

JULY 1973

FIVE PENCE

No. 11
new series

P R I S O N S E R V I C E J O U R N A L



Editorial Board

DAVID ATKINSON
H.M. Borstal, Hewell Grange
IAN DUNBAR
H.M. Borstal and D.C., Usk
GEORGE FERGUSON
H.M. Prison, Pentonville
KEN MOODY
Staff College, Wakefield
JOHN ST.Q. ROSS
South-west Regional Office, Bristol

PRISON SERVICE JOURNAL

Editorial Office: H.M. BORSTAL, HEWELL GRANGE, REDDITCH, WORCS.

For orders through H.M.S.O. for delivery by post:

Single copies . . . 7½p
Annual subscription 25p for four quarterly issues

The editorial board wishes to make it clear that the views expressed by contributors are their own and do not reflect the official views or policies of the Prison Department



Contents

Editorial	1
The Loneliness of the Long Distance Board Members Joyce Williams	2
Detention Centre After-care G. R. Saunders, B.A., M.Sc. A. Bilton, B.Sc. (Soc.)	5
Open Prisons—How Important are They in Future Prison Policy? John Williams	6
Delinquents into Donors Alec Dickson, C.B.E., LL.D.	8
Personal Experience an aid to Prison Administration Rosemary Deane	13
Grendon Still Under Disputation Mark Williams	14
Cartoon	15
The Individual and Aggression in Institutions R. S. Taylor	16
Thoughts on Disturbances in Prison R. H. Shapland	18
Can Recreation Programmes Help A. Chainey	20
Readers Write	23
Book Reviews	24

Our cover picture, supplied by Central Office of Information and taken early in the year, shows a scene from Spring Hill open prison



© Crown Copyright 1973

Printed at H.M.P. Leyhill, Wotton-under-Edge, Glos.

EDITORIAL

ONE of the more encouraging signs about today's world is surely the emancipation of "do-gooding"—a term of derision still in some professional circles. Lady Bountiful and her basket of goodies covered with a fair linen cloth still enjoys a muted existence, but she has some interesting company; helping the less eligible is no longer a genteel exercise confined to the assuaging of middle-class conscience, nor is it a sole prerogative of the trained social worker. The fabric of modern society may be warped by violence, crude commercialism and excessive permissiveness, but there is also a strong, healthy weft of anger and concern directed at the roots of inequality, and a vast enthusiasm for direct action shared by the least likely elements. One very tiny but significant example of this mood was provided by the Hells Angels chapter which undertook urgent letter deliveries (by motor-bike) during the postmen's strike.

The criminal is a person who has opted for a short cut to success, material and psychological. He is often, despite (or because of) his aggressive stance, a person with a low self-image, starved for recognition and unwarmed by the appreciation of his fellow men. Give him (preferably before he has acquired the criminal label, but as soon as possible anyway) the revelation that there are others who suffer more, often helplessly, the opportunity to earn their gratitude and the human satisfaction which goes with being on the delivering rather than the receiving end of the business, and the results may surprise even the most judgemental among us. You may not turn cynical, pragmatic proletarians into good conforming pillars of society, but you will in many cases turn predators into protectors, delinquents into donors. This is the theme of an article (page 8) by the man who founded V.S.O. and Community Service Volunteers, and who presumably knows something about the motivations and the end-products involved in the helping trade. C.S.V.'s already include borstal boys and ex-prisoners.

It is a well-observed fact that converts make the best evangelists. The delinquent *qua* social worker has the enormous advantage over his convicted colleagues of credibility. He knows what he is talking about. And there is a bottomless pit of need in our community for helpers—full-time, part-time, professional and voluntary. If we were less stuffy about "records", and really meant it as a society when we say that punishment wipes out the debt, we might make a real contribution to the solution of the problem of prisons. Government, especially in those departments concerned with law and order, could give a positive lead in this field.



Joyce Williams is a justice of the peace, deputy chairman of Hampstead Court and chairman of Chelsea Juvenile Court. She is a member of the board of visitors for Wormwood Scrubs and Feltham. She is hon. secretary of the Inner London branch of the Magistrates' Association responsible for the excellent report on the use (or non-use) of senior attendance centres, about which she wrote in this journal in July of 1972

The Loneliness of the Long Distance Board Members

*Inaugural Conference of the
British Institute of Human Rights*

JOYCE WILLIAMS

contribute with a modicum of insight on vital aspects of the deliberations. Indeed an odd situation!

DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES

But the threat to existing institutions and to our tiny part in them became apparent as the conference continued—particularly so when we split into our “working groups”, and the “us and them” situation crystallised. Yet everyone there cared deeply about the functions and working of prison establishments, wished to promote prison reform, to ensure the rights of the individual—and of course, wanted something done about overcrowding. The polarisation of attitudes of the board members and the rest of the conference seemed one of approach more than of desired goals, of a dedication to work for reform and improvement from within the establishment, as opposed to criticising the system at hook line and sinker level! Hence loneliness of an intellectual kind and the frustration of being a voice in the wilderness. Fluent discussion in the working groups proceeded with enthusiasm but with large wells of ignorance about how institutions function and of the by-products of inmate sub-cultures: so many there had, one suggested, penetrated prison gates only for professional interviews—cocooned from actuality. They meant well and they *cared*, but much of it was off beam.

The conference was held in the gloomy but respectable Church House, Westminster—with plenty of tables at the rear of the hall for bookstalls,

seemingly available for anyone's use. There were Cobden Trust reports, N.C.C.L.'s small folders on arrest/police cautioning/sureties, etc., heavy pamphlets from Strasbourg and Amnesty, and an account of Belfast University research on emergency regulations, in addition to a batch of leaflets on Long Kesh. Howard League's booklet on bail sold well (tragically released on the day of the press strike last summer it had received little publicity) Justice had its range of reports—and P.R.O.P. and R.A.P. their leaflets. Most of us appreciated the opportunity to select and browse (what a pity H.M.S.O. doesn't have a public relations and advertising section, for people like lay justices who have to go and buy their wares—but that's another hobby-horse of mine). Reception worked efficiently—it should, for conference fees were terrific. And we each got a file of information, notebooks, etc.—and a plethora of buffet meals.

After opening speeches by Lord Kilbrandon and the Rt. Hon. Silkin, Q.C., M.P., Lord Gardiner chaired a plenary session on “Imprisonment Following Sentence of the Court” at which papers were read by Shirley Williams, M.P., Professor Terence Morris and Norman Fowler, M.P.—and Duncan Fairn talked. Subsequently, the Rt. Hon. Sir Kenneth Younger chaired the session on “Detention Preceding Sentence or Acquittal” at which Michael Zander and Professor T. C. N. Gibbens read papers. Duncan Fairn again participated—(deputising I think)—and in his inimitable style

LONELY it was, for the two of us who attended, although both were magistrates of not inconsiderable experience and with long associations with various Boards of Visitors. Sent by the Magistrates' Association as representatives to the conference on 24th–26th November 1972 on “Detention—Minimum Standards of Treatment” we went with alacrity to take part in a programme of absorbing interest to each of us and keen to hear a galaxy of distinguished speakers. Not that it wasn't stimulating, informative and enjoyable—assuming you could provide the high level of concentration needed for very prolonged sessions—we could and we did. Nevertheless we were odd—very odd in the atypical sense, having no more than slight and remote experience of prisons among a bunch of professionals. There were lawyers, politicians, criminologists and other academics, writers and journalists, research workers and students, representatives of Howard League, Justice, N.C.C.L., a sprinkling of probation officers and justices of the peace and ex-prisoners—and a few from R.A.P. In the event, those ignorant amateurs, the board members, too often found themselves the only people able to

had everyone rocking with laughter and listening to every word. And he made some pungent points.

Saturday we assembled for the plenary session on "Detention Under Emergency Regulations" with Sir Leslie Scarman, O.B.E. in the chair, speakers being Cedric Thornberry, Peter Archer, Q.C., M.P., Sir Robert Thompson, and A. B. McNulty, secretary to the European Commission of Human Rights. Worthwhile heavy stuff—relished by lawyers.

Reeling slightly from this intensive experience, the conference then divided into the three working groups of their choice, and talked hard until about 6.30 p.m. Real audience participation at last: very stimulating, very chaotic, and not nearly enough time for it!

IDEALS AND PRACTICE

WORKING GROUP A with Lord Gardiner sphinx-like in the chair, was on "Imprisonment Following Sentence of the Court". Many conference members selected this group and in the event, suggestions and discussions ranged round optimum conditions for people in custody, in spite of the designated title "minimum standards". It having been agreed that the new British Institute of Human Rights should check that Home Office Prison Rules are "not less favourable than United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for Treatment of Prisoners", we got down to practicalities. On second thoughts, that may be a euphemism. At any rate, we discussed a variety of matters which have been exercising those in the Service for some time as well as certain facets about which individuals present had very strong feelings indeed. Lord Gardiner recorded the points made. Difficulty of access to prison rules was described in some institutions, and the desirability of there being complete sets in prison libraries, together with the "Standard Minimum Rules" was suggested: also that prisoners be entitled to order any book or publication available to the general public! Experiments in relaxation of censoring were welcomed, and some thought it should cease altogether, apart from incoming mail being examined for contraband in the presence of the prisoners (a fine practical idea for big locals!)

UNNECESSARY SECRECY?

Among restrictions widely held to be unnecessary was petitioning before obtaining legal advice, and the chronic problem of unstamped insurance cards. It was hoped that implementation of recommendations of the Franks Committee would diminish what was described as "the extraordinary degree

of secrecy about what goes on in our prisons". (How would landing officers react to peripatetic journalists?) More consultation between prisoners and staff was thought desirable as was the extension of contacts between prisoners and the local populace. Voluntary agencies should give more ancillary help to enable the Prison Welfare Service to expand, and parole be more freely granted in domestic crises. Consideration should be given to the increase of visits during the first month of a sentence (I omit diatribes on the iniquities of closed visits). Talk of prison work stimulated idealistic comments on the need for vocational training and the desirability of prisoners choosing their type of work. And the group was firmly unanimous that the Prison Medical Service should be part of the National Health Service—many thinking that all prisoners should have the right to ask for independent medical advice. Throughout the day's discussion, the degree of overcrowding now existing and its deleterious effect on proper standards was deplored. It was noted that a relatively small reduction in the average length of prison sentences would result in improvement and that the tradition of the judiciary in sentencing by multiples of three months affected this. "Could it be", said one cynic, "that the judges thought this necessary for calculation of the E.D.R. with accuracy"? So, preparation of statistics on the seemingly sparse use made of stretches of 7, 10, 13, 17 and 25 months might, in the long term, jolt the Courts and have far reaching effects! Does this journal penetrate the statistics department of Head Office?

For those who have spent their professional lives in the Service, many of the ideas expressed would seem irrelevant, irrational and totally impossible, because of the peculiar and abnormal pressures existing in institutions. Nevertheless, the group consisted of representatives of many organisations interested in this field spending long hours over a long week-end, considering and discussing their ideas. Yet the balance of actual and factual information was affected because the viewpoint of Home Office personnel, governor grades and prison officers was not available. Hence any report of the proceedings makes sad and rather inconsequential reading, for although the two Board of Visitors members separated, one to group A and one to group B, their actual knowledge and experience is necessarily limited and the "establishment" aspects of many

points were in consequence inadequately ventilated.

The functions of Boards of Visitors were fiercely criticised, it being contended that the members who do rota visits, take applications, hear complaints, etc. should not be responsible for disciplinary functions. Strong views were expressed about the conduct of adjudications, and the group resolved that the Home Office be invited to appoint a body to enquire into the present system, covering also whether evidence should be given on oath, whether there should be representation for prisoners and prison officers (with legal aid) and the power to subpoena witnesses. Disciplinary proceedings being open to the press, and right of appeal in more serious cases were also mentioned. All this heady stuff was, rightly, a blow to one's complacency. Yet there is no doubt that more thinking about it is necessary within the system, and probably there should be dissemination of information about the conduct of disciplinary proceedings to interested persons, penal reformers, etc. The strong criticisms expressed about Boards of Visitors, dual functions have been passed back to the Magistrates' Association Treatment of Offenders Committee, who are to study the matter. It is hoped that others will also consider the issues raised: there is no point in us well-intentioned Boards of Visitors members considering we give a fair hearing if justice is not "seen to be done"!

WORKING GROUP B on "Detention Preceding Sentence or Acquittal" was chaired by Sir Kenneth Younger, who collated recommendations under various headings: *Interrogation* following arrest, and before a Court appearance, necessitated reasonable rights for the detainee without unduly obstructing investigation of a crime. Use of tape recordings for reference in case of dispute were recommended—also that an independent (i.e. non-police) body should enquire into complaints against the police. A standard form notifying the detainee of his rights should be used, legal advice be available early, and a panel of lawyers be available on a rota system. *Bail* was thought to be too often refused, although an extremely low proportion failed to appear for trial, and it was hoped the Courts might be influenced by education. It was emphasised that the onus should be on the prosecution to inform the Courts of valid reasons why a remand in custody was thought necessary; also that the restrictions of section 18 of the Criminal Justice Act 1967 were ineffective and should be

replaced. More bail hostels were needed. And the group was unanimous that "punitive" remands in custody, without intention of eventually passing a custodial sentence, were rejected as unacceptable. *Conditions on remand*: the group agreed these should offer facilities as near to conditions outside as possible—but found time inadequate for detailed discussion of reception procedures, clothing, work, leisure occupation, etc. Contact with lawyers for preparation of a defence was often found difficult, and telephone and postal communication should be facilitated. All agreed that remands should be held in more numerous places, better distributed, so as to reduce the journeys for lawyers wishing to see their clients. There was thought to be a strong case for improving remand conditions in local prisons. *Medical and psychiatric reports*. The overall shortage of psychiatrists was noted, and the group regretted that Courts should use a remand in custody because a "state of mind" report was needed. If standing arrangements were made with local psychiatrists for the necessary reports to be made in the community in each area, pressures on prison medical staff and overcrowding in remand conditions could be reduced. This group also called for the integration of the Prison Medical Service and the National Health Service and welcomed the first few joint appointments of psychiatrists by the Home Office and Regional Hospital Boards.

WORKING GROUP C on Detention under Emergency Regulations was chaired by Mr. Geoffrey Garrett and made recommendations under two headings. Circumstances justifying detention should be governed by international standards which were embodied in substantive domestic law, and a British commission of human rights should be set up. All procedures should be in accordance with comprehensive written instructions, available to all detainees and to their legal advisers, and these advisers should have unrestricted access to their clients. Regular impartial inspection—including medical inspection—was recommended.

Detainees should not be deprived of any rights except their liberty and proceedings and treatment should comply fully with civil and criminal law. General standards should be at least as good as those for convicted prisoners set out in United Nations Rules. An independent judicial tribunal should investigate complaints expeditiously.

PRISON STAFF NOT WIELDERS OF PUNISHMENT

Sunday at 9.30 a.m. was a session for summing up and reporting back by the three distinguished chairmen of the working groups. (The content of previous paragraphs on views expressed in groups B and C was gleaned from this—and also from personal communications.) The concluding address by the conference chairman was a delightful philosophical discourse ranging over a selection of the points covered by the three groups. "It was wrong", he said, "to regard imprisonment as normal treatment for the social misfits . . . we ought to be looking for means of regulation, rehabilitation and punishment which do not involve the deprivation of liberty". And he spoke of "the deterioration of personality in custody which is so destructive of attempts to rehabilitate"; and of overcrowding in ancient buildings and its attendant evils both in the U.S.A. and also in Britain. Lord Kilbrandon observed "there may be, in this country, a remedy in the hands of the judges. The

judges might say 'we are authorised by law to impose the punishment of deprivation of liberty, but we are not authorised by law to impose the punishment of mental, physical and moral degradation. Unless there are places where we can order persons to be confined, deprivation of liberty being the only penalty imposed, we shall cease to send people to prison, because when we do so we are doing something which is beyond the powers which have been given to us' ". (Quietly said, this had a stunning effect.)

After speaking of local opposition to allowing the building of new prisons and difficulties of authorising the money, Lord Kilbrandon spoke of prison staff. "They were not", he said, "mere custodians, mere disciplinarians and still less wielders of punishment. The quality of entrants, the conditions of service and their standing in the community were important in a social service becoming more and more significant. The prison officer must have a job which is attractive not only to himself but also to his neighbours".

Historical Records

I am busy collecting information on material which will preserve our historical records and which may also be used in some future Prison Service displays (for example, our own museum). At present I am engaged on the history of prison officer uniforms (male and female) since the late 19th century. I am, therefore, anxious to study pictures, photographs or written details of these uniforms and I would welcome Service assistance in carrying this out. Some of this material may be found in establishments, but most likely it will be best discovered in museums or private hands.

My office is in Prison Department, 89 Eccleston Square and I shall be pleased to receive information from any quarter at this address. I am prepared to take copies and return originals very promptly and very carefully. Incidentally, material can be sent to me by official channels.

Dates, places and personalities shown should be included where possible.

I hope as many people as possible will turn out their cupboards and discover items which will make a good contribution to our records and displays in the years to come.

LT.-COL. HAYWOOD, *Home Office*



Collectors Corner

Mr. G. Ewing of H.M. Prison, Brixton, London, S.W.2, is well known as a collector of military insignia, including badges, etc. of prison services all over the world. (An article about his collection was featured in the PRISON SERVICE JOURNAL in January 1972.) Mr. Ewing believes that there may still be some undiscovered "treasures" lurking in private hands in this country and he would be happy to hear from anyone who possesses anything old or interesting in the way of "prison insignia, any country, any period, prices negotiable". Interested parties should contact Mr. Ewing direct.

Detention Centre After-Care

A Probation Officers Assessment

G. R. SAUNDERS, B.A., M.Sc.
Principal Lecturer in Psychology, Manchester
and

A. BILTON, B.Sc. (Soc.)
Lecturer in Social Studies, Manchester
Assistant Governor, Spring Hill

Graham R. Saunders, B.A., (Psychology) Leeds, M. Sc. Applied Psychology (Aston). Age 34. Experience: two years housemaster in approved schools, one year group work in Settlement House in America, two and a half years research at universities of Aston and Manchester, and seven years lecturing at Manchester Polytechnic

Anthony Bilton, B.Sc. (Soc.), L.S.E. Two years research assistant, Manchester Polytechnic, two years lecturer in sociology, Cambridge Technical College. Age 26

INTRODUCTION

As part of a follow-up study of 400 boys discharged from detention centre during 1968, each boy's after-care officer was asked to give his views on the boy's family situation, attitudes, problems and social adjustments. This paper reports on the way the after-care officers rate their clients and also on which of these ratings predicted further reconvictions.

RESULTS

Family and Home

When asked to rate the standards of furnishings and cleanliness within the home, after-care officers rated the boys' homes as "good" in 57 per cent of the cases, "average" in 29 per cent and "poor" in 14 per cent. Poor home furnishings and cleanliness were related to reconviction.

Rather more than 90 per cent of the sample had brothers and/or sisters. After-care officers did not generally see brothers and sisters as being "problems" to either parents or social control agencies. Only 18 per cent of the sample had a brother or a sister rated as a serious problem, and in 57 per cent of the cases, all the brothers and sisters were rated as showing no behaviour difficulties.

Family Relationships

The after-care officer was asked to assess the feelings each parent had for his or her son, and the feelings the boy had for his father and his mother. He was able to make such a judgement in the case of 68 per cent of the fathers and 72 per cent of the mothers. In the remaining cases either the parent was dead or absent, or the after-care officer did not feel that he was able to make a judgement with confidence.

As can be seen from Table 1, the relationships between the boys and their parents were generally seen as being good.

TABLE 1

After-care officers' ratings of the relationships between boys and their parents (figures are percentages)

	<i>Feelings of Boy for Father</i>	<i>Feelings of Boy for Mother</i>
Attached ...	31	61
Indifferent ...	26	15
Hostile ...	15	6
Over-protective	—	—
Other ...	28	19

	<i>Feelings of Father for Boy</i>	<i>Feelings of Mother for Boy</i>
Attached ...	32	44
Indifferent ...	19	8
Hostile ...	14	4
Over-protective	3	16
Other ...	32	23

Fathers seen as hostile were more likely to have sons who were reconvicted within one year of their release from detention ($p < 0.001$), but mother's hostility was unrelated to further convictions.

Work Record

During the year after their release from detention, 52 per cent of the sample were seen as having a good work record; 16 per cent were seen as average; and 32 per cent as poor. There was a positive correlation between reconviction and being seen as having a poor work record ($p < 0.01$).

Attitudes

After-care officers were asked to judge the attitudes of their clients towards work, their supervisor, the police, non-

authority adults, their own age group, and to obeying the law. The results of these judgements are as follows:

TABLE 2

After-care officers' ratings of boys' attitudes (figures are percentages)

Attitude to:	<i>Good</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Poor</i>
Work	49	23	28
Supervisor	32	42	26
Police	11	53	36
Adults	29	56	15
Peers	52	38	10
Law	28	46	26

The boys in the sample were much more likely to be seen as anti-police and making little effort to keep within the law, than being unwilling to work or getting on badly with their own age group. However, only a third of the sample were seen as markedly anti-police, and in every case except attitude towards the police, more boys were rated as "good" than "poor".

With all the ratings of attitudes, except attitude towards peers, a rating of "poor" predicted reconviction ($p < 0.001$).

Effects of Detention and After-Care

Each after-care officer was asked to judge the effectiveness of detention centres and after-care with each boy, and also the quality of his relationship with his client. A quarter of the boys were seen to have benefited "a great deal" from detention, whilst in a third of sample, no benefit had accrued.

