The SAGE Handbook of Criminological Research Methods

24 Conceptualising and Measuring the Quality of Prison Life

Contributors: Alison Liebling, Susie Hulley & Ben Crewe
Edited by: David Gadd, Susanne Karstedt & Steven F. Messner
Book Title: The SAGE Handbook of Criminological Research Methods
Chapter Title: "24 Conceptualising and Measuring the Quality of Prison Life"
Pub. Date: 2012
Access Date: January 23, 2020
Publishing Company: SAGE Publications Ltd
City: London
Print ISBN: 9781849201759
Online ISBN: 9781446268285
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446268285.n24
Print pages: 358-372

24 Conceptualising and Measuring the Quality of Prison Life

AlisonLiebling, SusieHulley, BenCrewe

Science is a continuous enterprise in which advance is made by successive approximations to 'the truth' and by a never-ending series of small excursions into the unknown (Foreword to Lewin, 1997/1951).

In empirical science everything depends on how fruitfully and faithfully thinking intertwines with the empirical world of study … and since concepts are the gateway to that world, the effective functioning of concepts is a matter of decisive importance (Blumer, 1969: 143–4).

Introduction

How can the social environment of a prison be accurately assessed? What is it important to measure? How should the prison experience be represented in empirical research? How do we capture distinctions between prisons, which can be good or bad in so many different ways? What kind of conceptual framework is relevant to the measurement of prison quality? This chapter will outline one attempt to address these questions in England and Wales, outlining the development of a recently revised 'quality of life' measure for prisons. There is considerable consensus about the inadequacy of narrow and selective performance measures, such as hours spent in purposeful activity or number of serious assaults, in representing prison quality. The difficulties are both methodological and conceptual; for example, prison operational managers can be very imaginative in defining all kinds of routine prison activities as apparently 'purposeful'. Official measures often reflect what is measurable rather than what matters most. We argue that, whilst all empirical measurement attempts can be revised and improved, and some important aspects of prison life change over time, the prisoner survey we outline here represents a useful measure of the quality of prison life. It provides a basis for understanding and improvement, and for the exploration of causal relationships, as well as for critical analysis.

Measuring Prison Environments

Most early attempts to assess prison quality were conducted in a quest for 'therapeutic effectiveness': what kinds of penal regimes led to positive outcomes on release? The framework within which such studies were conceived consisted of a set of beliefs about the 'people-changing' nature of institutions and their potentially rehabilitative effects and the growing recognition of the role of the social environment or 'field' in shaping behaviour (Murray, 1938; Lewin, 1997/1951). Moos, for example, applied the methods he had developed in his evaluations of treatment environments in psychiatric settings to correctional environments during the 1960s and 1970s. His scale was developed to provide a measure of the 'social climate' of psychiatric wards and was based on a number of items, which were used to form sub-scales. These sub-scales were empirically derived from respondents in these environments (Moos, 1975: 20).

Moos's 90-item scale–the Correctional Institutions Environment Scale (CIES)–assessed nine dimensions of the social climate of correctional programmes. It was adapted from the Ward Atmosphere Scale, used in hospitals. New items were devised, informed by the relevant literature, discussions with staff and residents on various correctional programmes, and certain statistical criteria (e.g., items should discriminate significantly among units; and each scale should have ten items each, half scored true and half scored false). Items with low item-to-sub-scale correlations were eliminated; and other sub-scales were collapsed into one. Three broad categories of dimensions were developed, clearly linked to therapeutic concepts so that, for example, relationship dimensions included involvement, support and expressiveness; personal development included autonomy, practical orientation and personal problem orientation and was a proxy for 'treatment'; system maintenance included order and organisation, clarity and officer control (see the CIES scale and the sub-scale dimensions in Moos, 1975: 41).

These sub-scales were not conceived as wholly independent from each other but as recognisable and interrelated aspects of prison life. A moderate degree of sub-scale intercorrelation existed. The items included 'the residents are proud of this unit' (in Involvement) and 'staff go out of their way to help residents' and were scored 'true' or 'false'. The scale was consistent with findings on other perceived environment scales in that assessments were relatively independent of background variables such as age, sex and length of stay (Moos 1975: 47). The scale was administered to random samples of prisoners using paper and pencil questionnaires, under conditions of anonymity.

The CIES was developed in order to evaluate specific treatment programmes and to link their characteristics to outcomes. It was used to describe and compare institutional climates, longitudinally and cross-sectionally, in evaluations of the effects of training, new treatment programmes and other interventions. Moos recognised that this kind of research was developmental. However, his model is limited because his measures were conceptually and ideologically linked to 'treatment' or behaviour modification, whereas the prison experience is about much more than this. The interest in staff was limited to their perceptions of prisoner behaviours and attitudes. Staff perceptions of the 'treatment climate' are always found to be more positive than prisoners' perceptions. There was no separate attempt to evaluate how staff saw and experienced their working climate. Whilst this chapter focuses on the prisoner survey, staff perceptions also form an important aspect of any measurement of a prison's climate. We describe that part of our work elsewhere. Applications and developments of this early work in a range of custodial environments include studies by Clarke and Martin (1971), Gunn et al. (1978), Heal et al. (1973), Jones and Cornes (1977), Sinclair (1971), Thornton (1987) in the UK and Hans Toch (1982) in the US.

A shift from a rehabilitative or correctionalist to a pragmatic and managerialist approach occurred in the 1980s so that later work by Saylor (1984) and Logan (1992) in the US, and King and McDermott (1995) in the UK, included a greater emphasis on less aspirational 'custodial' goals such as security and order. The 'confinement model', as Logan (1992) described it, brought with it a move away from the focus on social and individual change, in favour of 'relatively precise concepts' that were 'susceptible to operationalisation and empirical measurement', like levels of staff sickness, or cost per place. With this development, however, the relevance of measurement to the prisoner *experience* was lost.

Despite significant efforts made to develop and improve measurement of prison quality throughout the 1980s and 1990s, many limitations to these measurement or evaluation techniques have been identified. These limitations reflect an underlying major theoretical gap in approaches to the task (see further Liebling, assisted by Arnold, 2004). They are shown in Box 24.1.

The 'Measuring the Quality of Prison Life' Study

> [T]he essential nature of the work of the scientist consists of making a proper translation from phenomena to concepts (Lewin, 1997/1951: 160).

