

9)   Do you think that prisoners ever feel scared?

[a)   What scares them?

b)   Do you think that they feel generally fearful, or is it more specific?

c)   When?

d)   When is it worst?

e)   Where are they the most scared?

f)   What do they do to feel less scared?

g)   Is there anything that could be done to make them feel less scared?]

10)   How many colleagues do you have on the landing?

11)   Do you feel part of a team?

12)   Do you have confidence in those with whom you work? I don't want any names.

13)   What do you think of the other members of staff?

14)   Do you generally get on with them?

15)   Do you have any problems with them?

[a)   What sort?

b)   Do they happen regularly?]

16)   Do you ever feel worried about going anywhere or doing something in prison?

[a)   What worries you?

b)   When?

c)   When is it worst?

	d)	Where are you the most worried?
	e)	What do you do to feel less worried?
	f)	Is there anything that could be done to make you feel less worried?]
17)		Do you ever feel scared?
	[a)	What scares you?
	b)	Do you feel generally fearful, or is it more specific?
	c)	When?
	d)	When is it worst?
	e)	Where are you the most scared?
	f)	What do you do to feel less scared?
	g)	Is there anything that could be done to make you feel less scared?]
18)		How do you feel about talking about things like this?
19)		Do you want to add anything to what you've said so far?
20)		Is there anything that you want to ask me?

Closing.

CHAPTER FIVE

CUSTODIAL ADJUSTMENT AND ASSESSMENT-1993

This chapter gives the necessary information preceding an examination of the fears expressed by participants. As mentioned in the preface, context is not only interesting but vital for meaningful interpretation of research. It is therefore contended that fear must be placed within its proper milieu in order to be understood. This chapter illustrates participants' responses from those that fulfil this requirement. By gathering information relating to prisoners' and officers' feelings about their environment and the people within it, a picture of life and interactions within gaols may be constructed.

The picture presented is drawn within parameters that were considered most likely to be relevant to fears in prisons. The nature of prison environments and cultures have filled the pages of a number of dissertations, articles and books. The primary purpose of the custodial assessments collected as part of the current study was not to add to debates about prisonization (Clemmer, 1940). Rather, it was hoped that questions at the start of both interview protocols would provide information about the participants and their relationships that could help to explain other findings relating to fear.

For example, information about prisoners' offence types may help in the identification of particularly vulnerable prisoners who had not been segregated. In a similar manner, by asking prisoners and officers for their ratings of their regime, a measure of satisfaction was attained. Such a measure could have been useful should fear be found to vary between wings. Quotations reflecting participants' attitudes towards punishment and the effects of imprisonment are also included within this chapter. They remind us that prisoners are members of society and hold similar views to the rest of us. Prisoners may also display pro or anti social attitudes that could be associated with their behaviour both inside and outside custody.

REGIME ASSESSMENTS AND INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT

Prisoners

Of the 150 prisoners interviewed, 8 said that life inside was no different to life outside. Table 5.1 below shows the prisoners' ratings of the regimes of the various wings of the prisons. As can be seen, the majority of prisoners interviewed were fairly positive about their prison routines. Whilst 33 people rated the routines as OK or boring, only one prisoner said that his routine was very bad. It is not really surprising that remand prisoners are strongly represented in the "O.K. or bored" category as they have little opportunity for work or education. However the lifer assessment unit at Pluto seems to hold prisoners who were less satisfied than those further on in their sentences or than those given a lower security classification. Prisoners on D wing in Jupiter (the medium-to-low security cat. C wing) seemed to be particularly satisfied with their routine.

Table 5.1   Ratings of the routine (all numbers are actual).

	VERY GOOD	GOOD	O.K., BORING	BAD	VERY BAD
PLUTO	0	17	13	0	0
JUPITER A	7	19	5	0	0
JUPITER D	12	13	3	0	0
URANUS REMAND	4	15	10	0	0
URANUS VPU	3	23	2	0	1
OVERALL	**26**	**87**	**33**	**0**	**1**

If staff prisoner interactions are at all important, then prisoners' attitudes towards routines would be expected to be related to their ratings of the staff. When asked about the staff, most of the prisoners spoke about the officers on their wings but a few included civilians in workshops or governors, none included probation, etc.. Table 5.2 shows the prisoners' ratings of staff. (More information about staff prisoner relationships is included in chapter six.)

Table 5.2   Prisoner ratings of staff.

	VERY GOOD	GOOD	INDIFFERENT /DEPENDS,	BAD	VERY BAD
PLUTO	1	6	15	7	1
JUPITER A	6	5	17	2	1
JUPITER D	3	8	18	0	1
URANUS REMAND	6	5	16	2	0
URANUS VPU	0	8	15	4	1
OVERALL	**16**	**32**	**81**	**15**	**4**

As table 5.2 shows, Pluto seemed to gain the poorest ratings but the staff on the Uranus VPU also seemed to be rated slightly below par. The differences were not in the predictable direction but they are not statistically significant. Prisoners from Pluto were at the start of long sentences and are reliant upon staff to write reports that may influence the rest of their sentences (and lives). This means that there is the potential for a certain degree of discordance. However, the general feeling in prisons is that Vulnerable Prisoners are usually relatively easy to manage. Relationships on a VPU would be expected to be better than normal, not worse.

When asked if they get on with the staff, 132 (88%) of the prisoners said that they did and 16 (11%) said that they did not. Of those prisoners who did not "get on with the staff", 6 were from the Uranus remand wing and the rest were dispersed between the other wings. Thirty-nine (26%) of the prisoners reported problems with the officers. Half of those reporting problems said that they were rare. Although there were no significant differences, the most frequent reports of problems came from Pluto and from Uranus VPU. Four prisoners on each of these wings reported daily problems.

Officers

Officers were generally positive about the regime. When asked about their routine, 21 officers described it as good, 21 as OK and 4 as bad. When asked if they get on with the prisoners, 44 officers said yes and 2 said it depends. However, thirty-three officers said that they had problems with prisoners. Of those 33 officers, 12 said that they had problems rarely. Although not

statistically significant, there tended to be differences between the prisons. More Uranus (cat. B) officers reported problems and more often than officers at the Pluto lifer assessment unit (cat. A). These officers, in turn, reported more frequent problems than did officers from Jupiter (cat. C).

Overall, the majority of prisoners and officers were satisfied with the routines imposed. However, two thirds of the officers and 26% of the prisoners reported problems with members of the other group. Liebling and Krarup (1992) used the reports of "problems" as an index related to distress and the potential for self harm or suicide in prisoners. It is probably a fair assumption to make that problems reported will be associated with fear. This is examined further in later parts of this thesis as well as in the discussion at the end of this chapter. As well as relationships with the out group, within group problems existed and peer group relationships are examined in the section below.

PEER GROUP RELATIONSHIPS

Officers' evaluations of their peers

As part of an attempt to evaluate inter officer relationships, the officers were asked if they had confidence in those with whom they worked. Thirty-six of them did and 9 did not. None of those nine came from Jupiter, they were evenly split between the remaining three wings. Only one of the officers interviewed reported that he did not get on well with his colleagues. However, eleven officers reported problems with their colleagues. Seven of those officers who reported problems said that they were rare. One officer reported monthly problems, one reported fortnightly problems, one reported weekly problems and one officer reported daily problems with his colleagues. All four of the officers who reported fairly frequent problems were from Uranus. Hence it is possible to conclude that generally relationships were good but 20% of the officers did not have confidence in their colleagues and 22% reported peer group problems.

Prisoners' evaluations of their peers

The most general question about interactions between prisoners was whether each participant got on with the other prisoners. Out of the whole sample, 15 (10%) of the prisoners said that they did not get on with the other prisoners. However, a number of prisoners said that the reason that they did get on with other prisoners was that they were very select about the people with whom they mixed. In other words, if they mixed with more prisoners, they probably would not "get on well". This higher number is reflected in the finding that 30 (20%) of the prisoners reported that they had problems with other prisoners. Of these thirty prisoners, 17 said that the problems were very rare, 4 said that problems occurred monthly, 2 said that they happened twice in a month, 1 reported weekly problems and 6 reported daily problems. If one again draws on the implications made by Liebling and Krarup, then such prisoner problems may be of concern. However, it is important to note that frequent problems are anomalous.

When asked whether they "got on well with people at work", 44 (29%) of the prisoners said that they did, 55 (37%) said that they got on "OK" with the people at work, 1 (less than 1%) prisoner said that

he got on badly with the people at work. He was on A wing in Jupiter and reported that he had been assaulted at the workshop. He said that he had not reported this incident officially. Of the prisoners who were working, 89 said that their work mates were friendly and 11 stated that they were not. There were also a series of questions that related to educational opportunities at the prisons. Out of the prisoners interviewed, 98 were not taking part in education with other people. A few of these prisoners were taking correspondence courses from their cells but the vast majority were not taking part in any organised education. Out of those who followed educational options, 18 prisoners said that they got on well with their classmates and 34 reported that they "got on OK" with the others. Only one prisoner said that his classmates were not friendly.

From the information presented thus far, we can conclude that there is usually satisfactory progression through each day. There are problems experienced both within and between groups of prisoners and officers but they do not dominate the picture. The rest of this chapter gives more qualitative information to enlarge on participants' experiences.

Custodial adjustment and assessment

This series of excerpts from transcripts demonstrates that the prisoners' assessments of regimes varied from satisfied to ambivalent and malcontented.

"I'm comfortable as I can be. This is not a bad place to spend time. As pleasant as it can be. It's what you make of it. Attitude is everything."

"After Walton, this prison is relaxed and reasonably pleasant. There should be more snooker etcetera for otherwise there's bound to be trouble. This could be a good prison and if it's compared with the likes of Walton. It's all better but there's room for improvement. We're all slung into a big melting pot which can be difficult for the stable ones. You can be threatened--give me some burn-- it can get threatening. It's happened a couple of times, but I felt in control."

"I'm getting on all right here. About two and a half years to do. I think I'll be all right in here. I'd have been more anxious if I'd stayed in Leicester. Thirty of us locked away most of the time. In Leicester we were segregated, it's very different. Some of the officers treat you differently there, more unfriendly. Here, the general attitude is quite friendly. Some more than others though."

"It's getting better, with more association and decent food, it will be better."

"This prison will go up as it's known as a "nonces" prison. You get some who will make a point of not being one. Some rules are petty, the food is just passable and it's dog eat dog in here. You either survive or you go under."

"Remember that you have to bear in mind the race. It's the biggest problem. Here, there is an unwritten law for the Black man and one for the White man. For example food habits. They say that any Black should adapt so we lose part of our identity. It's going to get to a stage where it's going to blow up. When Blacks realise they have an identity, it's going to lead to riots. Colour is one of the biggest factors. Officers don't know how to handle prisoners who are different. You're

taking away a Black man's identity. [Uranus] has oppressors and oppressed. The majority of the time, Black prisoners swallow their pride."

"They shouldn't let prisons get too easy. People can take liberties. I know what I'm here for, I'll do my bit quietly and do it. But particularly, the heroin, you need officers to stand up to them. Conditions and convicted visits could be better. Drugs will get involved over at the visits and so on. They have done the right thing with D wing by breaking wing up. It stops people wandering in and out and nicking stuff."

"This prison doesn't give you any incentive. College gives you less money than cleaning. It's strange how they operate. Should have incentives to get educated but this place isn't relaxing enough. I'd like it to be run like school--talking to class and checking and helping and revising. No routine to settle in to."

"I just want out of here. Get some work as quickly as possible. Not even got off the wing. I don't want to be off the landing. I want to stay where I am without having to look over my shoulder all the time. Just let me do something, education, work--what are you supposed to do?"

Facilities

To a certain extent, the regime within a prison is determined by the facilities and staff levels available. Whilst staffing levels were not quantified, prisoners did have comments to make regarding the facilities in the gaols in which they were held: "This is a very old wing. When it rains, it leaks and comes in. It's depressing for screws as well as us. Nothing to occupy our minds. If it was more relaxed with a pool ladder or something like that. More things on the wing to take the tension out of it."

"The cells are too small. You suffer in the hot weather, no fresh air in the cell. A long time prisoner needs a bit of space. Bird, toilet, sink, TV's, etc. but no plugs. We have to buy batteries. People are putting plugs in illegally which will cause problems. Could put in electrics and charge £1 a week."

"I don't eat the food, I buy stuff from canteen. I just can't do the food. It's never hot. I get hot food at court, a small amount but it's hot. Some really load up. I go down only for hot water."

"When is the food going to get better?"

"Maybe the food; but bathing facilities. You get one bath a week, one shower, one kit change a week is unhygienic. It's--what about when you're convicted? No own clothes, no kit change. It's inhumane, it's wrong. Need to wash clothes overnight and wear them the next day. We should have showers on each wing. Cleanliness. If that part was sorted out, it wouldn't be such a bad prison. The business of association too. Improve these 3 things and life would be lot better, they'd have an easier time as well. And work, it's inadequate, how can you be banged up for 23 hours a day? Imagine nothing, absolutely nothing. On B wing, they'll relate. A lot of things happen which people don't know about."

"The hygiene is terrible, it's terrible, I've been here 11 days and today's the first shower that we've had. Toilets are filthy, people just don't care. It's barbaric. They are trying to change it, but it takes money and time."

"On visits, there's only a gangway separating the 43's from the main." Therefore, the prisoner was concerned for his own safety and that of his visitors. Such a concern is realistic and is reflected in the following quotations from different "vulnerable prisoners". "I'm cautious because I don't want to be labelled outside the system." "I'm concerned about my family. There's been threats to me and to my family because of the threats. Got to sort out a place for me as I can't go to my family. I don't feel happy but I've got to do what I can."

"I'm not happy about the situation. In a sense, it's a mistake to have the whole wing of sex offenders but at least in the wing, I feel comfortable. I wouldn't last on B, C or D wings. I wanted to be anonymous as far as possible not tell them about my profession. I don't want them to have a handle on me. I got a lot of grief in other prisons and I hoped that I would be anonymous here. It's awfully difficult. I've got enough problems without feeling uncomfortable. I'm thankful that I've only got 5 months to go. I haven't found a solution. They don't get shipped out fast enough. Must bring segregated people in on separate transports not segregate them within buses as we get labelled. One of the prisoners has been a pain in the neck. He shouldn't still be here. There's a danger of nutcases taking over the asylum. It's a good prison by and large, well run. Ethos is right. A little bit more could be done. There's so many young lads, they're just angry. Law has not worked. A bunch of sex offenders is a good target."

Effects of imprisonment

As mentioned in previous chapters, the research into the effects of imprisonment has been mixed. Participants in this study made some relevant remarks that might contribute to the debate. They frequently mentioned concerns regarding their families as well as their own loss of autonomy. "In the background, there's a lot of threat to individuality. They pressure single prisoners and can make life hard for other prisoners if they really want to go out of their way to do it. It wouldn't happen in the same way over there (within the main part of the prison). People would go off, here 80% wouldn't want that. On a Vulnerable Prisoner Unit, we're always the last to get things, rules to be cleared. A lot of victimisation from staff."

"The problem is not the sentence, it's what comes after it. Then I come in. You go from having a 3 bedroom home and family and then you have nothing. You can't even get house insurance as you have to explain or declare it. If you get a job, you are very lucky. It comes to release and you could have no accommodation or money in your pocket. You'd be lucky to get a bed and breakfast for a week."

"It's what you make it. If you keep moaning and groaning from day to day. Don't do the crime if you can't do the time. It's a lesson to be learned in here. Some people don't worry, it's part of their life. Who knows? Next time, you could come in for something entirely different. Another wing opens

and association is open, they have more problems. They know what they are doing here. If you look for trouble, you'll get it. No doubt about that."

"No matter what the perks are, when the door slams, you're still in prison and your freedom is denied."

Relationships with people outside prison

To many prisoners, the maintenance of relationships with people outside is a complicated, difficult task as well as one that is extremely important. A bad visit or "Dear John" letter has been blamed for many incidents on wings. Even though they were not directly asked about such relationships, a number of participants made pertinent remarks. Examples of these are shown in this section.

"Visits, there are times when they come from afar, they have to wait for AV's ["Accumulated Visits"] for transfers. Prisoners should be kept nearer families. If you ask to see someone in here, they are willing to see you. With lifers, there should be some independent body who comes in from time to time to talk to particular people who find out how they feel--problems etcetera what they would like."

"I just want my home." "I'm 220 miles from home, missing everything."

"They should build accommodation for wives and that to come in. They should give us home leave, even for just a weekend. While appealing, we should go home on a regular basis as it keeps the connections. I'm very lucky that I have a good wife and family. A lot have lost their families and their wives. Everything should be done to keep families together."

"My wife wants me back. She's kept by me. She's as good as gold. I like to know she's all right. I want to do my time and get on. I hope that I get home leave."

"I was set to go away for 4/5 years. I lost my wife, got drunk, flipped out and now, I've lost her. She was worried, through my stupidity, I've lost her. If I wasn't going down, I'd be in hospital. Now I've got a bit of hope. If I've got nothing, I'm going to get involved. I need a base but I can't do it walking out with nothing. I haven't got a life to go to at the moment and that's what worries me."

"Last night, I felt that I was going out of my mind. I had family, grandchildren, dogs. I've shed a lot of tears for them since I've been in prison. All the things that matter can be taken away. I'm just hoping to hell that I can hold on to my sanity. One grandchild has been born since I came in. I can't even get a picture of him. Everything is building up and it's just, I keep seeing things from the same point of view. If things don't change, I'll turn into something that I haven't been for a long, long time. My feelings will change. The SOTP (Sex Offender Treatment Programme) has brought it all back to mind, it screws me up a bit."

"Prisons are tough, expensive places for everybody especially families. Tough on children at school. You wake up one day and--children are number 1's on the landing."

It is not surprising that prisoners have strong opinions about the nature and purpose of imprisonment and such opinions are outlined further in the next section.

Purposes of imprisonment

"Economically, prison is quite unsound." "They don't encourage learning, they want you in the workshops. They don't encourage education. I'm looking at it for when I get out."

"I would like to see some progress. People are kept in prison for too long in a detrimental way. It might keep some one out of society but they are rotting away. And even if they don't do anything physically, verbally, they will influence people. I do it myself now. It's weird now. There's too many people in prison and if they send half home tomorrow, maybe they could do something with the other half."

"There are rules and umpteen guides for prisons. There are still certain things that might help. You get a system where a person is eligible for parole--quite often you say, you're waiting can you have home leave? Then you know you need to get on to a group. But then you can't get a group, particularly if you profess innocence. It defeats the object. You get set back and punished even further. Then, you've got to find the next step but that's risk assessment and that wasn't really wanted. Goal posts keep getting moved back."

"Prison used to supply you with a suit before you left. Now, unless you've done 5 years, all you get is a pair of trainers, pair of jeans and a wind cheater. There's nothing done by prison to try to ensure that when people go out, they can cope. They have left it to probation which is now a joke as most of that is left to personal officers. My own probation officer has been seconded to visits for the next 6 months and no one has been put in his place. There's my personal officer who to date, hasn't even been to me to say hello. My visitors do more for me than anyone in the Prison Service."

"Prison doesn't help the prisoners in the sense that things come and go much the same or worse as prisoners don't confront their position. Staff need to make you confront what you've done. They have to convince someone that what they did was wrong. Need to take action to say prison serves a useful purpose. On the whole, it's a waste of time because they are still trying to correct the behaviour patterns."

"The only point of prison is for the sort of person who can not walk 2 paces without killing someone. Certainly not a deterrent for a hardened crook. (Asked about alternatives) Organise them, get them to do something. Make prisoners do something that does the world some good and then you'd do some good, they'd think "this is a new thing, doing things for other people". Half of these people, 2 seconds later and they haven't got any money left anyway. In prison, it's out of your hands. If a decision is made, that's it. You don't get to argue. That is one slightly frightening thing."

However, for sex offenders, particularly those held on Vulnerable Prisoner Units, treatment is not only offered, it is "encouraged" through the sentence planning schemes. "I've had several sentences unfortunately, but I have never had treatment. It's started now and conditions have improved drastically." "The only way that I could get a transfer was to go on a group." "On other wings, S.O.'s are living a lie, on this wing, you have to do therapy before you can get home leave."

"This prison is a bad, bad place, you turn things over. If I didn't have The Bible, I'd be so revengeful. All my career, what I've worked for, it's all circumstances. You come out, back to the

streets therefore you reoffend. They don't understand. I'm not a nonce, I'm going around with all that crap. This is a bad prison. People have to learn that there are rules and there will be wrongs but if I go to court, and I get a prison sentence, then g-d will have to save me as I'll be very revengeful and crafty. Too smart, I'll beat the system."

"This prison could be a lot different. More time out of cells, let people associate with each other. Prison is not a deterrent from stopping you from coming back. Giving same solution each time doesn't stop him. May be they need to find out what motivation people have to commit crime. I'm 24 and I've been inside since I was 14. When I was 11, I was in children's homes. Cot corrupted even more. In prison, you meet people, plan things, learn things. To me, it's like sometimes I feel institutionalised, it's all water off my back. But for my family... that's what hurts me. If I was alone, I could do this. It's got to stop. This is all I've ever known, how to make money , never learnt to hold a job down, to respect money. There's always the drugs and everything."

Comments about the system

Prisoners made a number of comments and pleas regarding the way that the legal system succeeds, or fails. Examples of the remarks are reported in this section of quotations. They are presented with only limited interpretation as they are not usually directly linked to fear in prisons.

"I wish that we could get away from the Victorian values of prison. More association, more cell association for long term prisoners. More opportunities for the younger members. Outside exercise in summer evenings. A fixed sentence for murder with licence to keep men more calm."

"Sometimes I feel that as an Asian, I feel that I get a harder sentence. My crime was domestic, my wife, some people get a tariff of 4 years, some 10. I got 15. I can't understand why. I pleaded guilty and still got a harsh sentence."

Some prisoners spontaneously showed remorse and a number demonstrated shrewd cynicism in the ways they characterised their peers. "I'm ashamed for what I've done." "Unless you push, prisoners will stagnate in their cells." It was also suggested that, "if categories are going to stay, they should take account of people's attitudes." In common with some previous findings (e.g. Cohen and Taylor, 1981) a number of the participants were concerned about the possible deterioration of their mental health. This was particularly so during the early parts of an indeterminate sentence, "It takes too long to get your tariff. There's too much uncertainty. People lose it in the first 2 years when they don't know. I've been waiting 16 years. I know that I've got a life sentence but not the tariff."

"Those that need to be enlightened are your politicians and trouble. Tariff on basis of do x, y and z. We spend billions on other countries but not on our society. To disabled, or OAPs, there is no such thing as society. It defies the word. Let's have charity at home. We all want an environment to live in. Push it to politicians and governors. Give governors more authority. We don't like prison. Anyone who does has a serious problem but you can get things done. You don't mess about and

put governors on the block. If you mess up, you mess up for everyone else as well as yourself. You have to get an insight."

"Nothing can be changed. They should have a watch dog thing. The older ones know exactly how-- they have their firms. Prison Officers' Association or whatever, they are protecting each other. Talk behind the doors, how to deal with stuff. The only way is having some people watching. The Board of Visitors is just a waste of time because they claim to help you but powers are only limited to what the governor says. They have no power to override therefore they just act the same as the officers therefore they are hand in hand with screws. I go straight to a governor to avoid the games."

Although some of the prisoners were clearly sceptical about the roles of the officers, a number of the officers themselves demonstrated feeling as frustrated as those in their charge. Officer morale was not high and was probably related to the changes in their job structure, shift patterns and job security. A few, representative examples of the officers' views are presented in the last short section of quotations.

OFFICERS

"We don't always employ the right people. They don't get through... many are too young. The limit should be put up to 25 so that they live a bit and see a bit of life to understand the hardships of life."

As reported above, a number of officers mentioned or gave indications of low morale. However, the sources of frustration were not always expected. "Morale is very poor. It's Prison Officers' Association caused. Prison Officers' Association is fighting implementation of things that already seem to be working elsewhere. We should be working for our money but we shouldn't just be one person on a landing... It's abysmal that things get stuck in pockets, you have genuine blokes here... give us a fair crack of the whip, probation, psychology."

"We concentrate too much on needs of prisoners, should pull in more "victim confrontation". My job is under threat and we feel like we are victims. Reforms can be made but they should be monitored."

"Since Fresh Start, we have stopped looking after people because they can be replaced. It doesn't take much for prisoners to feed off this and that reflects on staff morale... If you show loyalty, then the "firm" should respond to that. They're detached really."

CONCLUSIONS

It is hoped that this chapter has provided the reader with a contextual framework for the fears reported in the following chapter. Overall, there is a certain level of discontent amongst prisoners and officers. The level of frustration amongst officers may be surprising. However, it is necessary to remember the changes that were being made to the Prison Service at the time of this study. Although riots were not as common as they had been in the recent past, their repercussions were being felt by prisoners and officers alike.

A number of the findings resonate particularly clearly. Prisoners are incarcerated because they have broken the law. They do not volunteer for imprisonment and even if they feel that their punishment is fair, they are unlikely to be thrilled by the prospect of serving a gaol sentence. Therefore, it may be surprising that any prisoners can see life inside as being no different to life outside. The eight prisoners who report no difference are likely to score highly on measures of institutionalisation. Perfectly reasonably, the majority of prisoners did not seem to be over enamoured with their situation. They stated that life inside gaol was not desirable and unlike that outside. Given that finding, it is encouraging to note that the prisoners largely rated their routines as being good. Of the prisoners who responded, 77% said that their routine was either good or very good; 22% were indifferent about it and less than 1% of the responses (one prisoner) rated the routine as being very bad.

The prisoners' positive views contrasts slightly with those of the officers. Officers were as likely to be indifferent towards their routines as to be positive (46%) and 8% of the officers who responded, rated their regime as being very bad. It is possible that officers' indifference could reflect disinterest during the research interviews. This is probably not the case as they tended to be positive when asked whether they felt that the exercise had been useful. The finding of indifference and negativity is pretty reflective of the situation at that time. It could reflect officers' feelings of being out of control due to changes imposed upon them. That the prisoners are positive whilst the officers are not, may indicate that the "law and order pendulum" had swung into prisoners' favour or that they were encouraged by the platform of reform that was introduced post Woolf report (1991) and "Custody, Care and Justice" (Home Office 1991).

Most of the prisoners were indifferent towards the staff, their custodians but there is some variation. However limited its scope, the very existence of such variation may be encouraging. It implies a degree of separation and awareness that would not be typically demonstrated by members of groups with so many incentives to be negative about one another. This is reinforced by the relatively low number (26%) of prisoners who reported problems with the officers. Both prisoners and officers reported problems within their peer groups (approximately 20% of each group) and although 66% of the officers reported problems with the prisoners, there was little to indicate the severity of such problems. It is possible that most were trivial. Even if seemingly unimportant, problems are not irrelevant. As already mentioned, Liebling and Krarup used reported problems as an index related to suicide and self harm.

It is likely that problems are associated with fear. However the relationship between problems both within and without one's peer group is probably less than simple. For example, the finding that people are having problems may be positive as it at least demonstrates that they are interacting. Within a prison, the person who may be most fearful, may report the fewest problems because (s)he only leaves the cell when forced. In a similar manner, if prisoners are locked up all the time, then they cannot interact with anybody. An alternative yet equally positive explanation is that through trivial problems, officers and prisoners become better acquainted and relationships are built that may reduce feelings of fear. Of course, the results of increased interaction may be negative. It is intuitive to suggest that if there are many problems, then there will be a high level of fear because

the problems reflect a lack of control and order. Before beginning to address such speculations, it is of course necessary to examine the findings pertaining to fear directly. These are presented in chapter six.

CHAPTER SIX

THE INCIDENCE OF FEAR IN PRISONS

This chapter presents the findings directly concerned with fear. As reported in the previous chapter, the interpersonal relationships within the prisons were generally good. As this is the case, it might be expected that little fear would exist. However, the findings also showed that there were a number of problems reported. Given that both officers and prisoners reported problems with their peers, it might be expected that some of them may be afraid of their peers.

This is not the only potential source of fear. Previous literature suggests that officers and prisoners are not particularly positive about each other. Although this study provides evidence to contradict that view, the previous chapter also demonstrated that there were problems between officers and prisoners. It is possible that either group may be afraid of the other but it is more likely that prisoners would fear officers as the officers are (at least supposedly) the ones with more power.

The current project was the first study of fear in the Prison Service but it was designed to add to the findings of Liebling and Krarup (1992) and the National Prison Survey (Walmsley, Howard and White, 1992). Before reporting the results from the current study, it is perhaps useful to remind the reader of the most salient of the previous findings. The National Prison Survey reported that 18% of prisoners were concerned about their safety. Approximately one third of those who were afraid were always afraid and the areas that were of the most concern to them were the toilets and showers.

If the current results are compared to those of Liebling and Krarup (1992), then it has been shown already that both prisoners and officers experienced problems amongst and between each other. However, the results of the current study show a lower incidence of prisoner problems with one another than has previously been found. Liebling and Krarup found that 66% of vulnerable prisoners and 43% of their comparison group of prisoners reported difficulties interacting with other prisoners. In the current study, 20.4% of prisoners reported problems with other prisoners and 26% reported problems with staff. This study was the first to assess staff reports of problems. Twenty-six per cent of staff reported problems with their colleagues and 66% reported problems with prisoners.

The rest of this chapter discusses the incidence and nature of fear in prisons. It begins with the findings from questions 18 and 19 on the prisoner questionnaires which correspond to questions 16 and 17 on the officer questionnaires. Having identified physical and psychological areas of concern to participants, the chapter moves on to possible explanations of these findings.

ARE PRISONERS AND OFFICERS AFRAID?

When asked purely about incidence rather than type or frequency of fear or worry, 22% of prisoners reported feeling worried and 51% reported fear. Thirty-five per cent of the officers reported feeling

worried and 67% of them reported fear. It seems that despite the good relationships portrayed in the previous chapter, half of the prisoners and two thirds of the officers do feel fearful some of the time.

The results demonstrate a higher incidence of fear than could have been inferred from the National Prison Survey. The higher incidence may be related to the use of interviews rather than forced choice questionnaires. Through the use of open ended questions and by taking time to ask about custodial adjustment and assessments, etc., the researcher had the opportunity to build up a degree of rapport with the participants and the participants could develop themes of personal relevance. Also, questions about fear followed those relating to worry. It is possible that the questions about worry may have been acting in a manner similar to the "foot in the door technique". Participants who had already acknowledged worries may feel less reluctant to disclose feelings of fear.

Of course, an opposing effect might also have occurred. Those people who did not report worry may have felt that they could not report fear in order to be consistent. However, this did not seem to be happening. In both groups, approximately twice as many participants reported feeling scared when compared with the number who were worried. It is possible that by asking about worries first, machismo resistance was depleted. These findings demonstrate that not only is fear prevalent within prisons, but it can be researched further. With appropriate methodology, people will reveal fears and concerns even to a young, female psychologist.

The participants in the current study were also asked whether their fears were general or specific. In the National Prison Survey, 33% of those who worried about their safety did so all of the time. In the current study, of those who felt scared, 13% said that they felt at risk all the time. However, this apparent discrepancy is actually a replicated finding. In the National Prison Survey, the third of concerned prisoners who were constantly worried constitutes approximately 6% of the entire sample. Within this study, the proportion is similar. Thirteen per cent of the 51% who reported fear in this research is equal to about 7% of the whole sample. Thus, the proportion of prisoners who are always afraid seems to be about the same in the two surveys. These are probably the prisoners in the greatest need of help and may well correspond with Toch's group of "high safety" prisoners.

WHERE ARE PARTICIPANTS MOST WORRIED AND FEARFUL?

The methodological advantages of the design are again demonstrated when one moves to a consideration of the nature or type of concern expressed. Unfortunately, a possible disadvantage is also revealed. Although more participants reported feeling fearful than worried, the variables that were associated with their feelings of worry and fear seemed to differ very little. In fact, the same things seemed to worry participants as to cause them fear and there were no statistically significant differences between the identified types of worry and fear.

Participants' descriptions of what worried or scared them were compared on a within subject basis. What appears to have been happening is that participants who report feeling worried about something usually carried on with the same theme when asked about their fears. This could be because they worried about feeling afraid; because over time, their worries had developed into fears and they felt worried about and fearful of the same things; because they did not consciously differentiate between the semantic requirements of the questions or because they already had the idea in their heads (a recency effect). All of these scenarios are logically consistent and no more light is shed by those participants who did not report feeling worried but did report fear. As mentioned above, there are a number of reasons why a person might disclose more in response to the second question than the first. Therefore, a null finding relating to worry does not necessarily mean that the participants really do not worry (but, it may).

However difficult to interpret, the finding that remains is that where both worries and fears were reported, they tended to be of the same things. Accordingly, data from these two variables were collated in the construction of the frequency tables below. Table 6.1 shows where prisoners and staff feel that they are afraid. The percentages shown are proportions taken from the numbers of prisoners and officers who expressed fear or worry (in themselves or others), not from the whole sample set. The table is divided up as follows. Column 2 reports the areas that prisoners state concern other prisoners. Column 3 presents the areas that prisoners are concerned about themselves. Column 4 illustrates the areas that the officers perceive as being of concern to the prisoners and column 5 reports on those areas which are of concern to the officers themselves.

Table 6.1   Areas of concern in the prisons.

	PRISONERS	%age response	OFFICERS	%age response
	Areas other prisoners fear	Areas you fear	Areas prisoners fear	Areas you fear
Anywhere	8	-	-	-
Association	-	-	14	-
Away from officers	3	1	2	9
Block	-	5	4	7
Cell	7	25	23	9
General pervasion	-	13	-	-
Main (from VPU)	9	1	7	-
Passages/on movement	10	1	7	-
Recesses	14	3	4	-
Showers	7	1	1	-
Situational	1	6	-	48
Workshops	1	-	12	-
Around officers	1	-	-	-
Away from alarms	-	-	-	1
Badly lit areas	-	-	-	1
Church	1	-	5	-
Court	-	-	2	-
Crowds	2	-	5	2
Depends on the offence	5	-	-	-
Exercise or open spaces	2	-	5	-
Gym	3	-	-	-
Hospital	2	3	1	-
Hot plate	-	4	4	-
Hot water	1	-	-	-
Kitchen	1	-	-	-
Landings	-	-	1	9
Library	1	-	-	-
(Mind games	-	1	-	-)
Off own wing	4	6	7	-
On own wing	1	-	-	-
Outside escorts	-	-	-	2
Reception	-	-	5	-
TV Room	2	-	-	-
Visits	1	4	-	-
VPU	2	-	-	-

When prisoners were asked where they felt concerned, 25% of those who reported fear said that they were most concerned within their own cells. Thirteen per cent reported that they were generally fearful (as mentioned above) and in contrast to the previous literature, only 4% reported that they were worried or fearful in recesses or showers. However when asked where they felt that other people might be concerned, a slightly different picture emerges. Twenty one per cent of the prisoners stated that other prisoners would be concerned either in the showers or in recesses whereas only 7% felt that other prisoners would be worried or fearful within their cells. Prisoners also highlighted the potential problems faced as they move or are escorted through prisons. This is particularly the case for prisoners coming from a segregated wing. The differences between

reported areas of personal concern and areas identified as being of concern to others imply that this group is demonstrating "pluralistic ignorance" of shared concerns (Rosenbaum and Blake, 1955).

Table 6.1 also shows that there is some discrepancy between the areas identified by prisoners and those identified by staff. Forty-eight per cent of the staff felt unsafe only in the context of certain situations whereas 6% of prisoners identified areas of concern in terms of the situation. Unsurprisingly, it appears that the officers felt insecure if unsupported. However, their presence did not seem to reassure prisoners. Nine per cent of officers were scared when they were out of the sight of their colleagues and only 1% of prisoners were concerned when away from the officers (3% reported that other prisoners would be concerned).

The area in which the most participants felt worried or fearful was prisoners' cells. As well as the 25% of prisoners who were worried in their cells, 9% of staff felt insecure in prisoners' cells. Whilst this may be predictable when regarding staff, it is worrying that the one place in which prisoners might be able to feel secure, their cell, is that most likely to be reported as where they feel fear. However, it is worth noting that 23% of staff felt that the prisoners would be worried or fearful in their cells. This is the area of concern for prisoners most consistently identified by the staff and it is the area most identified by prisoners. (This finding is discussed further in the discussion later in this chapter). Another "area" in which prisoners feel concerned and officers are aware of their concerns is during movement. Ten per cent of prisoners were concerned about the corridors or movement and 7% of officers identified this concern. The majority of these remarks came from prisoners at HMP Jupiter who reported muggings on the unstaffed corridors down which they moved unescorted.

WHAT WORRIES OR SCARES THE PARTICIPANTS?

In the same way as there were identifiable areas that concerned participants, there were particular situations or events that they associated with fear. Table 6.2 below shows those things of which prisoners and staff are afraid. Here too, there is a discrepancy between officer and prisoner concerns. Sixty-five per cent of officers and 9% of prisoners were afraid of situations of which they feel they may not be in control. Seventeen per cent of the officers and 4% of the prisoners were worried about unpredictable or "mental" cases. Overall, some officers are aware of most of the prisoners' concerns with one exception. Twenty-two per cent of officers thought that prisoners may be worried by bullying and 7% thought that they may have problems with debt. None of the prisoners identified either bullying or debt as a problem although 7% of prisoners feared assault.

Prisoners were worried by various things that included the effects of imprisonment on their families and on their own mental states. Of the factors traditionally associated with fear, for example violence or confrontation, 7% of prisoners feared or worried about assault; 1% was concerned by segregation; 5% of the prisoners from the Vulnerable Prisoner Unit and Jupiter A wing were worried about threats from the main prison; 3% worried about the effects of being labelled by their offence. These participants made up 7% of the sex offenders who were worried or frightened. Two per cent of prisoners were afraid of the officers and 6% of the other prisoners. Six per cent were afraid of

prison itself, 3% of what they could do themselves, 9% of situations that could arise and 5% were worried by the uncertainty of their situation. The table below illustrates the prisoners' and officers' concerns:

Table 6.2   Types of fear and worry.

	PRISONERS (%AGE)	OFFICERS (%AGE)	OFFICERS (%AGE)
	Of what are you scared/worried?	*What scares/worries the* **prisoners**?	*Of what are* **you** *scared/worried?*
Assault	7	2	-
Bullying	-	22	-
Effects on Family	7	8	-
Offence	3	11	-
Other prisoners	6	15	-
Situational	9	-	65
Unpredictable or "Mental" prisoners	4	1	17
Alarms	-	-	2
Association	-	-	2
Being enclosed	1	-	-
Block	1	2	-
Confrontation	-	2	-
Coping	5	-	-
Court	1	1	-
Debt	-	7	-
Disorientation	-	6	-
Drugs	-	1	-
Food poisoning	1	-	-
Getting more time	3	-	-
Ghosts	1	-	-
Groups	-	-	2
Hot Water	1	-	-
Loosing rest	1	-	-
Main from VPU	2 (of whole) or 5 (of those on the VPU)	-	-
Not getting parole	2	-	-
Officers	2	4	-
Prison	6	5	-
Property	-	1	-
Psychologists	-	1	-
Reception	1	-	-
Release	5	5	-
Returning	1	-	-
Rubbing down Sex Offenders	-	-	2
Rumours	-	2	2
Security dogs	1	-	-
Self	3	-	-
Sexual abuse	-	1	-
Staffing Levels	-	-	2
Staying sane	5	-	-
Stigma	2	4	-
Stress	-	-	4
Uncertainty	5	2	-

The following series of quotations illustrate participants' perceptions of fear. They range from those who depict the normality of fear (and its power) to the high safety, extremely fearful prisoner. "Fear is abstract but it's real. Fear in prison is when they bang the door. It can be so great that it sends you off your mind. After a while, you realise that they haven't thrown away the key, you accept privation. But, it's still unnatural so you come to terms with things. That's the position."

"In here, it doesn't matter what you do. As a con, you can't trust things being written down. Don't trust the screws, don't trust the cons. Paranoia is what the prisons built. The one thing that I've learnt is patience."

"Just if you've got blood and guts fights. Should be some sort of segregation, a fellow a few months ago, got life for stealing a bike and a watch. You're sharing tendencies of psychopaths and all to protect public. He's stuck straight on here because he's a danger to the public so shoved in here. He should be getting medical treatment not just be left to get on with it."

"I'm not able to cope with it. And they walk around with hardware, knives. They're playing head games. I don't trust probation. I left Grendon too soon. I keep my back to a wall at all times, alert, my eyes are everywhere. I walk around with my precons to protect myself. There's too many young kids, too many hotheads. I'm just wary of everyone."

Although such experiences should not be minimised, they are not the only view: "I've never experienced the things you hear. I used to work in Mount Pleasant. Then, I was fearful but it never actually happened."

"I've got over the fear, I used to dread waking up in the mornings, I can sympathise with people who drift out. I'm losing weight and not smoking. This prison is different. In cat. A and B, paranoia is always there. Wakefield was the best training ground. You loose your fears there. I'm glad that I did Wakefield... It teaches you that fear is just fear. You never went around in 1, 2 or 3's, always in 5 or 6 for a shower, 5 or 6 and always had knives... there is one thing that I fear, this is an unsubstantiated accusation from either an inmate or staff. The reason for this is the accusation is put on file and can and is used against you on parole applications years later. Then there is the way that it could affect your long term or short term lifer plan. In some cases, like mine, the inmate involved is not even told of the accusation until 12 years after it was made, allowing no recourse or being able to deny it."

It may perhaps be best to end this section of quotations with this officer's view, "In (Jupiter), we have seen the effects of violence in other establishments. One inmate in particular was a very, very scared man. He wouldn't work, permanently looking over his shoulder... he never got over what had happened previously. There are frightened people in prison no matter how safe and how much you reassure them. He will be scared for ever in the prison system. The regime here is not towards violence but it happens now and again."

As shown above, the main quantitative finding of this study is that 51% of prisoners and 67% of officers reported feeling scared. After this study was conducted, the Home Office published a similar finding relating to officers. They reported that 58% of officers had been worried about their

safety *(Briefing* 74). Although these figures are high, it should be noted that most of the officers reported feeling fear under certain circumstances, not all of the time and the proportion of prisoners who reported constant fear is relatively low at about 7% from this study or 6% from the National Prison Survey (1992).

It has been shown that prisoners and officers experience real feelings of fear. Officers' fears seem to be less location specific than prisoners. This implies that they are more concerned by a loss of control than where that control is lost. Although prisoners also feel fear, a substantial number (25%) of them are apparently unaware that they are not alone in feeling fear within their cells. But, cells are not the only place in which they are fearful. The size of Tables 6.1 and 6.2, indicates that there were a number of different places and situations that concerned participants.

The interview protocols were designed to allow some investigation of potential individual and institutional differences. Such differences may be associated with the different responses given in answer to questions pertaining to worries and fears. Through further examination of variables such as a prisoner's age or the offence for which he was convicted, it may be possible to draw some conclusions about the causes of fear and any variance in its expression.

VARIANCE IN FEAR AND AETIOLOGY

It would be possible to surmise that it might be particularly difficult to manage fear in prisoners. This is not simply because of the different types of fear felt, nor because of the likelihood of fear inducing circumstances but because they have little if any opportunity of withdrawal from such circumstances. Even if such withdrawal is possible, 25% of the fearful prisoners report still feeling afraid within their cells. There are at least two different interpretations that can be placed on this finding. The first is relatively benign. If prisoners are afraid within their cells, at least they are feeling fear away from situations of confrontation and actual risk. This would also be consistent with the idea that people feel fearful when they have time to think.

However, the second inference that may be drawn is that being behind a locked cell door can actually be one of the most dangerous situations that a prisoner experiences. From the interviews, it became clear that if someone wanted to assault another prisoner, an effective way of doing it was to be in his cell with him when the door was locked. Given the stretched resources and speed with which "locks, bolts and bars" are checked in the evenings and mornings, this is an all too feasible scenario. Even if the assailant is not supposed to be in the cell, he may go unnoticed. If officers do their jobs properly, then they should take time to interact with prisoners before locking and after unlocking their doors. With the actual amount of available time, it is not surprising that officers may rush such duties.

As the example above demonstrates, the interviews revealed a number of results that reinforce the importance of examining fear as a process within an appropriate context. It is likely that some of the prisoners' fears stem from intimidation on the wings. Twenty-two per cent of officers thought that prisoners may be worried by bullying and 7% thought that they may have problems with debt. This finding is consistent with *Briefing* 74 which later reported that 46% of officers thought that

prisoners did not feel safe from being injured or bullied by other prisoners. None of the prisoners in this study identified either bullying or debt as a problem but this does not mean that it does not occur. It is possible that the sample size was not large enough to encompass anybody who was afraid of being bullied at the time of the survey. Alternatively, the null finding could reflect reticence on the part of the participants to talk about such matters. However, two prisoners on the Uranus Remand wing said that they had previously been bullied although they did not report feeling fear. What is more likely is that the finding indicates that prisoners who are intimidated are more concerned with the effects of being bullied than with the label "bullying". A number of prisoners said that they were scared of things such as hot water or the knives in the kitchens. Unless the water or knives are being used in an intimidatory fashion, why would people be scared of them?

Another pertinent finding relates to the importance of a prisoner's location. The proportion of prisoners who were fearful varied between different prisons. When fear was used as a dependent variable for a χ^2 analysis, λ showed that location accounted for 21% of the variance and p<0.01. The greatest number of fearful prisoners was found to be in Pluto (73%), then in Jupiter (54%), then in Uranus (37%). The proportion of people who were fearful also varied between different wings of the same prison. In this case, λ accounted for 29% of the variance and p<0.01. Jupiter A wing held prisoners of whom 70% reported fear while D wing had a level of 40%. In Uranus, 45% of remand prisoners reported feeling scared and 30% were scared on the Vulnerable Prisoner Unit.

The wing with the highest incidence of fear was the Lifer Assessment Unit. This could be explained by the fact that prisoners there are at the start of their long sentences, and that they hold higher security classifications than most of the others who were interviewed (in other words, the wing holds the most volatile prisoners). As well as the young, possibly confrontational prisoners, a lifer assessment unit also holds people who have never been involved in crime before killing someone (probably someone they loved). Such prisoners would be expected to be feeling a gamut of emotions, fear amongst them.

As already mentioned, Toch (1992) concluded that "high safety" prisoners talk about institutions that are lax. Such prisoners' reports are independent of the security of the institution in which they are held. Toch thus refers to "the safety concern of the obsessed inmate" and does not really examine fear as a normal phenomenon. His particular focus on individual differences excludes the dynamic nature of most modern personality theories thereby denying the full extent of environmental interactions with the individual. The high numbers of people reporting fear in this study, both prisoners and officers, lend support to the conclusion that the environment is associated with a need for security in many more people than the 7% of "high safety" prisoners.

That the environment is important in terms of opportunistic fear prevention is intuitive and was also accepted after this investigation had been conducted. Recommendations were made to each of the prisons involved. Two areas that required further investigation were why the hospital in Uranus was listed as a problem area and what could be done about the corridors at Jupiter. By raising awareness of locations where fear is felt, a researcher can contribute to helping to minimise future occurrence.

From the interviews, it became clear that prisoners on Jupiter A wing were tannoyed by the hospital for them to come and collect their medication. This resulted in the entire prison hearing when people would be travelling alone down isolated, enclosed walkways and would be easy targets. The procedure not only seemed somewhat unsafe, it was unnecessary. It would have been quite possible for the hospital to ring the wing and ask the officers to find the prisoner(s) without having to tannoy the entire prison. Also, from their statements, it became clear that officers did not feel safe in the same corridors that concerned the prisoners. A number of them found the long, poorly lit corridors to be intimidating as they did not know what to anticipate. An increase in roving patrols was suggested as a way of alleviating the situation. Internal investigations were carried out at Jupiter and Uranus and both prisons replicated the findings of this study. Jupiter adopted most recommendations made and held a press conference at the launch of Adler, 1994 to publicly announce their improvements. Matters at Uranus were more complicated but management did try to address some of the difficult areas. Fear cannot be eradicated by identifying and improving physically unsafe areas in isolation.

Unfortunately, one of the other statistically significant differences that existed related to race and race effects have not always been successfully addressed. This was tested at the broadest level of non white compared with white because of the size of the sample set. When the sample set was tested as a whole, there was no effect of race. However, when tested on a wing basis, a significant race effect was found. In the Uranus remand wing, 5% of the white prisoners were worried whereas 34% of the non-white prisoners who were interviewed were worried. The difference is significant at $p<0.05$ but λ showed that race accounted for only a negligible amount of the variance in worry. On the Pluto Lifer Assessment Unit, the effect was reversed. Thirty six per cent of the whites reported worry but no non-whites reported feeling worried ($p<0.05$ but λ negligible).

When fear is used as the dependent variable, Uranus Vulnerable Prisoner Unit seems to show racial differences. Seventeen per cent of the white prisoners interviewed report fear whereas 71% of the non-white prisoners interviewed reported fear. The difference is significant ($p<0.01$ and λ shows that race accounts for 33% of the variance). Although the numbers are low, some speculation as to cause may be permissible. It is likely that the usual direction of the finding as found on Uranus VPU reflects racial harassment or misunderstanding on the wing. This acts to disadvantage anyone who is not White. On Pluto A wing, it is possible that the people who had previously been threatened bonded together for protection and now pose a threat to others (or are perceived as threatening).

As demonstrated above, Table 6.1 shows that there is some discrepancy between the areas of concern identified by prisoners and those identified by staff. However, Table 6.2 demonstrates that at least some of the officers are aware of the worries and fears of the prisoners. This is not totally satisfactory because only a quarter of the officers seemed to be emphasising the problems that are emphasised by the prisoners and it would be useful to raise the levels of awareness in other officers on the same wings. Also, it would be interesting to see how well prisoners can predict the worries

felt by the officers. Do prisoners know that, in contrast to themselves, officers are more concerned within the context of a ringing alarm bell and the potential loss of control?

