

VOLUME VII No. 25

OCTOBER 1967

PRISON SERVICE JOURNAL*Editorial Office:*

ROOM 10, HEPBURN HOUSE, MARSHAM STREET, LONDON S.W.1

CONTENTS

- | | | |
|----|---|----------------------|
| 2 | ASPECTS OF REMAND CENTRE REPORTING | <i>R. Cockett</i> |
| 11 | PENAL AND TOTAL INSTITUTIONS | <i>E. Clay</i> |
| 14 | WHO SWINGS THE PENDULUM | <i>W. J. Booth</i> |
| 26 | A TEACHER'S VIEW OF VOCATIONAL TRAINING
WITHIN A PENAL ESTABLISHMENT | <i>S. F. Johnson</i> |
| 30 | CONTRIBUTORS | |
| 31 | TRAINING—STAFF COLLEGE AND THE CRISIS | <i>N. A. Jepson</i> |
| 41 | WET COLD OR WET WARM | <i>P. J. Roney</i> |
| 44 | ROLE CONFLICT IN PRISON | <i>W. Perrie</i> |

Views expressed by contributors are their own personal opinions and are not necessarily those of their official departments

Aspects of Remand Centre Reporting

R. COCKETT

IN PREPARATION for a mixed conference on remand centres held at the Staff College late in 1964 a report entitled "Some Comments on Remand and Observation Centres" was issued. Originally drafted in 1959 it had, by 1964, in some respects slightly historical significance rather than immediate relevance. Informing the document is an implied—and occasionally stated—assumption that courts are very jealous of their own autonomy and consequently negativistic in their attitude towards what is referred to as "unsolicited advice".

Of course it is a cornerstone of individual freedom in this country that the judiciary is independent of the executive. It is also true that all kinds of well-meaning individuals and organisations exercise themselves from time to time in telling both judiciary and executive how to carry out their functions. It may not necessarily

follow that advice offered is always good; nor that when it is well-founded it is never heeded.

It has never seemed to me proper to regard the psychologist as purveying a necessarily more important or more significant point of view about individuals than does anyone else. He represents a unique point of view certainly, along with other specialists and colleagues. There are some limiting cases where he may require to act or advise exceptionally from his own special angle; but in the generality of cases he is to be regarded as participating in and contributing to the efficient discharge of the functions of the institution he is placed in. He brings his special training, qualifications and experience to bear on this, in concert with colleagues. I think this is paralleled by another situation, namely, the relationship between the remand centre and the courts. As with the psychologist

vis-à-vis the remand centre, so the remand centre *vis-à-vis* the courts. In both cases, the two parts participate in a common, unitary function.

It has been argued that, ideally, all individuals committed to remand in custody ought to be looked at in detail and reported on. In the interests of expediting court processes this has been modified, together with some changes as to the sources of some information supplied to courts. The consequences of the Streatfeild committee's recommendations were not satisfactory in the eyes of many courts who had come to regard Ashford's work as informative and helpful; with the result that we continue to afford a reporting service on request over and above that statutorily required. Currently this requested service concerns upwards of 1,000 cases per year, mainly to magistrates' courts, but also to a number of higher courts. Changes have thus been of two kinds: restrictive, by the recommendations of the Streatfeild committee, and expansive, at the courts' request. The first kind were by official action from above, the second developed from court-remand centre interaction, out of working experience. This latter does, I think, underline the sense of common purpose already mentioned.

Courts, of course, have their own specific concerns in dealing with miscreants. Over the whole

array of varied offences and degrees of seriousness of misconduct that come before them, one can expect that at either end of the scale the appropriate actions from the courts' point of view are obvious. They may also be of overriding importance in the interests of justice or of social security. Many minor misdeeds call for application of only minor sanctions; many serious crimes call for correspondingly heavy penalties. Where there is ground for debate and differentiation is likely to be in the middle range, and one may expect that it is with these middle-ground or less obvious cases, that the courts may seek further opinion. Here consideration of the individual may loom larger in influencing the decision than simple application of community sanctions. That is to say, this is the area where, provided there are sensible and intelligible alternative grounds on which to base decisions, it is reasonable and appropriate to question habitual or automatic sanctions. Such, for instance, as the "tariff" system of awards proportionate to culpability or gravity of offence; and what one may call the "sequential" system whereby the offender gets the sentence in a series next following that which he got last time. Essentially, I think that this is what our "by request" reporting service is about. It is, of course, important

to remember the proviso stated, that the alternative grounds on which to base decisions shall be sensible and intelligible. We deal at Ashford solely with the under-21 or pre-adult age group; in itself, by virtue of the customary solicitude of our society for the young, this adds some weight to the argument in favour of taking individual considerations fully into account wherever possible.

Given this general context, the kind of report appropriate to render has, I think, three essential parts. The first is *description*, constituting an account of the person, his equipment and capabilities, intellectual and emotional, his social and other circumstances, in so far as they may be relevant, and his use of and adaptation to them. The second part is *analysis*, that is, an attempt to see the offending behaviour in the light of the description, in order to try to explain or at least understand the behaviour. This should, if it is apposite, lead naturally to the third part, namely, *conclusions for action*, given a proper end in view.

In the matter of the end in view psychologists do not always appear to show a united front as to professional aims and responsibilities, and so perhaps sometimes confuse others. The British Psychological Society submitted a memorandum of evidence to the now defunct Royal Commission on the Penal System. It was subsequently berated

in a letter by a university lecturer in psychology for appearing "to be more concerned with the needs of the State", when "a psychologist's concern should be with the need of individuals". Truly, we are concerned with the needs of individuals; but individuals, with rare exceptions, have to live their lives within the context of a community, and so have to adapt to the community's necessary rules as the price for its protection and advantages. There is no society that makes no demands, or claims no sacrifices of individualistic whims. Consequently adaptation to the community's *mores* is as much a need of the individual as is the satisfaction of any impulse he may harbour. Undoubtedly he will suffer if he habitually preys on others' property and rights or holds their peace of mind to ransom.

For the psychologist reporting or advising in this setting ends are no different than for anyone else concerned with the erring individual's adaptation to adequate social living. He may, however, have specific proposals as regards means, and he may also be concerned to weigh the extent to which adaptation or adjustment is possible. And here he may well be concerned to urge the avoidance of contingent harm in the process of attempting good. The problem in reaching conclusions for action thus becomes: with a person

described as he has been, whose delinquent actions appear to be understandable in such terms and through such motives, what kind of disposal is best, what treatment is necessary in the interests of his personal and social adjustment?

But we must beware of interpreting "best" as "most radical". If we executed all our delinquents we would have no recidivist problem; but this is hardly appropriate. Drawing conclusions is, I think, a two-stage process: first, what *kind* of action is necessary? Second, how parsimonious can we be?

I suspect this is true for the concerns that are peculiarly those of the courts. I think it is also true for those like ourselves who are required to offer our professional views or advice for the courts' consideration. For the psychologist in particular it means first: what kind of treatment is necessary to enable the individual's adaptation—what can be envisaged as effective for the particular case? Second, the parsimony: from the social point of view how economical can we be? From consideration of the individual, how non-disruptive can we be—how little disruptive of his individual life? And, after all, the more disruptive, the bigger the resettlement problem.

Cast in these terms, it can immediately be seen that behind all reporting there must be

essentially questioning attitudes; questioning attitudes of the form: What evidence is there to indicate that such and such types of person are more likely to respond to treatment A or B or C, etc.? And, more individually, what features of this person and his circumstances are relevant pointers to his being able to respond to treatment A, B, etc.? Such questioning is clearly forward-looking, a point underlined by the Streatfeild committee in referring to "the fundamental difference between culpability and pursuing the other objectives of sentencing; namely, that where the court is seeking to reform, to deter or to protect, it is seeking to control future events rather than simply to pass judgement on past events".

I regard the psychologists at the remand centre as having basically two kinds of professional responsibility. Briefly stated, and without regard to relative importance, they are: (i) to advise and assist the community's representatives (Prison Service colleagues, the courts and other agencies) in the handling and treatment of cases; (ii) to provide what help is possible to further the individual's interest and to assist as far as we are able his processes of adjustment, adaptation, and his personal well-being.

To these ends the psychologist brings his professional skills, according to the circumstances and conditions of the individual cases met with and his own particular

bent without, necessarily, any overriding claims of expertise in the general field of delinquency and criminology.

So far I have been discussing what may be called matters of the general philosophy of remand centre work. Juxtaposed to these are what may be regarded as various problems of mechanics. I do not need to refer to all the multifarious administrative details of processing individuals through the centre. Nor, I think, is it necessary here to detail the various psychological instruments we use, except to say that we have to employ various screening devices in order to identify cases we ought to look at in more detail, and otherwise confine our specific attention to certain defined categories. This is for practical reasons of available staff and concentrating where we can contribute most effectively. I want to discuss three particular areas of general mechanics, all of which seem to me of crucial importance for the development of an effective service.

First, and in some respects simplest, is the practical problem of trying to reach an overall notion of what our population comprises and what happens to it. If one undertakes a simple population analysis, breaking down the population into types that may be administratively different, for instance, suitability report cases, previous custodial sentence cases,

SOM cases, one can arrive at important work load categories and, particularly, discover whether given categories are increasing or otherwise. This can, on occasion, provide data for forecasting if, for instance, it is linked with a parallel analysis of disposals or sentences. Thus, knowing the approximate contribution of the Metropolitan Police area to borstal historically, we ought to be able roughly to predict future borstal place requirements from trends in Ashford's population and trends in sentences awarded. We have in fact found fairly consistent characteristics in such simple population analyses. A little more remotely, and making certain further moderately safe assumptions, we tried to predict the number of cases that will be recalled to borstal annually under current conditions—a prediction relevant to our undertaking reporting for possible recall whilst on borstal licence—a function that the centre has recently taken over. It remains to be seen how inaccurate this turns out to be. This might be regarded as a simple application of data processing to immediate administrative or management problems; and obtaining the basic information from day-to-day material is quite within clerical competence under a little research-worker guidance. Process studies of this kind can often answer relevant practical questions. Of course, as we know, any service

provided tends to get fully used, e.g., detention centre places always seem to be in short supply; and perhaps there is a sort of Parkinsonian law at work here that may upset calculations if the centre provides more and better services. But I do not think this refutes the general point.