Our attempt to conceptualise and measure prison quality returns to the spirit of Murray and Lewin in emphasising the importance of perceptions and experiences, but seeks to avoid the narrow constraints of either a correctionalist or managerialist framework in identifying what should be measured. Instead, our methods began with prisoner and staff experiences and worked 'upwards', towards measurement, from a thoroughly grounded analysis of prison life.

The original study in which a measuring the quality of prison life survey was developed consisted of organised observation and deep conversation in five prisons over a one year period.[1] Our task was to identify what mattered, to whom and why. This was achieved in two ways. The first part of our research was based on appreciative inquiry (AI); briefly, a search for what is life-giving out of what is experienced as painful, in order to move beyond 'existing reified patterns of discourse' (Ludema et al., 2001: 189; see also Elliott, 1999;

and Liebling, assisted by Arnold, 2004) and was largely inductive. AI begins with exercises aimed at imaginative conversation and continues into loosely structured interviews. The method has certain similarities with symbolic interactionism and grounded theory: it is creative and mainly qualitative; it is concerned with theory generation and with the development of sensitising concepts; and it is concerned with 'lived experience', narrative, and meaning (Liebling et al., 1999). We worked closely with groups of staff and prisoners in workgroup exercises over a number of days in each prison. The facilitated workshops were intended to explore as fully as possible best and worst experiences of life in each prison, with participants trying to 'imagine' each prison at its best, drawing on experiences of 'appropriate treatment' in order to talk to each other and to us in depth about what mattered most to them. Throughout this process, we departed with all our notes and flip charts in the evenings, then returned each morning with a digested account of the previous day's work, for discussion (and rejection of anything we had 'got wrong'). It was clear from these exercises that the prison environment was multidimensional and primarily *relational*. This process led to the identification of themes which became the basis for agreeing a set of dimensions each group would wish to see reflected in any attempt to measure it. Via this circuitous route, we arrived in each prison at a list of important but difficult to measure conceptual dimensions such as 'respect', 'humanity', 'safety' and 'trust', and devoted the remainder of our time to exploring the meaning of these often used terms, in conversation, in the relevant literature, and in concrete examples from experience, until we arrived at conceptual definitions and were satisfied that they could be operationalised. We were surprised by the level of consensus achieved about the identification of relevant dimensions, but this enabled us to move to the second 'measurement' stage sooner than we had originally anticipated. The key dimensions identified were: respect, humanity, staff-prisoner relationships, support, trust, fairness, order, safety, well-being, personal development, family contact, power, meaning, and decency, as shown in Table 24.1. 'Respect' and 'humanity' almost always emerged first and were given the strongest emphasis.

Box 24.1 Limitations of Techniques Used to Measure and Evaluate Prison Quality

- A failure to address key dimensions in statements of aims (such as the term 'humanity' in the Prison Service Statement of Purpose)
- A lack of clarity about the meaning of key terms, such as 'respect' and 'safety'.
- A managerialist concern with performance-as-service-delivery, and poor operationalisation of this narrowly conceived agenda.
- Limitations in the use of specific measures: such as recorded assaults as a measure of 'safety'.
- A 'process compliance' and 'componential' framework for standards, where one practice is apparently unrelated to another.
- Insufficient information from prisoners and staff about a sufficiently broad and relevant range of areas of prison life.
- A failure to compare information from diverse sources (e.g., audits, performance data and inspectorate reports).

- A failure to analyse or interpret data in detail.
- Low ‘face validity’; that is, the rejection by staff (and prisoners) of the accuracy of the world painted by these data.

The second main approach was deductive and involved the development and administration of a detailed quality of life survey, which was informed and supplemented by the method of AI and structured around the dimensions identified in the first part of the study. Over 100 items (or statements) thought to reflect the various dimensions were crafted, from interview data and with the help of staff and prisoners, and these were tested in early versions of the survey. Prisoners responded to each statement on a five-point Likert Scale, from ‘strongly agree’ to ‘strongly disagree’. Some of the items were worded positively and others negatively. Later refinements were made via statistical analysis (particularly factor analysis and reliability checks), but our decisions were informed by our growing understanding of the prison environment and the meaning of terms as used in this environment.

Table 24.1 Original quality of life dimensions, with reliabilities

Respect	0.80
Humanity	0.82
Staff-prisoner relationships	0.71
Trust	0.78
Support	0.77
Fairness	0.90
Order	0.71
Safety	0.73
Well-being	0.84
Personal development	0.92
Family contact	0.62
Decency	0.74
Power/authority	0.70
Prisoner social life	0.75
Individual items	
Meaning	
Quality of life	

Our aim was to draw together the sociologically imaginative and rich with the empirically precise, and to end up with a quantitative measure that had strong qualitative foundations. The dimensions were both empirical

and theoretical constructs. We needed data that were amenable to quantification. But we also wanted to retain meaning, depth and individual contact in qualitative interviews. We continued to regard the exercise as exploratory even when a first workable version of the survey was devised. Once the design of the survey was complete, questionnaires were administered in five comparable prisons, to 100 randomly sampled prisoners in each, as one part of long one-to-one interviews. We continued to use appreciative questions in the interviews, before or after administering the more structured questionnaire, in order to allow for continual clarification of meaning. Examples of three of the dimensions are given in Box 24.2.

The dimensions shown in Table 24.1 reflect some subtle normative thinking about the sort of institution a prison ought to be, as well as identifying areas on which establishments are known to vary. Our method of discovery was organised conversation, with the aim of establishing principles of general applicability in the prison setting. We referred to the outcome as a measure of the 'moral performance' of prisons (Liebling, assisted by Arnold, 2004). In the language used by others, the survey provides an assessment (by prisoners) of the 'interior legitimacy' of an individual prison (Sparks, 1994; Sparks and Bottoms, 2008).

Box 24.2 Statement Items for the Original Dimensions: Humanity, Relationships and Well-Being

Humanity	*Staff–prisoner relationships*	*Well-being*
I am being looked after with humanity in here. I am treated as a person of value in this prison. Some of the treatment I receive in this prison is degrading. Staff here treat me with kindness. I am not being treated as a human being in here.	Relationships between staff and prisoners in this prison are good. Personally, I get on well with the officers on my wing. Staff are confrontational towards prisoners in this prison. There is a strong sense, or culture, of 'them and us' in this prison. The level of staff interaction with prisoners is low.	The atmosphere in this prison is relaxed and friendly. My experience of imprisonment in this particular prison has been stressful. I can be myself in this prison. I feel tense in this prison. My experience in this prison is painful. Morale amongst prisoners here is high. Generally I fear for my psychological safety.

