Communication is 'Key':
Barriers to Effective Staff Communication in a Custodial Setting

Bethany Kendle is a Regional Corruption Prevent Manager within the Counter Corruption Unit at His Majesty's Prison and Probation Service, and an ambassador of the Unlocked Graduates Programme.

Introduction

Effective internal communication is fundamental to success in every organisation. The effects of poor communication in a custodial environment manifest in quantifiable ways; to prisoners, it could increase violence; to staff, it can increase burnout or decrease work efficiency; to the organisation, it can limit the impact of rehabilitative culture and reduce its ability to achieve the mission of His Majesty's Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS) to protect the public and to 'prevent victims by changing lives'. By utilising the researchers experience as a frontline Prison Officer, this paper seeks to explore barriers to effective staff communication in a custodial environment to suggest policy recommendations at establishment level, and inform wider HMPPS strategy from a national perspective.

In a prison setting, good systems of communication between all staff are the signifier of a well-managed establishment[1] and information channels are vital to the flow of knowledge and conducting complex processes within a prison.[2] Staff rely on effective communication for vital instructions to maintain security, safety, and conduct. Whilst communication in a custodial environment is acknowledged as 'essential for organisational success'[3], it remains relatively unexplored as to what the specific barriers to communication are, particularly at establishment level.

HMPPS, as an organisation, recognises that internal prison communication needs improving and has embarked on projects to improve it; namely the High Reliability Organisation (HRO) model being piloted across fourteen prisons at the time of writing and a focus on the Ways of Working Team's methods of communication. The HRO model is implementing learned operational concepts from the 'Structured Communications' initiative at HMP/YOI Isis from the 10 Prisons Project. HROs can be defined as organisation which 'potentially can-do catastrophic harm to itself and the public, but operates effectively, error-free over a long period of time'.[4] Direct relevance of HRO theory has been applied to a custodial setting[5], where Bogue identifies that prisons exhibit a 'sensitivity to operations' in incident management where the chain of command fluctuates to those who have a deeper feel for the current climate (i.e. officers have considerable expertise of specific prisoners in their care and their knowledge empowers decision making of senior personnel). The focus of the HRO pilot is to bring the Prison Service in-line with other industries, such as aviation and the military, to be highly reliable in their outcomes but to also recognise that when a service is run by people, there will undoubtedly be errors. Bennett and Hartley considered HRO theory in the context of prison security procedures and were cautious to endorse a blanket use of the model in prisons, as they believed it would be inappropriate to rely on this approach without emphasis on social aspects.[6] Regardless, 'there still may be lessons that could be learned and applied' from HRO theory to prison management,[7] particularly in communication strategy.

The Ways of Working Team at HMPPS HQ have identified one-way and two-way communication as a particular concern. They have pinpointed that most communication, for all grades, is one-way communication (i.e., staffroom printouts, newsletters, intranet, and briefings), while word-of-mouth and emails function as two-way communication flows.

1. Coyle, A. (2002). Managing Prisons in a Time of Change (Online ed.). London: International Centre for Prison Studies.
2. Hancock, P. G. & Raeside, R. (2009). Modelling factors central to recidivism: An investigation of sentence management in the Scottish Prison Service. The Prison Journal, 89(1), 99-118.
3. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2010). Handbook for prison leaders: A basic training tool and curriculum for prison managers based on international standards and norms (No. E.10.IV.4 ed.). New York: United Nations.
4. Bennett, J., & Hartley, A. (2006). High reliability organisations and high security prisons. Prison Service Journal (166), 11-16, p.11
5. Bogue, B. (2009). How Principles of High Reliability Organizations Relates to Corrections. Federal Probation, 73(3).
6. Bennett, J., & Hartley, A. (2006). High reliability organisations and high security prisons. Prison Service Journal, (166), 11-16, p.12
7. Ibid.

While HMPPS has acknowledged the need to improve staff communication and is making efforts to do so, significant communication issues remain both hierarchically (vertically) and interdepartmentally (horizontally) that are impacting operational delivery in prisons that, if ignored, will undermine the safety, security, and decency in prisons for both staff and prisoners. This paper explores current communication issues affecting frontline staff in a prison setting, to enrich the understanding of what communication challenges are, and those that are not being addressed by the current approaches.

