

TECHNOLOGY

IDEOLOGY AND PRISON OFFICER TRAINING

Introduction

The following paper is a case study of the interplay between ideology, prison technology, and prison officer training¹. Ideology provides the legitimacy of the state to inflict harm upon its citizens (Cavadino, 1992; Sparks, 1994). It also determines the goals we seek to achieve with prisons and the views we hold about prisoners. The need for organisations to have clear and explicit goals is well established (Perrow, 1961; Etzioni, 1975). Furthermore, 'How we view the offender affects what we do with him, and determines what, precisely, we hope to accomplish' (Toch, 1979, p147) suggesting an iterative relationship between our views of the offender and the purpose of prisons. Grant (1992) refers to the views we hold about prisoners as their status. In sum, legitimacy, purpose and status are central to the concept of an ideology of prisons.

Technology refers to the application of knowledge to achieve identified ends. It includes the physical environment, the architecture and security system of the prison and also refers to the styles of prisoner management. These could be an impersonal barrier system or a highly interactive style based on the application of interpersonal skills; it may be a unit management system or a two week rolling roster. It could be argued that in most cases technology is based on an ideology. However, while ideology can change, certain components of technology cannot (for example, the architecture of prison). Technology may well be a given and therefore can be viewed as a constraint upon ideology.

The critical role that training plays in the prison system is well understood by prison administrators (see for example, Mugford, 1988) yet rarely is covered in the literature. This lack of attention is surprising since prison officers are the staff with the most contact with prisoners and thus create and control the prison world. If prisons are to achieve certain goals or to run according to certain ideologies then they will do so through prison officers, not academics, judges, prison administrators or forensic psychologists and the like. The prisoner/prison officers relationship is thus critical to the **application** of ideology. It is only possible to manipulate the prison officer component of the equation (we cannot advertise for particular types of prisoners). While prison administration is clearly crucial, the training and indoctrination of prison officers will be the major means of achieving a special ideology.

This paper attempts to identify the ideological factors and technological imperatives that have influenced the development of prison officer training in Western Australia. It starts with an examination of the ideological crisis in prisons, noting that this crisis is part of an evolving process. The impact of major ideologies on training are then analysed including the recent moves to professionalise prison officers through the involvement of a university. One of the major conclusions is that for the last 20 years there has been incongruence between ideology, technology and training. Finally, the need for coherency between these three factors is discussed and an ideology based on the prisoner as a citizen is suggested.

Guy Hall, Edith Cowan University. This study is based upon the author's experience of prisons in Western Australia but has relevance to all systems and is especially topical in the current context of ongoing penal philosophies in this country.

1. I would like to acknowledge the influence of David Grant on my understanding of these ideas; and thank Irene Froyland for her feedback on the paper.

The Ideological Crisis

The Western Australian prison system consists of 13 prisons accommodating just over 2,000 prisoners. The largest prison, Casuarina, has 400 prisoners of whom approximately 360 are in single cells. The secure prisons have all been built since 1970 and the older ones have all undergone substantial renovations. There is no 'slopping out' - all prisoners have toilets in their cells (some have full ensuite facilities). In the last 20 years there has been one major disturbance - a riot in Fremantle prison, which has since closed down. The system has some problems with overcrowding and budget restraints but compared to the English and some American jurisdictions these pale into insignificance.

While there may be no resource crisis it is evident that there is an ideological one. This clearly a common problem, succinctly put by Cullen et al: 'Corrections, then, has experienced an ideological crisis' (1993: 72). Even managers of prisons have made the observation that prisons 'have lost the plot' (Fisher, Hall and Smith, 1993: 2). Grant believes 'that the continuing crisis of New South Wales prisons springs from fundamental conflicts about prisoner status, that is, about the very nature of what a prisoners is' (Grant, 1992, viii). Sentiments regarding an ideological, status or legitimacy crisis have been expressed consistently over the 1980's and 1990's (for example Bottoms (1983), Braithwaite and Pettit (1990), Garland (1990), Cavadino (1992), Grant (1992), and most recently Sparks (1994)).