Again, we have checked our recommendations against what the courts have actually done in the cases concerned, and found in nine months of 1964, for instance, a 61 per cent agreement, with a slightly higher proportion of agreements (64 per cent) for those cases numbering 521, for whom the courts asked for our views. This proportion has tended to increase. One may regard this either as the extent to which our views are acceptable, or as a measure of the realism of our recommendations, according to one's viewpoint. I would guess it is an amalgam of both.

In another context, we have periodically reviewed the numbers of innocent cases that have suffered a period of remand at the centre. Obviously this can be a matter of serious social concern. A number of samples reveal reasonably gratifying results on this, proportions varying in discrete samples from 0.8 per cent to 2.7 per cent. In each sample the figure includes those where the case against the inmate was dismissed (presumably for lack of evidence) and those

actually found not guilty, who are usually a minority of the proportion.

Second as regards these areas of mechanics, we have, I think, a more general research responsibility, even though as yet we are very far from being able to meet it. I mentioned a little earlier that behind all reporting there must be essentially questioning attitudes. Researches, mostly of an operational kind, are the means of answering, so far as they can be answered, the questions involved. Provided careful collection and collation were done of data arising from examination of individuals, it would be possible through follow-up arrangements to facilitate better understanding and identification of, for instance, cases where detention centre treatment might be suitable, and where unsuitable. No doubt there are other equally significant questions we should be posing for enlightenment through research studies. But such activities presuppose careful collection of data and its subsequent scrutiny, calling for staff additional to those we already have. The remand centres, particularly the larger ones, are suitably placed in the system to undertake such work, and this might in due course yield valuable information as to the effectiveness of sentencing, particularly on different sorts of individual. Such research findings would still need

to achieve compatibility with considerations of justice in their implementation; but the basic research requirement is still almost wholly unfulfilled and belongs here, within the system. Psychologists clearly should be involved in this research function, as and when they are available, because some at least of the essential data needed would be obtained by the application of psychological instruments. Clearly, however, we can only meet this research demand if we have more people, because the aim would be defeated if we attempted it merely by switching staff from studying individuals, so reducing the amount and variety of information collected.

My third area of practical problems concerns communication. In slightly more leisurely days, both in borstal allocation work and in remand work in local prisons, it used to be regular practice to obtain reports on inmates from various sources before reports to court were prepared or allocation decisions finalised. As the volume of work pressed more and more heavily this practice gradually—or perhaps ultimately precipitately—fell into disuse.

There are some quite important problems of communication here. When Ashford was being planned we reverted to the practice of getting reports from the various

sources covered by the pages of F.1150, until the changes introduced following the acceptance of the Streatfeild committee recommendations. As our reporting functions increased, however, we would clearly have been left reporting largely in a vacuum had we not attempted to resume such report contacts. Time in itself poses a problem here, as even the postal service is not always what it used to be. And clearly it would be undesirable to try to get extra remand time in large numbers of cases for such a purpose. However, for those cases where we report we have reinstituted the system in a rather more limited way, so that we hear at least from police and probation service as far as possible. The study of the individual is then conducted in the light of background information and some details of the offence charged. Probation service opinion, too, is sometimes more informative via the telephone than by written report.

In contrast to having too little information, it is also possible to have too much. The trouble then is to try to reconcile contradictions, vastly different judgements about the same person or situation, and to decide how far, if at all, some early experiences are still relevant to the individual one is examining. These kinds of discrimination call

for judgement that comes only with experience, and this new staff have to acquire. It is clearly no help to relay to the court in a report a lot of detail and varied or contradictory information, when what it needs is the considered opinion of experienced people expressed in terms it can readily grasp and apply. This must clearly determine to a large extent the form in which conclusions and views are forwarded, and simplicity is probably the safest keynote.

We have been very conscious at Ashford of being the recipient and user of other people's information and views, and I think a little guilty in that this has largely been a one-way process. We have attempted to make a little recompense for this in at least one respect, although pressure on the clerical staff has interrupted the process at the moment. The Staff College report on the mixed conference late in 1964 referred to the lack of means of passing information to the probation service, whose members might well be able to make good use of it. Since a quarter or more of our inmates are placed on probation, it seems very reasonable to pass on any relevant and perhaps useful views there may be about them. We accordingly began the practice of forwarding to probation officers, for such cases, psychologists' reports where they had been prepared. This was in line

with the old established practice that probation officers receive psychologists' and social workers' reports from the allocation centre for cases they are to receive under borstal after-care supervision in due course.

Court personnel are also key people with whom we ought to have considerable two-way communication. Those who visit us seem favourably impressed by what we are trying to do and appear to appreciate our work. There is probably, however, a good deal of room for more liaison of this kind and for other methods of getting together. One would like to see some contacts by way of study groups, the sentencing conferences that are a developing practice, and so on. But all these things involve time which, though it is not in short supply in all prisons, is at a premium at the remand centre.

I have referred, though only rather sketchily, to these three practical aspects because they seem to me to underline something important. And here we really return to the general philosophy of remand centres. Besides achieving what is deemed to be the socially desirable end of separating the remand population from those people undergoing penal treatment, the remand centre should, I think, be considered in its func-

tional relationship to other social agencies dealing with the same population. The general reporting function of the centre is directed towards the courts, towards other penal (receiving) institutions—prisons, borstals, detention centres—and towards certain other social agencies, particularly the probation service. With the exception of borstal, these agencies are all associated with a region: probation officers serve courts, detention centres accept primarily from courts in their areas. Even in the case of borstal the local, regional feature retains its significance since the trainee usually returns after his training to be a responsibility of the local probation and after-care service. The link between detention centres and remand centres is as yet only tenuous, but exists in the sense that any reports prepared go forward to the detention centre with the inmate; and response to training received has to be considered when we have to report to court under the statutory provisions for previous custodial sentence cases.

Now it is the coming back of individuals to the centre from time to time that impresses on one's mind the fact that the remand centre in a particularly significant way also serves the region. A

sizable proportion of our population is not new to us, and it may be a still growing proportion. Of our 1964 total, 26 per cent had been with us before; in 1966, for a population which was itself 29 per cent greater, the proportion was 28.7 per cent. There are individuals who have come to the centre no less than five times in connection with successive offences, i.e. post-treatment reconvictions; and the number of those who have been twice with us must be quite considerable. With this kind of thing happening, one begins to feel that the centre is not just another institution of the Prison Department, but also has its roots in the local population. Area service is, I think, of the essence of the remand centre concept, and there is need for the establishment of more enduring links among the agencies of the area served. A felt and real cohesion that reaches beyond the Prison Service itself to courts, probation and other social services of the area would develop the relationship between the court and penal sides of the way society deals with its errant members. For indeed, the heart of all this is the people who inhabit the area—these are those whom all the social agencies exist to serve.

Penal and Total Institutions

E. CLAY

A TOTAL INSTITUTION can be described as an institution that confines the inmate population in living conditions 24 hours a day. It provides work, recreation, eating and sleeping in the confine of some area. The community are the same in place and role. The result of total confinement of people within an institution is that the institution directly meets all personal needs which are going to be required by all confined. To have a complete total institution, it would be necessary to cut off all outside contacts and the inmate population be subjected to the demands of the institution. It is impossible to have an institution completely cut off, because the institution itself has to depend upon outside contacts for its proper functioning.

Closed penal establishments are, by their nature, the nearest approach to full totality. In making a comparative study with other types of institution within the classification of "total", it is

necessary to recognise the institution falling within the category, such as mental hospitals and monasteries. To compare a penal institution with either a mental hospital or monastery and say they are similar is a bold statement, for the goals of each widely differ. On the one hand a penal population is an enforced one, while the other institutions are not completely enforced. Monasteries (although they have a prison-like existence) cannot be compared, for the monks themselves choose by vows to live their way of life. The nearest comparison is the mental hospital, for a vast number of their patients are obtained by order, and like prison, detained for the protection of society. However, today there are a growing number of people who enter mental hospitals on their own free choice because of mental illnesses which have grown with modern living and are treatable.

Being confined in total institutions, social relationships take on

a peculiar form, and there is a similarity of relationships both in prison and mental hospital. This may be due to the fact that in each institution there can be found a cross section of the inmate population. Both are subjected to security control and needs. In living together, they have a relationship with one another and the character type and degree of these social relationships depend on a wide variety of conditions. In both types of institutions, rules and regulations have to be applied to ensure the smooth running, and as a result, a barrier is developed between staff and inmates. The staff look upon the inmates as inferior beings, and therefore the role of inmates is subordinate and on the lowest level of the institution. All are classed the same, irrespective of the social status attained prior to admittance to the institution.

Social structure of staff is developed through grades and comprises of superior staff (non-uniformed) and subordinates (uniformed). Each grade develops and guards jealously, its own social status. All policies, orders and instructions setting out the way the institution will be run to achieve the desired aims, are passed downwards from the head of the institution through the various grades. This system creates problems of interpretation and communication thereby developing

a lack of the "personal touch", which adds to the individual losing his identity. The subordinate staff, who have the responsibility of giving the information to the inmate, are often misunderstood. Rules and regulations are enforced upon the inmates by the uniformed staff, with the result that officer/inmate relationships are often in conflict. The inmates look upon the subordinate staff as all that is evil in authority. There is no doubt that the officer in the prison and the nurse in the mental hospital find themselves in a buffer state, receiving the pressures placed upon them by senior members of the staff and inmates alike.

Inmates in both types of institution do have and share a similar kind of experience. Each on entering his respective institution loses his individual dependency. Loss of liberty and the taking away of personal clothing and effects, leads to a loss of identity. Contacts with the outside world are limited and inmates are fitted into the institution with numbers in place of names. Inmates are not seen by staff as having a structure. This helps to create the gap between inmates and staff, and rules of behaviour for staff and inmates forbid the gap to be closed especially among the prison community.

In general, total institutions have the smooth running of their units as their primary aim. The prison

inmate or mental patient is not accepted or tolerated as an equal with others of the institution and thereby controlled as such by the authorities. Many patients in the mental hospital submit with the hope of getting well. Some prison inmates submit to prison routine if it meets their needs. Others do not submit easily. Anyway whether the institution is accepted or not, a sub-culture emerges which affects the personalities of the inmates. The more one is addicted to institutional life, the more pronounced is his personality attitude. Once in the grip, it is difficult to break away.

Mental hospitals today are adopting a more permissive regime by the development of therapeutic treatments. With group relationships, involving the efforts of staff and patients alike, the patients are encouraged to try and understand their problems by discussing and expressing themselves with others in the same predicament. A staff/patient relationship aimed at coming to terms with the problem of mental instability. Prisons today are looking to see if a similar approach can be effective with the unstable personality of the prisoner. At present only the surface of group therapy is being scratched. The development along these lines in a penal institution must proceed with caution, for many conflicts can and do arise when change and tradition clash. One can point out

that by this development of change, the individual is being focused upon.