Another obvious avenue of exploration is whether prisoners convicted of different offences or particular categories of offences would be more likely to report fear. Liebling and Krarup's work would predict that more "Rule 43's" would be fearful than other types of offender. This was examined using the sample set as a whole, on a wing by wing basis and controlling for age. No significant differences were found between prisoners convicted of different offences. In a similar vein, it was also predicted that those prisoners who were serving their first sentences would be represented in greater fearful numbers than those with previous custodial convictions. However pre-custodial experience was found to have no significant effect on incidence of fear or worry. Another, final finding that was contrary to predictions based on previous literature relating to violence was that there was no effect of age. These findings may not be entirely helpful but are of relevance to anyone trying to predict fear in other officers and prisoners.

Previously, it has been assumed that "43 type" prisoners are the most vulnerable and need the most protection. This may be true even though this study's findings were not that clear. Although the life sentenced prisoners reported the highest incidence of fear, 70% of the vulnerable prisoners on Jupiter A wing also reported fear. This would seem to support previous findings. However, prisoners on Uranus VPU were the least likely to report fear. Liebling and Krarup (1992) found that two thirds of vulnerable prisoners reported difficulties interacting with other prisoners. They found that younger prisoners and those "on Rule 43" experienced the most problems. Some participants in both studies expressed remorse about "coming on to Rule 43". They said that since they had been segregated, their problems had increased. This is related to the fear of labelling and stigma expressed by some of the vulnerable prisoners in the current study.

The difference in fear incidence between Jupiter A wing and Uranus Vulnerable Prisoner Unit was unpredicted as well as sizeable. Seventy per cent of Jupiter A wing prisoners were scared while 30% were scared on the Uranus Vulnerable Prisoner Unit yet both wings are for vulnerable prisoners. However, Jupiter A wing prides itself on not being an official "VPU" and is not fully segregated from the rest of the prison. They are trying to integrate the prisoners more fully into normal routines. It does not seem to be totally successful. Prisoners on Uranus Vulnerable Prisoner Unit tended to be concerned about having to travel between the main prison and their secure unit. These findings suggest that vulnerable prisoners would feel more secure if they could be kept completely segregated.

In some respects, vulnerable prisoners are the most institutionalised offenders and institutionalised prisoners are unlikely to feel keenly the loss of autonomy within prisons. In common with those offenders who are held in special secure units, Vulnerable Prisoners' movements are heavily restricted when compared to the majority of prisoners. Unlike most of the highest category offenders, vulnerable prisoners are not separated for means of control but because they cannot cope.

Obviously, officers are employed to maintain control. It is therefore unsurprising that they fear loss of that control. It would be unfair to characterise most prisoners as institutionalised, thus it is slightly surprising that unlike the officers, very few prisoners mentioned concerns about unpredictable threats and limited personal power. If the feeling of loss of autonomy is as strong as implied by Sykes (1958) and Cohen and Taylor (1981), then it is not unreasonable to assume that more prisoners would have mentioned it when asked about their fears. Although prisoners did not identify lack of control as something that worried or scared them, autonomy *was* mentioned in terms of fear of deterioration. It is also interesting to note that (contrary to the findings of the National Prison Survey) most of the prisoners seemed indifferent to the presence or absence of officers. As well as supporting theories relating to the disparate nature of the two groups, such a finding may imply that prisoners manage themselves thereby maintaining a degree of autonomy.

The characteristics of the relationships between staff and prisoners and their management of fear are discussed further in the following chapter. This chapter has demonstrated that fear is real to most people who are incarcerated or who work in prison wings. The nature of such fear varies and it might be possible to ameliorate fear through effective coping strategies and management. Likewise, the incidence of fear also varies and such variation could be associated with different management strategies employed on the various wings.

Although interpersonal relationships do appear to be important, the direction of their effects on fear and whether they are mediated by other variables are still unclear. It would seem logical to assume that the wings with the greatest frequency of problems would be those wings with the highest incidence of fears. However, the findings from chapters five and six give mixed messages. Both prisoner and officer participants from the wing with the lowest incidence of fear reported the most frequent problems within and outside their peer group but the wings with the highest incidence of fear also had a high number of problems. Subsequent chapters will further examine the relationship between previous problems and incidence of fear.

CHAPTER SEVEN

COPING WITH FEAR

The previous chapter argues that fear does exist in prison and that it is multi-faceted. Fear is substantive, and it needs to be managed. Most prisoners other than those in the "high safety" group do not let fear take over their daily existence; they cope with it. The ways in which prisoners and officers cope with fear and their means of controlling it are presented and discussed in this chapter. The main information sought was whether prisoners and officers used avoidance procedures to minimise their exposure to risk. However, neither staff nor prisoners ever stated that officers employed such avoidance procedures when asked about means of coping with fear. Those coping strategies that were mentioned are presented below. First the prisoners' then the officers'.

PRISONERS' COPING STRATEGIES

All of the strategies used and suggested for potential use were coded and ranked on a wing by wing basis. The strategies that were popular on one wing were popular on the next. In other words, there were no significant differences in measures taken to cope with fear between prisoners from different wings (or who had been convicted of different offences). Thus, the coping measures employed have been collated and are shown in the first of the two tables below. The tables demonstrate that many prisoners either do not employ coping strategies or are unwilling or unable to divulge them. Answers from the prisoners who did report using coping strategies suggest that the most popular ones involve busying themselves in alternative ways and only eight prisoners reported turning to others for help.

Table 7.1   Coping strategies employed by prisoners (all numbers are actual).

COPING STRATEGY	NUMBER OF PRISONERS
Just accept it or do nothing	25
Paint, read, write, listen to radio	23
Pray or meditate	11
Talk	5
Exercise	3
Put on a front or be positive	3
Keep my head down	3
Stay on the wing	3
Tell a member of staff	2
Dream	2
Smoke or smoke a joint	2
Hit something or scream and fight	2
Work out how to avoid it again	1
Masturbate	1
Fooling around	1
Work	1
Phone home	1

Prisoners were also asked to make suggestions for change that would enable or remove the need for coping with fear. Their responses are illustrated in the table below.

Table 7.2   Suggestions for improvements made by the prisoners (all numbers are actual).

SUGGESTION FOR IMPROVEMENT	NUMBER OF PRISONERS
Nothing or don't know	27
Improve segregation (for safety)	7
Increase prisoner involvement and responsibility	6
Train the officers to be more understanding	4
Carefully select all prisoners for their wings	4
Change the atmosphere	3
Stop mind games or leave us alone	3
Improve facilities	3
Make probation and psychology more accessible	2
More courses	2
Give us treatment (medical)	2
More time with families or with outside organisations	2
Give us a fixed date or sort out parole	2
Give board of visitors independence	1
Cameras on landings and in segregation (punishment)	1
Don't segregate us	1

Thus, although many of the prisoners did not make suggestions about future strategies, 43 of them proposed changes. Despite the lack of interpersonal coping skills displayed in Table 7.1, the emphasis in Table 7.2 is on interactions with other people and groups of people. This is discussed in more detail later in the chapter. For now, we move to further illustration of what the participants said.

There is recognition of a need to talk to someone as a means of catharsis but whether that person should be from within the prison or outside is unclear. Ambivalence is understandable because of possible difficulties in divulging information to people who have not experienced life "inside".

"If you're feeling down, there is no one you can really turn to. They can't help. We need someone from outside, not the nuns. I've tried everybody. They ought to get someone who knows what your problems are, who has dealt with them. I've totally given up, explaining problems, as it gets worse because they can't do anything."

"There's no one to talk to. Doctors put it down to drugs. You can't share in prison. In Brixton, the Samaritans came round and that helped. Also that fear. Most of my time, I've been in hospital. Even here, I've been on medication for 1 year. I fear problems that are occurring like memory loss." "I would like to see people coming in and having prisoners talk without fear."

One solution to the problem is the "Listeners Scheme" that has been introduced in many prisons (including those in the study). The scheme relies on volunteer prisoners who are trained as "listeners" by The Samaritans. However, the scheme relies on good will of officers as well as the prisoners' trustworthiness and trust in others. "I'm proud to be a founder member of the Listeners Scheme here. It's working well apart from the governors' directive. They said that we could see anyone between 7.30 am and 8.00 pm but on Friday, Saturday and Sunday evenings, the officers curtail contacts to get off home. Also, we've not been permitted to use the safe cell as we have to

tell the Principal Officer why we need it and we can't do that. The wing governor said that he can't overrule the P.O. on duty in the evenings but he's trying to educate the P.O.'s into what we're trying to do. He issued a directive but he doesn't want to use a heavy hammer. We're worried that someone will get hurt before the cell gets used... We've had the safe cell for 3 months. I've asked to use it and been refused. Part of the problem is that the P.O.'s aren't from the wing and also, our own staff don't believe in it."

"When the pressure gets to me, I go and see the chaplain. Somebody who I don't really know. I can pour my heart out to him even though he's not my religion. When you talk, you get a lot off your chest. Every 5/6 months I have a half hour chat. It helps me a lot, it alleviates it for a while." Chaplains are an obvious source of succour yet a number of prisoners reported that they had encountered difficulties in practising their religion. The Church of England chaplain and governors were criticised for prevaricating and preventing observation of Hindu and Jewish festivals and for obstructing Free Church practice at Jupiter. "In Pentonville, I got a Hindu Minister, I've been here 6 months and have not been able to get one. Festivals come and go and I can't do anything about them."

OFFICERS' COPING STRATEGIES

The officers also utilised a number of strategies for coping with their worries. Only one officer directly mentioned improving relationships with the prisoners but nearly all of their techniques were socially based. Unlike the prisoners, they do not favour doing something else and tend to mention the importance of interpersonal skills. However, in common with the prisoners, officers' suggestions for improvements had significant resource implications. Their techniques for managing fear and their suggestions for improvement are outlined in the two tables below:

Table 7.3 Coping strategies employed by the officers (all numbers are actual).

COPING STRATEGY	NUMBER OF OFFICERS
Talk (7 to partners, 1 to the care team)	8
Depends on situation	5
Just cope or put on a front	5
Break the tension, joke	4
Have confidence in self and others	2
Go over what went wrong	2
Stay aware	1
Build relationships with prisoners	1
Get other officers	1

Table 7.4   Suggestions for improvements made by the officers (all numbers are actual).

SUGGESTION FOR IMPROVEMENT	NUMBER OF OFFICERS
Nothing	15
Increase Staff	2
Reduce the age bands	1
Get back to prisons where observation is possible	1
Avoid confrontation	1
Smaller groups of prisoners	1
Encourage post incident care teams	1
More balanced shift system	1

As mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, one of the issues of interest was whether prisoners and officers used avoidance procedures. The tables above demonstrate that coping strategies are identifiable and may be successful. Participants did not really mention avoidance procedures other than ones that required them to divert their attention to a different task. Yet, it is possible to conclude that prisoners organised their routines in ways that attempted to avoid confrontation. For example, a number of prisoners said that they had no problems because "I don't mix" or "I just talk to one or two people".

In a similar manner, Officers took precautions and organised their behaviour and that of prisoners in ways that attempted to avoid confrontation. For example prisoners from one wing in HMP Jupiter ate their meals behind their cell doors, on the other wing, the prisoners used the dining room. Canteen at Uranus was allocated on a "come when you are called" basis and prisoners went in small groups. Also, the remand prisoners could only attend the gym when they were called from a roster. As well as allocating scarce facilities efficiently, this should have helped to prevent intimidation from some prisoners keen to use the gym at the exclusion of others.

INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS AND COPING WITH FEAR

For a fuller understanding of fear and how to manage it, it is useful to delve in more detail into the interpersonal relationships within the prisons. As demonstrated in the tables above, social functioning was mentioned by both prisoners and officers. Good interpersonal relationships are a cornerstone of "dynamic security" policies that are popular within the Prison Service. This is because there is a belief that good relationships should minimise the potential for disruption. In terms of the current research, this would mean that good social interaction could minimise the number of fear inducing situations. Good relationships should also enable better coping should potentially fearful situations evolve, particularly if there is one identifiable person or group of persons who are trusted by the person in need (be (s)he prisoner or officer).

Prisoners with prisoners

As mentioned above, it is important to be able to self disclose. Sometimes, a listener can be a peer group member. "I'm not a threat, I get a lot of people knocking on my door who wouldn't talk to a probation officer or psychologist. They would sooner talk to someone in the same position. There's a lot of paranoia here."

However, "At times, people in this line make you sceptical. People have their own motives for doing things. Sometimes they're bored or self motivated for personal gain."

"In Leicester, I was on the rule. All the people there were crazy and there were dirty goings on. The gay side makes my stomach turn. It was like a whole new world down there. I wish I hadn't gone."

"In prison, you can't make relationships. She told me to feel but you have to be hard in here." Thus prisoners may have to turn to officers for support. Unfortunately, officers may also be a source of stress or possible fear.

Prisoners with officers

Prisoner officer relationships may be appalling, excellent or anything in between. However, there are situations that are likely to encourage hostility. One such situation is where prisoners are segregated under the rules of "Good Order and Discipline". "I'm down the block quite a lot, it's always for swearing. At least half on the wing shouldn't be there. It's not fair if officers can swear at you but if you swear back, you get nicked. They should be more experienced, they get a lot of money for doing nothing, they don't do anything. They are interested in banging you up. They should be trained to earn their wage, earn what they're getting. In here, you're on a pause button, nothing's happening, there's no solidarity. If it weren't for the inmates who look out for each other, the staff would get away with so much. People are scared to say things in case they get a backlash. People are scared to complain."

"I wish that something could be done about segregation. People go down for minor things. You can go down for swearing and get 3-6 days and you're guaranteed a beating as long as you stay down there. Searching is very degrading. They still make you bend or squat. It's horrible. I've got the 1993 rule book and it says you're not supposed to be made to do it. But they still do, it's horrible. It makes you feel degraded, dirty. All you've got in prison is self respect, dignity, pride. They take it away by doing things like that. They take away your self respect and leave you with nothing because you have no respect for anyone else. I hate the way they put you in belts and beat you up. There's no need, just causes you more hatred for them. I've been on the merry go round, been ghosted but there were no charges. They move you hundreds of miles and they know that you won't get a visit. You don't get a visit, no-one knows where you are. You see no one. It would be different if you had an argument and it was on a one to one basis. It's not fair when they jump on you. It's just not on."

"You can get a kicking down the block. They are bully boys and they haven't found their way. A lot of screws are idiots and when they get found out, lying, they pass the buck on people. 5 or 6 that I get on with. I get on with the female governors and probation. The worst thing is not knowing when you're getting out. They make you feel bitter and angry inside. You want to take time out but you can't. Even at night time, you're on the go. They've got us by the short and curlies, these people are writing our lives. We get it from all angles."

"Please teach them to have more compassion. We are human beings, even child molesters. Punishment is being behind the door. If a man rapes a little boy or girl, why shouldn't he be killed? He who calls you a rapist, he is the worst rapist. Judges etc., some of them are not good. Sentences are not equal, they depend on who you are. Race is a factor in it. If you're black, they put you to work for the government. Probation have never shown. They've never checked on me or my family."

"It's said, year after year, after year. If you've got sex cases, they will always be problems. They say, "Jupiter works", blah, blah. All it takes is a "Dear John" and he goes up to A wing and then there's trouble. Lack of communication here. They pass you around, you wait around, you get bitter, frustrated, you can't communicate."

"You often see staff sitting around. Need to be one of the few who are trying to help. Many are free loaders. It's very important to get people who do the job. The situation where staff could get involved is a bit better. I've been scapegoated for a relationship I had with a probation officer. Somebody only has to make a complaint and it costs you 4 or 5 years on top."

This critical picture is not the only view though. "It's a prison, but the officers, treat them with a bit of respect and they do the job." Other prisoners recognise the potential benefits of good relationships with the staff and seek improvement. "There isn't enough communication between staff and inmates. They're just starting, at nights to have a game in the yard. They should have a meeting every month. We should help each other, we need to communicate but there's none of it... How can they assess you? We're just cons. They ain't got no regard for us."

"Even here, there's people putting in for requests but it's prison. A thousand of us and so we won't get things done. Undermanned and over stretched here. They are not stretched out on chairs. They ARE over worked." It would not be fair to blame officers for all of the problems. As one participant pointed out, "I know that some people muck about officers, but when I went to the doctor, I just got brushed off. At 58, it could be anything, my heart even, I'm genuine. I don't have the luxury to play about."

"If you inadvertently put the back up of a prison officer, no one would believe your side of it. The authorities here will not, in any way ever, even though they may want to, back down. The less you have to do with the probation or officers, the safer you are. The gentle help that you get from the old person on reception is to keep your head down, do your bird. The minute you start complaining, you're seen as a potential trouble maker. I feel guilty enough anyway for mucking up my life, upsetting family, friends who all stuck by me but they're getting fed up, as am I."

"Half of the personal officers are a joke. You go to them with a problem and sometimes they are very unsympathetic. They don't take time to listen. They are not interested."

"... The second, and I think more important subject is how the effect of female officers being introduced into the male prisons has added to or diminished the fear element. I can only give a very limited opinion on this based on the observations and the atmosphere that I have seen in given situations. I have found that inmates are more relaxed in the company of the female staff and more prepared to accept inmates into their immediate circle who are talking to her at the same time as them. This then decreases that person's physical anger to that person and this is observed on the down side when there is an incident on any of the living quarters and a female member of staff is involved. There tends to be a higher reaction from the male staff and from those inmates who are friendly with her. Then, you have the system's reaction to a female officer being assaulted. Recently a female officer was attacked and injured in this prison, this led to a tightening of certain policies and a restriction on the time you could see an officer alone to talk to them. This therefore increased animosity to certain inmates (those friends of the inmate who did the attack) thus leading to a greater fear level and higher tension within the system."

The preceding quotations illustrate the importance of staff-prisoner relationships. Where negative remarks are made, they reflect situations that are difficult both for prisoners and officers. Positive attitudes from the prisoners may well mean that they react better to officers who (in turn) react better to them. With improved understanding of one another, will come greater chances of conflict resolution rather than deterioration and a lower likelihood of conflict occurring at all. From the prisoners' remarks, we can conclude that staff-prisoner relationships are important, could be improved and probably influence levels of fear. The next section addresses relationships from the officers' perspectives, first with the prisoners, then with their colleagues.

Officers with prisoners

Like the prisoners, the officers characterised their charges in terms that varied from being hostile to hopeful. It may be worth noting here that the language used by the prisoners and the officers was almost identical. Many officers referred to themselves as screws and the prisoners as cons, as did the prisoners. Also, they shared common terminology for places, procedures and types of prisoner.

"You are dealing with 28 people who hate the sight of you, you keep them here."

"Attitudes have changed and we're working together but the average officer finds it hard to find good in anyone."

"This is carrion you are looking at, in some cases, human carrion. There's nothing to be scared of. There's a lot to be sad about. I switch on through the gate in and switch out on the way out. Lots of people head for the bar."

"Can I catch it? Does this change your outlook? It's something I'm conscious of. It affects the way you think about things. I know one officer who did this and couldn't carry on counselling as he couldn't bath his 3 year old." (Officer on Jupiter A wing, dealing with prisoners on SOTP.) "I worry

about being recognised outside, fears for family, relates to name tags. Working with sex offenders, have to be cautious but you learn to deal with it, at first I didn't want to get involved, now I am looking to get on the SOTP."

"We need to improve discipline, be more consistent."

"It's hard for some prisoners to think for themselves. Wearing their own clothes isn't fair. It's probably better that wealth doesn't show so much as you create a class system. A softer image wouldn't help--uniform wise. There are some prisoners who shouldn't really be here, I'm not sure about how people are assessed what are the criteria? Who decides where people go?"

"Facilities for the prisoners. They are not financing the facilities. They play at it of course. Money is wasted on schemes that don't get off the ground."

The preceding two statements display some affinity with the prisoners' views. They are not where similarities between prisoners and officers stop. The picture can be enhanced when one considers the relationships between staff and supervisors. In much the same manner as prisoners criticise officers, the staff are less than effusive in their praise of those who manage them. Officers also reported concern about the directions in which the Prison Service appeared to be travelling.

Relationships with management

"Communication is the worst I've ever known it. There is such a reluctance to feed information down. Can't help. People not knowing about their future. Can't not give feedback. Management here is top heavy. Too many chiefs and not enough Indians. I'm part of the team working with inmates. Problem comes with the managers. People don't behave like rule books... we have to write in depth reports without the time to get to know the cons. It's hard to know how to get round it. Need to get to know them."

"Recently, a female officer was assaulted in a prisoner's cell, the very first question that they asked her was "why were you there?" It should have been, "how are you?" There's a conflict of interest in what the governor has to do. He's got money in getting people to work"

"This job can get to you or you can go with the flow. Every so often, even then... the fact that people are after you to sort out situations that are out of your control. I find myself getting cynical. I don't know if that's the way to deal with it. I'm less cynical here (Jupiter) than in Bedford. You have to handle things you know you can't change, get on with the job you're paid for. I've learnt not to take it out of the gate. Get to the point of having a go at your family but I do the job to keep them happy. If you're not appreciated by governors, then you start getting--"well, why should I? Nobody does it for me" No matter how professional you are, no backing for the governor. The governor needs to be able to rely on you, you won't do it though if you are not appreciated. After the Bedford riot, I took things home, I was not helped to come down off the adrenaline."

"What am I going to do when I have to retire? We've been shrouded in secrecy too long. Sometimes, when you meet people, they think you must have three heads or something. I worry where we're going now we're an agency. I fear for the lads. It's no longer a job for life. They won't

get the best out of people. Those who join have so much uncertainty. You could trust staff to back you up then but now--in other wings, I wouldn't like to trust the staff. We have the right to fear for the future. Promotion is a thing of the past. Going to need a degree to get anywhere. You need to be a graduate or freemason."

The officers report experiencing fear under certain circumstances. Such circumstances are entirely understandable if unpredictable. After the event, it would be relatively easy to ensure proper management of the fear felt yet such management does not appear to have been forthcoming. It was thus necessary to formally assess the provision and take up of support services. This is one of the areas reported in following chapters.

Although it would be tempting to draw conclusions from the differences that were found between the wings. Any such conclusions have to be qualified. No wing was perfect. On all wings, suggestions were made for improvement. These suggestions need to be investigated. The differences found in the incidence of problems between staff and staff, prisoners and prisoners, and prisoners and staff on the different wings are interesting and are of relevance to each of the prisons concerned. However, there are too many confounding variables to really say much about the causes of the problems. A much larger scale study would need to be conducted comparing like with like. For instance, how does the incidence of staff reported problems in Pluto compare with that in Wakefield? More interestingly, what are the implications of these relationships.

The relationships between staff and prisoners need further investigation. Although the officers perform a custody and a care role, it is clear that few of the prisoners felt that they could talk to the officers. The officers also recognised poor lines of communication and the unfulfilled need for consistency. One area that could be further investigated relates to the staff:prisoner ratio and its influence on fears and control. In the current study, the ratios of staff:prisoner were constantly changing. Due to the nature of the different security classifications, the staff were occupied in different ways in different wings. This means that, if at all possible, the "available staff:prisoner ratio" rather than the "staff on duty:prisoner ratio" needs to be measured in some way. Little seems to be known about how the officers feel about the way that they spend their day. The division of labour seems to vary widely from prison to prison and wing to wing and more information is needed about what the "available staff" are doing. However, it seems fair to repeat the conclusion of the Penal Affairs Consortium that, "The combination of increased overcrowding, lower staffing ratios, a lower proportion of experienced staff, more restricted regimes and more time spent in cells is likely to increase tension in prisons and threaten control" (PAC, 1996).

It is worth focusing on three other themes raised by the officers: their fears relating to sex offenders, their low morale and their views of senior management. A high proportion of prisoners in Jupiter and the Uranus VPU were serving sentences for sexual offences or had a previous conviction for a sexual offence. Therefore a significant proportion of the officers interviewed were working with sex offenders. A few of the officers were involved in the Sex Offender Treatment Programme. As part of that programme, offenders talk through their previous actions. As well as the officer who reported that another officer was experiencing problems bathing his child, a number of officers

reported significant effects on their daily lives. For example, the way they interpreted television adverts or the ways that they thought that other people perceived them. Since the time at which this study was conducted, the Prison Service has introduced counselling for officers involved in the SOTP.

One of the most common comments made by officers related to perceived management disinterest in what they had to say or in what they felt. A typical remark was "I've been an officer 14 years and no one has ever asked me what I feel about the job... after riots, the only person I could talk to was my wife." The introduction of post incident care teams for officers seems to be a good innovation. Unfortunately, officers said that they were unwilling to take up the service as they felt that it was seen to count against them. They also said that they found the members of the team to be too distant from them. In a major staff survey, the Prison Service concluded that "75% agreed or strongly agreed that people running the Service did not care enough about those who deal face-to-face with prisoners. Only 19% felt they worked for a well managed organisation... Nine out of ten agreed that "more time should be taken to communicate with staff."... (There was) insufficient opportunity for participation and use of skills... 82% of governor grades (agreed that they placed) a high value on staff participation whereas only 28% of officers and 50% of principal and senior officers concurred... 92% of officers agreed that the Prison Service management gives a higher priority to prisoners than staff" (Prison Service, 1994).

The interviews reported in the preceding three chapters also raised so called "minority" issues namely the role of female officers in male prisons and the race effect that was found. The issues surrounding both findings are too complex to examine here but there are some points that should be made. It is hoped that, with local recruiting, prisons will be more able to have a mix of staff that reflects the ethnic diversity of offenders in their catchment areas. However for such a policy to be successful, prisoners would need to be held in prisons close to their own communities. Although this is in line with recommendations made in the Woolf report (1991), the current record levels of people in prison make it well nigh impossible to attain. This is worsened by the authorities' penchant for placing prisons in remote locations without multi-cultural communities on which to draw for staff. Even if these problems can be overcome, there are still issues surrounding racial harassment of prison officers (from their colleagues as well as prisoners).

One finding that came through from the few women in this study was that they found the paternalistic protection of their male colleagues to be oppressive and counter productive. At the same time, they found that the senior officers could be insensitive towards issues that can not be avoided. Through trying to protect female officers, the male officers seemed to have a tendency not to tell their female colleagues if a threat had been made against them. This meant that female officers could walk into a situation unprepared. This seems to have been the cause of at least one assault that a female officer reported. Another issue is to do with "rubdown" or body searches. In female prisons, male officers are not allowed to search the women. However, it appears that female officers were being asked to search the men in male prisons. Senior female officers may feel able to say no to such requests but newer officers may feel that they are expected to carry out such tasks. This may make both the prisoners and officers feel uncomfortable.

In 1994, the Prison Service reported that 30% of women had difficulties from other staff because of their gender while 22% had difficulties from prisoners (*Briefing* 74). One of the prisoners in the current study raised two important issues regarding the deployment of female officers in male prisons. He first described a calming influence brought by female officers to the atmosphere on the wing in which he was held. Then, he demonstrated how a spiral of loss of control and increase in tension came about following a prisoner assault of a female officer. If female officers reduce tension more than they are associated with an increase in it, then their postings within male prisons may be seen as a means of managing violence and reducing fear.

Hughes and Zamble (1993) concluded, "senior correctional management have a special responsibility to assist employees in dealing with those stressors inherent in the work situation and the nature of work with offender clients." Of course the Prison Service's liability is limited under the scope of Crown immunity. Yet, it would not be unreasonable to accede to the Prison Officers' Association request that, "The government should ensure that Prison Officers and other penal workers are given the same rights to a safe and healthy environment as would be provided for workers in any other industry" (1987).

Officers are a much maligned group. Toch's call for positive feedback in 1977 should be addressed to the Prison Service of 1996. It would alleviate fear and provide more positive environments that might be better suited to fulfil the duty of care that the Prison Service owes to its staff as well as to its prisoners. From the previous three chapters, it is possible to conclude that fear exists in prisons, is real, fairly wide spread and seems to be related to inter and intra group relationships. To a degree, individuals and the organisation can cope with fear but much more needs to be done to permit its effective management.

The next part of this thesis examines one of the most fundamental changes to the Prison Service in recent years. This change is assessed in terms of its implications for control and coping with fear. As noted above by one of the prisoner participants, the impact of female officers in male prisons may be to reduce or to cause fear inducing situations and this had to be assessed systematically. The decision to investigate cross gender supervision and fear was made predominantly because the introduction of female officers was praised as a calming measure at the same time as being criticised for being a measure that would result in loss of order and control. Whilst investigating this area, further measures were taken relating to the levels of fear reported, previous experiences of fears, prisoners' awareness of officers' fears and officers' use of support services.

One of Toch's contributions to the debate on cultural importation and deprivation concluded that "Importing divisive norms does not predestine them to permanence. Organizations are small and tight enough to evolve community in ways that street corners cannot evolve it. But to achieve such community entails the evolution of accepted means and shared goals. This requires that we first diagnose violence-promoting norms, then establish goals and rules, identify means, and, ultimately, make goals and means shareable" (Toch, 1976, p 111). This study and the one that follows were steps towards addressing those needs within Her Majesty's Prison Service.

CHAPTER EIGHT

CROSS GENDER SUPERVISION AND FEAR

The information provided by the participants in the previous study left many questions unanswered. For example, do different officers employ different techniques in the performance of their job? If so, how do these techniques affect the daily running of the regime in which they work? Do they affect the ways in which prisoners react to officers? Likewise, do different prisoners deal with and pose different "challenges"? Of particular interest were the officers, as there is little research into the ways that they work. More specifically, we know little about how they cope with the violent, possibly fear inducing scenarios which inevitably occur within a prison wing, nor do we know if there is any variation in the levels of fear that officers express. Also in the previous research, officers were quizzed about their understanding of prisoners' concerns. One way to follow up such work was to reverse the roles to find out more about prisoners' perceptions of officers' concerns.

It has already been mentioned that the Prison Service has undergone many changes since Fresh Start in 1989. As well as becoming an Agency in 1993, the Service has been keen to tackle situations that pose problems for control. Changes after the Woolf report (1991) were essentially implemented to prevent any more rioting prisoners destroying institutions and lives. A number of measures were taken as part of attempts to calm and control prisons. One such measure was the anti bullying strategy referred to earlier. A more major introduction was the posting of female officers into male prisons. Such a change was probably inevitable under equal opportunities law but protagonists justified it by stating that women would bring about calm in a storm of male clashes for power. However, like many "pioneering" women, it was predicted that female officers posted to male prisons would face hostility and resentment from their colleagues as well as the potential problems of working with prisoners.

Although few women participated in the research reported in the previous four chapters, their statements indicated that they indeed did have different experiences of working within prisons. For example, during the course of her interview, one female officer mentioned that she had never been assaulted. Later on, she explained that the area of the prison that she had identified as being unsafe was where a "prisoner had got his hand inside my blouse", yet she maintained that she had never been assaulted. Another female officer reported that a prisoner had been masturbating out of his window every time she walked past. She had attempted to report him for this but the Senior Officer to whom she went for help treated the incidents as jokes and failed to give her the appropriate advice.

Hence, chapters eight to thirteen report on research conducted with male and female officers and male prisoners. This research attempted to provide further information about the nature of the fears expressed, to examine prisoners' perceptions of officers' experiences and to look at the effects on fear and its control since the start of cross gender postings in male prisons. Do prisoners

react differently to male and female officers? Are male and female officers' experiences different? Do male and female officers adopt similar approaches to their tasks?

CROSS GENDER SUPERVISION AND FEAR

"Equal opportunities are part of good management--not something separate or different. We therefore take decisions about our staff and about applicants for employment on the basis of evidence about performance and potential. We take specific steps to promote equality of opportunity and to guard against discrimination [whether direct or indirect, conscious or unconscious] on grounds of ethnic origin, religious belief, sex, sexual orientation, disability or any other irrelevant factor."

Prison Service *Briefing* number 40

Background

The policy of equal opportunities was extended to all Home Office staff in *Home Office Notice* 158/1991. Since that time, the Prison Service has developed its own policy of equal opportunity employment. This includes the policy of "cross posting", where officers of one gender have been enabled to work within a prison holding prisoners of the other. "The aim of the cross-postings policies was to create opportunities for staff of either sex to broaden their experience within the Prison Service, thus encouraging greater job satisfaction and providing greater scope for career development. [This was done within the terms of the Sex Discrimination Act 1975]." (Parentheses in original, DPF2, 1994 preface). Of the officer grades working on landings, women make up 10% of the basic grade officers; 5% of both senior and principal grade officers; approximately 10% of governor grades 2 to 5 and 4% of governor 1 grades (the highest and least likely to be attached to specific wings.) (Personnel Planning Group, 1995.)

Since 1993, the Prison Service has conducted a number of investigations into the policy of cross sex postings. These have mainly been concerned with the implications of the policy from the perspective of equal opportunities within employment. Their most recent research was being undertaken at the same time as this study (DPF2, 1994; Personnel Planning Group, 1995; Clayton, 1995 and Willerton & Patterson, 1995). Also, a postgraduate student at Cambridge was investigating cross gender postings from the perspective of equal opportunities law and prospects for promotion (Enterkin, 1995). Thus, although there is a need for the wider publication and dissemination of material about the general implications of cross sex postings, the research reported here will be concentrating on issues surrounding fear and control since the introduction of female officers into male prisons.

Women were brought into American, Canadian and Australian male prisons as "guards" in much the same manner as they were brought into English and Welsh prisons. However, they were employed within those prisons much earlier than here and there is a more substantial body of research into their deployment in those systems. Most of the research presented below is drawn

from that literature. On the whole, women were met with extreme resistance and it was predicted that a similar scenario would be experienced here.

Zimmer (1986) reports that women came into prisons as officers under conditions of change and turmoil. In this country, most female officers in male prisons have been posted there since the change to Agency status in 1993. Once in situ, women had to contend with the formal institution of prison and informal hierarchy of the prisoners. Zimmer describes prison as "the ultimate test of manhood". Her description is much the same as that of Irwin mentioned in earlier chapters (Irwin 1980). Zimmer also reminds us that irrespective of rapport between officers and prisoners, neither group can ignore the real chance of injury or even death. When referring to "guards'" shared norms, she states that questioning an officer's masculinity is the same as saying he is incompetent. "Faggot" and "pussy" are terms used for officers who show fear on the job.

Because of the inherent danger, there is intense interaction between officers on and off the job. Gardner, 1981 says that camaraderie develops because officers feel that only other officers understand their problems and concerns. Also, that they have been reluctant to take on counselling or caring roles partly because they knew that despite the rhetoric of reform, they will always be judged on security and control rather than on their ability to relate to prisoners. Zimmer (1986) also reports that newer, younger prisoners were not "buying the bullshit" of co-operation and are increasingly likely to use violence and intimidation to control other prisoners and the "guards". In the same year, Zupan reported that increasing care for prisoners and a rise in "bureaucratization" had led to officers feeling that their performance was in question and had undermined their self confidence. The male officers generally viewed the coming of women as one more liberal change imposed from on high. Women threatened the basic premise that they held that "masculinity" was what was needed to do the job properly. Men closed ranks and women did not receive the assistance or support of the male co-workers with whom they shared basic working conditions.

Based on her research, Zimmer 1986, developed a typology of women as officers. She stated that in order to be able to cope with their job, women were likely to utilise one of the following three strategies:

1. *institutional* role: women try to perform like men and follow all rules to the letter.

2. *modified* role: women doubt that they can be like men and opt to accept the protection and settle for "women's slots".

3. *innovator* role: women redefine the working techniques required and tend to work where contact with prisoners is infrequent. Even though they are not like men, they maintain that they are effective.

In 1987, Zimmer explicitly stated the reasons why she believed that women could not perform the correctional guard's role in the same way as men:

1. They are trained by men who are resistant to them being there therefore they are not properly socialised. They may be actively denied information or misled in manners of control, etc..

2. Training assignments may differ so that they have had only limited training, particularly in terms of confrontation control.

3. As they continue, they face persistent opposition and possible sexual harassment.

4. They are generally left with a feeling that they are not backed up by their co-workers.

5. Given the above, they may find it most effective to rely on relationships with prisoners that ensure compliance and even protection.

6. As well as the institutional obstacles, there is the question of societal norms. Things may be changing for women, but not particularly fast.

7. Zimmer concludes that despite the above, it is important to remember that there are institutional and individual differences in the way that women officers perform their jobs. They change with the job demands and with personal characteristics.

Jurik (1988) enlarged on the need for dynamism within a typology and stated that we have to examine how women overcome the barriers that they encounter. She detailed 5 ways in which female officers can attempt to avoid the "traps".

1. Women can project a professional image: know the ropes, apply rules courteously, consistently and assertively. This can be limited by rigid adherence to rules but helps to avoid being classified as a *pet* or *iron maiden.*

2. By demonstrating unique skills, women can show their value. However, they need to balance visibility to superiors with becoming non threatening to colleagues. Unfortunately, this can result in a very limited use of their skills and they are likely to be stuck in any roles so defined.

3. Some women cope by emphasising a team approach, e.g. when they do something well, "didn't WE do that well" or being the first to go in and back up others.

4. Others use humour as a distancing device. Jurik presented this an attempt to balance *seductress with iron maiden* however some women are teased and can neither "take it" nor "give it back".

5. The final strategy Jurik presented is that of using sponsorship to enhance positive visibility. However in the US, there is no formal mentoring scheme thus anyone seeking sponsorship is in danger of being seen as someone failing to take on all of the responsibilities of their job. Also, if women are seen to be too close, sexual rumours start and they become labelled as a *seductress*. This situation may be worse in this country as the formal existence of mentoring is limited to officers on the Accelerated Promotion Scheme and people within that scheme already face opposition.

As Jurik points out, these strategies are individual, there is no organisational help or training in such strategies. Many women fail to develop means of coping that succeed in helping them to avoid being negatively stereotyped and trapped. Jurik concludes that women caught in the traps will find it extremely difficult to be promoted. Her findings support Zimmer's contention that there are

individual and organisational characteristics that inform stylistic responses of female officers. But the adaptations are fluid and dynamic, changing with experience.

Alpert (1984) reviewed American court cases and social science research findings and concluded that "the bottom line... appears to be the *quality* of job performance. Sexual harassment, concerns about physically demanding duties, and other problems continue, but, if women officers work well, they tend to be liked and praised and serve as a means of normalizing the prison environment. If they create problems or attract trouble, they are discredited and disliked" (p 445).

A slightly different "bottom line" was presented by Horne (1985) who concluded that women may do as good a job as the men but that the core issue is one of attitude: "There are still and will continue to be significant obstacles placed on the path toward fuller utilization of women in corrections. Prisons are generally known as institutions especially resistant to change." This particular change was not favoured or easily accepted by most members of the prison community... "male opposition and harassment have blocked women's entrance into the prison guard subculture. Women, therefore, receive neither the on-the-job socialization nor the supportive psychological benefits of a subculture. Actual experience... indicates that discipline has not deteriorated; obscenity more often comes from disgruntled male co-workers than from the inmates; and sexual assaults are not prevalent" (p 53).

Women were introduced in an attempt to calm the prisoner culture and to normalise it (Jacobs 1983, Kissel & Katsampes, 1980 and Morris & Hawkins 1969). Van Voorhis, Cullen, Link & Wolfe (1991) argue that supporters of cultural importation models could proffer both negative and positive consequences from bringing in women to prisons. On the positive side, women are thought to hold attitudes related to therapy and rehabilitation that would be stronger than the punitive attitudes that are thought to prevail in their male counterparts. The negative predictions would mainly deal with job related discrimination. This would be worsened within the prevailing climate that pays superficial attention to caring for prisoners whilst really paying heed only to the needs of control and security. Within such an atmosphere, women may not measure up to the aims of the "old guard" nor of management.

Their findings are consistent with Jurik (1985) and Fry and Glaser (1987) in that they found no relationship between gender and attitude to treatment. When they examined job related adversity, Fry and Glaser initially observed few of the gender effects reported by Zupan, 1986 and Zimmer, 1986, but after controlling for peer and supervisory support, the relationship between gender and work stress became statistically significant. They also stated that the women reported higher levels of support which seems to replicate Zimmer's paternalistic finding of "support" from male supervisors but it is important to note that they did not ask what constituted support.

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

The following subsections present a more detailed review of the literature that led to the design of the cross gender supervision research. It is of particular interest in the light of the much repeated findings that relate to women's greater likelihood of reporting fear of crime (e.g. Hindelang, Gottfredson & Garofalo, 1978 and Warr, 1984). The sections represent each of the main areas of concern that have been raised in previous studies.

Calming

As mentioned above, the main argument in favour of the introduction of women, was that they would provide a calming influence over the heady prison environment. As Zimmer (1987) tells us, The mere presence of women at the site of incipient confrontation might do more to reduce violence than would any physical intervention. Becker (1975); Cormier (1975); Biemer (1977); Graham (1981); Flynn (1982); Szockyj (1989) and Bryn Jones (1996) have reported that women have a calming effect on the male prisoners. Zimmer (1987) concludes that this may be because they are unlikely to engage in such competitive relationships with inmates and avoid the "ego showdowns". Szockyj (1989) emphasises female officers' interactive abilities. She contends that female officers contributed to a more relaxed, calm environment as well as an increase in morale. "Many male officers mentioned that the women generally did have better interpersonal skills" (p 321) and the 23 participants in Bryn Jones', (1996, p 31) study all answered yes to the following question: "do you believe that the use of a female officer, in some situations, produces a better response from a male inmate, sometimes avoiding confrontation?".

Control

If the most frequently made argument in favour of women officers is one of calm, the main opposition to the posting of women in male prisons tends to revolve around concerns about their abilities to maintain control. Clayton (1995) reports outright opposition to the employment of women in all male establishments and a potentially more moderate argument that they should not be employed in the highest security, category A and B prisons because "women were more at risk of being taken hostage than men; that they would be more brutally assaulted than men; and that, in general, they had not the physical strength of men" (p 2). Bryn Jones' (1996) participants report that "Inmates will always seek out and exploit weak links in the system and women would be prime targets, they are physically weaker and not able to stand up to the confrontations that are a daily part of prison life. If somebody shouts at them they'll burst into tears" (p 17). "You could never use one on a 3 man team (Control and Restraint) they would be a liability, a danger to the other guys, they are too weak for physical situations. As for posting an all women team in, well forget it--I reckon that against any con. half way decent at handling himself, you would have three pregnant officers coming out of the cell" (p 18).

From Canada, Szockyj, (1989) reports that men thought they were more physically adept and women thought they were as good as men. All received the same training and apparently brute force was rarely needed. Despite this, only one third of men felt comfortable with female back up. Similar findings have been reported here: "It was disappointing to note that stereotypical and sexist views on the role and deployment of female officers were expressed at virtually all of the establishments that were visited... The main reasons behind such views appeared to be the perceived threat of female officers to the ability to maintain security and control... while these views were widely held, the consultants found little tangible evidence to support them. On the contrary, when challenged, those expressing such views found it difficult to justify them" (Willerton & Patterson, 1995, p 1).

As Zimmer (1987, p 417) stated, "guards must perform a wide range of diverse tasks to keep the prison operating, but the most important ones center around their custody and control functions-- keeping prisoners inside the walls and following the rules and regulations for inmate behavior that have been established by prison administrators." Officers' power to punish is informal as well as that given in rules. Many techniques of control have become part of the "guard role" as it has traditionally been performed by men. They portray an image of "personal, physical dominance". As Zimmer continued, even in the best prisons, there are times when intimidation, confrontation and physical force are going to be needed. There is also the potential for mass violence and it is officers who have to maintain control. Predominantly male administrators and officers may feel that women working as "guards" are reluctant to respond to situations in which physical force may be necessary and that they are inadequately prepared to do this side of the work. In other words, women are a risk to internal security.

In an interesting twist, Alpert & Crouch (1991) reported that overall, officers were slightly less worried about security and management problems than were the prisoners and all people thought that where men guard women, security problems would be more likely than when women guard men. Prisoners were also more likely to predict prisoner violence than were officers. It is also perhaps important to note that there are a number of different techniques that can be used in potentially violent situations. In the 1994 report from the DPF2, talking and calming down a situation were the most common means of controlling a potentially violent situation. However, some officers did report a preference for physical restraint, they were all men.

Staff prisoner relationships

In their 1994 investigation, the DPF2 found that all female respondents had encountered problems from the prisoners however these varied in seriousness. Five women reported prisoners who resented being given orders by a woman, 2 said that they were perceived as a "soft touch" and one women reported that wearing a skirt on an open landing gave her problems. Twelve of the fourteen female respondents said that they had not experienced any problems although "several" of them later reported being faced with violence. Most problems were to do with privacy and decency and

this reflects the previous litigation and research findings from outside the United Kingdom (Becker, 1975; Horne, 1985; Szockyj, 1989 and Alpert & Crouch 1991).

A number of researchers have reported that women are also more likely than men to develop friendly and pleasant relationships with prisoners (Jurik, 1985; Zimmer, 1987 and Szockyj, 1989). Some prisons have rules prohibiting such relationships fearing that the officer allegiance may switch from the prison to the prisoners. Toch (1977) showed that when male officers violated such rules, they risked disapproval of management and colleagues who regarded the prisoners as the enemy. From the female officers' perspectives, there may be a feeling of "nothing to lose" as the male officers may already consider them as enemies. Thus, they may be more able to form good relationships with the prisoners. It has also been found that the most important contributor to prison staff burnout is the relationship between staff and prisoners (Gerstein, Topp & Correll, 1987). Further, Jurik; Halembra; Musheno & Boyle (1987) concluded that more favourable (less punitive) attitudes to prisoners and more positive attitudes towards co-workers are positively associated with satisfaction levels. Hence in an ideal situation, relationships within and between both groups should be good.

However, the nature of the relationship between the prisoners and officers is not simple. This was demonstrated in the Woodcock report (1994, p 72) where a governor is cited as stating: "a failure to understand what we are dealing with was evidenced by the shock and surprise of prison officers that one of the prisoners should actually shoot one of them." Woodcock also stresses the problem of prisoner "conditioning" of officers' attitudes through a variety of intimidatory mechanisms. Such "conditioning" may be more likely when the officers concerned are not fully integrated into officer culture.

Paternalism

Despite court rulings of equality, research has demonstrated the prevalence of paternalistic over protection of women in potentially dangerous situations. Bowersox (1981) reports on the findings of a "Correctional role questionnaire" that was sent to 500 correctional officers. His findings suggest that men enact the "social responsibility norm" in the presence of women and that women find the "social responsibility norm" groundless. The "social responsibility norm" was defined as the male tendency to shield a woman from possible assault.

One of the male participants in Bryn Jones' (1996) study gave the following statement that is reported as representative: "What do you think would happen to you if you sent a woman into a situation on a landing which you knew was a bit dodgy and the worst case scenario happened--she was taken hostage or gang banged. Never mind about all this talk of equal rights and equal risks, you may as well top yourself because if the Department didn't do it the press would have a field day with you" (p 17). When asked about over protection, the findings from the Clayton (1995) report are unclear. Women did report being moved out of danger, having postings altered, etc. but the implications are not examined. For example, one possible implication has already been mentioned in earlier chapters: one of the participants in the fear survey explained how she had been

endangered through being shielded from knowledge that threats had been made against her. Such possibilities are not acknowledged in Clayton's report.

Willerton and Patterson (1995) report anecdotal evidence suggesting that female members of staff were prevented by male colleagues from dealing with incidents that would require the use of Control and Restraint techniques. However, they conclude that most of the time, female officers were allowed to deal with such incidents as and when they occurred. They continue by reporting that female staff do attend training courses to learn advanced "C & R" techniques "and were recognised as being proficient in them. Their greatest concern was that as they were prevented from using their skills and knowledge in actual incidents when they arose, such skills rapidly became stale... It also served to reinforce the prejudice that women could not handle certain situations with violent and refractory prisoners" (p 3).

Supervisor support

Regardless of arguments against and in favour of female officers in male prisons, it should be remembered that originally, their deployment was as a result of equal opportunities law both here and in other jurisdictions. Thus, it should not be too surprising that Horne (1985) reports that the reaction of most prison administrators was mostly negative. Apart from everything else, there have been a string of lawsuits with which the American administrators have had to contend, from males, females, officers and prisoners alike. Participants in Bryn Jones', (1996) study were asked whether they felt that they had received sufficient support, guidance or encouragement from line managers or governors. Three of them said that they had, the remaining 20 all said that they had not. In contrast, 16 of the 18 female respondents to the DPF2 survey reported support from their line managers. (One wonders whether this had anything to do with why these particular women responded to the survey when it was sent out and why 60% of the questionnaires were never returned.) However it should be noted that Horne (1985) also reports that the most resistance came from male co-workers.

Acceptance

One relevant aspect of in group relationships relates to the level of acceptance felt by the group members. Szockyj (1989) reports that the majority of people said that they had accepted female officers but that the officers concerned did not feel that they had been accepted. This may be because it is particularly hard for women to be accepted under the "brawl of honour". As mentioned in chapter three, Fleisher (1989) describes the responsibility of all male employees to respond to emergencies. In his "warehouse" women never respond. "Trust in fellow officers is a fragile thing. You're trusting them with your life... I don't respond to [new] guys until I see blood on them--his or an inmate's. I want to see blood" (p 209). Another participant goes on to describe a staff inmate brawl: "It was loud in there, ninety of them screaming and hollering... It was exciting. A sense of camaraderie with the three of us" (p 212).

An alternative explanation for the finding that women did not feel accepted could be because of story spreading. A common way of undermining a person's confidence is to spread rumours about them that they will come to hear. This is reported in the North American, Australian and English literature. For example, Clayton (1995) reports that 26% of women and 10% of men reported that stories had been spread about them in the previous six months. Also, 17% of women and 7% of men reported being intimidated or bullied at work.