This crisis can be understood as part of an evolutionary process of ideological development. As Garland notes 'one theory effectively supersedes another only when it explains the same range of data and problems more plausibly' and goes to state that 'in the sociology of punishment, theories have not been superseded so much as passed over in preference for other lines of questioning' (1985: 13). Grant refers to this process as archaeological layering and states that 'Each new perception of prisoners has simply entered into a struggle for ascendancy with its successors while other perceptions lie dormant until the

opportunity for re-emergency presents itself' (1992: 29).

As each model or ideology becomes operationalised it outlines prison management principles and expected roles for prison officers. Thus, as a new ideology becomes dominant, the role expectations grow on top of the existing ones. This process is one of sequential evolution, not revolution. Therefore, pre-existing models, and hence role expectations, remain part of the broader management system. As will be shown, the role of the prison officer in Western Australia has been based on a number of different and potentially conflicting models, paradigms, or ideologies. Even more critical, with the lack of any clearly accepted model of prisons, the role of the prison officer remains dependent upon these previous ideologies.

Just as prison management and role expectations have grown on top of pre-existing ideologies so too has prison officer training. Thus, the training of prison officers lies fundamentally on confused or shifting ground. With no clear purpose of prisons there can be no role clarity and thus no clarity of training.

The importance of the relationship between a clear purpose of imprisonment and the role of the prison officer is noted by Thomas and Stewart (1978) as one of the 'great truths' of effective prison administration.

In a situation where men are locked up, there must be a strong, intelligible, administrative framework designed to achieve certain ends. The first is to make clear to prisoners what their rights and obligations are. The next is to offer staff of all ranks, in all departments, clear unequivocal direction about their duties, how they are to be carried out, how failure or success is to be judged, and what is to be defined as unacceptable treatment of prisoners.

(Thomas and Stewart, 1978: 60).

As noted above, the ideological crisis of prisoners can be viewed as a result of an evolutionary process within which models have grown on top of one another. Generally three major periods of penology², Classical, Positivist and Neo-classical, have

2. Although these periods are based on the associated schools of criminology some differences are noted. Generally a school of criminology is not constrained to just prisons or punishment but to a wide range of issues related to crime.

been identified. It will be demonstrated how these periods have dominated the ideology and technology of the prison system since its inception. The focus of the analysis will be on the role of the prison officer and prison officer training in the Western Australia prison system over the last ten years.

The Classical Period

Like most other prisons systems, the WA system commenced operation under influence of the Classical School of Criminology. Classical criminology has its roots in a combination of retributivism and utilitarianism (Roshier, 1989; Braithwaite and Pettit, 1990).

The essential elements of the retributionist position are that:

- i. The only acceptable reason for punishing a man is that he has committed a crime.
- ii. The only acceptable reason for punishing a man in a given manner and degree is that the punishment is 'equal' to the crime.
- iii. Whoever commits a crime must be punished in accordance with his desert (Pincoffs, 1980: 542-543).

The major force of this argument is that criminals should be punished because they deserve it. Thus punishment is both a means and an end in itself. This retributivist argument, therefore, suggests that imprisonment should be punishing and that it should be punishing to all prisoners.

Utilitarianism takes a different view of punishment and argues that it should be viewed only as a means to an end. The Utilitarian argument is that social utility is a necessary and sufficient condition for punishing an individual with the amount of punishment being determined by how much good it would provide (Feinberg and Gross, 1980). 'Good' or social utility is achieved by ensuring that punishment acts as both a general and specific deterrent and thus ultimately produces good for the community by the prevention of further crime. To this end, prisons should be designed to achieve deterrence making them as aversive as possible.

Foucault (1979) and Grant (1992) suggest that the ideology associated with this period was based on two views of offenders. The first was that they should be viewed as enemy of the state. They suggest that this viewpoint preceded the introduction of

prisons but it is arguable that this ideology was (and still is) influential during the entire period up to positivism. For example, staff were frequently recruited from the armed services; uniforms were influenced by militaristic designs; rank names were militaristic; and drill was a common feature of prison life. In Western Australia, it is common for officers to talk of the prison service being a para-military organisation. Indeed, many openly harbour a desire for a return to drill and discipline.