A comparison can be shown in the way these total institutions are proceeding, but in times of pressure, such as public alarm and lack of confidence, the total institutions, especially prisons, will swing back to the traditional line of defence. If penal institutions are to make progress in providing the means in which an inmate, by his self-exertion can change his attitude towards social responsibility, then a balance has to be struck between security and rehabilitation. Security is the responsibility of all who serve in the institution and not just one grade of worker and therefore all have to ensure that basic security measures are carried out with efficiency. Likewise, with the carrying out of rehabilitative policies of the institution, all staff, irrespective of their specialised functions, have to be part of a team as a whole, in which communication and understanding of each other's role is appreciated—this being the foundation of rehabilitation.

If prevention of crime is to be one of the main goals of society the penal institution has to come to terms with change in a total environment in which there will be some hope for the inmate to readjust himself for acceptance by society and society has a social responsibility in accepting him back into the fold.

Who Swings the Pendulum

W. J. BOOTH

ONCE UPON A TIME, one was young, idealistic, uncynical, not to mention naïve. In that remote period the most irritating kind of Prison Service man to have to come up against was older, less idealistic, cynical and completely lacking the quality of starry-eyed wonder. His usual response to any suggestion implying development was an indication that he had seen it all before and was confident that he was contemplating another swing of "the pendulum". At times one wanted to wrap the pendulum round his stubborn neck but was restrained by either the feeling that there was a regulation forbidding assaults on colleagues with pendulums, or the simple fact that he was a physically bigger man. Recent events, however, have convinced me that I have somehow managed to join this club and can now see wisdom where before I saw only obtuseness. Following this conviction I have felt it necessary to have a look at this swinging process, because whoever

controls it, it does not seem to be me.

The recent White Paper on Adult Offenders made the claim, apropos the abolition of corrective training, that all prisoners now receive training. This claim produced some very negative responses and, in so far as the White Paper was a document for discussion, this may have been intended. On the other hand, it is just as easy to provoke the opposite responses. Many citizens would assert there is too much "training", that is, too little of punishment and deterrence, in present penal treatment. To review the present state of affairs in penal matters is to examine confusion and conflict and this has to be accepted if understanding is to be developed. Such a situation is not necessarily a bad one. Conflict, and its attendant confusion, are often prerequisites for progress, and the ideal of democratic unity on important issues is rarely achieved

and probably unrealistic. The worst that can happen, when one is dependent to a substantial degree on public interest and support, is to be ignored. If the present intermittent furore, about prisoners, prison staffs and prisons, indicates that they have ceased to be ignored, it contains the ingredients of a healthy situation. The price to be paid by the Prison Department and the Prison Service may be that of being much more subject to criticism and more frequently called to account.

Being called to account, however, gives one the right to ask what one is supposed to account for. An accounting entails that there was a task to be done and that it has been clearly specified somewhere. Given such a specification the review questions almost frame themselves and the criteria by which assessments can be made may be reasonably simple.

THE CUSTODIAL TASK

The basic task of prisons and similar institutions is usually agreed to be a custodial one and an expectation often exists that it can be easily defined or, at least, more easily defined than that of training or treating prisoners. When a sentence is passed no reservations are entered about the degree of incarceration to which the prisoner must or may be submitted and at this point "custody" might appear to be an absolute state which did not vary. The word "prison" conjures up for most people an image

of high walls, fortress architecture, strong cells and solitary confinement. This image survives a remarkable amount of contrary experience and even when it yields somewhat to facts it is probably replaced by another image, of barbed wire, electrified fences, and even armed guards. Perhaps some archetypal fantasy is always ready for projection when concepts of freedom are involved and threatened.

In legal fact, a "prison" is any place which the Secretary of State feels it necessary to designate as such for the purpose of holding persons in legal custody. The constellation of concepts involved in discussing prisons have currently to cover a wide spectrum of security conditions, ranging from the isolation of one prisoner in one strong cell in a genuinely maximum security prison, by way of the "open" prison (which is an interesting logical contradiction in itself if the usual meanings of the words are adhered to), to an ordinary house in an ordinary neighbourhood which might be used as a prison hostel.

It is not, therefore, easy to assess the success or failure of custodial arrangements in simple terms and some reference must be made to the process of change which has gone on in the past and is still going on. Without a brief glance at the historical background

current confusion and conflict is likely to be impenetrable.

There were times when the whole prison task was comparatively straightforward. In 1863 the then Lord Chief Justice headed a committee of the House of Lords which categorically stated that prisons existed to punish and deter criminals and not to reform them. Mid-19th century methods seem very dubious to us in retrospect but it could be said that they were an improvement on much that had gone before. The inhumanities which we now discern were not those of medieval torture and neglect but those of isolation, hard and useless work. The penal task then was a straightforwardly custodial one and it was this that the Prison Service was set up to perform and which is still reflected in its structure and, of course, many of the buildings in which it works.

THE ADDITION OF ANOTHER TASK

Doubts about the ethics of such an approach coincided with doubts about its effectiveness and the Gladstone committee of 1895 brought these together. In reporting, it said both that it was wrong to treat prisoners as sub-human and irredeemable and that this approach was ineffective in reducing recidivism. The identification and treatment of the probable recidivist was then, and it still is, the central problem of penal practice. The committee first made the point, still claimed to be valid,

that a very high proportion of those sentenced to prison for the first time do not return again. The residue were completely undeterred by harsh conditions and long sentences. It tends to be overlooked, forgotten or ignored that an extreme form of deterrent treatment was carefully examined at that time and unequivocally condemned as ineffective.

The changes which the committee advocated were a blend of the obvious and the revolutionary. In the light of hindsight and more modern knowledge they can be described as being more difficult and complex than supposed at the time. To abolish degrading and useless work was probably not too difficult by itself, to replace it by employment genuinely similar to that outside prison has been shown to be something else again.

More important, and more difficult again to achieve, was the introduction of the reformatory task, expressed in terms of the necessity of bringing good influence to bear upon prisoners. Since then, Prison Service development has been linked to a search for the means of changing prisoners' attitudes and the dilemma, which seems to follow from the juxtaposition of apparently conflicting aims of custody and treatment, has persistently dominated the process.

One may indicate some of the significant steps in this process

without claiming to have produced an exhaustive list.

1. The abolition of useless work such as the crank and treadmill.
2. The separation of some young offenders from adult prisoners by the introduction of borstal training (Criminal Justice Act 1908).
3. The introduction of compulsory after-care for preventive detainees.
4. The abandonment of the title "warder" about 1922.
5. The introduction of the pre-runner of the present grade of assistant governor, about 1923.
6. The introduction of "open" custodial establishments to borstal in 1930 and prisons in 1938.
7. The increase in vocational training provisions from 1945.
8. The increase in formal educational programmes since 1945.
9. The Wynn-Parry report in 1957 on pay and conditions in the Prison Service, which drew attention, amongst other things, to the changing role of the prison officer.
10. The great increase, about 1957, in the amount of time prisoners spend in association with each other.
11. The development of hostels and working-out schemes

to facilitate the transition from prison life to more normal society.

12. The report on after-care by the Advisory Committee on the Treatment of Offenders, in 1963.

There are more contemporary steps such as the Mountbatten Report which have to be treated as part of the present situation.

The trend indicated by these events runs in the direction of providing treatment estimated to be appropriate and necessary to the need of an individual. It is essential to emphasise that this comment merely refers to the direction of the trend, as it seems to me. We have by no means reached the position where treatment, whether custodial or reformative, has been individualised. The trend runs from the position where individual need was totally rejected, by way of concepts of "training" which envisage the individual deriving benefit from the provision of training programmes for the mass. For a discussion of the distinction which can be made between "training" and "treatment" there is a useful article in the Keele University Monograph No. 9, by Gordon Rose, entitled "The Administrative Consequences of Penal Objectives".

An examination of the trend in after-care over the same period reveals a similar direction. Both trends meet, as it were, in the

A.C.T.O. report, and this ought to mean that a more realistic concern with a total process of treatment will now be possible.

TRAINING OF STAFF BEFORE

A.C.T.O.

The continual change which took place over many years before the A.C.T.O. report might now be judged to have been based on an assumption that prison conditions are inevitably bad for individual prisoners and that society had a duty, both to the prisoner and its own interests, to mitigate the conditions as far as possible. Mitigation took the form of providing open conditions where possible, some positive training programmes (as distinct from treatment facilities) and, finally, the virtual abolition of most solitary confinement by the extension of the association part of the Norwich system in the late '50s. Offsetting the advantages which might follow from such general improvement, there were two important deficiencies.

1. A lack of adequate modern prison construction. Capital investment in prison building has few obvious attractions and when compared with other demands, in conditions where overall resources are scarce, is likely to get little or no priority.

2. The absence of any accepted techniques of rehabilitation. The only basis for expecting changes in prisoners' attitudes was the hope that a demonstration of the community's lack of vindictiveness, by

not making conditions as bad as they might have been, would produce a receptive state of mind which well-intentioned staff might use to exert influence for the better. The most typical approach to the prisoner was the offer to forget the past and judge him only on present and future behaviour.

In such circumstances pressures on prison staffs from outside to simultaneously improve standards of treatment and to maintain high standards of security, often seemed tragically bizarre. Training of staff, therefore, tended to be addressed to that part of the work which seemed to be clearest, namely, security, discipline and simple man-management. Understandably, the days of the straightforward custodial role would seem to have attractions in these circumstances.

THE SOCIAL CONTEXT OF MODERN PENAL TREATMENT

Before attempting an assessment of the A.C.T.O. report, it is important to add a social dimension to the context so far sketched in unless one wants to join in the pretence, frequently indulged, that society and its prisons have little or no connection.

Changes towards more humanitarian treatment of prisoners are frequently attributed to misguided people, or collections of people, with soft hearts, soft heads, and no guts. Interpreted more politely this might mean no more than that certain individuals have been

influential in facilitating penal reform, and this is not to be denied. General trends in society are, however, much more important and particular changes rarely move in an opposite direction and, when they do, are unlikely to be permanent. Ideas and ideals about individuals and their importance have crystallised to a remarkably non-controversial extent in the Welfare State. Because this is the case, the continued existence of a purely deterrent penal system would be as out of place as a social security system based on 19th century concepts of relief or a gunboat foreign policy. Ideals apart, it would prove to be impossible to staff such an anachronistic penal system unless a recruiting system were devised which deliberately excluded ordinary citizens who accept the current values.