Safety

One of the most pressing fears surrounding loss of control is that personal safety of both officers and prisoners will be compromised. Flynn (1982) and Alpert (1984) cite the Supreme Court Case of Dothard v Rawlinson 1977. In it, the court ruled that women in maximum security settings were at risk and thus posed a control problem. The court expressed concern about the particular system (Alabama) as it was seen as being badly out of control. However, Flynn also cites the California Supreme Court which concluded that "the desire to protect women from the general hazards inherent in many occupations cannot be a valid ground for excluding them from those occupations... Women must be permitted to take their chances along with men when they are otherwise qualified and capable of meeting the requirements of their employment... We can no more justify denial of the means of earning a livelihood on such a basis than we could deny all women drivers' licenses."

If one returns to the calming argument, Morris and Hawkins (1969, 1970) have said, "that the injection of women into the prison at all levels, including that of the front-of-the-line guard, will tend to reduce violence is offered as a confident proposition... As a matter of observation, men behave better in the presence of women... Frequent and constructive association with women as staff members of the prison will have a positive impact upon the prisoners' later social relationships... We suppose the risks involved... are fourfold: loss of discipline, a barrage of obscenity, sexual assault, and successful courtship by those we too often regard as pariahs. The first we doubt, the second is a matter of staff training, the third is not a serious threat, and the fourth is to be occasionally expected and welcomed" (p 133).

Sources of worry

If people are being harassed or bullied at work, then the obvious question to ask is who is being intimidatory towards them. In Bryn Jones', (1996) study, most of the female officers reported harassment or sexual assault of some variety. However, many more reported problems with their colleagues than with the prisoners. "Most of those interviewed felt that they tolerated more harassment since joining the Prison Service than they previously had because they were working... "in a man's world" and wanted to be accepted... Not all the women thought they had grounds for complaint even when they admitted to receiving lewd comments, backside patting, sexual innuendo, remarks on menstrual cycles and a deliberate increase in the use of foul language and blue jokes followed by a mock apology" (p 27). When the women were asked whether "problems"

came primarily from prisoners or from colleagues, 18 responded that staff were the most likely and 5 that they came from prisoners.

In contrast, the DPF2 study (1994) found that two thirds of their sample of women reported no problems from their colleagues and one third (6) reported similar findings to those reported above. However, when later asked if they had experienced "disrespectful or saucy comments made to (them) by colleagues of the opposite sex", two thirds (12) of the women reported that they had and that the intention had been to cause embarrassment. Thus, although they may not have complained, the participants were experiencing problems. This may be a finding that is sustained over time as Zupan (1986) demonstrated that after at least a year, women were still experiencing more job related tension than were men and they tended to be more negative in their evaluations of other staff members and slightly more positive in evaluation of prisoners than were male officers.

DESIGNING THE RESEARCH

The previous literature indicates that there may be a number of tensions surrounding the deployment of female officers in male prisons. There was a need to replicate and to extend previous studies within the Prison Service. The research aimed to address as many of the concerns raised above as was possible. It was particularly influenced by the following questions raised by Alpert, 1984:

1. "What is the probability of decreasing the risk of violence when guards of one gender guard inmates of the opposite gender?

2. Do inmates hold favourable attitudes toward guards of the opposite gender?

3. Do male guards hold positive attitudes toward female guards?" (p 451).

In light of the previously reported research, this study also sought to add to information relating to fear and control since the introduction of cross sex postings. As Zupan (1986, p 349) points out, the claims that mere presence of women softens the climate are founded upon the "assumption that women, by virtue of their sex, bring to correctional institutions qualities not possessed by men officers." She focused on:

1. Whether women and men bring differing attitudes, perceptions and behavioural traits to the institution.

2. Whether there is a differential impact of the environment on men and women.

3. Whether men and women have differing effects on the environment.

The only difference in expressed attitudes that she found was in safety and freedom. Women thought that safety was slightly more important and men thought freedom slightly more important. Men and women were very similar in their perceptions of inmate needs and both misperceived those needs. Women exhibited significantly higher levels of tension yet no significant difference was found between men and women in evaluations of the jail environment, although women tended

to be more negative. Women tended to be more negative in their evaluations of other staff members and slightly more positive in evaluation of prisoners than were men.

One difficulty in assessing her study is that the research was designed around forced ranking procedures. These are not the most sensitive means of measurement nor do they empower participants. Whilst one wished to attempt to try to replicate these findings, the methodology was too narrow to be consistent with the broad aims of the entire project. Having said that, in some respects, Zupan's research was too wide. Whilst there is little doubt that the attitudes expressed are interesting, it is hard to know how they should be interpreted. For example, did the participants hold such views before joining their correctional facilities? It was decided that the broad questions that Zupan asked would inform the current research but her methodology has not been adopted.

The main influence over the questions asked was from Gerstein, Topp & Correll (1987) who concluded that the nature of the prison environment seems to be more significant than the personal variables measured. They also reported a need to examine the frequency of violence between prisoners and officers. During the current research, this was attempted by means of trawling through adjudications, records of sick leave and observation books. However, it became clear that there were not reliable, functional records. Therefore, the frequency and severity of violence between prisoners and officers has been assessed as part of the self report and not checked for validity. There are a number of items from Gerstein et al.'s scales that have been adopted (albeit in a slightly modified form). Those chosen include:

1. How much time do you spend with co-workers away from inmates (aside from meetings)?

2. How much recreational time do you spend with co-workers?

3. Do you get the support that you would like from your co-workers?

4. How do your family feel about the work that you do?

5. Are they concerned for your safety?

6. Relationship with inmates: Do you trust them?

7. Role ambiguity: do you like what happens and how much influence do you feel you have?

8. Is there enough/too much structure?

The research is important for a number of reasons, not the least of which is that it provides some data necessary for cross cultural comparisons and should be of practical value to the Prison Service. The design was quasi experimental with the main Independent variables being sex (m/f) and prison ("Mars" or "Saturn"). There were numerous dependent variables including fear; perceived support (from peers, management and family); assessment of the regime; perceived level of influence; degree of team membership and acceptance.

METHODS

Participants

Two hundred and forty people participated in this study: Fifteen officers and fifteen prisoners from each of the four wings in two category B training prisons. The first prison will be referred to as Mars and the second as Saturn. In both prisons, officer selection was by a process of refusal. In Mars, a Governor circulated a short research outline with a bulletin and in Saturn, the proposal was cleared with the P.O.A.. In both prisons, posters were displayed and the researcher chatted informally to officers at wing meetings. She was seen for a couple of days by the officers before she formally approached any of them to take part in the study. This was achieved by concentrating on prisoner interviews for the first two days on each wing. (However, on two wings, the researcher appeared on the wing, explained what she was doing there and immediately began interviewing officers who were there and volunteered at the time.) More usually, officers were approached on the basis of who could be spared when the researcher was present on the wings (Sundays to Fridays 08.00-19.00, for May to September, 1995). Having agreed to take part, a time was scheduled for the interview. The reason for not making this a "true" random selection procedure was that it was hoped that every Asian or Black officer (5 between the two prisons) and each female officer working on a wing could be approached. In total, five officers refused (White, male B.G.O.'s). Each wing had between 26 and 29 basic grade officers posted in shifts. Given that a number were working nights, or had shift patterns that did not coincide with the researcher's times at the prisons, mention should be made of the high degree of co-operation given to the researcher.

The prisoners were all selected randomly from a list of prisoners broken down by race and wing. Each sample was chosen so as to reflect the ethnic proportions of the prisoners on each wing at the time of commencement of research on that wing. Having been selected, prisoners were approached in person. Posters were displayed on the wing explaining that some research was going on on the wing and that people might be approached to take part in the project. The prisoners from the selected sample, were told that their name had been selected by chance to take part in some research designed to see what they thought of the officers and the regime. It was pointed out to them that the research was concerned with what they thought of the officers, what the officers thought of them and what the officers thought of each other. It was made clear that participation was voluntary and would take about 20-30 minutes of their time. On one wing, there were no refusals from prisoners. Usually, two or three declined to participate, the highest number of refusals was 8 on a wing.

Participants from Mars:

Officers

All of the female officers from each of four wings participated in the study. Their ranks were: Twelve Basic Grade Officers (B.G.O.), 1 Senior Officer (S.O.) and 1 Principal Officer (P.O.). Wing 1 is a Vulnerable Prisoner Unit, two female B.G.O.'s were based here along with 1 male P.O., 1

male S.O. and 11 male B.G.O.'s. Wing 2 is a lifer unit with a mixed category population (B/C). Four female B.G.O.'s came from this wing as did 3 male S.O.'s. Wing 3 is a category C wing. The four females from that wing were all B.G.O.'s. The eleven male officers included, 9 B.G.O.'s and 2 S.O.'s. Wing 4 is a category B wing. The female P.O., S.O., and two of the B.G.O.'s were based on that wing. In addition eleven basic grade male officers were drawn from that wing.

Thus in total, there were 60 officers, 46 men and 14 women. Three principal officers, seven senior officers and fifty basic grade officers.

Prisoners

The prisoners were selected so as to gain an ethnically representative sample. Prisoners were not selected on the basis of age or offence type. However this information was collected where possible. Forty eight of the participants were white and 12 were Black.

Participants from Saturn:

Officers

All of the female officers from each of four wings participated in the study. Their ranks were: Ten Basic Grade Officers (B.G.O.) and 2 Senior Officers (S.O.). In Saturn, all wings are B category. Wing 5 is a wing with a differential regime. On this wing, two spurs house prisoners enrolled on the drug rehabilitation programme. Five female officers participated from this wing, one was an S.O. the rest were B.G.O.'s. The ten male participants included, 8 B.G.O.'s and 2 S.O.'s. Wing 6 has a landing for those going through the induction programme. Four female B.G.O.'s were based on wing 6 alongside 3 male S.O.'s and 8 male B.G.O.'s. Wing 7 is a normal location category B training wing and 2 female B.G.O.'s came from wing 7 as did 3 male S.O.'s and 10 male B.G.O.'s. Wing 8 is also split into two regimes. One landing houses prisoners on the "Basic" Regime (the bottom of three levels of incentives and earned privileges). The other two landings are normal location. One of the female S.O.'s came from that wing. In addition, twelve male B.G.O.'s, one male S.O. and the male P.O. took part.

Thus in total, there were 60 officers, 48 men and 12 women. One principal officer, eleven senior officers and 48 basic grade officers.

Prisoners

Again the prisoners were selected so as to gain an ethnically representative sample. This time, twenty-two prisoners were Black, one was Asian, four were classified by the Home Office as Other and thirty-three were White.

Officers Overall

Of the one hundred and twenty officers who participated, 26 were women; 5 were members of ethnic minorities; the average age was 35.4 with the youngest officer being 22 and the oldest being 58; the average length of service was 5.17 years with the shortest serving officer having been in post for two months and the longest for 29 years. Four principal officers, 19 senior officers and 97 basic grade officers participated.

Prisoners Overall

The following tables are designed to demonstrate the make up of the prisoner sample. For each table, the number reported is the actual number of prisoners.

The computer system did not have up to date records and certain fields seemed to have been somewhat haphazardly kept. For example, the vast majority of fields listing previous convictions (110) were empty. For 30 of the prisoners, the sentence length and type was missing or still awaiting further information for example they were listed under a holding warrant whilst their files were being transferred from their previous establishment. Correlations of actual and reported sentence type and actual and reported sentence length were calculated for those prisoners whose files were complete. The correlation between actual sentence type and reported sentence type was r = 0.991 and that between actual sentence length and reported sentence length was r = 0.997. Of the four prisoners who did not report the same sentence as that which appeared on their file, one said that he had been sentenced for Grievous Bodily Harm whereas his record reported Indecent Assault; one participant stated that he was serving a sentence for Robbery whereas his record reported Possession of a Fire Arm with Intent; the third also reported Robbery whereas his recorded sentence was a Holding Warrant and the final prisoner also said that he was serving a sentence for Grievous Bodily Harm whereas his record reported Attempted Murder. The one prisoner who mis-stated the length of his sentence reported a 10 year sentence made up of a 6 year and a 4 year one whereas his record was for six alone. These differences are consistent and not worrying thus for all analyses presented later and for the tables below, previous convictions, sentence length and type are those which were reported by the prisoners. Seventy prisoners reported that they had served previous custodial sentences. The tables below illustrate the rest of the prisoner participant information.

Table 8.1   Breakdown of prisoner participants by race.

White	Black Caribbean	Black African	Black Other	Other	Asian Pakistani
81	21	7	6	4	1

Table 8.2   Breakdown of prisoner participants by offence type.

Burglary	Robbery	Drugs	Other (non violent)	Kidnap	Possession of a fire arm	Indecent assault
3	29*	33	3	1	1*	4*
GBH	**Rape**	**Other (sexual)**	**Other (violent)**	**Attempted murder**	**Manslaughter**	**Murder**
5*	4	5	3	1*	4	20

* See explanation of mis-reporting above. Data is missing from 4 participants.

Table 8.3   Breakdown of prisoner participants by reported sentence length in years.

Under 2	2 - 3.9	4 - 10	10 - 25	Life (99)
1	2	65	28	22

Data is missing from 2 participants.

Procedure

Forty-five minute to an hour (or so) long interviews were held with staff participants. Each of the interviews with the prisoners took between 20 and 30 minutes.

The first part of all interviews was used to explain the broad nature of the research and to introduce the researcher to the participants. In the case of officers, they were told that the research tried to examine how they feel about their jobs and day to day routines. Prisoners were told that the study was about their day to day environment. A brief summary of the findings will be sent to all of the participants with a full debriefing. Each wing will receive a copy of the full report as will the governors of the prisons. Each participant was assured of confidentiality. Obviously, they were told that confidentiality is limited by security considerations. The questionnaires were read out and filled in by the researcher and participants jointly. The interview technique adopted was the same as that reported in chapter three.

Materials

The items on the questionnaires are based on previous work and sought to build upon it (Alpert, 1984; Zimmer, 1986; Gerstein, Topp & Correll, 1987; Gomme, 1988 and Adler, 1994). The issues under investigation are not only intangible but delicate and again, the questionnaires were designed in a manner that should have elicited information in as sensitive yet efficient a manner as possible. The questionnaires that are presented below are the final versions used. The first interviews in Mars were for piloting and no changes were made to the prisoner questionnaire. The officer questionnaire was modified by the addition of question 6 part a. This was a suggestion from a number of officers and was adopted accordingly (despite its lack of subtlety). (See appendix 2 for the coding sheets and examples of interview transcripts.)

As can be seen below, the interview protocols were developed from those used in the general survey of fear. On the prisoner questionnaires, the first two questions are related to custodial adjustment and assessment. Questions three to eight and fifteen are concerned with the prisoners' reports of relationships between officers and prisoners in general whilst questions nine to fourteen and sixteen pertain directly to their views on the deployment of female officers.

The officer questionnaire was also derived from the general survey of fear, but as can be seen, it was expanded. The first three questions derive background information and obtain officers' assessments of the regime. In a related area, question four attempts to assess whether the officers feel properly prepared for their job. Staff interactions with one another are assessed in questions five to ten and the interactions between staff and prisoners in general are assessed in questions eleven to fourteen. From there, the protocols are more directly concerned with means of control and fear. Questions fifteen and sixteen assess preferred means of control and awareness of potential environmental cues. Question seventeen requests information about previous experience that could be associated with "concrete" examples of fear. If an officer is fully incorporated into the prison environment, then he or she would be expected to respond positively to questions eighteen, twenty-seven and twenty-eight. Question nineteen relates to support from outside and questions twenty to twenty-four are concerned with fear, its degree and antecedents. Questions twenty-five and twenty-six ask about means of coping with fear and question twenty-nine follows on from acceptance to assess impact on the institution.

Prisoner Questionnaire

1) Sentence length and type, any "pre-cons."?

2) How would you describe the overall regime in here?   What's it like for you?

3)   a) Do you do any work in the prison?
   [b) How do you get on with the staff there?
   c) Would you describe them as friendly?]

4)   a) Are you doing any training/education?
   [b) How do you get on with the staff there?
   c) Would you describe them as friendly?]

5) Can you describe an officer to me, as someone coming in from the outside? (What are they like?)

6) What do you think of the officers on the wing?

7) Do you generally get on with them?

8) Do you have any problems with them?
   [a) What sort?
   b) Do they happen regularly?]

9) Is that the same for the male officers and the female officers?

10) Do you think that the women do their job in the same way as the men?

11) Do you think that they have any effect on the way that things work around here?

12) How do you feel about having women around here?

13) Do you think that it's a good idea to have women as officers?

14) Do you ever worry about having female officers around?

15) Do you think that the officers ever worry when they do their jobs?

{16) Is that the same for the men and the women?}

17) How do you feel about talking about things like this?

18) Do you want to add anything to what you've said so far?

19) Is there anything that you want to ask me?

Officer Questionnaire

1)   Rank, age.

2)   How long have you been an officer?

3)   What do you feel that the overall regime is like?
    a) Do you have any influence over the regime?
    b) Is the level about where you would like it to be?

4)   Is there enough structure to the job, to what you're expected to do and
the way in which to do it? (Too much?)

5)   Do you feel part of a team?
    a) Does is matter that you do/don't feel part of a team {how much?} Why?

6)   What do you think of the other officers?
    a) Does that depend on their sex?

7)   Do you have confidence in those with whom you work? I don't want any names.

8)   Do you generally get on with them?

9)   Do you have any problems with them?
    [a) What sort?
    b) Do they happen regularly?]

10)   Do you see your colleagues much after work?

11)   Do you generally get on with the prisoners?

12)   Do you have any problems with them?
    [a) What sort?
    b) Do they happen regularly?]

13)   Do you trust the prisoners?

14)   Do you think that they trust you?

15)   On the landings, would you say that you're always in control?
    a) How do you keep control?

16)   Can you tell if a situation looks like it could get violent? Not that it
necessarily will, but that it could.
    a) What kind of thing tells you?
    b) How would you handle a situation which looks like it could go off?
    c) What about if it still turns nasty?

17)   Would you please give me some examples of a "nasty situation"?
    a) Have you ever been involved in any nasty encounters with inmates?
    b) What sort of thing?
    c) How often?
    d) Have you ever been in an unpleasant situation with other officers?
    e) What sort of thing?
    f) How often?

18)   As an officer, how would you describe yourself?
    a) Do you think that management see you in the same way? (Is that how
you would like them to see you?)
    b) Do you think that the prisoners see you as you see yourself? (Is that
how you would like them to see you?)
    c) Do you think that the other officers see you as you see yourself? (Is
that how you would like them to see you?)

19)   What do your family think about you doing this job?
    a) Do they ever worry about your safety?

20)   Do you ever worry about going anywhere or doing something
that's part of the job?

21)   Are there any situations in prison which make you uncomfortable?

22)   Do you ever worry about your safety?

23)   Do you ever feel fearful while you do the job?
     a) How fearful?

24)   Is that based on personal experience?

25)   Do you feel that you have the support of other officers?
  a) Supervisors?

26)   If you have a problem, does the prison provide you with anyone, or anything that can help you to work through it?
     a) Have you ever taken up this service?
     b) Would you ever take it up?

27)   Would you say that you feel a part of the system?

28)   Have you been accepted?

29)   Do you think that you have made any difference here?

30)   How do you feel about talking about things like this?

31)   Do you want to add anything to what you've said so far?

32)   Is there anything that you want to ask me?

CHAPTER NINE

CUSTODIAL ADJUSTMENT AND ASSESSMENT - PRISONERS 1995

In reporting the results from the cross gender research, the findings have been divided into five chapters. This, chapter nine, provides the reader with the context for prisoners' views on officers in general. The focus within this chapter is on prisoners' custodial adjustment and assessments. Chapter ten then moves on to prisoners' perceptions of female officers. Chapter eleven is the first to present and discuss the findings from officers who participated in the current study. It reports their adjustment to and acceptance within their prison. Chapter twelve moves on to officers' perceptions of each other, their fears and means of control and chapter thirteen is a summary and discussion of the key findings presented in chapters nine to twelve. Please see appendix 2 for coding sheets, examples of transcripts, etc..

REGIME

The first measure of adjustment taken was the prisoner participants' assessments of their regimes. These were coded on a five point scale from very good (1) to very bad (5). The mean rating was 3 but 39% of the participants rated their regime as good or very good and 42% as bad or very bad. It is likely that there are institutional and individual variations that will affect the ways in which prisoners feel about regimes. Therefore, the first variable examined further was the prisoners' locations.

In the previous chapter, the actual wing names were replaced by numbers. The numbers were chosen on the basis of attractiveness of the regime. Although not reliably tested, these numbers did have face validity. Within the Prison Service, Mars is thought of as being a relatively "easy" place to serve a sentence whereas Saturn has a particularly poor reputation. This is associated with their uses. Mars tends to be used to hold long term prisoners who have been categorised as medium risk detainees for a substantial proportion of their sentence. Saturn, tends to be used for prisoners earlier on in their sentences. Saturn has also suffered from a number of riots relatively recently. Therefore, despite their similar categorisation, Saturn would probably be thought of less favourably than Mars. Also, within each prison, some wings are more likely to be volatile than are others. For example, in Saturn, prisoners held on a "restricted" or "basic" regime were less likely to be as contented as those confined within the drugs rehabilitation unit. After all, prisoners sent to the "basic" regime were those who had been identified as posing problems for control.

Given the differences between the wings, it is likely that prisoners will rate their regimes differently. Although not extensive, the trend in mean ratings supports this contention: (F $(7, 111)$ = 5.66, and p<0.01). This is demonstrated in Table 9.1 below. The mid point of the regime assessments was 3, O.K. or indifferent, lower scores are positive and higher ones are negative.

Table 9.1 Regime assessments broken down by wing.

Wing number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Mean rating	2.67	2.70	3.40	2.67	2.87	3.47	3.93	3.86
Standard deviation	1.29	1.03	0.63	0.98	1.13	0.99	0.70	0.66

The interviews yielded assessments of many factors that might have been associated with ratings of the regime. For this reason, attention was devoted to those factors that theory and research indicated to be of importance. Most of these are individual characteristics. For example, younger prisoners may feel more keenly any limitations on access to gymnasia and this may lead to more negative appraisals. Preliminary analyses indicated the apparent importance of these interpersonal factors: age of prisoners (younger prisoners are more negative); the race of the prisoners (white prisoners are less dissatisfied than are non white prisoners); the ratings that the prisoners gave of officers (more negative ratings of officers are associated with more negative ratings of regimes) and the prison in which the prisoner was incarcerated (Victorian Mars was rated more positively than the more modern Saturn). However, given the nature of the sample, it was not possible to control for all variables in systematic statistical analyses. In future work, these variables may provide useful starting points.

One area requiring future investigation is that relating to what constitutes a "good officer". This is discussed in more detail later but part of the problem is illustrated by the penultimate quotation below. In that remark, the prisoner depicts an ideal officer as one who leaves him alone to take his drugs. The rest of the quotations in this section allow the reader to better understand the remarks made by the prisoners in response to the question asking them about the regime. The responses range from the negative, to hopeful, positive and stoical.

"Crap. Too long out of your cells with the same old thing every day nothing to do it's limited too because I'm on the 43 units. Every day here feels like two days. It's very different to the main, a lot different. All timid, all paranoid. Stressful very stressful, it's the people I have to mix with, child abusers and things like that."

"It's changed a lot... they play games... this place is going crazy as far as I can see... area manager gives you the same answers but never investigates things. I told him they've got a bad drug problem and that makes me laugh. You tell him and fill in forms and they come back saying my form was out of date. If I wanted to put another one in, it would be dealt with. The date was irrelevant. They play games, that is they victimise people. The plain majority of officers in this gaol are racist. That's all I've seen. I've seen it going on around me and if you complain about it, it doesn't get any investigation. You've got people investigating their people."

"Out (here), it's a certain aspect, they don't understand Black people. It's harder for a Black guy, they're blind/blinkered... the staff inmate relationship is very relaxed, quite good. There's no us versus them. I quite like it, it's relaxed... London is cosmopolitan, (here it) is predominantly white, in prison, Black people, we're boisterous, loud voices. With my size, I'm seen, always associated with noise even if I'm not saying anything. If music is playing, they assume 9 out of 10 times, it's a Black guy and it's not always. We get caught in a catch 22. They don't understand us. They try their

best, getting a few ethnic officers, a couple as such, they are trying their best and it's hard to understand us. I'm not militant, just voicing my opinion."

"It's not adequate but it's the same everywhere, you don't address your offending. You get out and you get the same problems as when you came in. The system is an oppressive regime really... they just--what does it make you? After having abuse, what kind of person does it release into society? An angry person."

"It isn't stable... everything keeps on changing. You get used to something, do one thing but when they change, you don't agree."

"This prison's rules change every week."

"It was a shock at first... the changes coming through, they want the system to go backwards instead of forwards. You get caught up in things... At first they were more interested in your well being, before they gave the impression--now they show indifference openly."

When talking about the changes that had been implemented after the Woodcock report, one prisoner remarked "what doesn't help, each officer or rather, some do it as laid down and others don't. That can cause problems. You don't know where you are."

"It used to be positive but of late it's gone downhill and rapidly. I don't think the new drugs situation is going to help i.e. cannabis is prevalent but if they are testing for cannabis--fair enough for class A but to test for cannabis--I think it'll drive people to class A. The people selling cannabis have stopped and heroin, the place is full of heroin now as a direct result of the cameras and visits... banged up for five weeks because there is no work for me. It's a training prison and there should be work available. It's a bit of a paradox to call this a training prison when one day last week 75 of us were banged up because they couldn't provide work for us."

"It really is, they are trying to improve security, etc. and in doing so have gone childish... no system is infallible but certain things that go wrong, even a child could see are counter productive. Yesterday on the sports field, someone almost got killed. Five guys went to attack a young guy and because everyone was already on edge, the situation was aggravated... The problems in gaol start before, not in gaol, the problem lies in the street, like drugs... this was a good prison but now A class drugs are taking over inmates."

"It's been a varied two months. In that time, it changed from dangerous to more calm. In 1994, it was more or less prisoners who ran the prisons. Not that there wasn't control but prisoners were free-er to move around the wings and meet friends. In the last nine months, there have been dramatic changes, more forward. Not for the good of prisoners, for the satisfaction of authority and Home Office new policy. Most of the changes seem to bring distress to the officers themselves... At the moment, it's a melting pot waiting to explode--Home Leaves; cash; transfers and that cause a lot of distress. Drugs testing, I'm not completely against it but I believe a lot of the rules are enforced without explanation."

"There's a great prisoner staff relationship here if one wants to use it... I've taken heroin here but never ever seen it before that. This nick is 90% Londoners and the heroin is a bird killer... I use it but it hasn't used me at all because there is no way I want to go cold turkey."

"It's okay, I like it... each gaol has different rules but on the whole, the officer inmate relationship here is very good because there is an understanding."

To understand more about staff prisoner interactions within various situations, prisoners were asked about the staff at the workshops and in the education departments.

Work

Ninety (75%) of the prisoners worked (as would be expected of most prisoners in such prisons). Thirty three of them (43% of those who worked) said that they got on well with the staff at the workshops; twenty three (30% of those who worked) said that it depended on which staff or were indifferent; nineteen (25% of those who worked) reported that they got on very well with the staff at work and only one (1%) of the prisoners said that he got on badly with the work staff. When asked whether the work staff were friendly, sixty two (82% of those who worked) said that they were, eight (11%) reported that some of them were and six (8%) stated that they were not friendly. Hence, it is possible to conclude that staff prisoner relationships in work shops, kitchens, etc. are generally good. However, it is necessary to note that such staff are more often non uniformed staff rather than custodial officers.

Education

Forty three (36%) of the prisoners were involved in education. Eighteen of them were involved in full time education; 12 were engaged in it part time; 2 took evening classes and 8 men studied in their cells. When asked how well they interacted with the education staff, only one man said that he got on badly with them, 11 prisoners were indifferent, a further 11 prisoners said that they got on well and 9 reported getting on very well with them. When asked if the education staff were friendly, 24 prisoners stated that they were, 2 that they were some of the time and 2 stated that they were not.

"I've spent eight months waiting, there are only 3 courses, cleaners, painters and bricks--and computers but nobody does that, it's for fraudsters. You need something more, if I had discipline, it would keep you straight. More courses like roofing, scaffolds, etc. you could make a good living. The courses here would earn peanuts so there's no real incentive to go straight out there."

"I've finished my IT course and won't do any for the rest of my time because they can't provide full time education and they don't provide part time work so it's a bit complicated."

"There's nothing here for me."

Questions then moved to ratings of uniformed staff. Prisoners were asked first for a general description of officers.

General description of an officer

Encouragingly, many of the prisoners reported that this was an impossible question as it depended on the individual officers concerned. This finding is not what would necessarily be expected. Prisoners and officers are in invidious positions relative to each other. If there is a high level of enmity between them, then one would expect negative stereotypes to abound. The prisoners' answers to the request to describe an officer were coded on a 5 point scale from very positive to very negative. The mid point was taken as neutral or where a prisoner stated that they were all different individuals. Seventy-seven of the prisoners gave ratings that were 3 on the scale, i.e. they were neutral; seventeen of the prisoners were positive and one prisoner was very positive about officers in general; twenty prisoners were negative about officers and two were very negative.

Some examples of the descriptions are given below.

"Is a person who is able to control any situation. So his ideas are completely with the state, the rules, you don't motivate, you go along with them."

"... and the way they deal with Black inmates. Some of them, it's the first time they've ever seen Black people and it shows."

"80% I've managed to domesticate. I make attempts at being reasonable--most are too young to be corrupted by sadism or emotive like officers who have spent too long in Dante's Inferno. Most are not touched by it. It depends on the soul of the person and the ones with souls with which they are in tune are au fait. There is one warped individual and he's the one who has put me--one place not another."

"They can be all right one day then another have an off day--not swearing matches but off days... confrontation always comes up again. You have silly confrontations that are people letting off steam."

"Types: 1 is okay, just wants a peaceful time all round and generally pleasant. Just wants to be--comes to work and wants not too much stress, plods along and is pretty pleasant. He's all right. Another kind of officer likes the rules a lot and goes by the book and he's generally okay but the rules come first and the other kind of officer is a bastard. He knows he has the system behind him and he uses it to its full advantage. Generally that's the 3 types."

"I could give you 3 types: the old school has been in a long time and knows ins and outs and is down the line. You don't play games and he doesn't. The new officers, young some, come in and they think "hold on" throw authority at us. Then there is the third officer who is really basically scared and will do anything to keep people quiet so they are no bother. Anything for an easy life."

"On the whole, he's got--two months ago, I'd have been very negative but now I'm down here (the drugs rehabilitation spur)--really trying to give help. They are the minority in prison. They don't come in, get key and bang you up with no interest in keeping families together. Down here they really go for that."

"Without falling into the mistake that unit officers make in making generalisations, I look at all officers on the basis of individual responses to me. Part--there's a preponderance of intellectually disadvantaged people taking the job but that is changing and the younger staff coming in are even better."

"Here, it's difficult, I don't know them. I get on with them because they don't hang about on spurs... here, you can hide away, here it's not volatile and we're all on first name terms, that's new for me. That felt uncomfortable at first. Five years of "Gov." but here, there's no-one I don't get on with, maybe because I don't know them."

"When arrested, my immediate intention was to commit suicide. How could I survive? But I came in and saw nice people who related to me. I found out prisoners could relate to each other and respect each other and started looking up to life. Even prison officers, like x's my friend, we talk."

"I wouldn't. Most cons are low lifes, not that I'm above anyone but the other day, someone offered me a wedding ring for £10. Another wanted tobacco for his wife's chain and medallion he's taken off her, they're the junkies. I live with a handful you can talk to."

Wing officer ratings

Having been requested to provide a general description, prisoners were then asked to rate the actual officers on their wing. Five per cent of the prisoners rated the officers on their wing as being very good, 44% said that they were good, 32% were indifferent or said that they were mixed, 13% that they were bad and 3% that they were very bad. The mean scores for officer ratings broken down by wing are illustrated in the table below. Officer ratings are poorest on the more restricted wings and they are relatively positive on the wings in Mars.

Table 9.2 Prisoners' ratings of officers on their wing.

Wing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Mean rating	2.13	2.40	2.57	2.33	2.20	3.00	3.23	3.21
Standard deviation	0.74	0.51	0.85	0.72	0.56	0.96	1.01	0.89

"If they did their job to the letter, fine but they get personal and carry things over... they don't do what they are supposed to do, lazy. It would make a big difference if they did what they are supposed to. A lot don't have communication skills that they need for volatile people."

"I feel like closing up for my time and that is it... prison is not supposed to lock them up and forget about them. It must do more. People run a business or whatever for some reason and the officers must see what is the reason for they maybe can change the reason so that they can have a normal life after the prison time. Teach them some things or whatever. Teaching only what happens between people, teaching people how to live."

"I get on with most of them. Now and again, obviously in close quarters, have the occasional flare up... there are types of prison as well as officer."

101

Officer relationships: do you get on with them?

The vast majority of prisoners (110) stated that they generally got on with the officers. Two prisoners said that it depended on the officers and only 5 reported not usually getting on with officers. Despite this apparently positive finding, it is necessary to look at complete answers. Although only a few, a number of prisoners illustrated the need to go beyond the first word given in response.

"No. I avoid them."

"Yes, no problems. Take outs, if they want to get you down to the block, you don't get out unharmed. 3 or 4 suicides. The prison has changed 100% from good to bad compared with last year. There have been 3 or 4 suicides in the prison since the past 17 months. The Listeners must be allowed wherever they are asked for; yet no, never allowed to go down. The Governor 1 ordered they have to have access but they just refuse it. They are supposed to go to the cell of the guy who asked for it."

Officer relationships: do you have any problems with them?

Forty three of the prisoners (36%) reported problems with the officers. One prisoner did not answer the question and the rest said that they did not have problems. The tables below show the type and frequency of problems between officers and prisoners that were reported by the prisoners.

Table 9.3   Types of problem experienced between prisoner and officer.

TYPE OF PROBLEM	NUMBER OF PRISONERS	%AGE OF PRISONERS REPORTING PROBLEMS
Personality clash	12	29
Being petty	7	17
Me shouting or kicking off	4	10
Not doing their job properly	3	7
Poor communication	3	7
Mind games	2	5
Food	2	5
Searching/Drugs testing	2	5
Race	2	5
Other prisoners bucking the system	1	2
Unfair adjudications	1	2
Arguments over getting entitlements	1	2
Their sheer presence	1	2

Table 9.4   Frequency of problems experienced between prisoner and officer.

FREQUENCY OF PROBLEM	NUMBER OF PRISONERS	%AGE OF PRISONERS REPORTING PROBLEMS
Can't put a figure on it	6	14
Once or twice	10	24
They no longer occur	4	10
It depends	6	14
Less than 1 a month	3	7
Weekly	1	2
Every few days	4	10
Daily	8	19

Unfortunately, it is hard to know how to interpret these findings. Firstly, the numbers involved are relatively low. Secondly, there is no consistent pattern between types of problem and frequency. Given the size of the sample, and the few prisoners reporting problems with the officers, a certain amount of complacency could be forgiven. Nevertheless, the effects of such problems on those who experience them may be profound and some of them could be tackled relatively easily.

"No, but they are about to start." (The prisoner had been seen whilst influenced by drugs and thought it likely that some action would be taken. At the next wing meeting, a security officer came in to "deal with" him and the foreseen problems no doubt arose.)

"I do, with some of them but I'm trying to overcome them."

"The only problem is that they're generally helpful in other establishments and this place is literally every man for himself. May be government policy but they're in the front. For those of us who know the way the system works and read papers. We know it's not down to them. I'm not saying I don't have any problems but there's no specific problem."

"Only when they don't stick to their word."

"Testing, that's the biggest problem. If it does go off in Whitemoor and other gaols follow, I'd be happy and only because I know John Major will be gone. If he has another riot, it will be his fault for letting it get out of hand."

"One or two but not with ones here. One's gone and on the prison, there are one or two who are still here who I've had problems with. The same Black/White situation. I've reported one to the race relations officer but the biggest racist is the manager."

"I'm a bit volatile, it's hard for me to break out of that behaviour pattern. I've had a few swear ups but I'm getting better. I've changed more in the last three months down here (drugs rehabilitation spur) than in the rest of the time--I've wanted to."

The following section turns around the awareness measure from the fear survey. It assesses whether prisoners are aware of officers' difficulties.

Do the officers ever worry when they do their jobs?

Prisoner awareness is both high and accurate. The table below shows the officers' worries as identified by the prisoners.

Table 9.5   Prisoner perceptions of officers' concerns.

TYPE OF WORRY	NUMBER OF PRISONERS	%AGE OF RESPONSES
Safety	32	41
Loss of control	10	13
Fear	7	9
How to be professional	7	9
The work involved	5	7
Things from outside	3	4
What's coming next?	2	2
They do the sentence too	2	2
Drugs	2	2
Loss of personal control	1	1
Psychological games	1	1
Lack of experience	1	1
Dissatisfaction	1	1
Fires	1	1
Disease	1	1
For the prisoners	1	1
Personality clashes with prisoners	1	1
Some of the people here	1	1
Doing things imposed on them	1	1

Overall, ninety four (78%) of the prisoners said that the officers would worry in the course of their work; one prisoner was unsure and only nineteen (16%) said that the officers had nothing to worry about. As can be seen in chapter eleven, the prisoners have a good understanding of officers' concerns. The two main actual concerns of officers were violence then loss of control.

"Yes, they do, what it boils down to is a lot of pressure in here from the officers' point of view. The way they go on, take a liberty. In prison, even officers do sentences. They are locked in with us, they have to do nights and day time--must get sick of doors and keys. Stress, it's pressure, stress related. It affects them, if they get off on a wrong start in the mornings, there's going to be confrontations."

The following response is taken from a prisoner who reported frequent problems with the officers and who was negative about the regime. "Yes of course. Statistics showing their suicide rate is higher than inmates', also the break up of their marriages, and alcoholism. They are doing the time. Most of us come out but them, this is all they can do, it can't be good can it?"

"Some of them yes, very worried... some could be easily manipulated and intimidated if you wanted to be that kind of guy."

"I suppose it looks like it's their job to worry. To look if anything's going wrong, if offences are being carried out unnoticed. To check that there is no problem arising."

"If they are in a hurry. I've never noticed it. Sometimes to get something done, they rush. They don't bring their problems to work. They have them but I've never seen them, never seen it. It's

different asking me to someone who is in for their first time. I've been in prisons where I couldn't talk to them, speak with them, we never knew anything about them. Four looking after one hundred and seventy because we were all banged up all the time."

"I think they must. At the end of the day, you are walking a very, very fine line and it is so easy to tip over the line. I often hear how many people are going to sue everyone and it's all down to wretched money."

"I'm not sure, you get the whole thing. Every time someone upsets you, you think you are the only one in the world with troubles and when you earn good money for doing very little, they don't tend to take trouble. They don't seem to care. You get wound up in your own problems and minimise distractions they may have. Senior staff don't help juniors and it's getting worse because senior staff are worried about pounds. Instead of being governors, they've become accountants."

"They don't show it, or if they have, it's very rarely. But I should imagine that there is a worry that something may go down, always, not a tension but prison's never really relaxed, no-one can actually truly relax. From time to time, say there is a problem and the Home Office exacerbates it, unfortunately, officers are the front line so they may worry about a riot or something going off because they're the front line and cop it first. Generally, problems are Home Office caused."

That which they added

The next section in this chapter reports on prisoner addenda. These also add to the picture of life on the wings concerned. As might be expected, there were a multiplicity of issues on the minds of the prisoners. In an attempt to simplify matters for the reader these are reported first in tabular form, then qualitative examples are given.

Table 9.6   Prisoner addenda.

Addendum	Number of prisoners	%age of responses
Purposes of punishment	18	13
Drugs problems	13	10
Changes being imposed on the regime	10	7 (8.4)
Incentives schemes	9	7 (6.7)
Food	7	5
Sex offenders/S.O.T.P.	6	4 (4.4)
Criminal Justice system	5	4 (3.7)
Your time depends on yourself	5	4
Difficulties obtaining their entitlements	4	3
Intra prison difficulties with communication	4	3
Officer drinking habits	4	3
This prison is good	4	3
Reports	3	2
Female officers	3	2
Lack of facilities	3	2
The negative effects of imprisonment	3	2
Lifers	3	2
Can only talk to Board of Visitors	3	2
Staff prisoner relationships	2	1.5
Race	2	1.5
Staff attitudes	2	1.5
Temporary release	2	1.5
The need for better support for families	2	1.5
Remorse	2	1.5
Inexperienced officers	2	1.5
Control and restraint techniques	2	1.5
Security classifications	2	1.5
Inconsistency	1	0.7
Fear	1	0.7
Stereotyping	1	0.7
Prison wages	1	0.7
UK prisons better than others	1	0.7
Prison education	1	0.7
Causes of crime	1	0.7
Directorate of Health Care	1	0.7
Will any research help?	1	0.7
The need to educate the general public	1	0.7
Problems faced by foreign nationals	1	0.7

"The restricted regime just makes people worse. Got people down here, with no reason for being down here, no adjudications not told to go on basic. If you have a problem with staff, you're back down here, you can escape nickings but not the regime. If they took it as a job, it would be okay but some of them, it's their life. They've got to realise that this is our home, their work. Got to treat it as such. Most people on restricted get made worse, this is a dumping ground."

"Who we do see, they tend to try to wind you up to get you going. E.g. yesterday I was called out for a visit, then a freeze went on and I had to wait for an hour. If that doesn't build up tension, what does?"

"Relationships break up in here so maybe there should be counselling on relationships. The majority go out leaving bitter and confused... another thing is hard drugs. They should be controlled

within prison. Apart from that, a lot of geezers come in here not touched drugs and go out with bad habits on class A. They do try and help but they're not doing enough."

"The main thing is they are trying to move too fast. Trying to change all at once. Forcing a situation which will definitely end up in a riot... nobody in authority cares... officers could be hurt, female officers could be hurt, people will be kept away from their families longer. There's always trouble when trying to stop drugs. No way can you ever stop them completely. They can have a big effect but when there are no drugs, everyone is fronting up."

"The place is like, it's not good, so much drugs. If there was more to do like gym in the evenings, maybe people wouldn't be as bored and taking drugs all the time. If you've got nothing to do, you'll get yourself in trouble."

"I'm refusing to go over to (wing 3) now because of drugs."

"One thing I like is that staff are going to take courses like anger management, straight thinking, like inmates. It's a good step, let's hope it happens on other wings too."

"Some inmates blame officers for being here but we've only got ourselves to blame for being here. We know very well the consequences. It has been said to me, especially because it's murder, "but for the grace..." because they know my case. It could happen and anyone could just cross that line."

"What's in my file?! I'm doing 11 years. Yes it's made me grow up. I've got no animosity against my conviction. I want people to know there are good people, people who want to do the right thing. This is a set back in my life as a young man."

"There is no consistency in sentences... if you go to officers for a question, they can't answer... they can't even kick us without permission."

"I can't make sense of the way they class prisoners. I've got no violence on my record and I'm here listening to people who stab people for fun and laugh about causing people pain."

"It's only length of sentence that determines which prison you go to and that shouldn't be the case. There should be an assessment period and then you should be categorised."

"I've been in just under 3.5 years and I take the days as they come. It's a no win situation in these places. You can shout and fight but you end in here longer so it's futile to keep on dealing them out, so I chilled out."

"I've been away for 10 years now and get on with things. I let a lot go, maybe it's maturity... I got over my problems. I've seen a lot who didn't make it. Lifers don't get looked after and I find this sad. A lot are young men, who made one mistake and are suffering for 12 or 15 years and they are not bad people."

"Shouldn't have these screws on here. They've only been in the job only a year and straight on to VPU, because it's more volatile in here and not trained up for it. Sex offenders and suicide risks and all that. Should give them a couple of years, I think, before bringing on to the VPU... it gets to

the stage here when I can't wait to bang up. I came in with a reputation for a hard man and it's taken too long to lose. Screws think I'm bullying but if I growl and roll my eyes because of the way I look, they run. I don't like that. They can be really picky if they want. It's a doss all day. One b.s. screw S.O. standing there, staring at me going "punch me, punch me" 3 weeks ago. Wouldn't do it when someone's on the wing he's an arsehole--go into recess with people--wanker."

(Taken from the same wing as that above.) "Basically, the working relationship in here is very good. We've got the odd one or two who are idiots. I get on well with all of them or try to. I try to be helpful, do as I'm told and keep my head down. I don't look for trouble and I don't think one of them would say a bad word against me."

"What makes the prison liveable and also not liveable is this balance between staff and prisoner. Mutual respect in some ways even though two types of population. But there is still the need for balance, for good spirits and if it's not there, things go very wrong."

"What's the point, there's no point? I've rehabilitated, I know I'm not going to do it again. It's the first time in 15 years that I can say "not again". Sentences that judges are giving are too long for doing nothing. Need shorter sentences with rehabilitation, long sentences with nothing to learn. I agree with my sentence, it may be even low but at the same time, I know if I had a shorter sentence with rehabilitation, it would have been better than me getting bitter and hating the world... keeping us away from society, but leaving families out there who'll break up."

"I've never had any problems and if they leave me alone and just let me do my time, I'll never see any problems... I've never seen a bad screw yet, maybe lucky. I can see that they are doing their job. I don't respect them but still, it's their job. I took a risk, that was my choice, now I'm here. I can't be angry with them."

""Nonces", why do they have to put criminals in with sex offenders? We see them on open visits... they should have their own prison... one got bashed in the showers the other day, we've got a punk on the wing who's down the block."

"In my book, I've concluded that the reason that people aren't put off by prison is that seventy per cent have come through children's homes and care. No differences. Brought up in 24 years of the care system, 1, institutionalised; 2, you become dependent on others not your self; 3, there is no concept or awareness of responsibility. If they change the care system, change the prisons, definitely breeding criminals in care."

Of course, there is always someone who will sum up everything expressed by others... "Mr Howard's knee jerk reaction is just proved you can't meet violence with violence. Look at the mess Leon Brittan made. Now we are back to the swing to lock up. When another screw gets shot or killed, they will say what's happening? So it will all slip back again. It's a pendulum to take away the carrots. For the last three or four years, they've been working for carrots, they've taken them away. It's typical Home Office. In their desks in Whitehall, they make rules that they don't implement. Where do they get decisions from? The advisory board? It's no more with the times. Drugs reflect the problem outside. Drugs outside, it's only now they are doing something about it. I

came in in 1991 and it was puff. Since then, heroin's taken over. Eighty per cent of the population is puff but they want to do random drugs tests. What chance do they get to go off it? Why are they here? If they can't come off them outside, how can they here? Where are you going to put all the people who test positive?... If a woman was beaten up, I'd stop it but phew, I wouldn't feel comfortable."

The previous quotation illustrates well a number of the issues presented in this chapter. Not only are prisoners keen to talk to people from "outside", they have something to say. Although not central to this thesis, their attitudes towards imprisonment as a practice are an area that should be pursued in future research.

Possibly the most interesting two findings reported in this chapter are that a number of prisoners are pretty satisfied with their regimes (58%) and that they display a marked degree of empathy towards the officers. Prisoners understand that officers are "just doing a job" and that the officers may well experience difficulties in carrying out their duties. Few prisoners like to be in prison and although 42% were negative about the regime, most of their criticisms were levelled at Home Office policy rather than wing based officers.

It may not sound revolutionary to claim that prisoners are reasonable people who understand other people's problems but prisoners have previously been portrayed as being at war with officers. Indeed, most people in society have negative views of prison officers. We see them as being authoritarian and few of us would like their job. (See officers' addenda in subsequent chapters.)

CHAPTER TEN

PRISONERS' PERCEPTIONS OF FEMALE OFFICERS

As the previous chapter showed, there is the potential for good relationships between officers and prisoners. The prisoners have some understanding of officers' roles and difficulties. A number of them recognise that it is in the interests of both groups to maintain and strengthen such relationships. This chapter examines prisoners' specific reactions to cross gender deployment of officers in male prisons. It gives their perspectives on the calming versus controlling debate. Prisoners are as well placed as anybody else to make informed contributions to the debate on techniques of conflict resolution and minimisation.

After prisoners had been asked if they had problems, they were asked whether the problems were the same with female officers. This was the first of the questions relating to their views of female officers.

Are the problems the same with the male officers and the female officers?

Sixty nine (58%) of the prisoners had no problems with either sex; eighteen (15%) reported problems with men but not with the female officers; nineteen (16%) reported problems with both male and female officers; one (1%) prisoner said that he was more likely to experience problems with women but that he had problems with both and four (3%) of the prisoners said that they had problems with female officers but not with male officers. Thus, under half of the sample had problems with officers and more of those problems were with male officers.

"Yes but you see, they get treated different by most prisoners and they take advantage of it. They are more protected. Whatever you say to a man, they accept it, to a woman, if you say one word to a woman, you fly down to the block or segregation."

"Yes, I will speak to a woman more easily than to a man. When I speak to a man, they feel I'm intimidating them because I'm tall, big, they think I'm after something so I just don't bother anymore. I solve my problems my self anyway."

The next series of quotations relates to the findings from the previous literature relating to the way that female officers approach their job. The quotations demonstrate that some of the prisoners believe that the female officers use different skills in their work even when they "do the job the same".

Do the women do their job in the same way as the men?

Seventy seven (64%) of the prisoners felt that women did their job in the same way; five (4%) said that they did some of it the same and thirty (25%) of the prisoners felt that they did the job differently. Of those prisoners, 20 stated that women did the job better than men and 3 that they were worse. From these responses, it seems fair to conclude that the prisoners have no qualms about female officers' methods of working. If anything, the proportions suggest that prisoners respond better to female than to male officers.

"No, they don't. You can talk to them and they help you out more."

"What does the job entail? Not much. It does but doesn't. There's no difference if it's a bloke or a woman. No difference."

"Credit where due. They do the job. It's a man's world and I don't know, if they want to do it, let them do it."