The second view of offender was that of the sinner and flawed machine. Grant suggests that 'In its most excessive form, imprisonment was to be a machine for grinding out whatever was roguish and grinding in the tractable, productive citizen' (Grant, 1992: 35).

In sum, prisons were originally conceived to be highly punishing places which were to act as either a tool for retribution or as a powerful deterrent. The severity of the punishment was tolerated because the status of the prisoner was either that of the enemy or the sinner. The early Australian experience of prisons is entirely consistent with this viewpoint, that is, Australian prisons were extremely brutal, violent places (Castles, 1982). Indeed, they have remained that way for most of their history (Grant, 1992; Thomas and Stewart, 1978; Zdenkowski and Brown, 1982).

This penal philosophy of punishment was achieved through a number of different means, most notably, the management regime, the prison architecture and the nature of the interaction between the officers and the prisoners.

In Western Australia, Fremantle Prison, built in 1855 along the traditional lines of a Victorian penitentiary, was designed for the separate system (Thomas and Stewart, 1978). The separation in Fremantle was extreme, prisoners were isolated in their cells, with buckets as their ablution facilities, for more than 17 hours per day. The prison was dominated by a 'barrier' security system which emphasised the distinction between officers and prisoners. Movement around the prison or within the Divisions was controlled by gates and passes. The perimeter security was a single limestone wall manned by officers with guns.

Although not always officially sanctioned, the role of the officer was to maximise the punishment of the prisoner. At the minimum the role of the prison officer

was impersonal and distant with emphasis on physical control. Interaction between officers and prisoners was actively discouraged. It is clear that in addition to this, officers directly engaged in the brutalisation of prisoners (Castle, 1982; Grant, 1992; Thomas and Stewart, 1978; Zdenkowski and Brown, 1982).

Prison Officer training during this period was minimal (and in some cases non-existent). The emphasis in the early part of the century was on drill and fire arms training (Thomas and Stewart, 1978). By the 1960's this emphasis had changed to drill, fire arms and detailed understanding of the rules and procedures of Fremantle Prison, even if an officer's ultimate place of work was not that prison. This lack of training may well have been a reflection of the recruiting strategies of the time. As noted previously, many staff were formerly with the armed services (still a common occurrence) and therefore supposedly well versed in fire arm use, drill and discipline. Since these feature were likely to be found in former service personnel further training could be considered unnecessary. The focus on fire arms and drill combined with the recruitment of service personnel certainly suggests an ideology which viewed prisoners as enemies of the state.

The classical period was dominated by an ideology that viewed prisoners as traitors or sinners who should be sent to prison for punishment. The technology of these prisons and the role of the officer were designed to extract this punishment.

The Positivist Period

The influence of positivism began to be felt in Western Australia in 1963 with the introduction of parole. Rehabilitation, an important component of the positivist period, became a recognised purpose of the system in 1972 with the establishment of the Treatment and Training Branch.

Roshier has suggested that positivism has three main features: determinism, differentiation and pathology, where 'Pathology means that criminals are not only different from non-criminals, but there is also something "wrong" with them' (Roshier, 1989: 21-22). During the positivist period ideology shifted to view prisoners as

'sick' and, therefore, in need of 'treatment'. An important component of this traditional medical model was that the right and proper persons to 'cure' prisoners were the experts of the various professional specialists (psychologists, psychiatrists, social workers and so on). Prison officers were effectively alienated from the rehabilitation ideology as the new professions carved out this role for themselves.

In addition, the rehabilitation ideology brought with it a belief that specialisation was an essential component of good management so that by the late 1970's there were more than ten different 'types' of prison officers at the lowest rank (for example, censor officers, transport officers, assessment and orientation officers, records officers and so on). Furthermore, one of the 'new' rehabilitation professional groups, welfare officers, were recruited from prison officers. In the absence of any rehabilitation role, and with the removal of many traditional duties into the specialist positions, the majority of officers were left with purely custodial roles. It is not surprising then that the dominant ideology of punishment (based on retribution and deterrence) remained unchanged for prison officers.