Several revised and improved versions of the survey were developed in later studies for particular reasons, including an evaluation of a suicide prevention initiative in 12 prisons during which stronger emphasis was placed on measuring distress and well-being, and on identifying aspects of the quality of prison life that explained variations in levels of well-being and distress (Liebling et al., 2005). Such was the level of practitioner interest in the questionnaire, several versions of the survey were adopted by the Prison Service (and continue to be used) as a supplement to their usual Standards Audit procedure. It added 'colour and meaning' to these process-oriented measures of quality and performance (McConnell, pers. comm., 2001).

The most recent and thoroughly revised version of the survey took place during an ESRC-funded study of 'values, practices and outcomes in public and private sector corrections' (award ref RES-062-23-0212). In

this seven-prison study, described below, efforts were made to strengthen our grasp of aspects of prison life relating to security, order and policing (the use of authority) to balance and complement the more explicitly relational aspects of prison life emphasised in the first study. Prisoners appreciate fair and respectful treatment, but also order and organisation, as we explain further later. There is an element of authority–used appropriately–in legitimacy.

Measuring Prison Quality in Public and Private Sector Prisons

One of the developments to stimulate interest in accurate measurement of prison quality has been the onset of prison privatisation. Perrone and Pratt have argued, amongst others, that we do not know enough about the relative quality of public versus private prisons (2003; see also Gaes et al., 1999), and that there is no consensus on 'the best way to conceptualise and measure prison quality' (ibid. 317; Logan, 1992). As the Public Administration Select Committee has stated, 'the need for proper assessment, in a way that is transparent and open to scrutiny and challenge, is fundamental' (House of Commons, 2002: 13). The development of a satisfactory measure would be an important step forward in this field.

In March 2007, the authors embarked on an ESRC-funded study of 'values, practices and outcomes in public and private sector corrections'. The study included an observation, interview and questionnaire-based study of senior managers in public and private sector corrections; and an ethnographic and survey-based study of two public and five private sector prisons. We felt that the first version of our quality-of-life survey had captured relational or 'harmony' dimensions of prison life more satisfactorily than 'safety and security' dimensions, not least because these aspects of prison life are extremely difficult to measure in ways that distinguish between the aggravations of security procedures and their benefits to prisoners. Despite their emphasis on the relational aspects of prison quality, we found, using Valerie Braithwaite's terminology, that prisoners were 'moral dualists'; that is, they wanted respectful and decent treatment, but they did not appreciate chaos or inappropriate distributions of power (see Braithwaite, 1998; and Liebling, assisted by Arnold, 2004). The under-use of authority could pose as many problems in prison as the over-use of power (although these problems are distinctive). The mainly relational focus of the first version of the MQPL survey may have been advantageous to the private sector, given that 'the private sector was effectively invited to provide more 'humane' and reasonable treatment than the public sector had been achieving throughout the 1980s and 1990s' (Liebling, assisted by Arnold, 2004: 98). In our research up to that date, private sector prisons had scored well on dimensions related to these aspects of prison life.

The MQPL (Measuring the Quality of Prison Life) survey was revised and extended in this project during its early qualitative phase, to represent 'missing' aspects of the prison experience and new issues prisoners were raising in the context of the changing contours of prison life (e.g., how the introduction of Imprisonment for Public Protection [IPP] sentences, recall and other features of the new indeterminacy impacted on the 'weight', 'depth' and 'tightness' of prison life (see Crewe, 2009; Downes, 1988; King and McDermott, 1995)). Specifically, 38 new items were added to the survey.

The establishments were selected for fieldwork following a lengthy consultation process with senior managers in NOMS. We attempted to find two 'pairs' of public and private sector establishments that were similar in age, size and function. For this reason, we excluded establishments for women, young prisoners, high security prisons, and establishments that were over 20 years old. We also excluded Altcourse from the original private sector sample, because we were informed that it operated under the most expensive contract and was therefore unrepresentative of private sector prisons. We selected establishments that were used for other matching purposes (e.g., cost comparisons), so that they were already regarded as a 'fair match' by those working in the field. Inevitably, the matches were imperfect, but they constitute a 'best case fit'. The three additional private prisons were included in the study during its later stages for different reasons: Rye Hill, because we were invited to use our survey there as part of a formal performance review process; and Lowdham Grange and Altcourse, because prisoners in our main research sites talked about them relatively positively and we

were curious about what they were like.

In each of the seven prisons involved in the study, the revised MQPL survey was delivered alongside a staff survey, SQL (Staff Quality of Life survey) during an extended period of field-work. The research team spent between six to nine weeks in the four main prisons and one week each in the three additional prisons. Table 24.2 shows the main characteristics of the prisons included in the research at the time of our fieldwork.

In each of the four main prisons, extensive periods of observation were undertaken of daily life. Informal discussions were held in various areas of each prison and staff and prisoners were formally interviewed. Detailed research diaries were kept and notes were circulated among the team members for discussion.[2] New 'sensitising concepts' and related additional items were developed out of these conversations and tested in new versions of the survey. The formation of new dimensions and final decisions as to their titles came later, as we shall describe below.

The New Quality of Life Survey

At each of the seven prisons in the study, the MQPL survey was administered during prearranged focus groups. Each group lasted about an hour, which normally left some time after completion of the survey for discussion. A random sample of prisoners was drawn up from a list of the current population, organised by prison wing. Around 10 per cent of the population on each wing were selected. Prisoners were asked by staff and/or the research team whether they were willing to attend the group, and were reassured about confidentiality, anonymity and the independence of the research team. Notices were circulated alerting staff and prisoners to the exercise. Outlying areas, such as Healthcare and the Care and Separation Unit, were sampled separately due to their specific functions and the complexity of managing the research in these locations: here, surveys were supplied to a small number of prisoners who volunteered to undertake them.