After-care officers were sceptical of their own value. Boys were seen as being helped by after-care "a great deal" in only 19 per cent of the cases. In 29 per cent of the sample, the amount of benefit was seen as "nil". On the other hand the after-care officer saw himself as having generally close relationships with his client; he rated 72 per cent of these relationships as "good" and only 3 per cent as "poor".

Boys whom the probation officer saw as having benefited from both detention centre and after-care, and boys seen as having good relationships with the probation officer, were less likely to be reconvicted ($p < 0.01$).

Problem Areas

After-care officers were asked to rate the presence or absence in each subject of various "problems". The results of these ratings are summarised in Table 3.

TABLE 3

After-care officers ratings of problems (figures are percentages)

	No Problem	Some Problem	Serious Problem
Immaturity	32	47	21
Relations with opposite sex	72	22	6
Guilt feelings	74	22	4
Absence of guilt feelings	63	27	10
Physical aggression	70	22	8
Verbal aggression	68	24	8
Blames others for own faults	69	23	8
Little insight into own problems	32	45	23
Swings of mood	66	26	8
Alcohol	71	23	6
Drugs	96	3	1

After-care officers saw their clients as frequently being immature (defined as behaving in a way characteristic of boys younger than themselves) and having little insight into their own problems. In other problem areas, subjects were seen as largely stable.

Probation officers saw reconvicted boys as having more "problems" than non-reconvicted boys. Particularly significantly related were ratings of being immature, not having guilt feelings, being aggressive, blaming others for their own faults, and having little insight into their own problems. The reconvicted boy, therefore, was seen as being aggressive and lacking social awareness.

Delinquency of Neighbourhood

After-care officers described 48 per cent of the boys as coming from highly delinquent areas, 30 per cent as coming from areas with average rates of delinquency, and 22 per cent from areas with low rates. There was no association between these ratings and further offences.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Boys on after-care were not, on the whole, seen as being psychopathic menaces. The majority were seen as coming from reasonably stable homes and having good relationships with their

family, friends and work associates. Most did not have chips on their shoulders, most worked steadily, and few were seen as psychologically unstable. The after-care officer was able to predict the recidivist. Boys whom the after-care officer saw as having poor relationships with their fathers, poor attitudes to work, authority figures and the police, a poor work record and many problems, were boys who were likely to be reconvicted and also more likely to be sent to borstal.

However, there are problems in interpreting these results. When the after-care officer made his ratings, he was fully aware of whether the boy concerned had or had not been reconvicted. An after-care officer, asked whether John Jones, now in borstal, was a success on after-care, is hardly likely to answer "yes" without some reservations. Similarly if an after-care

officer firmly believes that poor work habits are related to delinquent behaviour, his judgements may show a marked "halo" effect. He may distort his perception of the boy's work record because of his knowledge of his reconvictions. He may also resent a less favourable report to the Court if the boy has been a poor worker, and thus make his committal to borstal more likely. Social science has certainly demonstrated that people's judgements and ratings can be markedly affected by their own beliefs and preconceptions. The after-care officers also varied in the extent to which they knew their clients. Some boys and their families had been well-known to the officer over many years. In some cases, there had been little contact. Generally speaking, the researchers were impressed with the detail in which the after-care officer was able to discuss the adjustment of these boys.

Open Prisons —

How important are they in future prison policy?

JOHN WILLIAMS

Assistant Governor, Spring Hill Prison

THE first pilot schemes in community service work, for offenders who would formerly have gone to prison, have now commenced in selected areas of the country. This most progressive step towards keeping and training offenders within the community deserves every support from those whose task it is to work within the prison system. In spite of this new option now open to the Courts there is still a considerable gap between methods available to the Prison Department and treatment carried out in the community. My purpose in writing this article is to present to the reader a case for rethinking our attitudes towards open prisons in the light of these latest developments, and to suggest that they could provide a means for bridging this gap.

CHEAP TO RUN

Open prisons in the United Kingdom

have evolved through pressure to relieve overcrowding in existing closed establishments. The opportunity to acquire disused service camps and use them as prisons, with a minimum of conversion, has been the financial motivation for the creation of an open unit. Once the negotiations have been successfully concluded and the buildings "converted" prisoners can quickly take up residence. Such prisons are cheap to run, with relatively few staff required to keep them ticking over. So long as allocation techniques and the regime of the prison do not cause an unacceptable level of absconding, they tend to fade into the background. Public opinion throughout the last two decades has not encouraged us to become too adventurous in our policies, but now that open prisons have become accepted, it seems to me that the time is ripe to adopt a more progressive approach towards their use.

As the community work project gains in usage it will cream off many of the men who could reasonably have expected to be allocated to open conditions. For those who continue to become category D a more planned, gradual return to the community should be provided. As we in the Prison Department know only too well "training people to remain free in conditions of captivity" is a responsibility which inevitably leads to many disappointments. As we lose some of our best clients to the community work projects care needs to be taken in the method used to replace them. Rather than take undue risks with freshly sentenced men of doubtful stability, more use should be made by governors of closed prisons of their ability to re-categorise men towards the end of their sentences. A man is more likely to return successfully to his home if he does so gradually via an open prison, particularly if such prisons are developed along the lines as suggested here. Several men came to us from Maidstone Prison in 1971 and were able to adjust well to the open conditions at Spring Hill.

The self discipline which keeps prisoners in open prisons could be harnessed to a programme of work and social activity both "inside" and within the community, designed to avoid one of the most distressing features of imprisonment, namely, the individual's gradual loss of self-confidence and personal dignity. Such a planned schedule of increasing contact with the outside would be of benefit not only to the individual, it is also potentially valuable to both the department and the local area.

NEW RULES WANTED?

We are governed by prison rules, borstal rules, detention centre rules and standing orders, backed by a considerable array of circular instructions. The majority of these rules are designed with the closed establishment in mind. Perhaps the time has now come for the "open prison rules" to be compiled and for standing orders to include sections which allow open prisons to develop their community links to a much greater degree than is now possible.

At Spring Hill we have tried to create situations which afford men the opportunity to spend some of their time outside the boundary hedges, but many of the men spend their entire sentence without leaving the prison. The number of men working for civilian employers varies from a self-imposed maximum of 35 in the summer to approximately 25 in winter. Some of these men dress in

civilian clothes each day to work in local factories, whilst the remainder work for surrounding farms. The money they earn goes to Treasury funds. It could go to the support of their families under the same rules as for the hostel scheme. Other outside activities are much the same as in other open prisons, with sporting fixtures on a home and away business, visits to local church services,



Towards the end of 1968, Spring Hill open prison was amalgamated with Grendon prison under the governorship of Dr. W. J. Gray, Medical Superintendent, with an assistant governor class I "in charge" of the open prison. John Williams was posted to Spring Hill in November 1970

Educated at Cathays High School, Cardiff, he joined the Prison Service in 1956, serving at Usk open borstal for six years as an officer, followed by seven and a half years as a housemaster at Guys Marsh open borstal. He was attached to the psychology department at Wormwood Scrubs for six months immediately prior to his present appointment. He is a married man with two children aged 12 and 15

working parties to assist at village fêtes, entertainment at old people's homes and the occasional man who plays with the local brass band. At Christmas, for the last two years, we have held a Christmas party for inmates' children by hiring the village hall and organising, through an inmate committee, and an inmate Father Christmas, an afternoon of presents, food, balloons and fun which allows families to be reunited outside the prison setting. Over 150 presents were distributed, paid for by the men.

The opportunity for the planned expansion of an outward-looking programme of rehabilitation for category D men is a challenge to us all. Several new category C camps are scheduled for opening in the next few years and they will no doubt wish to think along similar lines for selected men. By

enlisting the assistance of the local Probation Service, community service schemes could be developed from which men could progress to employment by local firms. The rules governing parole which are rightly designed to ensure that security risk men do not easily leave our prisons, could be rewritten for open establishments to allow governors greater discretion. This would enable them to work with welfare officers in the delicate field of domestic stress. The reformatory value of being able to send a man to visit his sick child in hospital, even if he or she isn't a dying relative, would be immeasurable. Through our system of hut meetings, inmate committees and group counselling, men at Spring Hill know they can talk to staff about their worries and be assured of a sympathetic hearing. Often, however, the help which one would like to give in smoothing over a domestic crisis is not possible. An application made to the department in 1970 requesting permission for men to be granted the privilege of spending their last visiting afternoon outside the prison, has recently been renewed, and an answer is awaited. Such an opportunity to spend one's last visit getting the feel of life outside would form a constructive final stage in restoring a man to freedom. Let some readers with former knowledge of Spring Hill are under the impression that only very short term men are accommodated there, may I state that our roll includes all sentences from six months to four years, with an average sentence varying between 18 months and two years. By no means all of our longer sentence men qualify for release on parole licence, and it is for the three and four-year man that I believe these changes could be particularly important.

Since their inception open prisons have invariably taken their place at the rear of the queue. That a man was placed in open conditions was considered privilege enough. From new buildings to such mundane items as the issue of foam mattresses, they patiently wait their turn. I trust that we will not become so involved with arguments for or against dispersal prisons, the ever-present overcrowding issue and the one-thousand-and-one other problems which cry out for our attention in closed establishments, that we miss the chance to use effectively one of our best avenues for reform. The redrafting of open prison rules along the lines suggested would cost relatively little, and could result in considerable savings for society from a section of our prison system which is already providing comparatively cheap custodial treatment.

Delinquents into Donors

The Student Aide Programmes at O.H. Close School and Karl Holton School for Boys Stockton, California

ALEC DICKSON, C.B.E. LL.D.

STOCKTON is a smallish town in Northern California, set in rather flat, undistinguished country. Drive down South Newcastle Road and where you should find No. 7650 you encounter a notice "O.H. Close School for Boys"—and, a little further on, another notice "Karl Holton School for Boys". A foreign visitor might be a little surprised both at the proximity of two apparently identical establishments and wonder whether, in all California, more scenically attractive sites might not have been found for two academies or prep schools. The native Californian, however, is not deceived. He knows that "Youth Center" and "Boys School" are euphemisms for correctional institutions run by the California Youth Authority—and that one should understand "youth" to imply "delinquent youth". Even the word "boy" is scarcely to be seen or heard once the notice board at the entrance is passed: thereafter it is normally "ward", occasionally "inmate", sometimes "youth"—and, praise be, even "youngster" or "kid" in conversation—but never "boy".

Three institutions, each with its fenced perimeter, in fact meet the eye. The third was designated as the DeWitt Nelson Conservation Training Centre, for younger boys, but is presently being used as a central administrative block, to service the other two schools. It was actually intended to be the nodal point of a complex of no less than 12 institutions, each with a roughly similar lay-out. This horrendous concept—that would have made Stockton a delinquent depot, a stockpile for deviant youth—has fortunately not been implemented. Different views regarding the treatment of young offenders now prevail with greater emphasis today on dealing with the youngster in his own environment and reserving residential training for those cases where this has been shown not to work.

Under the California Youth Authority—rightly known throughout the United

States for the blend of intelligence and humanity which permeates its work—youthful offenders with no history of violent crime, who are deemed to be minimum escape risks, go generally to the conservation camps. There—in a spirit redolent of the Civilian Conservation Corps during the days of the great depression—they work in outdoor programmes administered jointly with the Division of Forestry, building trails and cutting fire breaks. At one of these camps, Mt. Bullion, half of the boys have joined with local high school youngsters to form a sing-out group that sings songs of unabashed idealism, brotherhood and hope: in the words of one ward, "when we're singing, we're not thinking bad". Another imaginative introduction of the C.Y.A. has been to enable boys at the Youth Training School near Ontario to listen to convicts from a nearby prison speak about their own wrecked lives. The older, more sophisticated or aggressive youths are assigned to the Deuel Institution at Tracy: in contrast to what happens in many other states, the commitment of these older youths under the Youth Authority—a quarter of the C.Y.A.'s total ward population comes in the 18–21 age bracket—gives them one final opportunity to avoid the disabilities of felon status.

Somewhere in between the constructive open-air life of the youth conservation camps, where any day can bring the excitement of tackling a forest fire—and the more conventionally controlled regime of the Deuel Institution, administered as an adult establishment by the Department of Corrections—come the two schools at Stockton, O.H. Close and Karl Holton.

Both schools deal with boys of intermediate age—roughly between 15 and 19 years. Both owe something to a remarkable Englishman, perhaps more honoured in the United States than in Britain, Maxwell Jones, father of the concept of the "therapeutic community".

Both base their treatment strategy on the formidably sounding Interpersonal Maturity Level Classification System (Juvenile). "I-level", as it is mercifully known in abbreviated form, divides young offenders into subtypes according to how the youth sees himself and others in terms of emotional feelings. O.H. Close School has developed differential treatment programmes for the various I-level subtypes, using a transactional analysis approach. Karl Holton School, on the other hand, is applying a behaviour modification approach.

The lay reader who may feel daunted by allusions to the Interpersonal Maturity Level Classification System should not despair at the apparently even deeper social-psychiatric implications of transactional analysis. Its author, Dr. Eric Berne, has made the fundamentals of this concept not only comprehensible but even entertaining in his best seller *Games People Play*. Briefly, the approach is to make the individual aware of the feelings and behaviour patterns of the parent, adult and child—each contained within him. And then, since the life plan of an offender is typically destructive, the strategy is to confront him with the opportunity to decide whether or not, as adult, he wants to reverse that decision in favour of a more constructive one.

But no grounding in psychotherapy is required to understand the significance of the student-aide programme that O.H. Close School has introduced, surely one of the sanest and most compassionate innovations made by any governmental agency responsible for the rehabilitation of young offenders anywhere in the world. The general belief—exemplified in the influence of the Artful Dodger, under Fagin's tutelage, on the smaller boys, in *Oliver Twist*—is that the impact of the older delinquent upon the younger is nearly always injurious: hundreds of superintendents and wardens of institutions for juvenile offenders in so many countries would say that this was borne out by their experience. It is precisely this belief that the student-aide programme has turned upside down.

Older wards—who have been selected on the basis of background and education, and who have volunteered to train and serve as aides—are brought from other delinquency institutions to O.H. Close School to help look after the younger wards there. The wards chosen as student aides range between 18 and 21 years: the boys at O.H. Close are some three years younger.

The cross-age factor is a vital one. In their classic study on "Delinquency and Opportunity" Ohlin and Cloward noted how age status influences the transmission of delinquent behaviour patterns and values: in gangs that have senior, junior and midget divisions, the younger members model themselves on the older gang members. At O.H. Close this learning process is now being used to convey law-abiding patterns instead of delinquent standards. "Most of the kids don't want to appear childish when the aides are around: they act a little more mature in their presence and try to copy them in their work", one staff member remarked.

"Whereas the boys used to pattern themselves after each other and their peer group—which brought them down—now they behave more manly and have adult persons to pattern themselves after", one counsellor observed. "In our unit we have mostly low-maturity wards", another said. "When one boy gets excited, the rest seem to pick it up: now we're seeing fewer boys involved in acting-out incidents. The younger boys seem to look forward to be this age—I only hope they don't think they can eventually also become aides".

"What did we expect initially?—anything from manipulation to homosexuality. Certainly at the beginning some of the aides tended to identify more with the wards than with the staff. But I am impressed by the way each of the aides seems to have a special talent. One has an art class with seven kids—keeps them interested and sets a good example. Another aide is particularly good in woodwork and is a tremendous asset to the boys in the shop. The interns—we call them interns rather than aides—have helped to develop a good social climate. They've been able to take boys aside and counsel them and take disruptive influences out of the group"—so another member of staff has testified.

A teacher describes the contribution of an aide to his classroom work: "The aide is making it possible for me to devote more time to specialised teaching, and is taking the load off my hands in class. Then, too, just the advantage of having another personality in the classroom helps greatly. Sometimes when a boy is 'turned off with me' so to speak, I can get him to turn his attention toward the aide and do some work, whereas he normally would be finished with me for the morning, possibly through some mistake of mine".

The occasional critical comment: "we've had some trouble with a few

aides who tend to relate with boys more on a physical basis rather than a verbal basis" (whatever interpretation that might support) and "those aides who tend to manipulate boys are the hardest to manage in this programme"—would seem to indicate that the contribution of the majority is a positive one. It is also a reminder that older delinquents do not just of themselves naturally serve as positive models for younger wards: that most in fact do so is a tribute to this programme's ability to effect change in attitudes and behaviour. Indeed, some aides could be said to motivate the teachers.

The aides fulfil two functions as we have seen. The simplest and most direct is working as tutors and assistants to teachers: and in undertaking special activities—in hobby crafts, entertainment, recreation, etc.—for wards in a living unit. Also implicit is the concept of aides acting as role models for youngsters with whom they interact. But they have a third function: they serve, too, as mediators or interpreters between the value systems of wards coming from youth subcultures and those of middle-class oriented staff.

Yet it is, of course, the aides themselves who gain most from this programme. Frank Riessman has pointed out that "while it may be uncertain that people receiving help are always benefited, it seems much clearer that the people giving the help are profiting from their role". The change in status from inmates to assistants obviously gives deep satisfaction. Serving on a team alongside the school's adult staff, performing worthwhile service for younger wards, achieving competence as recreation organisers, teaching assistants or counsellors—small wonder that most of them derive considerable self-esteem and gratification from their experience. As with Alcoholics Anonymous and Synanon, the helping role brings dignity where previously there was degradation.

The student aide programme at O.H. Close School has been funded by a grant made under the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act. It numbers some 40 aides, a dozen or so allocated as a group to each of the four living units. "At the beginning we tried to choose them on specific racial counts as well as consideration of offences committed, etc.", we were told by Len Ralston, student aide programme co-ordinator. "An ideal group would have four browns, four blacks and four whites. We quickly broke through that and went for the young man who wanted to do the job". "We lean very

strongly for the outgoing athletic type. We're looking, of course, for young men older than our wards. For work with people I'll take personality over brains any day. We pick basically for leadership qualities. Student aides do not have to be high school graduates. However, part of their training is to finish their own academic education and they must have a high enough I.Q. to be able to complete high school. The aide must be able to comprehend written material, especially in his training: unless he can do this he may not change from his 'street' techniques when working with wards."

One modification that experience has brought about in the programme—the shift in selection away from a balanced racial allocation in favour of personal qualities—has already been mentioned. There have been others. Originally, three months were spent—as inmates—at the Youth Training School: during that time those chosen for this programme were receiving instruction in the concepts and procedures for dealing with younger wards: and in improved self-understanding and interpersonal relations through group dynamics. After this orientation the aides would spend the subsequent six months at O.H. Close, working as teaching, recreational and counselling assistants.

Recently, however, there has been a change in this procedure—and now instead of receiving aides in groups of 12 from the Youth Training School, selection is made from two nearby reception centres. This is intended to bring two advantages. First, the aides spend nine months at O.H. Close instead of six. And the O.H. Close staff have the opportunity themselves to choose directly from a wider selection of youths at the reception centres, instead of taking delivery just of those sent to them by the Youth Training School.

But it does not seem to be working out quite as intended—somewhat to the mortification of the O.H. Close staff. Perhaps it is too easy for the youth who finds himself being asked, shortly on arrival at a reception centre, whether he would like to transfer to the O.H. Close programme where he will at once enjoy the privilege of semi-staff status. Possibly Shakespeare was right in putting into Lear's mouth the words, "Expose thyself to feel as wretches feel". Being first an inmate, alongside other inmates, at the Youth Training School, discovering what it feels to be a disciplined ward, may be an indispensable part of the psychological preparation for assuming responsibility as an aide.

Another change relates to their accommodation. Originally aides occupied the same living units as the younger wards. Now, however, they have their own wing—and this arrangement has made possible an intensification of the counselling programme which enables the aides to deal with their own problems. Certainly it gives them a chance to enjoy some relief from the stresses and strains of being all the time amongst the younger boys. Yet, here again, one would have some doubts. In institutions of this kind it is the night scene in the dormitory, after lights out, that may present the real battle-field, to be dominated by the bully or the foulest-minded—or possibly influenced by a courageous and committed aide. In an army setting, officers have a function to fulfil that is accorded separate accommodation—though not in the field: the justification for junior N.C.O.'s is that they exercise leadership even whilst sharing conditions in all essentials with the men.

Not that the aides are allowed to forget the vulnerability of their position. Len Ralston eschews ambiguity and sentimentality. There is a brisk robustness about his approach and his pronouncements. Student Aide Rules state—in lettering larger even than the typeface employed for the Queen's correspondence at Buckingham Palace—that: "The responsibility for your conduct is yours. We, the staff, do not wish to play the role of the man, nor do we intend to play cops and robbers. . . . You choose to live within the limits of the student aide programme—or you choose not to live within the limits of the student aide programme. We can only define what the limits are, we cannot carry you".

Len Ralston brings to his work a fantastically wide and detailed experience in the organisation of recreation. Drama, music, sports, carnivals, crafts, free play, the devising of equipment, the utilisation of specialists, the planning of schedules, safety factors, the publicity media, the exploitation of holiday and seasonal opportunities, ward participation, the involvement of "loners" and misfits, the organisation of tourneys, the role of spontaneity; all of this is imparted to the aides, with the emphasis always on a helping relationship. Not only is it incumbent on the aide to develop a "recreation profile" on each of his wards, to know their individual interests and needs, he is never to use derogatory nicknames or to let down a boy.

For six months only? No—for this is a career training. Here, indeed, is a

cardinal factor in the student aide programme. The training is intended to prepare the aides for employment in human service occupations upon their parole. The helper role that permeates the whole programme is strengthened by the hope that most trainees are gaining experience and skills which will lead to a more meaningful aide job or some related career in the community.