The technology associated with this period was strongly influenced by the status of prisoners as 'sick' and in need of 'treatment'. Canning Vale Prison was designed and built during the positivist period³. Although a larger site than Fremantle, it was dominated by the 'envelope' of the single building, within which were the living units, workshops, education facilities and recreation facilities. It was clearly an 'institution' designed for 'not normal' people (clearly a connotation here to a psychiatric institution). The accommodation of prisoners was significantly improved with communal dining areas and in-cell toilet facilities. However, vestiges of the punishment ideology was evident in the decision to retain lethal barriers⁴.

The new ideology of positivism may have not directly altered the prisoner/prison officer relationship but it clearly did have impact on the role of the officer. An important element of the rehabilitation philosophy was that offenders could be changed by those who were appropriately qualified. For prison officers to be part of

3. Design commenced in 1971 but the prison was not commissioned until 1982.

4. In its original design gun towers were included. The use of non-lethal barriers, and thus removal of the armed guards occurred in the late 1980's.

this system they too needed to become properly trained (even though they were never admitted into the inner sanctum of rehabilitation professionals). Furthermore, it is arguable that the introduction of the human service professionals into the prison system directly led to the belief that prison officers should also be seen as professionals. To this end, it was recognised by the administrators of the prison system that training should become a significant component of the system. There was initially resistance to this dramatic increase in training by prison officers who viewed it as an additional intrusion by the professionals (Thomas and Stewart, 1978).

In response to this pressure to professionalise, prison officer training in Western Australia developed rapidly during this period. A formal two week programme was introduced in 1967. The University of Western Australia was asked to provide input into curriculum development in 1969 and in 1970 a Training College was established within the Department. It is arguable that the design features of the new prisons such as Canning Vale, rather than the ideology of rehabilitation *per se*, provided the direction for training. The new prisons allowed much greater freedom of movement, more recreation and work activities, friendlier reception procedures and a greater emphasis on individual responsibility. To meet this demand, the focus of the course was on the prisoner management procedures such as reception, searching, muster checks as well as the legal and administrative components of the job. Naturally, drill and fire arm training remained a significant component. Significantly, prison officers were not directly trained in processes that aimed to rehabilitate the offender.

In sum, the ideology of rehabilitation provided the impetus to professionalise but provided little direction about the role of the officer nor the relevant type of training. Training appeared to be designed to meet the technology of the system rather than the ideology of rehabilitation.

Post-Positivism

Following the publication of Martinson's (1974) evaluation of the effectiveness of correctional treatment, rehabilitation as a purpose for prisons became increasingly less popular. According

to Cullen and Gendreau (1988) 'Nothing works' became a doctrine of penology to be embraced by both conservatives and liberals. This 'nothing works' led to a resurgence of retributivist criminal justice models (Braithwaite and Pettit, 1990; Hagan, 1990). Braithwaite and Pettit (1990) suggested that the return of retributionist ideologies was based not only on the failure of the earlier models but also the injustices that were perpetuated in the name of these models (for example, indeterminate sentences and enforced treatment). There is considerable argument about whether reformatory penal policies were ever genuinely in practice (Garland, 1985) and more argument about the 'failure' of rehabilitation (DiIulio, 1991; Cullen and Gendreau, 1988). Notwithstanding this, there is no doubt that there has been a significant shift away from the rehabilitation ideology to alternative models.

In Western Australia this shift to retributivist ideologies was characterised by the renaming of the Department of Corrections to the Prisons Department in 1979. The demise of rehabilitation was greeted with some enthusiasm by prison officers. I do not think that this enthusiasm was based on the excesses or failures of the rehabilitation era but because, as noted above, it was an ideology that they had never been invited to embrace.

The new models fell generally into the category of neoclassical or post classical theories (Hagan, 1990; Roshier, 1989). Neoclassical theory is a continuation of classical approaches to punishment albeit somewhat more sophisticated since there is acknowledgement of mitigating circumstances. As Roshier puts it 'The main individual characteristics that have been incorporated, under neoclassicism, as making a difference to the culpability of offenders have been age, mental capacity and intent' (Roshier, 1989: 11). Braithwaite and Pettit argue that retributivism has provided a new justification for the maintenance of punishment as the 'pre-eminent response to crime' (Braithwaite and Pettit 1990: 6). Cullen and Gendreau (1988) point out that this shift to retribution is consistent with a return to law and order, get tough and war on crime policies of the late 1970's and early 1980's. Indeed, Cavadino (1994) refers to this period as being influenced by the 'law and order' ideology.

