In light of the 'Prison Crisis', what are the explanations of, and solutions to, violence within prison? A qualitative study of recently released prisoners' perceptions of the current prison environment within England and Wales using a General Strain Theory theoretical framework

Thomas Wells

PhD

University of York

Business and Society

October 2023

Abstract

The aim of this thesis is to provide an understanding of, and solutions to, England and Wales (E&W) prison violence using a General Strain Theory (GST) framework. The GST framework is designed to be able to provide explanations for a variety of types of behaviours and criminal activities. A recent research paper by Blevins et al. (2010) outlined how to apply GST with three major prison theories that are often used to understand prisoner violent behaviours - the deprivation model, the importation model, and the coping model.

Since Blevins et al.'s (2010) article was published prison researchers have tested this theory's understanding of prison strains and behaviour. However, these research studies have predominantly been conducted in United States (U.S.) prisons using a quantitative approach. This research offers a unique perspective by testing this theory qualitatively and by focusing on an E&W prison context. E&W prison strains will differ substantially from the strains highlighted in U.S. prison studies due to cultural and structural differences. It is therefore necessary for this research to highlight the specific strains that affect E&W prisoners' violent behaviour.

This research comprised interviews with 41 recently released prisoners housed in 11 Approved Premises. Through analysing the interview data, I identified three systemic strains that are contributing to prison violence. These systemic strains are as follows: the strain of blocked desired costly goods; the strain of prison staff attitudes, disrespect, lack of support and misuse of power; and the strain of a strict regime. Each systemic strain produces and increases the magnitude of various stressors inside prisons. These stressors create pressure on some prisoners to react violently to attract attention, to defend themselves, to remove anticipated risks or to gain emotional relief. In order to reduce violence in E&W prisons these systemic strains need to be addressed.

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

5

List of Tables

Declaration

I declare that this thesis is a presentation of original work and I am the sole author. This work has not previously been presented for a degree or other qualification at this University or elsewhere. All sources are acknowledged as references.

Abbreviations & Glossary

AP	Approved Premises
CBT	Cognitive Behavioural Therapy
CJS	Criminal Justice System
E&W	England and Wales
GST	General Strain Theory
HMPPS	HM Prison & Probation Service
IEP	Incentives and Earned Privileges
MoJ	Ministry of Justice
NRC	National Research Committee
PTSD	Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder
PRT	Prison Reform Trust
UK	United Kingdom
U.S.	United States

Chapter 1. Introduction

Prison violence in England and Wales (E&W) has been revealed by researchers, news outlets and government officials to be a growing concern in male prisons (McGuire, 2018; BBC News, 2023a; Chamberlen and Carvalho, 2019). Violence in prisons is typically perceived as a behaviour to be expected (Edgar, O'Donnell and Martin, 2003). Prisons are an environment that contain individuals coming from a wide variety of backgrounds, some of whom have lived violent lifestyles (DeLisi, Berg and Hochstetler, 2004). Therefore, since many of the prisons in E&W contain prisoners that have been involved in violent crimes they are perceived and categorised as high risk, dangerous environments in which security, order and control are paramount (Bennett, 2007). However, the prioritisation of security, order and control can mean that prisoners are subjected to varying levels of deprivation. Depending on how painful those deprivations are perceived by prisoners, this can create circumstances in which prisoners may try to cope through violence (McCorkle, Miethe and Drass, 1995; Jiang and Fisher-Giorlando, 2002).

Therefore, prisons are likely to have issues of violence due to the nature of the environment. If violence rates become too high there will be disorder (Byrne and Hummer, 2007). On a macro level, when prisons become more violent it becomes increasingly difficult for prison staff to manage and control behaviour to maintain order (Bottoms, 1999). If prisons become disorderly to the extent that staff are unable to manage prisoners, then prisons become places that are less able to rehabilitate and protect those housed there (Labrecque and Smith, 2019). On a micro level, prisoners who are victimised by violence can suffer from both physical and psychological harms which can have negative effects on their lives moving forward (McGuire, 2018; Armour, 2012; O'Donnell and Edgar, 1999). The issues caused by high rates of violence have resulted in an increasing need for focused research on this topic to understand the causes of violent behaviour/incidents and provide solutions to help resolve this growing problem. This research sought to achieve this by using a framework developed by Blevins et al. (2010) but yet to be qualitatively tested, to explore E&W prison violence. This framework combines Agnew's (1992) General Strain Theory (GST) with the deprivation, importation, and coping models (Blevins et al., 2010; Tasca, Griffin and Rodriguez, 2010; Rocheleau, 2015). These three models have been used extensively in past research to understand and provide solutions to prison violence (Cao, Zhao and Van Dine, 1997; McCorkle et al., 1995; Rocheleau, 2015). However, by combining these models with GST, Blevins et al. (2010) have developed a framework that allows the researcher to explore

various causalities for prison violence and thereby provide a more in-depth understanding of the phenomenon (see chapter 3).