In each prison, a liaison officer assisted with the organisation of the survey, usually suggesting days and times that suited particular wings. Liaison officers often gathered prisoners together and escorted them to the focus group venue. In all prisons, response rates were high, a fact assisted by the 'semi-official' nature of the research and by a lack of alternative activities for prisoners. The pace of action was often fast, and sometimes staff would include prisoners not on the original lists in their efforts to try to be helpful. Some of these departures from strict random sampling went unrecorded, so the final figures included a minority of prisoners obtained by 'opportunity sampling'. Exceptionally, in some prisons, prisoners on one wing were under-represented. This was due to difficulties in communication with staff on that wing, or regime conflicts; for example, when the time allotted to survey a wing conflicted with gym sessions. The group sessions were normally held in an association room on the wings, or in other areas of the prison such as the visits room, education block or faith centre. No staff were present in these sessions. Often, two members of the research team were present so that the questionnaire could be completed under supervision and questions could be answered. Mars bars or chocolate biscuits were provided as an incentive and a way of thanking prisoners for their participation.

A total of 1145 prisoners completed the survey in the seven prisons. Table 24.3 details the sample size at each establishment. We aimed to achieve a minimum of 100 prisoners in each sample.

Prisoners personally completed the survey during the focus groups, following a brief introduction, the distribution of pens, and the answering of any questions. Each survey contained 147 statements or items, which the respondents were asked to agree or disagree with on a five-point Likert Scale (from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree') (see Box 24.3 for details of how responses to these statements were coded).

Once all of the fieldwork, including the survey, had been completed in the first prison (Forest Bank), a factor analysis was carried out on the MQPL survey results, to explore the placement of the new items and their impact on the existing set of dimensions. Factor analysis allows a large number of items in a survey to be

organised into smaller or more compact dimensions, which cluster together. The dimensions constitute empirical and conceptual constructs or small clusters of survey items (measurable variables), which represent concepts that are considered to characterise key elements of a prisoner's 'quality of life'–a latent or underlying construct (also see Gray et al., this volume; and Field, 2005: 736). Each dimension consisted of between three and nine items. The overall dimension score for each prison was then calculated as the mean of these values and represented as a score ranging from one to five. The relative quality of aspects of prisoners' lives is represented by the mean score for each dimension. Table 24.4 shows the working dimensions developed at this stage, which were used during the research in the six remaining prisons. Whilst the analysis was based on a relatively small sample size (*n* = 188) it reflected the practice of continuous reflection and conceptual revision adopted since the earliest versions of the MQPL were developed and helped to make sense of the data for feedback to the prisons involved in the project.

Table 24.2 Details of the seven prisons involved in the ESRC values and practies research

	Main (matched) prisons				*Additional prisons*		
	Forest Bank	*Bullingdon*	*Dovegate*	*Garth*	*Rye Hill*	*Lowdham Grange*	*Altcourse*
Sector (company)	Private (Kalyx)	Public	Private (Serco)	Public	Private (G4S)	Private (Serco)	Private (G4S)
Year of opening	2000	1992	2001	1988	2001	1998	1997
Region	North West	South East	West Midlands	North West	East Midlands	East Midlands	North West
Function	Cat B Local	Cat B Local and Cat C Training	Cat B Training	Cat B Training	Cat B Training	Cat B Training	Cat B Local
Operational capacity	1124	963	860	847	664	680	1324
Fieldwork dates	Sept–Oct 2007	April–May 2008	Nov 2007–Jan 2008	Sept–Nov 2008	Sept 2008	Jan 2009	April 2009

Table 24.3 Sample size at each establishment

Prison	*Sample*
Forest Bank	188
Bullingdon	187
Dovegate	159
Garth	186
Rye Hill	167
Lowdham Grange	158
Altcourse	100

Table 24.4 MQPL working dimensions during the study

Working dimensions
Entry support
Distress on entry into custody (later 'Entry into custody')
Assistance for the vulnerable
Individual care
Dignity and material needs
Relationships

Respect
Fairness
Order and security
Physical safety
Care and safety (later ‘Psychological safety’)
Policing and sub-culture
Meeting needs
Personal development
Family contact
Personal autonomy
Well-being
Frustration
Compliance/resistance
Relationships with peers

Box 24.3 Coding the Survey Statement Responses

The structured questionnaire data were entered and analysed using the computer software package SPSS.

- Every response to each of the 147 statements in the questionnaire was coded on a ‘1’ (strongly agree) to ‘5’ (strongly disagree) scale, corresponding to the Likert Scale structure of the questionnaire.
- Eighty-four of the 147 items were worded ‘positively’ (where agreement with the statement constituted a positive response) and 63 were worded ‘negatively’ (where agreement with the statement indicated a negative perception). This format was employed in order to minimise acquiescence bias.
- To ensure that the higher the score or value, the better the quality of prison life, the scoring method had to be reversed for the 84 ‘positively’ worded items. For example, if a prisoner replied ‘strongly agree’ to the statement ‘staff address and talk to me in a respectful manner’, this response would originally be scored as ‘1’, but would then be re-coded in order that a score of ‘1’ would become a ‘5’.
- Any missing answers (of which there were few) were coded as ‘99’ and treated as missing values. A small number of ‘not applicable’ responses were coded as ‘77’ and excluded from the analysis.

The dimensions in Table 24.4 were useful as a working guide during the remainder of the field-work, but as the study progressed, and extended periods were spent in the remaining prisons, our understanding of prisoners' experiences grew. For example, greater emphasis on the ‘responsibilisation’ of prisoners and the experience of new, indeterminate sentences (such as the IPP sentence) meant that prisoners were under enormous pressure to personally manage their progression through the sentence. This led to a new sense of urgency in prisoners' need for staff assistance and expertise: to signpost them to the relevant form or department, to explain their sentence conditions, and to support them in their attempts to access the necessary information or personnel to progress through the system. As a result of prisoners' descriptions of their experience in each establishment, we observed that the term ‘respect’ was being used not only in terms of the way staff spoke to and treated them in general, as we had found in the original study, but also in relation to their ability to ‘get things done’ (see Hulley et al, in preparation). It was clear too that issues such as staff professionalism would be particularly salient to the research. What mattered to prisoners, and the precise meaning of concepts applied in practice in prisons, had changed (see below).

Informed by the qualitative fieldwork and by the quantitative survey results that emerged from the seven prisons, we began to reconsider the dimensions, leading to a new and more conceptually-informed factor analysis of the final data set.

The New Dimensions: The Moral Quality of Prison Life

Based on the overall sample of 1,147 prisoners from the seven establishments, the 148 items were entered into a principal components analysis (see Field, 2005, for details). In the first analysis, 32 factors emerged (factors were only retained where their substantive importance was confirmed using Kaiser's 1960 criterion). Principal components analysis was repeated on those initial factors upon which a large number of items loaded (i.e., eight items or more).