Here again we see the influence of Frank Riessman, from whose paper on "The 'Helper' Therapy Principle" we have already quoted. For the future of the new careers movement, with which he has been so closely associated, can vitally affect the development of this programme. As employment becomes increasingly difficult in the United States, the para-professional finds himself competing against the professional. There is a placement service to help wards when they are released on parole; but it is difficult to get jobs in the Civil Service—and harder still to get into the field of work with children and youth.

On the future of his student aides Len Ralston speaks with feeling: "We've been training in accordance with the new careers concept and sighting in on the bottom of the ladder position; now we find college graduates competing for these same positions. But if some of our own staff don't know how to make good use of aides, how is the community to know?" The small proportion (45%)—is that really so low?—of aides who secure jobs as para-professionals causes them uncertainty during their time at O.H. Close School and may explain why, initially at all events, there was no significant difference in parole violation (recidivism) rates between the aides and the control group which received vocational training at the Youth Training School. One recalls the last, sombre lines of Eric Berne's *Games People Play*—mindful that it is his theory of transactional analysis which underlies thinking and action at O.H. Close School: "There is no hope for the human race, but there is hope for individual members of it".

A very aggressive programme is needed to place aides, Ralston feels. The task calls for "hard-sell salesmanship", half-way houses, and greater staff involvement after parole—though Ralston urges that placing aides, giving them situational training and helping them to adjust to the new job, should be in the hands of the same staff who have worked with them at O.H. Close and in consequence really know them.

On release from O.H. Close School the student-aide receives a certificate of completion, testifying to his achieve-

ment in training as a "correctional staff assistant". It carries an illustration of a young man, head inclined, with chin resting on clasped hands. Admirers of Norman Rockwell may remember one of his illustrations for *The Saturday Evening Post* in the fifties—"Breaking Home Ties"—where at some country railroad station a father sits, pensive, beside his teenage son, eager for the train that will take him to the outside world. The figure that adorns the certificate of completion conveys concern no less poignantly—the concern of a young man for others, tinged perhaps with anxiety at his own ability to cope.

But the California Youth Authority has undertaken one very significant measure—surely outstanding in its blend of logic and humanity—to help remedy this situation. In view of the very limited job openings for such young men in the human services, it has itself created a new classification within the Civil Service—for correctional programme assistants. It is not as comprehensive as some would wish: for example, aides who have a felony on their record cannot thereafter work in institutions because they are debarred from becoming peace officers. But it is a step in the direction of making new careers not just a concept but a programme.

At the very moment of our leaving O.H. Close School two former student-aides were arriving—to take up positions as correctional programme assistants. We asked one, white, why he felt attracted to return in this capacity. With wry candour he replied: "I simply couldn't find any other work". Very different was the reply of the other, black: "I've come back to change things. When I was here I saw things that needed putting right—but I couldn't do that as a student-aide. Perhaps I can now that I'm a member of staff".

Meanwhile, back at Karl Holton School. . . only 4-500 yards away and in an identical administrative lay-out, an aide programme struggles for survival which is at variance with many of the principal characteristics of the O.H. Close approach.

At Karl Holton the aides do not number more than a dozen. They work in one wing only, Juba Hall. There is no supporting grant from the E.S.E.A. Neither does the programme bask in official approval: it is, rather, the product of the determination of a small group of staff working in one particular living unit.

More significantly still, the aides are not "imported"—pre-selected from amongst a wide range of youths and given preliminary orientation at the Youth Training School or the Deuel Vocational Institution. Karl Holton School is the source of its own aides. And all their training must be conducted on-the-job.

At this point we have to look more closely at the I-level system mentioned earlier—the Interpersonal Maturity Level Classification System (Juvenile)—which divides the wards, at both schools into a number of subtypes. For practical purposes the first of these—in a sense, the lowest—is known as Maturity level 2. Maturity level 2 (I₂) describes the individual whose principal concern is that the world take care of him. He sees others primarily as "givers" or "with-holders" and has no conception of interpersonal refinement beyond this. He is unable to explain, understand, or predict the behaviour or reactions of others. He is not interested in things outside himself except as a source of supply. He behaves impulsively, unaware of the effect of his behaviour on others. Within this categorisation the individual can be either aggressive or passive. At Karl Holton School the wards classified as I₂ are accommodated in Juba Hall—and it is to these wards, and to these wards alone, that aides of higher maturity levels are assigned.

Understandably enough, the aides are chosen from amongst those who have graduated from high school and/or shown sufficient intelligence and aptitude to undertake this demanding role. But immediately it is evident that one natural advantage enjoyed by the aides at O.H. Close is denied the aides at Karl Holton—namely the age-gap between them and the wards they are looking after. Whilst they have been selected on account of greater maturity, they are not necessarily older. It is amongst their chronological peer-group that they must make their influence felt—with all the problems implied thereby.

As if these difficulties were not formidable enough, they are added to by the nature of the behaviour modification theory that determines treatment at Karl Holton School. By this, one looks at what a ward is actually doing or saying that is socially undesirable—and works to change it. What happens immediately after a given action is important. A ward smiles and says hello! You smile and say hello! There is increased probability that it will happen again. If you ignore his

smile, there is decreased probability of a recurrence. The first process is reinforcement; the second, extinction. At Karl Holton "operant conditioning" ensures that reinforcement and extinction techniques take immediate effect.

So far, so good. What follows becomes rapidly more complex. On the strength of tests, the ward is issued with a computerised printout identifying his critical behaviour deficiencies. He then enters into contracts, in effect agreeing to do what you want him to do in return for something he wants which you control. He amasses thereby a number of behaviour change units which count toward his eventual release.

It is not just that the aide helps to administer this system—for example by assisting wards to write their "contracts". He is himself caught up in it, subject to its somewhat Pavlovian provision of instant rewards and instant penalties. When there is a menu (yes, that's the actual word) listing the price for every action, desirable or undesirable—when a ward's gesture in rising to open a door for us might, we were told subsequently, earn him an extra B.C.U. or two—what happens to altruism, the common act of kindness or friendship? Perhaps I₂ wards—by definition or classification—are held to lack the capacity for a disinterested deed: chaplains, please explain! Under these operant conditions—with which wards of all I-levels and the aides themselves must comply—it can be no easy task to demonstrate appropriate modelling behaviour.

Yet they do. In the social worker's office at Juba Hall we talked to Mr. Garry Jones and a colleague responsible for the programme—together with two of the dozen aides, Mark (white) and Frank (black). The atmosphere was informal and relaxed. Why was the use of aides restricted to this one unit, we asked? "There would be more conflict in the other units—seeing that aides would be roughly the same I-level as the wards—and their authority would be disputed. Here the I₂ wards, though they're probably aware that the aides aren't much older, regard them as superior beings."

Were they ever defied by the wards? "Of course—they'll say 'Go away, Uncle Tom' to Frank—or 'Get away, Patsy' to me", replied Mark. "You can't hit a kid and you can't give him early bed-time", said Frank: "you just try another tack—if you don't modify, you're dead".

Seeing that they did not draw their aides from other institutions, how were they chosen from amongst the wards at

Karl Holton, we asked. If on arrival a ward is assessed as possessing particular experience or aptitude, he can be assigned directly to the aide programme by the Initial Classification Committee. Mark—the son of a rich lawyer—was selected in this way. Alternatively, if during a youth's time as an ordinary ward, special qualities become discernible, he can be referred for re-classification as an aide. This had happened to Frank, from a ghetto background—originally classified as I₂. "Obviously a mistaken diagnosis", interposed Garry Jones. We silently rejoiced that Frank's qualities had eventually won him recognition: and we were not sorry, either, that the Interpersonal Maturity Level Classification System (juvenile) had been shown to be fallible.

Having to dispense with the preparation given by the Youth Training School to the aides destined for O.H. Close, how did Karl Holton organise training for their aides? "Time is needed for them to learn on-the-job", we were told. Time is what Mark and Frank both had. For one had been sentenced for a crime of violence—the other for murder. So, through an ironic chain of consequences, the care of wards comes, in some instances, to be entrusted to those who have themselves most grievously offended.

"In a sense they're bastards", said one counsellor, not unkindly, of the aides: "they belong neither to the staff nor to the wards". The programme sets out to turn the treated into treaters: in the eyes of some of their peers they are traitors. We recalled the illustration on the cover of one of Len Ralston's instructional pamphlets on recreation, showing an aide juggling with bat and ball: it bore the title, "The Great Balancing Act". "The best of them are creative, enthusiastic", remarked a social worker,—"and we burn them out".

O.H. Close and Karl Holton—two schools pursuing such different treatment strategies, yet each making such valiant use of delinquents as aides. It was a young offender—the world's first—who asked, "Am I my brother's keeper?" California Youth Authority's aides reply "we are".

.

Looking back, our concern would be what was said by one staff member: "The younger boys seem to look forward to be this age—I only hope

they don't think they can eventually also become aides". But surely the desire to achieve responsibility and recognition, even to be able to help others—should this not be within the reach of as many as possible?

The value of I-level lies not just in diagnosis, it has been claimed, but in differential treatment. The strategy of enabling young people to respond to the needs of others should not be reserved for a tiny minority: it should be extended to the many—indeed, to most.

It does not follow that the majority can achieve aide status. But alternative ways might be explored for enabling very many more wards to feel that they are wanted by the community. The outstanding youth makes his contribution as an aide within the therapeutic community of the fenced-in institution. Might not the others make their's in a less intensive, less demanding role—to the outside community of Stockton? Between the fire-fighting function of the youth conservation camps and the aide's role at O.H. Close and Karl Holton, there must be many other helping activities that wards could undertake. They could tackle many of the tasks undertaken by neighbourhood youth corps units elsewhere in the states.

The helping relationship is interpreted today throughout the United States as assistance given to those younger than oneself. Passing through a hall at O.H. Close School we saw some quite elderly folk—a small woman, white, in late middle-age and two negroes in the senior citizens category. "Is today a visiting day—or can parents come at any time?" we asked the student-aide serving as our guide. "Oh, these are local Stockton residents, they're taking part in the foster grandparent programme", he replied. Talking with the lady it was at once apparent how she delighted in the relationship as she reached upwards, almost on tiptoe, to place her hand on the shoulder of a six feet two inches tall adolescent, who grinned down appreciatively at her.

How different it would be in Britain! For there the position would be reversed. In delinquency institutions where a progressive-minded warden grants an afternoon's pass to selected youths to visit elderly folk living nearby, the assumption is that young offenders can help the local neighbourhood: it is the youths who are acting as foster grandsons to the lonely and aged. Is it the community that should be helping the young, or vice-versa? Surely there is room for both patterns



At the age of 18, Alec Dickson first met Alec Paterson in the early 1930s and today, like many others, regards A.P.'s friendship as the single most formative influence in his life. Whilst still a student, he spent week-ends at North Sea Camp, where his elder brother, Murray, was then working with Bill Llewellyn to establish the second open borstal. At 21 he accompanied Paterson as interpreter-cum-delegate to the notorious Fifth International Penal and Penitentiary Congress in Nazi-dominated Berlin, later managing on his own to penetrate into concentration camps. In 1938, he became a prison visitor at Wandsworth

After war-time service with East African troops, he worked in the field of community development and youth training in West Africa and the Middle East, punctuated on several occasions by undertaking refugee relief in Central Europe. In 1958 he founded Voluntary Service Overseas and then, in 1962, Community Service Volunteers, of which he is the honorary director. In recent years he has been consulted by the U.S. Peace Corps, the U.N. and African and Asian Governments on how their own young people can respond to human needs as an integral part of their education. Convinced that volunteering is not for students only, he is concerned today in enabling trainees at a number of borstals to be involved in community service

NEW THINKING IN THE PROBATION SERVICE

Collected papers given to the Residential Conference of Principal Probation Officers at Leicester University in September 1972.

Subjects include: Butterworth, the inspectorate, intensive supervision, bail hostels, day training centres, adult hostels, training for social work management. From F. V. Jarvis, Hon. Secretary, Conference of Principal Probation Officers, 73, Regent Road, Leicester, LE1 6YA. Price 50p.

CIVIL SERVICE COUNCIL FOR FURTHER EDUCATION

DAY RELEASE AND FURTHER EDUCATION PRIZE FUND (Inner London Region)

In the list of prize winners for this year, a member of the Prison Service is noted: Officer/Instructor Daniel James Scott of H.M. Prison, Pentonville.

Mr. Scott is a member of the Cartophilic Society of Great Britain and one of the leading cartophilists in this country today.

A cartophilist, just in case you are wondering, is a collector of cigarette cards and silk pictures issued with cigarettes in the period 1885 to 1939. War-time restrictions sounded the death knell of further issues. Even after the war, owing to purchase tax, the cigarette card companies found it impossible to re-issue cards again.

Mr. Scott, who joined the Prison Service at Canterbury Prison in 1956, has served all his service, apart from his training period, at H.M.P., Pentonville. He has amassed, over the years, nearly 500,000 cards and silks, the collection covers overseas issues such as the rare "Scissors" cigarette cards issued to British troops in garrisons in India and the Far East in the period 1900-18. Sets such as the longest numbered run of cards ever issued, 1 to 1,148, this famous set of "Guinea Gold" cards was issued in 1901. They were in photographic form and cover all aspects of Victorian and Edwardian life as well as the personalities of the day. In some cases these are the only photographs that exist of some of the leading lights of the day.

He also tells me that cards cover every subject including prisons. One card he has shows two inmates, Marks and Bacon escaping from Pentonville in 1925, this card is one of a set of 50 titled "Famous Escapes from Prisons and Dungeons" which depicts famous escapes throughout history. Elizabeth Fry the great prison reformer is also depicted on another card: I wonder how many people know that this famous lady died at Ramsgate in Kent?

This is one of the many hobbies that prison staff pursue to find relaxation in their off duty periods.

Mr. Scott received his award at the Commonwealth Hall, Craven Street, London, W.C.2., from Victor Feather, C.B.E. on 1st March 1973 along with the other winners.

Personal Experience an aid to Prison Administration

Report of an I.S.T.D. Study Tour of the Netherlands

P. C. R. DEANE



Rosemary Deane, who is an assistant principal probation officer, trained in 1941 and worked in Southend for two years. She then joined the Inner London Probation and After-care Service and apart from two years with the British Red Cross Commission (1945-7) has worked with them ever since, taking a year off to study at the Parents' and Children's Department at the Tavistock Clinic in 1957-8. She became the training officer at headquarters in 1966. In 1972 she became responsible under the principal probation officer for the probation staff working in the Borough of Islington, including the welfare departments of Pentonville and Holloway prisons

TOGETHER with J.P.'s, psychiatrists, lecturers, police officers and probation colleagues, I visited a number of clinics and penal institutions during our tour. We also had a number of lectures from professors at institutes of criminology, at Utrecht, the Free University of Amsterdam, Ministry of Justice, etc. Rather than list particulars of each institution we visited, information about which can be obtained elsewhere, I will give some general impressions which are, of course, entirely personal ones.

Historically the Netherlands appear to have shown concern and willingness to help the weaker brethren within their midst for many generations. Both their treatment of the mentally sick, delinquents and deviant members of society could be seen as humane and progressive or, by standards in Britain at the present time, excessively permissive. In addition to a generally accepting attitude by society is also the recent experience of the Dutch during the last war. Many of their leading citizens were imprisoned by the Germans. These men are now in positions of responsibility in Government, universities and elsewhere. Because of their own personal experience of the adverse effect of imprisonment they have sought to find alternatives to prison for their offenders. The result is that at the present time many of their oldest prisons have been closed and others are not full to capacity. Those who do require some kind of institution are mainly treated in purpose-built modern buildings extremely well equipped. Some of these institutions are run by private organisations, some by the State. Few are completely closed and the general trend is for inmates to be encouraged to go out into the community even on short excursions as soon as they seem able to do so. Running away is accepted as part of the system. We were told that on one occasion a group of eight young men were taken to a pop festival. When they got back to the

institution they had not eight but ten, two absconding members having returned with them.

The main principle of treatment which seems to run throughout is based on a small group. This is led by two or three group leaders working on a shift system. As much as possible is discussed in the group and decisions taken jointly. A great deal of emphasis is placed on the maturing effect of living together with others and learning to communicate. The task of the group leader is a strenuous one. They are mainly young people who train whilst on the job, being allowed time off for study over a period of about three years. They are graded as "middle class" social workers. Some go on to take further qualifications at university when they would become top grade professional workers. The majority however, seem to be content to stay permanently as group leaders working in residential institutions. Accommodation for the group leaders and their families was usually available.

A LAW-ABIDING SOCIETY

In the personal view of the two experienced police officers who were in the party there was little professional crime to be observed in, for instance, Amsterdam. The Dutch on the whole seem to be pretty law-abiding but a great many difficulties arise from the influx of other nationalities, particularly those in the young age group. The very free "walk-in" advisory centre in Amsterdam, J.A.C., was interesting and could well be considered for London or other big cities where young people tend to congregate.

In vain I tried to obtain information about the treatment of women offenders but completely failed to see even one. A very small number indeed are committed to prison, and sentences for both men and women are short by our standards. Alcoholism is not treated as an offence and the work done at the

Jellinek Clinic both with alcoholics and drug addicts I thought was impressive. They manage to combine a high degree of professionalism in the staff and yet an informal and homely atmosphere in a very large grand building which might have been somewhat oppressive. We visited one institution run by an old voluntary organisation which was only for girls. The village school was in the grounds as was also a special building for unmarried mothers. The children here were all deemed maladjusted and some interesting treatment was being given through the medium of the farm which was attached. The staff of the institutions we saw contained both men and women and this seemed to be accepted as a general principle.

LOOKING THE OTHER WAY

In our discussions with criminologists, psychiatrists, etc. we searched in vain for what we would describe as the professional criminal and his/her treatment. When asked what in fact they did with a man who continued, in spite of everything, as a petty pilferer, the reply was "we look the other way". Whether or not we should ever get to such a state of tolerance in this country seems rather doubtful. It also remains to be seen as to whether the extremely tolerant and accepting attitude of the Dutch authorities to, particularly, the young men

between the ages of 17 and 23, will pay off in the long run. As we know from our own experience here many young men do in fact settle down between the ages of 25 and 30, and maybe the Dutch way helps them to do this rather more easily than the direct punitive measures which are often handed out to mixed-up young people in this age group. Only, however, a look at the state of crime in the Netherlands in 10 years' time will show whether the Dutch way has been both effective as well as humane.

INSTITUTIONS VISITED

THE HAGUE. Central Training School for the Prison Service; Asylum for criminal psychopaths.

AMSTERDAM. Long term prison for adults (six months-four/five years); J.A.C.—Young People's Advisory Centre; Jellinek Clinic; Institute of Criminology, Free University.

UTRECHT. Van der Hoeven Clinic; Institute of Criminology on Research Projects.

MAARSBERGEN. Valkenheide vocational training home for boys.

ZETTEN. Helderling Foundation. (Group of six homes for observation and treatment of disturbed delinquent girls.)

ZEELAND. De Corridon.

(Penitentiary Training Camps.)

VUGHT. Prison for young adults.

Grendon Still Under Disputation

MARK WILLIAMS

Mark Williams was a psychological tester at Wormwood Scrubs Prison from 1964 to 1966. He graduated at Birkbeck College, London and joined the Service as a psychologist. Promoted to senior psychologist in 1968, he is currently on a year's secondment to the Institute of Criminology, Cambridge. This article is based on a talk given to a series of conferences for staff in certain Midland Region prisons

I WOULD like to add some comments to the article in your last issue, "Grendon Under Disputation" by Dr. P. D. Scott. Of course, this is no easy task. Dr. Scott has marshalled an army of experts who seem to have come together from varying standpoints and in the course of vigorous debate arrived at a reasoned position. My basic objection is that some potentially important contributors to this debate (including Scepticus) were unhappily not present; and furthermore, that some of those who were present were nodding off at crucial moments. Indeed, I have reason to believe that one at least was masquerading under a pseudonym, so that Statisticus must tentatively be regarded as Statisticus Manqué.

What were the results that set off this great debate? The major findings are below. In each case, the largest sample is taken over the longest period at risk; only sub-sample results have been omitted.

Sample	No.	Failed %	At risk for
Psychiatric:			
Wormwood Scrubs			
Hospital ...	77	38	1 year
Grendon ...	377	41	1 year
Corrective trainees ...	118	47	1 year
"Matched" Grendon group	171	44	1 year
"Matched-pairs":			
Borstal boys ...	58	64	2 years
Grendon boys ...	58	62	2 years
Oxford adults ...	87	67	4 years
Grendon adults ...	87	64	4 years

The results are uniform. Inspection of the table shows that for every comparison, for large samples of inmates and over a wide range of periods-at-risk, there is no significant difference between Grendon and the rest. The figures for anyone with experience of the Prison Service are familiar: the more "recidivist" the population, the higher the rate of reconviction; the longer the period-at-risk, the higher the proportion reconvicted. Whatever may or may not be happening at Grendon, there is no evidence of any impact on reconviction.

Now Dr. Scott has reported a lively discussion of these results in which three substantive points are made. First, the work is held to suffer from important "methodological shortcomings". Second, the results are said to be not unexpected anyway, since Grendon has been denied the authority and resources to "adequately expand and apply the model". And third, it is asserted that "Grendon's major contribution remains entirely untested", although Academicus does claim that it has "already achieved a great deal". The various contradictions expressed in these statements are the inevitable outcome of the meeting of diverse minds. However, some comment may be made.