"Generally yes but there are situations where a male member of staff can actually get involved a lot easier than a female member i.e. when people are heated up. But then again, I suppose a similar thing could be said for the male staff as well. There's been times on this unit where someone's been so distressed in different situations and finding things hard to cope with and from one male to another especially staff, at times can be too difficult to happen whereas I've seen that happen with a female who gets it sorted."

"No. The women, they keep the men laughing--they're different one or two, Miss T, she's got balls-- the men under her thumb. I respect her the most, I talk to her. Would never abuse her because she's got balls and I respect that. Women are the back bone of some big things."

"No but it's not possible is it? Women come into a male environment. It's not possible, however hard they try or how much of a man they resemble at times."

"I wouldn't say in the same way, but just as well. But they don't use it in the same way."

"Female officers are used differently in prison. They are used for female qualities. If someone is showing signs of depression, or whatever, it's more likely to be a woman than a man, then again, reactions to female officers are more sympathetic than to the men."

"They can't. They try to, bless them but they can't because there's always the sexual thing there. Men are dogs and will sleep with anyone. A woman can't--I can go up to a man and say "can you get me my paper?" And on the way back, we can chat. Nine out of ten times if a woman does that, they'd see that as being flirtatious and would respond. The women can't be seen to be friendly because most men see them only as sexual objects."

Do the women have any effect on the way that things work?

Eighty (67%) of the prisoners felt that women did have an effect, 1 was unsure and twenty nine (24%) felt that they had no effect. The vast majority of the effects cited were positive as is

illustrated in the table below. (All of the negative comments have been grouped at the top of the table.) As can be seen, 38 of the prisoners (32% of the sample as a whole and 45% of those who felt that women had an effect) spontaneously said that they calmed the environment.

Table 10.1 Types of effects associated with female officers.

EFFECT	NUMBER OF PRISONERS	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES
A combination of negative things	4	5
People try to get close to them	2	2
They orchestrate trouble for prisoners	1	1
They feel more threatened	1	1
They are calming	38	45
They normalise the environment	11	13
The language use is better	8	10
You can talk with them	5	6
They improve the environment (looks, etc.)	3	4
They are more professional	3	4
They treat us better	1	1
They are more understanding	1	1
They can get respect	1	1
They are better	1	1

The first quotations reflect those who felt that the female officers had a positive effect. Then, there are those who feel that they have an effect but are ambivalent about it. These are followed by quotations from those participants who were negative or felt that women had no effect.

"Yes, it's different. I like to respect women. A woman is something to treat nicely. Officers can take abuse but not a woman. I have to have respect for myself and for this side, it's no good."

"Yes, I'd say so. For me, I didn't think women would work well here--to see one and be ordered about by one is strange but you still feel human when you see an opposite sex and not all men. They are only officers and there are no relationships but it makes me feel that I'm still in society."

"I think that people who've been brought up right wouldn't swear around a woman so there is that to it. However only about 20% of people in prison have been brought up properly."

"In some cases--you wouldn't understand--I can't explain--it's good and bad. It works both ways, it's all right because it's just a job but then again, it isn't."

"It all depends on the female person. You have some on a power buzz, some on some sort of sexual thing and others just do it for a job."

"No, it's still predominantly a male profession and no they don't affect anything. But they do in an abstract way produce a calmer atmosphere around them. Calmer and there are some people here who get on better with women, they are definitely approachable and it's nice to have that feminine feeling around the place."

"I know a lot of animosity. A lot of people don't like the women like being outside. You meet all kinds of people. A lot of people don't like it and call them names."

"Not really, sometimes. I've not seen a woman for the most time. So good, they should have more therefore it's strange."

"Not the same job at all."

How do you feel about having women around here?

The responses to the question about how the prisoners felt about female officers were coded from 1 to 5. Again, 1 was very good and 5 very bad. Sixty eight (57%) were indifferent; forty three (36%) felt good about their presence; five (4%) felt very good; two (2%) felt bad and one (1%) felt very bad about their presence. In the course of the questions about women officers, a number of participants volunteered additional comments. These were fairly evenly split between positive and negative remarks. Forty six per cent of the comments made were negative and they are shown below. Five of the prisoners were concerned about loss of control, two, that the women were taken advantage of and the rest made remarks that would be more traditionally expected and classified as negative views surrounding women's employment.

Table 10.2 Negative comments made about female officers.

COMMENT MADE	NUMBER OF PRISONERS
Point proving	6
It's not a suitable job for a woman	6
Concerns for the women's safety	3
The women make sexual advances	2
The women are bitchy or bossy	2
They have more power	2
They are used as skivvies	2
Generally negative	2
They have no tact	1
Others object to them (but not me)	1
It's negative for the male officers	1
The women get intimidated	1
The women lose control	1

A further forty eight per cent of the comments made were positive, they are shown in the table below and demonstrate fairly typical findings relating to self disclosure and interpersonal skills possessed by women.

Table 10.3 Positive comments made about female officers.

COMMENT MADE	NUMBER OF PRISONERS
You can talk with the women	13
They are not macho	5
They are more helpful	4
They are more understanding	3
We need more	3
They are more professional	3
I admire them	2
They are better	1

There was obviously some divergence of opinion regarding how the prisoners felt about having female officers on the wings. Examples of these differing views are presented below.

"Loads of feelings. It winds you up sometimes like I'm in for a lot and want sex. If they're all right, you can talk better to them than to a man, women are more approachable. They should be here but only as prison auxiliaries, not prison officers. They are no good in physical situations and can be unfair."

"Generally, it makes no difference as far as I can see whether male or female, you always get positive and negative. No matter the prison or situation, there are always times when it is best for a woman or for a man. But one thing I do feel is that the male staff tend to use the female staff to their own advantage but there are times I've witnessed when that has been done and men have knowingly put women in a very dangerous position."

"At first I thought it was a liberty, in showers and that, all wrong, but my views have changed."

"It's new to me really but let them get on with it. It's their life. They can do any job."

"This would have gone up a long time ago if they hadn't been on the wing. Two of the women are more like a motherly figure... she does what she can, is always friendly because she has nothing to prove."

"I don't feel any way or the other, I'm happily married, totally loyal for the past 10 years. You always get an interaction between women and men and different women and men in same situations react differently. The majority of women officers in this establishment approach things in a professional way and don't abuse their position as the sole living female in prisoners' lives."

"I don't like having women in prison. I feel a woman should do--not that she shouldn't work, can be a good doctor or nurse or professor or secretary but I don't want women to be in a place of hardship."

Is it a good idea to have women as officers?

Sixty two (52%) of the prisoners felt that it was a very good idea; thirty six (30%) thought that it was a good idea; eight (7%) were indifferent and eleven (9%) felt that it was a bad idea.

"Yes but it goes to attitude and dealing with people. If you can talk to people, just talk and show more understanding, everything is all right. A woman is different, she can put her self over and cause clashes."

"50:50. They can create a calming influence on some people but some people, it can cause fights because people shout off in front of--shouting off in front of them."

"Yes, I don't hold with female staff being presented as the same as men because their application is totally different. They do the exact same job on the landing, no more so than male staff in a female prison, the influence would be the same. It depends on their personality but they tend to be a little less bolshy than the others."

Do you ever worry about having female officers around?

When asked whether they were concerned by the deployment of female officers, twenty one (17.5%) of the prisoners said that they were, and the other ninety nine (82.5%) were not. However during the course of answering other questions, a further six prisoners identified worries. In other words, the prevailing sentiment (78% of the sample) was not one of concern. The table below shows the concerns of the twenty seven prisoners.

Table 10.4 Types of concern about the deployment of female officers.

TYPE OF CONCERN	NUMBER OF PRISONERS
Privacy	12
The women's safety	8
Control during an incident	4
Searching	1
Being professional	1
"What's next?"	1

"No. I don't know, the only worry is some people are different and I don't want to see them getting hurt. The other day I read an article in *Inside Time*, there is a survey that women officers are more afraid of their colleagues than the criminals in the paper."

"Not really but at Long Lartin, a woman got raped and that was a shock to the system, a church helper. It's the only time I've heard of a woman officer or anything like that being assaulted. A lot of people find it easier to talk to women. My girlfriend thinks it's a bad idea to have women in. The first question she asks is "how old are they?""

"No, I've never actually thought about it but I relate easier to a woman than a man anyway. If I did have a problem, I don't think I'd sit down and speak to a guy."

"No, not really. I mean, I'm not the modest type, if a towel slips, tough, it happens... I apologise but if it happens, it happens. If they're embarrassed, they shouldn't be here."

"No. If a woman is on, you know they are on duty and if you need to go to the toilet, then you block the spy hole. If you're then nicked for that, that's not on. With women on the wing, the Prison Service should respect our privacy."

Do male and female officers have the same worries?

As reported earlier, prisoners were asked whether officers had any worries while they were doing their job. Following this, they were asked whether the position was the same for the female officers. A variety of answers ensued; one hundred prisoners responded, fifty eight of them said that it was the same; twenty reported that the men worried but the women did not need to; fourteen reported that neither the men nor the women worried; seven prisoners said that the men had nothing to worry about but the women worried and one prisoner said that both worried but that the women worried more.

The correlations between ascribed female officers' types of worries and officers' worries in general ($r = 0.81$, $p<0.01$) and between male officers' types of worries and officers' worries in general ($r = 0.98$, $p<0.01$) were both high although the male officers' were probably the archetypal image in the prisoners' minds. The results were compared using χ^2 and λ and no significant differences existed between the perceived concerns of male and female officers as reported by the prisoners. This should be demonstrated by the table below. The left hand column contains the numbers of prisoners reporting that male officers worried about a particular concern, the middle column identifies the concern and the right hand column contains the numbers of prisoners reporting that female officers worried about that concern.

Table 10.5   Prisoners' reports of male and female officers' worries.

NUMBER OF PRISONERS REPORTING MALES' WORRIES	TYPE OF WORRY	NUMBER OF PRISONERS REPORTING FEMALES' WORRIES
32	Safety	19
6	Loss of control	5
5	Fear	3
6	How to be professional	6
5	The work involved	5
3	Things from outside	2
2	What's coming next?	2
2	They do the sentence too	2
2	Drugs	2
1	Loss of personal control	1
1	Lack of experience	2
1	Dissatisfaction	
1	Fires	1
1	Disease	1
1	For the prisoners	1
1	Personality clashes with prisoners	1
1	Some of the people here	1
1	Doing things imposed on them	1
	Verbal abuse	1

A selection of quotations from transcripts is shown below. The selection presents a pretty varied picture and demonstrate prisoners' awareness of the officers' jobs.

"I haven't seen a woman officer at the point of a problem spot. I've seen them running but then the crowd is cheering when they see a woman running. It's like a football match and a welcome

diversion from a monotonous movement." (Note that "running" usually refers to running to attend an alarm bell.)

"Not sure, maybe a bit. It might be a factor but the men, they've got real problems. Half have been in the military and think that they're still there but it's a different label... they want you to hit them and I behave stupidly, they like the confrontation."

"I don't know, women are not so scared of violence. They are not going to be attacked. On the whole, men won't attack women. Most men here are married with kids and are not going to slap them about. Maybe sexual related but I don't think that would happen either but it could be one of the differences."

When asked whether officers ever worry, one participant referred to women officers first, his responses to questions 15 and 16 are presented below.

15 "Sometimes, the women may be worried when they are in a situation not conducive. Like if an inmate is arguing with a woman and she's by her self she would be scared. But personally, that's the last thing I could do, I can't argue with a female officer." *16* "Yes some of the men do too. It's the same thing. They get a little bit paranoid if an inmate is big and goes to the gym, they tend to look at you as somebody rough, something like that."

"Yes but with a woman, they're not spiteful or vindictive. They keep away from you. With the men, if they have the hump, they want you to know so they challenge or cause a situation."

"Yes but more so for the men."

"Oh yes, male officers more so, it's a male thing, fighting and that. A bloke hitting a female officer would have trouble from all places."

"Yes, the female officers when they start are a bit more afraid. They look around when they hear some noise but when they hear it's quiet, there's no problem. You have more problems with other inmates. The final thing is that an officer will never attack you."

"The only difference with women is the way they worry about a lot. They worry not to seem to be too friendly because men think they're having an affair. They worry about being enclosed with cons because anything can happen and constantly at the back of their mind is that they have to prove themselves to be as good as their male partners."

"I'm going by the men as I speak to them and it comes out. I've never actually asked a women. I take it that there would be other prisoners more inclined to protect a woman than if they see a man being attacked. I don't know if that comes across to them or not. Should think they do have the feelings as when it happens, people don't see the officer, they see the uniform."

How they felt about participating

One hundred and sixteen prisoners said that they felt fine about taking part, 1 prisoner was still unsure at the end, 2 prisoners were doubtful and 1 asked whether it would actually do any good. When offered the chance to withdraw, none took it.

117

"It feels--putting a view across and how inmates feel about officers and the prison. It must help in the long run for everybody."

"I don't trust no-one in the prison system."

CONCLUSIONS

The tone of the last quotation is cynical and entirely understandable. One of the most surprising findings from all of the prisoner interviews (in both the fear survey and the research into cross gender supervision), was the general level of satisfaction within prisoners. Obviously, they did have concerns in certain areas, a number were afraid, some were having problems coping and others freely admitted to being disruptive. However, very few prisoners were negative about officers. Their reticence in describing typical officers was not because they did not want to think about the "enemy" but because they recognised that not all officers are alike.

The level of understanding expressed by the prisoners offers a way forward in a number of fields. In terms of this research, such positive attitudes or lack of negative attitudes may induce hope that better relationships are being developed within the Prison Service. Such relationships may lead to less fear and more humane control. Good relationships also mean that the policy of cross gender postings should not result in any officers being put at more risk, be they female or male.

In a more general way, prisoners' positive attitudes display the ability to empathise. If rehabilitation is an aim of imprisonment, then it is important to see that prisoners are able to and do take the perspective of other people. Such an ability is emphasised within much of the cognitive skills training that is run in prisons. If the Prison Service really is aiming to prepare prisoners for life after their release, then encouraging prisoners to think about other people's problems may help to prevent recidivism.

However, the prisoners also made a number of negative comments. Few prisoners were happy with the facilities on offer for education, training or even eating. Scepticism and distrust were often evidenced and cynicism about the aims of the Prison Service and Home Office were normal. Prisoners' concerns about lack of consistency mirror remarks made by officers in the previous study (and those reported in following chapters).

The interviews conducted for this thesis began in 1993. At that time, the Prison Service was going through major changes. Three years later, some of those changes have been reversed or contradicted, others reinforced. Uncertainty and instability are partners within the Prison Service. Instead of building on the relationships between staff and prisoners and re-directing them where appropriate, the current climate in which security is pre-eminent seems to deliberately destroy hope of reform.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

OFFICERS' CUSTODIAL ASSESSMENTS, INTERACTIONS WITH PRISONERS AND FEELINGS OF ACCEPTANCE

This chapter presents the officers' responses to questions pertaining to their assessment of the regimes in which they work. It also provides the contextual framework for the following chapter relating to officers' means of control, fears and interactions with their peers. The current chapter concentrates on providing a picture of staff prisoner relationships and difficulties. Examples of transcripts and coding sheets are given in appendix 2. The first set of responses reported is that which details the officers' evaluations of the regimes in which they worked.

What do you feel that the overall regime is like?

Sixty seven (56%) of the officers rated the regime on "their" wing to be either good or very good; thirty (25%) of the officers felt that the regime was "O.K." and twenty two (17%) rated "their" wing's regime as bad or very bad. The officers do not display as much variation in their assessments of the regime as do the prisoners. Predictably, the officers tend to be more satisfied with the regimes. Fifty-eight per cent of the prisoners rated the regimes as O.K., good or very good whereas 81% of the officers were satisfied with their regime. Overall, officers concluded that they worked within good regimes yet, they made comments that displayed concern about the future direction of the Prison Service. When the quotations given in this section are combined with those in the addenda at the end of this chapter, the reader may construct a meaningful image of officers' views about their working environments.

In a model accounting for 21% of the variance, the only variable with significance was whether or not an officer felt that he/she had influence over the regime. Therefore the other variables were not included in the final model or the table below.

Those officers who felt that they had some influence within the wing were more positive about the regime than those who did not. This was tested using χ^2 which yielded a "λ" of 0.20. This would imply that 20% of the variance in assessments of the regime is accounted for by differences in perceived influence over that regime. This may add to evidence in support of encouraging greater "stake holding".

"When I joined, I had no idea of prison. They advertised in the Nationals and I didn't even think about prisons but I did fill the criteria. I love it, I love the job, it's a real challenge. Every day is different even if it's the same job."

"There is a lack of communication between the higher and lower grades. If they say bang up, they should. If 10 minutes later they don't want to, we look stupid. No-one gets told, so you look stupid when you give an answer."

"It would work but it needs consistency from staff and from management in particular."

"It was a hotchpotch but not too bad. When I was first here, it was very, very slack and things went on that shouldn't. Now there is more staff continuity and that's stabilised and the regime is more settled. It's taking shape nicely. The method being applied is really outstanding really."

"Personally, I think it's too easy, the general regime. This wing has a good idea, the stick and carrot, a very good idea."

"It's getting better, but saying that, the prisoners are taking the Home Office to court over the regime."

"It's crap. It still relies too much on the goodwill of the cons. Dynamic security. In other words, relationships, and the fact that some of the inmates police the landings better than we can because we're short staffed and there is a lack of experience in some and willingness in some."

Do you have any influence over the regime?

Given the importance of influence to assessments of regimes, it is to this variable that we now turn. Eighty five (71%) of the officers felt that they had some influence over the regime. However, when asked about the level of influence, a number seemed to concur with the views of those officers (29%) who reported having no influence over the regime. Some officers who initially reported having no influence, subsequently stated that they had much too little (i.e. they did have some). Overall forty one officers stated that they had too little influence, a further thirteen said that they had much too little influence. However, forty two reported that the level of influence was about right and one officer stated that it was too great. Thus, 36% of the sample felt that the balance was right or that they had too much influence and 45% of the officers did not feel influential enough.

An officer's level of influence might be expected to be associated with a number of the other measures that were taken. Unfortunately, most such variables were categorical. Accordingly, a number of χ^2 comparisons were made. Categorical comparisons of level of influence with whether an officer socialised with his or her colleagues and the expressed level of confidence were not significant. The two tables below show the distribution of answers for two other variables, problems with colleagues and problems with prisoners.

Table 11.1 χ^2 comparison of level of influence and problems with colleagues.

Colleague problems:	Yes	No
Level of influence:		
Much too little	10	3
Too little	22	19
Perfect	19	37

Pearson = 9.24, df 2, p <0.01

Table 11.2 χ^2 comparison for level of influence and problems with prisoners.

Prisoner problems:	Yes	No
Level of influence:		
Much too little	11	2
Too little	24	17
Perfect	26	30

Pearson = 6.48, df 2, p <0.05

Those officers who state that they have much too little influence on the wing also seem to experience problems with colleagues and or prisoners. There appears to be a ceiling effect as most officers report problems with prisoners but the direction of the differences appears to be the same in both tables. In other words, fewer problems are associated with the right level of influence.

"On occasion, we are given the opportunity to put forward ideas but at the end of the day, they don't take much notice. I think, unfortunately in the Service, when you're from the ranks, people build barriers as they go up and stop communicating. This leads to total chaos, communication is the main area of concern that mucks everything up. If you could sort out the communication between grades including the Home Office, the results would be tremendous."

"It's about right, on staff. Because, on the wing, there are a lot of newer staff. Anything from three years up, and they tend to come to you. So as far as staff are concerned, yes I have influence. Also, we have the personal officer scheme, so I have influence over some of the inmates. I could do more if allowed, get their act together."

Is there enough structure to the job?

As the previous (predominantly American) literature pointed to the strong informal structures and hierarchies within prisons, it was decided to test to see if the situation works the same within the Prison Service. If informal structures prevail, then unincorporated female officers would be likely to be more badly affected than male officers.

Thirty seven (32%) of the officers felt that the amount of structure was correct. Seventy nine (68%) felt that the job was not appropriately structured. However, a further 10 officers gave examples that indicated that they too did not feel that the amount of structure provided was appropriate. Of the 89 officers who did not think that the balance was correct, 44 felt that there was too little and 11 felt that there was too much structure. Eighteen officers raised concerns about the level of their training; 9 officers felt that resource shortages affected the structure; 3 officers worried that management did not make good use of them; 2 officers reported that the structure was improving; 1 that it was just wrong and 1 that changes were being made constantly. As demonstrated in the table below, there were no significant differences between male and female officers.

Table 11.3   Male and female officers' comments regarding the amount of structure in duties.

No. Female (actual)	Comment made	No. Male (actual)
13	There is too little structure	31
3	The training is insufficient or inappropriate	15
2	There is too much structure	9
1	Resources are too tight	8
2	It's improving	
	Management mis-use the staff	3
	The level is just wrong	1
	It keeps on changing	1

"There is the theory versus the practice. We're understaffed, there is sickness on the wing and the prison so the numbers are down... there's not enough training, ongoing. We need all sorts, I've conquered areas but new officers--sentence planning, it's 6 miles long. If you fill it in, that's your good fortune. I'm quite good at that sort of thing but I still have my doubts. There must be officers struggling, we've not been given training and we should be. There is quite a bit of muddling through but you get to think on your feet and you are not mothered so much."

"No, you are left, given, well you're not even given basic instruction. You do the job the way that you want to. Always security, that's always there but after that, it's up to you."

"Oh yes but, everything's laid down, there is an order covering everything, but unfortunately, it is not always stuck to. If we stuck to them as laid down, the roof wouldn't stay on this place."

Different ways of "keeping the lid on" an establishment may centre around informal structures and staff-prisoner relationships. The next area of interest to be considered is that of staff prisoner relationships and whether any gender effects were of influence. The first of such questions that was asked of officers regarded their general interactions with the prisoners.

Do you generally get on with the prisoners?

One hundred and fourteen (95%) of the officers stated that they generally got on with the prisoners. Only three reported that they did not.

"Yes, a very good rapport, relationship is a good word."

Problems with the prisoners

Despite such rapport, sixty eight (57%) of the officers reported problems with the prisoners. The type of problem and frequency of problematic encounter are shown in the two tables below. The officers identified many different types of problem and these have been grouped into four sub groups. The first group has been called Indirect System Problems. The problems making up this group were as follows: "food"; "petty/trivial things" and "anything at all". The second group has been identified as Direct System Problems. The problems making up this group were: "bucking the system"; "saying no"; "regime changes"; "instantaneous demands" and "doing my job properly". The third group of problems was characterised as Indirect Interpersonal Problems, this was made

up of: "their attitude"; "their stupidity"; "balancing the level of friendliness"; "personality clashes"; "racism or sexism"; "rumours"; "my inexperience". Please note that the numbers of officers reporting each of these problems were relatively low, hence the decision to collapse the data. For example, one officer (male) reported race related problems and one officer (female) reported problems with sexism. The final group has been called Direct Interpersonal Problems and consists of those problems reported which were physical in nature, namely: "unwanted physical contact"; "threats"; "violence" and "attempted bullying".

Table 11.4 Type of problems between officers and prisoners.

TYPE OF PROBLEM	NUMBER OF OFFICERS	%AGE OF OFFICERS REPORTING PROBLEMS
Indirect system problems	26	38
Direct system problems	27	39
Indirect interpersonal problems	11	16
Direct interpersonal problems (physical)	4	6

Although many officers reported problems with the prisoners, most of them were incurred by the environment rather than the individual officers concerned and relatively few are physically dangerous. There was no significant difference between men and women in reporting whether they experienced problems with the prisoners. However a χ^2 analysis indicates that there is a difference in the type of problems experienced by men and women. This is shown in the table below.

Table 11.5 Breakdown of type of problem with prisoners reported by men and women.

Gender:	Female	Male
Type of problem:		
Indirect system problems	2	24
Direct system problems	4	23
Indirect interpersonal problems	5	6
Direct interpersonal problems	2	2

The table above indicates that the women seem to experience all four types of problem whereas the men are much less likely to report interpersonal problems. Thus the women face both system and interpersonal problems from the prisoners whereas the men are more likely to face system problems. This is demonstrated more systematically in the table below.

Table 11.6 χ^2 comparison of type of problem with prisoners reported by men and women.

Gender:	Female	Male
Type of problem:		
System problems	6	47
Interpersonal problems	7	8

Pearson = 9.45, df 1, p <0.01

Unsurprisingly, the most frequent problem was one that is relatively trivial to officers but can be all important to prisoners namely, food. It is important to note not only the type, but frequency of problematic encounter between officers and prisoners. This is portrayed in the table below.

Table 11.7 Frequency of problems between officers and prisoners.

FREQUENCY OF PROBLEM	NUMBER OF OFFICERS	%AGE OF OFFICERS REPORTING
Can't put a figure on it	10	16
Once or twice	8	13
They no longer occur	6	10
It depends	9	15
Less than 1 a month	1	2
Fortnightly	2	3
Weekly	3	5
Every few days	3	5
Daily	19	31
Always/a part of life	1	2

The female officers seem to experience problems with the prisoners less often than do the male officers. Of the 15 women who reported a frequency, 10 stated that either the problem(s) had ceased, had only happened once or twice or that it/they occurred less than once a month. Three women reported a problem every few days and 2 reported daily problems. Of the 47 male officers, 24 reported that the problems had ceased, were irregular, or that they occurred less than once a month. Two officers reported fortnightly problems; 3 reported weekly problems; 17 reported daily problems and 1 reported problems "all the time". Thus the men seem to be proportionally more likely to report daily problems than the women. The quotations below illustrate the range of responses. As shown in the fourth quotation, interpretation of "problem" could lead to a different slant on the question.

"I don't go out for the problems. They arrive at me."

"You're not doing your job if you're not upsetting one every now and then."

"It's the nature of the game. I can understand their frustrations but in the last year we've gone from Woolf which was progressive with grey areas where we could make decisions. Now we have Woodcock and the Home Office tells as that things are black and white so we don't have much influence. It is good sometimes but sometimes--well, yes and no."

"Everything that happens--in fact, small things create problems. It's spotting them and dealing with them. Every minute there are things I perceive as not being a problem. He will, and we will deal with it. I think it should be 75% or more of our work, dealing with inmates' problems."

"No, it's, some are a lot more friendly. The majority of them are okay. Ones that aren't, are the same with all the officers, it's not personal. As a woman, I see the way men work and prisoners put themselves out to be more approachable to you as a woman."

Do you trust the prisoners?

In a prison, trust is an ambiguous concept. Distrust must be a common sense approach of the one group towards the other yet trust is vital for the maintenance of daily routines. Part of the difficulty inherent within an understanding of trust is demonstrated in the finding that officers display much less trust of the prisoners than they believe the prisoners have of them. Whilst it may be true that prisoners have to rely on officers to do things for them, whether prisoners would "trust" them is a question that needs to be addressed. It is likely that prisoners' responses would be negative. (As demonstrated in the quotations reported in chapter two).

Seventy five (63%) of the officers reported that they did not trust the prisoners at all; forty four (37%) of the officers reported that it depended on either the prisoner or the situation involved and only one (1%) officer reported complete trust in prisoners. The table below demonstrates that almost exactly the same proportions of male and female officers gave similar responses to the question about trust of prisoners.

Table 11.8   Breakdown of gender based responses to issues of trust of prisoners.

Female officers	Do you trust the prisoners?	Male officers
16	Not at all	59
10	It depends on the situation or prisoner	34
	Yes	1

"Definitely not."

"No, prisoners, by their very nature, will try to manipulate the system. They will use our naiveté to trick us or whatever but that's an understanding. So although we get on well with them, you've always got that line. You can only go so far and you always have got to be there all the time."

"If that is to say "trust", no. Trust them in the work that they do, then yes. I've not often, a couple of times, been threatened but there have been other officers there. All of the prisoners are capable of doing anything to you if they got the opportunity and it's only since I've been in the job that I've had that opinion."

"A few. The golden rule is don't but there are some I would trust. Not more than an officer mind, and a very select few but in the main, no because they will try to put one over on you."

Do you think that the prisoners trust you?

Sixty eight (57%) of the officers reported that it depended either on the prisoner concerned or on the task in hand; thirty four (29%) of the officers believed that the prisoners did not trust them at all; twelve (10%) reported that they "think so" and five (4%) of the officers thought that the prisoners trusted them completely. This picture contrasts somewhat with the lack of trust the officers express in relation to the prisoners. Although not statistically significant, there are two trends that may point towards a gender difference. These are demonstrated in the table below.

Table 11.9   Gender breakdown of beliefs in prisoners' trust in self as officer.

Female officers	Do the prisoners trust you?	Male officers
5	No	29
19	It depends on the situation or prisoner	49
2	I think so	10
	Yes	5

It is possible to infer that the male officers have a slightly more realistic view than do the female officers. This conclusion may be reached because the male officers tend to be over-represented in the group who believe that the prisoners do not trust them. Such a sceptical response may well be fair. However, another interpretation is also possible. The female officers might have better relationships with prisoners than do the male officers. This would mean that some of the prisoners might be less reticent to go to female officers when they have problems, etc.. In turn, this may lead to the female officers' beliefs that, under certain conditions, prisoners trust them. In other words, the trends may show better relationships between male prisoners and female officers than between male prisoners and male officers.

"Yes I do. One of the things is because if you say you'll do something, if you don't, they'll lose faith in you. I've had about sixty nickings. If it's a straight nicking and not stitched up, they're okay. If you tried to stitch them up, then you'd have problems. I've never done it so it's not a problem."

"I'm not worried about it. They do because of the reports I write. They do need to trust you because the reports put in could mean another four or five years on their sentence. You've got to know what you're about and they trust you. They all see my reports." The preceding quote is one example of the officers' performance of their caring role. The Penal Affairs Consortium (1996) has concluded that work such as this is high on the list of services that will suffer in the process of staff cuts and budget constraints. Although reports will be written, they may not be as in depth or open as implied here.

"To an extent, yes. But a lot, not all, are wary of the system. This is due in a large part to the amount of changes we've had over the last five years. And officers and all staff, have a hesitancy in explaining the changes. A lot haven't caught up. You learn one way then you have to unlearn and relearn. The personal officer scheme has helped to bring down a lot of the barriers and to improve the relationship."

"They should do but it depends on what you mean, it's a negative job. They can trust me but if that gives them the confidence to take me, then hopefully they don't. They trust you to do the best for them but at the end of the day they have more trust in us than in the police but not really, because it's not real."

"To do certain things, yes. They say they can ask me because I'll follow things up or take an interest in it."

"I hope not. I'm not particularly concerned about that. It's easy to hide behind it. They'll trust me to the extent that if I say I'll do something, I do. But if on my casework, they get direct questions and I expect answers otherwise they get reports as I think it to be."

The next sections of this chapter move to an assessment of the officers' skills and whether they feel appreciated by others: their supervisors, the prisoners and their colleagues. The first question that the officers were asked was designed to encourage them to rate their own performance of their duties. This question was asked so that a comparison could be drawn between how they described themselves and how they felt that others saw them. If an officer feels competent and recognised as such, then his/her morale and job performance may be enhanced. Given the previous literature, it was predicted that female officers would be more likely to feel under-appreciated.

As an officer, how would you describe yourself?

"Confident, dependable and reliant."

"Firm but fair."

"I think I'm conscientious and I try hard. Sometimes too hard, I take on too much sometimes but I like it. I like the challenge of it all. I've not heard complaints so I think I'm pleasant to work with."

"I don't know, confident in what I do. Reliable, I've never been sick, that's all really."

"I'm a fair officer. I examine the pros and cons and make judgements. I assess situations and deal with them."

Management view

Eighty nine (74%) of the officers were positive about themselves and felt that the management had a positive view of them as well. Fifteen (13%) of the officers were unsure as to the management's view of them; two (2%) of the officers were negative about themselves whereas they felt that their senior officers were positive about them; another two (2%) of the officers were negative about themselves and felt that the management was also negative about them and twelve (10%) of the officers were positive about themselves but felt that their management had negative views about them. The high number of positive responses is encouraging. Better still is that only twelve officers felt under-appreciated. Within that group, male officers may have been slightly over-represented as only two of them were women.

Is that how you would like them to see you?

Most officers were contented with reports and how they felt that they were perceived but there were exceptions:

"No, when I first joined, I came very close to being kicked out. Too many waves. I speak about not right things in proper channels. I don't let go."

Prisoner view

Ninety (75%) of the officers were positive about themselves and felt that the prisoners had a positive view of them as well. Thirteen (11%) of the officers were unsure as to the prisoners' view

of them; two (2%) of the officers were negative about themselves whereas they felt that the prisoners were positive about them; four (3%) of the officers were negative about themselves and felt that the prisoners was also negative about them and eight (7%) of the officers were positive about themselves but felt that the prisoners had negative views about them. There were no significant differences between men and women, officers from different wings or prisons. However, the women did tend to be marginally more positive and there was an over-representation of male officers in the unsure category. This is shown in the table below.

Table 11.10   Officers' perspectives on how they believe the prisoners see them.

Female officers	View of self c.f. view of prisoners about self	Male officers
22	Both positive	68
1	Unsure of prisoners' views	12
	Self positive but prisoners negative	8
	Both negative	4
1	Self negative but prisoners positive	1

Is that how you would like them to see you?

The majority of officers gave a response that was almost identical to this: "I do care, I care what prisoners say and I do take an interest".

However, it is worth noting that those officers who were positive about themselves yet felt that the prisoners were negative about them tended to be positive about the prisoners' apparent negative perceptions of them. They felt that such negative perceptions meant that they were being effective.

Officer view

Ninety six (80%) of the officers were positive about themselves and felt that their colleagues had a positive view of them as well. Ten (8%) of the officers were unsure as to their colleagues' view of them; three (3%) of the officers were negative about themselves whereas they felt that the other officers were positive about them; two (2%) of the officers were negative about themselves and felt that their colleagues was also negative about them and seven (6%) of officers were positive about themselves but felt that their colleagues had negative views about them. There were no significant differences between men and women, officers from different wings or prisons. Again, the high number of positive responses is encouraging, particularly from the female officers. The finding of no significant differences between male and female officers seems to reflect better than predicted levels of positive reinforcement from their colleagues.

Is that how you would like them to see you?

Again, although there was a degree of uncertainty, most officers were happy with the way in which they believed that they were perceived by their colleagues. "I've no idea, I'd like to think they see me as I do. I don't know for sure, but I think the majority do."

"Yes. In fact, my colleagues sometimes see me in a better light than I do. They are not aware of insecurities."

It is possible that through combining all three of these measures, some trends might be strengthened. Accordingly, the proportion of male and female officers giving each response was calculated and is shown in the table below.

Table 11.11   Comparisons of views of self with perceived views of others.

Female officers (%)	View of self c.f. view of others about self	Male officers (%)
84	Both positive	76
8	Unsure of others' views	11
5	Self positive but others negative	8
	Both negative	3
3	Self negative but others positive	2

As can be seen in the table above, the female officers and the male officers are very similar. Both groups tend to be positive in their assessments of themselves. Both tend to believe that others also assess them positively although women seem more likely to believe this (contrary to predictions). The chapter now moves to more direct information regarding measures of acceptance.

Do you feel a part of the system?

Eighty seven (73%) of the officers stated that they were completely part of the system. Twenty eight (23%) of the officers reported feeling partially within the system (for example, "part of this wing but not the prison") and five (4%) of the officers reported that they did not feel part of the system. Overall, there seems to be a strong feeling of system affiliation. There were no significant differences between officers from different wings or prisons or between male and female officers. The table below demonstrates that although women tend to be marginally less secure within the larger system, the 4% who are unaffiliated are all men.

Table 11.12   Breakdown of gender differences in feelings of system membership (all numbers are actual).

Female officers	Degree of system membership	Male officers
17	Full	70
9	Partial	19
	None	5

"The small system on the wing, yes. When you get to the prison population, yes but the Home Office and the bigger picture, I'm quite insignificant."

"I'm an individual but yes, we all are."

Have you been accepted?

The vast majority of officers reported a feeling of acceptance. One hundred and one officers said that they had been fully accepted, fifteen officers reported a partial feeling of acceptance and four officers said that they did not feel that they had been accepted. There were no significant differences between men and women, officers from different wings or prisons. As reported above, there is a relationship between the frequency of unpleasant situations between officers and a

feeling of acceptance. The correlation is r = 0.42, p <0.01. It therefore seems reasonable to conclude that relationships between officers appear to be important to feelings of acceptance. This is not particularly surprising but it might be expected that feedback from senior ranks, reports, rapport with prisoners, etc. would also have some effect at this juncture. One area that may be related to feelings of acceptance is that of perceived support. Although no correlation was found, more details regarding a possible relationship are reported in the following chapter.

Do you think that you have made any difference here?

Forty-four (37%) of the participants felt that they had made a difference to the prison; twenty one (18%) that they had made a partial difference; forty two (35%) felt that they had made no difference and thirteen (11%) did not know. There were no significant differences between officers from different prisons or from different wings. However, a χ^2 comparison revealed statistically significant differences showing that women are more likely to feel that they have made a difference whilst men are more likely to feel that their presence has made no difference. This is demonstrated in the table below. Examples of the differences made by female officers include gaining acceptance or providing the organisation to a wing office or aiding prisoners. As women are more visible, it may be easier for them to make changes. But, their very visibility means that they may be under pressure to make such differences even if they do not want to or are unable so to do. Also, any failures are equally visible.

Table 11.13 χ^2 comparison gender by feeling of making a difference.

Gender:	Female	Male
Difference made:		
Definitely	14	29
Partially	5	17
None	3	38
Don't know	3	10

Pearson = 8.16, df 3, p <0.05

"On the wing, yes. When I was first here, there was a regime but it was really laid back and not suitable for a category B establishment. They've implemented ideas. The basic one was unemployed bang up. They were causing problems before all day because they were not where they should have been. Now they are banged up if they're not working."

"Oh yes. Prior to my coming, the establishment was very anti women. I was also given opportunities at a very junior level to be a temporary Principal Officer. Prior to this, only long serving Senior Officers bothered to apply. The same faces had promotion all the time. Since my arrival, applications for S.O.'s exam have quadrupled and younger S.O.'s have been appointed T.P.O.'s. It's made a tremendous difference. From officer to Principal Officer in a week. I was given my Senior Officer's in writing three weeks later. I have now applied for Principal Officer. It was my handling of several nasty situations that had me tried by fire and accepted."

"It all depends on what you define. With individual prisoners, you can make a difference. Sort out their problems, help them to lead a better life once they are out. But in running the prison, no that's money. How much does it cost and is it cheap? Not, is it the best thing to do?"

That which they added

As with the prisoners, there were a multiplicity of issues on the minds of the officers. Again, these are reported first in tabular form then qualitative examples are given. High on the list of priorities, appears to be concern about the practices of the highest levels of management. Feelings of discontent with the Prison Service and Home Office were common.

Table 11.14   Officer addenda.

Addendum	Number of officers	Percentage of responses
Managerial practices	12	15
Training	12	15
Regime	9	12
Home Office	7	9
Interpersonal skills usage	5	6
Something personal	5	6
Race	3	4
Gender	3	4
Violence	3	4
Prisoners' concerns	3	4
Job satisfaction	3	4
Resources	2	3
Casework	2	3
Need experience of life	2	3
Changing job	2	3
Drugs	1	1
Fires	1	1
Wish I was allowed to say more	1	1
Sexism	1	1
Are we all saying the same?	1	1

The quotations that are presented within this chapter (drawn from addenda made by the officers) tended to be related to the prisons in general rather than to fear. Examples regarding fear have been given in the next chapter. The selections presented below are limited to those that add to the picture constructed by the prisoner participants. In much the same manner as prisoners' attitudes towards officers may help to predict behaviour on the wings, the way that officers act towards and react to prisoners will be associated with their degree of success in maintaining order. Therefore, the first selection of quotations relates to staff-prisoner relationships. The quotations shown were representative of the kinds of remarks illustrated in Table 11.14 above. (More quotations appear at the end of the following chapter).

Staff-prisoner relationships

"No questions there. Racism, our attitude towards ethnic monitoring which isn't here. Drugs, the only way to cut it down would be no touching visits... it would be a massive thing to co-ordinate. The Service may have left it too late."

"This wing is very laid back. The inmate staff relationship is second to none. When staff, for example, have come on here from the segregation, they mellow out very quickly. You can't help but, it's the way it is. We still do our job to a high standard. The inmates can't piss about. They can have a laugh and a joke, fine, but that's it. Be friendly but not friends."

"My problem has been in getting to help them. I quite like casework because you can talk to them and you get to know a bit about them. It's a waste of manpower having them locked up when they could be doing useful things. A lot more could be done. It's a question of money but I'm not in favour of giving them a living wage."

"I was talking with one of the cons. He said that he knows it's wrong. I said that I had no sympathy, but at least he's doing the youth project. More power to the man. I respect him trying to better himself. He's using the system where most aren't. Most are bone idle. He is the epitome of what the system can do if you bother to do it, it's all down to the individual. He's an example of how prison can help people."

Staff-Prison Service relationships

As well as dealing with prisoners on a daily basis, officers must interact with their line managers. Although contact with the governing governor will usually be rare, in theory, the staff interact with their supervisors all the way up to the Home Secretary. Of course, decisions taken by senior staff will have implications for the officers. For example, curtailing practices that have become normal and restricting them to "privileges" or prohibiting them entirely may result in an increase in tension on the wings. As the quotations below demonstrate, there is a certain level of discontent with Prison Service policies.

"There's not enough on the job training."

"More and more things are being pushed down by management."

"They let people in too young. To deal with people like this and do reports, you need some experience of life."

"The main problem was my age. I was only twenty and shouldn't have been in the service and I am female. A woman at 20 in the service, they couldn't cope with the idea, officers. I'm not a twenty year old child. They can cope with me now, I've grown up now."

"Maybe we should look more at families. A lot is reflected at work. It would be interesting to see how family reflects how they perform. A lot of staff have wives who work and people's availability depends on whether their wife works. This is a safe job, money wise, but attendance and performance depends on the partner's work. I've no doubt that I'll be in the job longer than I'll be

married... a crèche would be a good idea. They have... a young staff and no crèche. It would make life a lot easier. People could meet as well."

"I've always believed this is a great job. You've got a lot to put in and get out. What have I learnt? I've gained an awful lot, a lot more confidence, a great deal more. Strengths in skills it uses. Time to reflect on so many things that you don't normally get. The interpersonal skills are invaluable. It tended to be instinctive before, I hope this has improved. The Prison Service offers very good quality. The training is good and a lot of people are good. It falls down because of civil servants."

Overall, the relationships between prisoners and officers appear to be pretty good. However, the officers' concerns about Prison Service policy have implications for officer-prisoner relationships. The degree of change and inappropriate or wasted use of staff talent can have direct consequences on the daily regimes and routines. When staff feel over pressured, they are unlikely to perform their job properly. Firstly, they may not physically have the time nor, secondly, the inclination. If we return to an example from chapter six, we can see how poor gaol craft may have contributed to prisoners' feelings of fear within their cells.

At the start of chapter eight, it was noted that the introduction of female officers may result in a lower level of fear through their calming influence and better interpersonal skills. However, it was also noted that the female officers themselves may experience problems interacting with both prisoners and officers. Such problems would be predictable within an environment traditionally characterised as very masculine or "macho". That the staff-prisoner relationships are generally good may be as a result of the introduction of the female officers. It is possible that they have influenced male officers to the extent that the male officers adopt traditionally female responses to conflict. In other words, calming rather than exacerbating. However, this is less likely than that the Prison Service training in interpersonal skills use is actually beginning to work.

One way in which the female officers may be contributing to a better environment is through the prisoners' responses to them. If the prisoners believe that women should be treated with "respect", then they will be less likely to "kick off" when women officers are around. However, also as predicted, the female officers reported more interpersonal problems with the prisoners than did the male officers. Yet, this finding needs to be balanced with the other result that the male officers have more problems with the prisoners overall. When combined, the findings presented thus far tend to suggest that female officers reduce tension on male prison wings and their deployment should reduce the likelihood of confrontation and problems of control.

CHAPTER TWELVE

OFFICERS' PERCEPTIONS OF EACH OTHER, FEAR AND CONTROL

This chapter moves directly to officers' relationships with each other, fear, control of fear, control of the wings and feelings of support. The first measures reported relate to incorporation within the officer culture or environment and ratings of colleagues. Any inter officer problems are discussed then the chapter moves on to control of potentially "nasty situations". It reports on officers' previous experiences of incidents that might have been associated with fear then discusses their levels of fear and means of coping with fear.

Importance of being a member of a team

One hundred and ten (92%) of the officers said that they felt a part of a team; three (3%) of the officers reported feeling part of a small team or clique but not part of the whole team and five (4%) of the officers said that they did not feel part of a team. Seventy eight (65%) of the officers felt that it was important to be a member of a team. Thirty nine (33%) felt that it was very important; one officer was indifferent, one felt that it was unimportant and one officer said that it was not at all important. When asked to rate the other members of their team, fifty eight (48%) of the officers said that the other members of the team were good or very good, twenty seven (23%) that it depended on the officers concerned or that the team was "O.K." and eleven (11%) rated the team as bad or very bad.

Prison officers are traditionally portrayed as a closely knit group however little assessment has been made of their feelings regarding the teams with which and in which they work. The current research indicates that firstly, 98% of officers feel that it is important or very important to be a member of a team; secondly that 92% of them do feel part of a team. However, the third finding of relevance is that there is a degree of ambivalence over other members of the team. Just under half (48%) of the officers rate their team-mates as good or very good. In other words, there is still room for improvement. There were no significant differences between the ratings given by male and female officers. However, of the eleven most negative ratings, only one came from a woman. Given the proportions on the wings, it might have been predicted that three women would be negative.

"Yes, definitely. That is our biggest defence or weapon against inmates. We work as a team, they don't, they work as individuals. A lot of the time, you need input from a team. It does help and the support you get from it."

"Yes, you need back up and support. There are times when you can get into a situation and if not for the back up of some other officers, you couldn't get out of it safely."

What do you think of the other officers

The participants were largely positive about their colleagues. Eighty two (67%) reported that their colleagues were either good or very good. Thirty (25%) reported that it depended on the officers, or that they were okay in general; only five (4%) officers reported that their colleagues were bad or very bad. Although not statistically significant, it is worth mentioning that the older officers tend to be more positive about their colleagues. Surprisingly, the female officers also tend to be more positive about their colleagues than are the male officers. This finding seems to point to a worse relationship amongst male officers than between female and male officers. Alternatively, it is possible that women in general are more positive or that the base lines may be different between the genders.

"In general, they are a good bunch. In general, they are professional. We've got the extremes at both ends, those who aren't as good and those better, but overall they're pretty good."

"Brilliant."

Does that depend on their sex?

Perhaps unsurprisingly, the majority of officers stated that their view of their colleagues was unaffected by gender. However, thirty two (28%) of the officers stated that it did depend on the sex of their colleagues.

This was stated by a female Officer: "Not at all. If they are in trouble, I'm there. One time on the threes, a male officer got smacked. I went in there, flaming, you know."

"I've got nothing against women in the job. They do a good job. It's twice as hard for them in a male establishment. I did two weeks in East Sutton Park. What an eye opener that was. I had to explain pinch marks on my bottom with sharpened nails. We should be given more support when women go on maternity leave. They don't have any supernumeraries. Before, they could be borrowed."

"There is good and bad on both sides. Some female officers who are very good at their jobs and I would have no problem if there's trouble in having two female officers beside me but some men I wouldn't like. Their personalities aren't up to it. I disagree that they can't do all the jobs like rubbing down. It's swings and roundabouts. They are a calming influence but they cause their own problems, there are some quite pretty female officers but they sort out problems especially on the drugs unit."

One officer seemed to summarise most of the predicted ambivalence: "Personally, I wouldn't want my wife in a prison. I can't understand it: "treat everyone the same" but because of their sex, there are some jobs they can't do and it influences your decisions. You're protective towards them but in other situations, you bring them in, they are calming and have a very valuable role. You have to temper situations sometimes and try to explain to them why you do it. Female staff do a very good job but I can't understand why they do the job. It's sometimes hard to use them correctly without

appearing to be sexist and bearing in mind the limits they have. A couple on this wing have shown their mettle. They are often braver than the men and you should respect them for that."

Do you have confidence in those with whom you work?

The officers' levels of confidence in their colleagues were rated on a five point scale from complete confidence to not at all confident. Six (5%) of the officers reported complete confidence in their colleagues; eighty two (68%) of them answered that they were confident in their colleagues; twenty six (22%) of the officers said that they had confidence in most of their colleagues; five (4%) of them said that they were not really confident of their colleagues and one (1%) officer was not at all confident about the other officers. The relationship between officer and team ratings and confidence has been discussed above. However, one other relationship may be of interest. There is a low correlation ($r = 0.34$, $p < 0.01$) between family support and confidence in colleagues. Officers reporting more support are more confident in their colleagues. This may reflect a general optimism or positive personality trait. A more likely interpretation is that officers whose families do not support their career are faced with more awkward interactions during their work. These officers are less confident and have more negative interactions overall. There is insufficient data here to speculate as to the direction of the relationship. It may be that less supportive families make the job harder. Alternatively, the families may be recognising those officers who have difficulties in their work.

"Yes, I couldn't do the job if I didn't feel confident. If I didn't have confidence I wouldn't do the work."

"Not everybody, in the P.O. and in two of the S.O.'s. Within the Officer structure, only about two. I'll work with them even though they tend to run the other way and it's not good when that happens."

"When I get to know them, there will be some I'll trust and others I wouldn't."

Do you generally get on with your colleagues?

All one hundred and twenty officers reported that they generally got on with their colleagues. The most common quote was:

"You would have to ask them but I'm sure that I do."

"Yes, we have our differences but we're a team. I can rely on all of them and vice versa. The crunch comes when someone's attacking you and then you know who's with you. It's a good gauge of someone's character."