The neoclassical schools, however, provided no ideology for prisons, at least, not in Western Australia. Although the message may have been punitive, few were seriously suggesting a return to the brutality of the previous years. The neo-classical schools stated clearly, and it was a message well accepted in Western Australia, that imprisonment, the loss of liberty, was to be the punishment. There was no role for prisons to be a punishing experience beyond this loss of liberty. But if prisons were not places for punishment nor places for rehabilitation what then was to be their purpose? What would be an appropriate ideology? It was evident that the post rehabilitation period was without explicit statements about the fundamental purpose of imprisonment and about the nature of prisoners. Garland referred to this lack of ideology and suggests that 'for nearly two decades now those employed in prisons, probation and penal administration have been engaged in an unsuccessful search to find a 'new philosophy' or new 'rationale' for punishment' (1990: 6). He suggested that the major frameworks have been the justice model, humane containment, selective incapacitation, modified rehabilitation and even abolitionism. Cragg (1992) noted that these frameworks provided 'little guidance on how those sentenced to imprisonment should spend their time' (1992: 5). He later stated that 'Pure retributivist theories are notoriously difficult to defend and widely thought to be indistinguishable from the thoroughly disreputable goal of revenge' (1992: 5).

In my opinion, the answer came from an entirely different area. Occurring at the same time as this movement to retribution, was the general social movement of economic rationalism. In the public sector the 'the new speak' became corporatism and managerialism (Considine, 1988; Pusey, 1991; Wanna, O'Faicheallaigh and Weller, 1992)⁵. In very broad terms, this movement was characterised by the belief that many of the problems of the public sector could be solved through better management practices and specifically by the use of private sector management techniques (Wanna, O'Faicheallaigh and Weller, 1992). As Wanna et al state it 'Today's public sector manager consciously searches for "economy"

and "efficiency", rewards "management by objectives", extracts "value for money" in budgeting, and looks for standards of "effectiveness" in program delivery which can be ascertained by "performance indicators"' (Wanna et al, 1992: 11).

Corporatism became influential in prison management through the 1980's and remains a very powerful force. For example, in his address to the Australian Bicentennial International Congress on Corrective Services, the Executive Director of the Western Australia Department of Corrective Services spoke of corporate plans, an enhanced role of prison officers and strategies for change (Hill, 1988). While the context was penal, the message was managerial. A similar ideology was evident in Kidston's (1988) address 'Correction Policy and Management Issues'. It is arguable that managerialism provided a framework for the movement of the private sector into the management of prisons (Sparks, 1994).

With no clear purpose for imprisonment being provided by the neo-classical position, corporatism provided an alternative ideology - prisoners were viewed as 'objects of administrative action'. Beyond this, it is difficult to discern any views on the status of prisoners. However, this is not to suggest that managerialism had no impact, quite the reverse. The focus changed from the prisoner to the management of prisons, specifically, the work of the prison officer. In this context there have been significant changes in both the scope and diversity of the role of the officer.

The 1980's saw both horizontal and vertical enlargement of the prison officer's role. The role of the prison officer was re-defined to span four main areas:

- maintenance of custody;
- attending to the welfare needs of prisoners;
- assistance in the provision of constructive activities for prisoners (work and recreation); and
- contributing, to a more limited extent, to the provision of developmental opportunities for prisoners (counselling, skills development, education). (Hill, 1988)

5. In Western Australia at this time the government publicly spoke of WA Inc. Interestingly, the failure of WA Inc resulted in a Royal Commission and the criminal investigation of the major players. a 1994 review of the public sector has recommended the privatisation of some government enterprises, including prisons.

At the same time officers were given greater responsibility for prisoner supervision, control and sentence planning. This responsibility was achieved through case and unit management⁶. To make way for these changes, welfare officers were removed from the system and two ranks were eliminated.