THE PENDULUM LOCATED

Change does not occur tidily, of course, or simultaneously in all areas of society, nor does the whole community necessarily agree with all of its current manifestations. On the contrary, public reaction to deviance of any kind, not only delinquency, is notoriously ambivalent and tends to swing from one extreme to another. It may be, however, and research could possibly establish it, that the peaks and troughs of the swings, that is, the ambivalent vacillations, are themselves moving along an identifiable path of social change. The

best that the community wishes, and is willing to provide, is better than it was even 20 or 30 years ago. The worst that the community would inflict, or tolerate being inflicted in its name, is not so harsh as it would have been formerly. The whole cycle of ambivalence has moved to a higher level and will probably continue to move in that direction.

Pushing the analogy as far as it will go in imagination suggests that at some time the pendulum will disappear into the clock. But the most modern clocks do not need pendulums and this may be further progress towards consistency.

A.C.T.O. AND ITS IMPLICATIONS

The A.C.T.O. report suggested major changes in after-care on the following lines:

- "1. The amalgamation of compulsory and voluntary after-care into a common service."

This has been implemented and the Probation Service is now the Probation and Aftercare Service with statutory responsibilities for the after-care of those prisoners who are compulsory clients and those who voluntarily opt for after-care.

- "2. The employment of professional social workers on after-care, both in penal institutions and the community."

The implementation of this recommendation has been undertaken in a different way to that

envisaged in the report. A.C.T.O. defined a body of workers within penal institutions as performing a social worker function and their suggestions following from this definition would have provided these workers with a common training and a common basis within the Prison Service. In the event, prison welfare officers are now probation officers on secondment with their professional links and career expectations outside the Prison Service; borstal house-masters do not yet have a training which is the equivalent of full social worker training; and social workers in detention centres are recruited as such and do not receive initial training from the Prison Service. The perception revealed in A.C.T.O. of an identifiable body of penal social workers has not, therefore, been developed. Nor, it seems to me, could it have been developed, because the report in this area fails in two important respects:

(a) It completely ignores the role of the prison assistant governor, either as having a social casework function similar to his borstal counterpart, or as having some other penal function also linked to rehabilitation. On the other hand, A.C.T.O. specifically commented on the need for borstal house-masters to receive training which would equip them for their governing role. It may well have been that the terms of reference

were felt to exclude such considerations in detail and that we still stand in need of some examination of what prisons are supposed to do besides rehabilitating in the final phase, i.e. just before and during the return to society.

(b) This last point indicates the second failure of the report as a full explanation of the prison task. Perhaps unavoidably, the report so enhances the welfare/rehabilitation aspects of the work that there is a very clear impression that this is all there is. Is rehabilitation meant to be another word for reform? If so, it may be inappropriate to suggest that the techniques of social work can bring it about. If it is not reform by another name then it may have been much too closely linked to notions of welfare and there is evidence that this is how the task is seen. In practice, welfare concern tends to be relatively concentrated at the beginning and ending of a sentence. In the middle of the sentence, the prisoner usually goes through a period of prison orientation and it is here that the damage of the total institution is inflicted. What treatment should be given at this point and by whom should it be given? How realistic is it, or will it ever be, to suggest or imply that the prison welfare officer can undertake such a gargantuan task, however well assisted by prison

officers? What would be an appropriate professional arrangement to deal with the whole task?

"3. The decentralisation of the arrangements for after-care accompanied by a strengthening of the lines of communication between the social worker in the institution and his colleagues in the community."

The adult central after-care organisation no longer exists and this would necessitate lines of communication between welfare officers and after-care agents. The effectiveness of these lines of communication probably cannot yet be accurately assessed. The borstal central after-care organisation still exists and has been engaged in developing and supervising pilot schemes which are meant to ensure adequate communication between institutions and the field. The use of the scheme devised is to be widely extended this year. Arrangements for detention centre after-care were never centralised and there is nothing to dismantle.

"4. There should be a greatly increased understanding of the part to be played by members of the community in the rehabilitation of offenders."

This recommendation is fundamental to any hopes of developing a penal system complementary to the progress in other social

provision. Any set of recommendations should *begin* with this one or one similar and it is interesting that the report of the Mountbatten inquiry merely uses other words to make the same point.

Taken together, the major recommendations plus the tenor of the whole report, indicate the committee's perception of after-care as a social service quite clearly. It stops just short of saying something revolutionary about penal institutions, in terms of what they ought to be or may be becoming. Since the process of public education has not been completed, and it was further advocated in the Labour Party pamphlet—"Crime, a challenge to us all"—in 1964, it is not possible to say with any degree of certainty how far the implications of A.C.T.O. are acceptable as social policy. If social casework is an appropriate technique for use by assistant governors and detention centre social workers, and if prison officers are heavily involved in the social work being done by the welfare officer, it not only follows that after-care is a social service being provided for prisoners at or about the point of release, but also that penal establishments are appropriate places in which to use social work methods. A.C.T.O. does not talk of penal duties being undertaken as separate from rehabilitation work but of the two being reconciled, and any brief

reflection will lead to the conclusion that the work is genuinely indivisible. Social work methods must not be confused with the therapeutic methods of psychiatry, such as psychotherapy, group therapy, and community therapy. To use these would entail the view that criminality was equivalent to mental sickness, and that rehabilitation is the equivalent of cure—i.e. reform—to use casework, groupwork and, perhaps, an institutional variation of community organisation, entails either the expectation that the major problems of prisoners are social ones, or that these are the only problems which we can do much about. Social problem-solving processes can only be used where there are social problems to solve, the opposite is logical and professional nonsense.

TRAINING DEVELOPMENTS SINCE A.C.T.O.

The training of prison officers received adverse comment in the report and the suggestion was made that more stress should be placed on human behaviour, groupwork and the prisoners' rehabilitation. A new training syllabus was introduced early in 1964, which included some simple beginnings in some of these social subjects and which attempted to correct the previous heavy bias towards discipline and security and to achieve some sort of balance between the technical and social aspects of the job. This new form

went some way towards meeting the criticisms of the report by introducing new and more relevant subjects in the curriculum, teaching methods more appropriate for the instruction of adult students and, probably the most important innovation, the idea of using the whole of the officer's first year as primarily a training period. The pattern being aimed at is initial training for eight weeks, in-service training when posted and recall to the training organisation at the end of the first year for development training.

The training of assistant governors has undergone steady change over a number of years but following A.C.T.O. there has been a tendency for it to crystallise along the lines suggested. Change since then has to some extent been motivated by the need to discover a proper balance between what is appropriate for general social casework thinking and what must be the essential variations for an institutional setting. The present course is of eight months' duration, two separate months of which are taken for practical attachments. These are not casework placements and casework training is given concurrently with academic teaching, supervision being undertaken by Prison Service staff suitably qualified, augmented by probation staff from the local areas.

Management training on the course is linked with developments

in management training generally. Considerable use has been made of outside training resources, such as the Glacier Institute of Management, the Administrative Staff College, Henley on Thames, and the Leicester University/Tavistock Institute conferences, for preparation of teaching staff. The training given to Assistant Governors, therefore, owes something to all these sources and, for example, a conference on inter-personal and inter-group relations on the Leicester/Tavistock model is now included.

Induction training for prison welfare officers was initiated last year when, following consultation between the Probation Department and the Prison Department, two experimental courses were run under joint sponsorship and tutored by both a probation officer and a member of the Prison Service. Each course was for three weeks and the aim was to help students to undertake the new duties by undertaking a realistic appraisal of prisons, prisoners and prison staffs, and the likely interaction between all these and the welfare officer. These courses are to be repeated this year in something like the same form but, obviously, with possibilities of variation if the needs of the students are judged to be different.

Not all training development in the Prison Service in recent years can be attributed to the effect of the A.C.T.O. report. The amount of management training provided

would have increased in any case, again because of links with outside trends. Just as prisons are linked with society through the welfare of the individual, so also they are linked, as institutions and large organisations, with those areas of research, study and practical application which constitute the field of management. Penal problems are not, however, eliminated by an approach from a management angle; on the contrary, because the same basic problem arises when this approach is taken, the fundamental importance of the initial questions is emphasised. A.C.T.O.'s emphasis produces the question:

"What service are we trying to provide?"

In management terms the same question amounts to:

"What is the primary task of the organisation?"

THE SITUATION PRODUCED BY A.C.T.O.

The setting up of the sub-committee was a logical consequence of the concern, increasingly expressed in the '50s, about the bad effects of imprisonment. Significantly, the concern was expressed in terms of after-care, where the community may be said to be confronted with the results of imprisonment, rather than in an investigation of penal institutions, where many of the remedies would have been obvious and costly. Although the terms of reference

precluded any deep investigation by the committee or any major suggestions about altering institutions, their view that there is no realistic division to be made between an institutional process and an after-care process seems clear enough.

The original statement of the dual penal task by the Gladstone committee was re-emphasised by the report, given a modern idiom, and some of the roles necessary to fulfil it were outlined. The view that the work of security and rehabilitation have to be integrated, and that primarily this must happen in the work of the prison officer, left the situation much more clear but not determined in detail. Following this there has been an experimental period, particularly in staff training, and what has been introduced has been deliberately designed to be capable of further change and development.

THE MOUNTBATTEN REPORT

A.C.T.O. emphasised treatment aspects of penal work but without ignoring the existence of the custodial task. The Mountbatten inquiry, and the report which followed it, must be regarded as an expression of public concern about the security of prisons, a further swing of the pendulum of community ambivalence. If the theory advanced earlier, about the generally progressive movement of this cyclical effect, is tenable, then

the Mountbatten Report would be expected to deal with treatment in a similar way to that in which A.C.T.O. dealt with security. In fact it did better than this, in my opinion. Not only does the report leave unhindered the possibilities of treatment development, but by linking them with security in a positive way it encourages them. Furthermore, it speaks to the community in general, in a very direct way not commonly found in public documents, of its responsibility for the state of prisons and the treatment of prisoners. If this is not enough, the report gives a clear indication, perhaps not directly intentionally, of the way in which security and treatment (or rehabilitation) might be practically joined together.