This chapter serves several purposes. The first section provides the context of E&W prisons, highlighting the problems that prisons face, resulting in researchers and news outlets labelling them as being at crisis point (Cavadino, Dignan and Mair, 2013; Prison Reform Trust (PRT), 2023b; Martin, 2022). There follows a discussion of the impact Covid-19 had on E&W prisons. This period had a significant impact on both the prison landscape and those that have participated in this research. The second section explains why prison violence through the lens of a GST framework is worth exploring. The third section provides this thesis' definition of violence and will make it clear that it is exploring both physical and psychological violence. The fourth section provides the aims of this research and the research questions. The final section outlines the structure of the rest of the thesis.

1.1. E&W Prisons: The Prison Crisis and the Impact of Covid-19

For the past decade prisons have been reported by both the media and researchers to be at a crisis point (Taylor et al., 2017; Hough and Jacobson, 2008; PRT, 2023b; Martin, 2022). Prisons are suffering in many ways as a result of past political policy decisions such as an increase in the use of incarceration, the sentencing of individuals to imprisonment for longer, and penal cuts (Shaw, 2018; Ismail, 2020b; Cavadino et al., 2013; Jacobson and Hough, 2018). The high prison population has led to overcrowding, poor prison conditions and a general feeling of unsafety for both prisoners and staff (Cavadino et al., 2013; Chamberlen and Carvalho, 2019). Pre-pandemic acts of violence and self-harm in E&W prisons had seen record numbers, further contributing to the uneasy climate (BBC News, 2019). As stated earlier, one of the most significant effects of the prison cuts has been the reduction in the number of experienced staff members (PRT, 2022a). The loss of their knowledge and experience increases the risk of disorder and reduces prisoner/prison officer safety (Burki, 2017; HM Inspectorate of Prisons, 2022). A lack of experienced staff has been linked to the increase in violence and suicides (Howard League, 2014; Maruna, McNaull and O'Neill, 2022). Experience allows staff to handle difficult/violent situations more proficiently than less experienced staff. Prisoners become more vulnerable to assaults, intimidation and bullying if there are not enough experienced staff around (Burki, 2017). Furthermore, lack of staff has the negative effect of prisons becoming less productive (Howard League, 2014). Purposeful activity and educational programmes cannot be run if there are not enough officers to facilitate them. In recent reports, prisoners have been found to be spending too much time

locked in their cells which can be attributed to a lack of staff and purposeful activities (Bulman, 2022; Dawson, 2022). Too much time in cells poses the risk of prisoners developing mental health issues, drug misuse and self-harm (Johnson et al., 2021; Hewson et al., 2020). The high number of prisoners developing mental health problems is a prevailing issue that demonstrates the deterioration of the E&W prison service. It has been estimated that "two-thirds of prisoners suffer from personality disorders, roughly half suffer from depression and anxiety, and one in twelve suffer from psychosis" (Burki, 2017:904). Those suffering from mental health problems are most at risk of self-harm and/or suicide if not properly identified and treated (Humber et al., 2011). An overcrowded and underfunded prison system employing inexperienced staff carries with it the risk of mentally unwell prisoners remaining untreated in an environment that is considered unsafe and antagonistic (Haney, 2017: Marzano, Adler and Ciclitira, 2015). With all the issues plaguing prisons in the last decade, doubt has been raised as to whether prisons can keep prisoners safe, "let alone help reduce re-offending" (Allen, 2016:2). Even more troubling is the effect that the recent pandemic has had on the already deteriorating prison conditions.

On 23 January 2020 the first confirmed case of an individual who had contracted Covid-19 in Wuhan landed in the United Kingdom (UK) (Wright, 2021). Due to the contagiousness and lethality of the virus, all institutions including prisons were required to take measures to combat Covid-19 (Brennan, 2020). The threat that Covid-19 posed for prisons was substantial. Many Prisons in E&W are overcrowded and poorly ventilated which makes the spread of Covid-19 difficult to contain (Simpson and Butler, 2020). Furthermore, according to Burki (2020) "prisoners tend to be in worse health than the wider population" (p.1411). Many prisoners are smokers, and many suffer from diabetes and asthma (Burki, 2020). Also, prisoners tend to be less active due to confinement and are often fed poor quality food (Burki, 2020). The deadly risk that Covid-19 posed to prisoners made enacting restrictions and distancing rules a necessity. The rules created, however, were strict. Many prisoners were only allowed out of their cells for 1 hour or less a day (Dawson, 2022:1), whereas HM Inspectorate of Prisons (2021b) recommends for prisoners' physical and mental well-being that they should have at least 10 hours a day out of their cells (p.1). Prisoners mentally suffered as many of their usual daily routines, including attending programmes, education, purposeful activities, and face-to-face visitations, were cancelled during this period (Brennan, 2020; GOV.UK, 2022a; Parliament, 2020).