During this period, Casuarina prison was designed and built. The major ideological influences should have been economic rationalism and retributivism but this is not entirely evident. Certainly there was considerable emphasis placed on the security technology of institution with the use of multiple electronic and physical barriers. Yet other principles such as the maximisation of prisoner/officer/prisoner interaction; the minimisation of harm (physical, social and emotional) to the prisoner; maximising the perimeter security to allow for minimised internal security; internal design to reflect the normal (outside) world as much as possible; and non-lethal barriers seem entirely inconsistent with either retributivism or economic rationalism.

The end result was a prison that had many of the attributes of a small campus or town. Accommodation blocks were spread across the site, with separate hospital, education, industrial and recreation areas or facilities. Accommodation in small units (30 prisoners per unit) with their individual dining facilities and cells with flush toilets and hand basins were included. One cell block was provided with its own cooking facilities with cells which have full en-suite facilities. Security was to be achieved through two main processes: high technology perimeter security and high levels of prisoner/prison officer interaction.

The lack of an explicit ideology driving the design of Casuarina was evidenced by the lack of a clear role for the prison officer. This absence purpose was noted by the Superintendent in October 1993 (Fisher, Hall and Smith, 1993). Without an explicit ideology for this prison one would expect that officer training would fall back to the pre-existing one. As noted above, rehabilitation merely emphasised the importance of professionalism. Without direction from the rehabilitation and post-rehabilitation period one would expect the ideology of retribution and the need to meet

the technological demands of the system to remain dominant. This hypothesis was tested against an analysis of prison officer training undertaken by the author in 1990 the results of which are discussed below.

Analysis of Prison Officer Training

As part of a general review of prison officer training, the author, in 1990, evaluated the training of prison officers for Casuarina prison. The training course was not structured around generic themes but rather covered specific topics of very short durations (typically topics were covered in 1.5 hours). In order to undertake a content analysis, it was necessary to arrange those topics into general cognate areas. After discussion with training staff a final list of 11 categories was used. A Senior Officer was asked to go through every item in the course and indicate to which category the item belonged. Following this, the total time spent on each topic as well as the percentage of the total was determined for each category.

The results for the analysis are given in the table following. The first column is the categories that were used for the analysis; the second represents the total amount of training time spent on that category in hours; and the third column is the percent time spent on that category. The final column was derived by dividing the previous cell (time spent on category) by the sum of the column.

The results showed that the greatest amount of time in the course was spent on physical skills. This category consisted of topics such as physical training; self defence; drill; and restraints training. These skills dominated the course, taking up nearly one third of the time available. The next most common category was prisoner management. This category included topics such as unit management; prisoner supervision; discipline; assessment and orientation of prisoners; case management; escorting prisoners; reception; searching; authorised absences; and drug identification. This category was oriented to prisoner control issues and prisoner movement.

The analysis suggests that the major themes covered in this course were physical control skills. There is no doubt that this

6. Case management refers to prison officers being allocated a case load of prisoners. Officers would be expected to provide their case load with information regarding their progress through the prison and to provide the basic welfare services. Unit management is a system that rosters a group of officers to a unit for an extended period so that they can establish a good rapport with the prisoners in that unit.

Table 1		
Category	Hours on Topic	% of Total
Physical Skills	71.5	31
Prisoner Management	38.83	17
Orientation	32	14
First Aid/Fire Drill	23.75	10
Legal Issues	21.33	9
Interpersonal Skills	19.83	9
Aboriginal/Intercultural Issues	9	4
Report Writing	5.67	2
Welfare Skills	4.5	2
Personal Issues	3	1
Community Based Issues	2.25	1

emphasis originally emanated from the Classical period and had changed very little in the intervening period. The technology of Canning Vale, a prison designed during the full bloom of the positivist era, was evident in the category 'prisoner management'. However, the impact of the technology of Casuarina prison had been minimal. The design of Casuarina placed great importance on prisoner/prison officer interaction through unit and case management as well as emphasising control through the use of interpersonal skills yet interpersonal skills and welfare skills combined amounted to only 11 per cent of the course. It was evident from this analysis that training had not kept pace with the design features of the new prison.

