

JOURNAL

PRISON SERVICE

September 2016 No 227



An exploration of prisoners' perceptions of the Incentives and Earned Privileges (IEP) scheme:

The role of legitimacy

Zarek Khan *Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge.*

Introduction

Since its inception over two decades ago, the Incentives and Earned Privileges (IEP) scheme has become a central pillar in the daily functioning and understanding of prison life. Given the policy's integral part in determining prisoner progression within the prison system, its success is largely determined by 1) prisoners' perceived legitimacy of the scheme and 2) the manner in which IEP is implemented and enforced by staff authorities. At a time of increasing prison population, these two intimately linked components have become progressively pertinent to understanding the ways in which everyday prison practices, of which IEP is a major constituent, are routinely established and how the development of these interactions contribute to whether or not prisoner compliance to IEP is achieved. Drawing on data collected as part of a qualitative study of an English prison for men, this article examines prisoners' perceptions of the IEP scheme, paying specific attention to the perceived fairness of IEP implementation in light of the concept of legitimacy.

In 1995, a policy of Incentives and Earned Privileges (IEP) was introduced in England which sought 'to ensure that prisoners earn privileges by responsible behaviour and participation in hard work and other constructive activity'.¹ Within this overall purpose, five specific aims were outlined:

- 1) to provide that privileges generally are earned by prisoners through good behaviour and performance and are removable if prisoners fail to maintain acceptable standards;
- 2) to encourage responsible behaviour by prisoners;
- 3) to encourage hard work and other constructive activity by prisoners;
- 4) to encourage sentenced prisoners' progress through the prison system; and

- 5) to create a more disciplined, better controlled, and safer environment for prisoners and staff.²

This framework consisted of three broad privilege levels: basic, standard and enhanced. The 'key earnable privileges' comprised extra and improved visits, ability to earn more money in prison jobs, eligibility to participate in enhanced earning schemes, access to in-cell television, greater time out of cell and the opportunity to wear one's own clothes. However, it must be noted that, the Prison Service Instruction expressed that not all key earnables would apply to all prisons (for example, long-term prisoners in the confines of maximum security could not expect community visits; all women prisoners already wore their own clothes). Therefore, only two out of the six initial key earnables were included across all establishments; that of extra and improved visits and access to private cash.

In 2013, the National Offender Management Service revised the IEP scheme for prisoners – this was the first review of the policy for 10 years and has posed some of the most significant changes since the policy was first introduced. Under the revised IEP scheme, prisoners are expected to 'demonstrate a commitment towards their rehabilitation, engage in purposeful activity, reduce their risk of reoffending, behave well and help other prisoners and staff members'.³ Principal to this scheme was the belief that, given the rational model of human conduct, incentives were to encourage and reward 'good' prisoner behaviour and deter 'bad' behaviour by the loss of earnable privileges. The IEP scheme was therefore fundamentally designed to promote conforming behaviour based on the impetus for the access to material privileges and on a set of assumptions about the subjective value of these privileges. That is, given the rational choice theory foundations of an incentives-based approach, incentives were expected to have direct beneficial effects on prisoners' behaviour.

While the creation of the original IEP scheme was a seemingly plausible solution to the prisoner disturbances preceding the Strangeways riot,⁴ the Prison Service's

1. Bottoms, A.E. (2003) Theoretical reflections on the evaluation of a penal policy initiative. In L. Zednar and A. Ashworth (Eds.) *The Criminological Foundations of Penal Policy: Essays in Honour of Roger Hood* (pp. 107-194). New York: Oxford University Press.
2. Ibid.
3. Prison Reform Trust. (2014) Punishment without purpose. [Online] Available from: <http://www.prisonreformtrust.org.uk/Portals/0/Documents/punishment%20without%20purpose%20FINAL2941007.pdf> [Accessed January 2015].
4. see Woolf, H. and Tumin, S. (1991) *Prison Disturbances* (CM. 1456). London: HMSO.

oversimplified conception of the relationship between incentives and compliance in prison was subject to practical scrutiny. Bosworth and Liebling's⁵ examination of the concept of incentives suggested that the 'simple model' of incentives, based on the rational system of human behaviour, should be extended to a 'complex model', which took greater account of the various interconnecting features of prison life in which the rational choice model of behaviour is not the only factor at play.