In several paragraphs the report presents the security problem as it really is. Not one of providing maximum security for all who are sentenced to imprisonment, but one of a graduated provision related to a classification and allocation system which has as a major element in it a means of estimating probability of security risk. Many, if not most, prisoners accept their sentences and are prepared to serve them out (para. 318). To put these into expensive custody would be a waste of community resources and unnecessarily inhumane and degrading. It seems at least arguable that more could be done for those

prisoners by way of treatment than for others at the further end of the scale and more open conditions and greater flexibility would enhance this possibility. If at the other end of the continuum there are both the prisoners with very long sentences and also those who are determined offenders, it seems very likely that they will be long-term treatment propositions for whom available social work treatment methods may be entirely inadequate or only useful in a supportive way. At this end of the scale it seems obvious that very special arrangements must be made and in the first place the aim would have to be to discover what could usefully be done. But, at least, there is the possibility of beginning a further development.

The role of the officer is again given some prominence and the duties of security and rehabilitation approvingly juxtaposed. The role of the assistant governor in prisons was not examined but the recommendations of paragraph 255 for scrutiny in terms of complementing may well produce an eventual role definition. The terms of reference of the inquiry precluded any interest in borstals and detention centres and there is a great deal, therefore, in the two reports which cannot be compared.

THE RESULTANT SITUATION

The situation which is created by the Mountbatten Report probably has more reality about it, in

terms of community wishes, than the one which preceded it. Constructive treatment of the prisoner and the provision of security are both being demanded and it is essential always to keep them linked together, as A.C.T.O. pointed out. Failure to do this almost inevitably involved a wasteful conflict between protagonists of treatment and security as separate and opposed aims. This is a battle which neither side can win in the light of available methods and resources. It is also a battle between short-sighted opponents, namely, those who cannot see that security has a part to play in treatment and that treatment has a part to play in security. Almost certainly the wider community wants both these things to be provided and the important questions are in the area of how strongly does the community want both and what resources it is prepared to provide. Training, in both the senses from which we started originally, is entirely dependent upon the answers which the community provide. This is to say, of course, that training in this field of work cannot be undertaken as a fashionable practice, it must have purpose.

What is now needed is a continuance of the debate with the object of achieving more clarification and increasingly realistic allocation of resources.

A Teacher's View

OF VOCATIONAL TRAINING WITHIN A PENAL ESTABLISHMENT

S. F. JOHNSON

THE TITLE is misleading: the intention is to make some broad general comments about which aspects of vocational training seem (to teachers) to be satisfactory—and where not, the way(s) in which improvements could be made and if my categoric statements bring correspondence, I should feel justified in having taken up my pen.

From tutor organisers in general the initials V.T. bring varying reactions: some profess to have “nothing to do with it, it’s the Dep.’s job”; some rather condescend to provide a number of allied evening classes, but even to some of these (in my view) rather more enlightened gentlemen the feeling seems inbred that the “V.T. evening class” provides a perk for the C.I.O. rather than anything much of an educational nature: to others the C.I.O. has no standing as a teacher (this is frequently true as will be pointed out later, but the gap is often a narrow one) or he

would be employed as a teacher in a college of technology . . . with the resulting higher pay, better status, shorter hours, shorter working year (i.e. longer holidays), in short with superior conditions.

But it is necessary to face facts as one sees them: in Wellingborough Borstal where I am (truly) privileged to work the vocational training facts are seemingly as briefly outlined: and subsequent upon the bald statement of facts I suggest a possible solution in outline which is both relevant to training in penal establishments *and* in line with modern training procedures.

Some 200-plus receptions are dealt with yearly. They arrive after periods varying between six weeks and over four months at the allocation centre (this time in fact does include their generally brief sojourn in a local prison before being sent on to allocation at either Wormwood Scrubs or

Manchester). They then average between nine and 11 weeks in our induction wing—though some part of this time will generally be in the next step on their training ladder, as training grades. By April 1966, presumably because of the simple fact of pressure of numbers being sentenced to borstal training our overall training period was shortening and there became a tendency on the part of the rather better potential training material to visualise the simple mathematics of their own case and realise that vocational training, if not available quite early after their arrival at Wellingborough, would automatically preclude the possibility of an early discharge. Facts must be faced: DISCHARGE DAY is the major aim in a lad's mind. Thus the general standard of course material declined—

- (a) not because of lack of attainment or potential, although this has and probably always will be a factor;
 - (b) not simply because the lads were "anti" after their long and enervating stay at allocation centre;
 - (c) not because employment in the particular trade was a tremendous problem in the area to which they hoped to be discharged;
- simply because lads did not want to commit themselves after seven or eight months to the certainty

of a further six months "inside".

As an aside at this point one must make the assertion (amply proved by the figures produced by borstal after-care in whatever light they are read) that vocational training must not *in itself* either—

- (i) be offered seemingly on condition that the lad enters the type of employment to which the course is geared—although almost every selection board one attends seems biased in this way;
- (ii) or be offered specifically to those lads who, whatever their general post-sentence aims, seem to offer a good chance of examination success. It is at this stage one would make the point that the "mock examination" run by the Home Office V.T. Unit seems quite irrelevant to one of the problems offered. Of course it matters that the lads should, if possible, take an external examination of the City and Guilds or U.E.I. type; and equally, of course, it matters that public money should not be wasted. But it seems to most of those involved that it is patently impossible for six-month courses (and making allowance for instructors' leave and possible sickness) in any way to be

geared to a "mock-examination" *at the right time* in the course.

C.I.O.s, as teachers already are, should be trusted to recommend and their recommendation be then acted upon. This seems an admirable point to briefly continue the theme raised in paragraph 3. Most C.I.O.s nowadays have a full technological qualification: if not the full Technological City and Guilds (or possibly in some cases an Ordinary or even Higher National Certificate) then an ordinary City and Guilds certificate in their chosen field. Therefore, many of them could NOW move into junior craft teaching in colleges of technology, and many more are fitted to take the "Technical Teachers' Certificate Course" run by university departments of education part-time at local technical colleges or to attend the one-term in-service training courses or the full one-year technical teacher training courses provided (with full grants) by the four colleges set up by the Department of Education and Science (then the Ministry of Education) for this very purpose. Facts must be faced.

Yet another postulation: is the purpose of the V.T. course to—

(a) teach people to "think"?

Universities, no less, would like to learn the secret; or

(b) as work therapy—possibly

an excellent aim in itself?; or

(c) is it aimed simply at teaching a man to earn his living?

Some experimentation has been indulged in in penal establishments: some vague threats are implied—that if sufficient numbers do not appear for courses the C.I.O.s will duly disappear (at least to pastures new). Unfortunately the extent to which experiment has been allowed is unknown as either publicity is shunned or the White Paper on Communications has not yet been fully digested. Therefore I should like to make a number of general propositions which, to me at least, seem educationally sound as well as economically viable, and (dare I add) light be shed on reasons for administrative instructions which appear both unsound and largely unworkable.

1. The fight between V.T. and other departments at Head Office be ended by some form of armistice (doubtless it will be denied that a state of war existed, but the evidence is to the contrary).

2. Trade training courses of indeterminate length be allowed in industrial training shops where (as in, for instance, carpentry) there is an obvious possibility. The course need not be of any pre-ordained length or form, but suitable material could be retained for a

longer than usual period and allied evening classes provided for those with especial interest.

3. If a situation is arising that delay in allocation centres threaten some of the more successful existing-type courses, then there might be quicker allocation of those who opt for and are suitable for vocational training by the allocation centres—after all, it would be difficult to argue that those who WANT training ought not to have priority FOR training.

4. In the larger "world of work" it is becoming more and more common to have separate courses for "technicians" and for "craftsmen": the City and Guilds of London Institute courses by their "G-course" selection subscribe very firmly to this thesis.

5. In 1966, of 87 who completed V.T. courses, 18 failed the internal examinations—and of those entered after Head Office screening for external examinations, five of 10 passed City and Guilds inter, whilst nine of 14 passed U.E.I. stage 1.

6. Certification is at least a step on the road towards Union recognition: the present certificate awarded at the successful completion of the internal examination is not only not recognised: it is not even *held* by the person who has earned it!

7. What is patently needed is courses at two levels—at technician for the more able lad: the lad who wants to go into the trade

and is worth a chance; the lad who is educationally up to taking, with a reasonable chance of success, an external examination. Alongside should run, over a shorter period, a craft level course—similar in a practical sense but without the theory which so bedevils the less able and further, that entry should be staggered.

Difficult? At first, no doubt—but certainly possible, as I now try briefly to outline.

Apart from the possible courses running within industrial training workshops entry to vocational training courses to be staggered; not more than three lads to enter per month (and they together) and the course to have a ceiling number as at present of 12.

The course to be basically aimed at being a craft course, with the C.I.O. keeping his eye open for likely lads of technical standard. Dealing first with the craft lads: these would remain on the course for four months only; their work would be practical in nature (except in so far as theory came within the area of general discussion when setting up a job); their examination would be practical in that it would, over perhaps the last two or three weeks of the course, consist of a job which covered in its performance as many as possible of the facets of the trade. Advice would be forthcoming from both other lads and the instructor (as is the case with "improvers" within the factory-situation) and

the end-of-course certificate would be issued *to the lad* as a "craft certificate" based solely on the recommendation of the C.I.O.

Those lads who showed extra promise—perhaps 25 to 30 per cent of the intake—would remain on the course for a minimum of six months; longer if the instructor felt this was in the lad's interest and/or particularly necessary. These lads would have an allied evening class in theory, and also be placed by the tutor organiser, acting in consultation with the C.I.O., on extra maths. classes or perhaps on technical drawing. They would also be allowed, at the C.I.O.'s discretion and after consultation with the orderly officer, to use classrooms during the working day for study purposes. These would, in all probability, be the lads recommended for permission

to sit external examinations—one would also hope that for them also a method be found of giving *them* a successful course completion certificate.

In my view, an overall scheme somewhat on the lines herein propounded would have many advantages over the present rather archaic and over-formalised one—it would present a format more closely allied to training in normal society and thus would enable the released prisoner more easily to reorientate and come to terms—it would to an extent be self-selective of those who were likely to continue in the trade in which they had been trained.

Equally, the success/failure figures produced by after-care would be meaningful if they considered separately those lads who had done well as technicians *and* intended to follow the trade.

CONTRIBUTORS

R. COCKETT, B.A., Ph.D., F.B.Ps.S., transferred from Air Ministry, where he was a Principal Scientific Officer, in 1950 to be Principal Psychologist at Latchmere House Borstal Reception Centre. Moved to take charge of the psychological department at Ashford Remand Centre when the centre opened in 1961. Works also in certain borstals.