Increasing Professionalism: Prison Officer Training and University Education

The results of the above evaluation caused some consternation within the Western Australia Department of Corrective Services, and the author, in conjunction with a Chief Officer was requested to review training and develop a new curriculum. The goals of the review was to ensure that prison officers should have the skills to be able to function effectively in prisons and to maximise the opportunity for credit transfer into an academic award at a University.

The ideology behind this review was still managerialism with the content driven by the technology of the tasks of the prison

officers. We approached the review by concentrating on the core competencies that we believed were required for the job 'prison officer'. These competencies were derived from a thorough job analysis. We ensured that we only identified behaviours and knowledge that were critical to the position. Most significantly, we did not establish a purpose for prisons, and from that, what it was that prison officers do to contribute to that purpose. The decision to link into a university academic programme was based on an express purpose of professionalising the prison officer position.

Briefly, the new course aimed to

- equip officers with core competencies;
- help them gain a broader understanding of the Criminal Justice System and their role in it; and
- develop good interpersonal skills.

In addition, the delivery of the material was altered such that it would be presented in an educative manner which sought to exercise critical and analytical thinking and judgement. The new programme, therefore, was both educative and skills based. A description of the course has been provided elsewhere (Hall, 1993).

The extent to which these aims were met was evaluated in a number of ways. Firstly, the new programme was content analysed and compared to the 1990 study. The results of the analysis are given below⁷.

Table 2		
Category	Previous Course %	New Course %
Physical Skills	31	10
Prisoner Management	17	26
Orientation	14	3
First Aid/Fire Drill	10	8
Legal Issues	9	18
Interpersonal Skills	9	19
Aboriginal/Intercultural Issues	4	3
Report Writing	2	1
Welfare Skills	2	9
Personal Issues	1	2
Community Based Issues	1	2

7. Aboriginal and Intercultural Issues were integrated into specific work related areas. In the analysis, it has been categorised according to these areas rather than as Aboriginal and Intercultural Issues (for example, cross cultural communication was categorised as Interpersonal Skills).

Clearly there were marked differences in emphasis. Most significantly, the physical components of the course no longer dominated. These were replaced largely by a concentration on interpersonal skills. This concentration reflects the importance of these skills as a 'technology' of control in Casuarina prison.

The course was also evaluated using structured feedback from specific Superintendents, Senior Officers and trainees the results of which have been reported elsewhere (Hall, 1993). Briefly, this evaluation showed strong acceptance of:

- the increased emphasis on interpersonal skills;
- the use of training prisons rather than a training college;
- the general content of the course; and
- the use of university academics to provide content and assessment of trainees.

On the negative side, there was a concern that the Department had lost control of the course, particularly evident amongst a significant group of Superintendents who viewed the University's involvement with some reticence. After considerable discussion with the author, and some internal reorganisation of responsibilities this concern became less serious and the involvement of the University is now generally well accepted.

In conclusion, the professionalisation of prison officers in Western Australia has progressed significantly by the engagement of a university to provide substantial input into the training of officers. This development has been well received by prison officers and prison administrators. However, it is evident that the crisis of ideology has not been resolved. Analysis of the new programme suggested managerialism and the technology of a campus style prison to be the major forces behind the development. An ideology clearly stating the purpose of prisons and the role of the prison officer still needs to be identified.

New Ideologies

Managerialism has been criticised for devaluing social objectives and not concentrating on important social issues (Sawer, 1989). For prisons, in Western Australia, this may have been a blessing in

disguise. While there have been law and order campaigns, few people (of any consequence) have seriously suggested that prisons return to the brutal and punitive regimes of yesteryear. That is, there has been no determined return to an ideology where in the prisoner was viewed as an enemy of the state. None-the-less it has been established that there is a need to develop a new ideology.

Although not explicitly stated, Casuarina seems to suggest an implicit view of the prisoner - that of citizen. Grant (1992) has suggested that an ideology of prisoners as citizens, with the attendant rights, privileges and obligations, is an appropriate status for the modern era. Grant's influence is not limited to his academic discourse on the New South Wales prison system, he is also the Director General of the Western Australia Ministry of Justice. Under his direction, attempts have been made to operationalise the concept of citizenship. While this has proved somewhat elusive to operationalise (Fisher, Hall and Smith, 1993) the model does provide a useful starting point.