Problems with colleagues

Sixty-three officers reported that they did not have problems with their colleagues. However, of these, a further 3 then went on to describe problems. In other words, half of the sample reported problems with their colleagues. A χ^2 comparison demonstrated that female officers are significantly

more likely to report problems with their colleagues than are male officers. This is demonstrated in the table below:

Table 12.1 χ^2 table comparing incidence of problems between colleagues.

Gender:	Female	Male
Experience of problems:		
Yes	17	40
No	9	54

Pearson = 4.26, df 1, p <0.05

Thus 65% of the female officers report having problems with their colleagues whereas 42% of the men report such problems. Further comparisons were made between the type and frequency of problems experienced. These findings are demonstrated in the tables below. The first table indicates the types of problem experienced by all officers.

Table 12.2   Types of problem between colleagues.

TYPE OF PROBLEM	NUMBER OF OFFICERS	%AGE OF OFFICERS REPORTING PROBLEMS
Job Structure	17	28
Social loafing	14	23
Interpersonal	13	22
Anti women	6	10 (23% of the women.)
Management style	5	8
It varies	4	7
People not following instructions	1	2

The table below reports the distribution between men and women of the types of problem between officers. It points to findings that are consistent with the previous literature, namely, that women are more likely to experience interpersonal problems with their colleagues than are the male officers.

Table 12.3   Type of problem between officers broken down across genders.

Gender:	Female	Male
Type of problem:		
Social loafing	0	14
Job structure	3	14
Interpersonal	8	5
Anti women	6	-
People not following instructions	0	1
Management style	0	5
It varies	0	4

If anti women attitudes are simply ranked as one form of interpersonal interaction, then 14 of the women, (half the sample of women) are reporting interpersonal difficulties whereas 10 (approximately 11%) of the men report such difficulties. The table below reports a χ^2 analysis comparing problems related to job structures and interpersonal difficulties between the genders.

Table 12.4 χ^2 job related and interpersonal difficulties compared across genders.

Gender:	Female	Male
Type of problem:		
Interpersonal	14	10
Job performance	3	29

Pearson = 15.55, df 1, p < 0.01

Hence, proportionally more men experience difficulties related to job performance than do women whereas the female officers experience proportionally more interpersonal problems. There was no significant difference between the genders in terms of frequency of problems between colleagues. The table below demonstrates the frequencies expressed by the officers who reported problems with their colleagues.

Table 12.5   Frequency of problems between colleagues.

FREQUENCY OF PROBLEM	No. OF OFFICERS	%AGE OF OFFICERS REPORTING
Can't put a figure on it	8	15
Once or twice	17	31
They no longer occur	8	15
It depends	13	24
Less than 1 a month	1	2
Weekly	3	6
Every few days	3	6
Daily	2	4

"Sometimes I get a little bit frustrated, the way a couple of the officers have spoken to me is purely because I'm female. They tell you what to do in a way that they wouldn't to a man, but I can answer back so I nipped that in the bud right at the start."

"Not really, only, it's nothing I can't handle. Staff who have been in the job for donkeys years think that either you can't do it or that they shouldn't be doing it. They have you running around but, I'll challenge it. Not the S.O. but the basic grades with time in. It crops up a lot, one thing or another."

Do you see your colleagues much after work?

Another way of measuring integration into the culture is to measure the time spent with colleagues away from prison. In contrast to the image of complete camaraderie traditionally portrayed, sixty five of the officers (54%) did not socialise with their colleagues. There were no significant differences between men and women although age was correlated with staff association (r = 0.25, p <0.01). Thus, there may be a slight tendency for younger people to go out together. This is hardly surprising in terms of opportunity. The most likely reason for not socialising together is geographical. A number of officers reported that they would go out with their colleagues if they all lived closer together or if there were more staff houses located close to the prison. Most of the officers who had been in the job for long enough, mentioned the effect of local recruiting. Previously, officers had been transferred from all over the country and re-housed by the gaol in Service Quarters. With the move to local recruiting, people already live in the environs but further away from one another.

Having established the level of incorporation within the environment, the focus now shifts from team incorporation to means of control and maintenance of good order. It was predicted that female officers would favour different methods and the research presented below tested this contention.

Would you say that you're always in control?

Sixty eight (57%) of the officers said that they were in control all of the time; forty one (35%) said that they were in control for some of the time and ten (8%) said that they were never in control. There were no significant differences between the male and female officers' assessments of whether they were in control.

"We're in control, there are situations which do go wrong but you can't ever lose can you?"

How do you keep control?

There were a variety of answers to this question and they are shown in the table below.

Table 12.6   Means of control employed by officers.

MEANS OF CONTROL	NUMBER OF OFFICERS	%AGE OF OFFICERS
Interpersonal skills	45	39
The system maintains control	25	22
The prisoners are in control	20	18
Experience	8	7
It varies	7	6
Respect or authority or presence	6	5
Control and Restraint	1	1

Although there were no statistically significant differences between the methods favoured by male and female officers, it is worth stating that the female officers only reported making use of three of the methods above. Eleven female officers reported using interpersonal skills to maintain control, 6 reported that the system maintains control rather than individual officers and five reported that the prisoners were in control. It appears that both men and women use techniques that have been traditionally associated with women. This is demonstrated more clearly in the table below.

Table 12.7   Female and male methods of keeping control.

FEMALE OFFICERS	FAVOURED TECHNIQUE(S)	MALE OFFICERS
11	Use of interpersonal skills	34
6	Reliance on the system and its processes	19
5	The prisoners are in control	15
	Through experience	8
	It varies	7
	Through personal presence or authority	6
	Control and Restraint techniques	1

"By voice and rapport."

"You just do. You use your interpersonal skills and just do it. If they want control, they can do it. One hundred and twenty six against six. In the evenings, there are only four or five on."

"The prisoners or the staff? You need to be approachable to both. You need to listen and to be seen to be listening. You need to be understanding and fair but firm at times. Get to know them, staff and prisoners."

"With the staff, governors' rules, the regime, good will and through their aspirations."

"I try and keep control. They know where the line is with me. You can have a laugh and a joke from the fact that you are working with and living with people. You do get friendly and you have to deal with them all the time. At the beginning, you have got to put that line down."

"I think that by being assertive and straight with them."

Irrespective of good relationships, there will always be times when order may be threatened, particularly by violence. Hence, officers were asked whether they could recognise a potentially violent situation and what they would do to maintain or to re-establish order.

Cues to violence

One hundred and eleven (95%) of the officers stated that they could recognise a potentially violent situation; one officer said that it was often but not always possible to recognise a potentially violent situation and five officers said that they could not tell when a situation might become violent. One hundred and ten of the officers gave examples of the signs that a situation could become violent. There were no significant differences in the cues to violence identified by the male and female officers. These are shown in the table below. Again, they demonstrate that officers rely upon interpersonal skills.

Table 12.8 Cues to violence.

POTENTIAL CUE	NUMBER OF OFFICERS	%AGE OF OFFICERS REPORTING
Prisoners' non verbal cues	51	46
The atmosphere on the wing	21	19
Knowledge of the prisoners	17	16
When it becomes calm	15	14
Verbal cues	4	4
It depends	2	2

The table below shows that there are few differences between the male and female officers. Although the female officers tend to be more likely to identify the use of non vocal cues to identify potential threats, the male officers are more likely to report that they rely on "inmate knowledge". This, of itself, indicates that they are using interpersonal skills.

Table 12.9   Male and female officers reported cues to violence.

FEMALE OFFICERS	POTENTIAL CUE	MALE OFFICERS
15	Prisoners' non verbal cues	36
5	The atmosphere on the wing	16
2	Knowledge of the prisoners	15
1	When it becomes calm	14
1	Verbal cues	3
	It depends	2

"Of course. That's what we're paid for, we should all know... The history of the wing, the day, the mood, how they lock up, a feeling. We feel an atmosphere and notice they are in strange associations. A hood and drugs were found on gaol craft. If you can't tell, you shouldn't be doing the job."

"When you've seen the stance of an inmate, the expression on his face, how many inmates there are there, their tone of voice. Whether or not an officer is agitated. If the officer is, then it will be more likely to go off. You want to hide your agitation. The best way of losing control is to let them know they've got you rattled."

"When you're escorting 1 or more prisoners, there are times when you are in a visual black spot, where you could be attacked and no-one would know."

"The normal, shouting, if an officer is talking and he raises his voice, hopefully other officers are aware."

"Non verbal cues, raised voices, basic stuff you're taught in college."

"There are two ways, two types of prisoner, Ethnics and Whites and they handle things differently. Whites go quiet and walk away and you know you'll get something. Ethnics shout and scream and get so uptight, it's very hard to calm them down. Indians and Pakistanis are very different. Every situation varies but usually there is hostility and experience tells you when it's going to go."

Control of violence

When coding the interviews, it became clear that the officers were combining two of the questions in their answers, namely how they would handle a situation that looks like it might become nasty and how they would handle a situation that has turned nasty. Their answers have been collapsed and are shown below. There were no statistically significant differences between male and female officers' preferred means of control nor were there statistically significant differences between the methods favoured in either prison or wing (despite their different "clientele").

Table 12.10   Means of controlling potential and actual violence.

MEANS OF CONTROL	No. OF OFFICERS	%AGE OF OFFICERS REPORTING
A stage approach from use of interpersonal skills through to Control and Restraint.	77	66
Control and Restraint	15	13
Calming the situation	12	10
It depends on the situation	7	6
By talking to the prisoners	3	3
Through knowledge of prisoners	2	2
Use of non verbal cues	1	1

The table below illustrates that there are no significant differences between male and female officers' preferred means of controlling violence.

Table 12.11   Means of controlling potential and actual violence broken down by gender.

FEMALE OFFICERS	MEANS OF CONTROL	MALE OFFICERS
19	A stage approach from use of interpersonal skills through to Control and Restraint.	58
3	Control and Restraint	12
2	Calming the situation	10
	It depends on the situation	7
	By talking to the prisoners	3
1	Through knowledge of prisoners	1
	Use of non verbal cues	1

"It depends on the staff and the situation a bit. There is "them and us" and "them and them". You need to tell staff if you see something happening, isolate it and get help. You need to give a full brief to someone and deal with it as you see fit. If it is inmates fighting, you don't get involved. If it is staff fighting, you go in. Inmates, don't go in, it's stupid, you seek advice. A lot of staff haven't come across people like this until they work with them. These buggers don't think twice before they would assault you."

"It depends on the situation... sometimes the more mature inmates, if someone sounds too aggressive, his mates pull him away."

"I've turned it full turtle. Everybody on the wing was annoyed that something had been taken. We got the cells searched with full inmate co-operation. It could have gone violent. I tend to reverse the roles. If you get them involved, you defuse half the problem. Mostly what happens is that something let's you know something's wrong, smashes a window, threatens someone or slams a door, they show us there's a problem."

As part of an attempt to gain more understanding of concrete fears, officers were asked what would constitute a nasty situation. They were then asked about their previous involvement in nasty situations.

Would you please give me some examples of a "nasty situation"?

Various different types of nasty situation were mentioned as prototypical "nasty situations". The table below shows those situations that were identified as being "nasty" by the officers. In order to avoid double counting, some officers are shown as experiencing combinations of encounters.

Table 12.12 General examples of nasty situations.

NASTY SITUATION	No. OF OFFICERS	%AGE OF OFFICERS REPORTING
Violence in general	37	32
Violent and non violent combination	25	22
Prisoner versus prisoner violence	15	13
Prisoner versus officer violence	12	10
Other non violent events e.g. attempted bribery or an escape on escort	10	9
Large group violence	5	4
Assault	3	3
Drugs	2	2
Non violent combination	2	2

The table shown below gives a gender based breakdown of the same information.

Table 12.13 General examples of nasty situations as reported by male and female officers.

FEMALE OFFICERS	NASTY SITUATION	MALE OFFICERS
8	Violence in general	29
4	Violent and non violent combination	21
4	Prisoner versus prisoner violence	11
4	Prisoner versus officer violence	8
1	Other non violent events e.g. attempted bribery or an escape on escort	9
2	Large group violence	3
	Assault	3
	Drugs	2
	Non violent combination	2

Although the response shown first is the only one of its kind, it is a good demonstration of one of the avoidance techniques employed. "No, I can't do that because I couldn't do my job. I'm never conscious of not wanting to be somewhere. On the wing, there are officers around you all the time. Before speaking to prisoners behind doors, you always have some officers with you."

"Racism, on C wing, someone has been waiting for months and months. There is a real black and white tension. We all are expecting it to go and big style." (A short time later, there was a fight on the exercise yard involving approximately twenty prisoners. The next morning an officer informed the researcher that there had been a "race riot" last night. The same day, two prisoners reported that there had been a fight over debt and some older prisoners had "moved in" on a younger prisoner. Both the group and the individual prisoner received "support" from allies. "The officers are saying it was over race but it wasn't.")

"Being confronted by an inmate with a weapon of some sort in his hand. Perhaps in an area where you are out numbered and there are no other officers around."

"For me, it depends on what sort of incident. For me, I don't like visits and some things on visits have made me feel pretty uncomfortable."

Previous involvement in nasty encounters

One hundred officers (83%) reported that they had been involved in nasty encounters. Exactly half of these came from each prison and there were no significant differences between the wings of either prison nor between male and female officers. There was a wide pattern in the frequency of involvement in such encounters. Thirty (25%) of the officers reported involvement more than four times a year with fifteen officers stating that they were involved in nasty situations all the time. It may be possible to assume that such officers were involved in relatively trivial events, particularly as they included such things as "flare ups at the hot plate". However, although such events can happen once or twice a week, their frequency should not minimise their potential seriousness. Although twenty nine officers did not report a figure of involvement, the remaining half of the sample reported involvement in nasty situations as a regular but infrequent occurrence (four times or less a year).

Actual nasty events

As can be seen, there is little difference between those encounters identified as being potentially nasty and those actually experienced. Again, in order to avoid double counting, some officers are shown as experiencing combinations of encounters. As before, there were no significant differences between male and female officers, officers from different wings or officers from different prisons. The tables below show those situations that had been experienced by the officers.

Table 12.14 Actual examples of nasty situations identified by 100 officers.

NASTY SITUATION	NUMBER OF OFFICERS
Violence in general	35
Violent and non violent combination	16
Prisoner versus officer violence	14
Other non violent events e.g. attempted bribery or escort escape	8
Large group violence	8
Assault	7
Prisoner versus prisoner violence	6
Riot	3
Fires	1

Table 12.15   Actual examples of nasty situations identified by male and female officers.

FEMALE OFFICERS	NASTY SITUATION	MALE OFFICERS
9	Violence in general	26
7	Violent and non violent combination	9
2	Prisoner versus officer violence	12
2	Other non violent events	6
	Large group violence	8
	Assault	7
2	Prisoner versus prisoner violence	4
	Riot	3
	Fires	1

Although the differences are not statistically significant, it may be fair to conclude that the male officers reported being involved in a greater variety of violent incidents.

"Yes, the riots at Christmas, there were only four of us. That was pretty horrendous. Fires and out of their cells on the restricted regime. That was the worst situation and I did feel very vulnerable."

"An incident on the unit with a prisoner who was being wounded up outside the door. He punched glass and smashed it. I saw it happening and didn't get there in time. One, I don't know if it's nothing or unfortunate, potentially. A few years ago, a chap who died of a heart attack had had his parole accepted. He was only young and died in his cell. I didn't find him but I was his personal officer. There was a situation, we got a letter from the Padre but on the wing at the time, the inmates didn't believe it and they thought he may have been untreated. It wasn't the case but a tense situation at that time. It was dealt with properly and we kept them informed from the chaplaincy."

"There was an incident where six were assaulted and we remained professional. We didn't lose the wing and we did lock others away, the inmates came to our assistance... I've been taken hostage, but because I was trained in break away techniques, I was able to throw the inmate against the back wall and escape. That was laughed off because I escaped very quickly. He was under the influence of drugs at the time... [The officer then returned to the first incident]. There was a fight on the top landing and we managed to lock one of the fighters in a cell. The inmates, prisoners saw two prisoners on the floor covered in blood and surrounded by officers, 6 officers. They immediately thought that the officers had beaten the inmates. They started coming at the officers and then smashing up the lower levels. We called for help and had the other inmate not involved locked away. I managed to withdraw the staff and then the injured inmates started to attack the other inmates because they were drunk. The prisoners then decided to change sides and they locked away. It was a very stressful time for the staff, 6 were assaulted including me but none attacked the inmates because of their professionalism. We prevented the wing from being destroyed and it took 45 minutes to bang them away. No support was offered... describing problems to colleagues isn't an accepted way to retain strength of character. It is seen as a weakness and they don't want to push it so they don't say what they should."

Have you ever been in an unpleasant situation with other officers?

Given the nature of this research, it was also particularly important to attempt to assess whether the officers had come into conflict with each other. The relevant findings are reported in this section. Thirty eight (32%) of the officers had been involved in unpleasant situations with other officers. There were no significant differences in the number of male and female officers reporting previous involvement in unpleasant situations with other officers. The frequency of such events varied but was largely rare. Nine officers had been involved in nasty situations with other officers more than twice a year. Of those, five officers reported constant clashes of personality with certain officers that occurred "all the time" or "daily".

The types of situation encountered between officers are shown in the table below. There were no significant differences between the types of situation reported by men and women nor in the proportions reporting such involvement (39% of the women reported involvement in such situations and 33% of the men). As can be seen, physical unpleasantness is rare.

Table 12.16   Actual examples of unpleasant situations between officers.

UNPLEASANT SITUATION	No. OF OFFICERS	%AGE OF OFFICERS REPORTING
Verbal (direct)	22	53
Physical violence	8	20
Verbal (indirect: rumours)	5	12
Results of social loafing	3	7
A combination of factors	2	5
Drugs trafficking	1	2

"To do with work, you expect officer\inmates, that amused me. Officers on this wing, I've had to step in, that really unsettled me."

"When I was at (Saturn)... we had a particularly nasty individual and staff went in to give him his breakfast and he punched one. Staff restrained him and during the course of restraint, I saw one officer start to put the boot in. At the time, I advised him if I ever saw him do that again, we wouldn't have the conversation unless a governor was present."

"There is a female officer here... and there was slander going round... I found out who it was and I confronted him... it had been going on for six months and it was over in six days."

Worries about going anywhere or doing something that is part of the job

Fifty (42%) of the officers stated that they did worry about some aspects of the job. There were no significant differences between officers from different wings or prisons. However, a χ^2 comparison between male and female officers tended towards significance. Women tend to worry about their job whereas men tend not to. This is shown in the table below.

Table 12.17 χ^2 comparison of gender and incidence of worry about the job.

Gender:	Female	Male
Worry about job?:		
Yes	15	35
No	11	58

Pearson = 3.36, df 1, p = 0.07

"I suppose there are times when I am so... but I can cope with any threatening situation, a group and a con., deal with whatever arises."

"Doing an escort is sometimes a little worrying but other than that, no. With escorts, you like to think that you're in charge but your--your control is limited."

"No. If you are worried, it's better to face it straight away. I had threats made against me in the segregation so I made sure that I unlocked him. There was a team hidden around the corner so if he was going to do anything, I had support. A lot is just idle threats but if you don't do it, it plays on your mind and then it becomes a problem." Although this officer reports not being worried, her response indicates that she was coping with a very real concern regarding safety.

"No. If they are going to do it, they are going to do it."

"Yes, every time we go to a major incident because if I don't, I'm dangerous, your head goes. I do worry, I worry for my staff. I worry how bad an incident can get or whether we can cope. There is no good being *that* brave. That's stupid. That's when people get hurt, when you go to take an inmate out."

"What worries me is: if I get to an alarm, that I might let others down."

Are there any situations in prison which make you uncomfortable?

There were no significant differences in the numbers of officers reporting discomfort between officers from different wings or prisons or between male and female officers. However, there were some differences between genders that related to the type of situation that made officers feel uncomfortable. Sixty five (55%) of the officers reported that there were situations which made them feel uncomfortable. Those situations are shown in the table below:

Table 12.18 Examples of uncomfortable aspects of officers' jobs.

UNCOMFORTABLE ASPECT	No. OF OFFICERS	%AGE OF OFFICERS REPORTING
Violence	9	15
Lack of control	9	15
Other things*	9	15
The working environment	6	15
Privacy/searching prisoners	6	10
The hierarchy	5	8
Searching visitors	4	7
Prisoners' offence types	4	7
Imposed changes	3	5
A combination of factors	3	5
It depends on the other officers	2	3
Prisoners being too personal	2	3

* reported by only one officer, for example searching a transsexual prisoner

The gender differences referred to above are demonstrated in the table below. Only one woman is made uncomfortable by general violence, none report discomfort from a lack of control, changes to the regime, from the hierarchy or from the actions taken by other officers whereas no men report problems with prisoners becoming too personal. Women are proportionately *more* likely to report problems in their working environment, discomfort when searching prisoners or over privacy and related to offence types. The full table is shown below and although the proportional differences seem real, the directions are not always as would have been predicted. Concerns that are in the predictable direction, include those related to their working environment, issues over privacy or searching prisoners' cells and over prisoners' offence types. However, unpredictable differences related to enhanced male concerns over violence, lack of control and problems incurred within the hierarchy.

Table 12.19 Comparison of type of discomfort and gender.

Gender:	Female	Male
Type of discomfort		
General violence	1	8
Lack of control	0	9
Working environment	3	3
Changes to the regime	0	3
Privacy or searching	3	3
Searching visitors	1	3
Hierarchical	0	5
Depends on other officers	0	2
Prisoners being too personal	2	0
Offence types	2	2
A combination	1	2
Other things	2	7

"It's nothing to do with prisoners, but one thing is the rubbing down of female visitors. I don't feel comfortable doing it. Women and children under 16. If I was allowed to rub down inmates, I wouldn't hesitate but doing a stranger off the streets, I don't feel comfortable doing it. It's not just me, we're not happy about it at all. It puts us in a difficult situation." This statement is reflected in comments made by the Federation of Prisoners' Families Support Groups within the Penal Affairs Consortium (1996). "Searches are being carried out with scant regard for people's dignity and the presence of children. This is particularly alarming where cultural customs and religious beliefs may be affected" (p 4).

"Escorts, I've been on some quite high security risk escorts and in my opinion I'm not experienced enough."

"Yes, there is one situation I feel slightly uncomfortable in. If I'm made, through policy, to do something I don't necessarily believe in yet I'm ordered to do so, there are--it's hard to say--there have been little things that have come up. I don't like telling someone to do something I wouldn't do. It's a similar thing, if we're holding someone in custody who I believe to be genuinely innocent, I feel uncomfortable about that. It's only happened once or twice but I do feel slightly uncomfortable, the feeling is similar to the first one."

"The only time I feel really uncomfortable is socially when you meet someone who knows what you do and can't leave it. Wants to announce it publicly to see the reaction. It's not the sort of job that a lot of people can accept as being worthy. To announce it and talk openly is bragging and I think that is more likely to upset people than just keeping quiet. I prefer to let people ask and you just get on rather than you leading and bragging. If they want to know, let them ask."

"People that tell me that they never get scared or worry about it, they worry me."

Following this, officers were asked directly about their personal safety concerns.

Do you ever worry about your safety?

Fifty eight (48%) of the officers said that they did worry about their safety. There were no significant differences between officers from different prisons or wings or between male and female officers.

"I'm concerned sometimes, not worried. What's going to happen will happen."

"Sometimes, I wouldn't be human if I didn't. Sometimes, certain situations could be deadly. For example, this morning I was on concourse patrol. I'm out there with up to 300 inmates at any one time going off to work. You can feel very threatened, it's so enclosed, there's no back up. The stand by bell but it's a very dodgy area."

"That is not an easy question. I must do. I'm not so concerned about myself because I can handle myself but I can only do that if I see it coming. I can't see behind me but I'm not unduly concerned. It's not one of the top of the list."

"Not till after the event. Sometimes it has happened."

Do you ever feel fearful while you do the job?

Sixty four (54%) of the officers reported that they sometimes felt fearful whilst carrying out their duties. This is a lower figure than that reported in the previous study. This could be for a variety of reasons, the most obvious is that they are in different prisons. An alternative is that overall levels of fear may have dropped in the Prison Service in the time between the collection of data. Another alternative provides support for the methodology adopted in the previous study. Where time was taken to develop notions of worry before moving on to fear, participants may have felt easier about reporting their feelings of fear.

In contrast to Gomme's findings (1988), there were no statistically significant differences in the incidence of fear between male and female officers. There were also no differences between officers from different wings and officers from different prisons. However, significant differences were found when categorical comparisons were made between fear and previous experience of a "nasty situation"; fear and worries during work and fear and worries about safety. These are predictable and are shown in the three χ^2 tables below.

Table 12.20 χ^2 comparison of fear and experience of nasty situations.

Do they feel fear:	Yes	No
Previous involvement in a nasty situation:		
Yes	58	41
No	6	14

Pearson = 5.47, df 1, p <0.05

The table shows that although most officers appear to feel fearful, this is somewhat mediated by previous involvement in "nasty situations". Arguments relating to the unrealistic nature of fear should be treated with appropriate caution as most of these participants have real personal experience of "nasty situations". In other words, there appears to be little fear, either formless or concrete without previous experience. Only six officers of the officers who reported feeling fearful had no previous experience of nasty situations. However, it is also worth noting that a significant number of those who have been involved in a nasty situation do not feel fear. This means that there must be other factors at play such as degree of seriousness; whether the officer successfully coped with the situation; was backed up at the time; was supported after it and so on. The following two tables illustrate predictable associations between job related worries, safety and fear.

Table 12.21 χ^2 table relating fear with worries about the job.

Do they feel fear:	Yes	No
Do they worry at work:		
Yes	35	15
No	28	40

Pearson = 9.62, df 1, p <0.01

There appears to be quite a strong relationship in the predictable direction namely that officers who do not tend to worry at work generally, also tend not to report fear.

Table 12.22 χ^2 comparison relating worries about safety and fear.

Do they feel fear:	Yes	No
Do they worry about safety:		
Yes	40	17
No	23	37

Pearson = 11.92, df 1, p <0.01

As in the previous table, the finding is unsurprising and is that the same officers tend to worry about their safety and report feeling fear.

"Not really--apprehensive, never fearful because I'm generally in control."

How fearful?

As mentioned previously, one aim of this research was to assess the levels of officers' fears. Of the officers who expressed a degree of fear, the majority (32) stated that it was apprehension or a certain level of awareness; 9 of the officers reported an adrenaline rush; 5 said that they had been pretty scared; 9 others reported that they had been afraid and 5 reported feeling extremely afraid at times. There are probably at least two different interpretations being made here. From the answers given, it was clear that those officers who reported the lowest level of fear were reporting it as a frequent or normal state whereas those who reported extreme fear tended to be referring to specific

incidents in which they had been involved. Again, there were no statistically significant differences between the levels of fear between male and female officers, officers from different wings and officers from different prisons. However, there was a low correlation between experience and level of fear ($r = 0.27$, $p < 0.05$). This seems to support the suggestion that officers with more experience are more likely to have been involved in worse situations. They can report having felt fearful under certain conditions because they have had time to find themselves in those conditions.

"No, not 100%. No, I've got a twist of guts of course but I just get on with it. If I stopped and thought about it, I wouldn't do anything. I'm not a hero but I'm paid to do it. If you start thinking like that, you'll end up killing yourself with a heart attack or something will definitely affect you medically. It's a stressful job."

"Butterflies, a rush of adrenaline. It's hard to explain, maybe it's why I do the job, I like the adrenaline."

"To the point of being bloody minded and saying "if he's going to do me, he's going to do me". Facing it head on, you don't give in to it or you change jobs."

"Shit scared."

Is that based on personal experience?

One hundred and five officers (88%) reported that their answers relating to fear were based on personal experience. Given that half of the officers who reported being involved in "nasty situations" came from each prison, it is not surprising that there were no significant differences in personal experience of fear between different wings or prisons. There were also no significant differences between male and female officers.

"I think that because I've not been here long, I've not got many war stories. I've only been involved in two incidents and perhaps if I'd been involved or seen more--I don't think it would affect me. You take on board more by what the other officers say, you get used to it."

In a stressful environment, support might mediate the effects of fear. Such support can come from a number of places and the next section opens with a consideration of familial sources of support.

What do your family think about you doing this job?

Two of the officers reported that they had no family. Sixty seven (64%) of the officers reported that their family supported them in their job and thirty five (34%) of the officers said that they did not have the backing of their family. For this third of the sample, support may be forthcoming from elsewhere, however this was not systematically assessed. There were no significant differences between men and women, officers from different wings or prisons.

"My family aren't interested. They are never involved in it."

"They think it's changed me and it concerns my wife greatly."

"They all seemed rather amazed when I first joined. They were very surprised you could do it. They think of prison as something very taboo. Prisons are somewhere you do not go."

"I live with my parents, my Mum, she's quite happy for me to be in the job but I do hide things from her. A wing riot and prisoners charged with mutiny. When it came up, I played it all down. I do the same with my boyfriend. I am selective in what I tell them."

"Very proud."

The question relating to family support had a subsidiary question regarding family concerns for safety. The results from this question are portrayed below.

Do they (your family) ever worry about your safety?

The most common answer was one word, "yes". Eighty five (74%) of the officers reported that their families worried about their safety whilst twenty eight (24%) reported that their families did not worry. However this includes some people who answered that their families knew that they could look after themselves which may imply a degree of concern. Again, there were no significant differences between men and women, officers from different wings or prisons. However χ^2 comparisons did reveal two findings that tended towards significance. Officers from Saturn were somewhat more likely to report that their families worried about their safety (Pearson coefficient of 2.85, df 1, p = 0.09). A similar, unsurprising finding is that women's families seemed to worry more than did men's (Pearson coefficient of 2.81, df 1, p = 0.09). Lennon & Rosenfeld (1992) systematically demonstrated that women's mental health is affected by both work and home effects hence such family concerns may inadvertently increase pressure on female officers.

"That's why I don't tell her half of the things that happen."

"I think my boyfriend was until I did "C & R" on him and he realises that if the numbers are manageable, I can have a go."

"Yes, all the time. She's always moaning."

Do you feel that you have the support of other officers?

Eighty-eight (73%) of the officers reported that they had the support of their colleagues. Thirty-one (26%) that it depended on the colleagues or the situation and one officer reported no support from colleagues. There were no significant differences between male and female officers' reports of support from their colleagues.

"Yes we do. Obviously, personal feelings come in and there are various problems."

"Yes, on the wing, they are quite protective over women officers. I don't have any problems off the wing either. Officers are harder to understand sometimes than the prisoners." There appears to be a degree of ambivalence within this statement. One would tentatively suggest that this is another example of paternalism that is recognised as such by the recipient who is also aware of its benefits.

"For the most part."

Do you feel that you have the support of your supervisors?

Fifty seven (48%) of the officers said that they felt they had the complete support of their supervisors; fifty nine (50%) reported that it depended on the supervisor concerned and three (2%) said that they did not feel supported by their supervisors. Of those 3, two were women. There were no significant differences between different wings or prisons. However, there was a degree of ambivalence expressed by the female officers. When tested, this was statistically insignificant. The responses are shown in the table below.

Table 12.23   Breakdown by gender of feeling of supervisor support.

Gender:	Female	Male
Support:		
Yes	9	48
It depends	15	44
None	2	1

"Yes, no hesitation."

"Sometimes, the immediate supervisors although their hands may be tied. We have limited support from governors not to be totally negative, none."

Care teams

The most visible Prison Service sources of succour after an incident may be the (post incident) care teams. One hundred and thirteen officers were aware of the existence of the care teams in their prison. Only seventeen (14%) of the officers reported that they had previously used the services of the care team. When asked whether they thought that they might use the services in the future, sixty three (53%) of the officers said that they would, fifty one (43%) said that they would not and one officer was unsure. Thus almost half of the sample either foresaw no likelihood of difficulties ahead, or were unwilling to disclose their potential needs for support to their colleagues on the care teams or simply felt that they could cope with whatever came their way without the aid of a formal support service. There were no significant differences between men and women, officers from different wings or prisons in whether they had previously used the care team or whether they would in the future.

"The prison do but I wouldn't use them. I would use my line managers and people that I know personally or respect. I would not use the care team. I've got no faith in them at all, in the way they do their job or in their confidentiality. That is, in general, they have not been there when they were required. I'm very bitter for staff, one officer definitely needed it (after an incident) and they never even asked."

"I disagree with the care team. My name was used to threaten an officer as an example of someone scraping through. I was very upset."

"We have a care team, but I couldn't tell you who was on it, there's an area they fall short. But certain people, I could go to with my problems. After the riot, we were burnt and it was extremely traumatic and not once did someone ask "are you all right?" The care team came in for the "tornado" but they paid more attention to the "C & R" teams. We were forgotten about, not everybody feels they should ask, they should come to you." Note that a "tornado" is the name given to the response team of officers called in to attend a riot, etc. at any prison within the locality.

"They say that they do [have someone to help] but it's yet to be witnessed on other officers... the Board of Visitors is supposed to be there for us too but they're only ever there for inmates."

"If I felt I needed it, no qualms."

How they felt about participating and addenda related to fear and control

One hundred and fourteen officers found the experience positive. Two were sceptical about the study and four were still unsure about participating at the end. All were reassured as to the confidential nature of the study and none chose to withdraw.

"It's helpful, you get used to doing the job and when we go out socially, we don't take partners so we can talk about work but it's not the serious side. It's the laughter. It's nice to talk about it."

"If it gives insight, it certainly helps you think more about the job. Makes you go back to your training and look at yourself."

"If I was attacked, someone would help because of the way I am with them. They treat me fair and I treat them fair."

"You could have a confrontation every day, two or three times a day. If you want a scrap, go ahead and do it. If you don't, then talk to them as humans... Sexual assaults, they go for the male prisoners too. Three of my charges have been raped."

"One tried to get me as a hostage. He had me by the wrist and was trying to pull me in to his cell. I talked my way out of it, he'd been on hooch. I didn't realise how vulnerable I was until I found out afterwards he'd taken several officers hostage. He was in for a sexual offence as well. I should have logged it but then I was too naive in the job to log it."

The quotation above is taken from a transcript of an interview with a female officer. It demonstrates exactly the kind of concern that was expressed before (and during) the cross gender deployment of female officers in male prisons. Although problems are undoubtedly experienced, the amount of positive repercussions may well outweigh the negative effects of posting female officers into male prisons. However, there are a number of negative effects as well and they cannot be ignored. The problems affect the female officers themselves, their male colleagues and the prisoners.

Marginally more female officers (65%) reported problems with their colleagues than with prisoners (50%) and this is in line with previous literature (Zimmer, 1982, 1986, and *Briefing*, 74). Also in line with previous literature is that the female officers' problems with colleagues is in marked contrast to the experiences of the male officers. Almost half of the women reported interpersonal problems

with their colleagues whereas only 10% of the men reported such problems. Similarly, male officers seem to be more likely to experience environmental problems with the prisoners than interpersonal ones whereas female officers are as likely to report interpersonal problems as environmental problems. However, the male officers seem to experience problems with prisoners more frequently than do the female officers. Associated with this finding, male officers are more likely to report more frequent "unpleasant situations with other officers".

As has been demonstrated, the women are perceived as calming influences by the male officers and the prisoners. This is concordant to the findings of Cormier, 1975; Flynn, 1982; Jurik, 1988; Szockyj, 1989 and DPF2, 1994. However, the women are also seen as being less able to control violent situations and this is in line with Zimmer, 1987 and Szockyj, 1989. In relation to the management of violence, it is interesting to note that when asked what made them feel uncomfortable, only male officers mentioned lack of control. Essentially the issues over calming and control are at the crux of the debate about the deployment of female officers in male prisons. It is with this issue that the following chapter begins. The chapter then discusses the rest of the findings from this study in terms of the themes presented in chapter eight.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

DISCUSSION OF KEY FINDINGS FROM THE CROSS GENDER POSTINGS RESEARCH

This chapter concludes the section of the thesis devoted to cross gender supervision. It presents the key findings from the current research in terms of the previous debates. The chapter opens with a discussion of the costs and benefits of deploying female officers in male prisons in terms of maintaining control and minimising tension. It then moves on to an examination of the results pertaining to interpersonal difficulties that had been predicted at the outset. The main debate has been between those who believe that women exert a calming influence and those who believe that they are more likely to lose control. This chapter turns first to issues regarding their calming influence.

CALMING

Of those prisoners who did report problems with the officers, only four said that they were more likely to occur with women than men and eighteen reported that they only had problems with men. This finding is in accordance with the view that female officers might reduce the numbers of problems in a prison (Toch, 1977 and Zimmer, 1987). However it is possible that because the male prisoner does not wish to "clump a woman he clumps some poor old bloke instead".

This suggestion is made less likely by some of the other findings relating to the "calming" versus "controlling" debate. Two thirds of the prisoners felt that the women did have an effect on the prison and the majority of those prisoners (58% of those reporting an effect) stated that the women either calmed or normalised the environment. This finding is in accordance with Toch (1977); Zimmer (1987) and Jurik et al. (1987). Thus, data from prisoners suggest that the introduction of women officers to male prisons does seem to reduce the chances of fear inducing incidents. This can be put in better perspective by examining the conclusions relating to control.

CONTROL

Despite predictions to the contrary, men and women do not favour different methods of control. The prisoners reported that female officers do the job differently to male officers but this was not evidenced in the reports from the officers themselves. In line with previous findings, very few female officers favoured physical means of control over non physical. However, neither did most of the male officers. This is not to suggest that violence is unimportant in these prisons. It does suggest that most staff do not exacerbate it and are successfully managing to abate potentially nasty scenarios.

There are a number of possible interpretations of this finding but all require further research. The first is that the participants tended to give "text book" answers in an attempt to fulfil perceived

experimenter demands. However, it is unlikely that such an effect would only manifest itself in relation to some of the "awkward" questions and not others. Most officers were keen to portray their view and to have it heard. Such views were not always in line with Prison Service policy nor were they "politically correct". Social desirability is probably not an adequate explanation.

The two most plausible interpretations are either that there really is no difference in means of control or that male and female officers are using different terms of reference. The first of these interpretations would mean that Zimmer's (1987) concerns that women should not be evaluated on the same scale as men may not be as relevant in the English and Welsh Prison Service. Such a conclusion could reflect improved training from the Prison Service. The training could result in women adopting traditionally masculine approaches, and or men adopting traditionally feminine approaches.

The reliance on a stage approach to (potential) conflict resolution implies that both men and women use techniques that are demanded by the situation. If this is the case, then it means that the traditional portrayal of prison officers who favour "getting their hands dirty" is insufficient (e.g. Irwin, 1980 and Fleisher, 1989). Either, it was always inappropriate within the Prison Service or the Prison Service has changed. Even if techniques have changed, it is also possible that the techniques relying on interpersonal skills are still seen as being more acceptable when they come from women than from men. The Prison Service's emphasis on interpersonal skills may lead to a degree of ambivalence and even role conflict within the male officers.

The second main interpretation of the finding that men and women favour the same techniques relates to their terms of reference. For example, it is possible that both male and female officers favour trying to negotiate before using physical restraint. However, the points at which they decide to change approaches and their techniques within each approach may be different. In other words, the labels that men and women use may be the same, but may apply to different techniques. It was not possible to test this conclusion in the current data set therefore it is suggested that this would be a useful area of future research. There are a number of issues raised within this study that require further investigation. For example, the following section begins to illustrate the importance of interpersonal relationships within the Prison Service.

STAFF-PRISONER RELATIONSHIPS

In line with previous literature, it is possible to conclude that prisoners like to have female officers around. Although a little over half of the prisoners expressed indifference towards the female officers, 88% of them felt that it was either a good or very good idea to have them posted in male prisons. Although there are some real concerns expressed including issues relating to privacy, female officers do seem to have better relationships with prisoners than do male officers. However, this was difficult to assess quantitatively as there were strong ceiling effects in both samples. Generally speaking, prisoners and officers report getting on with each other but there are differences in the kinds of interactions reported. These are clearer in the prisoner group who tend to see the women in traditional ways and treat them accordingly. Hence they are less likely to

confront a female officer and more likely to approach one for help. Much the same could probably be said in any large organisation. From the perspective of *Custody and Care* (1991), the prisoners perceive the female officers as the best source of care. Therefore it is safe to conclude that prisoners seem to feel that they have different relationships with male and female officers.

The nature of the prisoner-officer relationship is surely fundamental to the smooth running and fulfilment of the aspirations of the Prison Service. It is encouraging to note the numbers of positive remarks made by the prisoners about many of the officers. Many prisoners' reticence in describing a typical officer is also an encouraging finding as is their recognition of the worries that officers might have in the course of their job. The awareness shown by both officers and prisoners of the problems experienced by the other group is not typical of two groups who have traditionally been characterised as extremely antagonistic (Zupan, 1986 and Brown, 1996). However, it may be necessary to examine in more detail what is meant by a good prisoner-officer relationship.

From the qualitative examples given, it appears that to some of the prisoners, a good officer is one who leaves you alone. Whilst not wishing to advocate antagonistic relationships, at least two scenarios can be given which would illustrate why such a "good relationship" is undesirable. The first relates to substance abuse. This is a growing problem and as has been recognised as such by the implementation of the programme of Mandatory Drugs Testing and commissioning of research by the Prison Service (e.g. Player, 1996 and Mason, 1996). A prisoner who is left alone to develop or maintain a heroin habit is being neither controlled nor cared for by the Prison Service.

The other problem area relates to "good" or "model" prisoners. In Saturn, a number of prisoners complained that they had never been noticed by the officers as they were quiet and gave them no problems. It was reported that they therefore spent longer on the wings than prisoners who "kicked off" and "got their move" or were recategorised sooner. When raised with officers on the same wings, they admitted that prisoners who caused no problems were less likely to gain as many privileges or to move through the system as fast as they should. The personal officer scheme is supposed to minimise such problems but there are too many competing claims on officers' time for it to be properly implemented (Penal Affairs Consortium, 1996).

Having mentioned the existence of good relationships, one must also balance this with mention of the findings relating to problematic prisoner-officer relationships. Although over half of the prisoners did not report problems with the officers, even prisoners who reported no problems, gave examples of less than perfect behaviour. For example the prisoner who reported no problems but went straight on to state that "if they want to get you down to the block, you don't get out unharmed".

Relationships are important from the officer perspective as well as from the prisoner point of view. Again, there is the need to assess what makes a "good relationship". The Learmont (1995) and Woodcock (1994) reports both mention the problems caused by officers who did not believe that the prisoners would actually go as far as killing them. Although many would argue that a significant proportion of the prison population does not need to be there, there is no dispute that there are a number of prisoners who have previously shown their aptitude for violent confrontation. It is commonly accepted that competent coping with such prisoners involves teamwork from the

officers. Whilst the picture is generally positive in this regard, it should be noted that there were a number of qualms expressed about support from line managers and governors for actions taken by the teams or individuals on them. This effect is particularly marked in female officers whose expressed ambivalence regarding supervisor support does not sit well with the Service's policy of equal opportunities (see below).

PATERNALISM

Another replicated, less desirable finding relates to paternalism (Bowersox, 1981; Zimmer, 1986, 1987 and Szockyj, 1989). Fourteen prisoners reported safety and control concerns and a number made remarks illustrating the existence of "over protective" male officers who may have inadvertently put their female colleagues at risk. Unsurprisingly a number of stereotypical attitudes seem to prevail and the prisoners report that the female officers carry out the job differently to the male officers. Women are described by the prisoners in ways that emphasise "feminine" strengths and weaknesses. In common with previous findings, prisoners reported protecting the female officers (Szockyj, 1989). These views were also noted by some of the female officers who reported receiving protection from some of the prisoners and mentioned the utility of protective male colleagues.

A related finding that tended towards significance was the reported family concern over an officer's safety. Families of female officers tended to worry more about their safety. The same effect was found in comparing the two prisons as the two genders. Saturn officers reported greater family concern. This supports the general view of the two prisons within the Service, media and their "clienteles". There is a difficulty in interpreting these findings. It is possible that women and or officers from Saturn are more aware of their families' feelings or are more willing to disclose them to a researcher. Either group (and there is obviously some overlap) might also report more concerns from their families because they are expected to be in more difficult circumstances. In other words, there may be some labelling effects at work.

SUPERVISION

As mentioned above, there was some ambivalence regarding supervisor support. It is possible to conclude that all officers felt in need of more support. The vast majority of officers were aware of the existence of the Care Teams but there was much ambivalence expressed over their efficacy, confidentiality and accessibility.

In *Briefing* 74, 90% of staff in prisons agreed that "more time should be taken to communicate with staff." Three quarters of those interviewed agreed that the Prison Service did not care enough about officers and "only 19% felt they worked for a well managed organisation." The findings reported here and earlier replicate those and suggest that improvements had not been made six months after the briefing came out. Officers also highlighted problems relating to training. Although the report in *Briefing* 74 was positive about the quality of training, it also mentioned that one third of the participants had not received any training in the previous year. Both male and female officers reported a lack of ongoing training and problems in implementing the good practices that they had been taught.

ACCEPTANCE

On moving to a consideration of feelings of acceptance, the picture becomes less clear. The male and female officers both socialised to a similar extent and both groups reported similar levels of support from their colleagues yet there are differences between male-female relationships and male-male relationships. There is some support for the idea that female officers have better relationships with their colleagues than do the male officers. All officers reported that they "generally got on with" their colleagues but women were significantly more positive in their ratings of their colleagues than were the men.

On the other hand, a minority of the male officers did express some qualms about the efficacy of their female colleagues. Some of the prisoners reported instances of inappropriate behaviour from the male officers directed at the female staff. Also, a number of the female officers' statements point to misunderstandings between the genders and actions that impeded their effective deployment. There is enough mixed information regarding levels of acceptance for the author to feel unable to come down on one side of the argument. Therefore, in the best of positivist traditions, it might be appropriate to conclude that a conclusion cannot yet be reached.

However, if a slightly different perspective is taken, then it is possible to conclude that female officers are not incorporated into the environment in the same way as are the male officers (even if predicted differences did not always emerge). There were no significant differences in the numbers of male and female officers reporting involvement in unpleasant situations with colleagues nor in the type of incident. However, male officers reported more frequent incidents. There were no significant differences between officers' perceptions of others' perceptions of them nor in incidence of fear and worry. There were also no significant differences in whether an officer felt part of the system or in his or her feeling of acceptance. However, one of the reasons for the higher frequency

of unpleasant situations reported by male officers was that female officers tended to report that problems "no longer occur". It was common for them to stress that their first few months (or even years) in the job had been characterised by a lack of acceptance from colleagues. This is reflected in the predicted finding that women were more likely to feel that they had made a difference than were men.

There were some other results relating to incorporation into officer role that were in the predicted directions. Female officers tended to worry about aspects of their employment whereas male officers tended not to worry. The female officers were also made to feel uncomfortable by slightly different things to the men. For example, no male officers reported feeling uncomfortable by prisoners being too personal and proportionally more female officers expressed concerns over searching and privacy. (However, no female officers reported feeling uncomfortable by lack of control. This could be because they are less likely to lose control than those male officers. Alternatively, it could be because they do not worry about it if it happens because they are better able to regain control or because women are not socialised to emphasise control in the same way as are men.)

When the officers were asked whether they felt accepted, there were no differences between the perceived levels of acceptance of male and female officers. This is not what was predicted but may be explained by the relatively low level of colleague social interaction generally. In other words, the officers, be they male or female, are not as bonded together as those described by Clemmer (1940), Mathieson (1965), Jacobs (1977) or Zimmer (1986). Given the associated violent problems that were reported by all of the above, this is not necessarily a problematic finding.

SAFETY

We now move onto the all important issues of safety and sources of concern. When asked to provide examples of "a nasty situation", 81% of the officers mentioned one or another form of violent confrontation. When recalling previous nasty experiences, 74% of the officers reported that they had been involved in 1 or more such incidents. There were no significant differences between male and female officers' experiences of such events despite reports that the women were protected or prevented from attending them. This apparent anomaly may have arisen because in attempting to shield them, male officers inadvertently put them at risk. Such an explanation would be consistent with the findings that prompted Bowersox (1981) to examine the effects of the "social responsibility norm". However, a number of the prisoners and officers report that the female officers "run to the bells". Thus, their involvement in violent situations is probably either as part of a team attending an incident or as a result of the interpersonal problems that they reported.

The finding that nearly half of the officers reported worrying about their safety is 10% lower than that reported in *Briefing* 74. This could be because of the good relationships reported in some of the wings, but is more likely to do with the relatively high proportions of mid term, life sentence servers and vulnerable prisoners in the sample. This might also explain why the incidence of fear was slightly lower than in the previous study reported in chapters three to seven (inclusive).

SOURCES OF WORRY

An area that has been examined already is that relating to the sources of worry and concerns about safety. The findings from this study demonstrate that there are areas in which the Prison Service has improved or prevented situations like those common in North America. Despite this, women do have different interpersonal relationships and problems when compared with male officers.

Although there was no significant difference between the numbers of male and female officers who reported experiencing problems with prisoners, the prisoners are more likely to report problems with male officers than female officers. Also, male officers were more likely to report more frequent problems than are female officers. However, there is a difference in the type of problem experienced. Male officers' problems with prisoners tend to be related to the environment whereas female officers' problems with prisoners are as likely to be interpersonal as environmental.

In a similar manner, a significantly greater proportion of female officers reported problems with their colleagues. Of those officers who reported such problems, there was no difference in the frequencies of difficulties reported by male and female officers. However, female officers are again more likely to experience interpersonal problems than are the male officers. Another, similar picture relates to worries about the job. A little over half of the women report aspects of the job that worry them whereas the proportion of men who worry is a little over a third.