Following the introduction of the IEP scheme, results of the Cambridge IEP evaluation found mainly negative effects on prisoner behaviour and perceptions of fairness and relationships.⁶ Findings showed that the majority of prisoners perceived the principles of IEP as fair but felt it was implemented unfairly. They were unclear as to what the rules and guidelines consisted of, especially their rights regarding appeals procedures. Staff found the discretion of IEP as a useful anchor to motivate prisoner behaviour and they felt more in control by the specific avenues they could adhere to if prisoners were not compliant. Two frequently cited themes which were observed in the Cambridge IEP study related to issues of fairness and (especially) unfairness.

An important consideration to bear in mind is that during the time of introducing IEP, 'the government was not only attempting to incentivise the prison system but was trying to rein in previous levels of privileges, and it believed it was politically and morally justified in promoting this change'.⁷ There were, therefore, two kinds of legitimacy at stake here: the *internal* legitimacy of the new penal policy initiatives (such as IEP) in relation to the subject group (the prisoners), and the *external* legitimacy of changing penal policies in relation to the societal audience at large.

Legitimacy and procedural justice

Much of the academic focus on the concept of legitimacy has been traditionally associated with explanations regarding compliance and cooperation with

legal authorities.⁸ The modern use of the phrase 'legitimacy' has its roots in classical sociological theory, and can most notably be traced back to the work of Weber.⁹ Weber argued that within advanced economies, the ability to conform to rules or commands is reliant on the ability of that ruler to enforce those rules legitimately and that 'every such system attempts to establish and to cultivate the belief in its legitimacy'.¹⁰ This conceptualisation is important as it provides the theoretical base for understanding contemporary analyses of legitimacy. For Weber, claims to legitimacy by external or political power-holders are universally concomitant; they are continuously negotiated through its practices in a kind of ongoing dialogue or speech,¹¹ 'to establish and to *cultivate*' legitimacy on a continuing basis. The plural use of the term 'power-holders' implies that more than one type of audience(s) is at stake and that there is a *continual relationship* between the power-holder and the stakeholders.

Thus, legitimacy is suggested to be central to the exercise of all forms of authority, whether in industrial or technological settings, and not simply concerned with the legitimate exercise of authority but to the manner of its application: 'the obligation to obey has some relation to the quality of the rules and the integrity of their administration'.¹² Implicit in these accounts of legitimacy concerns the beliefs individuals hold about the normative appropriateness or rightful conduct of governmental officials and the processes by which these actions are enacted and subsequently reinforced. This criterion of legitimacy is plausibly conceived to be typical across all societies,¹³ however their specific contents must be understood and determined in its given social environment.

Although most of the empirical work on legitimacy has been based on research on interactions with the police and court representatives, with an increasing emphasis on survey-based methodology,¹⁴ another branch of criminological research into legitimacy has surfaced in recent years, focusing on the everyday internal life of prisons. This began in the work of Sparks, Bottoms and

5. Bosworth, M. and Liebling, A. (1994) *Incentives in prison regimes: A review of the literature*. Unpublished report: Cambridge Institute of Criminology.
6. Liebling, A., Muir, G., Rose, G. and Bottoms, A.E. (1999) *An evaluation of incentives and earned privileges*. Unpublished report submitted to Home Office: London; Liebling, A. (2008) 'Incentives and earned privileges revisited: Fairness, discretion, and the quality of prison life', *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention*. 9(1): 25–41.
7. Bottoms, A.E. (2003) Theoretical reflections on the evaluation of a penal policy initiative. In L. Zednar and A. Ashworth (Eds.) *The Criminological Foundations of Penal Policy: Essays in Honour of Roger Hood* (p. 186). New York: Oxford University Press.
8. Sunshine, J. and Tyler, T.R. (2003) 'The role of procedural justice and legitimacy in shaping public support for policing', *Law & Society Review*. 37(3): 513–548; Tyler, T.R. (2001) 'Public trust and confidence in legal authorities: What do majority and minority group members want from the law and legal authorities?', *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*. 19(2): 215–235; Tyler, T.R. (2006) 'Psychological perspectives on legitimacy and legitimation', *Annual Review of Psychology*. 57: 375–400.
9. Weber, M. (1968) *Economy and Society*. New York: Bedminster.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 213.
11. see Bottoms, A.E. and Tankebe, J. (2012) 'Viewing things differently: The dimensions of public perceptions of police legitimacy', *Criminology*. 51(1): 103–135.
12. Selznick, P. (1969) *Law, Society, and Industrial Justice*. New York: Russell Sage. p. 29.
13. see Beetham, D. (1991) *The Legitimation of Power*. London: Macmillan.
14. Tyler, T.R. and Huo, Y.J. (2002) *Trust in the Law: Encouraging Public Cooperation with the Police and Courts*. New York: Russell Sage; Tyler, T.R. and Wakslak, C.J. (2004) 'Profiling and police legitimacy: Procedural justice, attributions of motive, and acceptance of police authority', *Criminology*. 42(2): 253–282.