E. CLAY is a principal officer at Pentonville. He is also a member of the P.O.A. executive and staff side chairman of the working party on "The Role of the Modern Prison Officer".

W. J. BOOTH is deputy principal of the Staff College.

S. F. JOHNSON, tutor-organiser at Wellingborough Borstal, studied at the universities of Calcutta, Manchester and Leicester, and externally for Oxford University's certificate in social studies.

N. A. JEPSON is adviser on studies at the Staff College.

W. PERRIE is Governor of H.M. Prison, Swansea.

Training—Staff College and the Crisis

NORMAN A. JEPSON

IN 1946 THE STAFF COLLEGE came into being, as the Imperial Training School, in the midst of a crisis—a crisis which arose, according to the annual report, because “the pressure of increased (prison) population on a seriously diminished and over-strained staff had strained the machine almost to breaking point”. In 1967 the Staff College came of age, appropriately and perhaps significantly during another crisis—the recent crisis precipitated by the escape of Blake. The suspension of large sections of the college’s training programme was not exactly the happiest, although a salutary, way of celebrating its majority. It did, however, provide the opportunity, the challenge, and in part the reason for re-examining the policy of the college. It resulted in some major changes in the Staff College programme, perhaps the most drastic being the loss of the refresher and

senior refresher courses for prison officers. This article is an attempt to outline some of the basic questions which were posed, as immediate and long term problems were faced.

But before examining these, reference might be made to the crucial distinction between short term and long term policies. The former term tends, on balance, to accept the limits of existing resources, as for example the number of college rooms, and to ask how do we allocate these resources among certain needs and/or demands. In concrete terms, the college has 110 rooms, is open at least 46 weeks in a normal year and consequently just over 5,000 students (or room) weeks are available. Such crude figures have the advantage that they allow crucial questions to be phrased bluntly. For instance, with a prison service staff of over 8,000 you might aim to give everyone

an annual short course of less than a week, or, at the other extreme, 100 "key" people a long course of a year. Limited training for all, or extended training for a few? Between the two extremes where should the balance lie and why? Again, the short term decision may be influenced by previous long term commitments—such as the provisions for a staff course and courses for overseas students which in 1965–6 occupied 1,500 room weeks—which leave limited room for manoeuvre. Such an approach may be described, to use an overworked word, as "realistic", but one of the dangers, perhaps, of realism is an over-ready acceptance of the limits of the existing situation. Meanwhile, long term policies, whilst by no means free of limits, may start from needs and demands and indicate the extent and nature of the necessary resources. In the short term, the emphasis is on existing resources affecting the priority of aims, and in the long term, the priority of aims influencing potential resources¹.

Given this distinction, four basic but general questions will be raised. Comments on the questions and indeed the choice of questions themselves may reflect my own personal views and prejudices. It is hoped, however, that they may provide an appropriate framework for communication between the college and the field. Firstly, should

a staff college be *primarily* concerned with initial or post-experience training?²

Secondly, should a staff college aim to provide directly for *all* members of the prison service or only for some, and if for some, for whom?

Thirdly, should a staff college be primarily concerned with the general needs of a uniform prison service, or with the specialised needs of a diversified service?

Fourthly, should a staff college be the centre of, or simply an element in, a comprehensive training programme involving in-service and extra-service resources?

1. INITIAL OR POST-EXPERIENCE TRAINING

The balance between initial (or pre-experience) and post-experience training at the staff college is one which has changed radically during the past four years, and is one which was, in some respects, challenged most acutely by the security crisis. To appreciate this, brief reference must be made to the evolution of the staff college, which may be seen in three stages—stage one, from 1946 to 1958, when all training, outside establishments, was concentrated at the Imperial Training School; stage two, from 1958 to 1962, during which period the I.T.S. became the staff college and the initial training of officers was transferred from the college to

separate accommodation, named the Officers Training School; stage three, from 1963 to 1966, when the college accommodation was significantly expanded, and post-experience training came into its own.

Two significant features of stage one may be mentioned. The opening of the I.T.S. in 1946 was significant not because it started centralised training—centralised training had begun some 50 years previously following the recommendation of the Gladstone committee—but because it moved part of the initial training of officers, at least geographically, out of the prison, out of the work situation. The importance of this wise or unwise move, has perhaps never been fully explored or exploited. This may be because the separation and yet close proximity of the college, training schools and prison, encourage an ambivalent attitude towards the problem. What ought, perhaps, to be examined is the hypothesis that the further the training institution is away from the work situation the more appropriate it is for post-experience training, the less appropriate for initial training. For a college to be described as an ivory tower may be adverse criticism in the latter context, but complementary in the former. The greater the experience, the greater the need to withdraw

periodically from the work situation. The second significant aspect of stage one was that, although the initial training of officers at I.T.S. was of short duration for most of the period, reaching eight weeks only in 1955, and although extremely interesting experiments in post-experience courses were tried, initial training dominated the I.T.S.

Stage two saw initial training of officers transferred to the O.T.S. and an expansion in post-experience training at the Staff College, particularly through the refresher course for prison officers. This course had been planned as far back as 1950, but sacrificed in the financial crisis of the following year. The staff course, however, previously limited to potential A.G.s from the ranks of prison officer, now included, in increasing numbers, direct entrants and was consequently transformed into a primary initial training course. Together with the more formalised and extended course for overseas students, it occupied a significant proportion of the college accommodation and as late as 1962, only a quarter of the accommodation was used for post-experience training.

With the expansion of the college accommodation in 1963 the college entered stage three, during which time post-experience training assumed a dominant position, so

that by 1965-6 it utilised nearly two-thirds of the college resources, as compared with just over one-third for the staff course and overseas courses. Consequently, although service-wise (Staff College and the two O.T.S.s) initial training continued to dominate, the Staff College had emerged as a predominantly, though not exclusively, post-experience training centre. It was under these circumstances that the college staff structure was changed and departments introduced, partly in order to cope more efficiently with the new primary task.

The security crisis, however, and the ensuing Mountbatten report, with its demand for more prison officers and assistant governors, required a new assessment of the balance between initial and post-experience training. At one period, it looked as though the Staff College might return to its original status as a primarily initial training unit. But, by increasing the numbers accommodated at Wakefield (Aberford Road) O.T.S. and Leyhill O.T.S., with attendant strains for staff and students there, the overspill of officer initial training into the Staff College has so far been avoided. The likely increase of the staff course to 50, however, increases the accommodation required at the college for initial training. In the short term, therefore, the balance between pre- and post-experience training

at the Staff College has shifted, but still remains weighted in favour of the latter. It reflects a belief—rightly or wrongly held—in a staff college of this kind and a readiness on the part of staff at the O.T.S. to support it. The long term question of balance remains, however, if for no other reason that the more personnel recruited in 1967, the more personnel will be eligible in the late '60s and early '70s for continued training. This is not a new problem, the increase in staff during the whole of the post-war period has posed the problem, but the possibility of a rapid increase in the post-Mountbatten era underlines it. The case for—and against—post-experience training needs to be fully understood and, if accepted, its status and that of the college clearly defined. The very suspension of much post-experience training during 1966-7 may have reflected in part some uncertainty about its merits. There is, indeed, a danger that continued training courses may be a new manifestation of Parkinson's law, but such training stands or falls on three basic assumptions:

(i) that training is a continuous process, which, like the digestion of food, can best be achieved in relatively small doses rather than in one prolonged session;

(ii) that post-experience training allows for an examination of an

adaption to change, whether the change emanates primarily from the individual, the establishment, the service or society;

(iii) that such training, based as it should be on experience, implies that college staff and members of courses constantly interchange the roles of teacher and student. In such a way each challenges the other and the college gains as much from the field as vice-versa.

2. TRAINING FOR ALL OR TRAINING FOR SOME

Given the appropriate balance between initial and post-experience courses, the inter-related question is for whom? For all or for some? If for some, by what criteria are these selected?

When the policy of the college was considered in the light of extended accommodation in 1963, the emphasis was heavily upon courses for *all*. The initial training of officers at the two schools was ideally to be followed, in *all* cases, by three courses held at varying stages in an officer's career—the development course at the end of one year, the refresher course after five years, the senior refresher after ten. Likewise, the initial training of assistant governors at the Staff College was ideally to be followed, in *all* cases, by three courses, at intervals of two years up to and including the sixth year. Apart from the sixth year course for A.G.s, all the above mentioned

courses were “refresher” courses, in that they aimed primarily to examine experience and change. The cost of such a comprehensive programme, with prevailing resources, was relative superficiality, arising from the shortness of the course duration, but the philosophy underlying it was the desirability of a staff college having direct contact with the *whole* service.

Beyond the tenth year for officers and the sixth year for A.G.s, however, the balance shifted towards a selective basis—to some rather than to all. The selection was based essentially on promotion, in that courses were ideally provided for all who were promoted to principal officer and chief officer, to A.G.I and governor III. The aim of the courses was more specific, in that it reflected the increased managerial responsibility accompanying promotion to the next grade. Also, side by side with these were courses for people assuming, or likely to assume, new roles, as for example the new training principal officer and the new hostel warden.

The overall picture, however, was that the staff college programme was dominated by the “refresher” type course for *all*³.

It was this refresher type of course which was suspended in November 1966. It is this type of course which, in the reconstructed

programme for 1967-8, has suffered most severely. Why?

It had been originally intended that the programme developed in 1963-4 should be reviewed after approximately five years. The crisis of autumn of 1966 prompted an earlier appraisal. It was clearly apparent that the enormity of the task which the college had set itself was proving too much, even for the increased resources which the Prison Service had provided. The additional backlog created by the suspension of training would make the task almost impossible. Officers on the development course were already coming back a year later than originally planned. The drive in 1965-6 to cover, through the senior refresher course, officers up to 15 years remained incomplete. Meanwhile the good recruiting years of the early '60s presented a formidable problem for the five-year refresher course. Given the existing more limited accommodation resources for post-experience courses, reality indicated that the refresher and senior refresher courses could not continue to be part of the resumed programme. The alternative was courses for some rather than courses for all. With the development course, meanwhile, a compromise was achieved, in that whilst many officers would not be able to attend any development course, the course itself should be

resumed, as soon as possible, for officers with one year's experience and, if and when possible, the course should be linked more closely with initial training and the staffs of the O.T.S.s.