The final dimensions were developed using a combination of conceptual and statistical methods. Theoretical reflection on the factors generated by the quantitative analysis led to revisions, which were then re-tested statistically. The process was deliberative and iterative, drawing on our fieldwork experiences and interviews. Conceptually plausible changes to the placement of items that did not significantly lower the statistical reliability of a factor remained. Where reliability was compromised, further options were considered until reliability and qualitative interpretation were in accord (i.e., factors were split, or items were removed or added from other factors). Where reliabilities were somewhat low (although they all emerged at 0.561 or higher) dimensions only remained in use where they were deemed conceptually important and no alternative was found. Factors were retained only if they contained at least three unique loadings. The set of dimensions arrived at are shown in Table 24.5.

Table 24.5 Dimensions measuring the moral quality of prison life

Dimension	*Reliability*
Harmony dimensions	
Entry into custody	0.618
Respect/courtesy	0.886
Staff–prisoner relationships	0.867
Humanity	0.889
Decency	0.636
Care for the vulnerable	0.803
Help and assistance	0.772
Professionalism dimensions	
Staff professionalism	0.885
Bureaucratic legitimacy	0.801
Fairness	0.820
Organisation and consistency	0.836
Security dimensions	
Policing and security	0.751
Prisoner safety	0.734
Prisoner adaptation	0.623
Drugs and exploitation	0.780
Conditions and Family Contact dimensions	
Regime decency	0.705
Family contact	0.635
Well-being and Development dimensions	
Personal development	0.875
Personal autonomy	0.664
Well-being	0.786
Distress	0.561

Once the final set of dimensions had been agreed, they were clustered thematically into five overarching categories: Harmony dimensions; Professionalism dimensions; Security dimensions; Conditions and Family Contact dimensions; and Well-being and Development dimensions. These categories reflected our broader thinking and theorising about the content and meaning of the survey overall. We retained the term ‘moral’ as the survey dimensions reflected, as originally, the way prisoners feel morally treated by the institution (i.e., largely by staff).

Some of the dimensions in each of the theoretical categories are outlined below as an illustration of this final stage of the analysis, during which the themes were identified, the dimensions were defined and descriptions of the items and concepts were developed. The following dimensions have been selected to demonstrate the range of concepts included in the survey and as examples of our attempts to capture important aspects of prison life and quality (as described previously).[3]

Harmony Dimensions

This group of dimensions represent the mainly interpersonal and relational aspects of the prison experience.

Respect/Courtesy: Positive, Respectful and Courteous Attitudes towards Prisoners by Staff

The term ‘respect’ has broad and subtle meaning in the prisons context, including overall treatment by staff, the expression of courteous attitudes and also the question of whether staff respond effectively to prisoners'

needs. ‘Courtesy’ was an important but not exclusive or defining aspect of respect.

Respect/courtesy items	*Correlation*
I feel I am treated with respect by staff in this prison.	0.782
This prison is poor at treating prisoners with respect.	0.709
Most staff address and talk to me in a respectful manner.	0.691
Relationships between staff and prisoners in this prison are good.	0.669
Staff speak to you on a level in this prison.	0.651
Staff are argumentative towards prisoners in this prison.	0.646
Personally I get on well with the officers on my wing.	0.561
This prison encourages me to respect other people.	0.533

Staff–Prisoner Relationships: Trusting, Fair and Supportive Interactions between Staff and Prisoners

It is widely agreed that ‘staff–prisoner relationships lie at the heart of the prison system’, for reasons that have been well documented (Home Office, 1984; Liebling and Price, 2001). It was the topic most often raised by prisoners and the term was readily acknowledged and understood. Whilst arguably all the dimensions under this general heading reflect aspects of the staff-prisoner relationship, this dimension was its most direct measure.

Staff–prisoner relationships items	*Correlation*
I receive support from staff in this prison when I need it.	0.723
Overall, I am treated fairly by staff in this prison.	0.704
I trust the officers in this prison.	0.687
Staff in this prison often display honesty and integrity.	0.683
This prison is good at placing trust in prisoners.	0.602
I feel safe from being injured, bullied, or threatened by staff in this prison.	0.550
When I need to get something done in this prison I can normally get it done by talking to someone face-to-face.	0.550

Humanity: An Environment Characterised by Kind Regard and Concern for the Person, which Recognises the Value of the Individual

The term ‘humanity’ is at the centre of the English Prison Service's Statement of Purpose, but critics have argued for a long time that none of the service's key performance indicators measure or reflect it. The dimension below retained all of the original items in the first version of our MQPL survey but, in addition, we found that items incorporating notions of care and concern belonged in the concept of humanity.

Humanity items	*Correlation*
Staff here treat me with kindness.	0.736
I am treated as a person of value in this prison.	0.734
I feel cared about most of the time in this prison.	0.716
Staff in this prison show concern and understanding towards me.	0.709
I am being looked after with humanity in here.	0.698
Staff help prisoners to maintain contact with their families.	0.609
I am not being treated as a human being in here.	0.593
Some of the treatment I receive in this prison is degrading.	0.534

Professionalism Dimensions

The Professionalism dimensions represent key aspects of the ‘craft’ of prison work, shaping the way it is carried out, involving communication and other skills, general expertise, knowledge, reliability and experience, and internalised as well as organisational values. This set of dimensions emerged out of our observations of and conversations with staff and prisoners, as we came to understand the significance of ‘delivery’, authority (used carefully, rather than avoided) and confidence in the experience of prisoners. They bring together ‘harmony’ and ‘security’ values, in the sense that whilst they are essentially *relational*, they forge (or prevent) a link between attitudes and behaviour: between staff orientation towards prisoners and the way in which they approach their daily tasks. The largest differences between prisons were found in these dimensions. Under-uses of authority were regarded as ‘illegitimate’ as well as over-uses of authority.

Staff Professionalism: Staff Confidence and Competence in the use of Authority

The daily application of prison rules and procedures involves considerable skill and discretion and is a low visibility activity. How staff approach, interpret and apply ‘the rules’, or avoid them, constitutes one of the most significant variations between prisons. Staff action in this domain can be related to confidence and experience as well as expertise. This dimension contains items related to the way in which staff use their authority and discretion.