Understanding the Problem with Staff Communication in a Custodial Setting

There has been limited research on staff communication in custodial settings. The literature which does consider this, often in the broader context of staff relationships and leadership, illustrates that prisons are hidden environments, where communication to the outside, even for staff, is constrained within a closed environment[8], with significant professional isolation.[9] This directly impacts the quality of communication, where, in frequent circumstances, even 'senior prison management […] are not made aware […] of the challenges encountered in prisons'.[10] Considering that prison staff 'perform one of the most challenging and complex work of public services',[11] good systems of communication should be established and maintained to support staff and organisational management, to ensure that duties can be executed successfully and accurately. For example, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime emphasise the value of communication to staff outside primary information

> Good systems of communication should be established and maintained to support staff and organisational management, to ensure that duties can be executed successfully and accurately.

transmission channels, 'improving internal communication among the staff and between the staff and the managers will increase employee morale, support a collaborative approach, encourage individual responsibility and initiative, and minimise grievances.'[12]

Overcoming a lack of information as a result of poor communication is not only significant to providing critical and necessary information to Prison Officers,[13] but research shows this also has effects on 'job stress, job satisfaction, and organisational commitment'.[14] In the current staffing climate, where the Prison Service is facing challenges with recruitment and retention of Prison Officers, improvement of communication channels would be likely to have a much wider impact on the job satisfaction and morale of the workforce.

Alarmingly, discontent of prison staff has been attributed in research to the 'organisational conditions and relationships between [prison] authorities and staff', rather than staff/prisoner interaction.[15] Both the hierarchical structure and consequential depersonalised relationships have negative impacts on the contentment of staff towards their role, and the communication between frontline staff and their management intensify the risk of stress.[10]

To comprehend communication structures in a prison, it is essential to understand the impact of the vertical (hierarchical) and horizontal (interdepartmental) forms.

Vertical communication stems from prisons being hierarchical bodies following a strict structure whereby each rank reports to the rank above to feed information upwards, thereby ensuring only critical information gets reported up to the Governors. This was recognised by Coyle (2002) who noted that there is 'no upwards feedback and there is very little

8. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2018). Unique features of the prison environment. Handbook on Anti-Corruption Measures in Prisons, pp. 7-17.
9. Goffman, E. (1961). Asylums: Essays on the social situations of mental patients and other inmates. Doubleday.
10. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2018). Unique features of the prison environment. Handbook on Anti-Corruption Measures in Prisons, pp. 7-17.
11. Ibid.
12. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2010). Handbook for prison leaders: A basic training tool and curriculum for prison managers based on international standards and norms (No. E.10.IV.4 ed.). New York: United Nations, p.41
13. Lambert, E., Barton, S., Hogan, N., & Clarke, A. (2002). The impact of instrumental communication and integration on correctional staff. Justice Professional, 15, 181-193.
14. Lambert, E., Hogan, N. L., Paoline, E. A., & Stevenson, M. T. (2008). I Want to Know and I Want to Be Part of It: The Impact of Instrumental Communication and Integration on Private Prison Staff. Journal of Applied Security Research, 3(2), 205-229.
15. Fraser, A. (2014). Staff health and well-being in prisons: leadership and training. Prisons and Health, pp. 185-189.

information passed across the organisation'.[11] Consequential to their low position in this hierarchical structure, prison officers receive the least information and dialogue in a prison setting.[9] Most prison staff desire instrumental communication[16], defined as 'the degree to which information about the job is formally transmitted by the employer to employees'.[17] This suggests issues with the communication channels themselves rather than lower grade staff having disregard for communication per se. To exacerbate this issue, the lack of upward feedback noted above, creates a separation in objectives between the senior leadership and frontline staff.

The need for **horizontal communication** is recognised to address the hierarchical boundary through a multi-layered communication system that encourages a transparent dialogue between junior staff and senior management.[18] The broader importance of communication in a prison setting across hierarchical structures has been recognised, as 'a well-managed prison […] will have a good system for communications between everyone'.[19] Good communication in a prison cannot happen if there is no trust between staff, particularly across the hierarchical boundaries within the staffing structure.[20] Formal hierarchical, or vertical, communication channels are argued to be just as critical to achieving organisational success;[21] additionally, little information is passed across the organisation because each department has 'no formal means of communication with each other'.[22] From the researcher's personal experience, the limited information passed across the organisation is symptomatic of this vertical communication structure and creates an entanglement of communication networks.

> The definition of communication was left open to staff to allow for open discussion and to identify where current understanding and expectations of communication within the prison setting lie.