Whilst the details of short term planning are possibly important, the implications underlying decisions are more important, in that they may affect long term planning and future resources. The short term policy would seem to imply that the aim of the central training organisation to provide training for *all* may be limited to initial training, including the first recall course, principally the development course for officers⁴. The corollary would be that post-experience courses *at the Staff College* would be for *some* rather than for *all*. If this is so, two issues immediately arise. Firstly, if the selection remains as at present based on those who are facing new responsibilities, does this imply a move towards less general and more specialised courses? Secondly, does this imply that additional training responsibilities are thrown upon the region and upon individual establishments?

3. GENERAL OR SPECIALISED COURSES

The basic assumption underlying the development, refresher

and senior refresher courses, was not only that the Staff College had a direct responsibility to *all*, but that, irrespective of the type of establishment from which an officer came and the nature of his responsibilities, a common course should be provided. These courses were homogeneous with respect to membership of the Prison Service, rank and length of service, heterogeneous regarding type of establishment and type of experience. They reflected a belief in the underlying unity of the Prison Service and the generic qualities of officers' work. On the other hand, there were more specialised courses reflecting the diverse needs of establishments and the specialised needs of particular officers' roles, as for example the courses for hostel wardens. But the balance was clearly with the general course. Should it continue to be so?

The question of the balance between the general and the specialised courses is basically the problem of the balance between uniformity and diversity within the Prison Service. One aspect of this balance was referred to and affected by the Mountbatten report. With respect to the twin aims of the Prison Service, the Mountbatten report stressed unity, in so far it maintained, *vis-a-vis* the role of the prison officer, that "it would be a mistake to create two

classes of prison officers, one concentrating exclusively on security and the other on training and rehabilitation . . .". It stressed specialism, however, by continuing that ". . . but security would be enhanced if it were possible for a small number of senior prison officers or principal officers to take a course in sophisticated security techniques". The creation of the position of "security officer" and the provision of courses for security officers possibly accelerate a shift towards specialisation and diversity. The suggestion that, "there is an increasing body of relevant knowledge (*re* the rehabilitation of prisoners) which it would be an advantage for selected prison officers to have" may, in turn, strengthen the trend.

Again, in terms of establishments, diversity is stressed by the enormous expansion during the post-war years and the changes which have taken place, particularly those emanating from the Criminal Justice Act 1948, with its remand centres and detention centres⁵. Likewise the Mountbatten report, with its recommendations about maximum security prisons and the classification and allocation of prisoners, according to security risk, emphasises diversity of establishments whilst seeking to reaffirm the unified aims of security and rehabilitation.

In the short term, the shift toward diversity and specialisation

is seen not only in the provision of courses for specialist officers, like security officers. It is seen also in the decision to try to ensure that personnel attending "post-promotion" courses are selected so as to form groups more homogeneous in terms of establishments and experience, and to provide more specialised and relevant courses for them.

The emphasis on generality, meanwhile, is retained in the initial training courses, with only a limited amount of streaming. In the long term, however, the balance between uniformity and diversity, between generality and specialisation must rest upon a classification of establishments' primary aims upon a more thorough and detailed appraisal of the roles of officers, assistant governors and specialists in different types of establishments, and upon the responsibility of the Staff College to each.

There is one further aspect of this question which has received some attention. In the main, courses have been recruited from personnel of the same status—all officers, or all P.O.s or all welfare officers or all governors. As such it might be claimed that the college was helping, consciously or unconsciously, to perpetuate the hierarchical structure of the service. In one respect, however, it departed from this—in the case of mixed conferences, at which specific

problems, as for example life imprisonment or the selection of officers, were discussed by prison personnel of different ranks and status. In the immediate programme these have been maintained but not expanded. In the long term, the problems of communication between different levels in the hierarchy, which this question poses, must be re-examined. To bring people together in a staff college for a limited period does not in itself guarantee improved communication within the establishment. Perhaps the crucial problem in this area is one linked with the general question, springing from providing courses at the Staff College for some rather than for all, namely, what is and should be the role of the college in relationship to other resources in the training field?

4. STAFF COLLEGE OR TRAINING IN ESTABLISHMENTS

One of the very clear implications of the shift from initial to post-experienced training, from comprehensive to selective course recruitment, from general to more specialised courses, is that the provision at the Staff College and the training schools must be appraised within the context of the training resources in separate establishments and in the regions, and as a part of the further and higher educational resources of the country. If the refresher and senior refresher courses had any

significance at all, their cancellation adds to the training responsibilities of the establishments and/or the regions. Negatively, the abandonment of these courses may be regarded as a loss; positively, they may be regarded as an important and necessary change in the devolution and decentralisation of training responsibility from the college.

The short term policy has been to try to ensure that the three-week courses for new training P.O.s and the one-week course for more established training P.O.s are retained in the programme. The problem here continues to be that in so many cases the responsibility of the "trainer" in establishments is not matched by appropriate power and resources. Given, however, a clearer picture of the in-service training needs, the demand for resources should have more weight. To this end the 1967-8 programme contains a limited number of conferences for deputy governors or assistant governors in charge of training in establishments. The hope is that the college and the service learn more about the training programme in establishments and more about how establishments see their own role, that of the regions and that of the college in the whole training complex. It could be, that in respect of long term policy, the role of the Staff College should increasingly be that of collector and disseminator

of information about training schemes developed in establishments, and a "trainer" of the "trainers".

Finally, however, the thinking precipitated by the suspension of training was influenced by the place of the Staff College as a part of a system of further and higher education, as well as part of the Prison Service. The expansion of university extra-mural classes for Prison Service staff, the experiment in introducing university and higher education staff to in-service training in establishment, the secondment of prison staff to university full-time courses—all reflect the increasing bond between the Prison Service and the wider educational system. It reflects too, perhaps, an awareness that work within the Prison Service, whilst different, is not unique, and that the Prison Service has something to offer as well as receive from other agencies. The original decision in 1964-5 to structure the college into three departments: management, social studies and technical, was a part of the same process—to facilitate communication with comparable departments in other training and educational establishments, as well as with the experience of the field. Each college department, therefore, must have in any programme courses of sufficient length and specialisation to ensure that personnel of seniority within the Prison Service and within

universities, or other training organisations, can join with the college staff in extending the boundaries of subjects which are relevant to the job situation. This is reflected in short term policy particularly in the medium length management courses for senior personnel. It is also one of the

encouraging features of the new security course, that it provides opportunities for development at this level for technical studies. In the long term, it is perhaps only if the rather longer senior courses develop that the Staff College will become a college in an educational as well as a service sense.

References

¹There may or may not be a conflict between the two, between the framework that is and the framework that ought to be. Usually there is. If the Staff College cannot grapple with this, then indeed it may well be said, "Doctor, heal thyself", for presumably the primary aim of any staff college is to help equip people to administer efficiently what is, but also to analyse critically so as to promote what ought to be.

²The term "post-experience" is used because I understand it is fashionable, but also because it conveys, more than any other phrases, the fact that it is "training" organised after, and on the basis of, some reasonable experience in the work situation.

³It is, perhaps, appropriate to suggest, at this stage, that the alternative model was to be found at the Police

College at Bramhill. There post-experience training is clearly separated from initial, is based on provision for some rather than for all, and is pre-promotion rather than post-promotion.

⁴This in turn raises important questions about the location of officer initial training in relationship to A.G. initial training on the one hand, and to post-experience training on the other. The developing role of the officer in treatment establishments would suggest the desirability of seeing the initial training of officers and A.G.s related to each other.

⁵A survey of the role of the prison officer being carried out at present suggests that his role in certain establishments is so essentially different from that of others, that the whole concept of the prison officer's role is, in reality, thrown in doubt. Presumably the same applies to the role of the assistant governor. Hence the problem of the general course.

We who work in penal establishments (in our early days before selection) are often asked "What are your outside interests?" and somewhat later in our careers many of us feel the value (or sometimes the lack) of a hobby taking us right outside the job. Canoeing is part of the job of many physical education instructors; to P. J. Roney of Gaynes Hall it is also a hobby. Here is his account of the 1967 race from Devizes to Westminster. He and his partner, David Bennett, finished 25th overall and ninth in the civilian class. Of 137 crews starting, only 60 finished; the result for them can be described as "first class effort against terrific odds".

Wet Cold or Wet Warm

THE RACE IS FROM Devizes along the Kennet and Avon Canal to the Thames at Reading, a distance of 53½ miles with 57 locks, then down the Thames a further 71½ miles and 20 locks. In good conditions the race calls for strenuous and sustained effort; if the weather is bad it's almost impossible.

It is difficult to pinpoint what really induces crews to enter this event. After a previous failure at the 70 miles mark a couple of years ago, I vowed never again. However, a quiet drink in the local with fellow members of the Viking Kayak Club left me committed for the 1967 race. My partner was to be David Bennett, a very experienced canoeist at home and abroad who, during 1966, won 11 major L/D races. Who was I to turn down the opportunity to race in such good company?

As both of us had had a successful and long racing season behind us we felt that training should be kept to a minimum and we only paddled a total of 100

miles together in preparation. We decided to save our strength for the actual day. A K.2 canoe was loaned to us and several people assisted with special items of kit necessary for the race. Not only must the distance be covered but the canoe must be entirely self-supporting. Therefore, all food and drink is carried, together with a quantity of compulsory equipment (two-man tent, two sleeping bags, a complete change of clothing, cooking and eating utensils, a liquid fuel stove, torch and issued emergency rations). As the 77 locks are all portaged, the canoe and contents very quickly become a weight-lifting competition at each lock.

The race itself is a time trial with senior crews choosing their own starting time, from 08.00 hours on the Good Friday to 10.00 hours on the Easter Saturday. The duration of the race is around the 24 hours mark, depending on the ability of the crew. This means that at least half the race must be



Mr. Roney (rear) and Mr. Bennett emerge from 600 yards of pitch black tunnel where to capsize would mean immediate retirement

negotiated at night. It is general policy to tackle the canal section during the day.

We elected to start at 08.00 hours on the Good Friday and, after having our kit inspected and checked, our race number was sealed on to our wrists (this is to prevent any crew changes during the race—the number tags are checked at least 20 times and the kit twice during the race). Sixty other crews were starting with us and we went off at 30-second intervals, finally getting away at 08.15 hours.

It was a little chilly at first, but we were soon warm and the sun shone at regular intervals. Our support team, who had driven us

down and taken all the worries of preparation off our shoulders, were giving good vocal support every three miles. At the 30-mile mark we holed the canoe on a submerged rock, but were able to repair it satisfactorily and it held throughout.