As of late 2022 the remaining Covid-19 restrictions in E&W have been lifted (GOV.UK, 2022a; Coomber, 2022b). However, the impact that the pandemic has had on prisons, prisoners and prison staff has been significant and the consequences of this will likely

continue for some time (Coomber, 2022b). One of the unintentional consequences of the measures taken during Covid-19 is that there are many prisoners that now need significant support as a result of being subjected to the conditions of what can be termed as prolonged solitary confinement (Suhomlinova et al., 2022; Maruna et al., 2022). McCarthy et al. (2022) state that "long-term solitary confinement has been associated with increased risk of mental illness, such as clinical depression and impulse-control disorder, even in people with no prior history of psychiatric problems" (p.10). Many of those still incarcerated will likely be mentally suffering from the psychological effects of prolonged isolation. However, healthcare provided for prisoners has become increasingly strained as a result of increasing numbers of prison staff resigning in light of the pandemic (Maruna et al., 2022). A significant number of those who have resigned were experienced staff, thereby severely undermining the prison service's ability to provide healthcare and an environment that is rehabilitative and safe (Maruna et al., 2022). Furthermore, due to the abnormally high numbers of prisoners that needed healthcare during the pandemic there are increasingly lengthy waiting lists for prisoners to get medical and psychological help (Wainwright et al., 2023). Prisoners that were prioritised during the pandemic were elderly prisoners as they are considered the most vulnerable. This has left many young prisoners feeling disadvantaged and at increased risk of mental health issues from having to wait for necessary support (Wainwright et al., 2023).

Due to factors such as prisoners and prison staff having less interaction, increasing staff shortages, and prisoners' resentment at being locked up for significant periods of time, relationships between prisoners and staff have deteriorated (Wainwright et al., 2023; Coomber, 2022b). The deterioration of these relationships negatively affects staff's ability to maintain order as it increases the likelihood of conflict between both parties (Drake, 2008; Sparks and Bottoms, 1995). One positive outcome of the pandemic has been the introduction of video calling technology, named Purple Visits, across the prison estate (Codd, 2020; Maruna et al., 2022). During Covid-19, it was essential for prisoners and family members to be able to make contact remotely, and video calling options provided a level of interaction which phone calls could not achieve (Brennan, 2020). This had the benefit of easing some prisoners' pain at being unable to meet face-to-face with their family and friends (PRT, 2020b). There have however been criticisms of this service by some prisoners who have argued that they "did not always work and were not very long – for example, someone might get one half-hour visit per month" (Coomber, 2022a:1). The HM Inspectorate of Prisons (2021c) report did find that a significant number of prisoners deeply valued the service which helps justify their continuing use post-pandemic in conjunction with other family contact methods.

In sum, there are a multitude of systemic issues that negatively affect E&W prisons, some of which have been exacerbated by the Covid-19 pandemic. Issues such as health-care provision, high rates of violence, worsening staff-prisoner relationships, mental health, long lock-up times and the loss of experienced staff are all factors contributing to what has been termed the prison crisis. All these deprivations/pains that prisoners are facing can contribute to prison violence (Edgar et al., 2003; McCorkle et al., 1995). How prison environmental factors and policies affect prisoner violent behaviour will be explored in chapter 2 of this thesis.

1.2. Why Focus on Violence and GST?

The purpose of this thesis is to improve our understanding of violence in E&W prisons using the framework of GST. During the inception of this thesis in 2019, prisons in E&W were suffering from unprecedentedly high rates of violence, and assaults were said to have reached record levels during that period (Siddique, 2019). In the past few years there has been a sharp decline in assaults in E&W prisons, largely because of Covid-19 prison lockdowns which severely limited social contact for prisoners (GOV.UK, 2021). However, as expected, violence rates increased as lockdown measures were lifted. For example, between April 2020 to March 2021 the rate of prisoner-on-prisoner assaults was 140 per 1000 prisoners (GOV.UK, 2023c:1). This statistic increased to 163 per 1000 prisoners between April 2021 to March 2022 (GOV.UK, 2023c:1). This figure is not as severe as it was pre-pandemic (i.e., 250 per 1000 prisoners April 2019 to March 2020), however, there is a risk that gradually violence rates will increase to pre-pandemic heights if necessary/effective measures are not implemented (GOV.UK, 2023c:1).

The detrimental effects of prison violence are numerous. It is both physically and psychologically harmful for prisoners and staff members (McGuire, 2018). Being a victim of violence or even just bearing witness to such behaviour can increase the risk of suicide and/or developing Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) symptoms (Lerman, Harney and Sadin, 2022). Violence disrupts order and staff control of the prison environment. As argued by Auty, Cope and Liebling (2017), "violence in prisons impacts negatively on the delivery of a consistent daily regime and therefore undermines efforts to provide programs, education and work activities for inmates as well as posing direct risks" (p.126). Therefore, violence does not just impact the violent individual's ability to rehabilitate but also that of other inmates who are housed in the disorderly prison. Furthermore, prisons that allow violence to become commonplace increase the chances of initially non-violent prisoners seeking to use

violence as a means of protecting themselves and to fit into a macho/violent environment (Michalski, 2017; Crewe et al., 2014).