Researching the Problem

Having experienced the direct effects of poor communication in a prison as a Prison Officer, the author wished to identify the barriers that inhibit effective communication between staff. Consultative research was conducted in early 2022 with serving prison staff to better understand perspectives from the frontline of current challenges related to communication. The staff interviewed worked in various grades in one establishment, a training prison in the Midlands which holds category C male prisoners. A total of 12 staff, who all had varying degrees of time-in-service and experience, were consulted, using semi-structured interview questions. These included Prison Officers, Supervising Officers, Custodial Managers, and a Governor grade, all of whom are uniformed staff.

Research findings primarily examined differences of opinion between the different grades by looking thematically at general, methodological, and cultural perceptions of communication. The definition of communication was left open to staff to allow for open discussion and to identify where current understanding and expectations of communication within the prison setting lie.

General perceptions towards communication from all grades was negative, although feelings about communication within the establishment from the Custodial Manager (CM) group were a lot less emotive than from the Prison Officer (PO) or Supervising Officer (SO) group. The Governor grade interviewee expressed similarly negative perceptions to the POs and SOs but demonstrated consideration to how each grade is affected differently. Negative elements identified were a 'lack of visibility' from management, a 'weak sense of

16. Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., & Allen, R. I. (2006). Correlates of Correctional Officer Job Stress: the Impact of Organisational Structure. *American Journal of Criminal Justice,* 30(2), 227-246, p.238
17. Mueller, C., Boyer, E., Price, J., & Iverson, R. (1994). Employee attachment and noncoercive conditions of work. *Work and Occupations,* 21, 179-212, p.188
18. Coyle, A. (2002). Book Review: The prison officer. Punishment & Society, 4(4), 491–495.
19. Coyle, A. (2002). Managing Prisons in a Time of Change (Online ed.). London: International Centre for Prison Studies. P.93
20. Ibid.
21. Lambert, E., Hogan, N. L., Paoline, E. A., & Stevenson, M. T. (2008). I Want to Know and I Want to Be Part of It: The Impact of Instrumental Communication and Integration on Private Prison Staff. Journal of Applied Security Research, 3(2), 205-229.
22. Coyle, A. (2002). Managing Prisons in a Time of Change (Online ed.). London: International Centre for Prison Studies. P.93

direction', and so-called 'blanket bollockings' to lower grades when errors occurred. Only the Governor grade interviewee referred to operational delivery in a collective sense; 'how are we as [residential unit] getting things done' as opposed to lower grades who typically expressed individual perspectives 'I have to dig to find out what I need to do'. This demonstrates the importance of those in leadership positions understanding that communication barriers extend beyond the means of communication alone.

Views differed amongst the grades about what the word 'communication' meant within the context of the establishment. For POs, communication came from the SO or the CM for that unit, following the hierarchical structure embedded into the communication networks. Notably, those in the CM group stated that communication for them was about understanding why a decision has been made, including having an opportunity to voice their opinion. These expectations were not raised by the PO and SO group who felt that communication was principally to know things and have clear and guided 'expectations.' Despite these concerns, there was a general lack of understanding from those it affects of the reasons why communication can be problematic. A Supervising Officer with over 20 years' experience exemplified this by stating: 'the communication is shocking but if you're going to ask me how to fix it, don't bother'.

Methodological perceptions of communication can be understood as methods of communication practiced between staff, including for example, face-to-face (briefings), emails, intranet, and word-of-mouth. All grades emphasised the importance of face-to-face communication, establishing verbal communication as the most valuable. Face-to-face communication, depending on the format, generally is conducive to two-way communication, thereby allowing individuals both to relay information and check understanding. There were expectations from the lower grades for management to be competent communicators and pass on the information their staff need. Whilst the higher grades also acknowledged this, the SOs particularly felt they were the 'middle-men' yet received insufficient information to be confident that the information they were passing on was of quality and

informative. SOs were the only grade to express that they felt they did have positive relationships in their peer group but did not have enough face-to-face contact with each other. Thus, SOs felt disadvantaged by the fact that they had to be reliant on written communication between each other when they had preference for verbal communication. POs expressed that communication was 'diluted' and felt this was due to the numerous stages of passing information that were needed prior to reaching them. POs felt that discussion about messaging being conveyed would be beneficial in an open forum with higher grades present. While for them the current delivery method—which was primarily in the form of daily morning briefings—was useful, it did not allow for long discussions due to time-constraints. Too often, they felt such briefings were not the time or place to contribute information, rather they were to receive instructions for the day.