It is possible to conclude that the net result of prisoners' reactions to female officers is that women seem to do more good than harm for what can be characterised as undesirable reasons. They do calm the situation and listen to the prisoners, etc. but this may be partly a labelling effect. Some of the participants castigated the younger prisoners for not treating women with the respect they deserve. However, it seems that the younger prisoners are merely treating female officers in the same way as they treat the male officers. Such antisocial behaviour as was mentioned is not desirable, but why should it be less unacceptable when directed at male officers? Perhaps it is best to draw to a close with two quotes mentioned above:

"... prison's never relaxed, no-one can actually truly relax."

"The only difference with women is the way they worry about a lot. They worry not to seem to be too friendly because men think they're having an affair. They worry about being enclosed with cons because anything can happen and constantly at the back of their mind is that they have to prove themselves to be as good as their male partners."

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

FEAR IN PROBATIONARY CONSTABLES

This chapter reports the findings from a study into fear in probationary police constables. The study was conducted for one main reason: to gather data from a group of police officers as a control group for the prison officers. Both deal with the same "clientele" and if a prison's culture is imported, then police officers might be expected to share similar experiences to those of prison officers. However, if there is something intrinsically different about the institution that incarcerates offenders, then the nature of any fears expressed by police officers should be different to those expressed by prison officers.

Previous literature has assumed that prison and police officers are in similar positions of power, enjoy similar privileges and are liable to similar risks. However, systematic tests of whether they have similar concerns are limited to discussions of stress related problems which do not tend to focus on fear specifically. As Coid (1991) points out, when you remove a violent group from one condition, the group does not cease to exist, it becomes someone else's problem. Offenders move from being police officers' "problems" to prison officers' on incarcerative sentence. After release, they may again come within the police officers' scope.

The police officers who participated in this study worked in an inner city area that has a history of race and drug related incidents. All interviews were conducted at one of two police stations in this area. The officers who took part were all "probationers". In other words they had experience of less than 2 years' service. In wide ranging open ended interviews, they were asked about safety, fear and their levels of "preparedness".

FEAR IN PROBATIONARY CONSTABLES

As reported earlier, Toch (1977, p 7) identified a number of reasons for being concerned about the levels of violence within the police and prisons. Toch's concerns are still applicable and they include:

1. That the police service is a public agency that reflects society's norms and values.

2. That the power of an officer is great therefore so is his[/her] power to abuse.

3. Any violence that does take place is often not made public thus would not be subject to outside control.

4. Excessive violence has public opinion repercussions. At its most extreme, the law and order debate can bring down governments. At the very least, it affects policies towards law enforcement.

Storch & Panzarella (1996) reported that the most common appealing factors about being a police officer are the excitement, challenge and variation. Officers also highly rated helping people. Their

third "like" was the job security and if this was combined with salary, benefits, etc., this was preferred above the other two. The alternate view presented is that the least liked aspect of the job related to the shift patterns. This was closely followed by the image that the police have with the public, negative stereotypes and blame. The next equal dislike was inadequate pay and other parts of the legal system. Gudjonsson, had earlier reported that police officers' stress related problems might be "construed as unacceptable weakness" (1984, p 233). He reported an excessive fear of failure that added to his previous findings that pointed to the need for organisational change and improved support systems within the police (Gudjonsson & Adlam, 1982).

Other studies have also looked at stress related aspects of policing. Patterson (1992) reported that police officers suffer from more stress related problems than do probation officers but they are under less stress than American prison guards. A previous study by Pendleton; Stotland; Spiers & Kirsh (1989) had reported that police officers experienced more stress than fire officers but less than council workers. In a paper that was similar to the report elucidating Figgie's notions of fear, Cullen; Lutze; Link & Lemming (1983) reported that police officers are likely to rate their job as being potentially very dangerous. In practice however, they do not believe it is actually as dangerous as it could be. This is similar to a prison environment. The potential for disorder is high, but in reality, its occurrence is relatively low in all but minor forms.

The study reported here was designed in the light of Toch's statements and was intended to follow the work carried out by Lawrie (1995) and that presented in earlier chapters. In order to add to these studies, it was felt that the sample should be made up of probationary constables, (officers with up to two years of service). It was predicted that their fears could be affected by a number of different variables. These could include the age, gender or length of service of the officers; the area in which they work (both geographical and type of work involved); the type of people with whom they interact on a regular basis; their style of working; the level of police presence in the area in which they work and numerous other possibilities. The research attempted to address as many of these issues as possible but was unable to control for all of the variables.

Violanti & Aron, (1995) point out that danger may manifest itself in two different ways for police officers. There is expected, predictable danger such as that during under cover work or there is unexpected danger such as when entering a building. However, prison and police officers may fear predictable danger that comes at unexpected times. Therefore, it was felt that the distinction between expected and unexpected fears was insufficient. From a series of preliminary discussions with other researchers and senior ranking police officers, it was felt that there would be 6 possible kinds of fear that police officers may experience. These primarily build upon definitions of predictable fears.

1. The first is of the *unknown.* Going into situations without knowing what they entail can be daunting for anyone. For police officers, the chances of the situation being unpleasant are much higher than for most of society. Prison officers do experience similar situations but not on such a regular basis.

2. The second type of fear is linked to that of the unknown and is of the *uncontrollable*. This is probably the type of fear with the most salience to the two groups of officer, prisoner and police.

3. The third type would be *disciplinary*. This is particularly relevant to probationary police officers and can include formal and informal *disciplinary* measures. Not only are their reports written by sergeants and inspectors, but probationers have to satisfy the other members of their team. These will usually include other constables who may have years more experience and "seniority" within the service. This relates to feelings of team membership and others' perception of self.

4. The fourth type of fear could be of the *legal system*, particularly of preparing papers for and going to court. Unlike police officers, prison officers may only rarely go to court but they do deal with adjudications. The main difference is that officers nearly always "win" adjudications after putting a prisoner on report. Therefore, prison officers are less likely to experience the same sort of fear of the system.

5. The fifth type of fear is based on *folklore* or the canteen culture of tall tales. This is likely in both environments.

6. The sixth and last type of predicted fear is that *learned* or based on experience. For example, an officer may have had no doubts about going to an incident with a particular colleague until that colleague runs away once leaving the officer to deal with the situation alone. Fears based on experience include many that are not really a separate group as experience is fundamental to all of the preceding types (whether direct or indirect).

Despite the intangible nature of fear, an attempt was made to examine actual experiences of incidents and their repercussions. Hence, the design incorporated a critical incident analysis: Officers were asked about events that were particularly memorable and how they felt after them. The aim was to see what affects officers and whether they coped as successfully as possible with such incidents. Investigations into coping included ascertaining whether necessary support systems were in place and whether they were used. The types of support predicted were internal and external. For example, internal support could come from peers, line, organisation, staff association and federation. External support could come from spouses/partners, friends, religious or social groups.

OVERVIEW OF DESIGN

Thirty five probationary police constables took part in individual semi-structured interviews and completed a series of scales. The scales were designed to categorise them as either a "Thief-taker", "Service-provider", "Diplomat-cop" or "Hired-officer" (Lawrie, 1995). In addition, a number of brainstorming sessions were run in which group size varied from 3 to 6 officers at any one time.

This was a quasi-experimental design and the independent variables included the length of service, gender and professional style of officer. The main dependent variable was the level of fear in officers. This was operationally defined in terms of fear and worry. The interviews were carried out in April 1995 in an inner city, multi-racial area with high levels of unemployment. Half way through the interviews, a probationary constable from another area was shot whilst conducting a routine stop of a vehicle.

METHODS

Participants

The stations from which the participants were recruited had a total of forty-one probationary police constables assigned to them. Thirty-five of the officers participated in the interviews, eleven women and twenty-four men. Two of the officers were Black, the rest, White. (See ethics section, chapter fourteen for more detail about informed, voluntary consent.) The shortest serving officer had 5 months' experience, the longest, 26 (extended probation). The mean length of service was 18.09 months.

Procedure

The individual sessions lasted for approximately one hour. The first part of each session was used to explain the nature of the research and to introduce the researcher to the officer. Each participant's confidentiality was assured then approximately forty-five minutes were spent in conducting the interview. The last 10 or so minutes were used by the participant to complete the scales measuring their style of working. These were all completed in the presence of the researcher so that she could answer any questions that may have arisen. (The most common questions were requests for definition of "niche" and "victim offender mediation".)

The questionnaires were read out and recorded by the researcher and the participants jointly. In these sessions, the data collection was by means of "paper and pencil" and the techniques were the same as in the other interviews previously described. Brainstorming sessions were recorded on audio cassette. They ranged in length from 1 to 2 hours. The interviews were carried out in one of four locations: the conference room at the main station, the senior officers' mess (when the conference room was busy) and an office at the satellite station when interviews were conducted during the night shift. Brainstorming sessions all took place in the conference room.

Materials

Appendix 3 includes the interview protocol/questionnaire and the categorical scales that were used. The categorical scales were from Lawrie 1995 and as can be seen, the interview protocol was a slightly altered form of the questionnaires used to assess prison officers' fears (illustrated in chapter four). The first two questions assessed experience and assessments of their job. Questions three to six assessed interactions between officers and members of the public or other legal officials. Questions seven to twelve asked about colleague interactions. Thirteen to eighteen looked at fear and previous experiences. Questions nineteen to twenty-one tap into coping and the last three questions were the usual ones on closure.

The categorical scales were designed and tested by Lawrie (1995). Her findings yielded Cronbach's Alphas of 0.7 for each of the styles. Thus they were used unaltered. As can be seen in appendix 3, 48 items were used. They consisted of a statement followed by a bipolar, seven point scale, that ranged from "very like me" to "very unlike me". Twelve questions pertained to each of the four categories of professional style, that is "Thief-taker, Service-provider, Diplomat-cop and Hired-officer." So as to avoid order effects and response biases, the scales were not presented in "batches" of categories. Also, the statements were designed so that, within each category, some could be seen as desirable and some undesirable.

RESULTS

Coding sheets and a transcript appear in appendix 3. The results that are presented here are in two subsections. The first gives a descriptive summary of the participants' prevalent attitudes. This is to provide the context once more. The second section presents a more systematic analysis of the information that was collected that related to fear, both quantitative and qualitative. The results and discussion draw on material gathered in interviews and brainstorming sessions.

CONTEXT, AND JOB ADJUSTMENT

Feelings about the people with whom they came in contact

Other professionals

This was coded on a five point scale where 5 reflected very negative and 1 intimated very positive feelings about the professionals with whom the police officers came in contact. The mean score was 2.57 with a standard deviation of 0.77. Eighteen of the participants held neutral feelings about the professionals. Only one officer was negative about them, five expressed no opinion and the rest were positive. All of the 33 participants who stated whether they "generally got on" with the professionals said that they did. Overall, the officers were still establishing relationships with other workers in the legal system but seemed to adopt a professional manner in so doing.

The public

The officers were marginally more negative about the public than about the legal professionals. In this context, it is worth noting that the "public" are made up of at least two groups, the law abiding and the law breaking. Again, findings were coded on a five point scale with 5 being very negative expressions and 1, very positive ones. The mean was 2.91 (very slightly positive) and the standard deviation, 0.87. Five of the officers were negative about the public in general, 25 were neutral. They said that it depended on the people with whom they came into contact. Some officers were both extremely positive and extremely negative depending on the "type of public". Four officers were positive about the public and one did not express an opinion. The entire sample said that they "generally got on" with the public but their attitudes towards offenders seemed to be more negative than those expressed by prison officers.

Some examples of officers' attitudes towards witnesses and victims may be of use at this juncture. "We've got clear up rates but it's not just our job... The public has to help us but there isn't a start... the witnesses may be involved in crime themselves."

When asked about victim offender mediation in interviews, the concept had to be explained to a number of officers. When it was brought up in brainstorming sessions, this was one response that went unchallenged: "I've given out the name and address of the offender, warned them not to step over the edge but it could scare the kid back into line. It's not a good idea, but something, maybe a short sharp shock of confrontation. Violent people need to be locked up but they won't be, we're disillusioned because there's no back up from courts."

"Victims don't get time, we rush off to find out where the criminal is, they get--almost preferential treatment. We leave the victim in the front office while we interview the criminal. We know the victims will wait."

Problems with the people with whom they came in contact

Other professionals

Thirty-two of the participants said that they never had problems with the professionals they encountered. The rest did not answer the question.

The Public

Twelve of the participants said that they did not have problems with the public whereas twenty-two reported that they did. The sort of problems encountered by some of the officers included: abuse of them as officers; racial remarks directed at them; snubbing or "blanking" female officers when a male officer was present; misunderstanding of their roles/powers and refusal to take them seriously because they looked too young. Nine of the officers counted the problems as minor, 7 reported them as being of average significance and 6 said that they were severe.

Teamwork

Issues surrounding teamwork were assessed by questions 7 to 12 on the interview protocol. When asked how many colleagues they worked with on a daily basis, officers produced a number of answers. The discrepancies in the figures suggest that the interpretation of "colleagues" varies between individuals to a greater degree than might be expected from such a team oriented profession. The mean number of colleagues was estimated at 19 but the standard deviation for that figure is 9.34. This reflects the fact that almost every officer produced a figure different to his/her colleagues. The most common figures were between 14 and 30. The lowest number was 4 and the highest, 40.

When asked if they felt part of a team, 27 of the officers did, 4 said that they did most of the time and 4 said that they did not. Nine of the officers were very confident in their colleagues, 20 were pretty confident in them and 6 did not really have confidence in those with whom they worked. In reporting their thoughts about the other members of staff, 3 officers said that they were excellent, 9 said that they were very good, 21 said that it depended on who they were and 1 officer reported having pretty poor colleagues. However, they all reported that they "got on" with their colleagues[1].

The last area relating to teamwork is that of problems between officers. Although problems were reported, the level and frequency of such problems were not considered to be particularly high by the group as a whole. Thirteen of the participants said that they did experience problems with the other members of staff. Six of those officers responded that the problems were minor; 3, that they were average and 2, that they were severe. Eleven of them said that the problems were very rare or rare; 1, that they were fairly frequent and 1, that they were frequent. When compared to prison officers, the frequency is proportionally lower.

The chapter now turns to more specific information regarding fear and coping in probationary police constables.

FEAR AND COPING

In the first instance, the analyses were carried out using both fear and worry as dependent variables. However, statistical interpretations could not be made when using "worry" as a dependent variable due to fewer responses. Hence the data presented below concentrates on "fear" rather than on "worry". In terms of whether fears expressed were formless or concrete, the vast majority were concrete.

Officers were fearful of specific situations. Sixty-six per cent of the officers reported fear. Of those officers, 1 said that the fear was general rather than specific, 1 could not decide which it was and the rest said that the fear was specific. The situations that they identified are shown below. Their levels of fear were similar to those of the prison officers. Of the officers who expressed fear, 48%

---

[1] It should be noted that some of the women officers said that they felt excluded by their male colleagues. They were not encouraged to go "out with the lads" and reported being called "plonks" and "handbags". Yet, they still said that they got on with their colleagues.

said that it was a feeling of being aware, 13% said that it was a feeling of apprehension, 26% said that they were a bit scared and 9% reported feeling very scared. None of them reported terror. The types of fear expressed are reported below.

In the brainstorming sessions, officers raised fear in three ways. They expressed concern that the people controlling the radios did not check their status during incidents as a matter of course. Officers also worried about going to court. This was reported as being particularly intimidating when there are a number of people supporting the defendant. This seems to be exacerbated by their feeling that:

Officer 1:   "You have prove everything, like no-one believes anything you say."

Officer 2:   "Yes, it's like you're on trial."

Officer 1:   "Because you're a police officer... I hate court, it's not a fear, yes, it is. It's part of the job but..."

Officer 2:   "...The system scares you. It seems like a game, a serious--a show."

The other issue raised as a fear related to arming the police. The "probationers" were opposed to arming officers as standard but wanted more armed response vehicles and better protection. (Although they expressed qualms about the efficacy and practicality of body armour.) There were two main reasons expressed for not arming all officers. The first was that when joining the service, officers did not expect to be armed. Thus, it should not be made a condition of their employment. However the most relevant reason here is that they did not feel confident in the competence of others. They did not believe that all officers had the right "attitude" to carry guns nor did they believe that selection procedures and training would be rigorous enough to solve that problem. They pointed out that a gun is unlikely to stop someone from being shot by an offender. They also stated that it was possible that they could be shot by a colleague accidentally.

During the interviews, participants were asked what scared them, when and where they felt fearful. The tables below show the responses that they gave. As reported above, 66% of the officers reported feeling scared. The percentages in the table below are of those who reported fear, not of the entire sample. The police officers use different language to the prison officers, often, it appears harsher. Also, the situations that they mention appear to be different to those raised by the prison officers. However, when one examines the nature of the fears that they raised, there is a high degree of similarity between prison and police officers. Both are concerned by violence and volatile people who might behave in an erratic or unpredictable manner. Both groups worry about assault and essentially, both groups appear to be afraid when control is missing, (even if the "control" is of themselves).

Table 14.1   Table to show what scares the participants.

OF WHAT ARE THEY AFRAID?	PERCENT OF THOSE EXPRESSING FEAR
Weapons/Armed Suspects	23
Preliminary Assessment/Stopping & Searching	18
Unknown/Unpredictable	14
Dead Bodies	9
Chasing Suspects	9
Fights	9
Extreme Violence/Someone going Berserk	9
Assault	4.5
Reactions of Victims or their Families	4.5

Table 14.2   Table to show when the participants feel scared.

WHEN THEY ARE AFRAID	PERCENT OF THOSE EXPRESSING FEAR
During the Incident	36
After the Incident	32
Before the Incident	14
All the Time	9
When they have Previous Knowledge	4.5
Until Someone Else Takes Over	4.5

Table 14.3   Table to show where the participants feel scared.

WHERE THEY ARE AFRAID	PERCENT OF THOSE EXPRESSING FEAR
Anywhere/Depends on Situation	50
When Alone	18
On Specified Housing Estates	14
When Among a Potentially Hostile Crowd	9
Places Known as Trouble-spots	4.5
Heights	4.5

More information about the nature of probationary constables' fears can be obtained through an examination of the critical incident analysis presented in the following section.

Critical Incident Analysis

The tables below show the types of incidents that stood out in the participants' minds. These were what they remembered and the situations that they predicted would result in a need for support. The incidents reported number more than the sample size as most people reported more than one incident or potential incident. (All numbers are actual.)

Table 14.4   Incidents remembered by the participants.

INCIDENT	NUMBER OF OFFICERS REPORTING IT
Sudden/"grotty" deaths	12
Potential Violence with weapon (knife/gun)	5
Mental illness case	3
One that got away	2
Threatening crowds	2
Actual Violence with weapon (knife/gun)	2
Assault (unarmed)	2
Young death	2
A domestic	2
Conditions in which some people live/situations they get stuck in	2
Particularly threatening individual (without overt weapon)	1
Fatal accident	1
Hanging	1
First arrest	1
Nothing	1
Vehicle pursuit	1

Table 14.5   Likely nasty incidents envisaged by the participants.

INCIDENT	NUMBER OF OFFICERS REPORTING IT
Fatal Accidents	10
Something involving Children	10
Don't know	6
If badly assaulted	4
If shot	4
Sudden Deaths	3
Witnessing a serious incident involving a colleague	2
Murder of colleague	2
Whenever seriously threatened	2
Something major	2
Domestic Violence	1
Sexual assault	1
Nothing	1
Hostage situation	1

There was no significant association between length of service and amount of fear, nor service and incidence of fear. This contrasts with the prison officers but as the level of service varied very little, this was probably a floor effect.

An attempt was made to categorise officers' style of work but as can be seen from table A3.1 in the appendices, only one officer fell into one of the categories. Hence it is not a surprising report that style of work had no significant effect on level of fear. Therefore, the next stage examined was that concerning officers' coping strategies. The table below shows the coping strategies adopted by officers and those that they suggested. Due to the small sample size, the numbers are low but they are ranked in order of amount of people who suggested the same strategy (the first suggestion is the most popular).

Table 14.6   Table to show the coping mechanisms suggested by the participants.

CURRENT COPING MEASURES	# reports	SUGGESTIONS TO IMPROVE COPING	# reports
		More training	6
Talk and joke	5		
		Personalised body armour	4
Never go in alone/Tell someone where you are	3		
Just do it	2	More response vehicles	2
Try to forget it	2		
Practice/Work Harder	2		
Hold on to Baton	1	Leave job	1
Drink	1	More reliance in colleagues	1
Increase aggression	1		
Mentally remove the uniform	1		
Faith	1		

When asked whether they would receive support (should it come to be needed), 62% of the officers thought they would, 20% did not know and 18% thought that the support would not be forthcoming. In other words, 38% of officers did not believe that support would be available. Of the entire police sample, no officers were aware of all of the welfare provision provided for them. Some knew of the existence of a department for welfare. Two knew that there was an occupational health officer somewhere, 1 officer mentioned the mentoring scheme and none of them knew the identity of their welfare officer (a chief inspector). This is unlike the prison officers. Although there were issues about prison care teams' efficiency, prison officers at least were aware of their existence and whom to see.

The table below shows the numbers of officers who reported needing and receiving support in the past and from where it came. It also shows to where and how many officers felt they could turn for support. Note that not all of the sample is included in this table. It only reports findings for the 28 (82% of) officers who felt that they would or might get support. (As a number of the officers suggested more than one place for support, the numbers total more than 28. Actual numbers are used in the table.)

Table 14.7   Table to show the places and people who have offered support and who are thought of as being likely to offer future support.

PREVIOUS SUPPORT	# reports	PREDICTED SUPPORT	# reports
		Friends/family	10
		Team/colleagues	9
Team/colleagues	8		
Friends/family	6	Welfare	6
		Off division/civilian	5
		Something but not sure what	5
		Victim Support Schemes	2
Doctor	1	Doctor	1
		Priest	1

Two approaches were taken to assess the attitudes towards support. First, answers were grouped and classified together to examine whether the participants were at ease with the notion. Then the

qualitative content was examined more closely. When grouped together, twelve participants were at ease with the idea of seeking support, eight were more cautious in that they said that it would depend on conditions being fulfilled that they thought may not exist at present (e.g. confidentiality). Ten officers were wary of requesting support and three were very unhappy about taking up the provision.[2]

A selection of the comments that the police officers made is presented below. These are representative of the 23 participants who expressed some level of doubt about support services. Each quotation is from a different participant.

"I would take it up if it was the norm, many would, but it's just not offered."

"P.C.'s will talk but it becomes part of a joke. They're not willing to advise, it's the male reaction to most things and this is still a very male dominated environment." (Male participant).

One female reported an unpleasant incident that had been responded to by 2 male and 2 female officers. The longest serving officer present at the time was a female who had 6 years of experience. "Afterwards, the chief inspector asked us, the women, if we wanted help. He only talked to us and said "there's no point my talking to guys, girls can talk about things" therefore they (the men) were offered nothing."

(From the Brainstorming sessions) "I didn't know who the welfare officer was, now I've been told but Chief Inspector xxx? You just wouldn't go to a chief inspector. Even the skippers, it depends on whether they know what goes on but some inspectors just have the heads up their arses."

"It's in confidence but what's your number?"

"Welfare is not mentioned a lot... there's an in built stigma."

"A lot of the problem comes from needing to be able to rely on colleagues. You become a liability if you can't cope."

"It's the nature of the job to be so sceptical... it would take so much to admit a problem. It shouldn't be but if I needed help, I'd consider it a failure. I should be able to cope."

Scepticism was evidenced in a number of areas. Officers' cynicism and disillusionment came through in the interviews and in the brainstorming sessions. It must be noted that the disillusionment tended to be with "the system" rather than with "the job" although there were areas in which the probationers felt that their expectations had been far removed from reality. This is reflected in the final, short section of quotations relating to management and aloofness.

---

[2] A five point scale was used, completely at ease, at ease, depends, ill at ease, very ill at ease. X^2 was significant p=0.02. The three groups above random representation were, at ease (n = 11), depends (n = 8) and ill at ease (n=10).

Management and training

Like the prison officers, the police officers seemed to be pretty disillusioned with the senior ranks. Given that the police officers are still in their probationary period, such a finding is not encouraging. "People don't know how to manage... we don't often get help. They assume that if you don't know how to do something, are not able to do it, so you get scared to ask, so you don't know."

"The job doesn't allow you to bring skills in with you. Be it driving, mental health nursing."

"This used to be a vocation, now it's a market."

"Morale is low, but we've not known any different since we joined."

Aloofness/Separation

Another area of similarity between prison and police officers appears to be in their separation from others. They believe that people who are not part of their culture, cannot understand their experiences, needs or even recognise their successes. Although deliberate separation from others may be a coping measure, it is mentioned here as an illustration of the strength of the culture. "Towards the end of (college) your mates say you're different. You behave differently and regard people differently."

Officer 1   "Sometimes like robots"

Officer 2   "I'd like to think I've got a personality. Awareness not a programme."

Officer 1   "... the only way I know how to think."

"You become blasé about things that should concern you. Shocks friends why you have dealt with situations that should be exceptionable." It is this separation that distances both police and prison officers from "outsiders" and is an example of a link between the groups. That is, one of misunderstanding and lack of empathy from others.

DISCUSSION OF FEAR IN PROBATIONARY CONSTABLES

The main aim of this research was to provide some preliminary data about police officers' fears in comparison to prison officers. The sample size means that any conclusions will have to be cautious. However, the research does systematically link prison officer and police officer fears. It also points to a number of areas for future work.

Police and prison officers enter the job knowing of the violence. Often, offenders are familiar and the officers are adept at handling them. A question that remains is "What is in their minds when they join the Services?" Many officers are connected with the Services before they join. They expect a level of violence, are prepared for it and believe that they can handle it. During their career, they have the chance to test this proposition.

In 1993, 67% of prison officers reported feelings of fear (Chapter six and Adler, 1994). In the present study, 66% of police officers also report feeling fearful. There are several possible interpretations of this finding, two more obvious than others. Both groups are dealing with the same clientele and are thus both as likely to report feelings of fear. Alternatively, any group in society may display an incidence of fear in this amount. This is unlikely and does not fit with the findings for example Crime Surveys, etc. (e.g. Crawford, 1986 and Mayhew & Matthews, 1989). Nor does it sit with the marginally lower figure reported in chapter twelve.

Like the prison officers, the police officers were fearful of specific situations. Only one police officer reported being generally afraid but a number said that they were always aware. As police and prison officers are nearly always at risk, when on duty, such awareness is probably necessary (as well as a potential source of stress). This holds even if the actual levels of incidents against them are low.

The six types of fear that were predicted in the police were: *unknown, uncontrollable, disciplinary, system based, folklore* and *learnt.* Fears of the unknown, uncontrollable, disciplinary and the system were all mentioned. Also mentioned, were a number of violence related fears. This is intuitive and fits in with earlier chapters and Lawrie, 1995. Lawrie found that police are not fearful of criminals or crime. She did report that there is a fear of injury. Yet, an injury is considered part of the job. More than that, Lawrie even suggests that an injury is a necessary rite of passage.

If injury is necessary, then "awareness" may be a useful state for the officers. However, it is obvious that there are fears that should and could be alleviated; for instance, the police fear of the courts or of failure. Having respect for an institution and job surely need not entail being afraid of them?

As reported above, there was ambivalence over whether fear can be alleviated. This is not surprising given the varying types and levels of fears that were expressed. However, methods of coping suggested by the participants should be investigated further. The categories presented in the results section do not fully reflect the ideas of the police officers; for instance, the ideas relating to greater reliance in colleagues, included:

1. Debriefing sessions at the end of every day for all officers. These could be relatively short but could highlight any problem areas. Alternatively debriefing sessions after every major incident for all the officers involved (those that currently take place were reported as being selective).

2. Raising awareness of the services on offer and reassuring officers of their confidentiality: Senior ranks at the stations concerned all knew that there was an occupational therapist with the division, that the Service's H.Q. provided a confidential welfare service, that a named Chief Inspector was the welfare officer for the station and that all probationers were "encouraged" to take part in a mentoring scheme. They seemed to assume that the probationers all shared this knowledge yet had never provided them with the information. This point has been raised with the Chief Superintendent and should have been addressed in a new welcome pack that was being prepared at the time of the research. The issue of confidentiality of support services is harder to address. In this instance, the scepticism of the officers is based on experience. Such experience is common to prison and police officers.

3. Drop in services and on site welfare offices were suggested by two of the officers. They said that at the training college, people had been on hand and were known before they had to be approached.

4. Constable counsellors were also suggested as an option.

It is important to note that the fear may be useful. If it keeps officers aware, then it may protect them. One finding that can be inferred from all of the studies is that a fear inducing incident can occur almost anywhere. Thus it may be wise to be as on guard behind the desk in the office as on the street or wing. However, high levels of fear cannot be ignored.

The final comments to be made on fear relate to coping. Being able to cope with fear, may be part of the attraction of the officers' roles. If it is, and an officer acknowledges that (s)he is still fearful of some things and can not cope by his/herself, what is left? There may be a need to radically revise notions of officer professionalism.

Lawrie (1995) reports that the more experienced officers became, the less their families understood them. It is possible that this is related to the aloofness/separation ideas reported above. If you believe that people can not possibly understand your experiences, you tend not to report them, or to edit them before reporting them. This results in a self fulfilling prophecy. This could be similar to the ambivalence expressed by prison officers. They do not want to taint their families therefore try to avoid talking to them about life inside the prison. When things go particularly well or particularly badly, then they tell their families. Thus, the families see a skewed view of the job and can not understand it or provide effective aid in coping with difficulties.

When looking at internal or peer support in the police, Lawrie reports that it seems to be a comparison of battle scars rather than hints to aid their healing. As the "bravado" is always present, she questions the value of such support. However, it may be cathartic and the officers in this study have identified joking and laughing as one of the ways that they cope. Canteen or gallows humour tends to be very "close to the bone" but does provide an outlet for emotion. The trouble is that it

seems to be the only outlet for a number of people or that it raises issues that still have to be "dealt with" alone. Other work that could be conducted would include: the nature and incidence of fears in more experienced officers; the types of problems experienced with the public (and whether the new quick cuffs, batons and uniforms will change them); the effects of "Care in the Community" on policing and the efficacy of coping procedures and support services.

In conclusion, it may be useful to summarise the most salient similarities and differences between the prison officers and police officers. The incidence of fear in officers is not significantly different between the two groups. Although the range of types of fear was different between the two groups, both are concerned with situations which are beyond their control. Both groups of officers may need to be wary in order to adequately perform their job. However, both groups of officers seem to need more support under certain circumstances. Having said that, awareness of care teams and services available within the Prison Service is higher than within this Police Service.

Finally, given that female police officers have been deployed with male police officers for longer than cross deployment has been a policy of the Prison Service, it was worrying to note the similarities in women's experiences with their colleagues. If anything, the comments made by the "plonks" and "handbags" indicate that the female police officers still have some ground to break to reach the same point as the female prison officers employed in male prisons.

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

COMMENTARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Prisons and gaols provide environments within which it would not be unreasonable to assume that fear would be pervasive. Yet, there has been little previous psychological research into the nature of fear within organised settings, and within the Prison Service in particular. What have we learned from the studies reported here?

Throughout this presentation of research conducted, there have been a number of recurring themes. Five themes have been pre-eminent: the reality of fear; the need to assess fears within their proper context; the importance of good prisoner-officer relationships; the difficulties within officer-officer and officer-manager relationships, and the need for successful strategies for harm minimisation. It is to these themes that this chapter will return before raising some concluding ethical and methodological issues.

THE REALITY OF FEAR

Previous correctional literature has included work that emphasised violence and aggression within prisons. However, the research has not offered much enlightenment regarding the safety concerns and fears felt by those inside a prison. The exception to this has been in work by Toch (e.g. 1992). Toch tells us that fear is present in prisons but that its effects are most keenly felt by a relatively small group of "high safety" prisoners. Most authors do not mention fear or safety concerns at all. Those who give such issues (cursory) consideration, tend to draw conclusions that have intuitive appeal but little substantive support. Fleisher (1989) is one of the more recent authors to have carried out an in depth analysis of prison violence. Despite the extreme levels of violence he depicted, the closest that Fleisher comes to analysing the psychological impact of fear is to remind us that prisoners are better able to cope with violence than are people who have not been incarcerated. That conclusion has been reached before and since, despite the lack of systematic analysis of many of the aspects of imprisonment with which people have to cope.

For the purposes of this thesis, the most telling gap in our knowledge relates to the prevalence and extent of fear in prisons. It had been assumed that fear might be felt by a number of prisoners but that they would be unwilling to disclose those fears. Similarly, from the previous (limited) research into officers, it was possibly to infer that although some fear may be experienced, it has to be overcome. An officer has to manage violence and intimidation of self and others without showing fear. Further, one may conclude that only after a prison officer has been tested may he be accepted. Female officers cannot be tested, therefore, cannot be accepted fully.

Responses from prison officers who participated in the research presented in this thesis, indicate that although a degree of officer testing does take place, a competent officer will use a number of techniques before resorting to "Control and Restraint". Further, within the Prison Service, female

officers can and do react to the same situations to which a male officer will "run". Officers do feel fear and many would welcome the knowledge that effective, proactive, trustworthy help is available.

The research presented in earlier chapters allows us to conclude that fear is a common and accepted part of officers' and prisoners' lives, not just those in high need of safety. Fear is a real and reportable aspect of life in prisons. It is a social psychological process that is expressed over time and can have varying effects. In order to properly understand fears expressed, they must be placed within their proper context. Such a context is itself a social psychological process as it too is dynamic.

PUTTING FEAR INTO CONTEXT

A primary finding from this research relates to incidence and was that 51% of prisoners and 67% of officers in adult, male prisons reported feeling fearful. Fear is widespread but there are 7% of prisoners to whom the label "high safety" can be applied. These 7% of prisoners report feeling constant fear. The size of the constantly fearful group replicates one of the findings of the National Prison Survey and it is likely that such prisoners are probably those in greatest need of help. However, to varying degrees, fear affects most people who live and work within gaols.

As mentioned above, there are variations in the incidence of fear. The study reported in chapters three to seven indicates that, in different locations, different proportions of people report fear. Intuitively, such differences could be explained in terms of architecture and facilities. However, the discrepancies between wings may well be related to other factors. For example, are the prisoners "left alone to do (their) time"? If so, then it is possible that they are "managing" themselves. Although self management may promote autonomy, accountability and responsibility, the practices of "taxing", "mugging" and drug related extortion mean that prisoner self regulation is far from ideal.

If there is a high degree of self management, then the ways in which prisoners respond to daily challenges may need to be different to those techniques adopted when all prisoners are treated the same (at least supposedly) by an authority that has been legitimately empowered to maintain and control an institution. Fear is probably associated with prisoners' abilities to cope with life in prison but the coping strategies needed may well vary with amount of control exercised by staff.

Prisoners' choices of coping strategies might also be related to their offence types and sentences. For example, a sex offender has good reason to feel fearful and may feel safer by relying on officers or by being segregated under "Rule 43". A different sex offender may choose to serve the entire sentence on "normal" location. To do so successfully, the offender may have to lie (in a consistent manner) about the offence committed or may have to be capable of facing physical challenges that will be designed to cause serious harm.

The examples above help to demonstrate why it is contended that a situational context is intrinsic to a meaningful understanding of fear. For example, the classification and available facilities of a prison are relevant as are the number and level of expertise of officers deployed, interpersonal relationships and individually adopted coping strategies. In other words, "situational context" is

dynamic and includes the previous experiences that a person carries with him or her, her/his current (possibly changing) physical and psychological state, how others interact with the individual and the individual's perceptions of the repercussions of any action taken.

It is perhaps inevitable that research that gives rise to such broad conclusions should also result in some apparent contradictions. For example, the prison with the biggest race problem, the most prisoner-prisoner, prisoner-officer problems, and officer-officer problems also contained the wing with the lowest incidence of fear. This is counter intuitive and requires further investigation. Could it be that the bad relationships come about through tight implementation of rules that, although unpopular, control intimidation? Alternatively, could discrepancies be explained in terms of successful coping? If they often experience difficult interactions yet manage them effectively, then maybe officers are justifiably more confident of the safety of prisoners and colleagues than officers who less frequently experience problems and are less adept at handling them.

In other words, previous concrete experiences of fearful incidents and their repercussions may well determine reactions to new situations. Having been previously involved in a "nasty situation" is not sufficient to account for incidence or degree of fear felt. However, when the after effects of a "nasty situation" are taken into account, we could come closer to a complete understanding of the influence of previous experience. Previous incidents that were coped with successfully may well diminish concern whereas those that resulted in loss of control and or no appropriate aftercare may well increase fear. This implies that previous experiences need to be assessed within a contextual framework and possibly re-assessed over time.

When one tries to take further account of the various "locational" variables, then one finds that there are areas of specific prisons that are identified by a number of people, both prisoners and officers. In some cases, it would be relatively simple to address safety concerns in these places thereby helping to quell fear through enhancing security. However, situational crime prevention techniques tell us that such an approach might merely lead to a shift in location of vulnerable areas or, that not all areas will be identified at any one time. For example, before this research had been conducted, recesses and showers had been consistently identified as areas in which prisoners might be liable to attack (and therefore areas of concern to them). Although the two areas were mentioned as places where "other prisoners" may feel worried, the area in which the most prisoners reported feeling fearful was a cell. If there is literally nowhere to hide, then coping strategies employed by prisoners and the control evidenced by officers are of paramount importance. Yet, many prisoners reported that they could do nothing to cope with their fears and officers' awareness of prisoners' concerns was patchy.

The officers' inabilities to identify areas of concern to prisoners can be interpreted in at least two ways. Either, officers are not particularly competent, or their lack of awareness again demonstrates the importance of contextualising fear. Officers cannot identify all physical locations of concern because the areas are only of concern to certain prisoners at certain times under certain conditions. Whilst such a conclusion is probably fair, it may be tempting for those in authority to infer that it obviates the need for attempts to address fear. If fear is unpredictable, then can it be "targeted"

effectively? It might be possible to excuse such an assertion but not to condone it. A more reasonable (but potentially costly) inference would be that a multi-modal or multi-layered approach will be needed to adequately calculate needs of current and future prisoners.

The importance of context is again reinforced when a group of police officers are compared with the prison officers (chapter fourteen). The most significant difference between the two groups of officers appeared to have been in the effect of previous "nasty situations" or critical incidents on fear. In the police sample, officers with the lowest levels of fear tended to be those who had the most problems with the public. Within the group of prison officers, the most fearful men and women had had the most experience of previous nasty situations.

It is possible to interpret the apparent discrepancy in the effects of previous incidents as support for one of the other conclusions drawn about prison officers. It was postulated that the prison officers with the lowest levels of fear had the most frequent trivial problems with prisoners but had rarely experienced serious difficulties. This might be being replicated in the police officer sample. It is only after an incident has resulted in a significant loss of control, or when its ramifications were not appropriately managed, that future fears may be affected. Unfortunately, the design of the research does not allow for systematic comparisons of interactions between degree of seriousness of problems experienced, frequency of problems experienced, incidence of ever feeling fearful, frequency of feeling fearful and level of fear felt. It is hoped that any such connections may be tested in future research.

PRISONER-OFFICER RELATIONSHIPS

Another area for future consideration relates to the relationships between officers and prisoners. The two groups share an environment yet because of their different roles, would not be necessarily expected to share experiences. When comparing officers to the prisoners, then specific areas of prisons seem to be less important as a unitary correlate of fear. Unlike prisoners, officers were more concerned with cues that might signal loss of control, for example a ringing alarm bell. However, there are some experiences which prisoners and officers do share. The most striking similarity between the groups was in their expressed ambivalence towards their fears. Should they just ignore fears or recognise and try to manage them appropriately? Should they talk to peers or keep quiet about their concerns? It is this very ambivalence that leads to the finding of "pluralistic ignorance". Because people do not share their concerns, they are left in isolated ignorance.

Although there are experiences that are common to both prisoners and officers and although they are often drawn from similar socio-economic backgrounds, the relationships between the two groups are far from simple. An officer has to turn the key yet be the person to manage prisoners' problems. Officers have to maintain order and care for prisoners. To do so effectively, they need to be aware of prisoners' difficulties and concerns. A number of officers mentioned the importance of prisoners' experiences and laid emphasis on interpersonal skills but were less accurate in their identifications of physical areas in which prisoners felt fear. Although some officers were aware of

the types of fears expressed by the prisoners, the majority of officers did not identify the appropriate concerns of prisoners (despite their shared experiences).

A more interesting and hopeful finding relates to the prisoners' awareness of the difficulties entailed in being a prison officer. Prisoners understood that officers had problems too. Very few prisoners expressed hostility towards the officers and many were reluctant to provide descriptions of "typical" officers stating that all officers were individuals. Such a picture does not sit well with the images of warring groups drawn by Mathieson (1965,1990). The findings presented here did replicate prisoner unease with pettiness, inflexibility and inconsistency from the officers. But, officers and prisoners were not two groups behind battle lines. Indeed, some of the officers were as uneasy with inconsistent approaches from their colleagues and senior ranks as were the prisoners. Like the prisoners, a number of officers had difficulties with the (other) officers. Accordingly, it is to a further examination of inter-officer relationships that we now turn.

STAFF RELATIONSHIPS WITH EACH OTHER

It was through an interest in effective means of control and calming potentially violent situations that the research that followed the survey of fear was designed to be an investigation of the influence of female officers within male prisons. Gomme (1988) reported that sex is the most powerful predictor of fear and concluded that females express greater anxiety than males. The research presented in chapters eight to thirteen tested this conclusion as well as a number of issues pertaining to fear and control. Building on previous literature, it tried to answer questions relating to whether women were more likely to ease tension or to lose control in prisons. It assessed whether there were gender differences in the approach to prisoners, means of performing duties and interactions with colleagues.

There were no significant differences in the incidence or levels of fear expressed by female and male prison officers. However, some of the results were surprising and the implications of many were awkward. The surprising results include both significant and null findings that have been reported in earlier chapters. For example, female officers did experience more interpersonal problems with their colleagues and the prisoners than did the male officers. However, the male officers experienced more problems overall. A null finding of interest is that there are no actual differences in the self-reported means of control used by male and female officers. Yet, some male officers and prisoners stated that women worked differently. If the women do adopt different approaches, they do not report relying on any when in "nasty situations".

When describing the effects of employing female police officers, Toch (1977, p 48) made a statement that he could equally have applied to prisons: "The argument becomes self-fulfilling. It *begins* with the assumption that combat readiness is crucial; it pounds this assumption into the minds of men most likely to feel inferior as a result; and it ends by deducing a man's inadequacy from his vain efforts to prove himself by living up to the myth... Strain is present for men but a serious incongruity could result if police women also feel compelled to emulate super-male conduct. Demonstrations of toughness would not bring into play the interpersonal strengths that many

women possess and which the police desperately need." It is encouraging to note that almost twenty years later, male prison officers in England and Wales are demonstrating the "interpersonal strengths" associated with women. Hence, there were no significant differences in the means of control favoured by female and male prison officers. They were both using traditional "feminine" methods as well as "Control and Restraint Techniques".

Politically unpalatable as it may be, the conclusion drawn is that stereotypical attitudes and sexist behaviour towards the female officers work to improve the environment and to protect the women, prisoners and other members of staff more often than they cause problems and put people in danger. The women do not intend to do anything that a man would not. Yet, they are perceived and reacted to differently. Therefore, interactions involving women may evolve and have different eventual outcomes than those involving men alone, even when the men and women officers would adopt the same approaches to each circumstance that could unfold.

A reliance on interpersonal skills is emphasised to all officers at training college and it would be hoped that if officers are adopting desirable means of performing their duties, they would feel successful and valued as such. However, officers seemed to be alienated from their managers, demonstrated low morale and often mentioned governor and Prison Service inadequacies. In all of the studies, officers reported feelings of insecurity and a certain degree of cynicism was directed at their supervisors (although that was most evident in the probationary police constables). It would not be unreasonable to conclude that such negative reports might adversely contribute to levels of job related tension. The ramifications of such discordance could be severe and it is to ways of managing them that the chapter now turns.

STRATEGIES FOR HARM MINIMISATION

Professional approaches to imprisonment and policing

Gerstein, Topp and Correll (1987) point out that staff burnout can be from being either over stressed or under challenged. Despite popular imagery, it seems ridiculous to suggest that prison officers will be able to "sit in the office reading the papers" for much time in the foreseeable future. It is likely that they will have to cope with being both over stressed and under challenged. With scarce resources, their jobs are likely to become more physically demanding and the challenge of caring for the prisoners is likely to be relegated behind the needs to maintain control. This assertion is made in the context of a recent change to Prison Service departments. Previously, "security" came within the remit of the "custody" section. Now, "custody" is subsumed within a "security" group. The change is more than semantic, it reflects the prevailing political attitudes where "care" is relegated far below duties of "control".

Under staffing and inappropriate postings that do not maximise the use of an officer's skills are problems that are not going to disappear. It thus seems more likely that poor wing management will ensue and control will be harder to maintain even though it is a primary priority. Officers' levels of stress are unlikely to drop significantly therefore it is even more important that proper support

services be offered and taken up. Encouragingly, there was a slight shift in tone by the end of the cross postings research. During the first survey (of fear), officers had tended to state that they felt that should they require the services of the "care bears", they would be seen to be failing in their jobs. This concern was not as great in the officers who participated in the later research. However, all officers were critical of the practices employed by the care teams in their prisons. Confidentiality and trust are vital if such services are to be successful and both had been violated.

When compared with the police officers interviewed for the research reported in chapter fourteen, the prison officers' views of support services were relatively good. Within the police, there seems to be still a "machismo" mistrust both of the officers who need such services and of the motivation behind management that offers them. As long as "coping" with fear, violence, death, fires, etc. means joking about them but nothing else, then the definition of a professional officer can not incorporate one who utilises such services.

There can be little doubt that a certain level of awareness in both police and prison officers is necessary to work effectively. However, an officer who employs inadequate strategies for coping with fear may well be more of a liability than one who recognises and seeks help when needed. In other words, there may be a need to redefine professionalism and what constitutes "coping" in prison and police officers. This is a fundamental problem of attitude and attitudes in cultures such as prison and police services are notoriously hard to influence. However, there are some areas that could be addressed.

Policy implications

Before continuing with an assessment of the implications of the research presented, it is appropriate to quote Keane (1995, p 451) who stated that: "All types of victimization are harmful, but it is clear that the chronic stressors involve subtle forms of behaviour that serve as constant reminders of vulnerability. Unfortunately, it is these behaviours that are often the most difficult to legislate against and eradicate." Toch (1976) had earlier concluded that there are certain groups of problems that can be addressed. Of most relevance to the issues discussed would be to assist more of the vulnerable prisoners, to group and assign compatible staff and prisoners and to improve relationships generally between prisoners and officers and within each group.

Similar conclusions have been reached by Cooke et al. (1990) who advise staff on the importance of communication skills, observation, listening skills and the need for assessment of non verbal cues to behaviour. They cite (without referencing) an 1844 report from the Inspectors of Prisons for Scotland, "in some prisons, an unusual degree of good conduct is induced and the number of punishments kept low, by the personal influence of the officers and by their care in reasoning with prisoners before resorting to punishment" (p 90). Cooke et al. also recommend control measures other than removal of protagonists from violent situations. Their recommendations include questions that might well be addressed to any governing governor:

"If dislikes or personality clashes... can be identified early on, then aggression can be avoided... Is the institution flexible enough for prisoners' cells or work parties to be changed if serious problems

arise? Can an officer's role be changed so that he [or she] is never in sole charge of a particular inmate who hates him [or her]? Are officers on duty in one place regularly enough to know what combinations of people are liable to be troublesome?" (p 105.) Cooke et al. also point out the need for proper debriefing of staff who are unlucky enough to have been caught in nasty situations and for proper means of support for staff in need.

Despite attempts to ignore the recommendations of Learmont, 1995 (*The Guardian, 5th July 1996*), were the suggestions to be implemented, many of the problems relating to low staff morale would be improved. However, it is unclear as to the effects on prisoners and the resulting interactions with officers and other staff. In general, the new key performance indicators suggested (and the amendments to those currently in existence such as escapes, and purposeful activity) are logical, sensible and could help to ease the tension between the competing demands of custody and care. The proposed K.P.I.'s that are most relevant to this thesis are those that would indicate:

1. The extent to which staff training fulfils a clear staff development policy (the Service having first introduced a clear development policy).

2. Staff morale.

3. The degree of success in dealing with the drug problem in prisoners.

4. Standards of physical security.

To concur with one other Learmont recommendation: "The problems of intimidation, manipulation and boredom must be thoroughly addressed during recruitment and training, continuously monitored by line managers and carefully studied by the Service with a view to appropriate action. More important still is visible leadership which recognises the human dimension, shows enthusiasm for people's efforts and promotes feelings of self-respect and self-confidence" (p 172). (A similar sentiment is also expressed in Woodcock, 1994.)

It is an almost meaningless cliché to call for more investigation at the end of any report of research. However, there seemed to be scope for a number of follow up studies. After the survey into the incidence of fear, the research developed into a study that included an assessment of levels of fear. An alternative line of inquiry to have pursued would have been to have to compared like with like. For example, three Victorian local prisons could have been compared as could four Vulnerable Prisoner Units.

If such research is to be conducted, then it needs to be carried out not just by professional inquirers but also by the managers of the prisons. Nearly all the officers and many prisoners felt that governors were out of touch with daily life on the wings. The results presented here suggest that not enough of the officers are aware of the problems faced by the prisoners. The prisoners and officers interviewed felt that their experiences were being neither listened to nor heard. The Prison Service claims to be serious about improving conditions in prisons and dealing with intimidation. If this is the case, then the Prison Service has to commit to carrying out the kinds of research that it suggested were needed when it produced the bullying information pack in 1993, yet have still to materialise.