Hey's *Prisons and the Problem of Order*,¹⁵ to more recent studies which have advanced our understandings of legitimacy in the prisons context.¹⁶ Despite the different methodological approach in comparison to Tyler and colleagues, these various studies have drawn attention to the significance of procedural justice theory, which is fundamental to the understanding of legitimacy. Firstly, it shows that legal authorities sometimes have to consider their actions in relation to more than one type of audience and that these audiences may have significantly different priorities.¹⁷ Secondly, as the present research demonstrates, prisoners' perceived fairness of procedures and outcomes are of great importance to their acceptance of whether or not practices are deemed legitimate. The expanding literature of prison-based research on legitimacy has thus opened up important debates and questions in relation to criminal justice practice and policy that seek to go beyond the boundaries of the work on procedural justice which are at the forefront of contemporary criminology.

Of increasing importance to this study is the manner in which IEP is implemented and enforced by staff authorities and the perceived fairness of those actions in the eyes of prisoners. Therefore, in order to understand the complex dimensions of IEP and whether such practices or actions are considered legitimate or illegitimate, it is useful to turn to the interconnecting relationship between legitimacy and procedural justice theory.

At the heart of the rule of law are principles of due process and equality, with equality being secured through the generality of the law.¹⁸ In Tyler's¹⁹ procedural justice model, namely the dimensions of 'quality of decision making' and 'quality of treatment', there are two empirically interconnected facets of procedural justice as conceived by citizens. The first considers the judgements about provisions of honesty and representation and whether authorities have acted objectively; the emphasis here is on consistency and participation. The second aspect places value on the justice of authorities' behaviour and whether individual citizens have been treated with respect, dignity and courtesy.²⁰ There is empirical evidence suggesting that legitimacy tends to be treated as procedural justice plus respect, with research suggesting that these twin-concepts are closely linked to achieving legitimacy.²¹

In short, we can posit from Tyler's work — when we extrapolate from it into the prisons context — that ordinary everyday encounters between staff and offenders can have crucial implications for the nature of the power relations involved, and to the validity of staff claims and decision making — that is, to legitimacy. Beetham²² states that essentially all systems of power relations, whether despotic or impartial in nature, stand in need of legitimation. Thus, an analysis of this kind is particularly relevant to the everyday interactions between prison officers and prisoners; that is prisoners' perceptions as to whether staff are acting fairly and whether the decisions they make about IEP are regarded as legitimate. Tied to this belief are aspects of procedural justice which are therefore highly relevant to the study of IEP.

Methodology

The study was conducted in an adult Category B local prison, HMP Wandsworth, in the London region, England. The Trinity unit was specifically chosen to undertake my research due to the opportunity of interviewing Category C prisoners, rather than prisoners from the main landings; they would have spent a longer time in prison and therefore would be expected to have had more exposure to the IEP scheme. Established in 1851, initially as a Surrey House of Correction for those serving short sentences, Wandsworth is the largest prison in the United Kingdom, holding at the time of study around 1,650 prisoners. A stratified purposive sampling technique²³ was used in order to draw a representative sample from the Trinity unit. This sampling approach was the chosen method as it provided variation among prisoners on different IEP categories so that comparisons between each category could be drawn. Data collected consisted of 16 semi-structured interviews with prisoners, 8 of whom were on enhanced privilege levels, 3 on standard and 5 on basic. All respondents initially approached, and who agreed to take part in the interview, participated in the research study. Themes included in the interview schedule were drawn primarily from sociology of prison life literature and the criminological theories of legitimacy, procedural justice and compliance.