First, the methodological shortcomings. It is quite extraordinary to me that Statisticus was so bashful in this

area. Why did he not enquire as to what *does* constitute a proper follow-up, when told that one year is "very short"? Or indeed, why did he not remind us that several other studies were over longer periods, and all demonstrated the essential validity of the one-year interval? The reconviction rates of the Oxford and Grendon samples were virtually identical at six-monthly points over four years. Where was Statisticus when this was ascribed to the fact that "the Grendon and Oxford samples must be different"? More generally, why didn't he point out that large samples, matching and long follow-ups are to protect us against spurious differences, not (as we have here) similarities? Only Statisticus himself could explain why he described the Wormwood Scrubs sample (of 77 psychiatric patients) as "tiny". Or why he omitted to mention Mrs. Newton's comment that this was "a comparison between the subsequent conviction of men who received psychiatric treatment . . . [and who] . . . were allocated on a largely random basis to two institutions", that is Scrubs and Grendon.

But these are mere details. The suggestion of methodological defects was more generally conveyed by reference to "L" plates, the "difficult" nature of studies in the "social services", "the limitations of the discipline", the need for "interdisciplinary studies", and so on. Luckily, my friend Historicus was on hand. He informed me that contrary to all these suggestions, Mrs. Newton's work ably demonstrated a standard research technique that was revealing good hospital practice over 150 years ago! However, he also warned me that such studies often find disfavour with those whose treatment methods have been shown to be ineffective. Their reaction is often to insist that the result simply means that we must first of all sort out the "curable" from the "incurable" if we are adequately to test the treatment (and nowadays this is called "classifying" or "validating a typology").

It is Statisticus who in fact informs us that "we see that valid typologies of inmates, together with classification of offences . . . and of treatment methods and agents, are still priorities". Now any genuine statistician will point out that this is simply an *ad hoc* attempt to avoid acceptance of the null hypothesis. Perhaps the solution to the riddle is that Statisticus is *not* a statistician after all. The root we seek is "statist" (= a politician), and the name should be amended to Statisticus (Psychiatricus), to suggest the quality of one whose skilful bedside manner soothes the ruffled feelings of

those whose treatment methods are suggested to be non-effective.

No, the question of methodology is in this instance a red herring. It is Crito who seems to accept it as such, when he suggests that the problem is one of Grendon being unable to "control essential factors" in the creation of the therapeutic community. This would on the face of it seem a suitable point for consensus: Grendon is not effective because the efforts are nullified by administrative indifference. But the discussants are reluctant to leave it like that.

Apollodorus, for example, goes on to conclude that "it is probable that Grendon's major contribution remains entirely untested". Now this is somewhat ambiguous. Is it "entirely untested" because Grendon is unable to apply the "treatment", or is it because of the inadequacies of the present research? If the former, then the results of Mrs. Newton's work may be acknowledged without criticism. But if the latter is intended, then surely the speaker should give some consideration as to why the "proper" research is not being carried out. If the complicated principles of experimental design were *in fact* "generally accepted" as the only ones proper for this field, then why is no one criticised for their not having ever been applied to Grendon.

Mind you, Apollodorus is a hard task master when it comes to research. Mrs. Newton had not only to be statistically sound, but also clairvoyant! Thus she was expected to cite work that had not yet been done when her own was being written up. Robert George, a student of Brunel University, unfortunately did deserve the "L" plates suggested for others (as becomes a student, after all). The conclusion that Apollodorus presumably wanted mentioned (that the longer you stayed at Grendon the better) on expert scrutiny (my own as it happens) turned out to be invalid, and the paper was not published. So even at clairvoyance Mrs. Newton wins, since she *didn't* cite subsequent work that was not in the end published!

Curiously enough, Apollodorus had also criticised Mrs. Newton for not citing her own previous work. Just what light this would have thrown on the matter may be gauged from her own bald summary of that work:

"... the reconviction rates for borstal boys treated at Grendon have been compared with those for a matched sample of boys who received training at various other borstals. While the incidence of reconviction is not significantly different for the group as a whole, the less recidivist boys do

rather better than their controls at the end of one year, and the difference has disappeared by the time they have been at risk for two years".

Academicus is the least restrained in his conclusions. "Grendon has already achieved a great deal and has had an enormous and beneficial impact on the Prison Service as a whole." "A favourable therapeutic tradition has certainly been built up, and a number of pessimistic forebodings laid low." Is this true? It is certainly an extravagant claim, and I would have thought one that needed substantiating in the present context (rather than simply asserting; perhaps even a reference or two). My opinion is not that of Academicus. I would paraphrase Professor Medawar (only he was talking about psychoanalysis):

"... the case against a psychiatric system of treatment such as that practised at Grendon does not really rest on the fact that it is inefficacious—for that must be true of a great many forms of

medical treatment—but on the fact that belief in such treatment is an impediment to the discovery of the true causes of delinquency".

This is no doubt extreme. But it illustrates surely that we need at this moment not opinions but evidence. Mrs. Newton has produced just that. She also spent many years working at Grendon, so perhaps the last word should come from her:

"... we do little service to the inmates if we treat them kindly for a while and then release them just as likely as before to commit further offences and serve further terms of imprisonment. We must continue to look for effective methods of treatment, and for this, it will be necessary to adopt a more systematically experimental approach. We have not demonstrated success in treatment so far, but the conditions have been created at Grendon in which the necessary experiments could perhaps be carried out".



"Well, you did say you wanted to opt out of society . . ."



Roy Taylor graduated in psychology at Cambridge and joined the Prison Service in 1949. He served at Reading, Wandsworth and Wakefield, and latterly at the Staff College, where he was engaged in staff training until 1972. He is now Deputy Principal Probation Inspector at the Home Office, with special responsibility for training and social work in prisons

The Individual and Aggression in Institutions

R. S. TAYLOR

also with the hostility which abounds within institutions, and with one's own aggression.

Anthony Storr reminds us that it is necessary for us to express our aggression if we are to assert our individuality and to preserve our self esteem. In institutions, there can be the fear that "self" will become a nonentity. This poses a problem which confronts most of us who are employed by an organisation, namely how to preserve our identity within a setting which requires allegiance and conformity. In order to preserve our identity we require foils against which we can express our distinctive view. This requires opposition, for it is through working together yet with some opposition, that constructive work is done. But there is also a requirement to conform. We may resolve the conflict between independence and conformity by adopting a love/hate relationship with the organisation which employs us. This is to make the obvious point that the expression of aggression is a feature of life within organisations as much as elsewhere. That it is expressed by staff as well as by inmates is commonly recognised.

An example of the expression of assertiveness in an acute form is the destructive remarks which are made about people's competence, motives and integrity, where hostility is directed against ideas which people hold, positions they represent, as much as against the people themselves. Such a situation arises from uncertainty as well as from a striving for self recognition—a situation when "I" can survive only if others are denigrated.

AMONG ENEMIES

When comparison is made between patients in a psychiatric hospital and inmates in prison, the former may be described as being emotionally flat, acquiescent and, maybe, apathetic. It is likely that the words "sullen" or

"hostile" are two adjectives which might describe many inmates in a penal establishment. Woodmansey (*Brit. J. Crim.*, April 1971) suggests that the problem of understanding delinquency is identified as: "hostility to others, which on generally accepted principles, is most likely to have arisen in the course of (and to be currently reinforced by) the hostility of others". The argument runs that since the offender is convinced, whether mistakenly or not, that he is among enemies, treatment must depend on correcting this belief; whereas punishment can only serve to confirm it. In passing we would want to examine the phrase "correcting this belief" in some detail and to consider its implications for treatment.

If Woodmansey is correct, offenders will perceive their custodians as hostile and potential enemies. Since generalised hostility is a feature of life in organisations, in penal establishments this is likely to be heightened because of the inmates' own hostility. If we accept that many inmates come into the prison system with a sense of hostility, it is worth considering some of the feelings which staff may bring to their work. When I used to interview prison officers under training, two remarks were commonly made to the effect, "I thought the job was just locking 'em up. I did not realise how much there is to it". The other was to the effect that "I am looking for a 'man's job' ". This latter remark is not uncommonly expressed by many serving officers. That is, prison is seen as emphasising control rather than treatment and for many control has a masculine connotation; yet so often the work requires compassion, a readiness to listen and to help. The way we see our work and believe others perceive it will affect our self image. I would suggest that the striving for the *man's job* is important to us, but especially for those who come from working origins in heavy industry which emphasise the physical demands of work, such as

I WAS very impressed by Dr. Anthony Storr's treatise on "Human Aggression" when I first read it about three years ago. Much of it seemed so relevant to situations we meet daily in work in prisons and other institutions, which is illustrated by the following statement: "*One feature of modern existence which tends to convert aggression into hate is the size and complexity of civilised institutions. When man is or feels himself to be an unimportant cog in a large machine, he is deprived of the chance of a proper pride and dignity. His sense of ineffectiveness is bound to re-awaken the earliest feelings of helplessness and weakness which he had as a child and unexpressed aggression turns into hate and resentment*".

The main point which Storr makes is that aggression in human beings is natural and necessary. Much of our aggression is expressed in ways which have become generally recognised and are socially acceptable. It is when aggression is expressed in an unacceptable way that difficulties arise. There is also a distinction to be made between an individual expression of aggression and collective aggression.

Let us consider some of the ideas which Storr has developed, coupled with other concepts which have been formulated about institutional life; in particular to consider ways in which those working in institutions have to deal, not only with the aggression which is directed towards them, but

miners, steel-workers and seamen. To an extent, a confrontation with hostility may help to reinforce the sense that one is engaged in "man's work". For the newly joined, there is the expectation that the work will be with "criminals". That many "criminals" are also unstable, neurotic and socially damaged can come as a surprise. For some inmates the notion of being labelled "criminal" may not be wholly unacceptable for it does imply potency and aggression; witness claims of criminal exploits which inmates make.

UNDERLYING TENSIONS

A penal institution, whether for young offenders or adults, male or female, can harbour strong feelings and so much misery, yet paradoxically, staff and inmates appear to go about their work cheerfully and often seem to be making the best of their situation. We know that this can be misleading just as we know that the apparent calm can quickly change to a state of tension. There can be that state of tension where there is an expectation that something explosive may occur, a belly-feeling that only a blood-letting will allow the status quo to be regained. Staff in an aggressive mood can be almost as frightening as inmates in an ugly mood. An establishment then can be seen as a potentially explosive system of human energies which strives to achieve a balance to accommodate the powerful feelings which exist.

It is Albert Camus who, in *The Rebel*, reminds us that an act of rebellion is retrospective. It is about things past rather than current, which makes it sometimes the more difficult to understand what it is all about. After the event, there can be an acute awareness of the damage done to relationships with a marked desire to make reparation.

Surprisingly, there appears to be an almost complete absence of references in the criminological literature to generalised aggression and hostility within institutions. There are many references to the characteristics of aggressive patients and aggressive prisoners. It is surprising that a book such as *Community as Doctor*² (Rappoport) makes no reference to aggression within the community since "acting out", such as window-smashing, has been a feature of life at the Henderson Hospital. Goffman, too, makes no reference to this. Furthermore the literature on the management of organisations contains little or no reference to generalised aggression. Yet industrial sabotage and pilfering may be interpreted as manifestations of displaced aggression; we might ask—

what is the equivalent manifestation in our establishments?

In *The strike at Pilkingtons*³ (Tony Lane and Kenneth Roberts) the authors suggest that an important feature of that dispute and by analogy other major industrial disputes (Fords, G.P.O. and miners) is the sense of power which strikers have over their employers. Strikes may give a sense of power when a complex industrial process has been halted, where authority can be rendered impotent.

It is arguable that a direct comparison cannot be made between working in an industrial organisation and working in a prison. In addition to the strong feelings which staff of any organisation may have, those working in penal institutions have to contend with other powerful feelings, not least the fear of attack.

THE NEED FOR PERSONAL SPACE

It has been pointed out by several writers that man is especially vulnerable to attack. Animals have various means of protection from attack which man does not have; we realise this only too well when we come face to face with an angry bull or a swan which is set to fight. Staff and inmates do feel especially vulnerable to attack where the fear of an aggressive assault is often real. Staves may be reassuring for staff even if inmates view them with suspicion. Staff are naturally concerned that inmates should have little access to make-shift weapons, such as shovels, although it is not usually feasible to deny inmates access to substitute weapons.

In an article in a recent issue of *New Society*⁴ (the Body-Buffer Zone) Kinze argues that violent behaviour often goes with a disturbance of personal space. The concept of personal space has also been developed by those who set up encounter groups. Kinze poses the following question: "Are violent individuals provoked simply by physical closeness to others"? Evidence collected at the Medical Centre for Federal Prisons in Columbia suggests physical closeness to other prisoners was at least as powerful a trigger to violence as were threats, thefts from cells and other provocations. Remarks made after a violent assault of the kind "I wanted him off my back" supported this notion. The original idea of body buffer-zones came from work by Harrowitz with schizophrenics. In general, rear zones are much larger for the violent than they are for the non-violent. It is not unreasonable to suppose that

there will be variations in the size of buffer zones between members of staff as well as variations in different working situations. In this sense it is surprising that there are relatively few incidents during evening association, a time when many inmates are jostling together. Perhaps the explanation may lie in the opportunities which association affords to inmates to meet one another; almost a market place function.

There are situations in our establishments where the likelihood that feelings of hostility and aggression will be aroused are greater than in others. We need to look at the context in which such things happen. In particular we need to understand more about the way in which incidents can acquire a particular significance in one situation which in other settings would pass unnoticed. We would want to consider such factors as the size of the institution, its task, the experience of the staff and many other details. One such aggressive prone situation is unlocking cells in the morning. Few people are at their best at 7 a.m. For officers there is the awareness that inmates can be sensitive about the way in which they are unlocked and the remarks which may be made. We know enough about non-verbal communication to know that a gesture can speak louder than words. The tone of voice, emphasis on particular words, facial expression and gestures can be very expressive but may not always be perceived accurately. This then is a situation which provides ready opportunities for misunderstanding leading to a display of verbal aggression.

It might be said that unlocking a cell is an invasion of an inmate's privacy, a violation of space which has hostile elements in it. Electronic unlocking may reduce the confrontation but it also introduces the impersonal element which may be worse just because the opportunity for a personal exchange is missing. For officers, unlocking is but the start of the day during which they will be carrying out tasks which by ordinary standards are distasteful, disgusting and frightening. Inevitably strong and often conflicting feelings are aroused, feelings of pity and resentment, of envy and occasionally of hatred. Officers too are made the object of inmates' feelings of disdain and ridicule. How then, does one cope with one's own strong feelings at the moment when one is also the recipient of strong feelings? In one sense officers, but particularly junior staff, can be at a disadvantage because they lack territory of their own. Inmates can retire to their cells; other staff can work out their

feelings in the privacy of their offices; an officer is in an exposed position.

PLAYING VIOLENT GAMES

There are, of course, a variety of ways in which we express strong feelings. We may contain, "internalise" them, or we can express them openly. The most common way of relieving feelings is by talking about them, of which swearing is a particular example. Hans Toch⁶ comments: "One of the ironies about violent men that we have repeatedly pointed to is that they not only play violent games but involve others in the playing of these games. . . . Often the role taken by persons representing the controlling authority may trigger the playing out of a game that ends in violence". Put another way: although the expression of strong feelings can have a relieving effect and may in some circumstances be appreciated by the recipient, in the sense that "we've had it out", however, with some violent men, this can have only a further ensnaring effect.

There are informal ways within institutions which enable us to deal with our hostile feelings. Senior staff have the opportunity to drop in on colleagues or walk about the establishment which can be tension-reducing or, within the privacy of their offices, they can smoke. They can telephone their friends. All this is denied to more junior prison officers, who can be in a particularly exposed position. An officer posted from the O.T.S. has yet to establish his identity as an officer. He does not have the security of an office, and may not have a permanent place of duty and so is without "territory". Each inmate at least has his bed. It is hardly surprising then that officers carry powerful feelings and if only for this reason, some means of support for staff is so important. An important element of the A.G.'s role is to assist staff to cope with their strong feelings, but we also recognise that we do give support to each other, though this too can sometimes intensify feelings rather than reduce them. Other means of relieving feelings can be through leisure activities, pursuing an interest; going to the club; or by making use of staff associations. Sometimes "going sick" may be of itself an expression of aggression.

Finally, we might note the part played by scapegoating, where aggressive feelings have been displaced. Since the thwarted person has been unable to direct his hostility towards the object of hostility, feelings are projected onto the innocent scapegoat because there is no fear of retaliation. A feature of scape-

goating can be a collusion of staff and inmates in the process. Anthony Storr stresses the constructive uses of aggression by man. Penal institutions by their nature can heighten feelings of staff who work in them and it is therefore important that we recognise that this is so, and endeavour to understand more about the handling of aggression in institutions.

- (1) STORR, A. *Human Aggression* Pelican (1968)
- (2) RAPPOPORT. *Community as Doctor*. Tavistock (1960).
- (3) LANE and ROBERTS. *Strike at Pilkingtons*. Fontana (1971).
- (4) KINZE, A. "Body Buffer Zone". *New Society* (Jan 1972).
- (5) TOCH, H. *Violent Men. An Inquiry into the Psychology of Violence*. Pelican (1972).

Thoughts on Disturbances in Prison

P. H. SHAPLAND

This article is based on a talk given to a series of conferences for staff in certain Midland Region Prisons

IT IS difficult to say with certainty why disturbances occur in prisons. Each interested group has its own opinions about the causes of disturbances and these naturally place the emphasis at different points. Journalists, for example, stress political factors outside the prisons and slack management inside; criminologists emphasise lack of treatment facilities and low financial investment in prisons; prison staffs point to interference from outside in running the prison, intractable prisoners and the undesirable effects of publicity; inmates and ex-inmates refer to unsuitable staff, lack of individual treatment and general public apathy concerning the penal system; official reports call attention to shortage of staff, lack of staff training and heterogeneous populations. The situation, therefore, is rather like the search for causes of crime. There is no single cause but each interested group of people will contribute opinions based on their own special experience—the late Dr. Kinsey¹, for example, said in 1955 that some riots are caused by tensions arising in normal prisoners from sexual frustrations. No doubt this kind of explanation is satisfactory for some cases but by no means all, and what remains is the fact that many of the conditions mentioned exist in many prisons but disturbances are relatively rare. So what we need is a simple framework which highlights what seem to be the most relevant factors.

Vernon Fox² says "The way to make a bomb is to build a strong perimeter and generate pressure inside". In a maximum security prison the strong perimeter is

obvious (less obvious are the effects on inmates of making escape more and more difficult). Pressure inside the strong perimeter is determined by two factors—kinds of inmates and the nature of the controlling system.

Hugh Marriage³, senior psychologist at South East Regional Office, has recently completed an illuminating study of the disturbances which occurred in adult male prisons during the last half of 1972. The purpose of this was to see whether any of 11 variables derived from the prison index could predict the extent of the disturbances. The variables included size of prison, age of inmates, age at first offence, previous convictions and proportion of sentence to be served. As expected, the results suggested strongly that the prisons holding the more serious offenders are more distur-



Peter Shapland is regional psychologist, Midland Region. Before that he was based at Birmingham Prison and worked in a variety of establishments

bance-prone and that the bigger prisons have bigger disturbances. The most interesting feature, however, was the effect of combining the variables to maximise prediction of disturbance. The best prediction was given by high personal average sentence length together with low age. Personal average sentence length is a measure developed by Hugh Marriage and is the average length of sentence, including the present, which an inmate has served. This means that it may be possible to account for the extent of a disturbance in terms of two simple characteristics of the inmates in the prison. Factors like regime and management style may affect only the form of a disturbance once it has started. This study needs repeating of course and its conclusions at this stage are tentative but apart from that it demonstrates the necessity for continuous monitoring of characteristics in the prison population in order to give adequate warning about the build up of high risk men. (Hugh Marriage's study used only information available on the prison index. Other variables will also be important. Psychiatric history, for example, is obviously relevant; the distance a man is away from home may be). It is interesting to compare this finding with Herbert du Parcq's⁴ comments in his report on the disorder in Dartmoor Prison in 1932. He refers to the emergence of a prisoner whom he described as being of the "motor bandit" or "gangster" class. He noted that sentences upon these men were necessarily severe and that they were usually young, determined and adventurous. He went on to say: "Their qualities, directed into evil channels, have made them great powers for evil, and with many years of monotonous imprisonment facing them, they may well think it worth while to take great risks. They are dangerous in two main ways: first—because they will be prepared to take great risks themselves to retain their liberty; secondly, because they are capable of exercising great influence over the weaker-minded prisoners".

The second factor which generates pressure is the sort of control or the nature of power used in the prison. Because most inmates do not want to be inside and because basically the staff's job is to keep them there, the control structure is coercive—it rests ultimately on the use of physical force. At this point it is worth comparing the way other kinds of organisation like industry, hospitals, universities and so on, control their members and what the members feel about the controls they are subjected to. The power of industrial

organisations, for example, is mostly based on control over material resources like money. Educational organisations, on the other hand, use the power of symbolic rewards and esteem like certificates and degrees. By and large, students are in sympathy with the aims of the institution so that their involvement is positive. The involvement of industrial employees can be described as neutral—they may or may not be in sympathy with the aims of the organisation. Inmates, however, certainly do not feel committed to the aims of the prison and their involvement tends to be negative. Thus, a coercive control structure leads to alienated inmates and the degree of alienation or negative feeling will vary directly with the degree of coercion applied to carry out the controlling function. As it is possible to monitor characteristics of the inmates it should also be possible to devise a system for monitoring the effects of the control system. To provide, in other words, a number of pressure gauges for the prison. Here we have no research studies to help us. It may be that useful measures can be derived from information which is already recorded: for example, the incidence and distribution of disciplinary reports, the number of petitions and applications, sickness rates and acts of sabotage. This kind of variable may provide a swift pointer to the state of morale or degree of contentment which exists. Or it may be that we need to devise new methods in order to monitor tension. Certainly we shall need to pay more attention to the development of management information systems within the prison.