The main limitation to future research (and to the studies presented here) centres upon the nature of fear itself. As mentioned above, it is an intangible construct and fairly inaccessible. It is hoped that the picture of fear and avoidance procedures can be enhanced by the continued use of sensitive interviewing techniques. This thesis suggests that meaningful predictions of where fear is going to be highest can only be made by taking representative samples from each wing and examining personal histories. The majority of officers are not aware of all of the concerns of the prisoners and may lay the emphasis on what to look for in the wrong "places", both physically and mentally. The managers of officers are also apparently unaware or unmoved by the difficulties faced by their charges, prisoners and officers.

It would be relatively easy to tackle problems related to physically unsafe areas that may be reported in any prison. Raising awareness, improving lighting and other improvements to the environment to limit opportunity for confrontation are necessary but not sufficient. Past experience also needs to be assessed so that any problems may be properly managed. In prisoners, the way to start assessing past experience may be an examination of their files. In officers, past experience assessments could be implemented as part of a training strategy. In both officers and prisoners, such information gathering has to be devolved from a consideration of their "advancement" whether through security classifications or the number of pips on a uniform.

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Being realistic, prisoners' informed consent was something of a misnomer. It is possible that some of the participants were less concerned with the nature of the research than with the fact that the interview broke up the tedium of the day. This could be the case with the prison officers as well. Informed consent forms were not used. On balance, it was felt that if participants were asked to sign something formally, they may have felt that assurances of confidentiality were less credible.

The interviews were carried out as sensitively as possible. The researcher was conscious of the participants' reactions to the matters discussed and the interviews were run in a manner that avoided unnecessarily stressing the interviewees. From another perspective, it should be pointed out that the researcher was a female. Generally, this was probably an advantage. Self disclosure research shows that both men and women are more likely to disclose honestly to a woman than to a man. From the point of view of the researcher's security, the officers on each prison wing were helpful and nearly always in proximity. One participant (who had been convicted of a sexual offence) directed sexual comments at the researcher. He was told immediately that if he continued in that vein, the interview would be terminated. He stopped using such terminology and the interview continued. The least safe time for the researcher was probably whilst interviewing police officers during the night shift not whilst working in gaols.

As with the prison officers, interviews with the police officers were carried out as sensitively as possible. However, there was a problem in the recruitment of participants. Due to the highly efficient duty officers, no sooner had access been agreed than probationary officers were informed to report to the conference room for interview. Thus within 24 hours, people had been ordered to

report for research. It had been hoped that a less formal approach could have been made in the first instance. At the time scheduled for each interview, the researcher made it very clear that participation was voluntary and that the officer did not need to stay (or reschedule if called away) unless he or she so desired. Despite stressing the voluntary nature of the participation, the impression was received that some of the officers participated under duress. None of them refused to be interviewed nor did they take up repeated offers of chances to withdraw. However, a number of officers did not want to take part in brainstorming sessions and were not pushed so to do. It should be noted that a number of these officers stated in interviews that they felt a certain degree of exclusion from their colleagues and the general camaraderie.

METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Hindsight is the best tool that a researcher can possess. Unattainable as such a tool would be, there are a number of aspects of the research that reflect compromises between ideal research designs and reality. It had been hoped that a dispersal prison would participate in the study of fear and that a women's prison would also take part. However, the dispersal prison concerned had a tendency to riot whenever the research could have been conducted. It was also not possible to gain access to a female prison at the same time as the male prisons investigated.

There are also minor changes that could have been made to the interview protocols that were used. The language on the scales used for cross gender supervision research reflects the researcher's greater experience and knowledge of life inside prisons. Some of the questions on the first survey were not as appropriately worded as had been hoped at the time. For example, the substitution within the later study of the word "regime" for "routine". It would also have been advisable to have included questions relating to the level of fear experienced in the first study. However, such questions would have created a longer questionnaire. It was felt to be more important and practically useful to assess the nature and the places where fear occurred rather than how fearful participants felt.

More fundamentally, had it been possible to adopt a prospective longitudinal design, then interaction effects could have been examined even though they were not predicted. This is because the data would have been there for post hoc analysis. The decision to interview officers as well as prisoners was unusual but having decided to follow that line of investigation, the research could have gone further and encouraged participation from non uniformed staff. This would have been particularly useful in assessing the implications of negative management views and the generally poor level of communication.

As mentioned in the opening of this thesis, there is also a need to exercise a degree of caution when evaluating the statistical tests of the information presented. It was not possible to conduct a sufficiently large scale test of the reliability of the coding of qualitative information that was subsequently statistically analysed. However, the cross gender supervision study was coded with the aid of two assistants who also helped to construct the coding sheets. Where there was any ambiguity in interpretation of comments made, a conservative figure from the appropriate scale was used. If sufficiently unclear, the item was left as a missing cell for the particular participant.

Throughout this thesis, participants' quotations have been reported. Again, there may be some concern as to how representative are such quotations. In most cases, they have been presented alongside frequency tables. This presentation should have helped the reader to determine how representative of the sample set are any individual remarks. In further support of this style of reporting, it should be mentioned that prisoner and officer participants' feedback on reports (both summary and full) has been positive.

The main area of investigation that somehow disappeared from the original proposals relates to the nature of prison culture. It had been hoped that the studies mentioned in chapter two and the

comparison with police officers (presented in chapter fourteen) would have helped to shed some light on the importation and deprivation debates. It is tempting to concur with Grapendaal (1990) who concluded that a prison culture was partly imported and partly maintained through deprivation. However, the results from the research presented in this thesis are too ambiguous to draw even that tentative a conclusion and add little to previous knowledge regarding the evolution of prison cultures.

For example, one could interpret the findings relating to intimidation in terms of importation and in terms of deprivation. It is possible that prisoners who are always afraid ("high safety" prisoners) are as unable to cope outside prison as inside prison. Indeed, this is one of Toch's (1992) conclusions. However it is equally likely that "high safety" persons are able to fulfil their needs for safety outside a prison environment thereby not experiencing the associated fears or that it is the prison environment that makes them so fearful.

The intangible nature of fear may be one of the reasons for the lack of previous research from a social psychological perspective. It also hinders interpretation of the findings presented here. However, one can be reasonably confident that the results can contribute both to future research and to Prison Service personnel. Fear does exist in prison. For some prisoners it can have profoundly difficult effects. One prisoner interviewed was literally too scared to go out of his cell. He was prepared to be "put on report" for not working and to be labelled as an awkward prisoner rather than go to an officer for help following an assault. His experience is not unique, neither is it the norm. Most prisoners and officers do not walk around in constant fear for their lives but they do practice avoidance techniques and accept both "formless" and "concrete" fear as part of their environment. Overall, they cope quite successfully with their situations but both groups seem to "take it home with them."

The level of fear in prisons may not fulfil Goodstein and Wright's (1989) definition of long lasting harm (rather than short term pain) in all but a few people. But, fear in prisons is associated with altered behaviour and attitudes of wariness and distrust that are carried outside the gates. Fear in prisons is not unreasonable, nor is it unrealistic. Even those few prisoners who reported "formless fear" at all times, have had "concrete" experiences on which to base such fears. Police and Prison officers' "awareness" could be characterised as formless but it too is based on knowledge of what could and usually has happened to them. Actual confrontation and violence are not daily occurrences for all officers but they have experienced them. The fears of prisoners, police and prison officers are real, founded in experience and not to be ignored.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX ONE: INCIDENCE OF FEAR

The fear interviews were "coded" and data analyses were carried out using SPSSPC+. Given that the questions elicited categorical information, the coding task was more a matter of recording the categories and numbers involved in each one. Dummy variables were used (1 and 2) to enable χ^2 and λ to be calculated. An example of a prisoner and an officer transcript are shown below following their respective coding sheets.

Prisoner coding sheet (fear in prisons)

Column 1-3	*subject number*
Column 4	*age* under 30: 3 and under 40: 4
Column 5	*prison* Uranus remand: 1; Uranus VPU: 2; Pluto: 3; Jupiter A: 4 and Jupiter D: 5
Column 6-7	*sentence length* (in years)
Column 8	*sentence type* property, driving & drugs:1; violence:2; murder:3 and sexual, etc.:4
Column 9	*previous custodial convictions* yes: 1 and no: 2
Column 10	*different to life outside* yes: 1 and no: 2
Column 11	*routine, good* 1, boring or okay: 2 and bad: 3
Column 12	*get on with people at work* well: 1, okay: 2 and badly: 3
Column 13	*people friendly at work* yes: 1 and no: 2
Column 14	*get on with people at education* well: 1, okay: 2 and badly: 3
Column 15	*people friendly at education* yes: 1 and no: 2
Column 16	*staff rating* very good:1; good:2; indifferent/it depends/okay:3; bad: 4 and very bad:5
Column 17	*staff get on* yes/ignore: 1 and no: 2
Column 18	*problems with staff* yes: 2 and no: 1
Column 19	*frequency of problems with staff* daily:5; weekly:4; fortnightly:3; monthly:2 and less:1
Column 20	*get on with other prisoners* yes: 1 and no: 2
Column 21	*problems with other prisoners* yes: 2 and no: 1
Column 22	*prisoner problem frequency* daily: 5; weekly: 4; fortnightly: 3; monthly: 2 & less: 1
Column 23	*worry* yes: 2 and no: 1
Column 24	*anything to help the worry* yes: 1 and no: 2
Column 25	*scared* yes: 2 and no: 1
Column 26	*anything to help the fear* yes: 1 and no: 2
Column 27	*ethnicity* WH: 1; BA: 2; BC: 3; BO: 4; AI: 5; AP: 6; AO: 7; AB: 8 and OT: 9

Sample transcript: prisoner fear

Data entered: 00633993113****312111*1*211

1)   **Sentence length and type, any prior sentences?**

Arson, yes but not for arson. *006, 3, 3, 99, 3, 1*

2)   **Do you feel that prison life is different to life outside? Y. (How so?)**
                    N. Straight to 3.

Yes, it's regimented, structured, very little freedom. Everything is done for you. It's nothing like being outside. *1*

3)   **What's the overall routine like in here?**

The routine? That's difficult. I don't like routine anyway but to have to do things when required makes me unhappy. I don't like people thinking for me. *3*

4)   **Do you go to the gym? (N->6)**

No.

5   **a) How often do you go?**
               b) Who decides how often you go there?
               c) Are there set amounts of time that you can spend in the gym or can anyone go there at any time?
               d) Why do think that it is organised in this way?

6)   **a) How often do you go to canteen?**

Once a week.

               b) When you go, do you go with anyone else?

Yes, we're not allowed to go on our own.

               [c) How often do you see him/her/them?

Sometimes I go with my cell mate, so 24 hours a day.

               d) When?]

7)   **a) Do you do any work in the prison?**

No. *

               [b) How do you get on with the people there?
               c) Would you describe them as friendly?] *

8)   **a) Are you doing any training/education?**

No. *

               [b) How do you get on with the people there?
               c) Would you describe them as friendly?] *

9)   **What do you think of the staff on the wing?**

I don't think about them. They're there and unless they cause grief, I try to pretend they're not there but the majority are doing the job and reasonably OK. Some are a bit power crazy. I try not to think too much about them. *3*

10)   **Do you generally get on with them?**

Yes. *1*

11)   **Do you have any problems with them?**

No serious problems. *2*

               [a) What sort?
               b) Do they happen regularly?] *1*

12)   What do you feel about the officers?

The majority are people who are somewhat lacking. This job boosts their confidence. They have an inferiority complex and can be getting off on the power.

13)   Overall, how much time do you spend with other prisoners?

Apart from my cell mates, very little. If I go on exercise, I don't choose to go on association.

14)   What do you think of them?

They are not the kind of people I'd mix with on the out so I don't mix very much and it's probably vice versa.

15)   Do you generally get on with them?

Yes, I'm not stand offish or snobby. *1*

16)   Do you have any problems with them?

No, never had any friction. *1*

> **[a) What sort?**
> **b) Do they happen regularly?]** *

17)   What areas of the prison do you think that other prisoners find to be unsafe?

On exercise or in the cell if you're with the wrong person. I know people who are frightened in a crowd. Very insecure. I know people from the same psychiatric hospital I was in for years, a sense of paranoia.

18)   Do you ever feel worried about going anywhere or doing something in prison?

Not as yet, I haven't. I choose not to socialise, not because I'm frightened but because of the type of people. I might have to change that point of view. *1*

> **[a) What worries you?**
> **b) When?**
> **c) When is it worst?**
> **d) Where are you the most worried?**
> **e) What do you do to feel less worried?**
> **f) Is there anything that could be done to make you feel less worried?]** *

19)   Do you ever feel scared?

Yes. *2*

> **a) What scares you?**

The thought of having to spend a long time in this place. Losing the people close to me, the people I love.

> **b) Do you feel generally fearful, or is it more specific?**

Specific.

> **c) When?**

Night time--always there.

> **d) When is it worst?**

More overwhelming at night.

> **e) Where are you the most scared?**

No one place, when I'm isolated, as much as one can be in a cell. It can be something that will get hold of me. I seem to choose to be isolated too.

> **f) What do you do to feel less scared?**

I write letters to my girlfriend hoping that she will write back and allay those fears. Writing makes contact. While I'm writing those letters, it feels as though I'm in contact at that moment.

g) Is there anything that could be done to make you feel less scared?

I don't think so. The Listeners, but I've never met someone. I don't know if it would help. I've not pursued it though. *1*

20) **How do you feel about talking about things like this?**

It's helpful.

21) **Do you want to add anything to what you've said so far?**

No.

22) **Is there anything that you want to ask me?**

No.

Closing.

Officer coding sheet (fear in prisons)

Column 1-2   *subject number*

Column 3   *sex* male: 1 and female: 2

Column 4   *prison* Uranus remand: 1; Uranus VPU: 2; Pluto: 3; Jupiter A: 4 and Jupiter D: 5

Column 5-6   *time an officer* (in years)

Column 7   *different to life outside* yes: 1 and no: 2

Column 8   *routine* good: 1, boring or okay: 2 and bad: 3

Column 9   *get on with prisoners* yes: 1 and no: 2

Column 10   *prisoner problems* yes: 2 and no: 1

Column 11   *prisoner problem frequency* daily: 5; weekly: 4; fortnightly: 3; monthly: 2 & less: 1

Column 12   *whether the prisoners worry* yes: 2 and no: 1

Column 13   *anything to help the prisoners' worries* yes: 1 and no: 2

Column 14   *whether the prisoners are scared* yes: 2 and no: 1

Column 15   *anything to help the prisoners' fears* yes: 1 and no: 2

Column 16   *number of colleagues*

Column 17   *member of a team* yes: 1, usually: 2 and no: 3

Column 18   *confidence in colleagues* yes: 1, usually: 2 and no: 3

Column 19   *get on with colleagues* yes: 1 and no: 2

Column 20   *problems with colleagues* yes: 2 and no: 1

Column 21   *colleague problem frequency* daily: 5; weekly: 4; fortnightly: 3; monthly: 2 and less: 1

Column 22   *worry (self)* yes: 2 and no: 1

Column 23   *anything to help the worry* yes: 1 and no: 2

Column 24   *scared (self)* yes: 2 and no: 1

Column 25   anything to help the fear, yes: 1 and no: 2

Sample transcript: officer fear

Data entered: 06140812121212*02111*2222

1) How long have you been an officer?

8 years. *08*

2) Do you feel that prison life is different to life outside? Y. (How so?)

Totally. This is solely a place of work. I earn my money and while here, I do as I'm paid and be professional but I do it solely for my family. You have to be different, here, I boss about, you have to be. I do a group now, one minute, you're on first names and supportive. The next minute, you have to give a rollicking for something petty. When I walk out, I don't think of this place. *1*

3) What do you feel that the overall routine is like?

I'm used to it now but when I first arrived, I felt like it was Butlins for all of us. Even now, the inmates do not realise or they have forgotten, what it's like in a local. At one point, I contemplated going back to Bedford. *2*

4) What do you feel about the prisoners?

I don't have feelings regarding them. Only a professional basis. You cannot afford to have sympathy. Coming from a local where you know the majority spend life in and out. That is their way of life.

5) What do you think of them?

Treat everybody as you wish to be treated. I treat everybody the same, sex offenders or burglars. I treat them as they treat me.

6) Do you generally get on with them?

The majority. I get on, I'm not here to have arguments. *1*

7) Do you have any problems with them?

Oh yes, you do occasionally. *2*

> **a) What sort?**

You need to sort out irate prisoners whether it's your problem or not.

> **b) Do they happen regularly?**

There's one inmate who chooses me, not very often. In Bedford, C. & R. regularly, here once. On A wing, there are not many awkward prisoners maybe every four or five months. *1*

8) Do you think that prisoners ever feel worried about going anywhere or doing something in prison?

The majority, no, but some are picked on. *2*

> **a) What worries them?**

Mainly, the inmates of a lower standing in the inmate hierarchy. When they're leant on, tobacco or pills to smuggling drugs through.

> **b) When?**

Any time, coming out of hospital or after pay.

> **c) When is it worst?**

Any time.

> **d) Where are they the most worried?**

None of the A wingers will go on C wing or in certain workshops.

> **e) What do they do to feel less worried?**

In Bedford, they would bang themselves away, keep out of circulation and go around with mates. On this wing, they come and tell you.

f)   Is there anything that could be done to make them feel less worried?

If they give you a name, yes. *1*

9)   Do you think that prisoners ever feel scared?

Yes. *2*

a)   What scares them?

They are scared of being inside. Of what their family thinks. Marriages fall apart, many things. It's too long a list.

b)   Do you think that they feel generally fearful, or is it more specific?

Both. There are incredibly anxious people, too many people in the system.

c)   When?

Similar times to in the previous question.

d)   When is it worst?

After a visit, letter, phone call. It hits everybody differently.

e)   Where are they the most scared?
f)   What do they do to feel less scared?
g)   Is there anything that could be done to make them feel less scared?   *

10)   How many colleagues do you have on the landing?

On the wing, there is the S.O. and three others. I'm on my own on the landing. In Bedford, there were always two of us, you need someone to watch your back. *0*

11)   Do you feel part of a team?

On this wing, yes but not on another wing. Whereas in Bedford, the whole staff gelled, even if there were personal problems *2*

12)   Do you have confidence in those with whom you work? I don't want any names.

On this wing. I hope I have on other wings, I don't know them well enough on the other wings. *1*

13)   What do you think of the other members of staff?

At this present time, governors, some are very good. Others, just don't have an ounce of common sense between them. I'm very much a staff man, the women and men you work with them. You run the place and rely on people. Quite a few of the governors against that. They upset them and rely on them still. Everybody needs praise. Some come out with silly schemes simply to get promotion. P.O.'s and S.O.'s, it's the same with those as the governors. Half know that they won't get further and are more in touch with the staff. The other half are out to further their careers. That is not a bad thing in itself, but there are ways and there are ways.

14)   Do you generally get on with them?

Yes, I don't pick faults with somebody. I deal with people on one side if something goes wrong. I feel that people get on with me too. *1*

15)   Do you have any problems with them?

No, never, it goes on but not me. *1*

[a) What sort?
b) Do they happen regularly?]   *

16)   Do you ever feel worried about going anywhere or doing something in prison?

I have recently, I've started running the groups. I've never been one to stand and talk. It worried me like mad. As for dealing with situations, no I'm not worried. *2*

a) What worries you?

It was an unknown quantity. Was I capable of being professional enough to be taken seriously enough?

b) When?

For the first couple of groups.

c) When is it worst?

The first ten minutes.

d) Where are you the most worried?
e) What do you do to feel less worried?

Just got on with it.

f) Is there anything that could be done to make you feel less worried?

I'd done a couple of weeks course but you need to learn at the deep end, it's down to me. *2.*

17) Do you ever feel scared?

I haven't for a long, long time. But, I've been in a couple of riots. I've been in to deal with some violent people. You have to feel scared, in full riot gear. *2*

a) What scares you?

Full riot gear.

b) Do you feel generally fearful, or is it more specific?

It's general, what was going to happen once you got in there. And so much adrenaline, to enable you to cope.

c) When?

d) When is it worst?

In riots.

e) Where are you the most scared?
f) What do you do to feel less scared?

Joked and laughed, people are aware. Took the Mickey. We were aware of what was going on. Nobody tried to belittle anybody else. Not enough staff in this establishment have been through that kind of situation. (Q. Is there complacency?) Yes, definite.

g) Is there anything that could be done to make you feel less scared?

No, nothing can prepare you and if anybody isn't scared, they shouldn't go into it. You need to get your mind and body prepared. *2*

18) How do you feel about talking about things like this?

Fine.

19) Do you want to add anything to what you've said so far?

Complacency isn't their fault. If I'd come here from training, I'd have ended up with some degree of complacency. The majority have not seen totally violent inmates and seen what they have to deal with. It comes down to where they're posted. You fit in to the system, go with the flow.

Facilities for prisoners, they're not financing the facilities. They play at courses, money is wasted on schemes that won't get off the ground.

This job can get to you or you can go with the flow. Even then, every so often, the fact that people are after you to sort out situations that are some--also, I find myself getting cynical. I don't know if that's the way to deal with it. I'm less cynical here than Bedford. You have to handle things you

know you can't change, get on with the job you're paid for. I've learnt not to take it out of the gate. Get to the point of having a go at your family but I do the job to keep them happy.

If you're not appreciated by governors, then you start getting, well why should I? Nobody does it for me. No matter how professional you are. No backing for the governor. The governor needs to be able to rely on you and you won't do it if you're not appreciated. After the Bedford riot, I took things home, pumped with adrenaline.

20)   **Is there anything that you want to ask me?**

No.

Closing.

APPENDIX TWO: CROSS GENDER SUPERVISION

The interview transcripts from the cross gender supervision work were coded and entered into SPSS for Windows. Two other people assessed a selection of transcripts to ensure inter rater reliability. The coding sheets shown below are quite detailed. This is due to the open ended nature of the questions asked. As can be seen, in an attempt to avoid double counting, categories were constructed that permitted the combination of other categories within each question. Unfortunately, this means that a degree of sensitivity is lost.

The first section replicates the coding sheets used for the prisoner participants. This is followed by a transcript with its numerical equivalents then by one for comparison. The second section opens with the coding sheets constructed for use with the officer participants. This is followed by a transcript with its numerical equivalents and one other for comparison.

As can be seen from the comprehensive coding sheets, some of the distinctions made were somewhat arbitrary. For example, the difference between "aware or apprehensive" and "adrenaline buzz/rush". However the categories were determined by three people and there was a noticeable lack of discordance. Areas of difference were where the researcher had taken a more conservative view and tended to use figures towards the mean.

Prisoner coding sheet (cross gender supervision)

Participant number   3 digit

Race   WH: 1; OT: 2; BA: 3; BC: 4; BO: 5 and AP: 6

Prison   Mars: 0 and Saturn: 1

Wings Mars   VPU: 1; lifer: 2; Cat.C: 3 and Cat.B: 4

**   Saturn**   A: 8; B: 5; C: 7 and D: 6

Sentence length   in years

Sentence type burglary: 1;   robbery: 2;   drugs: 3   oth. non violent (including holding
warrant: 4
    kidnap: 5;   poss.fi.wi.: 6   ABH: 7   indecent assault: 8
    GBH: 9;   rape: 10   oth.sex: 11   other violent: 12
    attempted murder: 13   manslaughter: 14 murder: 15

Previous convictions   custodial: 0 and non custodial or only juvenile: 1

Regime   very good: 1; good: 2; neutral/all right: 3; bad: 4 and very bad: 5

Work   yes: 0 and no: 1

Work staff get on   very well: 1; well/good: 2; neutral/all right: 3; badly: 4 and very badly: 5

Work staff friendly   yes: 0 and no: 1

Education   yes: 0 and no: 1

Education type full time: 1; part time: 2; evenings: 3 and cellular: 4

Education staff get on very well: 1; well/good: 2; neutral/all right: 3; badly: 4 and very badly: 5

Education staff friendly yes: 0 and no: 1

Officer description   very positive e.g. "fantastic" or "brilliant" or "good as gold": 1

positive e.g. "good" or "pretty good": 2
neutral or "it depends" or "okay" or examples given of different types: 3
negative e.g. "not up to much" or "pretty bad": 4
very negative e.g. "crap" or "a bunch of bastards": 5

Wing officer ratings   (as for officer description)

Officer get on   yes: 0 very well: 1; well/good: 2; neutral/all right: 3; badly: 4 and very badly: 5

Problems with officers yes: 0 and no: 1

Officer problem type   personality clash: 1   not doing their job: 2   being petty: 3
                            privacy: 4   mind games: 5   me shouting/kicking off: 6
                            food: 7   communication: 8   searching: 9
                            race: 10   other prisoners bucking system:11 unfair adjudications: 12
                            not getting entitlements: 13   just them being there: 14.

Officer problem frequency   can't put a figure on it: 0
                                     once or twice only: 1
                                     no longer occurs: 2
                                     it depends: 3
                                     less than 1 a month: 4
                                     1 a month: 5
                                     fortnightly: 6
                                     weekly: 7
                                     every few days: 8
                                     daily: 9

Same problems with female officers   don't know: 0
                                         no problems with either gender: 1
                                         problems with male officers but not with female: 2
                                         problems with officers of either gender: 3
                                         problems with female officers but not with male: 4

Comments about female officers
privacy: 1   worries for females' safety: 2   point proving: 3
sexual advances from women:4 women loose control: 5   women get intimidated: 6
other -ve remark (re fem offs):7 women are bossy: 8   negative for the prisoners: 9
other -ve remark (re mal offs):10 other: 11   better than men: 12
admire them: 13   they are not macho: 14   they have more power: 15
can talk with them: 16   they get involved: 17   we need more: 18
it's not a job for a woman: 19   they are more helpful: 20   they are used as skivvies: 21
they need attention: 22   more professional: 23   more understanding: 24
worse on some things and better on others: 25   a lot (others) object to them: 26
over the top: 27   pris have sex on their minds: 28 they are bitchy: 29
they have no tact: 30
combined   21 + 16 = 31; 23 + 14 = 32; 24 + 16 = 33 and 3 + 24 = 34.

Women do the job the same   yes: 0 and no: 1 if no, better: 0 and worse: 1

Do women have an effect   yes: 0 and no: 1

Type of effect combination positive: 1 calming: 2   can talk with them: 3
more helpful: 4   normalise the environment: 5   they try harder: 6
improve the environment: 7   they are more professional: 8 people try to get close to them: 9
women feel threatened: 10   the language is cleaner: 11   other positive: 14
negative combination: 15   they get respect: 17   more understanding: 18
orchestrate trouble for prisoners: 19   treat us better: 20
combined   5 + 8 = 21; 2 + 5 = 22 and 4 + 8 = 23

Feelings re female officers very good/well: 1; well/good: 2; neutral/ok: 3; badly: 4 and
                                 very badly: 5

Are women officers a good idea   completely: 1   some reservations: 2   don't know: 3
                                        no: 4

Do prisoners worry in relation to female officers   yes: 0 and no: 1

Prisoners' type of worry concerning female officers   if there is an incident: 1   privacy: 2
the women's safety: 3   searching (rubbing down): 4
searching (the cell): 5   it could cause problems: 6
scared of kicking off and a woman dealing with it: 7   of their colleagues: 8
combined   2 + 4 = 9 and 2 + 3 = 10

Do the officers worry   yes: 0 and no: 1

Officers' type of worry   violence or safety: 1   fear: 2   loss of control: 3
loss of personal control: 4   psychological games: 5 staying professional: 6   the unknown: 7
when they are new: 8   drugs: 9   dissatisfaction: 10   verbal abuse: 11
fires: 12   things from outside: 13 disease: 14
acting under duress: 15   the work they do: 16   for the prisoners: 17
problems with specific prisoners: 18   some of the people in here: 19
they do the sentence too: 20
combined 3 + 6 = 21; 1 + 9 = 22; 1 + 10 = 23; 9 + 12 = 24; 1 + 14 = 25; 1 + 3 = 26 and 1 + 13 = 27

Same worries with female officers   don't know: 0
                                          no worries with either gender: 1
                                          worries with male officers but not with female: 2
                                          worries with male and female officers: 3
                                          worries with female officers but not with male: 4

Feel about participating   fine/good: 0, problems: 1 and "is there any point?": 2

Addenda   yes: 0 and no: 1

Addenda type   this prison is good: 1   aims of imprisonment: 2 race: 3
attitude of staff: 4   imposed changes: 5   bucking system shouldn't work: 6   food: 7
use of reports: 8   anti sex offenders: 9   temporary release: 10   officers drinking: 11
female officers:12   time depends on self: 13 better facilities needed: 14   more for families: 15
-ve fx of prison: 16   drugs: 17   fear: 18   can only talk to outsiders: 19
communication: 20   rule 43: 21   life sentences: 22   SOTP: 23
the system: 24   remorse: 25   inexperienced officers: 26   stereotyping: 27
C&R: 28   security categories: 29   staff prisoner relationship: 30   prisoner wages: 31
getting entitlements:32   British prisons good: 33 prison education: 34   causes of crime: 35
DHC: 36   will it help?: 37   need to educate the public: 38   basic regime: 39
Board of Visitors: 40   foreign nationals: 41

Sample transcript 1: prisoner cross gender supervision

1)   **Sentence length and type, any "pre-cons."?**

4 years, 21 months (record = 4yrs), kidnap, yes custodial. *008, 0, 4, 4, 4, 5, 5, 0, -, 29*

2)   **How would you describe the overall regime in here? What's it like for you?**

Relaxed, easy going. Fits, it suits me fine, no problems at all. *2*

3)   **a) Do you do any work in the prison?**

Yes, wing cleaner. *0,--*

         [b) How do you get on with the staff there?
         c) Would you describe them as friendly?] NA

4)   **a) Are you doing any training/education?**

No, no education, just training down at the gym. *1,---*

         [b) How do you get on with the staff there?
         c) Would you describe them as friendly?]

5)   **Can you describe an officer to me, as someone coming in from the outside? (What are they like?)**

It depends on their mood. They are not to be trusted, don't tell them too much. He's a man who locks us up, even though you can get on well. Once in a bad mood, all screws. And, moods change pretty quickly in prison. *4*

6)   **What do you think of the officers on the wing?**

They are a pretty fair bunch, no problems. *2*

7)   **Do you generally get on with them?**

Yes. *0*

8)   **Do you have any problems with them?**

If I'm moaning about food or something. *0*

         a) What sort?

I shout or knock them down. They don't respond, they are pretty good here. If they responded, there would be more trouble. *6*

         b) Do they happen regularly?

They can. It does, if something is on my mind, waiting for a home leave answer, on edge, it can blow up. Two or three times a week on average. *8*

9)   **Is that the same for the male officers and the female officers?**

I treat them the same. *3*

10)   **Do you think that the women do their job in the same way as the men?**

Some of them, it's the same job, just don't like to see them here and treat them like a man. *0.5*

11)   **Do you think that they have any effect on the way that things work around here?**

They have an effect on some of the lads, who try to get, talk to them. It's nice, I talk to them, I wouldn't be rude to them unless in a bad mood. *0, 9*

12)   **How do you feel about having women around here?**

I just accept it but if we had a choice, I'd prefer all men, a male environment. *3*

13)   **Do you think that it's a good idea to have women as officers?**

No, we don't need them on the wing. *4*

14)   Do you ever worry about having female officers around?

No, of course not. *1, -*

15)   Do you think that the officers ever worry when they do their jobs?

Some of them do. Some are pretty nervous, not frightened but nervous of something. Some are dead quiet and don't know what to say. It's very different from Saturn, completely different. There, they were straight down the nick, lots of arguments, and knives pulled out before. *0, 2*

16)   Is that the same for the men and the women?

It's very different, more stabbings, more debts, a tougher regime. There are the same people as here but it's more relaxed, it worked here. There, we're bitter and twisted and very angry. Surely it's better to have us relaxed than go home all stressed out. *---*

17)   How do you feel about talking about things like this?

No worries, it depends on a mood. There is nothing on my sentence, it gives me nothing so I'll do nothing to help them. *0*

18)   Do you want to add anything to what you've said so far?

"Nonces", why do they have to put criminals in with sex offenders? We see them, opened visits, they have a big pond and all sorts. Open visits here and we have visitors, they should have their own prison e.g. swap prisons, all of Saturn. There is talk of them running the kitchens because no-one will want to eat it, the place will get smashed up. One got bashed in the showers the other day, we've got a punk on the wing, he's down the block. *0, 9*

19)   Is there anything that you want to ask me?

No.

Sample transcript 2: prisoner cross gender supervision

1)   Sentence length and type, any "pre-cons."?

Five years, robbery, no previous convictions. (*Participant from Saturn, 29 years old*)

2)   How would you describe the overall regime in here? What's it like for you?

This prison is, the regime, this prison stinks. It's very, they like to play psychological games. I've been to a few and this is the worst for that sort of thing. They like to see how far people can go without blowing up. It's, for me personally, it seems to be a psychological fight everyday, you know. As I said, they are not all officers but certain officers try to needle you. Knowing your personality tends towards violence so they try to push you as far as you can go and you burst. Losing time and your privileges. Now, I've learnt just to take it in my stride, blank them out, not take it too seriously. Look at it as a game. In that way, I don't lose my temper or time and slowly but surely, progress, not much but you do progress. I personally feel that Saturn doesn't treat adults as adults. It treats them, not as children but not with respect they treat us as criminals, not human beings. Another thing I see here is they seem to punish you not because you have done anything wrong but they push psychological punishment on you because you've done a crime. We're doing, it's a hardship anyway coming away from the family. This psychological stuff makes you bitter and angry which doesn't help if you're criminally inclined.

3)   a) Do you do any work in the prison?

I do work, in the light assembly shop.

**   b) How do you get on with the staff there?**

Great, there are no problems over there.

c)   Would you describe them as friendly?

Yes, yes.

4)   a)   Are you doing any training/education?

No, not here, I've only got seven months left.

        [b)   How do you get on with the staff there?
        c)   Would you describe them as friendly?]

5)   Can you describe an officer to me, as someone coming in from the outside?

The way I've always looked at officers, they seem to be people who were bullied in life as kids and now they are in uniform. They have that power, but some do take it to extremes they look down at people, the younger ones especially.

6)   What do you think of the officers on the wing?

Some are all right. Some you can be friendly to or with others, you have got to avoid them like the plague. The way I've looked at it, at first I hated them. Recently, I've started to go with the flow. You still have your personal little hatreds but you have got to look at them as human beings, I suppose. Some officers do deliberately try to push you to test your anger management. The thing that gets to them is when you're nice to them. Officers should do the same courses I've done so they can have a bit more--or look on prisoners as human beings. We still have feelings and emotions. We've still got a bond between each other. We care for each other.

7)   Do you generally get on with them?

Yes, now, I keep my self to my self. If I do feel that it's a bad day, I tend to put on a false smile and walk around with it. They greet me and I greet them. If they don't, sod them, let them go about their business. I've done enough time. Sometimes, I feel that the officers are too nosy in respect of your personal life. They are always asking "how's your girlfriend, or mother?" They're showing a false caring. They are not genuinely interested in your life, they just like you to think so which, I think, is pretty hypocritical as they have their life and we have our own sort of thing.

8)   Do you have any problems with them?

Not so much, it depends on what you mean by problem. Certain officers are arrogant. You can more or less see the hatred in their eyes. I can't stand arrogance even though sometimes I am myself. It winds me up. I try not to show it's a problem because as soon as they see it's a problem, they try to play a game with it. Apart from that, no, no problems, not any more.

        a)   What sort?
        b)   Do they happen regularly?

It's only certain officers, some will act like villains from James Bond movies. They think they are it but the majority, I don't get any problems with.

9)   Is that the same for the male officers and the female officers?

No, it isn't the same. Then again, with one it is.

10)   Do you think that the women do their job in the same way as the men?

It's the same job but not in the same way. They seem too, I don't know. If in a bad mood, I wouldn't feel so angry if a woman locked me up probably because you don't want to get angry with a woman officer. They seem to put it over in a "softer" way, that's not the right word, softer.

11)   Do they have any effect on the way that things work around here?

Yes, definitely, two on this wing, one, the S.O. and she's terrible. The other one's normal. A normal officer, it's irregular not to see a smile on her face. If a woman walks around with a smile, it calms them down. If there's tension or a scene, a woman officer comes over and it stops because you don't want to hurt the woman. She's a calming inference. In other prisons as well, a woman does calm things down. Don't ask me why but it does.

12)   **How do you feel about having women around here?**

It's um, just like everywhere, you see women everywhere. I'm not a chauvinist in any environment. But, there is an argument to it in a B cat. there may be sex offenders which then could spark off in their horrible minds. It's dangerous for women in prison for that fact.

13)   **Do you think that it's a good idea to have women as officers?**

It's a good idea on normal people but not a good idea to have a female officer around sex offenders. Very dangerous and sparks their corrupt mind I suppose.

14)   **Do you ever worry about having female officers around?**

Not really, they can handle themselves.

15)   **Do you think that the officers ever worry when they do their jobs?**

I suppose they must have yes.

16)   **Is that the same for the men and the women?**

Yes, a bit more for women as it goes.

17)   **How do you feel about talking about things like this?**

Yes, it doesn't worry me at all.

18)   **Do you want to add anything to what you've said so far?**

Only that things should be changed in the system. More for us as prisoners on rehabilitation. Some geezers are doing a big sentence. You could use rehabilitation to--how to go about things in the proper manner outside. There should be more, more groups, more discussions, more courses e.g., pre release course. Go into things in more detail. The main concern for us is money, how to claim the Social etc.. There have been a lot of changes while inside, Social, clothing benefits should all be explained and how to handle confrontation with police. Some of us find that a mark is put on us. How to go about it in a proper manner so we don't get ourselves--in a proper manner.

Something else is, relationships break up in here so maybe counselling on relationships would help, the majority go out feeling bitter and confused. We should have some time to talk about things rather than "get out now, it's your life". It's not that easy.

Another thing is hard drugs, they should be controlled within prison. Apart from that a lot of geezers come in here not having touched drugs and they go out with bad habits on class A. They do try and help but they are not doing enough. You get out with a habit and have to support that habit, so you get in more trouble.

And how to get on with the social side of things, have a sort of social life. I went out on home leave and found it hard to communicate with people because I was out of the prison environment. It was all right going for drinks and that but I found it hard to even talk to people, you know. I suppose, that should be judged on a bit. What's being happy? It's not easy for us getting out there and talking to people in a friendly manner. I thought, I think it's very important. It should help a lot more people. Not officers either, the majority of prisoners distrust officers so someone like NACRO or the 38 group to come in and talk, no, 38 is drugs but that is my worry, my main worry.

19)   **Is there anything that you want to ask me?**

No.

Officer coding sheets: cross gender supervision

Prison   Mars: 0 and Saturn: 1

Wings **Mars**   VPU: 1; lifer: 2; Cat.C: 3 and Cat.B: 4

   Saturn   A: 8; B: 5; C: 7 and D: 6

Ranks   Principal Officer: 1; Senior Officer: 2 and Basic Grade Officer: 3

Gender   male: 1 and female: 0

Age   in years

Experience   in months

Regime   very good: 1; good: 2; okay/neutral: 3; bad: 4 and very bad: 5

Any influence   yes: 0 and no: 1

Level of influence much too little: 1; too little: 2; perfect: 3; too much: 4 and much too much: 5

Enough structure yes: 0 and no: 1

Amount of structure   too little: 0   too much: 1
resources are too tight: 2   training is wrong: 3   it's improving: 4
management misuse: 5   it's just wrong: 6   keep on changing things: 7

Team affiliation   yes: 0 and no: 1

Team rating   very good: 1; good: 2; okay/neutral: 3; bad: 4 and very bad: 5

Team importance very impt: 1; impt: 2; it depends/neutral: 3; unimpt: 4 and very unimpt: 5

Officer rating   very good: 1; good: 2; it depends/neutral: 3; bad: 4 and very bad: 5

Officer rating re sex yes it makes a difference: 0 and it makes no difference: 1

Colleague confidence very good: 1; good: 2; it depends/neutral: 3; bad: 4 and very bad: 5

Colleagues get on yes: 0 and no: 1

Colleague problems yes: 0 and no: 1

Type of problem social loafing: 1   job structure: 2   interpersonal: 3
anti women: 4   lack of understanding: 5 management style: 6 it varies/other: 7

Officer problem frequency   can't put a figure on it: 0
                once or twice only: 1
                no longer occurs: 2
                it depends/varies: 3
                less than 1 a month: 4
                1 a month: 5
                fortnightly: 6
                weekly: 7
                every few days: 8
                daily: 9

Socialise with colleagues yes: 0 and no: 1

Get on with prisoners yes: 0 and no: 1

Prisoner problems yes: 0 and no: 1

Prisoner problem type   indirect system: 1   direct system: 2
                             indirect interpersonal: 3   direct interpersonal:4

Indirect system: trivial things, anything at all and food

Direct system: bucking the system; saying no; regime changes; instantaneous demands
and doing my job properly

Indirect interpersonal: their attitude; their stupidity; my inexperience; racism; sexism;
rumours; getting the level right; friendliness & personality clashes

Direct interpersonal: unwanted physical contact; threats; attempted bullying & violence.

Prisoner problem frequency can't put a figure on it: 0
                                once or twice only: 1
                                no longer occurs: 2
                                it depends/varies: 3
                                less than 1 a month: 4
                                1 a month: 5
                                fortnightly: 6
                                weekly: 7
                                every few days: 8
                                daily: 9

Prisoner trust   not at all: 1, it depends: 2 and complete:3

Prisoner trust in officer not at all: 1; it depends: 2; I think so: 3 completely: 4

In control   all the time: 1, sometimes: 2 and never: 3

Means of keeping control   interpersonal: 1   reliance on system: 2
Control & Restraint:3   it varies: 4   the prisoners are in control: 5
presence/authority: 6   personality: 7   experience/other: 8

Recognise violence   yes: 0 and no: 1

Cues to violence   non vocal cues: 1   vocal cues: 2   "inmate knowledge": 3
                        interpersonal skills/calm: 4   atmosphere: 7

Controlling violence (as above) then interpersonal skills through to Control & Restraint: 5
                          only Control & Restraint: 6   it depends: 8

Nasty examples   prisoner prisoner: 1   prisoner officer: 2   large group: 3
self harm: 4   fires: 5   other: 6   multiple violent: 7
violent and non violent: 8 multiple non violent: 9 drugs: 10   assault: 11
riot: 12   potting: 13

Previous experience of nasty situations   yes: 0 and no: 1

Type of nasty experience prisoner prisoner: 1   prisoner officer: 2   large group: 3
self harm: 4   fires: 5   other: 6   multiple violent: 7
violent and non violent: 8 multiple non violent: 9 drugs: 10   assault: 11
riot: 12   potting: 13

Frequency of nasty experience   per annum or don't know: 0

Unpleasant situation with colleagues   yes:0 and no:1

Type of unpleasant situation verbal indirect: 1   verbal direct: 2   physical: 3
                                  drugs: 4   combination: 5   social loafing: 6

Frequency of unpleasant situation   per annum or don't know: 0

Management, prisoner and officer views   Don't know: 0   self and other positive: 1
self negative and other positive: 2   self and other negative: 3 self positive & other negative: 4

Family support   yes: 0 and no: 1

Family concerns for safety   yes: 0 and no: 1

Personal worries about job   yes: 0 and no: 1

Uncomfortable aspects of job yes: 0 and no: 1

Type of discomfort general violence: 1 lack of control: 2
working environment: 3 changes imposed: 4 privacy/searching: 5
searching visitors: 6 hierarchy/management: 7 depends on other officers: 8
prisoners being too personal: 9 offence type: 10 a combination: 11
other: 12

Personal concerns for safety yes: 0 and no: 1

Feelings of fear yes: 0 and no: 1

Level of fear apprehensive: 1 adrenalin: 2
"fearful"/"pretty scared": 3 "really/very scared": 4 terrified: 5

Based on personal experience yes: 0 and no: 1

Support of colleagues yes: 1, it depends: 2 and no: 3

Support of supervisors yes: 1, it depends: 2 and no: 3

Support services awareness yes: 0, no: 1 and don't know: 2

Previous care team use yes: 0 and no: 1

Potential care team use yes: 0, no: 1 and don't know: 2

System affiliation yes: 1; partial: 2; no: 3 and don't know: 4

Feeling of acceptance yes: 1; partial: 2; no: 3 and don't know: 4

Made a difference yes: 1; partial: 2; no: 3 and don't know: 4

Feel about participating fine/good: 0, problems: 1 and "it's not an easy task": 2

Addenda yes: 0 and no: 1

Addenda type managerial: 1 Home Office: 2 regime: 3
training: 4 race/gender: 5 drugs: 6 interpersonal skills use: 7
personal matter: 8 other: 9 first time asked about anything: 10

Sample transcript 1: officer cross gender supervision

1)   **Rank, sex, age.**

P.O., male, 46 (Mars). *57, 0, 3, 1, 1, 46*

2)   **How long have you been an officer?**

Almost 16 years. *190*

3)   **What do you feel that the overall routine is like?**

Satisfactory but still room for improvement. *2*

         a)   **Do you have any influence over the routine?**

Yes a fair bit. *0*

         b)   **Is that they way you would like it to be?**

At the end of the day, my title is group manager: I would expect a fair bit of control ("and do you get that control?") Yes if I had any less, I would be shifting my responsibilities. *3*

4)   **Is there enough structure to the job? (Too much?)**

Yes-although there is too much emphasis on the job being run as a business. I know a lot of governors and Home Office go along with it--our commodity is human beings regardless of what they have done. It's immoral to use human beings as commodities. Some areas in which it would apply but we're dealing with people and can't predict. *0*

5)   **Do you feel part of a team?**

Oh yes. *0*

         a)   **Does is matter that you should feel part of a team {how much?}**

Yes, it's very important for a number of reasons: safety, continuity--you can achieve more and expect more from staff if they are all part of a team and you get a better reaction from staff and they're more committed. An easy mistake to make is to say "this is where I am" and become dictatorial therefore you're not seen as a team member, you're seen as a dictator. *1*

6)   **What do you think of the other officers?**

Very good group. *1*

         a)   **Does that depend on their sex?**

No, without exception. They all have moments, but generally, I am more than satisfied with the officers I've got. *1*

7)   **Do you have confidence in those with whom you work? I don't want any names.**

Yes. *2*

8)   **Do you generally get on with them?**

Yes. *0*

9)   **Do you have any problems with them?**

Nothing serious that can't be resolved with a quiet chat in an office. Most problems would be personal ones-work related are usually resolved with an informal chat. *1, -, -*

         [a)What sort?

(See above)

         b)   **Do they happen regularly?]**

No, I couldn't be that specific.

10)   **Do you see them much after work?**

No, because of where I live. *1*

11)   **Do you generally get on with the prisoners?**

I think so, yes. *0*

12)   **Do you have any problems with them?**

Problems? All the time, at the end of the day you try to be fair and I think a lot would say that. *0, -, 9*

13)   **Do you trust the prisoners?**

No. They're, it would be unfair as some do prove to be trustworthy. It depends, 1 immediately springs to mind that I would trust. They have to prove to be trustworthy. *2*

14)   **Do you think that they trust you?**

Some do, yes. But again, it's a trust you have to earn. *2*

15)   **Would you say that you're always in control when you're on the job?**

I'd like to think so yes. *1*

        a) How do you keep control?

Communicate ("with staff and prisoners?") Yes, and encourage communication. *1*

16)   **Can you tell if a situation looks like it could get violent?**

Yes. *0*

        a) What kind of thing tells you?

Usually, you have, you know your inmate and you get to know his tolerance levels and recognise signals saying that he's gone beyond control bounds. The easiest one is when they pick up the broom! *3*

b)   **How would you handle a situation such as that?**

Talking first. It's very important to try to talk to them first. It's all too often--same staff tend to jump first and find a problem afterwards. I always feel that by allowing staff to--by over-reacting--you are putting staff at risk. I feel that one day, we'll say "take him out" and someone will come out injured-- a member of staff or an inmate. Even if it takes half an hour, 9 out of 10 times can pacify a situation without pain or injury to anyone.

        c) What about if it still turns nasty?

Left in no option. You deal with it appropriately. If it means physically restraining inmates, then you give that instruction and then my job is to ensure restraints are in accordance with instructions laid down. *5*

17)   **Would you please give me some examples of a "nasty situation"?**

Most I've been in have been successful. At the moment, an inmate you're trying to pacify--the moment he picks up a weapon--this is it--the point where we've got to react. All the time he's talking you're talking--and a good thing. *7*

        a) Have you ever been involved in any nasty encounters with any prisoners?

Never been assaulted myself. Been close but... *1, -, -,*

        b) What sort of thing?

        c) How often?

        d) Have you ever been in an unpleasant situation with other officers?

Yes. *0*

e) What sort of thing?

At (Saturn)-I was a segregation senior officer at the time, I had a particularly nasty individual. The staff went in to give him his breakfast and he punched one. Staff restrained him and during the course of restraint, I saw one officer start to put the boot in. ("You had to deal with it?") Yes. At the time, I advised him if I ever saw him do that again, we wouldn't have the conversation unless a governor was present. *5*

f) How often?

The second incident was at (Saturn) again. I was on the wing at the time an alarm bell went and staff responded. When I got to the scene, three officers were on the landing with one inmate cornered with a chair in his hand. He was threatening to hit the first member of staff who went to him--I told him to put the chair down. He said he knew he had to go to the block and he would if I took him there. I got him to put the chair down, etc. I assured him that he'd walk, not go on restraint. He shouted to inmates that he would walk, and I let him. He complied but the three staff who had him cornered were unhappy and felt that they should have been able to take him under restraint as he'd hit an officer. My other concern was also that we had to go past 30 inmates and what they didn't realise was that had I allowed them to take him under restraint, we wouldn't have got off the spur. The officers see a situation but don't assess the whole situation. What's going on around them at the time, they become blinkered. *0.13*

18) As an officer how would you describe yourself?