15. Sparks, R., Bottoms, A.E. and Hay, W. (1996) *Prisons and the Problem of Order*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

16. Liebling, A. (2004) *Prisons and Their Moral Performance: A Study of Values, Quality and Prison Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; Crewe, B. (2009) *The Prisoner Society: Power, Adaptation and Social Life in an English Prison*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

17. Ibid.

18. Allan, T. (2001) *Constitutional Justice: A Liberal Theory of the Rule of Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

19. Tyler, T.R. (1990) *Why People Obey the Law*. Connecticut: Yale University Press.

20. Tyler, T.R. (1988) 'What is procedural justice?: Criteria used by citizens to assess the fairness of legal procedures', *Law & Society Review*. 22(1): 103-136; Sunshine, J. and Tyler, T.R. (2003) 'The role of procedural justice and legitimacy in shaping public support for policing', *Law & Society Review*. 37(3): 513-548.

21. Butler, M. and Drake, D. (2007) 'Reconsidering respect: It's role in Her Majesty's Prison Service', *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*. 46(2): 115-127; Hulley, S., Liebling, A. and Crewe, B. (2012) 'Respect in prisons: Prisoners' experiences of respect in public and private sector prisons', *Criminology and Criminal Justice*. 12(1): 3-23.

22. Beetham, D. (1991) *The Legitimation of Power*. London: Macmillan.

23. Patton, M.Q. (2002) *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. California: Sage; Ritchie, J., Lewis, J. and Elam, G. (2003) Designing and selecting samples. In J. Ritchie and J. Lewis (Eds.) *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers* (pp. 77-108). London: Sage.

This study has limitations that are important to acknowledge in order to guide future research in the field. Firstly, questions relating to various demographic factors, such as ethnicity, were not included in the interview schedule. As a result, the potential impact of cultural differences and linguistic expression may have been relevant to make demographic links, given the diverse nationalities of the respondents. A further limitation was the use of a purposive sample gained through collaboration with the Head of Residence. Consequently, sampling was hindered by the scarce number of participants on basic privilege levels which created practical and ethical difficulties in obtaining a representative sample. Before the final day of fieldwork, I had to gain permission from the relevant authorities to interview prisoners from the main landings, as opposed to where the sample was initially drawn, in Trinity unit, in order to obtain a more representative sample of prisoners on basic levels. Future studies that address these limitations, among many others, will contribute toward advancing our understanding of the role of legitimacy in shaping prisoner compliance to IEP.

Prisoner perceptions of IEP implementation

Findings indicated that IEP was a pervasive tool that had significant impact on prisoners' everyday lives. It was of priority amongst prisoners because of the direct effects IEP cast on them. All but one of the prisoners knew the scheme was in place, and most were aware of the different privilege levels and the distinction between them. Broadly speaking, prisoners reported that the IEP policy was unfair in its regulations. There was a general emphasis placed on the uncertainty of IEP boundaries, especially in relation to what types of behaviour and actions consisted of inappropriate conduct. As one red-band²⁴ prisoner expressed:

Looking on the IEP form, what you can get an IEP for is inappropriate conduct. There's about 15 or 20 things you can be done for inappropriate conduct [...] Is that me smoking on the landing? Is it me telling the officer to fuck off? So what's inappropriate conduct you know what I mean?
(Prisoner, enhanced)

As this passage indicates, the IEP 'net' was largely inclusive and all-encompassing. It served to embrace actions perennially, and some prisoners resented this magnitude for it harnessed them into an 'unknown' domain:

Findings indicated that IEP was a pervasive tool that had significant impact on prisoners' everyday lives.

They should give you a little bit of a warning first coz half of the IEPs I didn't even know I had. It's just put through my door and I'm thinking what's that about, like they don't give you a warning.
(Prisoner, basic)

The widened scale of actions worthy of negative entries pointed towards inconsistency of IEP rules which prisoners were to abide by. It remained unclear as to what consisted of 'petty' or 'serious' behaviour, apart from prior self-conceptions of what constituted misconduct, leaving the prisoner in a frame of instability. Prisoners viewed staff decisions as a primary indicator of whether or not they complied with IEP rules. This belief appeared only to manifest when prisoners perceived they were treated fairly through staff use and implementation of IEP. Some prisoners expressed that IEP decision making was unfair most of the time and that it had detrimental effects to their sentence. As one prisoner commented:

They keep threatening you with IEPs and basic. That's all you hear them shout so freely, IEP, IEP, IEP and all you hear him say 23 times a day [...] It's the same as outside. If you get on with someone and they treat you like a human then you'll treat 'em the same way back. If they treat you like shit, you're not gonna give 'em the time of day. (Prisoner, basic)