Additionally, research evidence indicates that those who commit acts of violence in prison are more likely to commit further offences once released (Cochran et al., 2014). There are multiple explanations for this outcome. For example, those who are prone to aggression and explosive violent outbursts tend to have difficulty with developing relationships, struggle to control their emotions and are at risk of being labelled anti-social violent individuals (Hausam, Lehmann and Dahle, 2020). Also, those who are continually involved in violent misconduct are likely to have fewer opportunities to improve themselves in prison, as they are likely to be punished for their wrongdoings. Punishments such as "being kept in their cell for up to 21 days" limit access to prison programmes that are designed to improve inmate behaviour (GOV.UK, 2022b:1). Although punishments for misbehaviour might be considered justifiable, the unfortunate outcome is that they can hinder the rehabilitative process by adding additional stressors. The detrimental effect that violence has highlights the importance of further research that provides different perspectives and solutions.

The framework adopted by this thesis is GST. This framework will be explained in more detail in chapter 3. However, in simple terms, GST argues that stressors/strains put pressure on individuals to commit crime (Agnew, 1992). Some individuals struggle to cope legitimately when faced with severe strains and as a result feel intense negative emotions such as anger, frustration, depression, and fear (Agnew, 2006). To cope with these negative emotions, some may act violently as a source of relief or as a reaction to the strains that have caused them to feel emotional and/or physical pain. Blevins et al. (2010) explain how to apply the GST framework to a prison context and other prison research in other countries has utilised a GST framework (Morris et al., 2012; Zweig et al., 2015; Joon Jang, 2020).

My research differs in its intent to apply this framework in an E&W prison context. There is, as far as I am aware, no other research that has used this framework to qualitatively analyse E&W prisoners' understanding and experiences of strain and violence. This matters because strains vary across different prison cultures (Blevins et al., 2010). Prison strains in the United States (U.S.) will differ from the strains experienced in E&W prisons. Even strains that emerge in Leeds prison for example, will to some extent differ in their impact compared to strains in Wakefield prison. Strains are impacted by the prison architecture, personal background experiences, policies, sub-culture, prison category and much more. Through qualitative research this study can help uncover specific strains that are affecting modern-

day E&W prisoners. By uncovering these strains, the thesis aims to provide solutions that will help prevent violent behaviour from emerging.

To sum up, the thesis has two major purposes. Firstly, it aims to highlight E&W prison strains that are conducive to violence based on the perceptions of individuals that have experienced prison life. Secondly, it aims to provide solutions based upon those highlighted strains.

1.3. Defining Violence

Discussing violence is problematic in that there is no simple, fixed definition (Edgar et al., 2003). This causes methodological challenges in research, as there is variance in how researchers have defined prison violence (Schenk and Fremouw, 2012). Prisoners and prison staff will also have varied perceptions of what constitutes violence. For example, Wolff et al. (2007) argued that some prisoners would not define "slapping" or "hitting" an assault (p.596). This variation highlights the importance of defining terms such as violent misconduct.

The most simplistic definition of individual violence is an act that causes harm to others (Steinke, 1991). However, this simple definition falls short of explaining what constitutes a violent act and its associated degree of harm. The World Health Organisation (2022) offered a more in-depth definition by stating that violence is the *"intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person, or against a group or community, that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment or deprivation"* (p.1). This definition emphasises the importance of intentionality. For an act to be considered violent, an individual or group must intend for their physical force or power to cause harm (Rutherford et al., 2007). Based on these definitions there are numerous behaviours that can be considered violent.

In a prison context, violence can take the form of physical violence such as fights, assaults, stabbings, beatings, or property damage (Modvig, 2014; Martin and Edgar, 2000; Steinke, 1991). Physical violence can be separated into two categories, armed and non-armed assaults. In prison history a variety of tools have been modified into weapons such as "padlocks, toothbrushes, disposable razors, metal from ventilators, batteries, and even paper hardened with toothpaste and sharpened" (Lincoln et al., 2006:195). Physical violence committed by prisoners can be directed either towards other prisoners or towards staff. For

the purposes of this research both will be considered[1]. Those interviewed may also discuss their experiences of staff mistreatment. This will be viewed through the lens of GST as a way of examining whether mistreatment by staff is conceptualised by prisoners as being a strain that contributes to their violent misbehaviour. Due to ethical concerns, sexual violence will not be addressed in this study. It is important to distinguish between the two major types of violence in this research, physical and psychological violence. What gives rise to these behaviours and the affects that they have on the individual will likely vary. Types of psychological violence include threats, bullying and intimidation (Jackson and Ashley, 2005). Threats and bullying may give rise to physical violence. Likewise, assaults and fights may increase the rates of threats and intimidation. Both physical and psychological violence are damaging and will be regarded as of equal importance and worthy of discussion. Unless one attempts to resolve both negative behaviours, it can be argued that neither is likely to decrease significantly.