An intranet is used by HMPPS to distribute information, policies, resources for departments, and localised information. Whilst technology can enhance methods of work,[23] at an establishment level the use of technology in prisons can splinter communication channels. For example, methodological concerns of POs generally concentrated on their ability, or lack thereof, to access emails. For them, the primary source of information was verbal, through staff briefings and/or other forms of face-to-face communication. They felt frustrated when information was communicated to them via email due to lack of facility time to access them. POs collectively stated that they do not use the intranet, with one officer describing it as a 'poor tool'. This is in direct contrast to SOs, CMs and Governors who all stipulated that the Intranet is essentially their 'idiots guide'. One CM acknowledged that in their promotion from SO they relied on the resources on the Intranet to support them.

Cultural perceptions of communication can be understood as organisational culture that impacts on communication in a custodial environment. Under this category, the themes: confidence in information, relationship with others, trust, and feeling united in a common goal were explored.

Prison staff stressed that trust among colleagues was essential,[24] and effective communication from

> Cultural perceptions of communication can be understood as organisational culture that impacts on communication in a custodial environment.

23. See, for example, Cascio, W. F., & Montealegre, R. (2016). How Technology Is Changing Work and Organizations. The Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 349–375.
24. See, for example, Hacin, R., & Meško, G. (2019). *The Dual Nature of Legitimacy in the Prison Environment.* Springer International Publishing.

leaders was the best way to improve trust with employees within an organisation, demonstrating the coalescence of the two. For participants in this study, the lack of trust between different grades was palpable. The POs and SOs specifically sought out their sources of information dependent on their trust of individuals. For example, an SO disclosed that communication helped them 'weed out who they can trust', this would then have a direct impact on what sources of information they would utilise. Whilst staff briefings were mentioned by all to be the main source of communication, one PO emphasised that the 'staff briefing is only as good as the person running it'. Every grade, except for the Governor, stated that communication 'depends on the person', highlighting the importance of trusted relationships on how communication is received. Importantly, each grade felt the communication between others of the same grade was positive, but between grades was often less so. Additionally, POs and SOs highlighted that their lack of trust for managers was due to their 'competing values' of being operational whilst instigating senior management's objectives which were seen as more strategic. Regardless of their rank, the more the staff member felt they 'got on well' and had similar ways of working to their senior, the more they expressed trust.

Addressing the Effectiveness of Staff Communication

Research participants discussed their perceptions of barriers to effective staff communication. Three themes were identified: (1) methodological and cultural issues; (2) different grades using different sources; and (3) over-reliance on one-way communication channels.

Barriers comprised both **methodological and cultural issues.** Each rank from PO through to Governor, emphasised different perspectives about why communication in the prison was problematic. For example, the POs focused explicitly on cultural factors and made the following observations: 'lack of trust in managers', 'it's hierarchical', 'too many working parts', and 'the relationships between us and manager'. CMs however focused more on methodological factors such as lack of face-to-face communication and technological restrictions. The Governor tended to focus on cultural factors by identifying the lack of

'diversity of personalities in communication'. POs and SOs highlighted the importance of face-to-face communication in the execution of their roles, and the lack of trusting relationships outside of their peer group with management. CMs and the Governor however placed greater emphasis on methodological concerns, largely related to the use of emails, as well as a knowledge disconnect to the front-line. While examining methodology and culture independently helps to unpack and understand communication issues, they should not be treated as mutually exclusive, they are intertwined and overlap in complex ways. Accordingly, any recommendations or solutions must encompass and address both. Taking such an approach would mitigate the risk of implementing improvements that are either so simplistic that they do not capture the roots of the issue or perceive the communication barrier too broadly to have applicable solutions. For example, if a weekly newsletter was implemented to improve senior leadership information, this is unlikely also to improve the trust that underlies effective communication.

> Varying prioritisation of communication methods from different grades resulted in differential amounts of information gained.

Different grades used different sources of information and relied on different channels of information flow. Varying prioritisation of communication methods from different grades resulted in differential amounts of information gained. This difference in knowledge base impacts on job execution and related teamwork, trust, and relationships. Additionally, there is a lack of clarity over where responsibility for communication lies despite the entrenched hierarchical model. As a result, the different sources of information which flow through multiple communication channels often contradict each other. This suggests that, following development and operational change post-COVID-19, senior leadership should consider where, how and why information can or should be accessed to build confidence in these sources. Correct utilisation of technology should be adopted to compliment, rather than replace, face-to-face communication as a priority and all sources of information should support each other, rather than compete with one another.