Prisoners placed value on their experiences of IEP in relation to perceived fairness of decision making and the exercise of discretionary power. If staff implementation of IEP was felt to be unjust or lacked legitimacy, then prisoners retreated from any attempt to demonstrate active commitment to the scheme. Linked to these accounts of perceived fairness is procedural justice theory which states that prisoners place great value on the justice of authority's behaviour. In this context, respect, being one of the focal components of procedural justice, was an important element in making claims about staff actions and decision making of IEP. There was a negative perception toward staff decision making and the manner in which they were implemented:

If they don't show you respect, you're not gonna want to show them respect. If people do certain things to you that you feel are not fair then you're not really gonna bother with them. You're just gonna tell 'em to fuck off and keep it movin.
(Prisoner, basic)

24. 'Red-band' refers to prisoners who have a greater degree of trust and autonomy in the working positions available to them and is restricted to those on enhanced status.

*Most officers in here talk to you with authority, like they've got something against you [...] It's hard when you can't have an IEP or any negative entries for 3 months and then you get an officer who talks to you like a c*** [...] If they talk to you funny from the start you're not gonna be polite back coz it's not on is it? (Prisoner, basic)*

Respect was cited among prisoners to be a deciding factor of whether or not staff actions were perceived as legitimate. This mutual process often flowed cyclically and was perceived as a powerful instrument in determining prisoner compliance to IEP regulations. Furthermore, there was a lot of emphasis placed on the implementation of IEP, particularly in relation to how staff used IEP and the decision making involved. The majority of prisoners understood why the scheme was introduced but few agreed with its application. Prisoners felt that there was injustice in the way the scheme was being used against them.

IEP and procedural fairness

Prisoners who claimed that the scheme was implemented unfairly, adjusted their behaviour and attitudes accordingly towards those staff. There were prisoners who felt completely powerless to affect their position given the outcomes of IEP demotion and losing privileges:

The really annoying thing about the IEP system which isn't fair is if you get charged with an unauthorised item like a telephone, they immediately put you on basic [...] I haven't even been found guilty of that but they just take it away from you on the off-appealing charge that you're gonna be judged for in a prison trial in a few weeks time coz this might be adjourned [...] So you end up getting punished twice. (Prisoner, basic)

As this excerpt suggests, there was a sense of perceived unfairness not only regarding loss of privileges but their consequences which prisoners had no scope to negotiate. This progressive effect IEP imposed on them had been described as a kind of 'double jeopardy' (Prisoner, basic), that punishment was exercised continuously; firstly, through adjudication and secondly, by loss of certain aspects of privileges which for some prisoners were of fundamental importance in getting through their sentence. This experience of negative treatment of IEP in turn reinforced a sense of perceived illegitimacy towards staff in that the power they exercised

through IEP decision making was seen as unfair. As one prisoner stated:

It's like a power flex with a lot of these people [...] Hiding behind your uniform, hiding behind these IEP scheme things to punish people [...] They abuse the IEP system left, right and centre. (Prisoner, basic)

Across all privilege levels, there was great emphasis placed on the illegitimacy of staff usage of IEP. Most prisoners reported that IEP was used as a mechanism of power to ensure compliant behaviour although it was reported that this implementation was often unjustified. There were, however, a few prisoners who felt that the policy was applied fairly. As a result, these prisoners perceived the IEP scheme and the staff enforcing this scheme as legitimate and this fostered positive attitudes towards both the policy and staff:

Prisoners placed great emphasis on perceptions of procedural justice, particularly in regards to the fairness of staff decision making of IEP.

I think it's a fair system. The teachers and the people who participate in the courses are amazing and it makes your life much easier if you're involved in that because time passes and you learn something [...] I think it's a system which ought to be in place and I support the enhanced system, the IEP system. (Prisoner, enhanced)

The way I've seen the IEP scheme, it seems quite fair. On Trinity, they genuinely treat everyone with respect. It's a good little system and I think it does keep prisoners on their toes as well. (Prisoner, enhanced)

Prisoners placed great emphasis on perceptions of procedural justice, particularly in regards to the fairness of staff decision making of IEP. It was found that these attitudes generally tended to be more positive among enhanced level prisoners compared to those on basic. One reason for this was due to the working opportunities IEP presented for enhanced level prisoners. Prisoners claimed that the Trinity unit made a positive difference to their sentence in terms of the respect they received from staff. On the other hand, prisoners on basic were often especially sensitive to injustices and to feelings of defiance and resentment and that these negative views, particularly of IEP and staff fairness, strengthened as prisoners' IEP levels declined, so that prisoners on standard and basic respectively were least convinced of the fairness of their treatment.