Another type of violence is self-directed violence such as suicide, self-harm, and attempted suicide (Modvig, 2014; World Health Organisation, 2022). This goes beyond the desired scope of this research. Self-harm and suicide are complex behaviours that deserve their own research focus. Similarly, there will not be a focus on sexual violence as it goes beyond the desired scope of this research. Violence committed by staff members will be analysed only for its role in creating noxious strain for prisoners which can result in prisoner conflict.

To sum up, this research will focus on physical and psychological violence committed and experienced by prisoners. The following section will outline the research aims and questions.

1.4. Scope and Research Focus: Research Aims and Questions

To gain a comprehensive understanding of violence in E&W prisons this research will be guided by the GST framework. This framework informs the research questions, topic guide and the data analysis of this thesis. This research seeks to understand the stressors that are affecting prisoners at an individual level and prisons on a structural level. For example, on an individual level, it will explore how prisoners respond emotionally to the different stressors that they encounter and what type of coping mechanisms they employ for the purposes of reducing prison violence. On a structural level, this research wants to understand what areas

---

[1] In order to limit the scope of this research, solutions to violence committed by staff will not be provided. Since this research did not involve interviewing staff members, I did not consider it ethical/reasonable to offer this perspective.

of the prison system, whether that be its design, staff and/or policy, are causing prisoners to cope illegitimately. In sum, this thesis aims to:

- Use GST as a framework for understanding prison violence. GST is a theory that aims to provide an explanation as to why people commit different types of crimes and misbehaviours, including violence. It explains how the strains (stressors) that individuals face in their daily lives can make it difficult for them to cope effectively. Without the proper tools and support systems, some individuals may respond to accumulated negative emotions with illegal behaviour to relieve the stress they are under.

- Generate qualitative data on GST. This is an innovative approach as other research studies that have explored prison culture using GST as a framework have only used quantitative methods.

- Identify both the structural and individual level strains from the perspective of the participants. In particular, explore which strains are perceived as more emotionally impactful than others.

- Explore the negative emotions produced by these stressors and whether these negative emotions resulted in conflict.

- Provide a reflective account of my experience of conducting the research, thereby providing a review of the difficulties that I personally faced and thus offer advice to future HM Prison & Probation Service (HMPPS) researchers.

The research questions for this qualitative research are:

- What role do experiences of strain and negative emotions, as outlined in Blevins et al.'s (2010:148) comprehensive strain framework, play in the understanding of prison violence?

- What are the explanations for prison violence from the perspective of recently released prisoners?

- What are the potential solutions for prison violence that can be interpreted from recently released prisoners' accounts, using GST as a framework?

- Which parts of the prison structure are considered to be most conducive to strain for prisoners?

- What positive coping methods could prisoners employ to help them avoid violence?

1.5. Organisation of This Thesis

There are eight chapters in this thesis. This introductory chapter is followed by a literature review which covers two key topics. The first half analyses literature concerning which prisoners are more likely to commit violence in E&W prisons. Violent behaviour is influenced by imported and deprivation variables and how they affect how prisoners adapt and cope in the prison environment. The variables that will be explored are age, sentence length, substance misuse, mental health/illness and violent criminal history. Analysing these variables in depth helps inform the research design and analysis. The latter part of the literature review explores the ways in which E&W prisons manage violence, in order to gain a deeper understanding of the policies and methods currently employed in E&W prisons.

The third chapter explores and explains the GST theoretical framework. It will provide a brief background to the development of Agnew's GST and will explain how it can be applied to prison violence. This explanation is primarily informed by Blevins et al.'s (2010) article which provides a framework that combines GST with three prison models that have regularly been used to understand and analyse prison violence. These models are the deprivation model, the importation model and the coping model. Furthermore, this chapter provides a critical view of past prison research that has used a GST framework.

The fourth chapter outlines the methodology and explains the research questions and aims, the research design, the institutional setting, the data collection methods, the chosen analytical method, the ethical considerations, and the research limitations. This chapter will also provide a reflexive account of my research experience. This research comprised semi-structured interviews with 41 Approved Premises (AP) residents. The interviews were conducted at AP which are institutions managed by the HMPPS. These residents are recently released high-risk prisoners who are required to stay in temporary accommodation. Through interviewing recently released prisoners this research was able to circumvent the Covid-19 restrictions imposed on prisons, whilst simultaneously gaining rich data from these participants. The data collected was transcribed and later analysed by using the NVivo software and thematic analysis.