Participants highlighted **significant overuse of one-way communication channels** for information sharing. This undermines effective communication because it restricts feedback, understanding assurance, and hinders information sharing. Both methodological

and cultural factors discussed by interviewees emphasised issues with one-way communication, with negative perceptions expressed including not feeling heard and being given diluted information. While front-line staff have periodic opportunities to raise issues to overcome the one-way channels, the ability to do this with HQ is near impossible. One member of staff expressed that 'if a Governor doesn't understand our problems, why do HQ staff think they do'. This has the effect of isolating those staff from engaging in organisational discussions outside of their establishment. The Governor grade, who identified the importance of consulting with staff prior to decision-making, evidently engaged in additional two-way communication, such as discussions with staff and encouraging feedback. Both POs and SOs spoke about this individual extremely positively and valued their visibility that enabled face-to-face communication. Nevertheless, tools which managers utilise for two-way communication, namely emails, are regularly perceived as a one-way tool from subordinate POs and SOs. It is important to recognise that substantial value is placed on two-way communication from front-line staff, particularly in an environment where critical information is changing rapidly.

Synthesising Experiences from Across the Prison Estate

It is important that these findings from one establishment are situated within experiences of other initiatives across the prison estate to give a fuller, more holistic understanding of staff, and to establish both the extent to which the findings align with similar perspectives or highlight isolated experiences, and whether they can provide valuable insight to further develop the national initiatives. The findings were therefore tested with three staff at another establishment (a PO, an SO and a Governor grade) who had experienced the implementation of a 'structured communications' project (the theoretical predecessor to the HRO pilot) which focused specifically on 'check-listing' as an active attempt to bridge the hierarchical divide.

The check-listing tool, which continues to be utilised in the HRO pilot, is regarded as an effective teamwork tool already in use within HMPPS and other industries. This approach seeks to provide consistency of information delivery, ensuring that all essential information is discussed and responsibility for improving the communication channels is identified. A staff member, not dependent on seniority, will lead on briefing and all staff are encouraged to contribute by engaging in questions to ensure that the information imparted is understood. It is important that the information delivered is accurate, concise, and establishes responsibility or escalation for actions.

The feedback from use of this method was overwhelmingly positive. The SO stated that they felt methodologically that checklist-briefings were ideal for informing staff in a custodial environment, and that they '[were] empowering lower grades', 'encouraged people to be more included', and developed 'better cooperative teamwork'. An important part of the approach is empowering staff of lower grades to make decisions within their team, whilst having the supervision of management to support the process. This shifts the communication away from being directive, and towards collaborative discussion across the grades. Additionally, it ensures all staff are aware of critical information, thereby reducing the likelihood of incidents and making the environment safer for staff and prisoners. Importantly, this model requires visibility and support from managers and supervisors who also engage in the briefings. While staff stated that check-listing does not fully solve the influence of human factors in communication barriers, they identified that having a consistent space for open communication, with various managers present, illuminated potential risk factors before they escalated. Prison managers also felt able to get to know their staff better and therefore more able to recognise subtle changes which may require intervention.

On the other hand, the implementation of communication strategies from HMPPS for operational staff was felt to be limited to 'upward' communication improvement. For example, while it was considered essential to have a Governor grade present at morning briefings to improve their visibility and awareness, consequently improving communication channels, the perception of the SO was that information flow was solely upwards. It was stressed that while messages were more adequately conveyed, 'downward feedback remained the same', echoing similar feelings of exclusion as the staff in the initial establishment.

Two strategic tools were identified as making a notable improvement by the staff in the second

> It is important to recognise that substantial value is placed on two-way communication from front-line staff, particularly in an environment where critical information is changing rapidly.

establishment: (1) communication workshops, and (2) daily briefings from Governing Governor with SOs. Workshops were described by the staff member as being 'vitally important in improving communication interdepartmentally and between grades'. The approach comprised team building mornings where games were played to teach and encourage improved communication. Secondly, having the Governing Governor facilitate a briefing with SOs each afternoon, was seen as facilitating better relationships whereby front-line supervisors were fully aware of changes and had a space to escalate concerns which could then be discussed and swiftly resolved. Additionally, it improved morale by increasing understanding of what is colloquially termed 'prison business' to work towards a common goal through bridging the hierarchical divide. All those consulted agreed that both tools not only improved communication directly but impacted the culture of the prison by strengthening staff relationships and collaborative working.