I am suggesting, therefore, that there are three factors—the secure perimeter, the kinds of inmates and the nature of the control system—which inherently predispose the prison to disturbance. The bomb, however, needs a detonator before it can explode and in the prison there will be some precipitating factor which leads to the disturbance itself.

Precipitating factors can be grouped in three categories—perceived injustices, general frustrations and external events. Perceived injustices on the part of the inmates is the commonest and also the most serious precipitating factor. At Dartmoor in 1932, for example, the punishments awarded by the governor were felt to be unduly severe; feelings also rose when the minimum time on a work party before a labour change was raised from three to 12 months. This precipitating factor is concerned with inmates' feelings about specific features of the regime. This helps to distinguish it from the second category where the

feelings are more general and may be seen in terms of frustration rather than injustice. Behaviour, like some of the sit downs last summer, may arise from feelings of boredom, the need to seek attention, the wish to copy others, or just for kicks. All these serve to reduce frustration in a situation where the inmate is relatively powerless. Well worth comparison here are certain kinds of industrial sabotage which "frequently embody common feelings of hostility towards machinery and authority", as Laurie Taylor⁵ puts it in his very relevant paper on the motives and meanings of industrial sabotage. The third category of precipitating factor comprises organisations and events outside the prison, together with the prevailing climate about protests in society. P.R.O.P., happenings in another prison, and maybe the general industrial situation are examples of these.

The prison situation is by its nature predisposed to disturbances and there will be precipitating factors which lead to the disturbance itself. This in turn may or may not need a trigger event. Disturbances themselves may be classified in terms of riots and demonstrations. A riot is spontaneous, unplanned and triggered by a single event like a fight or breaking glass; a demonstration on the other hand, which can take the form of a go slow, a strike, a sit down, is planned and used for a more constructive purpose.

So the bomb explodes, the disturbance happens. The form it takes, the amount of violence involved and the length of time it goes on will be determined by the kind of regime and the management structure in the prison. In other words, the nature of the communications in the prison will determine how much the explosion is cushioned and its destructive effects minimised. We talk a lot about this word "communications" but a lot of the time we have no answers to the kind of questions we are asking, we do not know, for example, what the most appropriate management structure is for a maximum security prison or indeed whether there is a most appropriate one. We cannot really answer questions about the role of the inmate in prison nor specify the role of the officer. Three aspects of communications deserve some comment:

INTER-GROUP RELATIONSHIPS

The most obvious inter-group relationship is between inmates and staff. Then within each of these larger groups are sub-groups. Within the staff there are divisions between uniformed and non-uniformed staff, specialists and

non-specialists, senior and junior, and so on. It is not difficult for the thinking of one group about another to become distorted and stereotyped and no doubt all who work in prisons can quote examples of this from their own experience. The point I wish to make is the need for both staff and inmates to discriminate between that which is real in their behaviour and that which they project on to one another. Most often the opportunity for this will be in the various meetings which occur in the prison, especially as the move towards consultative management is increasing the frequency of these. But meetings among prison staff tend to be unpopular; this is not surprising when the tasks of the meeting are unclear so that the roles of the members are confused. Beyond that, however, I suspect that prison staff, and inmates, when coming to a meeting have expectations of what is going to happen. The hope is that discussion will lead to decisions which get rapidly translated into action so that change occurs; and those participating in the process will enjoy a rosy glow of job satisfaction. When such hopes are unfulfilled, faith in consultation can easily disappear. All staff need to learn how to use meetings more effectively and most would benefit from some preparation for their role in them.

THE PURPOSE OF CONTROL

As I said earlier, the prison control structure is coercive—it depends in the last resort on physical force, so control tends to be a negative idea associated with undesirable behaviour like disobedience, violence and rioting. This suggests that control should be seen as a means to an end and not an end in itself. Vernon Fox (*op cit*) touches on this point and I take it this is what Alastair Papps⁶ is saying in his paper on "Control-Treatment". In the absence of movement towards objectives other than control, control itself becomes merely custodial which in the long run is self-defeating.

BARGAINING

Over long periods inmates can only be controlled through their own co-operation. The goals of inmates and staff will overlap to the extent that no one enjoys a state of anarchy for long and that an ordered existence for most of the time is in most people's interests. This entails give and take, or a bargaining situation. This is one of the ways in which an officer on a landing, for example, exerts control in his dealings with inmates. Most of the time this sort of bargaining is unofficial and

informal. In times of stress, however, during or after a disturbance, the bargaining or negotiation becomes official and formal. Perhaps we need to look at ways of institutionalising conflict in the prison situation by formalising rather more the bargaining situations which occur in order to maximise the investment which inmates themselves have in an ordered existence. (For a very well documented development of this argument see Robert Reich's paper on "Bargaining in Correctional Institutions").⁷

From this brief discussion of disturbances some general conclusions stand out. There is the complexity of the prison as an organisation which makes it hard to disentangle the factors involved. So it becomes easy to call a precipitating factor, like poor food, the cause of a disturbance and proceed to overlook more intangible things, like staff-inmate relationships, because they are so difficult to unravel. The prison is intrinsically an unstable organisation so that conflict is inevitable and distur-

bances are to be expected. The problem therefore is how to institutionalise the conflict so that its effects are constructive and not destructive. This means looking at the prison in directly political terms, recognising that there are groups in the prison with different objectives and different kinds of power to achieve them. The issue is the sharing of power.

REFERENCES

1. Quoted by VERNON FOX in *Violence Behind Bars*. Vantage Press Inc. N.Y. 1956, page 305.
2. *Why Prisoners Riot*. VERNON FOX. Federal Probation, Vol. 35, Part 1, March 1971.
3. Unpublished paper.
4. *On the Circumstances Connected with the Recent Disorder at Dartmoor Convict Prison*. H.M.S.O. 1932.
5. *Industrial Sabotage: Motives and Meanings*. LAURIE TAYLOR. In "Images of Deviance", edited by Stanley Cohen, Penguin 1971.
6. *Control-Treatment*. A. H. PAPPS. "Prison Service Journal", October 1972.
7. *Bargaining in Correctional Institutions: Restructuring the Relations between the Inmate and the Prison Authority*. ROBERT B. REICH. The Yale Law Journal, Vol. 81, No. 4, March 1972.

Can Recreation Programmes Help?

A. CHAINEY

A. Chainey read sociology at London University, specialising in criminology and social administration. He took a post-graduate diploma in physical education at Loughborough. He now works for the University of Edinburgh as assistant in the Department of Physical Education and is a visiting officer for physical training and recreation to the Scottish Prison Service. Last summer he made a full tour of Scottish penal institutions

IN THE next six years £20 million is to be spent on a building development programme for the Scottish Prison Service. Will the new institutions, the extensions and improvements to the existing institutions, do anything more than alleviate the problems caused by overcrowding in the 20 Scottish penal institutions? In some quarters there are doubts as to whether the building programme will be adequate in the face of the growth of crime and the increase in the "success" rate of the

police in bringing the criminal to court. Sentencing policy, the law relating to remission of sentence, the use of parole and, perhaps, the suspended sentence, will influence the pattern of growth of the prison population; a population which at present numbers approximately 5,000 made up of some 3,400 in adult institutions and some 1,600 in institutions for the under 21's.

One of the main aims of a prison sentence is to try to establish a common rhythm to the life of the offender, a

rhythm so often missing in the offender's life outside. While many members of the public argue that the prisoner's life today is too predictable, too easy, the weakness lies not in the daily framework to prison life but in the content of the daily round. The prisoner spends 168 hours each week at "Her Majesty's pleasure", and with the very limited facilities and manpower available it is a difficult task to fill that time constructively. Despite the efforts of industrial contracts managers, the governors and staff, work programmes remain inadequate at nearly all of the penal institutions. Consequently inmates spend many hours under-employed in over-manned workshops, or engaged in the numerous menial, albeit necessary, tasks connected with servicing the penal community. So that although work ought to be a central part of the penal sentence there is in fact often very little to occupy and to challenge the prisoner in his work situation. Without challenges, be they mental, physical (or both) at work, life for the imprisoned becomes a round of eating, sleeping, and marking time. There are all too few demands on the individual once the initial adjustment to the deprivation of liberty has been made.

The work programme is a continual headache to governors who, with a view to the need to maintain continuity and harmony in the community under their charge, adopt the policy of employing the longer term offenders in the workshops and on the training programmes. The short term offender, and 90 per cent serve less than six months, rarely receives an adequate work programme, unless he possesses some known and readily useable labour skill. The problems in making the work programme adequate vary from institution to institution. At Barlinnie prison and young offenders' institutions a daily average population of some 1,500 (mainly short term) has to be found "employment" in a cramped urban setting. At the remote setting of Peterhead prison, 500 offenders, mainly long term and under the age of 35, have to be found work in high security workshops. At Penninghame open prison some 80 long term offenders in the last stages of serving their sentence have to be absorbed into a programme of work in the prison gardens and garden workshops and local farms and estates.

NOT ALL WORK

While concern centres, at the present time, on the problems of finding sufficient suitable work for the penal institutions, this ought not to lead to

the neglect of other areas of life within. (Having recently undertaken a tour of all the Scottish penal institutions, bar Inverness prison, in order to study the provision of physical recreation, I have been made aware of the problems involved and the successes achieved in meeting the task of providing a stimulating programme of recreation). The importance of the recreational programme should not be ignored since it can play a vital part in relieving tensions within the community. The weather, television programmes, a meal(s), the arrival of new inmates in a hall, disciplinary measures by the governor, changes in the work programme or in the composition of work parties, can all radically alter the "barometer" of the institution in a short space of time. But it is not just in the maintenance of day to day harmony that the programme of recreation is important, for research has indicated that many offenders have fallen foul of the law in their leisure time, and often in pursuit of the "means to a life of leisure". Can the prisoner be educated in the field of leisure? Can the amount of time which is spent dreaming about and planning the perfect job, and the life of ease which is to follow, be reduced? Fifty years ago recreation consisted of opportunities for the inmate to read a limited range of literature and periods of exercises and walks in the yard. Such activities were considered necessary to ensure that the individual remained mentally alive and since the prisoner spent most of the day in his cell, to stop his muscles from atrophying. Today the silent and non-association regime has passed away and recreation is seen as offering further opportunities for the treatment of the offender's problems. There are three components to the recreation programme: education, passive and active relaxation. All three components can contribute to the reform of the prisoner by changing his interests and outlook, developing knowledge and skills, extending his range of experiences and his associations.

The recreation programme operates primarily during the evenings and weekends in prisons. At the institutions for young offenders, i.e. under the age of 21, programmes of day classes do take place alongside the work programme wherever possible. Evening classes of instruction staffed by officers, teachers, instructors, social and other professional workers, enthusiastic laymen, provide programmes catering for a wide range of interests for the illiterate and the educated. Television, radio,

tapes and correspondence courses are increasingly being employed alongside the more traditional teaching techniques. A senior officer, often an assistant or deputy governor, is usually allotted the task of organising and developing the programme of education classes. There are many problems on this front, not least the scars left from school experiences of the past, but shortages of space for classes to take place and difficulty in securing the services of teachers, are the problems immediately facing the organising officer.

NOT ALL BEER AND SKITTLES

Opportunities for other leisure activities have expanded considerably in the past few years to supplement the fairly generous provision of darts, billiards, cards and other table games. Televisions, radios, tape recorders, record players, books, periodicals and papers, are all to be seen in penal institutions. These items have been provided from prisoners' incomes, the institution's common good fund, or have been brought in from outside with permission from the authorities. Such generous provision of recreational facilities is frequently criticised by members of the public. They should not be misled into thinking that prisoners spend much of their time seated on easy chairs watching T.V. Cell blocks remain spartan and overcrowded, offering little scope for privacy, while hall recreation rooms are certainly not packed with colour sets and easy chairs. In all of the institutions the right to recreation has to be earned. In the prisons the right to the full recreational programme is earned after the serving of two months of sentence in the prison. As with the work programme, it is the long term offender who is likely to experience the greatest opportunities while the short term offender, through good behaviour and the passage of time, will likely earn the right to the mass media recreation programme, but is unlikely to benefit from the limited education opportunities available at the institution.

Active physical recreation in prisons once centred on the statutory hour's walking exercise in single file and keeping five yards apart after lunch each day in the prison yard. While this statutory requirement still applies, today there is a somewhat liberal interpretation of the rule so that time walking to work may be included in the daily hour. The period in the yard remains a useful means of ensuring that untried and

prisoners confined to cells get a daily breath of fresh air, while for the other inmates the less authoritarian supervision of exercise in the yard enables them to talk freely and in warm sunny weather to lie with shirts off enjoying what is commonly known as "Peterhead exercise".

Attempts have and are being made to provide a more substantial programme of physical recreation. In institutions for offenders under the age of 21, physical training is a statutory requirement for all bar the medically excused, and facilities, staffing and the programmes of activities have expanded considerably in the last 25 years. Unlike

Despite poor facilities and the absence of regular sporting opportunities, some prisoners, like the modern business executive, try to keep their bodies in trim. In prisons, circuit and weight training and basic keep fit exercises are in demand.

SELF-HELP

As the table indicates, the numbers within the prisons are large and the facilities and staff are few. Not only is there a need to improve basic provision, but also more effort should be made to educate in this sphere, to widen the range of sport with the inclusion of other activities which may be of value

A summary of the staffing facilities and prison population of the Scottish prisons, May 1972 is as follows:

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Daily average population</i>	<i>Prison officers with P.T.I. duties</i>	<i>Facilities for physical recreation</i>
Barlinnie prison (Glasgow)	1,300	0	One ash park for soccer, under construction. One gymnasium.
Low Moss prison	300	0	Nil.
Perth prison	600	2	One gymnasium. One ash soccer pitch and athletic track. One bowling green.
Edinburgh prison	550	1	One grass soccer pitch. One weight training room. One gymnasium.
Peterhead prison	400	2	One ash soccer park. One circuit training room.
Aberdeen prison	165	0	Nil.
Penninghame "open" prison	70	1	One grass soccer pitch. One hard tennis court. One bowling green. One putting green.

the physical training instructors in the under 21 establishments, the P.T.I. in Scottish prisons finds only a small portion of his work time allotted to physical training instruction duties; he remains essentially a discipline officer with responsibility for physical recreation. The prison P.T.I. must interest volunteers in his programme of evening and weekend activities. He faces the enormous challenge in some cases of an absence of space and of purpose-built facilities, the dominance of a soccer syndrome, strict security requirements which restrict the numbers and the groups which he can cater for.

to the prisoner both inside and after leaving prison. Recreationally one of the most active prisons is Perth and it should not be allowed to escape attention that nearly all of the facilities at Perth were constructed and are maintained by the prisoners. While it would be unrealistic to expect the government to provide funds for Olympic standard sports halls and swimming pools, cheaply constructed self-built facilities would go a long way towards providing the prisoners with a more challenging, a better balanced and, in the long term, a more useful physical recreation programme.

HOWARD LEAGUE SUMMER SCHOOL

10th-14th SEPTEMBER 1973
at YORK UNIVERSITY

Who are the Prisoners?

Dr. CHARLOTTE BANKS

Home Office Research Unit

What Resources and Changes are Needed to Reduce the Prison Population?

JOHN HARDING

Senior Probation Officer, Nottingham

Day Training Centres

DAVID AITKEN

Director of "Centre 45", Sheffield

Homeless Single Persons

Dr. RICHARD SMITH

Administrator of "No fixed Abode"

Institutions—Improvements and their Evaluation

PETER NOKES

Leeds University

Parole

Dr. PAULINE MORRIS

Nuffield Research Unit

Preventive Youth Work

Dr. C. S. SMITH

Civil Service Staff College

Prisons: How Can They Reduce Their Own Population?

Speaker from the Prison Department

Probation

ROBERT TOLLEMACHE

Inner London Probation Service

Sentencing

Sir BRIAN MACKENNA

Judge of the High Court of Justice

Full details and application forms available from:

THE HOWARD LEAGUE FOR
PENAL REFORM
125 KENNINGTON PARK ROAD
LONDON, SE11 4JP

Telephone: 01-735 3773

Readers Write . . .

TO THE EDITOR,
Prison Service Journal.

Your issue of April, 1973 (new series No. 10) was devoted to staff training and provided some thought-provoking material. Reading through all the articles one word kept crossing my mind—"professionalism". The range of tasks facing Prison Service staff is enormous, and the range of skills required equally large. Staff are to be found dealing with political detainees in Northern Ireland; aggressive, violent prisoners in dispersal prisons; disturbed, even psychotic, inmates in Feltham, Grendon and Holloway; inadequate individuals in nearly all establishments and a mixture of all of these in most "locals". The Service's resources for dealing with all these problems are thin and stretched, particularly the most important resource—basic grade staff. Most people would like to see a degree of specialism, and "fitting the man to the job" but, under our present circumstances, this is unrealistic; we just have not got enough staff. Within the foreseeable future, discipline and governor grades will have to be generalists. This does not mean they will be unprofessional. I maintain that professionalism is an attitude of mind, an approach to the job. Whatever the constraints, whatever the physical and psychological problems, one always aims for and demands the highest standards. As generalists greater flexibility of thinking and creativeness is required.

These aspects have been brought home to me during my current appointment as governor of a "temporary" prison in N. Ireland. The only specialists on the staff are two hospital officers (English), one principal clerical officer (Scottish) and one clerical officer (Scottish). The remainder are officers of the Irish, Scottish and English services.

All staff have to do many jobs not necessarily normally done by their grade. Basic grade staff have had to turn their hands to catering for staff and prisoners, be instructors in workshops, take games and P.E., be in charge of fire equipment, be able to assess and report on prisoners, maintain security, and *above all* maintain credibility in a politically volatile province. What has really impressed me is the range of skills and experience that staff possess, skills and experience gained both outside and within the Service.

Society demands the highest standards of its professionals, i.e. doctors, nurses, police, armed forces, solicitors, barristers, etc. It accords them a certain status which is reflected (in most cases) financially. Society's attitude to prison staff is highly ambivalent, everyone thinks he is an expert penologist! The only way the Service can mitigate this situation is by showing its professionalism in approach and conduct.

A basic grade officer recently asked me how you can be professional on a basic pay of £22 per week. We all know what he means, particularly the nursing profession. The public recognise the professionalism of the nurses although sadly the recognition is not yet reflected financially. What is recognised is their attitude to the job, which is "only the best is good enough". That is the approach we must adopt within our own Service. It can only bring benefit to the staff in terms of job satisfaction and eventually financially by the recognition that must surely follow.

I often wonder if we really know the skills and experience an officer possesses. Even if we do, Mike Milan in his article has indicated the problems of applying them. The problem is clearly one of management. The Service has locally and nationally a para-military structure; some of the problems created by this were indicated by Norman Jepson. The structure provides a rank-role linkage. The para-military structure is appropriate for some tasks but clearly not for others. In order to release the skills and experience of staff for use, it is necessary to divorce rank from role. We can then find the resources to meet the task. The strains both locally and nationally created would need very careful management. However, if the "top management" of the Service is truly professional then they will think creatively and flexibly about this. In any organisation structure, role and function are linked. I have indicated the great range of roles demanded of staff to meet the roles of different establishment. If we are to make the best use of our staff, accepting they must, by and large, be generalists, we must accept the divorce of rank from role. This will allow men and women to use their special talents, encourage them to demand high standards and thus achieve professionalism.

J. L. UZZELL,

H.M.P., Magilligan, N. Ireland.

TO THE EDITOR,
Prison Service Journal.

I cannot accept that my evaluations of the methods of Taylor and Cohen miss the point. A careful reading of my review will indicate that I was objecting

neither to the method of participant observation nor to the use of supplied material. What I was objecting to was Taylor and Cohen's *misuse* of these. Research in sociology and social psychology may well support taking sides as a method of gaining information, but it never removes from the researcher the obligation of sifting the material carefully, afterwards to ensure that as far as possible he makes allowance for his personal influence in arriving at his findings. Taylor and Cohen make no attempt to do this. My second major criticism was that they gave no opportunity for the reader to judge the merits of the case because they did not present a balanced sample of quotations. If Taylor and Cohen know of any method of reporting research which allows the researcher to present only one side of the argument I should be interested to hear of it.

I cannot comment on relationships between the Home Office and outside researchers except to point out that at present a number of research projects by outside researchers are going on in English prisons.

P. S. LEWIS,
Staff College, Wakefield.

TO THE EDITOR,
Prison Service Journal.

It is with great interest that I read the Journal every three months, along with many of my colleagues, to learn of, and hear opinions of, all the new innovations in our Service.

However, of late, I am becoming increasingly tired of reading such phrases as "perceptual correlates of criminality". Along with many of my colleagues, I attained a good educational standard, albeit not of a university standard. I find myself having to refer to a dictionary more often than good reading allows. Concerning this particular phrase, one of many similar I might add, I asked two eminent members of our staff and they could not enlighten me.

Is it too much to ask that the use of the English language, beautiful though it is, be "toned down" to enable the Journal's many words of wisdom reach a wider audience.

I cannot believe that this Journal is only meant to be read by those few members of this Service who can understand such words. I suggest that this toning down would increase your circulation, failing this, definitely a greater understanding by a greater number of my colleagues throughout the Service.

M. B. ASTILL, Prison Officer,
H.M.P., Shepton Mallet.

Book Reviews

SOCIAL NEEDS AND LEGAL ACTION

PAULINE MORRIS, RICHARD WHITE, and
PHILIP LEWIS. 95p

KNOWLEDGE AND OPINION ABOUT LAW

ADAM PODGORECKI and others. £1.50

DEVIANCE, CRIME AND SOCIO-LEGAL CONTROL

ROLAND ROBERTSON and LAURIE TAYLOR, 95p

All three of these books are in the "Law
in Society" series, published by
Martin Robertson, London, 1973.