Staff professionalism items	*Correlation*
Staff here treat prisoners fairly when applying the rules.	0.747

Staff here treat prisoners fairly when distributing privileges.	0.734
Privileges are given and taken fairly in this prison.	0.718
Staff in this prison have enough experience and expertise to deal with the issues that matter to me.	0.659
Staff in this prison tell it like it is.	0.587
The rules and regulations are made clear to me.	0.587
Staff carry out their security tasks well in this prison.	0.586
The best way to get things done in this prison is to be polite and go through official channels.	0.556
If you do something wrong in this prison, staff only use punishments if they have tried other options first.	0.538

Bureaucratic Legitimacy: The Transparency and Responsiveness of the Prison/Prison System and its Moral Recognition of the Individual

The term ‘bureaucratic legitimacy’ arose in our discussions about some of the new aspects of prison life being described by prisoners. It reflects a ‘new penological’ (see Feeley and Simon, 1992) treatment of the individual prisoner as part of an aggregate, risk-averse management strategy that deepens and ‘tightens’ the experience of imprisonment and makes the sentence more difficult to navigate (Crewe, 2009). These issues were of major concern to prisoners, particularly in the category B training prisons, and were among the major focus of their complaints about the prison experience.

Bureaucratic legitimacy items	*Correlation*
I have to be careful about everything I do in this prison, or it can be used against me.	0.617
I feel stuck in this system.	0.570
All they care about in this prison is my ‘risk factors’ rather than the person I really am.	0.548
Decisions are made about me in this prison that I cannot understand.	0.531
Decisions are made about me in this prison that I cannot influence.	0.526
When important decisions are made about me in this prison I am treated as an individual, not a number.	0.495
To progress in this prison, I have to meet impossible expectations.	0.452

Fairness: The Perceived Impartiality, Proportionality and Legality of Punishments and Procedures

Fairness is one of the most important aspects of prison life. Lack of fairness has been linked to a number

of serious disorders in English prisons (Home Office, 1991; Sparks et al., 1996; Liebling, assisted by Arnold, 2004) as well as to levels of distress among prisoners (Liebling et al., 2005). The concept of fairness measured here is primarily *procedural justice*: the application of prison rules and procedures in a flexible, accountable and unbiased manner.

Fairness items	*Correlation*
My legal rights as a prisoner are respected in this prison.	0.653
The regime in this prison is fair.	0.632
In this prison things only happen for you if your face fits.	0.612
This prison is poor at giving prisoners reasons for decisions.	0.590
In general I think the disciplinary system here is unfair.	0.553
Control and restraint procedures are used fairly in this prison.	0.476

Security Dimensions

The security dimensions reflect those aspects of a prison's environment concerned with the rule of law and the proper use of authority, the regulation of behaviour, and the provision of safety.

Policing and Security: Staff Supervision and Control of the Prison Environment

The policing of the prison environment requires a careful balance between imposing and under-enforcing the rules to facilitate the ‘smooth flow’ of prison life (Sykes, 1958; Liebling, 2000). The role of staff is to monitor, regulate and challenge prisoners' behaviour, and to maintain the appropriate balance of power for the purpose of ensuring the safety of staff and prisoners. Failure to supervise and control the prison environment leads to an ‘authority vacuum’ (Bottoms, 1999: 239) and is regarded as illegitimate by prisoners.

Policing and security items	*Correlation*
Staff in this prison turn a blind eye when prisoners break the rules.	0.562
Supervision of prisoners is poor in this prison.	0.540
This prison is run by prisoners rather than staff.	0.505
This prison does very little to prevent drugs being smuggled in.	0.444
Staff in this prison are reluctant to challenge prisoners.	0.398
There is a lot of trouble between different groups of prisoners in here.	0.384
In this prison, there is a real ‘pecking order’ between prisoners.	0.374

This prison has too few staff.	0.357
Staff respond promptly to incidents and alarms in this prison.	0.287

Well-Being and Development Dimensions

The dimensions under this general heading reflect prisoners' perceptions of their own well-being, capacity to act autonomously, levels of support for their personal development, and help with progression. They refer to a prisoner's present and future prospects.

Personal Development: An Environment that Helps Prisoners to Address their Offending Behaviour, Prepare for Release and Develop their Potential

Since the advent of ‘what works’ and a renewed commitment to ‘public protection’ or risk reduction, much greater emphasis has been placed in prisons on responsible engagement with offending behaviour programmes and other activities or courses thought to challenge thinking and behaviours relevant to offending. The availability of opportunities to undertake such programmes or engage with relevant services differs between establishments. The provision of and focus of psychologists, the number of accredited courses on offer, and the size and scope of the education department, for example, can influence a prisoner's chances of ‘making progress’. Progression (or a sense of progression) is influenced by prison staff, as well as by availability, as officers are often the gatekeepers to much of the information and personnel necessary to apply for, find out about and be accepted onto such courses.

Personal development items	*Correlation*
My needs are being addressed in this prison.	0.690
I am encouraged to work towards goals/targets in this prison.	0.689
I am being helped to lead a law-abiding life on release in the community.	0.683
Every effort is made by this prison to stop offenders committing offences on release from custody.	0.660
The regime in this prison is constructive.	0.650
My time here seems like a chance to change.	0.655
This regime encourages me to think about and plan for my release.	0.592
On the whole I am doing time rather than using time.	0.477

Together, these and the remaining dimensions (in Table 24.5), represent a carefully balanced conceptual framework for thinking about the moral quality of a prison, as experienced by prisoners. The survey constitutes a tool for reflection and analysis, and for the ‘identification of symptoms’ indicating moral failings as well as strivings for legitimacy. Exploring relationships between the dimensions, between these and various ‘outcomes’ (such as rates of suicide, or reconviction) and looking closely at lowest and highest scoring dimensions overall, tells us much about the contemporary prison experience.