The mechanisms that contributed to this particular analysis — *perceived fairness of staff decision making for legitimacy* — underpin Tyler's²⁵ notion of procedural justice theory. The two most relevant factors here are 1) 'neutrality', (also referred to as fairness) placing emphasis on the application and consistency of fair practice and 2) 'respect', which is associated with courtesy, dignity and the recognition of human rights. According to Tyler,²⁶ both these elements, *fair and respectful treatment* — are more important to individuals than the outcomes they regard as either fair or favourable to themselves. As documented, prisoners often expressed that the processes in which staff made decisions about IEP (and the manner of implementation) reinforced their perceptions of whether staff practices were deemed legitimate. The primary emphasis here is twofold — the way in which these decisions are enforced and the outcome of IEP implementation. It was this dimension of the *perceived quality of IEP treatment* received which ultimately shaped prisoners' compliance to prison rules. In other words, the procedurally unfair experiences of IEP as claimed by prisoners eroded their perceived legitimacy of authority whereas positive IEP experiences heightened their perceptions of staff legitimacy. Tied to these aspects of perceived fairness of IEP implementation was the aforementioned element of 'respect' which was of particular relevance to understanding whether staff decisions about IEP were perceived legitimate. These perceptions of staff behaviour were mostly negative in terms of respectful encounters between prisoners and staff which generated multiple forms of non-compliance, the most common being detachment from IEP involvement. The definition of respect as observed by prisoners therefore represents a grounded understanding of what Tyler calls 'procedural justice'.

Furthermore, it must be acknowledged that the results in this study have reinforced findings from other accounts of prison research which are important to address in order to assist subsequent research in this area. The study echoes findings from the Cambridge IEP evaluation conducted by Liebling et al.²⁷ There were evident parallels in the inappropriate implementation of IEP and the ambiguity surrounding the policy's guidelines. Similarly, prisoners perceived a sense of grievance towards the consequences

of being punished twice, through adjudication and demotion with the advent of IEP increasing discretionary power of lower-level staff. One of the key theoretical lessons from this research which supports Liebling et al IEP evaluation is that staff decisions made about prisoners and the actions that support them, through policy initiatives such as IEP, shape prison life more than we realise and to a greater degree than official prison rules.

Concluding comments

This study has explored prisoners' perceptions of the IEP scheme using the concept of legitimacy as a primary site for analysis. Coupled with the notion of procedural justice theory, this research highlights why an examination of these two components is important; it serves to elucidate the impact of IEP on the daily interactions between prisoners and staff that are fundamental to understanding prison life; and how the quality of IEP implementation has great value for prisoners' perceived legitimacy of authority which in turn affect the likelihood of compliance to IEP rules. As illustrated, there is empirical support in this study for the intimate connection between legitimacy and procedural justice theory. The aspect of the *perceived procedural fairness of staff implementation of IEP* and the *perceived fairness of the outcome* of the prisoner's encounter with them was particularly important in shaping prisoner compliance. The manner in which staff decisions are made, then, is of significance to prisoners' perceptions of staff legitimacy.

Future research should explore the interactions between prisoners and staff in order to determine the influences of legitimacy and procedural justice in shaping prisoners' IEP experiences. An examination of this kind would benefit from highlighting the importance of staff-prisoner relationships to demonstrate prisoner perceptions of the legitimacy of IEP as well as ascertaining how these relationships shape prisoner compliance to IEP. Exploring this facet with an ethnographic scope would enable the researcher to temporarily occupy the point of view of the prisoner; to directly observe the realities and consequences of the multiple ways in which legitimacy, and thus compliance, flows among prisoners, as opposed to what they just say about them.

25. Tyler, T.R. (2010) 'Legitimacy in corrections: Policy implications', *Criminology & Public Policy*. 9(1): 127–134.

26. Ibid.

27. Liebling, A., Muir, G., Rose, G. and Bottoms, A.E. (1999) *An evaluation of incentives and earned privileges*. Unpublished report submitted to Home Office: London.