The next three chapters explore the findings under three major themes. Chapter five focuses on the major theme of the costly desire for prison goods and its link to coping, bullying, theft and debt. This theme was informed by the major strains of "failure to achieve positively valued goals" (p.51) and the "removal of positively valued stimuli" (p.57) (Agnew, 1992).

Prisoners desire a variety of licit goods which they can buy at the canteen. Such purchases are positive stimuli which help prisoners cope with daily stressors. However, the cost of these goods requires prisoners to have family financial support, and/or participate in work or education and/or achieve enhanced status as part of the Incentives and Earned Privileges (IEP) scheme. Prisoners who desire prison goods but are unable to earn money are more likely to cope illegitimately through bullying, thieving, or getting into debt. All these illegitimate behaviours come with the risk of being involved in violence by being either the perpetrator or the victim. Chapter six explores the second major theme concerning the strains of prison staff disrespect, declining support, misuse of power, and their effects on inmate violence. This theme analyses the stressors caused by prison staff and how this results in prisoners coping through violence. The first section covers various forms of staff disrespect such as the use of discriminatory language, making false promises, and younger staff patronising older prisoners. The following section analyses the consequences of declining support offered to prisoners who are struggling with their mental health. And lastly, the final section reveals the different ways in which staff can misuse their power through, for example, favouritism and weaponizing IEP against prisoners. Chapter seven focuses on the question of whether stricter regime measures are better for the management of violence. This theme focuses on the stressors that are produced and/or become greater in magnitude because of the stricter regime during the height of Covid-19, highlighting the strains produced by such a regime which result in violent conflicts. This will include a discussion on the stressors linked to sharing with a cellmate, noxious noises, limited socialisation, and the increasing desire of prisoners to get out of their cell.

The eighth and final chapter covers the discussion/conclusion of this thesis. This chapter summarises the findings; provides conclusive thoughts on how the major themes work together; and offers solutions to prison violence. The second section reviews GST as a framework. This part of the chapter provides a discussion of both the strengths and weaknesses of the framework when used qualitatively from my perspective and experience. The third section provides recommendations for prison policies and practices. The fourth section offers recommendations for future research based upon the types of information that this research was unable to capture/produce. The last section offers my final remarks regarding what contribution this research offers to prison academic literature.

Chapter 2. Examining Violence in England and Wales Prisons

In this chapter literature will be analysed in order to contextualise violence in E&W prisons. The literature analysed varies in terms of disciplines and includes criminological, sociological, medical/psychological, and political sources. This variation is necessary because this research seeks to understand both the individual and structural variables that contribute to violence in E&W prisons. In terms of types of sources that have been cited these include academic journal articles and books; government articles/websites; prison inspection reports; news reports; and prison charity websites. Academic journal articles and books provide this research with a more nuanced and in-depth understanding of prisoner violent behaviour and the history of E&W prisons. On the other hand, government articles/websites, prison inspection reports, news reports and prison charity facilitate an understanding of contemporary policy decisions/implications and prison conditions.

This chapter will examine two key questions - which prisoners commit violence, and how do E&W prisons manage violence? The extent to which prisoners are likely to commit violence is affected by imported and deprivation variables which influence how well they are able to adapt and cope in the prison environment. This first part of this chapter will analyse a variety of variables that, according to the literature, heavily influence violent behaviour in prisons: age, sentence length, substance misuse, mental health/illness and violent criminal history. These variables are either imported or produced by the depriving/painful prison environment. Examining these variables provides a deeper understanding of the types of individuals that are more susceptible to strain because they are more likely to cope poorly whilst incarcerated.

The second half of this chapter covers the different approaches/methods that E&W prisons have employed to manage violence. These measures involve prison officers, IEP scheme, family contact methods, penal management, rehabilitation methods and prison design. Examining these various measures provides an understanding of the strengths and limitations of current E&W policies designed to manage prison violence.

2.1. Which Prisoners Commit Violence in E&W Prisons?

In E&W prisons, some prisoners are more likely to commit violence than others. What contributes to whether prisoners are more likely commit violence are various factors that are both imported and affected by the depriving prison environment (Tasca et al., 2010; Lahm,

2008; Lai, 2019). These factors/variables can range from individual characteristics, economic and environmental factors, and past criminal behaviour (Schenk and Fremouw, 2012; Lahm, 2009). In the pursuit of creating a safer prison environment in their respective nations/states, quantitative researchers have tested numerous variables that can best predict acts of violence (Gendreau, Goggin and Law, 1997). Many of the previous quantitative researchers who investigated violence predictors proposed that if they could find correlations between behaviour, environmental factors and/or individual variables and violence/misconduct then the prison system could better manage risky/dangerous behaviour and individuals (Campbell, French and Gendreau, 2009; Gendreau et al., 1997). For the purposes of this research the imported variables that will be analysed are age, sentence length, substance misuse, mental health/illness, and violent criminal history. These variables influence how well prisoners adapt and cope with the prison environment. But the effect that these variables have on prisoners' adaptation to the prison environment will vary depending on prison policy and conditions. So, for example, how E&W young prisoners adapt to the prison environment will differ in subtle and/or significant ways compared to equally young prisoners in other countries. Furthermore, variables such as substance misuse and mental health can develop or become worse due to various prison pains. Therefore, the following discussion will analyse both importation and prison environment (deprivation and adaptation) effects on these variables to explain why certain prisoners commit more violence than others.