I feel, fair and honest-I get frustrated at times with the system. Frustrated at times with hierarchy-not necessarily within the establishment but outside it who use authority to the point of "I am area manager and you will do what you are told". With consultation, you're told to run the wing but you know that you'll be overruled. Can accept if I'm wrong but if I'm a manager, at least I should be consulted and asked about my opinion. I'm entitled to that, it's not too much to ask.

a) Do you think that management see you in the same way?

I don't know, like to think that if they're doing their job, they would. *0*

b) Do you think that the prisoners see you as you see yourself?

Yes because there are times when I'll agree with them on things, for example on home leave, it's a nonsense, a farce, completely and other areas. I can sympathise and agree with them. One thing we agree is that policy decisions are made by people who have never experienced it from working in a gaol. Ministers visit the prisons and make ideas based on visits. There is one phrase I hate more than anything "I think that that's what staff want..." *1*

c) Do you think that the other officers see you as you see yourself?

I'd like to think so. *1*

19) What do your family think about you doing this job?

I've never really asked. My son and daughter see it as "Dad works", they don't make anything of it. Don't, with friends, they don't talk about Dad being a Principal Officer in the service. If they ask, then I'll say but that makes a conversation out of it and the wife is the same. *0*

a) Do they ever worry about your safety?

Occasionally. If they know that things are a little bit unruly or there is dissension in the wing, then yes, they would be a little concerned. *0*

20) Do you ever feel worried about going anywhere or doing something in prison?

No, like most officers, going into an emergency in other words, an alarm bell. It's natural to go and half way there, think "what am I going into? And why am I running?" But you do go, but you do that. *1*

21)   Are there any gaol situations in which you would be uncomfortable?

The only time I'm really uncomfortable is socially when you meet someone who knows what you do and can't leave it. Wants to announce it publicly to see reaction. It's not the sort of job that a lot of people can accept as being worthy. To announce it and talk openly is bragging I think and that's more likely to upset people than just keeping quiet. It's safer to let people ask and you just get on rather than you leading and bragging. If they want to know, let them ask. *0, 12*

22)   Do you ever worry about your safety?

Occasionally ("running to a bell?") Yes, potentially volatile but then, worry about safety of those I'm with. You worry about your own but you know that you'll send staff in. You're on the scene but not going in. The staff rely on you to give the orders and the right ones. They worry that you're not going to give the wrong orders and that you'll make the right ones. *0*

23)   Do you ever feel fearful while you do the job?

No. *1*

**   a) How fearful? -**

24)   Is that based on personal experience?

Yes, the terminology we use now is "gaol craft". We use it as an expression. You see people handle situations and see that whilst the idea is right, they do it wrong. You need to learn your "gaol craft" and get to know inmates. Talk, observe, try to understand them and know the rules and regime. *0*

25)   Do you feel that you have the support of other officers?

Yes. *1*

**   a) Supervisors?**

Oh yes, yes, up to the governing governor. *1*

26)   If you have a problem, does the prison provide you with anyone, or anything that can help you to work through it?

Yes. *0*

**   a) Have you ever taken up this service?**

Yes ("was it helpful?") Yes. *0*

**   b) Would you ever take it up again?**

No. I'm part of the care team. Mine was personal and it was useful. *1*

27)   Would you say that you feel a part of the system?

Yes. *1*

28)   Have you been accepted?

Yes. *1*

29)   Do you think that you have made any difference here?

I'd like to think that I have. *1*

30)   How do you feel about talking about things like this?

No problem. Always have policy that people say, say this and that and it's confidential. If I'm going to say it, I don't say what you don't want people to know. I quite often put my name on because it's my honest opinion. It's not done me any disservice. May not be over enamoured but always honest. I thought that it would be detrimental but it never has been. *0*

31)   Do you want to add anything to what you've said so far?

Area of frustration: higher authorities who aren't prepared to communicate. But no, nothing else. *0, 1*

32)   Is there anything that you want to ask me?

No.

Sample transcript 2: officer cross gender supervision

1)   **Rank, age.**

Basic grade officer, 48 (Female, Saturn).

2)   **How long have you been an officer?**

15 months.

3)   **What do you feel that the overall regime is like?**

Very good.

          a) Do you have any influence over the regime?

A small amount.

          b) Is the level about where you would like it to be?

Yes, I'm happy with the way it was done. I am happy, it's well run.

4)   **Is there enough structure to the job, to what you're expected to do and the way in which to do it?**

No, probably not. Once you're in, that's it, there is not much follow up here and you are left to get on with it. Once in, there is not much follow up, procedures or the way that things are done.

5)   **Do you feel part of a team?**

Yes.

          a) Does is matter that you do/don't feel part of a team {how much?} Why?

Yes, very much. You need the back up of other officers in all, not just dangerous situations but from day to day. I can count on other people.

6)   **What do you think of the other officers?**

Pretty good. By and large, they are a pretty good bunch of officers.

          a) Does that depend on their sex?

No. We are very out numbered, the majority are men but they've proved it works.

7)   **Do you have confidence in those with whom you work?**

Most of the people, yes. Obviously, some I'm not confident in. There are 29 officers. If my life was on the line, probably three who I would not feel happy with.

8)   **Do you generally get on with them?**

Yes.

9)   **Do you have any problems with them?**   **[a) What sort?**

It depends on the problem. The only thing is in a predominantly male environment, slight, always a macho image they have. Some don't think that women belong or that we're as capable as them. It's very little really, it's there but not a big problem, a minor problem.

          b) Do they happen regularly?

Yes because the sort of people with these views are there all the time, usually in a group showing their masculinity. I can see that because I'm older. ("Would younger women officers have a harder time?") Yes, definitely.

10)   **Do you see your colleagues much after work?**

Yes we go out of our way to, at least once a month, even if only over at the mess.

11)   **Do you generally get on with the prisoners?**

Yes.

12)   **Do you have any problems with them?**

I haven't had, not that I'd call a problem.

    [a) What sort?
    b) Do they happen regularly?]

13)   **Do you trust the prisoners?**

No, not really.

14)   **Do you think that they trust you?**

I think so, the majority of them do.

15)   **On the landings, would you say that you're always in control?**

Yes, I would say yes, I think I am.

    a) How do you keep control?

By being me. I'm firm, they know when I say something, it's meant. I've got a good rapport, so I'm told. Not afraid to say no which possibly, a lot of officers are.

16)   **Can you tell if a situation looks like it could get violent?**

Yes, I think so.

    a) What kind of thing tells you?

You just pick up on the atmosphere. Tones of voices, looks on faces. You know if there is something wrong.

    b) How would you handle a situation which looks like it could go off?

My way is to approach them and say what's the problem? Ask anyone what's wrong and they quieten down once you start to talk to them or listen. You can't expect them to be quiet and well behaved all the time. They have off days and it can get heated.

    c) What about if it still turns nasty?

It depends on how nasty. I'll shout to stop if I see pushing and shoving. As of now, I shout and they stop. It's amazing the effect it has when a woman approaches and there's trouble. They tend to behave a bit better. An alarm situation--if in the distance and I couldn't involve, then I would press the alarm.

17)   **Would you please give me some examples of a "nasty situation"?**

Being confronted by an inmate with a weapon of some sort in his hands, bad in an area where we're outnumbered and no other officers are around.

    a) Have you ever been involved in any nasty encounters with inmates?

Yes, the riots at Christmas. There were only four of us. That was pretty horrendous. There were fires and a lot out of cells on the restricted. That was the worst situation and I did feel very vulnerable.

    b) What sort of thing?
    c) How often?

Nothing else on that scale but there have been some fairly minor ones. Only three or four, nothing life threatening.

d) Have you ever been in an unpleasant situation with other officers?

No.

e) What sort of thing?
f) How often?

18)   As an officer, how would you describe yourself?

I like to think I'm a good officer, very good judge of character. I don't label inmates as all the same, it's a mistake and people do. I'm a good listener. I think I do what I should be doing to the best of my ability I've not become cynical yet.

a) Do you think that management see you in the same way? (Is that how you would like them to see you?)

Yes, they've told me they do, yes. If I wasn't doing my job, I'd be told.

b) Do you think that the prisoners see you as you see yourself? (Is that how you would like them to see you?)

I think so, yes, I don't want them to think that they can pull anything over and they've learnt that they can't.

c) Do you think that the other officers see you as you see yourself? (Is that how you would like them to see you?)

I don't know, it's hard. I think they do, I think I've got the respect of other officers. They ask my opinions quite readily so they must approve of my methods. They feel they can ask me and if I don't know, I'll find it out.

19)   What do your family think about you doing this job?

They all think I'm mad. I've got three daughters who, when I came in, said "yes, we can see you doing it, but why?" It frightens them. They can't come to terms with the fact. They think I'm in constant danger. My husband also thinks I'm mad but he admires me for working here. He hasn't got a good opinion of prisoners, it's different there (he works at a category D prison). My parents are proud of me, I wanted to do it very badly.

a) Do they ever worry about your safety?

I think they do, they do worry.

20)   Do you ever worry about going anywhere or doing something that's part of the job?

Yes, oh yes.

21)   Are there any situations in prison which make you uncomfortable?

It's nothing to do with prisoners. One thing is the rubbing down of female visitors. I don't feel comfortable doing it, women and children under 16. I've rubbed down boys under 11, we have to rub them down. It's a bit wide open for ourselves. I'm not always happy on escorts. For some reason in prison, if I was allowed to rub down inmates, I wouldn't hesitate but doing a stranger off the streets, I don't feel competent doing it. It's not just me, not happy about it at all. It puts us in a difficult situation and until something goes wrong...

Escorts, they are dodgy. The escorts I have been on have been quite high security risk prisoners and in my opinion, I'm not experienced enough to have the ones I've been on. We are very, very lax on security with escorts and it is an area where we've got to be very strict. There should be a big sign saying you will be rub down searched. There is not enough information given to visitors.

22)   Do you ever worry about your safety?

Sometimes, I wouldn't be human if I didn't. Sometimes, there are certain situations that could be dodgy for example this morning I was on concourse patrol. I'm out there with up to 300 inmates at any time going off to work. I feel very threatened, it's so enclosed, there is no back up. The stand by bell but it's a very dodgy area.

23)   Do you ever feel fearful while you do the job?

No.

       a) How fearful?

24)   **Is that based on personal experience?**

It's the way I am. I'm not that way inclined, not a fearful person.

25)   **Do you feel that you have the support of other officers?**

For the most part. ("Their attitudes?") Yes.

       a) Supervisors?

Yes, definitely.

26)   **If you have a problem, does the prison provide you with anyone, or anything that can help you to work through it?**

We have a care team but I couldn't tell you who's on it. There's an area where they fall short but certain people I could go to with my problems. Namely, the P.O., certain people you can talk to for help or advice with any problem.

       a) Have you ever taken up this service?

No. ("Were you not approached after the riot?") We were burnt and it was extremely traumatic and not once did someone ask "are you all right?" Tornado, the care team came in but whenever there is a bad situation, they pay more attention to the C & R teams' counselling. Not that they don't need it, they do. But we were forgotten about. Not everybody feels they should ask, they should come to you.

       b) Would you ever take it up?

If I needed it, yes, oh yes. That includes talking for weeks or having nightmares. I talked to someone from a care team elsewhere. It should have come from here.

27)   **Would you say that you feel a part of the system?**

Yes, I do, yes.

28)   **Do you think that you have been accepted here?**

Yes, by and large I do, it's taken a while but yes.

29)   **Do you think that you have made any difference here?**

I'd like to think I have. I've been told I have, a calming. My report says I'm good for staff morale which is great. I have a good attitude to life and the job in general, a good sense of humour.

30)   **How do you feel about talking about things like this?**

Fine.

31)   **Do you want to add anything to what you've said so far?**

If it's relevant? It relates to, there's not enough on the job training. As far as I'm concerned, the course doesn't prepare you. I'd worked here for eighteen months prior. There should be more training and talking about things. The main thing is that there is not enough follow on information. Not everybody does know enough after college.

32)   **Is there anything that you want to ask me?**

No.

APPENDIX THREE: FEAR IN PROBATIONARY CONSTABLES

Police officer questionnaire with codes

1)   How long have you been an officer? **months**

2)   Would you please describe your day to day work for me?

3)   What do you feel about the people that you deal with on a regular basis? {profl. and public} **very good to very bad, 1 to 5 (3 = average, OK,/depends)**

4)   What do you think of them? {professional and public} **very well to very poorly, 1 to 5 (3 = average, OK, depends)**

5)   Do you generally get on with them? **yes/no**

6)   Do you have any problems with them? **yes/no**
     [a) What sort?
     b) Do they happen regularly? **(monthly as cut off point)**
     c) Would you say that {x,y,z} was a minor, average or severe problem?] **1 to 3**

7)   How many colleagues do you work with on a daily basis?

8)   Do you feel part of a team? **yes/no**

9)   Do you have confidence in those with whom you work? I don't want any names. **Very: 1; average: 2; not really or some: 3 and not at all, 4.**

10)   What do you think of the other members of staff? **very good to very bad, 1 to 5 (3 = average, OK, depends)**

11)   Do you generally get on with them? **yes/no**

12)   Do you have any problems with them? **yes/no**
     [a) What sort?
     b) Do they happen regularly?
     c) Would you say that {x,y,z} was a minor, average or severe problem?] **1 to 3**

13)   Do you ever feel worried about going anywhere or doing something as part of your job? **yes/no**
     [a) What worries you?
     b) How much does it worry you?
     c) When?
     d) When is it worst?
     e) Where are you the most worried?
     f) What do you do to feel less worried?
     g) Is there anything that could be done to make you feel less worried?] **yes/no**

14)   Do you ever feel scared? **yes/no**
     [a) What scares you?
     b) Do you feel generally fearful, or is it more specific?
     c) How much does it scare you? **1 to 5 (aware to terrified)**
     d) When?
     e) When is it worst?
     f) Where are you the most scared?
     g) What do you do to feel less scared?
     h) Is there anything that could be done to make you feel less scared?] **yes/no**

15)   Since you've been in the job, have there been any particular events or incidents that stick in your mind? **yes/no**

16)   What was it about that/those event(s) that make(s) you remember it/them?

17)   Would you describe it/them to me in a bit more detail?

18)   What did you feel during {x,y,z}?

19)   And how did you feel after {x,y,z}?

20) [If apt] Do you feel that you needed any support after {x,y,z}? **yes/no**
      a)   Did you get the support that you needed?
      yes/no (no includes because it came from elsewhere)
      b)   Where did that support come from?
      c)   How do you feel about taking up {p,q,r} for support?
      d)   Do you think that there are other places from where you could have got support?
      [d.ii) Why didn't you take it/them up?
      e)   Should there be other places from where you could have got support?
      f)   How would you feel about taking up support offered?
      very happy to very unhappy 1 to 5

21)   Can you imagine (other) situations in which you would need some kind of support?
      yes/no
      a)   What kind of situation(s)?
      b)   Do you think that you would get the support that you needed? **yes/no**
      b)   From where would that support come?
      c)   How would you feel about taking up {p,q,r} for support?
      d)   Do you think that there are other places from where you could get support?
      [d.ii) Why wouldn't you take it/them up?
      e)   Should there be other places from where you could get support?
      f)   How would you feel about taking up the support offered?

22)   How do you feel about talking about things like this?

23)   Do you want to add anything to what you've said so far?

24)   Is there anything that you want to ask me?

Closing.

Sample police officer questionnaire

1)   **How long have you been an officer?**

On division, five months. (Female officer).

2)   **Would you please describe your day to day work for me?**

It varies really, each day you go in and you're not totally sure. Being a probationer, you've got to do something to get process stuff out and play with traffic. In the vehicles, you tend to do reporting burglaries, crimes. Yesterday, up on the vehicle, got to more major calls. But also you get these enquiries sent from the DVU or the DVLA we have lots of enquiries about whether people are still living there etc.. You have to take things as they come.

3)   **What do you feel about the people that you deal with on a regular basis?**

The people on the street, there are two kinds of people, no, 3. Those really happy to see you and those who hate your guts and those who just don't care. The Crown Prosecution Service, I've only been in contact with them three times and it was the same lawyer for two. Some can be quite helpful but the vast majority are doing the job to their advantage. I was kept in the dark on my first case and didn't tell me. There was lots of standing around going "what's going on?"

4)   **What do you think of them? {professional and public}**

I don't think much about them. The public are just the public. People you deal with, ones you see more regularly, you have a sort of relationship with. You stop and say "Hi" to them no matter how busy you are which is all right.

5)   **Do you generally get on with them?**

Yes.

6)   **Do you have any problems with them?**

Some of them have problems with me. I get a lot of abuse from young Black guys. Being Black in the job, 9 out of 10 times, I come across the small percentage who don't like the uniform. Black in Blue. Asian men are brilliant. They totally ignored me and the other officer walked off. It's not really a problem at the end of the day, if they want it done, they'll speak to you.

         [a) What sort?
         b) Do they happen regularly?
         c) Would you say that {x,y,z} was a minor, average or severe problem?]

7)   **How many colleagues do you work with on a daily basis?**

It varies, I don't know. On my team, sometimes there are four others parading sometimes, eight.

8)   **Do you feel part of a team?**

Not really, no. Partly it's because of the way things are [here with the satellite station] because we are cut off [there]. They have known each other for goodness knows how long and I joined the team three months ago. I'm an outsider coming in. They don't need me and I'm a bit of a burden because I'm a probationer who knows nothing. I'm new, I get to make the tea.

9)   **Do you have confidence in those with whom you work?**

Oh yes.

10)   **What do you think of the other members of staff?**

I don't see too many senior ranks up at (the satellite station) most of them stay here. I have a quite helpful sergeant. Raving mad but you can speak to him. But it's a bit worrying at times. As police officers, we look up to them all. They do their jobs well as people don't really know. We don't have too much to do with them, or they don't with me. ("Would you like to?") It would make the work easier and me more comfortable but I'm not too bothered. I can get by, but of course everyone wants to be accepted. Talk to me and be civil to me, help me when I need help and we can work together.

11)   **Do you generally get on with them?**

Yes.

12)   Do you have any problems with them?

        [a) What sort?

There is one guy that I think everyone has a problem with. I was made aware before I even joined the team. In fact, I was told we're the worst team. Told this beforehand so as much as I wanted to go in with an open mind... but one person in particular, no-one likes him except a few on the team. He's not subtle, makes a point of pointing out mistakes in public in a nasty way. I'd just done an accident report book, I took it upstairs, he slammed it down asking "where do I start?" and ripped it to shreds. Fair enough, but there are ways and means. You don't have to make me feel really small. But he wouldn't do that in front of inspectors or sergeants, but other P.C.'s.

        b) Do they happen regularly?

No, I hardly see him, the old sweat.

        c) Would you say that {x,y,z} was a minor, average or severe problem?]

It's minor. May not even be a problem. The attitude needs attention, the problem is with *him.*

13)   Do you ever feel worried about going anywhere or doing something as part of your job?

All the time, there is something new, I've not dealt with before.

        [a) What worries you?
        b) How much does it worry you?

Not very much, I don't get sent in alone. On my way down, I rack that person's brain or follow their lead.

        c) When?

If called to, call on radio, something like a fight or drugs or whatever, if it's new. I try to refer back to [College] and the white notes but it doesn't always come to you. People are very helpful. People always say if you don't know, ask. It's better than making a fool of yourself or anything.

        d) When is it worst?

I'm more worried at the more serious fighting or more disturbances. It's a different worry, will I get beaten up, will I have to draw my baton? It's momentary, if you know you are going to a call out that is trouble, adrenaline, you get worked up, hyped up but once the car stops, you forget, you get a situation and deal with it.

        e) Where are you the most worried?

In the car where you have time to think about what you are going in to.

        f) What do you do to feel less worried?

I don't, I just sit there and wait.

        g) Is there anything that could be done to make you feel less worried?]

I can reassure myself that there is always help. Always let people know where you are and everybody and the world and his wife will turn up, especially as [the next precinct] are poachers.

14) Do you ever feel scared?

        [a) What scares you?
sIt really scared me chasing a suspect.

        b) Do you feel generally fearful, or is it more specific?

It is specific. I was scared because I stopped and realised I was on the train tracks. Then the guy turned around and asked if I wanted the power off. I was scared then, afterwards, you stupid woman!

        c) How much does it scare you?

Again, the adrenaline was going. I'd never have caught him up but you run, you're part of it. You keep on going but it's a bit frightening to think you go into things without thinking about them.

d) When?

In retrospect, you realise it is not totally rational. You put yourself in danger. Then to avoid it, you're not in the job to get hurt. I don't intend to run down the train tracks again.

e) When is it worst?

In retrospect, when you realise the full danger. Something you've done, not had to do, but chose to do.

f) Where are you the most scared?

I don't like the dark so whenever suspects go into premises and you go round the back. I don't like the dark, never have so will be scared but you concentrate and do it. I don't think I've been sent around by myself as I'm new. However, I've had to prove my worth. I won't be accepted until I do dive in but they won't send me round there until I've proved myself and I'm only a "Doris".

g) What do you do to feel less scared?

I'm an Xian and so I have my trust in G-d. I do tend to say a quick prayer, it helps to calm me down and also, confidence in the officers around me. I try to be rational, I'm not the most rational person but I can be.

h) Is there anything that could be done to make you feel less scared?

I don't think so. Not really, except leaving but that's not what I want to do. Just carry a big torch with you.

15) **Since you've been in the job, have there been any particular events or incidents that stick in your mind?**

Lots of things. Every time something new, everything's exciting at the moment. I go home and it's really boring because we're all talking work. Domestic type situations.

16) **What was it about that/those event(s) that make(s) you remember it/them?**

I've always been the sort of person concerned about welfare. It's just, it doesn't distress me but I wonder how people can treat each other like that. I went to four yesterday. One, the wife had beaten him up, he'd done everything for her. The business was falling apart for her and she treated him... I don't understand people. We discussed it on the way back to the station. I can't take a board on it, it would do your head in. I get a bit upset to think people can be so cruel. I've learnt to deal with it as I used to work with abused children in a children's home.

17) **Would you describe it/them to me in a bit more detail?**

18) **What did you feel during {x,y,z}?**

My pager went off half way through, the vibrations. I go into good Samaritan mode. At one point, I wanted to be a Counsellor. I'm a people's person, I try to appeal to their better sides. When I'm not laughing, I have got quite a sad sense of humour.

19) **And how did you feel after {x,y,z}?**

Sorry for the guy. The situation he had put himself into. His first marriage was exactly the same. It seemed apparent that he was lonely, very large and because of physical experience, I can see he doesn't fit in. You do feel a bit sorry for him, he's a genuine guy and now his family's world is being torn apart again and there is yet another child in the middle of it. But, after the initial think about it, I just switch off.

20) [If apt] Do you feel that you needed any support after {x,y,z}?

No.

a) Did you get the support that you needed?
b) Where did that support come from?
c) How do you feel about taking up {p,q,r} for support?
d) Do you think that there are other places from where you could have got support?

[d.ii) Why didn't you take it/them up?

e) **Should there be other places from where you could have got support?**

f) **How would you feel about taking up support offered?**

21) **Can you imagine (other) situations in which you would need some kind of support?**

a) **What kind of situation(s)?**

b) **Do you think that you would get the support that you needed?**

b) **From where would that support come?**

I don't know, I tend to be, I have a very close relationship with my mother and millions of brothers and sisters and there's my team. You do that and be comfortable because at the end of the day I can go home and off load it all. I do have someone to talk to, even if I do have to just laugh about it. I've never been in a situation so stressful that I've come away from it upset or down hearted.

c) **How would you feel about taking up job related provision for support?**

It would be a good idea but I do have people I can talk to. I do know a few people who take things on board and you see the tension building up. They don't do anything about it. Just talking to someone is very, very good therapy. We recommend it to victims all the time. I don't see why we shouldn't take it on board ourselves.

22) **How do you feel about talking about things like this?**

23) **Do you want to add anything to what you've said so far?**

24) **Is there anything that you want to ask me?**

Officer style Categories

The following sheets contain a number of statements. For each statement, please circle the number that is the most appropriate for <u>you</u>.

1)   I take problems as they occur but above all stay out of trouble

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

2)   I see it as my responsibility to keep the peace, to protect citizens from criminals and to preserve the social order

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

3)   I believe that the law allows criminals to escape their just deserts through exploitation of loop-holes

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

4)   I prefer an arrest to a mediation

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

5)   I think that society is a shambles and that people dislike the truth

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

6)   I believe that the <u>most</u> important qualities of a police officer are honesty, patience and   understanding

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

7)   I take a qualified and long-term perspective in relation to policing

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

8)   I know residents and shop-keepers and spend time exchanging pleasantries and information about activities in the area

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

9)   I do just enough work to keep the sergeant happy

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

10)   I <u>used</u> to want promotion or specialisation

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

11)   Above all, I just want to avoid trouble

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

12)   I would like to find a civilised niche within police work

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

13)   I present myself as a professional and make my own decisions about what should and should not be done

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

14)   I feel that my relationship with the public is important

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

15)   I prefer working with people to fighting crime

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

16) **I am prepared to work long hours despite the disruption to my family life**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

17) **I think that it is better not to answer the telephone when possible as it always means more work**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

18) **My primary identification is with the police**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

19) **I see the opportunity to exercise discretion as more important that the opportunity to use police powers**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

20) **I place more emphasis on detection of crime rather than prevention**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

21)   I would be interested in becoming a home beat officer

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

22)   I like to show red (in the book) and to make significant arrests involving serious crime

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

23)   I can cope with crime while maintaining a rapport with the community

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

24)   I place high value in individual rights and due process of the law

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

25)   I believe that "real" police work is the skilful application of techniques learnt on the street

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

26)   The job has ceased to be a vocation to me

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Very like me | | | Neither like me nor unlike me | | | Very unlike me |

27)   I am not very likely to consider a transfer to a specialist post

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Very like me | | | Neither like me nor unlike me | | | Very unlike me |

28)   I believe that enforcement of the law should be tempered with an understanding of human foibles

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Very like me | | | Neither like me nor unlike me | | | Very unlike me |

29)   I believe that I am responsible for what I do and want to do it right

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Very like me | | | Neither like me nor unlike me | | | Very unlike me |

30)   I like to give correct, sensible, balanced responses

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Very like me | | | Neither like me nor unlike me | | | Very unlike me |

31) I think that it is a dismal world and I feel a little cynical but I still want to stay on the job

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

32) I am disillusioned about the job and its purpose

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

33) I have stringent standards of success and failure

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

34) Family life is important to me, but I see promotion as the way to fulfil my responsibilities to my family

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

35) I believe in enforcing the law but am flexible enough to know when not to

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

36) I think that promotion and success in examinations is a sign of a good police officer

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

37) I am dedicated to the crusade against crime and disorder

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

38) My main goals in life are the achievement of promotion and higher rank

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

39) I am tied to the job by money

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

40) I apply the law with discretionary common sense

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

41) **My goal in life is to perform the police role through doing real police work**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

42) **I am conscious of the public relations image needed for the police service**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

43) **I feel that policing is "just a job"**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

44) **I believe that it is my responsibility as a professional to implement, and not to undermine, police policies**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

45) **I want to be considered a "good cop"**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

46)   I am happy doing uniformed patrol work as I see this as the core part of policing

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

47)   I would like to be a traditional "village police officer"

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

48)   It is a compliment to be known by other officers as "a good thief-taker"

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very like me			Neither like me nor unlike me			Very unlike me

Please check that you have not left out any pages or questions.

Thank you very much for taking part in this research.

Good luck with the rest of your time as a "probationer".

Joanna Adler

The following questions pertain to each of the styles:

Thief-taker	3, 4, 13, 16, 20, 22, 25, 33, 37, 41, 45, 48.
Service provider	2, 6, 7, 18, 24, 29, 30, 34, 36, 38, 42, 44.
Hired-officer	1, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 17, 26, 31, 32, 39, 43.
Diplomat cop	8, 14, 15, 19, 21, 23, 27, 28, 35, 40, 46, 47.

Categories of type of officer

Table A.3.1   Table to show the mean scores on each of the scales of officer style.
The scores range from 1 to 7 where 1 is "very like me", 4 is "neither like nor unlike me" and 7 is "very unlike me".

Subject No.	Thief-taker	Service-provider	Hired-officer	Diplomat-cop
1	2.83	2.83	5.67	3.08
2	3.00	4.50	6.92	3.42
3	3.92	3.00	5.75	3.83
4	3.58	4.16	5.67	2.21
5	2.42	2.75	4.25	3.42
6	2.58	4.00	4.33	3.17
7	2.58	3.75	4.67	3.67
8	2.75	2.50	5.83	3.08
9	3.25	3.50	5.83	2.83
10	1.67	3.42	5.67	2.00
11	3.33	3.25	5.67	2.33
12	2.08	3.58	4.92	3.42
13	2.00	3.75	6.25	2.75
14	3.25	2.58	5.17	3.33
15	2.42	3.92	5.42	3.42
16	4.00	4.42	5.58	4.25
17	2.75	3.50	6.42	3.33
18	3.92	3.17	3.50	3.58
19	2.83	3.92	4.25	3.50
20	2.42	3.67	4.58	2.83
21	3.50	3.58	3.83	3.83
22	2.55	3.00	2.42	3.64
23	3.75	3.83	3.67	3.51
24	2.42	2.92	3.42	3.67
25	3.17	3.67	3.92	4.08
26	2.25	3.92	6.17	3.25
27	3.25	3.75	5.58	2.08
28	2.67	3.83	4.75	3.83
29	3.00	3.42	5.83	3.17
30	2.92	3.67	5.27	2.75
31	4.58	3.00	5.75	4.08
32	1.50	4.67	3.08	3.50
33	2.33	3.92	5.83	2.83
34	3.33	2.42	5.17	3.75
35	2.35	3.83	4.63	3.58

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND REFERENCES

Adams, S. (1970) *Staff Perceptions of Inmate Characteristics: Implications for correctional progress.* Washington DC: Department of Corrections Report, 26.

Adler J. R. (1993) *The Effects of Prison on Prisoners: Thesis submitted for the Mphil examination in Criminology.* Selwyn College: University of Cambridge.

Adler, J. R.(1994) *Fear in Prisons.* London: Prison Reform Trust Occasional Paper.

Adler, J. R. (1995a) "Asking the turtle: Methodological issues in Prison Based Research." *Proceedings of the British Psychological Society* 3, 1, 22.

Adler, J. R. (1995b) "Fear in prisons." *Proceedings of the British Psychological Society* 3, 1, 22.

Adler, J. R.(1996) "Fear and Safety in Probationary Constables." *Issues in Criminological and Legal Psychology* Eds. Clark, N. K. and Stephenson, G. M. 25.

Alpert, G. P. (1984) "The Needs of the Judiciary and Misapplications of Social Research: The case of female guards in men's prisons." *Criminology* 22, 3, 441-456.

Alpert, G. P. and Crouch, B. M. (1991) "Cross-Gender Supervision, Personal Privacy, and Institutional Security: Perceptions of jail inmates and staff." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 18, 3, 304-317.

Becker, A. (1975) "Women in Corrections: A process of change." *Resolutions* 1, 19-21.

Behr, T. A. and Newman, J. E. (1978) "Job Stress, Employee Health, And Organizational Effectiveness: A Facet analysis, Model and Literature Review." *Personnel Psychology* 31, 665-699.

Betz, M. and O'Connell, L. (1989) "Work Orientations of Males and Females: Exploring the Gender Socialization Approach." *Sociological Inquiry* 59, 3, 318-330.

Biemer, C. (1977) "The Role of the Female Mental Health Professional in a Male Correctional Setting." *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare* 4 882-887.

Black, J. (1993) "The Prison Service and Executive Agency Status --Her Majesty's Prisons plc?" *The International Journal of Public Sector Management* 6, 6, 27-41.

Bolton, N.; Smith, F. V.; Heskin, K. J. and Banister, P. A. (1976) "Psychological Correlates of Long-Term Imprisonment." *British Journal of Criminology* 16, 38 - 47.

Bondeson, U. V. (1989) *Prisoners in Prison Societies.* New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Bonner, R. L. and Rich, A. R. (1992) "Cognitive Vulnerability and Hopelessness among Correctional Inmates: A state of mind model." *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation* 17, 113-122.

Bonta, J. and Gendreau, P. (1990) "Rexamining the Cruel and Unusual Punishment of Prison Life." *Law and Human Behavior* 14, 347-372.

Bonta, J. and Gendreau, P. (1991) "Boats Against the Current: A rebuttal." *Law and Human Behavior* 15, 563-565.

Bottoms, A. E. (1977) "Reflections on the Renaissance of Dangerousness." *Howard Journal* 16, 70-96.

Boudouris, J. (1988) "The Politics of Research Revisited." *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services and Rehabilitation* 13, 183-192.

Bowersox, M. S. (1981) "Women in Corrections: competence, competition, and the social responsibility norm." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 8, 4, 491-199.

Bowker, L. (1980) *Prison Victimization.* New York: Elsevier North Holland.

Box, S. (1971) *Deviance, Reality and Society.* London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Briefing 74 (See Prison Service).

Brown, R. J.(1996) Personal Communication.

Bryn Jones, C. (1996--personal communications from Home Office) (Unpublished Report for Criminal Justice Studies) *A Woman's Place... Cross Sex Postings and Problems of Acceptance in the Prison Service.*

Bukstel, L. H. and Kilmann, P. (1980) "Psychological Effects of Imprisonment on Confined Individuals." *Psychological Bulletin* 88, 469-493.

Chapman, J. R.; Minor , E. K.; Rieker, P.; Mills, T. L. and Bottum, M. (1983) *Women employed in Corrections.* Washington D.C.: US Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Clayton, M (1995) *Male/Female Working Relationships in Five Prison Service Establishments.* Kent: Psychological Services.

Clemmer, D. (1940) *The Prison Community.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Cohen, S. and Taylor, L. (1981) *Psychological Survival.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Coid, J. (1991) "Interviewing the aggressive patient." In Corney, R. (Ed.) *Developing Communication and Counselling Skills.* London: Tavistock/Routledge.

Cooke, D. J. (1989) "Containing Violent Prisoners: an analysis of the Barlinnie special unit." *British Journal of Criminology* 29, 2, 129-143.

Cooke, D. J.; Baldwin, P. J. and Howison, J. (1990) *Psychology in Prisons.* London: Routledge.

Cooley, D. (1993) "Criminal Victimization in Male Federal Prisons." *Canadian Journal of Criminology* 35, 4, 479-495.

Cooper, C. and Livingston, M. (1991) "Depression and Coping Mechanisms in Prisoners." *Work and Stress* 5, 149-154.

Cormier, B. M. (1975) *The Watcher and The Watched.* New York: Tundra.

Crawford, A. (1986) *The Second Islington Crime Survey.* Middlesex: Centre for criminology, Middlesex University.

Cullen, F. T.; Lutze, F. E.; Link, B. G. and Lemming, T. (1983) "Paradox in Policing: A Note on Perceptions." *Journal of Police Science and Administration* 11, 457-462.

Cullen, F. T.; Lutze, F. E.; Link, B. G. and Travis-Wolfe, N. (1989) "The Correctional Orientation of Prison Guards: Do officers support rehabilitation?" *Federal Probation* 53, 1, 33-42.

Ditchfield, J. (1990) *Control in Prisons: A review of the literature.* London: HMSO.

Dobash, R. E. and Dobash, R. P. (1984) "The Nature and Antecedents of Violent Events." *British Journal of Criminology* 24, 3, 269-288.

Dothard v Rawlinson, (1977) 433 U.S. 321.

DPF2 (1994) *Equal Opportunities in the Prison Service: Working in Cross Postings.* London: HM Prison Service.

Enterkin, J. (1995) personal communications between Jill Enterkin, her supervisor, Professor A. Bottoms and the author.

Etzion, D. (1984) "Moderating Effects of Social Support on the Stress Burnout Relationship." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 69, 615-622.

Evershed, S. (1987) "Special Unit C Wing HMP Parkhurst." in Bottoms, A. E. and Light, R. (eds.) (1987) *Problems of Long Term Imprisonment.* Hampshire: Gower Publishing Company.

Farnworth, L. (1992) "Women Doing a Man's Job: Female prison officers working in a male prison." *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology* 25, 278-296.

Fattah, E. A. (1991) *Understanding Criminal Victimization.* Scarborough: Prentice-Hall cited in Cooley, D. (1993) "Criminal Victimization in Male Federal Prisons." *Canadian Journal of Criminology* 35, 4, 479-495.

Figgie, H. E. (1980) *The Figgie Report on Fear of Crime: America Afraid.* Ohio: ATO Inc..

Fleisher, M. S. (1989) *Warehousing Violence: Frontiers of Anthropology Volume 3.* London: Sage.

Flynn, E. E. (1982) "Women as Criminal Justice Professionals: A challenge to change tradition." in Rafter, N. H. & Stanko, E. A. (Eds.) (1982) *Judge, Lawyer, Victim , Thief: Women , gender roles and criminal justice.* Northeastern University Press.

Fry, LJ and Glaser, D (1987) "Gender Differences in Work Adjustment of Prison Employees." *Journal of Offender Counselfing, Services and Rehabilitation* 12, 39-52.

Gallagher, E. M. (1990) "Emotional, Social and Physical Health Characteristics of Older Men in Prison." *International Journal of Aging and Human Development* 31, 251-265.

Gardner, R. (1981) "Guard Stress." *Corrections Magazine* October, 7-14.

Genders, E. and Player, E. (1989) *Race Relations in Prison.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Gerstein, L. H.; Topp, C. G. and Correll, G. (1987) "The Role of the Environment and Person When Predicting Burnout Among Correctional Personnel." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 14, 3, 352-369.

Gibbs, J. J. (1991) "Environmental Congruence and Symptoms of Psychopathology: A further exploration of the effects of exposure to the jail environment." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 18, 351-374.

Goffman, E. (1961) *Asylums. Essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates.* New York: Doubleday.

Gomme, I. (1988) "The Role of Experience in the Production of fear of Crime: A Test of a Causal Model". *Canadian Journal of Criminology* 30, 1, 67-76.

Goodstein, L. and Wright, K. N. (1989) "Inmate Adjustment to Prison." in Goodstein, L. and MacKenzie, D. L. (eds.) (1989) *The American Prison: Issues in research and policy.* New York: Plenum Press.

Graham, C. (1981) "Women are Succeeding in Male Institutions". *American Correctional Association Monographs* 1, 27-36.

Grapendaal , M. (1990) "The Inmate Subculture in Dutch Prisons." *British Journal of Criminology,* 30, 341-357.

Gudjonsson, G. H. (1984) "Fear of "Failure" and "Tissue Damage" in Police Recruits, Constables, Sergeants, and Senior Officers." *Personality and Individual Differences* 5, 2, 233-236.

Gudjonsson, G. H. and Adlam, K. R. C. (1982) "Factors Reducing Occupational Stress in Police Officers: Senior Officers' View." *The Police Journal* 55, 365-369.

Heskin, K. J.; Bolton, N. and Smith, F. V. (1973) "Measuring the Attitudes of Prisoners by the Semantic Differential." *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology* 12, 73-77.

Hindelang, M.; Gottfredson, M. R. and Garofalo, J. (1978) *Victims of Personal Crime: an Empirical Foundation of a Theory of Personal Victimization.* Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing.

Home Office (1984) *Managing the Long Term Prison System: The report of the Control Review Committee.* London: HMSO.

Home Office (1991) *Custody, Care and Justice.* London: HMSO.

Home Office (1993) *Anti bullying pack.* London: HMSO.

Horne, P. (1985) "Female Correction Officers." *Federal Probation* 59, 3, 46-54.

Howard League for Penal Reform (1996) "The Prison Population in 1995/96." *Fact Sheet 20* (Statistics Derived from the Offenders and Corrections Unit, RSD).

Hughes, G. V. and Zamble, E. (1993) "A Profile of Canadian Correctional Workers" *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 37, 2, 99-113.

Hughes, J. A. (1990) *The Philosophy of Social Research.* (2nd Ed.) Harlow: Longman.

Irwin, J. (1980) *Prisons in Turmoil.* Boston: Little, Brown and Company Ltd..

Jacobs, J. (1977, 1983) *Stateville--The penitentiary in mass society.* London: University of Chicago Press.

Johnson, R. (1987) *Hard Time: Understanding and reforming the prison.* Pacific Grove: Brooks-Cole Publishing Company.

Jorgensen, J. D.; Hernandez, S. H. and Warren R. C. (1986) "Addressing the Social Needs of Families of Prisoners: A tool for inmate rehabilitation." *Federal Probation* 50, 47-52.

Jupp, V. (1989) *Methods of Criminological Research.* London: Unwin Hyman.

Jurik N (1985) "Individual and Organizational Determinants of Correctional Officer Attitudes Toward Inmates." *Criminology* 23, 523-39.

Jurik, N. (1988) "Striking a Balance: Female Correctional Officers, Gender Role Stereotypes, and male prisons." *Sociological Inquiry* 58, 3, 318-330.

Jurik, N. C.; Halembra, G. J.; Musheno, M. C. and Boyle, B. V. (1987) "Educational Attainment, Job Satisfaction and the Professionalization of Correctional Officers." *Work and Occupations* 14, 1, 106-125.

Keane, C. (1995) "Victimization and Fear: Assessing the role of offender and offence." *Canadian Journal of Criminology* 37, 3, 431-453.

Kissel, P. & Katsampes, P. (1980) "The Impact of Women Corrections Officers on the Functioning of Institutions Housing Male Inmates." *Journal of Offending Counselling Services and Rehabilitation.* 4, 313-311.

Lawrie, L. (1995) *Socialisation of Police Probationers and their Preferred Policing Styles.* University of Kent at Canterbury: PhD thesis.

Learmont, J., General Sir (1995) *Review of Prison Service Security in England and Wales and the Escape from Parkhurst Prison on Tuesday 3rd January 1995.* Cm 3020 London: HMSO.

Lennon, M. C. and Rosenfeld, S. (1992) "Women and Mental Health: The interaction of job and family conditions." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 33, 4, 316-327.

Liebling, A. and Krarup, H. (1992) *Suicide Attempts in Male Prisons: A report submitted to The Home Office.*

Liebling, A. (1993) Notes and lecture materials from MPhil. course: *Prisons*--Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge.

MacCorquodale, P. and Jenson, G. (1993) "Women in the Law: Partners or tokens?" *Gender and Society* 7, 4, 582-593.

MacKenzie, D. L. (1987) "Age and Adjustment to Prison: Interaction with attitudes and anxiety." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 14, 427-447.

MacKenzie, D. L. and Goodstein, L. (1985) "Long-term Incarceration Impacts and Characteristics of Long-term Offenders: An empirical analysis." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 12, 395-414.

Martin J. P. and Webster, D. (1971) *The Social Consequences of Conviction.* London: Heinemann.

Mason, P.(1996) Work in Progress to Calculate Outcome Targets for Drugs Rehabilitation Programmes.

Mathiesen, T. (1965) *The Defences of the Weak.* London: Tavistock.

Mathiesen, T. (1990) *Prison on Trial: A critical assessment.* London: Sage.

Mayhew, P. and Matthews (1989) *The 1988 British Crime Survey, H.O.R.P.U. study 111.* London: HMSO.

McAllister, D. F. and Little, D. J. (1989) *A Right Liberty.* London: HMSO.

McCorkle, R. C. (1992) "Personal Precautions to Violence in Prison." *Criminal Justice and Behavior,* 19, 160-173.

McDermott, K. and King, R. (1988) "Mind Games: Where the action is in prisons." *British Journal of Criminology,* 28, 357-377.

Megargee, E. I. (1982) "Psychological Determinants and Correlates of Criminal Violence." in Wolfgang, M. E. & Weiner, N. A. (Eds.) *Criminal Violence.* California: Sage.

Meisenhelder, T. M. (1985) "An Essay on Time and the Phenomenology of Imprisonment." *Deviant Behavior* 6, 39-59.

Morris, N. and Hawkins, G. (1970) *The Honest Politician's Guide to Crime Control.* London: The University of Chicago Press.

Morris, R. (1976) *Prisons.* London: Batsford Press.

Patterson, B. L. (1992) "Job Experience and Perceived Job Stress among Police, Correctional, and Probation/Parole Officers." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 19, 260-285.

Pelham, P. W. (1993) "The Idiographic Nature of Human Personality: Examples of the Idiographic Self-Concept." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 64, 665-677.

Pelissier, B. (1991) "The Effects of a Rapid Increase in a Prison Population: A pretest and postest study." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 18, 427-447.

Penal Affairs Consortium (1996) *Prisons--Some Current Developments* London: PAC.

Pendleton, M. Stotland, E. Spiers, P. and Kirsh, E. (1989) "Stress and Strain among Police, Firefighters and Government Workers: A Comparative Analysis." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 16, 196-210.

Perry-Jenkins, M.; Seery, B. and Crouter, A. C. (1992) "Linkages between women's provider-role attitudes, psychological well-being, and family relationships." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 16, 3, 311-329.

Personnel Planning Group (1995) *Equal Opportunities in the Prison Service: Progress Report, 1st October 1993-31st March 1995.* London: HM Prison Service.

Player, E. (1996) *Talk Assessing the Performance of RAPt Given to the Prison Service Research Seminar Relating to Health* London: Dolphin Hotel, January 1996. (Later published as Research Findings, 31--HORPU with C. Mason.)

Porporino, F. J. (1983) *Coping Behavior in Prison Inmates: Description and Correlates.* Canada: Ph. D. Thesis for Queen's University.

Prison Officers' Association (1987) *The Case Against Crown Immunity in Penal Establishments.* London: Prison Officers Association.

Prison Service (1994) *Briefing* 74, 6th June 1994. London: HMSO.

Roberts, J. V. and Jackson, M. (1991) "Boats Against the Current: A Note on the Effects of Imprisonment." *Law and Human Behavior* 15, 557-562.

Rosenbaum, M. J. and Blake, R. R. (1955) "Volunteering As a Function of Field Structure." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 50, 193-196.

Rowe, A. (1983) "Race, Age and Conformity in Prison." *Psychological Reports* 53, 445-446.

Sapsford, R. (1983) *Life Sentence Prisoners: Reaction, response and change.* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Silverman, M. and Vega, M. (1990) "Reactions of Prisoners to Stress as a Function of Personality and Demographic Variables." *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 34, 187-196.

Storch, J. E. and Panzarella, R. (1996) "Police Stress: State-Trait Anxiety in Relation to Occupational and Personal Stressors." *Journal of Criminal Justice,* 24, 2, 99-107.

Sykes, G. M. (1958, 1965) *The Society of Captives.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Szockyj E (1989) "Working in a Man's World: Women Correctional Officers in an Institution for Men." *Canadian Journal of Criminology* 31, 3, 319-328.

Thornton, D. M. (1987) "Assessing Custodial Adjustment." in McGurk, B. J.; Thornton, D. M. and Williams, M. (eds.) (1987) *Applying Psychology to Imprisonment: Theory and practice.* London: HMSO.

Toch, H (1972) *Violent Men: An inquiry into the psychology of violence.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Toch, H. (1976) *Peacekeeping: Police, Prisons, and Violence.* Toronto: Lexington Books (This is the same book as that below, but they were used at different times, thus both have been cited).

Toch, H. (1977) *Police, Prisons, and the Problem of Violence.* Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Toch, H. (1992, 1979) *Living in Prison: The ecology of survival.* Maryland: American Psychological Association.

Toch, H.; Adams, K. and Grant, J. D. (1989) *Coping: Maladaptation in prisons.* New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Van Voorhis, P.; Cullen, F. T.; Link, B. G. & Travis Wolfe, N. (1991) "The Impact of Race and Gender on Correctional Officers' Orientation to the Integrated Environment". *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 28, 4, 472-500.

Violanti, J. M. and Aron, F. (1995) "Police Stressors: Variations in Perception Among Police Personnel." *Journal of Criminal Justice,* 23, 3, 287-294.

Walmsley, R.; Howard, E. and White, S. (1992) *The National Prison Survey 1991: Main Findings.* London: HMSO.

Ward, D (1986) "Control strategies for problem prisoners in American penal systems." unpublished, cited in Fleisher, M. S. (1989) *Warehousing Violence: Frontiers of Anthropology Volume 3.* London: Sage.

Warr, M. (1984) "Fear of Victimization: Why Are Women and the Elderly More Afraid?" *Social Science Quarterly* 65, 3, 681-702.

Willerton, C & Patterson, P (1995) *Study of Women in Prison Officer Grades.* Management Consultancy Service, Reference M044.

Woodcock, J. Sir (1994) *Report of the Enquiry into the Escape of Six Prisoners from the Special Secure Unit at Whitemoor Prison, Cambridgeshire on Friday 9th September 1994.* Cm 2741 London: HMSO.

Woolf, H. K., Right Honourable, Lord Justice and Tumin, S. His Honour, Judge (1991) *Prison Disturbances April 1990: Report of an inquiry.* Cm 1456 London: HMSO.

Wright, K. N. (1989) "Race and Economic Marginality in Explaining Prison Adjustment." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 26, 67-89.

Wright, K. N. (1991) "The Violent and Victimized in the Male Prison." *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation* 16, 1-25.

Zamble, E. (1992) "Behavior and Adaptation in Long-Term Prison-Inmates: Descriptive longitudinal results." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 19, 409-425.

Zamble, E. and Porporino, F. (1988) *Coping Behaviour and Adaptation in Prison Inmates.* New York: Springer-Verlag.

Zamble, E. and Porporino, F. (1990) "Coping, Imprisonment and Rehabilitation: Some data and their implications." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 17, 53-70.

Zimbardo, P. G.; Haney, C.; Banks, W. C. and Jaffe, D. (1973) "A Pirandellian Prison." *The New York Times Magazine* 8th April, 38-60.

Zimmer, L (1987) "How Women Reshape the Prison Guard Role." *Gender and Society* 1, 4, 415-431.

Zimmer, L E. (1986) *Women Guarding Men.* London: University of Chicago Press.

Zupan, L. S. (1986) "Gender-related differences in correctional officers' perceptions and attitude." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 14, 4, 349-361.