THESE three paperbacks contain articles about re-definitions in the realm of law. When the legal system works imperfectly, the tendency has been to make improvements within the existing framework: dock briefs, legal aid, legal advice (the "£25" scheme) and proposals for duty solicitors. But sociologists' observations show that framework's limitations. White asks the fundamental question: what is the nature of the society in which law operates? Is Society —(i) One community with common interests, within which legal processes resolve conflicts between individuals and try to stop certain individuals from breaking the law? (ii) A conflict between a dominant group and the dominated (working class, blacks, catholics, etc.)? (iii) A structure which is accepted but gradually changing and which contains ongoing multiple conflicts between interest groups: consumers against manufacturers, residents against planners?

White examines shortcomings in various tribunals which attempt to resolve these conflicts; much would apply to adjudications by boards of visitors. (He also suggests adapting the system to allow legal action on behalf of groups; rather than individuals; I would not advocate an analogous development in prisons, but unless they move away from the second of the above models of Society towards the first, it may come to that.) Supplementary benefit claimants, for example, if treated with suspicion and lack of sympathy, are pushed into hostility or submissiveness and redefine their needs as rights to be fought for rather than applied for. White cites glaring procedural improprieties, and suggests that trained lay advocates would safeguard against these, besides helping claimants present their case.

Pauline Morris further explores the overlap of needs, rights and privileges, and the pressures forcing a lawyer to present his client's case from a legalistic viewpoint which does not challenge prevailing norms.

Lewis analyses assumptions about "unmet legal needs": he propounds no conclusions, but should set people in other disciplines thinking about their premises.

In *Knowledge and opinion about law*, authors from five European countries describe research in their own and other countries and show how opinions about law, morality and punishment tell us more about those who hold the beliefs than about the validity of their sentiments. Interestingly, tolerance is associated with high social status on some countries, low in others; and most studies show that convicted crimi-

nals' moral outlook corresponds to that of others from their social background. "Having described what ought to happen, the study of law rarely proceeds to the description of what actually happens" (p. 15); the same could be said of penology.

The most criminological of this trio is *Deviance, Crime and Socio-legal Control*. As Pauline Morris remarks (p. 47), "unfortunately . . . there appear to be considerable barriers to communication between the professions (of sociology and law)" and one can see why. No doubt "sociocultural embeddedness of deviance and social control", "the negotiated character of deviance" and "de-reification" are shorthand for important concepts, in explaining the thesis that crime or deviance is not an absolute, a "thing", like a typhus epidemic, which can be combated by sterner measures or whatever, but is determined by many factors, from interactions with law enforcement agents to statistical recording practices. Sociology, like other professions, needs its own technical terms, and this book repays the effort which is in places needed. But before the sociology of law can develop, sociologists and lawyers must each write in language which the other can understand.

MARTIN WRIGHT,
Director of the Howard League for Penal Reform

TRAINING FOR RESIDENTIAL WORK

A new pattern suggested by the Working Party on Education for Residential Social Work with implications for training and education in the entire social services field.

C.C.E.T.S.W., February 1973. Free

IN JULY 1972, the Central Council for Education and Training in Social Work appointed a working party—

to review the existing pattern of training for residential work;
to consider the levels of training needed;
to develop proposals for a scheme of training in residential social work; and
to report its recommendations.

The working party has produced a discussion paper: in the light of comments received on this the working party will draw up its report. C.C.E.T.S.W. is the body which approves courses of training and awards qualifications: its importance in the field of social work is therefore very great indeed. The working party excluded nursing and the penal system from its deliberations on the questionable grounds that the primary goals of these are respectively medical and custodial as well as on the grounds that nurses and prison staff have their own training systems and career structure.

The main recommendations of the working party are that there should be two levels of qualification: C.Q.S.W.—Certificate of Qualification in Social Work; C.Q.W.W.—Certificate of Qualification in Welfare Work; and that each qualification should be obligatory for certain posts not only in field work (where qualifications are already relatively common) but

also in residential work (where qualifications are very rare indeed). The working party also hopes that the status of residential work will be considerably raised.

The size of the training task is enormous. In 10 years' time there are likely to be 18,000 residential centres (for children, adults, families, the handicapped and the elderly) housing 520,000 clients and employing 96,000 staff.

The proposals for training allow a great deal of flexibility in the way in which staff may gain their qualifications (especially at the lower level of C.Q.W.W.) as well as flexibility in the syllabus of training and there would appear to be strong arguments for the Prison Service to fall into line with the concepts of training and qualification outlined by the working party.

ACROSS THE BOUNDARIES OF ORGANISATIONS

THOMAS MATHIESEN

Institute for Social Research, Oslo 1971

COMMUNICATIONS. That word is imprinted on every manager's brain. Whatever "system" is introduced, however many corny training films are seen, whenever the bright young manager comes along with his latest innovation, one always finds staff saying: "The communications in this place are lousy". In this study, Mathiesen has attempted an "Exploratory study of Communication patterns in two adult penal institutions" in Scandinavia. One is an old traditional maximum security prison (not enough work, etc.) with an inmate population of 230, the other is a newer medium security prison which is more "treatment orientated" and with an inmate population of 90.

In Mathiesen's words, the study focuses on "the ways in which top-level external communications between penal institutions, and other organisations, may influence the further internal communications of information gained outside". Difficult to comprehend? I find these kinds of statement (which occur regularly in the book) difficult to assimilate on first reading. The subject of communications is clearly very complex, but Mathiesen's terminology and expression, I feel, do not help to clarify the complexities. The examples from his empirical work do, however, clarify the meaning of these statements. Thus the meaning of the above quote is that communication patterns which exist between individual members of senior management in prison and members of organisations outside the prison, influence the way in which the information gained from these other organisations is communicated to other members of senior management.

Mathiesen has concentrated on the effect of external relations on penal institutions, as he feels it is an important area which has been largely neglected by sociologists who have been concerned with the prison as a total and separate organisation. In this sense he is exploring new ground and certainly stimulates one's thoughts about this area.

Questions concerning communication with external organisations were put by Mathiesen to staff who compose the "council" (the group of senior staff who advise the governor). He concentrated on the governors themselves, the ministers (chaplains), the social workers, the psychiatrists and the inspectors (the head of the custodial staff). A general pattern emerged,

although the pattern varied in degree from group to group, and from individual to individual. First, each group specialised in direct communication with particular outside organisations, e.g. the governor's specialist areas were with the prison bureau (Prison Department) and other penal institutions; the social workers' specialist areas included private charitable organisations running half-way houses, and official organisations such as the police, municipal social boards, and Ministry of Social Affairs. Secondly, the form of the staff members' direct specialist communication with the particular external organisations showed a high degree of informality and personalisation. For example, a "friendship" relationship grew between the governor and members of the prison bureau, or between the social worker and the superintendents of half-way houses, rather than a formal bureaucratic relationship. Thirdly, the members of the senior staff interviewed found this informal and personalised external communication to a large degree necessary, efficient and satisfactory. Fourthly, the staff members showed a high degree of dissatisfaction with external communications with organisations other than in their specialist area. For example, governors felt the institution was isolated from other organisations like the Courts, police, community social workers, whilst the social workers and psychiatrists felt there was to a large degree a lack of effective communication with the impersonal and bureaucratic prison bureau.

This evidence led Mathiesen to hypothesise that "Information reaching institutional boundaries to each staff member as a specialist . . . tends *not* to be shared with non-specialists on the inside". This the author develops into the main hypothesis of the study: "The informal and personal nature of external communication, essential if external information is to be procured, at the same time seriously obstructs internal sharing of information obtained outside". His arguments in support of this hypothesis delve into the complexities of communications and the nature of friendship relations (i.e. the informal and personalised communications). Although I found this section complicated, it was also interesting and stimulating. For instance one argument Mathiesen uses to support his main hypothesis is "the aura of external conspiracy". That is, where bureaucratic relations are considered ideal (e.g. between governor and prison bureau), "friendship" relations appear secret and illicit. Further the staff member reacts conspiratorially to defend his external relationships (e.g. governor reacts by considering his friendship relationships as "behind the scenes"), and so internal communication of external information becomes hindered. This and other arguments are developed and qualified, and certainly produce new questions and ideas in my mind. Mathiesen claims that the "friendship" relations involved in external communications produces a vicious circle in hindering internal communication of the external information, i.e. friendship relations are essential in receiving communications from external organisations, which in turn are essential for the efficient running of the institution, but at the same time friendship relationships hinder internal communications.

Clearly, for the purpose of this review, I have generalised what Mathiesen has already generalised. Mathiesen discusses variations in his hypothesis and possible omissions. One area he considers is worth mentioning because it is probably the immediate response of most readers, i.e. surely the differences in regime,

management style, personalities, etc. in an institution determine the extent of internal communication more than does the nature of external communication. Mathiesen argues that institutional variations in internal circumstances and personal style may produce differences in degree of internal communication difficulty, but external friendships and inadequate internal sharing were common to both the institutions he studied and this, he claims, suggests that external friendships have the major effect on internal communication difficulty. Mathiesen admits this is no proof and I would like to see these ideas further tested before fully accepting them.

Finally the study looks at the adverse effect of hindered internal communication between members of the management group upon their own function and upon the function of other groups within the organisation. The author then generalises his hypotheses outside the penal setting to other organisations within Society and to Society as a whole. Again this section throws up interesting ideas.

Mathiesen anticipates criticisms of his methods of data collection. He admits that his use of interviews, observation, personal acquaintanceship and interpretation through empathy of what the interviewee says is not very scientific. His answer to this is that he does not know a more scientific method: fair enough! He has no theoretical framework within which to carry out his research. He does not set out to test hypotheses but rather ends up with hypotheses.

This is an exploratory study in a complex area. In summary, I found it interesting and I hope it encourages others to look more at communications in prison. But I did find it hard going. Although Mathiesen is very pessimistic about prisons, at least he prophesies that we will always have work!

A. J. BARCLAY,
Assistant Governor at Coldingley Prison.

ATTICA—The Official Report of the New York Special Commission on Attica.

Bantam Books Inc., New York 1972. \$2.25

BETWEEN 9th September and 13th September 1971, 40 people lost their lives during an uprising at Attica Correctional Facility, New York State. In the space of 15 minutes 39 deaths and over eighty woundings occurred, during which the State Police and correctional staff regained control of the prison.

According to the commission's preface to their official report, with the exception of the Indian massacres in the late 19th. century, the assault which ended the uprising was the bloodiest one-day encounter between Americans since the Civil War. Small wonder, then, that the Attica uprising has become internationally known, and that the report, without its appendices, covers 485 pages.

The report is a full one, very detailed and yet written in a style which makes for interesting, if not compulsive, reading. The account of the event itself is preceded by a short, potted history of the New York State prison system, and a description of life in Attica for inmates and

staff and this provides insights into the tell-tale signs of deteriorating relationships and mounting tensions. Vividly illustrated are the minor happenings and frustrations which combined to erode morale and polarise attitudes and which occurred spontaneously and epitomised poor communications and gross misunderstandings.

The account of the four-day event is absorbing and told with great attention to detail; it started for me a train of thought in which I was continually making reference to what happened in our own system last year. There are, of course, apparent differences, but what is important are the essential similarities. I am sure that readers will also find interesting the examination of the social and power structures within the inmate group immediately after the first shock of their initial success, of how the negotiations were protracted and difficult and of how the passage of time affected the eventual solution.

The feelings of hopelessness and helplessness experienced by all concerned, of the anger and hostility which festered, the recklessness of the final assault, all these are picked up by the commission and communicated to the reader. To assist in this process, a considerable number of photographs is included to reinforce the earning.

My view is that this book should be read by all those connected with prison management and the treatment of inmates; it deals far less with the philosophy of treatment than with the realities—the inmate's reality, the custodian's reality, the manager's reality. The report should be read whilst the events of 1972 in our own system are easily remembered.

R. CLARKE,
Deputy Governor, Channings Wood

(1) ANNUAL REPORT 1971-72, APEX CHARITABLE TRUST

(2) A SURVEY TO DETERMINE THE VALUE OF A SERVICE OFFERED PRIOR TO DISCHARGE COMPARED WITH A SIMILAR SERVICE OFFERED SUBSEQUENTLY

Apex Charitable Trust 1972. Mimeograph. 25p.

(3) THE EMPLOYMENT FUTURE OF THE EX-OFFENDER

Apex Charitable Trust 1973. Mimeograph. 25p

APEX was set up in 1965 to give a service for the placement of ex-offenders in suitable employment. A voluntary organisation, it has recently specialised in the placement of "white collar" and sexual offenders. (White collar applies to the offender's usual type of employment, not necessarily to his offence.) These two groups were identified as most needing additional specialised help in securing suitable employment. Though voluntary, Apex is far from amateur in its approach to the problem. By concentrating on a limited field it has acquired an expertise not found elsewhere and, further, its various projects have been the subject of survey and research.

The annual report outlines work done during the year and utilises some of the research findings. The two mimeographs give more details on the survey and research done but, as they also make other comment on the work

of Apex, there is necessarily a fair amount of overlapping between the three. If I had to choose just one, it would be "The employment future of the Ex-offender", the sub-title of which, "A report of the work on the 'white collar' offender and sexual offender project of Apex Charitable Trust", is the more accurate description of its contents.

Space is given in all these reports to now familiar statements about the deficiencies of existing sources of help for the ex-offender. If the tone at times is emotional rather than rational, one has to remember that Apex is concerned to sway opinion and to change public attitudes toward the offender.

Useful information is given about the scale of Apex operations—at present confined to the London area. Referrals from all sources are at a constant level, 234 in 1970, 225 in 1971, 240 in 1972. The source of referral has, however, changed in some ways. Between 1970 and 1971 there was a shift from post-release to pre-release referral. Between 1971 and 1972 there was a big increase in self referral (32 to 66), and over the three years a decline in referral by other statutory or voluntary agencies, including the Department of Employment. If one takes the point that referral by H.M. Prisons means in most cases by the welfare officer, then the Probation and After-care Service accounts for two-thirds of all referrals, direct contact and former clients well over another quarter, and all the rest a mere 6 per cent between them.

Against the constancy of total referrals, the number placed (i.e. men actually starting the job found through Apex) has improved each year: 44 in 1970, 53 in 1971 and 67 in 1972. Furthermore, the number of contacts Apex had to make with possible employers to achieve each placement has steadily decreased. The survey published in 1972 covered 50 consecutive placements, 30 referred pre-release and 20 post-release. It was found that the pre-release referrals had much the shorter waiting time between release and commencement of work and needed far fewer approaches to employers to achieve placement. Some explanation is to be found in differences between the two groups, the post-release referrals being older, more often single, and previously of higher occupational level.

The probability not mentioned in the survey is that all the best prospects in this group had either placed themselves or been placed by other agencies, Apex getting only those who all other help had failed. Thus, as acknowledged in the survey, starting operations before release may result in some help being given to men who could manage on their own but this is clearly preferable to waiting for a post-release referral, which may not be made until despondency has set in. The saving in Social Security payments accruing from the shortening of the unemployment period alone could justify substantial expenditure on a placing service which initiated employment action for prisoners before their release.

The 1973 publication includes a "profile" of men referred to Apex. It appears that Apex clients tended to be better educated than "white collar" offenders in previous studies. Even so, the majority had no professional qualifications, but this did not prove as big a handicap to placement as expected.

Proposals for the future and comments on past and present are worth attention, especially those on the slowness of change in the public's attitudes.

As a probation officer practising in the north where no Apex service is available, I hope that the case for a publicly financed national

service is made out. Whether the resources are to be within or without existing departments is a secondary consideration.

Finally, project III is under way and further reports can be expected. I look forward to them.

A. G. HUDSON,
Assistant Principal Probation and After-Care
Officer
West Riding Probation and After-Care Service.



(1) THE FUTURE OF PAROLE

D. J. WEST
Duckworth 1972
Hardback £3.25; paperback £1.45.

(2) REPORT OF THE PAROLE BOARD FOR 1971

H.M.S.O. 1972. 29p.

(3) PAROLE BOARD FOR SCOTLAND: REPORT FOR 1971

H.M.S.O. 1972. 18½p.

(4) PAROLE: A BIBLIOGRAPHY (2nd EDITION)

KEITH HAWKINS
University of Cambridge. Institute of Criminology 1971. £1.25

(5) PROGRESS IN PAROLE: A report of the Treatment of Offenders Committee, National Association of Probation Officers

N.A.P.O., 6 Endsleigh Street, London, 1972. Mimeograph

(6) BRITISH JOURNAL OF CRIMINOLOGY

Volume 13, No. 1. January 1973

PAROLE, as a feature of the penal system, was proposed in the White Paper, "The Adult Offender", in December 1965 and the Parole Board began its work in 1968. The board, in its annual report for 1971 attempts to take stock. How well has parole worked?

Prisoners are eligible for parole when they have served 12 months or one-third of their sentence, whichever is the greater. When the board started work it had a backlog of cases to deal with and, in order to win confidence, it proceeded with caution. By 1971 the percentage of eligibles recommended for parole had risen to nearly 29 per cent (this figure comprising those recommended at first or subsequent reviews). The figures of first reviews in 1971 are as below.

These figures say something about the system. First, why do men refuse to be considered? No one knows for certain—there may be fear of rejection—and the Home Office Research Unit is attempting to find out. The Scottish Parole Board includes in its report for

1971 an outline of research done about the question of self-rejection. The proportion of self-rejects in Scotland is far higher than in England—four times as great at the point of first review. Three Scottish institutions showed a self-rejection figure of 90 per cent! There seems to be clear evidence in at least one Scottish prison that strong inmate pressure is responsible for the very high level of self-rejection.

Secondly, the Parole Board does not rubber stamp the recommendations of Local Review Committees. The relationship between the board and the committee is odd, indeed officially it does not exist since each L.R.C. is responsible direct to the Secretary of State. The L.R.C. makes recommendations to the Secretary of State who asks the Parole Board to consider those cases which he thinks ought to be considered. Originally the Parole Board considered only those cases recommended by L.R.C.s but now it also considers cases which, though rejected by L.R.C.s, are identified by the parole unit (an administrative unit) as having, statistically, a reasonable chance of success. Thus in 1971, over 250 men not recommended by L.R.C.s were in fact paroled. One is led to wonder whether there is much point in sifting cases at two levels.

Not only may the Parole Board disagree with the L.R.C., the Secretary of State may disagree with the Parole Board. In 1971 the Secretary of State rejected one man recommended on first review (see the figures given above) but, more importantly, rejected at second or subsequent review 14 men serving five years or more. The Secretary of State thus rejected one recommendation in 20 of a group which, if one may infer seriousness of crime from length of sentence, may be taken to represent an important test of the Parole Board's ability. The board says: "In cases of grave crimes . . . we feel bound to give particular consideration to public opinion, quite apart from the element of risk, before deciding whether to recommend for parole . . .". One must conclude that, on occasions, the Secretary of State is (perhaps justifiably) more cautious than the Parole Board.

Thirdly, what is "being given away"? A little work on Table 3 of Appendix I of the Parole Board's report indicates that the total amount given in parole in 1971 was approximately 1,834 years. One might conjecture that one hardworking stipendiary might, in 1971, have awarded sentences totalling more than that. The average period of parole licence in 1971 was seven months, over half the parolees being licensed for less than six months and almost nine-tenths being licensed for less than 12 months. These are not, except to the chafing prisoner, long periods of time and although one can only guess at the total cost of the parole exercise (preparation of documents, reviews by L.R.C. and Parole Board and supervision by

Eligible	8156
Declined to be considered	451
Considered by L.R.C.	7705
Recommended by L.R.C.	2649
Not recommended by L.R.C. but referred to Parole Board	917

Recommended by Parole Board	...	2114
"	"	253
"	"	2367
Parole Board's recommendation not accepted by Secretary of State	...	1
Total actually paroled	...	2366

probation staff) one may wonder whether in terms of cost-effectiveness, the exercise is worth the cost.

Fourthly, how successful are men during the licence period, and subsequently? The Parole Board's report for 1971 does not give all the information one would like. Of those actually on licence in 1971 (we are not told how many) 224 were recalled. (This is 7.6 per cent of those actually paroled in 1971). Three out of four of the recalls had completed less than six months before recall but one is not told exactly what proportion of the licence period had been served before recall. The reasons for recall? About half in 1971 were because of further offences, the rest for failing to comply with the terms of licence. The Parole Board gives little information about the types of offence committed during parole. It merely reports that of the 8,140 offenders paroled since 1968 only 24 men paroled from sentences for crimes of sex or violence were, whilst on parole, convicted of similar offences. If the overall recall rate be 7.6 per cent what may we conclude? A change of policy could lower or raise standards for parole selection and the recall rate would presumably move up or down in rough correspondence. But there are two other areas of interest. Half the men recalled in 1971 had not committed offences but had failed to comply with their terms of licence. It is very difficult to know what subjective judgements probation officers applied in recommending recall and whether there are national standards for recall. A change of policy (more, or less, leniency regarding apparent breaches of licence) might readily change the recall figures. The other (and perhaps the crucial) question is whether parole helps parolees to avoid reconviction after the expiration of the licence period. We just don't know—but research data about the long term effects of parole are being collected and analysed.