The Role of Social Science and New Horizons

Blumer argued in *Symbolic Interactionism* (1969) that we should always be self-critical and cautious about how well social-scientific variables (or dimensions) indicate the complex abstract categories they are designed to measure. Part of the long-term project giving rise to the new survey was explicitly concerned with the identification of and relationships between complex and important aspects of prison life that mattered to prisoners. The survey only has value to the extent that these complex aspects of the prison experience have been identified, and translated into items reflecting the social, relational and moral atmosphere of a prison. If this has been achieved, even if to a modest extent, then we can begin to move from description to explanation (e.g., which aspects of the moral quality of prison life give rise to suicides in prison?) and to interpretation. We would always advocate deep and messy qualitative work, alongside use of the survey, so that interpretation and meaning (a picture of 'human beings in their particular world'; ibid: 131) can be appropriately anchored in 'empirical instances of their occurrence' (ibid. 148). The concepts we are seeking to measure are intricate, so that any attempt to fix their content or meaning is premature. There are dangers in using this type of survey naively or instrumentally, or out of context. What we have attempted to do is make a meaningful contribution to the sociological analysis of the prison, and to make it possible to find relatively stable patterns otherwise impossible to observe in the experience (and provision) of imprisonment. Neither the concepts nor their definitions are intended to be definitive.

We are satisfied that in this extended exercise we have found considerable confirmation of the original 'core' dimensions. 'Quality of life' is a 'latent construct' (Gray et al., this volume) amenable to operationalisation in the prison setting. That we have grown its 'security and policing' components in this study is a considerable advance on where we had got to in previous studies, and a reflection of areas where we think we have found important differences between the public and private sectors (see Crewe et al., under review). This is, we propose, a patient, slow and careful enterprise, worthy of effort and self-conscious critique. As Blumer argued, the role of the concept in social science is to 'sensitise perception' (1969: 152)–to change the perceptual world, so that consciousness of fairness and unfairness, differential uses and abuses of power, and the intended and unintended effects of changing punishment provisions are brought into existence. That is the underlying purpose of the survey.

There are many limitations to this survey (as with all surveys) including its failure to take into account age, location, architecture and other characteristics of the prison, or differences between population groups in their capacity and tendency to be critical (long-term prisoners are far more aware of their rights and entitlements that young prisoners, for example). Surveys are inherently time bound and restrictive, as they force respondents into fixed choice categories that leave no room for elaboration. Prisoners prefer open conversation, and they sometimes have such powerful individual stories to tell that a survey item looks inadequate as a reflection of their experience. We hope that the overall methodological strategies we use offset, to some degree, some of these inevitable limitations. We have focused here on the basic measurement task, rather than on our results, or on explanations for those results: what shapes prison life? Why is one prison so much better or worse than another? What is the role played by governors, management teams, staff culture, in the experience of prison life for prisoners? These and other questions like them will be the focus of other work. The survey we have developed here provides an ongoing methodological and conceptual foundation, upon which we and others might continue to work.

Formal statistical analysis has (we suggest, analytic guidance) value only in so far as the 'groundwork' has been carefully completed–that the concepts, their operationalisation and any methods of data collection have meaning and validity. The material subjected to mathematical exploration should be 'mature' (Lewin 1997/1951: 169). The point of all empirical research is to help us take (often small) steps towards solving analytic puzzles about the nature of the social world. Once the data are available in their most carefully statistically analysed form, we have arrived at the beginning of a process of meaning-making. At this stage, it is our exposure to 'the field' we need to draw upon, to formulate understanding. We should strive for rigour and precision,

whilst knowing that the best social science is always approximate, intuitive and developmental.

In relation to the prison, the important questions raised by this methodological journey remain: is it possible to construct a form of imprisonment whose basic structure and daily practices are more or less acceptable to those who endure it, despite their domination and commonly low social position (Liebling, assisted by Arnold, 2004)? Are prisoners slaves or citizens? If they retain their citizenship, then certain things follow. If it were possible to construct a form of imprisonment whose basic structure and daily practices were more rather than less acceptable to those who undergo it, then the effects of this form of imprisonment might be less damaging and more socially constructive. There are further questions to be asked about the extent to which the prison setting–a context of punishment–shapes the meaning of concepts like 'trust', 'frustration', and 'relationship'. To feel 'safe' in a prison may be a very different experience from feeling 'safe' (or conversely, unsafe) in one's home or work environment. The meaning of terms like 'well-being' may be peculiarly narrow in the context of a 25-year prison sentence. Our work attempts to provide valid tools for meaning-making, appropriate means for 'dissecting the social' in the strange and complex environment of prison. We are confident that there is relevance beyond the prison in much of what we have learned and that the use of authority, the way power works, and the links between legitimate treatment and psychological well-being work in similar ways 'outside'. Our focus is on understanding the contemporary experience of imprisonment, and on finding methodologically legitimate ways of doing so. In pursuing this work developmentally over a number of years, we have learned much about the craft of social science, its methods and its difficulties. We have learned above all that empirical research is critical to the development and clarification of conceptual understanding, and vice versa.

Notes

1 This research project was carried out under the Home Office's *Innovative Research Grant* scheme, under the title, '*Measuring the Quality of Prison Life and Locating the Energy for Change*'. See Liebling and Arnold (2002). In the original MQPL research, HMP Doncaster (a privately run prison) had outperformed four public sector prisons on the relational qualities of prison life. There were, however, some weaknesses in security (see Liebling, assisted by Arnold, 2004).

2 In one of the three additional prisons (Altcourse), the MQPL was delivered by the Prison Service Audit and Assurance Unit as part of their auditing programme, with a researcher from the project present to ensure consistency of research methods and to gain insights from the discussions.

3 With the exception of Conditions and Family Contact dimensions, which are the most straightforward and easily measurable category.

Recommended Reading

The origins and methodological and conceptual underpinnings for the survey can be found in Liebling, A., assisted by Arnold, H. (2004) *Prisons and their Moral Performance: A Study of Values, Quality and Prison Life* (Oxford: Clarendon Press). An application of the methods to suicides in prison, as well as a more general overview of the literature on the effects of imprisonment can be found in Liebling, A. and Maruna, S. (eds) (2005) *The Effects of Imprisonment* (Cullompton: Willan); and Liebling, A. (1999) 'Prison Suicide and Prisoner Coping' in M. Tonry and J. Petersilia (eds) *'Prisons', Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*, vol. xxvi (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), pp. 283–360. The main findings from the most recent version of the survey, applied to public–private sector imprisonment, can be found in Crewe, B., Liebling, A., Hulley, S. and McLean, C. (under review) 'Prisoner Quality of Life in Public and Private Sector Prisons'.