Whilst staff in this prison were positive about communication improvements, similar to those in the first establishment, the staff also recognised the complexity of the hierarchical structure of staff in prison and acknowledged that there was no simple solution to overcome these barriers. Communication between staff in both prisons continue to need significant development to be more effective, both in understanding localised issues and cultures, and in addressing the issue of embedded hierarchical structures across the prison estate.

> Communication between staff in both prisons continue to need significant development to be more effective, both in understanding localised issues and cultures.

Recommendations to Improve Staff Communication at Establishment Level

The key points which need to be addressed to improve communication in the first establishment are methodological vs. cultural issues, discrepancies in sources of information, and challenges with existing methods of one-way and two-way communication.

It is recommended that **the checklist briefing tool used in the HMPPS pilots be introduced by senior leaders in residential morning meetings.** This would shift an existing and established channel of communication (briefings) from one-way to two-way communication which would have several benefits.

Firstly, the format would allow management staff to 'manage' whilst operating their management style in an inclusive framework that empowers frontline staff. Secondly, positive feedback from end users who had experienced the tool showed that it addressed the primary barriers to communication, by establishing a consistent means of critical information delivery where lower grades were more involved, were given greater responsibility, and were better engaged in teamwork.

It is recommended that a **local 'Communication Strategy' should be developed and published,** in consultation with staff. The strategy should outline where, how, and when communication should be executed within the operational function of the staffing group. This would help all grades assimilate to the variety of communication methods that exist within a custodial environment, as well as establishing clear expectations and responsibilities and enabling staff to support one another in facilitating effective communication. An essential element of this strategy should be staff development sessions that focus on teambuilding, improving communication delivery, and reflection for continuous development. Specifically, team building exercises that encourage collaborative working and teamwork should be utilised (for example, team sports events, competitive games, and problem-solving exercises), consisting of both departmental and inter-departmental sessions. These sessions should be a standard part of operational delivery and be conducted, at least bi-annually. Additional research focusing on the impact of this, and consideration for the individual needs for a specific establishment, should be conducted to enhance the strategy, and explore the complexities of interdepartmental communication to support the internal communication throughout the establishment, not just within the operational grades.

It is recommended that **increased focus on communication should be implemented, through mentoring, training, and engagement, for middle management grades.** Since these roles (Supervising Officers and Custodial Managers) have high levels of responsibility for communicating essential and strategic information interchangeably through from Governor grades to front-line operational delivery, they need ongoing support for, and review of, their

communication styles. Prisons can induce a 'prevailing authoritarian chain of command' from managers, and support should be implemented to ensure those stepping into these roles 'enforce a democratic style of leadership, based upon establishing and maintaining good relations with all of their subordinates'.[25] Investing time and resources into communication specific guidance for Supervising Officers and Custodial Managers, in conjunction with regular informal performance reviews with a mentor, would develop communication for the operational grades and improve the culture for staff. Governing Governors have recently been given guidance—under the 'Free, Flex, and Fixed' model—that enables them to have clearer understanding of where they have existing flexibility and freedom in their role and empowers them to access and use those powers more readily. A similar approach to devolving responsibility and empowering Supervising Officer and Custodial Managers could equally be applied to simplify communication and support the delivery of business plans from senior leaders. With greater transparency about role responsibility and accountability, all staff would have greater confidence in communication delivery and a better understanding of where discretion can be exercised.

Whilst these recommendations cannot entirely address the barriers to effective communication, they are expected to improve the current communication climate for operation staff.

Conclusion

Due to the complexities of communication in a custodial environment, there is no 'quick fix' set of solutions that can be applied to address the barriers to effective communication for staff. Nevertheless, through consideration for specific issues at a category C prison in the West Midlands and ideas trialled at other establishments, the recommendations for implementation at a local level are expected to improve communication at an establishment level. These recommendations seek to overcome the divide in communication within the hierarchical structure of operational prison staff in both methodological and cultural practices, to shift the working environment and communication practices to be more inclusive than directive.

HMPPS should prioritise efforts to improve staff communication channels as the impact of communication has a direct influence on security, safety, and conduct within a prison. By creating an environment with effective communication, staff would have better organisational commitment through knowledge sharing to improve the service and greater relationships with their peers and management. This in turn, should increase retention and job satisfaction and create workplace environments that are solution focused for continuous learning and development.

25.   Hacin, R., & Meško, G. (2019). *The Dual Nature of Legitimacy in the Prison Environment.* Springer International Publishing, pp.66