But this is to skate over the surface. A broader treatment is given in D. J. West's *The Future of Parole*. There are seven contributors to this book which, apart from the irritating omission of some references in chapter 5, is a readable and generally well-balanced work. The only disappointing chapter is one by W. H. Pearce, a principal probation officer (and former member of the Parole Board) who describes the business of "caring for offenders on parole". Mr. Pearce's account is a bland, "official" one which ignores some of the major difficulties facing a supervising officer: there is no mention of difficulty over establishing recall criteria, no recognition of the considerable problems of the homeless offender in a hostel. (Sinclair and Snow¹ in 1971 showed that the average length of stay in a hostel for ex-offenders was two months: if a condition of residence is written into the parole licence a host of relationship problems for both warden and parolee may be raised). Pearce writes: "It is one of the hopeful assumptions underlying 'after-care' that work with the family whilst the prisoner is serving his sentence will build up his confidence in the service's ability to help, and so cause him to co-operate when released". Contrast this with the N.A.P.O. report *Progress in Parole* which says: "There is a very clear feeling among officers with experience of parole that there should be a home circumstances report for every man whose case is due for review. At present this is not always available. If 'through-care' were being carried out successfully the information would be automatically at hand . . . but only

in some areas is there a sense of field officers being vigorously engaged with offenders and their families from the outset of imprisonment". Perhaps the pattern across the country varies? Pearce concludes: "Although the small percentage of 'failures' is a statistic which may be due to the careful selection of offenders for parole, I believe the efforts of probation officers have also made some contribution. I think this view is likely to be confirmed when the research unit of the Home Office has sufficient data to compare the reconviction of paroled offenders with their expected reconviction rates, based upon data collected before parole came into operation". Pearce may be right and it is certainly understandable that he should want to believe that the Probation Service is doing a good job. But there are a great many variables in the situation and it may be wise to wait to see what the evidence does show. In a later chapter in the book, J. Irvin Waller says: "When other factors have been allowed for, it is difficult to find tangible evidence that either the 'carrot' of casework or the 'stick' of recall have much influence upon reconvictions, although they may well have an effect upon other aspects of an ex-prisoner's life". Waller's contribution spells out many of the problems involved in assessing the effectiveness of the parole supervisor—he is writing about United States experience. There is little hard evidence about the different effects of intensive casework, small case loads, etc., but Waller makes it clear that, unless some sort of control is established, different probation officers will apply different standards about what sort of behaviour merits reporting and possible recall. As noted earlier, half the recalls in England in 1971 were because of licence violation. An attempt to establish common standards for reporting apparent violations of licence is important if statistics of parole "failure" are to be of much value. Waller concludes: "Instead of concentrating upon casework, it could be that effort would be better directed towards the provision of sheltered workshops, or compensation to employers willing to take an ex-prisoner, or simply the promotion of more community tolerance. Alternatively, it may be . . . that money is being squandered on 'corrections' when it could be used more effectively in 'prevention'. Belief in the panacea of the probation or parole 'relationship' has swept England and California, and may sweep through Europe and other parts of North America. Now it is time to stop trying to prove that this easy 'cure all' will work. Parole was not a rationally thought out solution . . .".

Dr. West contributes two chapters to his book. He introduces the subject and goes on to describe the workings of the system. Noting the Parole Board's reluctance to grant more than a minimal licence period to long-termers, he observes that reasons are never given for deferring a case to a second or later review and maintains that, if the gravity of the original offence was recognised in the awarding of a long sentence, a policy of a minimal period on licence is difficult to justify. West quotes Lord Hunt, chairman of the Parole Board, who admitted that concern for the public is the main reason why few long-termers are paroled after serving one-third of their sentence. The problem of when to parole is a vexed one: do we parole early only the harmless or do we parole those more evidently in need of the control and support which parole may be thought to offer? (but see the comments on Pearce and Waller, above). West suggests a number of "improvements" in the system:

- (i) a minimum of six months for the licence period;
- (ii) reduce the period to be served before eligibility for parole from one-third or 12 months to one-third or six months; and
- (iii) give greater discretion to L.R.C.s.

Section 35 of the Criminal Justice Act 1972 in fact takes up this last point. The Secretary of State now has discretion to release a man on parole on the recommendation of the L.R.C. without reference to the Parole Board. Paragraph 159 of the report on the Work of the Probation and After-Care Department 1969/1971 says in this regard: "The object of this arrangement is to relieve the board of some of the simpler cases, in which the risks are not great, and so enable the board to concentrate on more difficult cases and in particular to deal with a wider selection of cases found unsuitable by the Local Review Committee. The section provides that the class of cases to be dealt with under the modified procedure should be determined after consultation with the Parole Board and initially the intention is to apply the procedure to cases where the sentence is less than three years, where the offence did not involve violence, sex, arson or drug-trafficking and where the recommendation of the Local Review Committee was unanimously favourable". This change may permit greater speed in processing cases but maintaining common standards among L.R.C.s, may become even more difficult especially since no clear criteria for release were specified in the original legislation. West concludes that in spite of all its problems the parole system has "by and large, been operated with progressive efficiency and success . . .".

Prof. J. P. Martin, an unusually well qualified member of a Local Review Committee, writes about L.R.C.s in general. He notes that the original legislative proposals envisaged not a central Parole Board but a number of local and informal boards (similar to L.R.C.s) which would make recommendations direct to the Secretary of State. Martin identifies as a major problem for the L.R.C. the uncertain nature of its role: the L.R.C. may be a judicial body (in effect "re-sentencing" offenders) or an administrative body concerned primarily with treatment aspects. In practice the L.R.C. is a compromise. The governor is identified as having a considerable influence on the L.R.C. and Martin considers that the welfare officer's influence should be enlarged. "If, therefore, parole is to be used as anything more than a legal device for letting some prisoners out early without too much risk to the community, the rationale of the system must be understood among prisoners, and this implies the full involvement of the prison welfare officer." Martin comments on the critical nature of the interview of the prisoner by a member of L.R.C. and it is important for prison staff to appreciate how significant the interview may be to the prisoner and what a difficult task it may prove to be to the L.R.C. member. (N.A.P.O. has suggested the provision of training—especially in interviewing—for L.R.C. members. The Prison Department has organised a number of conferences, on a regional basis, for L.R.C.s). The L.R.C. has the task of weighing the information (by no means always adequate) about a particular prisoner but prison staff often misunderstand this part of the L.R.C.s task and find it hard to accept

that a man who is a nuisance in prison may be an excellent prospect for parole. Martin raises the question of when a man should be paroled. The original White Paper, (*The Adult Offender*, 1965), spoke of "peaks of training" when a man might advantageously be released. No answer has yet been given to Prof. Rupert Cross' splendid tirade in the *Criminal Law Review*, April 1966, when he asked whether the "peaks of training" idea was an empirically established proposition or a statement of Prison Department lore. There is virtually no evidence to substantiate the existence of peaks of training but perhaps this does not matter since the L.R.C. has the task of making a decision based on *all* the information available rather than merely on a man's performance in prison. Martin concludes by agreeing with West that decisions in minor cases could be made by the L.R.C.s without reference to the Parole Board—thus anticipating (and influencing?) the Criminal Justice Act 1972.

Evelyn Shea compares parole philosophy in the United Kingdom and the United States and notes that in the American Model Penal Code (which so far as I am aware is not practised in full by any State) the criteria for release are specified in considerable detail, one reason for this being that the nature of United States sentencing requires consideration of *when* a man should be paroled rather than *whether* he should be. There is pressure in America for prisoners to have, as the model code allows, legal representation before a parole board but there is also pressure by prisoners towards much greater determinacy in sentences which would reduce considerably the importance of parole. Shea is uncertain whether the "legalistic" approach in America is preferable to the English one.

Keith Hawkins is a parole expert. He has recently produced a second edition of his invaluable bibliography on parole (up to date to 1971) and contributes to West's book what, for readers of the PRISON SERVICE JOURNAL, may be the most interesting chapter.

Among the questions parole raises are—

(a) How far there is a real recognition by L.R.C. and prison staff of the power for control of inmates which a parole system may have.

(b) What are the effects of parole on the prison community?

These effects may concern—

The motivation of inmate behaviour.

The maintenance of institutional morale.

The maintenance of population equilibrium.

The fact is that the Parole Board and the L.R.C.s do not operate in isolation: they exist in a dynamic relationship with the other parts of the penal system as well as with the wider society. Hawkins concludes: "The value of parole in regulating the penal system is both more obvious and less open to dispute than its value as a means of rehabilitating offenders".

The introduction of parole has produced a much-needed pressure on prison staff to examine what they do to, with, and about, prisoners. "Keeps a clean and tidy cell" is, one hopes, no longer acceptable as a report on a prisoner's response to his situation. But we are still light-years away from the ideal in so far as observing, recording and interpreting behaviour are concerned and the poor layout of the basic report form (LB2) on which information is presented to L.R.C.s invites contributions from assorted, anonymous hands. Further, the expectation that a deputy governor

can honestly or usefully comment on the applications of men in a large prison, is clearly a relic of an earlier era. N.A.P.O., in the document quoted above, suggest that the report to L.R.C. should concentrate on factors which are known to be of use in predicting the likelihood of success during parole. (Keith Bottomley in *Brit. J. Crim.* reports on his observations of parole decisions in a northern prison and classifies inmate relationships and attitudes according to typologies suggested by Clemmer² and Schrag³. This typology might usefully be incorporated into the parole documentation.)

Vincent O'Leary and Daniel Glaser contribute a fascinating chapter on the assessment of *risk* in parole decision making. They start from Hawkins' point that whether the members admit it or not a parole board is in some way open to influence by a range of considerations other than the simple correctional one of "is the applicant now fit to be paroled?" The dominant factors in parole decision-making thrown up by O'Leary and Glaser's United States sample were: likelihood of serious offences during parole; possible benefit from further time in prison before parole and, its opposite, possible deterioration due to continued incarceration. From their sample O'Leary and Glaser draw out a number of threads (which do not necessarily have validity in England). Those who are interested will no doubt examine the generalisations which O'Leary and Glaser identify and will be aware of the need to check what are, in effect, hypotheses for validity on this side of the Atlantic.

O'Leary and Glaser conclude with a section on prediction and stress the difficulties of predicting human behaviour. Those responsible for parole often show a concern about the possibility of parolees committing violent offences but "even if a board were given all the psychiatrists, sociologists, statisticians, and other experts it desired to make a thorough investigation and analysis of each case, it is doubtful if it could achieve 80 per cent accuracy in identifying the less-than-five-per-cent of parolees who commit clearly violent offences after release. Eighty per cent accuracy is about the greatest precision that has been demonstrated by any man or any prediction system, applied to a cross-section of prisoners, for predicting parole violation in general, rather than the more difficult task of predicting violence on parole. Of course, a board might sharply reduce the number of violent offences committed on parole if it stopped paroling, but this would merely mean releasing prisoners to commit violence as discharges without the services of parole in facilitating a non-criminal life and restricting activities leading to crime".

The whole of the *British Journal of Criminology*, January 1973, is devoted to the subject of parole and summarises and expands the views in West's book. Keith Hawkins outlines an important alternative approach to parole and maintains that it is no use tinkering with the machinery: we need a new machine. Hawkins argues for parole hearings, for reasons for rejection to be stated and for an appeal mechanism to be provided and he goes on to suggest that L.R.C.s should be abolished and replaced by peripatetic, regional paroling authorities. These authorities would conduct personal parole hearings and make final decisions about parole. The Secretary of State, who might retain the power to parole offenders who present a risk to national security, would play no part in the parole procedures. Such a

scheme would be simple and speedy and would enable a degree of involvement for the prisoner. "The suggestion that the Home Secretary be removed from the parole process is, in constitutional terms, not novel. The tradition of ministerial responsibility appears in certain respects to be somewhat in decline. The Home Secretary has no similar responsibility, for example, for such analogous bodies as immigration tribunals and mental health review tribunals."

The Home Office has sponsored several research projects on aspects of parole and one looks forward to their publication.

K. B. MOODY

REFERENCES

- (1) SINCLAIR, IAN and SNOW, DAVID. "After-Care Hostels receiving a Home Office grant" in *Explorations in After-Care*. Home Office Research Study No. 9, H.M.S.O. 1971 (page 97).
- (2) CLEMMER, D. *The Prison Community*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston 1940.
- (3) SCHRAG, C. "Some foundations for a theory of corrections" in Cressey, D. R. (ed.) *The Prison*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.



DEVIANCE, REALITY AND SOCIETY

STEVEN BOX

Holt, Rinehart and Winston 1971

Hardback £2.95. Paperback £1.95

THIS BOOK is a very readable exposition of the "labelling" school of deviancy studies. It is avowedly *not* an impartial work; Box states in his preface: "Instead of hiding behind the 'facts' and allowing the reader to draw out any theoretical implications, I have instead assumed a perspective on the phenomenon of deviance in advanced industrialised countries, and have attempted to illustrate parts of this perspective by referring to various data. I have not, as far as I know, stated things to be so when I *know* them not to be the case, but I have sometimes, by inference, taken data from one part of one country and tacitly implied that the social process they illuminate probably exists in other areas of that country and even similar countries".

The seven chapters discuss the conception of deviance, its functions in society, the extent to which the amount and quality of deviant behaviour in Society can be known, and the social process of becoming deviant. The author draws heavily on the work of others—particularly Becker, Lemert and Matza for his theoretical perspective and on many others, including some old fashioned criminologists, for facts to, as he puts it, "illustrate" his point of view. The book is lightly and at times engagingly written but suffers somewhat from the disadvantage that Mr. Box does not appear to have had much direct contact either as a researcher or as an individual with the sort of criminals familiar to readers of the PRISON SERVICE JOURNAL; there are a number of inaccuracies, e.g. H.B. Gibson is renamed Gibbons, while the B.M.A. is not the body which removes doctors from the Medical Register. Where this book overlaps with Hood and Sparks' *Key Issues in Criminology*, readers may find the latter more scholarly.

Both old and new fashioned criminologists will surely delight in the author's story of how

his fellow-members of a jury fiddled their expenses at the end of the day—one hopes it is not apocryphal.

J. P. MARTIN,

*Professor of Sociology and Social Administration
at the University of Southampton.*



NEW CAREERS FOR EX-OFFENDERS

D. L. BRIGGS and N. HODGKIN

Howard League 1972. 25p.

THIS Howard League pamphlet falls into two parts. The first is an account of the therapeutic community within the Californian Institution for Men (a minimum security prison at Chino near Los Angeles). This was inspired by the ideas of Dr. Maxwell Jones and made use of work done by Eric Trist and Leslie Wilkins. All three are well known in England for their work at the Belmont Hospital, the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations and the Home Office respectively.

English ideas took root in Californian soil, but not without difficulty. The basic idea was to provide group situations in which the inmates would largely work out their own problems with the help of staff. The "problems" looked at in the groups included the difficulty of living together in prison and all that meant, individually and collectively. Successful efforts were made to turn potentially serious and dangerous situations into a "living learning" experience. The account faces up to the real difficulty of setting up and maintaining such a regime and warns against too glib an attempt to copy it. There was follow-up and the success rate is claimed to be better than in the control group. Nine months emerged as the optimum treatment period. Inmate participation, it is claimed, increased security. One certainly gets the impression that inmates and staff were striving to make relevant the period spent in the unit, and that surely is an aim we can all applaud.

The major part of the pamphlet deals with the New Careers project at Vacaville. It is a write-up by Nancy Hodgkin, following a thorough investigation of the project, the investigation method being largely the interviewing of those taking part. This particular project drew its inspiration from an American source and the New Careers Movement was launched in 1965. Briefly, it seeks to involve the under-privileged in welfare programmes. They begin by training on the job, and in theory and practice the promotion ladder to posts of high responsibility should be open to them. The attempt to train "social workers" in prison led to some interesting, and on occasions, surprising results. The more deprived the inmate the better he seemed to respond was one rather unexpected result. The Californian parole system comes in for some criticism and on the whole the parole scheme. A high success rate is claimed: two-thirds of the men in the scheme now hold down responsible, social work posts.

Should we try it here? Projects it is said, owe so much to the personality of their originator that they cannot be repeated elsewhere. Well, Belmont's therapeutic community went to California, cannot we try to emulate Vacaville here in England?

Before giving your answer I recommend you to read *New Careers for Ex-Offenders* and ponder the issues raised.

A. P. NUTTALL,

Principal Probation Officer, Teesside

PUNISHMENT

Editors: RICHARD H. WALTERS,
J. ALLEN CHEYNE and ROBIN K. BANKS

Modern Psychology Readings. Penguin 1972

Paperback 75p.

"PRISON IS FOR PUNISHMENT" was the firm statement of a sociologist at a recent conference I attended. Some may gulp in horror at the thought, others may think "well we've known that all along, it's just that we don't talk about it". Whatever one's view about the general purpose of imprisonment, there is no doubt that within the prison setting, punishment is used as a technique of affecting behaviour, just as in all other walks of life. Familiar words like "discipline" and "control" are sometimes used instead or perhaps we may resort to more sophisticated terms like "deprivation" and "sanction".

So it behoves us not to ignore a book which consists of a series of papers arranged under these five headings: (1) Issues and Approaches; (2) Punishment Effectiveness and Punishment Parameters; (3) When Punishment Fails; (4) The Punishing Agent; (5) Punishment in Real Life. Where the papers are descriptions of the findings of experiments, the subjects have been either animals, mostly rats, or children. Reflect on that and conclude what you will! Most of the book is devoted to studying the effects of the punishment solely on the subject to whom it is applied. Some of the language and the research methods used need considerable familiarity with psychology to appreciate fully what is written. Nevertheless there is enough of general interest to make selective reading worthwhile.

The main theme is that punishment is not as ineffective a means of suppressing undesired behaviour as was formerly supposed. The conditions surrounding the undesired behaviour and the punishing response provoke some of the problems the book seeks to tackle. It would appear that three points are generally accepted, and I list them in order of strength of acceptance. Firstly, punishment certainly temporarily suppresses a certain piece of behaviour. Secondly, the effect of punishment will be the greater, the more closely it follows upon the behaviour which the punishment is intended to suppress. Thirdly, if the punishment is applied with consistent, moderate intensity every time the undesired behaviour occurs, there is more likelihood that the behaviour will be permanently extinguished. Perhaps these are not great revelations. But we must go further and distinguish between instrumental behaviour and consummatory behaviour. Before fantasies become rife these terms ought to be explained.

Instrumental behaviour is the means which leads to a separate piece of behaviour at the end. This end behaviour is called consummatory. To take a homely example, an owner of a puppy, in house-training it, wishes to alter its instrumental behaviour, not its consummatory behaviour. In other words, the owner wishes to change where it does it, not what it does. We are not trying to train a property offender not to acquire property, which is, after all, the goal of highly respectable citizens, but we are trying to alter the behaviour he adopts to acquire it.

Punishment is relatively effective in reducing undesired instrumental behaviour. It is enhanced by a parallel plan of rewarding desired instrumental behaviour, with the cautionary note that the subject may continue the undesired behaviour in order to obtain the reward, if the desired behaviour is not seen as totally incompatible with the undesired behaviour. Also, adaptation to punishment can occur and new, intense punishments can prevent the resulting decrease in effectiveness. Punishment, slowly increased, tends not to be as effective as when it is introduced at a high intensity value. What of our human need to give a man a chance when he first breaks the rules?

Consummatory behaviour tends to be related to the basic drives of an individual, and may be seen as fundamental to his survival. Surprisingly and frighteningly such behaviour can be eliminated by punishment. With this type of behaviour, there is concern about the side effects, and the long term effects on the personality, which would result from punishment. So it follows that if punishment is contemplated to suppress behaviour it is of supreme importance to distinguish between these two types.

If punishment is applied in a mild and irregular fashion it seems that undesired behaviour is likely to be reinforced. The possibility of punishment induces fear, but due to the other possibility that punishment may not result, the fear loses its effect as an inhibitor and may in fact elicit the undesired behaviour. Again, if the undesired behaviour is previously learnt by punishment it appears that any effort to reduce that behaviour by further punishment will have the opposite effect. Another point, perhaps relatively obvious, about the shortcomings of punishment is that it draws attention to the behaviour being punished. Perhaps here we do have a comment on the value of deterrence.

Two points from the section "Punishment in Real Life" seem worth mentioning. First of all there is the use of isolation of children by mothers as a disciplinary measure. This usually follows a chain of events, where the child has misbehaved and the mother's initial punishment provoked further misbehaviour, often some form of verbal defiance. By isolating the child, the mother was not present when the child engaged in any further misbehaviour and so the mother avoided the need for further punishing responses. The parallel in the prison setting does not need elaboration by me. The second point is that children, who are frequently punished by their parents, may be aggressive because they learnt to become so from their parents' general self-presentation rather than as a result of frequent punishments.

One of the issues referred to in the book is the wider discussion of the relative effects of punishment and reward. Claims for the greater effectiveness of one or the other as techniques of changing behaviour may not be helpful. Perhaps one really should be asking what is the appropriate balance needed in order to achieve the desired end, if for no other reason than that both are likely to be present in any system, even when the organisers of that system stress the predominance of one. The Kennedy Youth Centre has its "Readjustment Unit". Adherents to the behaviour modification school, producing for instance the token economy regime, need to read this book. One of the points made is that the non-rewarding of undesired behaviour may reinforce the

behaviour, because tacit approval will be deduced from the absence of punishment.

Finally as feelings grow about the need for reintroduction of punitive measures to deal with offenders, this book, or at least, its subject, deserves our special attention so that we can contribute knowledgeably to the crucial questions which must arise.