References

Blumer, H.(1969)Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method.New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
Bottoms, A.E.(1999)'Interpersonal Violence and Social Order in Prisons' in M.Tonry and J.Petersilia (Eds) 'Prisons, Crime and Justice: A Review of Research, vol. xxvi.Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 205–282.
Braithwaite, V.'The Value Balance of Political Evaluations',British Journal of Psychology,89:(1998)223–247.
Clarke, R.V., and Martin, D.N.(1971)Absconding from Approved Schools.Home Office Research Studies. London: HMSO.
Crewe, B.'Prisoner Society in the Era of Hard Drugs',Punishment and Society,7(2005)(4):457–481.
Crewe, B.(2009)The Prisoner Society: Power, Adaptation and Social Life in an English Prison.Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Crewe, B., Liebling, A., Hulley, S., and McLean, C. (under review) 'Prisoner Quality of Life in Public and Private Sector Prisons'.
Downes, D.(1988)Contrasts in Tolerance: Post-War Penal Policy in the Netherlands and England and Wales.Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Elliott, C.(1999)Locating the Energy for Change: An Introduction to Appreciative Inquiry.Winnipeg: International Institute for Sustainable Development.
Feeley, M.Simon, J.'The New Penology: Notes on the Emerging Strategy of Corrections and its Implications',Criminology,30:(1992)449–474.
Field, A.(2005).Discovering Statistics Using SPSS,
2nd Edition
. London: Sage.
Gaes, G.G., Flanagan, T.J., Motiuk, L.L., and Stewart, L.(1999)'Adult Correctional Treatment' in M.Tonry and J.Petersilia (Eds) 'Prisons', Crime and Justice: A Review of Research, vol. xxvi.Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 361–427.
Goffman, E.(1967)'Where the Action is' in E.Goffman (Ed.) Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behaviour.New York: Doubleday Anchor, pp. 149–270.
Gunn, J., Robertson, G., Dell, S., and Way, C.(1978)Psychiatric Aspects of Imprisonment,London: Academic Press.
Haney, C.'Psychology and the Limits to Prison Pain: Confronting the Coming Crisis in the Eighth Amendment Law',Psychology, Public Policy and Law,3/4:(1997)499–588.
Heal, K.Sinclair, I.Troop, J.'Development of a Social Climate Questionnaire for use on Approved Schools and Community Homes',British Journal of Sociology,24/2:(1973)222–235.
Home Office(1984)Managing the Long-Term Prison System. The Report of the Control Review Committee, Cmd. 3175. London: HMSO.
Home Office(1991)Prison Disturbances April 1990: Report of an Inquiry by the Rt. Hon. Lord Justice Woolf (Parts I and II) and his Honour Judge Stephen Tumim (Part II),London: HMSO.
House of Commons(2002)Home Affairs Public Administration Select Committee,The Public Service Ethos, Seventh Report of Session 2001–2 263-II, London: Stationery Office.
Hulley, S., Liebling, A.Crewe, B. (under review) 'Respect in Prisons: Prisoners' Experiences of Respect in Public and Private Sector Prisons'.
Jones, H., and Cornes, P. (assisted by Stockford, R.) (1977)Open Prisons,London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
Kaiser, H.F.'The application of electronic computers to factor analysis',Educational and Psychological Measurement,20:(1960)141–151.
King, R.D., and McDermott, K.(1995)The State of Our Prisons.Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Lewin, K.(1997)Field Theory in Social Science.London: Harper and Row. (
1st edition 1951
).
Liebling, A.Price, D.Elliot, C.'Appreciative Inquiry and Relationships in Prison',Punishment and Society: The International Journal of Penology,1(1999)(1),pp. 71–98.

Liebling, A.‘Prison Officers, Policing and the Use of Discretion’,Theoretical Criminology,4/3:(2000)333–357.
Liebling, A., and Arnold, H.(2002)Measuring the Quality of Prison Life: Research Findings 174.London: Home Office.
Liebling, A.; assisted by Arnold, H.(2004)Prisons and their Moral Performance: A Study of Values, Quality, and Prison Life.Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Liebling, A., Durie, L., Stiles, A., and Tait, S.(2005)‘Revisiting Prison Suicide: The Role of Fairness and Distress’ in A.Liebling and S.Maruna (Eds) The Effects of Imprisonment.Cullompton: Willan Publishing, pp. 209–231.
Liebling, A., and Price, D.(2001)The Prison Officer.Leyhill: Prison Service and Waterside Press.
Logan, C.H.‘Well-Kept: Comparing Quality of Confinement in Private and Public Prisons’,Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology,83/3:(1992)577–613.
Ludema, J., Cooperrider, D., and Barrett, F.(2001)‘Appreciative Inquiry: The Power of the Unconditional Positive Question’ in P.Reason and H.Bradbury (Eds) Handbook of Action Research.London: Sage, pp. 189–199.
Moos, R.H.(1975)Evaluating Correctional and Community Settings.New York: Wiley Press.
Murray, H.A.(1938)Explorations in Personality.New York: Oxford University Press.
Perrone, D.Pratt, T.C.‘Comparing the Quality of Confinement and Cost-Effectiveness of Public Versus Private Prisons: What We Know, Why We Do Not Know More, and Where to Go from Here’,The Prison Journal,83(2003)(3):301–322.
Saylor, W.G.(1984)Surveying Prison Environments.Washington: Federal Bureau of Prisons.
Sinclair, I.(1971)Hostels for Probationers.Home Office Research Studies. London: HMSO.
Sparks, R.(1994)‘Can Prisons be Legitimate?’ in R.King and M.McGuire (Eds) Prisons in Context.Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Sparks, R.Bottoms, A.E.(2008)‘Legitimacy and Imprisonment Revisited: Notes on the Problem of Order Ten Years After’ in J.Byrne, F.Taxman and D.Hummer (Eds) The Culture of Prison Violence.Boston: Pearson/Allyn and Bacon.
Sparks, R., Bottoms, A.E.Hay, W.(1996)Prisons and the Problem of Order.Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Sykes, G.(1958)The Society of Captives.Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Thornton, D.(1987)‘Assessing Custodial Adjustment’ in B.J.McGirk, D.M.Thornton, and M.Williams (Eds) Applying Psychology to Imprisonment.London: HMSO, pp. 445–462.
Toch, H.(1982)‘Studying and Reducing Stress’ in R.Johnson and H.Toch (Eds) The Pains of Imprisonment.London: Sage.

- prisons
- prison life
- prisoners
- private prisons
- correctional industries
- correctional personnel
- staff

http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446268285.n24