The canal was choked with weeds and debris and at times we fancied ourselves on the *African Queen*. We progressed steadily throughout the day to arrive at Reading at 20.00 hours, a little tired but comfortably wet. (You are never really dry canoe racing, it's either wet cold or wet warm.) The last lock on the canal has a weir and the water changes dramatically from static to rapid. To

complicate matters the road bridge just below the lock was being rebuilt and all the water funnelled through a shootable eight-foot gap. A small crowd had gathered to watch the fun but with frantic support strokes we were able to disappoint them and sped off down the Thames.

With the coming of darkness comes depression and a rapid deterioration of morale. We had been paddling now for 12 hours and beginning to feel the strain. The night was fairly kind to us and a full moon peeped from behind clouds to shine an occasional light. The large and dangerous weirs thundered out their warning and we were glad of the additional impetus after each portage. At 05.00 hours the sky darkened and we were now both physically and mentally tired, a large danger sign loomed up on our left and as we carefully passed it a row of large sluice gates appeared before us. We had missed the lock cut and were racing towards a miniature Niagara. Turning a K.2 right round is difficult enough in still water—we had about 25 yards in which to go about with the current pushing all the time. Enough adrenalin was pumped into our blood stream to suffice all the competitors!

Once past this hazard we were further stimulated by dawn breaking. With just 25 miles to go we began to feel confident. On towards Teddington, our last portage, with the last 14 miles of tidal water

below it. To catch the tide coming in is disastrous as it will push a tired crew back up river. We dragged the canoe over the rollers and with a strong wind on our backs pushed ourselves on in greater effort with the knowledge that the tide had already turned at London Bridge and we were racing to meet it.

At Putney Bridge we were both suffering from cramp so much that we had to get out of the canoe and stand thigh deep in water stumbling about trying to restore our circulation much to the delight of waiting boat race supporters.

Off again and the tide had turned. The final four miles was to take us one-and-a-half hours. The wind against the tide roughened up the water and this was further aggravated by large ships that had started to move about on the high water. It seemed as if Westminster Bridge would never come and for the first time we lost our tempers and blamed one another for our predicament.

Suddenly we were there! Willing helpers lifted us bodily out of the canoe, a quick handshake to my partner and the relief of having made it was overwhelming. The watching crowd chanted "Never again" and took the words right out of my mouth.

I would like to take this opportunity to say "Thank you" to all the people who helped us, especially Trevor Colebourne, P.E.I. from Hindley, whose cheerful encouragement helped us so considerably.

Role Conflict in Prison

W. PERRIE

BEFORE WE CONSIDER the roles and role conflict in a prison there are two factors we must consider. The first is, a prison is a total institution with all that implies. The second is the apparent conflict in aims inherent in the containment or security aspect of prison and the reformatory or rehabilitation task it is expected to perform.

A total institution is recognised by the all encompassing or total character which is symbolised by the barrier to social intercourse with the outside, i.e. walls, locked doors, etc. A prison is primarily organised to protect the community against dangers to that community.

The normal social practice is for people to sleep, work and play in different places, under different authority and without an overall rational plan. The central feature of a prison is a breakdown of the barriers normally separating the three aspects of life I have mentioned.

Firstly, all aspects of life are conducted in the one place and under the same authority.

Secondly, each phase of the individual's life is carried out in company with others all of whom are treated alike and required to conform together.

Thirdly, all phases of life are tightly scheduled and planned under a central ruling. The rules are imposed by an authority and finally the enforced activities are dovetailed into an overall rational plan and designed to fulfil the official aims of the prison.

To control and implement the movements and activities of largish groups of people, a small number of staff are used. This, of necessity, results in surveillance rather than supervision and guidance—a seeing to it that everyone does what he has been told in a situation where non-compliance will stand out clearly.

In such a situation there is a basic split between staff and inmates resulting in preconceptions one has about the other. Staff can see inmates as bitter, mean and

untrustworthy. Inmates can see staff as condescending, authoritarian and rigid. Staff can feel superior and righteous; inmates can feel inferior and blameworthy.

These are a few basic features of a total institution and they apply not only to prison but to establishments ranging from a mental hospital at one end of the scale to a monastery for religious training at the other; from a public school to a home for old people.

A prison has two legal requirements laid upon it. One is contained in the Order of Court or Committal Warrant and decrees the length of time the offender will be contained away from society. The second is a statutory law requirement which directs that the offender shall be encouraged and assisted to lead a good and useful life.

In the first instance, the inmate's co-operation is not invoked. He is removed from society and once that is done, he is not obliged to co-operate in his containment. Strictly speaking, of course, the man who agrees to be sent to an open prison and remains there and serves his sentence, in part co-operates in his containment. However, to ensure any progress in reform and rehabilitation, the inmates' co-operation is essential.

Thus we have a situation where the inmate is contained by physical means, such as walls and locks, against his will, and expected to co-operate in his reformation

willingly when no sanctions against his non-reformation can be brought to bear.

By the same reasoning he can see the establishment committed to two aims—to keep him and reform him. He will more easily identify with the success of the latter than with the success of the former. We may now turn to conflicts of interest, conflicts of roles in the day-to-day administration of a prison, but before we do I would like to point out that staff who successfully deal with role conflicts are staff who understand the problems of a total institution and the apparent contradictions of security and training or treatment goals.

The original concept of a prison sentence was that it should be punitive. Isolate a man at work, at exercise, even at church, give him degrading and non-productive tasks such as the crank and the treadmill to perform and he would reform his ways. That the Gladstone committee found men were discharged from prison brutalised and embittered under such a system is now a matter of history.

But the system was in essence simple. Contain inmates for the period of their sentence and submit them to an uncomplicated, punitive regime. It followed that the organisation to manage such a system was also simple and uncomplicated.

The prisoners were under a system of surveillance by staff and

staff were under surveillance by senior staff and so on. There was a hierarchical pyramid of command and orders were passed down the chain of command. All that was asked of inmates was that they obeyed orders and conformed to a rigid regime. All that was asked of staff was to ensure the regime was maintained to ensure prisoners carried out orders and to carry out orders themselves. Aims and goals were built into the system and staff were not asked to become involved directly in a treatment situation.

There was no treatment even in the sense we know it; there was no communication between staff and inmates, there was little or no communication between senior and junior staff and as a result no organisational or role conflict was permitted to develop.

This brings us to the situation of today. Steadily over the years there has been encouragement for staff to communicate with inmates, for juniors and seniors to communicate with each other. Experiments such as the Norwich scheme, the hostel scheme, open prisons, working-out scheme groups have been mounted and a genuine attempt to come to grips with the task of rehabilitation has been made. But the primary task of containment has remained. We in prisons may have changed from being punitive-minded to being reformative-minded, but being

security minded has an unbroken history with us—and quite properly so. After all, you cannot train a man who is unlawfully at large in the next county.

Communications and ideas about group work, working-out schemes and other positive aspects of reform now flow upwards, downwards and outwards. Communications about security still flow downwards and in the main only downwards. In a prison, all communications flow through the centre and this is manned and controlled by uniformed staff. Uniformed staff are in a strong position to influence the priority given to communications they feed into the communications system.

They are also not unaware that whilst no one has ever been taken to task over failure to reform an inmate, this is not so about the security of an inmate—and the uniformed officer is responsible for discipline and good order.

Communications, then, are at the source of role conflict. Social workers, psychologists, welfare officers and even idealistic staff, come into work in prisons; the emphasis of treatment has changed; but unless the people I have mentioned can get space in the communications system of a prison, they can become isolated and partly ineffective through no fault of their own.

The following are two examples of role conflict: the prison welfare

officer has a responsibility for inmates' welfare; to do his job he must have access to inmates, not only that, often he requires that men be at a certain place at a given time. His priority is welfare. The discipline officer on whom he depends to gain access to inmates, to whom he goes to get men in a given place at a given time, has a different priority: it is that of good order. As he sees it, it is not all that important that inmate A should see the welfare officer. To the officer discipline and order have a higher priority, and so the communication is not passed and the man does not arrive. It is only when staff recognise the right of other staff to carry a role and the sanction to exercise it that they begin to work as a team—and this requires training. Contrary to the impression I may have given in this illustration, staff have always interested themselves in genuine welfare problems, even in the darkest days, but they were always frustrated in doing something about them as no one else seemed interested. Consequently, training brings quick results. A commentary on the present position at Swansea might be the cry of an already over-worked prison welfare officer that he was being snowed under by discipline staff uncovering inmates problems on their landings and bringing the inmates to him.

The trained discipline officer not only ensures that his role has its

priority, but exercises his responsibility to communicate other inmate needs to the proper authority. He thus ensures other priorities within the prison, not directly his, are fulfilled and in so doing reduces role conflict.

The second example is about work. The industrial scene has changed over the years in prisons. With the advent of new industries it was necessary to appoint civilian trade instructors. These men were civilians responsible for output and production in workshops. They had no immediate production boss in the prison, but were under the control of the Directorate of Industries at Head Office. Periodically they were visited by industrial supervisors, but in the main there was little direct support at the establishment in their carrying the role of production experts.

The situation was that they were in workshops, possibly with a couple of discipline officers and completely isolated from communications about production. In a sense they were captives of staff exercising the role of discipline staff. The result was they began to borrow the tools of discipline staff. They judged their workshops by standards of good behaviour and good order. In this sense an orderly workshop was more important than a productive workshop and, not surprisingly, inmates fell in with these standards. In these circumstances it was necessary to

emphasise to instructors that they had a right to demand a priority for production; that their needs had a place in the system of prison communication.

It was also necessary to ensure that they were supported in the role they carried. Finally, with regionalisation of prisons, it was possible for them to maintain closer contact with their immediate superiors in the field of production.

In conclusion, my experience has been that there are several "musts" to reduce role conflict in an organisation such as a prison. I would list them as follows:

1. Agreement on aims and goals.
2. Organisation of the establishment to carry out aims and goals.
3. Agreement about priorities and methods.
4. Definition of areas of responsibility, authority and accountability.
5. Effective communications.
6. Training of staff.
7. Constant reappraisal and consultation with staff about all aspects of the system.

I suggest it is only along these lines will a solution be found.

"The Transfer"

NEW BOOK

Eyre & Spottiswoode. 25s. 0d.

SILVANO CECCHERINI was sentenced to five years' imprisonment in Italy in 1940 for striking a naval officer. He escaped in 1944, was sent back, escaped again and after trial on two charges of theft was sentenced to 22 years' imprisonment.

The Transfer, his first book, published in 1963, was written in prison but the same year he was released suffering from a heart complaint.

The story is of a transfer between prisons: it is not sensational but rather sad, with a helpless, hopeless air about it which catches the character of many long-term prisoners.