J. W. T. CAPE,
Deputy Governor, Leyhill Prison.



A SEARCH FOR A PRODUCTION FACTOR COMMON TO HOSPITALS, SCHOOLS AND TRAINING PENAL ESTABLISHMENTS

J. S. MCCARTHY

Unpublished report, University of Manchester 1970-71

THIS REPORT is the result of a year's work undertaken while the author was the holder of a Simon Fellowship at the University of Manchester. It deals with a problem which has been regarded as endemic in the Prison Service for some time, but which the penal establishment shares with the school and the hospital. This is that by comparison with industry such organisations lack what McCarthy calls "acceptable standards of productivity as success outcome".

The research aimed to discover a production factor which could be treated as some sort of criterion of success in each of the non-industrial settings studied, the hospital, the school, and the training prison. He defines such criteria in terms of the Likert theory of management. McCarthy aims to test the proposition that the more closely the structure of the organisation approximates to Likert's System 4, the greater will be the consensus regarding the goals of the organisation. Likert's System 4 is one of a repertory of management styles and can be fairly briefly summarised as resting on ideas of participative management and a high level of group cohesion. Likert contrasts this style with System 1: "Exploitive Authoritative"; System 2: "Benevolent Authoritative"; and System 3: "Consultative Management". Likert himself argues that System 4 is not merely the best management style for most organisations most of the time (in terms of the increased involvement of management at all levels in decision making) but that it is, moreover, associated with increased production. There is some empirical support for his view. For a System 4 management style to work, more than mere technical ability and systematic planning is required. Decision making becomes a group rather than an individual process and management must aim to be supportive of decisions made by the group. Moreover, what the manager asks of his subordinate should normally be at least what the manager may realistically expect the subordinate to achieve. As McCarthy points out it is a great compliment to ask the impossible from a subordinate in the confident expectation that he will achieve it.

The aims of McCarthy's research are clearly of interest and potential value to those who work in the Prison Service and not merely in the training function. McCarthy's major hypothesis is "that an assessment of the efficiency of staff management within training/treatment penal institutions, and in other institutions, can be effectively based on the

parts of industrial human organisation theory contributed by Likert". It has to be said that this hypothesis is not really substantiated. Nonetheless the Report is an important one and should be thoroughly studied by managers and staff at all levels within the penal service. For McCarthy points out that common to all theories of management and human relations in organisation is a concern with the motivation of staff. The report concludes by recommending that further research should be carried out in penal institutions and industrial organisations, and more importantly that one or more large or medium sized training institutions should be managed on an experimental basis of Likert principles over a minimum of five years, that this research be adequately evaluated and that a fall in reconviction rates over a comparable time scale be one of the main criteria of success. Clearly, only research and evaluation on such a scale would be adequate to the scale of the problem.

Many would disagree that reconviction rates represent the most viable or realistic production criterion available. McCarthy himself grapples with this point by aiming to identify intermediate factors which are also associated with "successful production" in the system for organisation. These intermediate factors are chiefly associated with the way in which junior staff perceive, evaluate and are involved in decision making with their superiors. Thus McCarthy hypothesises that "the motivation to produce in the classes of institution investigated can be measured by assessing the degree to which the junior supervisors perceive their immediate superiors as being identified with the beliefs of the top managers in the basic philosophies and methods of the organisation". But as he himself realises, such intermediate factors can only operate as *potential* production factors, that is by affecting the motivation to produce, and cannot themselves be realistically said to be output criteria.

The results of McCarthy's studies into schools, hospitals and industrial organisations are complex and require detailed study. Many of the subsidiary hypotheses were stated in such a way as almost to defy operationalisation. But the major thrust of the argument, that a consensual structure of beliefs is associated with the motivation to produce, is fairly well supported by the evidence adduced, given the many limitations (some due to time, some due to inherent difficulties) in the application of the Likert research instruments. It would undoubtedly be valuable to take the research a stage further and one would like in particular to see the Likert system for concepts operationalised in terms more directly relevant to training penal establishments. The search for a common production factor may paradoxically have vitiated the attempt to find applications of the Likert principles which are specifically relevant to the prison setting.

This report is not easy reading. The research itself is not entirely satisfactory in some ways and the results are fairly difficult and complex for the general reader. In its present form the report is neither an adequately supported piece of "academic research" nor does it provide firm and unambiguous guides to action. But it would be most unfortunate if these tangential deficiencies were to obscure the vital significance of McCarthy's theme.

D. T. H. WEIR,
Manchester Business School.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS CODE OF PRACTICE

H.M.S.O. 1972. 15p.

EVERY governor and union representative will need to be familiar with this pamphlet. Conditions of service and methods of arbitration were for many years far better for civil servants than for those in industry but, perhaps because the spectre of unemployment is virtually unknown on the civil service scene, there are areas of industrial relations where paternalistic somnolence has led to the civil service falling behind. There are reminders in this pamphlet for both staff and official sides.

"Employee representatives and trade unions should:

i ensure that they have the means to communicate effectively with those whom they represent;

ii recognise that management has a responsibility for communicating directly with its employees" (para. 63).

"Consultation means jointly examining and discussing problems of concern to both management and employees. It involves seeking mutually acceptable solutions through a genuine exchange of views and information".

"Consultation between management and employees or their representatives about operational and other day-to-day matters is necessary in all establishments . . . (paras. 65 and 66).

It is not easy for management to determine how best to involve employees in consultation. Some managers attempt to do so by what Wilfred Brown (perhaps one of the most experienced of enlightened employers) would regard as a quite inappropriate method, i.e. inviting union representatives to be present at command meetings. Ideally there should be two quite separate systems, one for command and one for consultation. Anything else leads to the erosion of the authority of middle and lower management and to ambiguity in the role of the union representative.

One hopes that both staff and official sides will take to heart the contents of this pamphlet so that the civil service will be seen to be an example of *good* industrial relations.



EIGHTH REPORT FROM THE EXPENDITURE COMMITTEE: SESSION 1971-2 RELATIONSHIP OF EXPENDITURE TO NEEDS

H.M.S.O. 1972. £1.00

How does the Government spend your money, does it buy the right things and get value for money? Decisions at national level are difficult but important. This report records the examination (by a subcommittee of M.P.s) of public expenditure in four areas, including *prisons*. The bulk of the money spent by the Prison Department now and in the next few years is to pay staff and to provide more prison places in order to relieve overcrowding. The subcommittee were interested in the *output* resulting from expenditure and the chairman commented (Q307) . . . "Taking everything into account, it costs £40 a week to keep a person in prison and it costs £1 a week if someone is on probation. It would almost pay to have one probation officer per man sentenced rather than sending him to prison . . ."

The report is interesting evidence of the difficulties of policy making.

THE NEW CRIMINOLOGY: FOR A SOCIAL THEORY OF DEVIANCE

IAN TAYLOR, PAUL WALTON and JOCK YOUNG

with a foreword by ALVIN W. GOULDNER
Routledge and Kegan Paul 1973. £4.50
(paperback £2.75)

This is the first major British text on criminology since Mannheim's two volumes of *Comparative Criminology* appeared in 1965. For students of criminology, it will surely prove to be very important. Consequently, if the gap between students of criminology and those responsible for the agencies of social control is not to widen disastrously, it is essential that members of the Prison Service should know something of the book. This is especially true, since criminology is featuring in more and more undergraduate courses.

We have to face the uncomfortable fact that the accounts of the world with which we have to deal are becoming increasingly complex. The day of the book which is easy reading and sufficient in itself is passing fast. This book sets itself the task of providing a new synthesis of ideas in criminology and presumes a considerable familiarity with the old stuff and with some of the not so old. The new synthesis involves paying attention to the reality of social inequality—a social phenomenon which previous criminology has largely disregarded in a curiously purblind way. In paying attention to the reality of social inequality, the book is explicitly political and explicitly Marxist. Marx gets his first mention in the text in a note to p. 6, soon followed by a reference to the convenient disregard for "the existence of inequality in the ownership of wealth and property" which characterised the writing of positivist criminology (p. 17).

The foreword is contributed by Gouldner, one of the most obvious voices of American sociology, famous for "The Coming Crisis in Western Sociology". He refers to "The New Criminology" as "a work of power" and I think he is right. He goes on to say that it is "the first truly comprehensive critique that we have ever had of the totality, of past and contemporary, of European and American, studies of 'crime' and 'deviance' ". Of course the book is not comprehensive, truly or otherwise. If it were, one wouldn't be able to lift it. But it is pretty comprehensive and it does, as Gouldner also says, refer to a host of "obscure, unknown" theorists. Gouldner goes on: "Very rarely, if ever, have crime and deviance studies been subjected to a critique and excavation which is at once comprehensively thoroughgoing, patiently probing, and systematic". He doesn't actually say so, but implies that the book provides these things. I agree with the spirit of his implication, but not the letter. The authors periodically lapse into unforgivable aphorisms like: "Classicism and positivism have in common what they ignore, rather than what they include" (p. 17). And there is a paragraph in the middle of p. 19 which I cannot make intelligible, however often I read it.

If the book is, understandably, not comprehensive, it is selective. It is also reactive in that it takes the stimulus provided by "positivist criminology" and indicates the directions which the study must take if it is to avoid the evident pitfalls of positivism. It is not easy to present the essence of positivism briefly to the uninitiated, although it might helpfully be represented by the following passage from J. R. Rees: "It should be stressed that all failure to comply

with the rules of the game, and indeed all anti-social behaviour, whether it is noticed merely in the nursery or comes eventually to the Courts of the country, is evidence of some psychological failure in the conduct of life. Crime (behaviour which is prohibited by the criminal code) is the outward manifestation or sign of some disorder in the personality or character". Given this sort of individual psychological positivism or socially deterministic varieties, the authors argue: "(Positivism) suffers in *scope* because it omits the reasons for reaction (against the deviant) (the conflict of interests, the nature of the morality which informs reactions against deviance, the theories of deviancy held to by those with the power to act against the deviant); it ignores or debases the deviant's own reasons for engaging in deviant action, and it holds out no explanation at all of the deviant's interpretation of the reaction against him" (pp. 28-9).

Observant readers will notice that these authors are, then, on a tack which parallels that of Stan Cohen and Laurie Taylor in *Psychological Survival* in which they similarly attack the positivist approach to the study of long-term imprisonment.

In the first chapter, "Classical Criminology and the Positivist Revolution", the authors sketch the historical development of criminological writing. The chapter presumes familiarity with, say, Mannheim's *Pioneers of Criminology*. If one accepts the categories of theory which the historians have created, then it is a helpful review of the evolution of theory in its early stages. There are occasional sloppinesses in the writing and some unresolved preoccupations about the demands of science, lightened with some taunting of Eysenck, the authors' favourite positivist target.

Chapter 2: "The Appeal of Positivism", offers a more protracted parade of Eysenck, the pantomime horse, around the paddock. There is a preliminary account of Lombroso's work which is both familiar and rather partial and a superb presentation of the positivist trap into which Reg Cockett falls when he trades in terms like "suspicious", "withdrawn", "emotionally tense". The whole passage between p. 33 and p. 35 distils a wealth of criticism most effectively. Later, the comment: "'Positive and negative reinforcements' are not the autonomic response of a 'taken-for-granted' universe to conformity or deviation but meaningful attempts of the powerful to maintain and justify the status quo of wealth and interest" (p. 52) represents the attitudes of the authors fairly explicitly, though without the precision and simplicity which they might have commanded.

Chapter 3 is a dazzling reassessment of Durkheim's work and an examination of the indignities to which his subtlety has been put in the standard text-books. The authors give Durkheim a very sympathetic and perceptive reading which puts him well into the stream they wish to follow. This is a very important chapter for those with a sociological training and might send some back to the original sources to discover the political strain which has since been suppressed.

Chapter 4: "The Early Sociologies of Crime", is the longest and most closely argued. It examines what subsequent writers have made of Durkheim, starting, of course, with Merton. The authors are not impressed with Merton. His theory does not sufficiently account for crime or deviance or for the places in which it occurs, doesn't specify what sort of behaviour will occur, doesn't sort out cause from effect, doesn't trace what it is that mediates the

communication of the urge to achieve, doesn't take account of the interchangeability of roles in society and, finally, the individual actor is "rarely seen to evolve a solution to his problem in his own terms" (p. 108). In the remainder of the chapter, the authors examine the positivist streak in the Chicago school and review Sutherland's Differential Association theory. They also look at Cloward and Ohlin and at A. K. Cohen, noticing particularly Cohen's more recent movement toward an interactionist position. As a review of fairly recent history, the chapter is substantial and organises certain of the theoretical orientations which have been knocking about. As a source, it compares favourably with Downes's coverage of similar material in *The Delinquent Solution*.

The fifth chapter, "Social reaction, Deviant Commitment and Career", deals with more recent history—from Becker and Lemert onward—the so-called labelling theorists. I don't personally find the treatment as complete nor as coherent as those of their earlier chapters, although it makes up in stimulation and contemporaneity for what it lacks in precision and definition. The authors acknowledge the difficulty of the chapter—but that hardly exonerates them from suddenly introducing the notion of "absolutism", for example, without explanation or expansion. Part of the difficulty arises from choosing to introduce the idea of deviant commitment on the strength of the only known article which makes any worthwhile attempt to analyse commitment of any kind. Another part of the difficulty arises from the authors' determined hunt for a theory ("a consistent and interrelated set of hypothetical concepts") as distinct from finding merely "a catholic and unconnected perspective" (p. 158). They show the earnestness of their hunt for a theory very helpfully, however, when they specify the steps required in "an adequate model of all the processes involved in the evolution of deviant action" (p. 165). For the authors: "a relevant theory of deviancy must treat the causal variables—motivation and reaction—as determinate and as part of a total structure of social relationships. If we examine the creation of deviancy and reaction in this way . . . we see that the institution of private property, in a stratified and inequitable society, divides men from men as owners and non-owners. It is in the light of this division that the activities of thieves, police, magistrates and property owners become explicable" (p. 170). This passage, although curiously placed, presents the dominant theme of the book. Ideologically, I've no doubt that it is proper that it should be the dominant theme, but it is one that has to be forced on the existing literature—not one that is continuous with it.

With chapter 6, the intensity of criticism recedes somewhat while the authors bow, quite properly in my opinion, in the direction of Matza and then go on to the dread ethnomethodologists—the people who see, as grossly problematical, the things which other people take for granted. The issue with which the chapter is concerned is the "philosophical inner life of the subject as he bestows meanings on events" (p. 173, via Matza). Regrettably, it will take a gross reorientation before penal administrators begin to believe that their "inadequate" charges have a "philosophical inner life". The chapter, most unhelpfully titled "American Naturalism and Phenomenology", requires familiarity with Matza's *Becoming Deviant* and, ideally, with *Delinquency and Drift*. Beyond those sources lie Cicourel and Garfinkel. Matza emerges, largely by his own admission, as a muddled man—one who had perhaps not

discovered the optimism offered by Marxism. It looks rather as if he has since made this discovery, however temporarily, as an outcome of his concern with poverty.

The latter section of the chapter, which deals with ethnomethodology, is an astonishingly coherent critique—although it is seriously qualified by the note (8) on p. 193 which suggests that the authors belatedly realised that they may have managed only a partial assimilation of the appropriate literature. (This admission may be more damaging to the book as a whole than the authors appreciate. They depend, throughout, on clippings from the literature which might be rearranged or for which substitutes might be taken. Such alterations might well modify the argument and counter-argument quite fundamentally. This would particularly affect chapter 5. The authors of the sources quoted there are largely alive and kicking!)

Chapter 7: "Marx, Engels and Bonger on Crime and Social Control", is where the seam of gold is to be found. Here the quotations are granted a respect for their contexts which is denied to other authors elsewhere in the book. Marx, for example, is interpreted as "asserting the possibility of a crime-free society by demonstrating, albeit ironically, the normal interdependence . . . of capitalist productive social relationships and crime" (p. 212-213). But this conclusion is reached at least partly on the strength of a passage in which Marx might alternatively be seen as doing little more than poke fun at the idea that all professions are productive, by choosing to present the criminal, perversely and ironically, as a case in point. The fact is, however, that crime was never central to Marx's concerns and there never was sufficient reference to crime in his writing to suggest that his works, of themselves, could provide sufficient basis for a theory. Taylor, Walton and Young enrol themselves to take over where Marx left off—with a proper grounding in the polemicism of which Marx was such a master. The authors' treatment of Bonger is a tremendous demonstration of their right to the heritage—a judicious mixture of vilification and patronising encouragement. Bonger emerges as a disaster of a disciple, as a self-supposed Marxist whose command of the dialectic was insufficient to warrant his volunteering to carry the banner.

Considering the commitment of the book, chapter 8: "The New Conflict Theorists", is strangely placed to follow the elaborations from Marx. It offers what must be a digression into the criminologies of Turk and Quinney. Both are credited as conflict theorists while Turk is regarded as a follower of Dahrendorf—a man who is satisfied that capitalism has given way to post-capitalism, a social phase to which Marxist analysis is held not to apply. Quinney is given slighter and unkindler consideration as a person who is subject more to his "own existential Angst than . . . clear-headed analysis" (p. 253), despite "periodically formulations" (p. 260). He is preoccupied with the individual and his civil liberties and says little about "the structure of civil society as such" (p. 262). The essential criticism levelled at Turk and Quinney is that they slip into the trap of regarding crime as pathological, as

essentially a-political, largely because they cannot face the implications of a Marxist analysis which sees crime as a function of the inequality of capitalist society.

Chapter 9—the conclusion—might have capped the book with a thoroughgoing statement of a Marxist theory. The appetite for this has been well stimulated. But the 14 pages devoted to the section is too brief a span. Instead, the conclusion becomes more of an exhortation: "It should be clear that a criminology which is not . . . committed to the abolition of the inequalities of wealth and power, and in particular of inequalities in property and life-chances, is inevitably bound to fall into correctionalism" (p. 281). Correctionalism, it should be pointed out, has been described by Matza in *Becoming Deviant* and it is mealy-mouthed. "For us as for Marx and for other new criminologists, deviance is normal—in the sense that men are now consciously involved (in the prisons that are contemporary society and in the real prisons) in asserting their human diversity. The task is not merely to 'penetrate' these problems. . . . The task is to create a society in which the facts of human diversity, whether personal, organic or social, are not subject to the power to criminalise" (p. 282).

In the run up to this tract-like close, the authors return to their specification of the steps required in "an adequate model of all the processes involved in the evolution of deviant action" of p. 165. In doing so, they rather quixotically amend their wordings of the final step. Their review of these steps, however, provides a helpful summary of some of the arguments earlier in the book.

The book, then, raises a host of vital issues. One is the authors' fairness in their selection of material. There are great gaping holes in their coverage! Apart from Radzinowicz, none of the Cambridge gallery get so much as a look in—not even Martin and Webster on the social consequences of conviction. Oxford is equally badly served, let alone some hardy faithfuls like Howard Jones. Curiously, Morris and Hawkins, of *The Honest Politician's Guide to Crime and its Control*, are not referred to. Mannheim gets scarcely any substantive

mention as an original worker in his own right. Barbara Wootton has only token inclusion. Incidentally, in this connection, the index is a travesty and the text is riddled with proof-reading errors.

More substantially, given the close relationship between criminology and the work of the social services and the agents of social control, there is no offering on the implications of the book for those whose living, in the meantime, depends upon a supply of cases suitable for treatment. It may be, as Nils Christie is quoted, that: "We (criminologists) have not made it clear that our role . . . is not first and foremost to be received as useful problem-solvers, but as problem-raisers. . . . Together with other cultural workers, we will probably have to keep a constant fight going against being absorbed, tamed, and made responsible, and thereby completely socialised into society—as it is" (p. 280-281).

But, just as Taylor, Walton and Young have invested tremendous effort in presenting a case for a new criminology rather than directly making Marxists, so it is, perhaps regrettably, possible for some criminologists to separate their search for regularities in the phenomena of crime from the call to political action. In practice, this is easier than it is to separate the ordeal of not attending to music, the arts or the solicitations of brewers and publicans from the ubiquity of the profit motive.

After all, Marx would himself have argued that there are plenty of sufficient reasons for embracing what might, for convenience, be called a Marxist interpretation of society without finding any overwhelming satisfaction from the prospect that the collapse of the capitalist system would have a pay-off in the dissolution of criminality. There are some capitalist enclaves which have already made great strides toward the dissolution of criminality. There is the example we may have to follow while we endeavour to chip away at the pillars which support society "as at present constituted".

MARK BEESON,

Lecturer in Criminology, University of Leeds

TO THE EDITOR,

Prison Service Journal.

Dear Sir,

REVIEW OF "PRISONS UNDER SENTENCE"

As author of the above title for which you were kind enough to include a review in your April issue, I would like to make a few points, with your permission.

The review states that I was a prison visitor at Wormwood Scrubs for many years. This is not so because I have always been associated with Wandsworth.

The review also states that I have over-simplified the real complexities of the penal system. I am surprised that the subject matter has given this impression because I understand the com-

plexities only too well and thought I had made this plain.

The running of a prison filled mostly with unwilling guests is one of the most difficult tasks imaginable. One object of my book was to reduce the complexities by placing more emphasis on rehabilitation and treating convicted men, wherever possible, outside prison. Recidivism itself, in most cases, is proof of the failure of prisons in their rehabilitative role.

Finally, a substantial part of my book was concerned with helping the prisoner to adjust for his release, his after-care and community responsibility for all wrong-doers.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. H. W. CHATFIELD,

St. Christopher's, Woodcote Park Avenue, Purley, Surrey.

Copies may be obtained from
HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE

49 High Holborn, London, W.C.1
Brazenrose Street, Manchester, M60 8AS
13a Castle Street, Edinburgh, 2
50 Fairfax Street, Bristol, BS1 3DE
109 St. Mary Street, Cardiff, CF1 1JW
258 Broad Street, Birmingham, 1
7 Linenhall Street, Belfast BT2 8AY
or through any bookseller

Printed in England