It recognises that most prisoners will be returned to the community and that whilst in prisons they have significant contact with other members of the community. With its focus on both rights and responsibilities it provides protection for prisoners yet demands that they should strive to become law abiding citizens both in prison and when they return. The latter focus suggests that prisons should provide an environment which aims to reduce offending behaviour. DiIulio (1987) and Cullen et al (1993) both note that prison administrators recognise the importance of rehabilitation as an end in itself and as an appropriate prison management regime. Furthermore, it is clear that the general public, judges and offenders view rehabilitation as an important component of the criminal justice system (Indermaur, 1992; Walker and Hough, 1988). As noted by Sparks (1994) prisons must ensure justice for prisoners which this model provides through the recognition and protection of prisoners' rights. A properly constructed prison management system based on the citizenship ideology can be legitimated with the three groups (the public, staff and prisoners) identified by Cavadino. Finally, the ideology is entirely consistent with the political doctrine of the new right and utilitarianism (arguable the

major political doctrines of the modern, western state). The new right doctrine emphasises the maximisation of individual liberty (Nozick, 1974) which is achieved if offenders are removed from society and when returned to society do not re-offend. Similarly, general utility is enhanced if offenders do not re-offend when released. At first glance then, the ideology appears sound although further work is necessary. The Ministry of Justice and the author are continuing to work on a model that clearly ties an ideological position with management practices and ultimately prison officer training.

Other theories or models of punishment have been suggested (for example, Braithwaite and Pettit, 1990; Cragg, 1992) but these have not been directly related to ideologies of imprisonment. DiIulio (1987) notes that 'Most prison administrators were highly conscious that a particular correctional philosophy was at work in the way they governed their state's prisons' DiIulio, 1987: 166) and goes on to give description of the control, responsibility and consensual models. The relationship between these models and the criminal justice system and the implications for the role of the officer have yet to be further illustrated.

Conclusion

In the introduction, it was argued that the critical component of implementing or applying an ideology was the prisoner/prison officer interaction. This relationship forms the basis of our views of the prisoner and what we might hope to achieve. It is arguably the litmus test of an ideology. We can only influence this relationship by manipulating how officers behave, principally, through their training and indoctrination. Therefore, if an ideology is to be effectively implemented there must be congruence or coherency between it and the training of officers.

In analysing the Western Australia prison system, it was found that the curriculum of prison officer training has not matched the official ideology since before the introduction of rehabilitation. Basically, we have not been training officers to do what we want them to do. If universal, this lack of coherency may partly explain Garland's observation that 'the penal institutions of the United Kingdom, the United States of

America, and many other Western nations have experienced a crisis of self definition' (1985: 6).

Substantial changes have been made to the role of the prison officer in the Western Australian prison system over the last 20 years. The analysis examined how positivism and managerialism influenced these changes and how officer training responded to these developments. Both positivism and managerialism contributed significantly to the professionalisation of the role of the prison officer, culminating in Western Australia with the involvement of a university in training. However, it was argued that neither provided a clear role for the prison officer, and in the absence of an explicit ideology, training was found to be based on pre-existing and out-dated ones. In sum, one cannot avoid ideology in prisons, even if it was a desired outcome, the void will always be filled, most likely by a superseded one. This analogy to archaeological layering, as suggested by Grant (1992), appears to be confirmed by the study.

Although the ideological crisis has not been resolved, there are some alternatives being suggested. The ideology of the prisoner as a citizen proposed by Grant (1992) appears to have some merit. This ideology is implicit in the town planning model of Casuarina prison and is consistent with the major political doctrines of Western European countries.

This study shows the need for an explicit expression of ideology from which prison management principles should be derived. It is from these explicit statements that the nature of the prisoner/prison officer interaction and the role of the prison officer should evolve and hence from which prison officer training is generated. In the current case, the lack of such explicit statements resulted in training programs based on the technology of the system and outdated or superseded ideologies. ■

A list of references is available from the editor or author.