2.1.1. Links Between Age and Prison Violence

It has been found that a younger age at imprisonment is related to higher rates of violence when compared to older prisoners (Cunningham and Sorensen, 2007; Schenk and Fremouw, 2012). Lahm (2009) also found that younger prisoners are more likely to be aggressive and assault staff members. It is argued that young male prisoners are more likely to adapt to, and cope with, the hostile prison environment by adopting a hyper-masculine persona (Jewkes, 2005). These types of prisoners seek to be perceived by others as strong men to be accepted by, and gain the respect of, other inmates who value toughness (Crewe et al., 2014). By adopting this persona, they are protecting themselves from being perceived as vulnerable/weak and therefore easy targets to be assaulted or bullied (Crewe et al., 2014; O'Donnell, 2001). But to prove their toughness, they themselves might victimise the perceived weaker prisoners to demonstrate their dominance (De Viggiani, 2012).

Younger prisoners therefore may cope with their fears and pressures through aggression and defensiveness (McCorkle, 1992). But this means of coping and presenting oneself increases the risk of being involved in violence. Conversely, it is found that older prisoners tend to be more isolated and passive, mostly avoiding confrontations. The risk of passivity, however, as stated by McCorkle (1992) is that it can be perceived as weakness which can lead to other prisoners choosing to victimise that individual. It has been shown that older prisoners are also less involved in aggressive acts because they are more critical thinkers than their younger peers (Barling, Dupré and Kelloway, 2009). With age comes experience. Therefore, older prisoners are arguably more able to consider the consequences of their actions and therefore do not allow their aggression to inform their decisions. As a result, research stresses the importance of young offenders being given effective coping strategies whilst in prison to deal with their increased likelihood of resorting to violent coping mechanisms (Jordaan and Hesselink, 2022).

2.1.2. Links Between Sentence Length and Prison Violence

There are many aspects of prison life that make it difficult for the offender to cope legitimately. Life experiences that they have imported into the prison environment as well as the depriving nature of the institution can lead offenders to commit violent acts (Sykes, 1958; DeLisi et al., 2004). Furthermore, not all prisoners are sent to prison with equal preconditions. Each prisoner will have been given different sentences of varying lengths. Most pertinently, some prisoners are currently in prison on indeterminate sentences which have their own unique psychological impacts on their lives and their families (Straub and Annison, 2020). Past research has shown that differing lengths of prison sentence do have an impact on behaviour and violence rates. In Toman et al.'s (2015) research, they found "that longer sentence lengths result in a substantively modest increase in the overall likelihood of misconduct during the first 6 months of confinement" (p.517). They argue that the strain of a lengthy sentence has an impact on an individual's ability to cope when first imprisoned. Knowing that they will face the depriving nature of prison for a longer period can make the noxious stimuli that prison presents even more painful. It is argued through a GST perspective that people will be more likely to commit criminal acts when strains are cumulative and high in magnitude (Agnew, 2001). The psychological toll of a sentence of 10 or more years would be high in magnitude for the individual and will not be the only strain that they will face when entering the prison environment. It is also argued that longer sentences can make prisoners feel that their situation is unfair (Toman et al., 2015). Feelings of unfairness can result in individuals feeling greater levels of negative emotions such as

frustration. Furthermore, it also been found by Lahm (2009) "that the likelihood of an inmate assaulting a staff member increases as the inmate nears the end of his or her sentence" (pp.145-146). Some prisoners may find stressful the notion that they are about to be released because they are well adapted to prison and this strain increases the likelihood of coping through violence (Lahm, 2009). Once released, former prisoners must find a job, accommodation, rebuild connections and adjust to a society that has changed since their incarceration (more significantly for long-term prisoners). Therefore, a potential solution is to commit violence on a staff member or prisoner to get more time added to their sentence (Lahm, 2009).

2.1.3. Links Between Substance Misuse and Prison Violence

Another key factor that has been explored in research for its effects on inmate behaviour is pre-prison substance misuse. The two substances that are highlighted in the literature are alcohol and/or illicit drugs (Young, Wells and Gudjonsson, 2011). These two types of substances are also identified as risk factors for offending both in the prison environment and on release (Loucks and Zamble, 2000). Findings show that prior drug and alcohol use is positively correlated with violent misconduct in prison (Kuanliang and Sorensen, 2008; Pickard and Fazel, 2013; Jiang and Fisher-Giorlando, 2002; Franklin, Allison and Sutton, 1992). However, in Loucks and Zamble's (2000) research on female offenders' prison misconduct they only found a weak association between drug use and violent offending even though it is known as a widespread problem within the population. This finding indicates that there may be a difference in how genders respond in their behaviour to drug consumption in prison.

Individuals that have developed an addiction to these substances, whether that be illicit drugs (heroin, cocaine, psychoactive substances etc) or alcohol, will likely desire them during their prison sentence and may either commit violence in prison whilst under the influence of these substances or in order to acquire them. A large amount of alcohol consumption, for example, is said to "dampen fear, distort cognition, and reduce impulse control, which may lead to enhanced aggression" (Lundholm et al., 2013:110). And those under the influence of dangerous drugs such as synthetic cannabinoids are said to "become unpredictable, uncontrollable and violent" (Duke, 2020:13). Prisoners that view alcohol and drugs as coping mechanisms are also more at risk of being involved in violent acts both as aggressors and victims. For example, the desire to acquire drugs has led to prisoners being involved in fights, bullying or assaults (Crewe, 2005). Illicit substance-using individuals who

have become entangled in the prison drug market leave themselves open to threats and violence if they cannot pay their debts (Crewe, 2005). Debtors use violence to demonstrate their power and to send a message to others that if they do not pay their debts, they will also be violently targeted (Sazzad et al., 2020). The consequence of being in debt in prison is severe as it has been linked to prisoners developing "poor mental health" and demonstrating "suicide related behaviours" (Smith, Sharman and Roberts, 2022:401). Prisoners are however, limited in their ability to avoid violence as a result of being in debt. If they approach prison officers to inform them they are in danger, they risk being further violently targeted by prisoners as the act violates the inmates' code of conduct (Sazzad et al., 2020). Being viewed as a "snitch" by other inmates gives them a poor reputation for being weak and for breaking other prisoners' trust (Dirkzwager and Kruttschnitt, 2012:409). Another option that some victim prisoners choose is to defend themselves from potential attackers (Wooldredge, 2020). They use violence against those who pose a threat to their physical and mental well-being with the added intent to prevent future conflict by displaying to others that they are not to be considered weak (Wooldredge, 2020).

An added risk factor is if the substance user has a co-occurring serious mental illness such as PTSD, schizophrenia, major depression and/or bipolar disorder (Wood and Buttaro, 2013). Mentally ill substance users are at high risk of being victimised and assaulted (Wood and Buttaro, 2013). Furthermore, victimised mentally ill substance users are at greater risk of victimising others whether that be in the community or in prison (Wood and Buttaro, 2013; Mericle and Havassy, 2008). One explanation for this is that mentally ill victimised individuals are more likely to cope with strains through violent reactions because they suffer from high levels of anxiety and stress (Elbogen and Johnson, 2009). These arguments are further backed up by Pickard and Fazel (2013) who state that "the odds of violence in comparison with the general population increased by 8-10-fold in individuals with severe mental illness who abuse substances, whereas the odds of violence increased only around two-fold in non-substance abusing individuals with the same disorders" (p.4). According to these findings prisoners that misuse substances and have a mental illness may therefore be at great risk of committing violent misconduct in prison.

2.1.4. Links Between Mental Health/Illness and Prison Violence

Mental health has become in recent decades a matter of concern in contemporary society. Unsurprisingly, prisoners represent a sector of the population that disproportionally suffers from mental illness (Forrester et al., 2013; Jordan, 2011). Poor mental health can have

severe negative effects on an individual. If the psyche of the individual is unwell and put under strain, then prison life can become increasingly difficult to cope with. Outcomes such as self-harm and suicide have often been linked to poor mental health. The Prison Reform Trust (PRT) reported that "70% of people who died from self-inflicted means whilst in prison had already been identified with mental health needs" (PRT, 2021:15). The likelihood is that the percentage would be higher if the prison service were more successful at identifying those suffering from poor mental health. In the last decade, there has been a trend of violence, self-harm and suicide rising each year (Dearden, 2018). This has led to researchers and journalists claiming that E&W prisons are in crisis (Cavadino et al., 2013; PRT, 2023b; Martin, 2022). For example, in 2019, suicides in prison had "surged by 23 per cent across England and Wales in the past year" (Bulman, 2019:1).

Many prisoners enter prison with pre-existing mental health issues. Many within the prison population have "histories of abuse, deprivation, homelessness, unemployment and substance misuse" (Birmingham, 2003:192). The pains that these individuals have suffered in the past (pre-incarceration) have often left them vulnerable, lacking in adequate coping skills and social support (Swanson et al., 2012; Rocheleau, 2014). Therefore, the strains (i.e., deprivations, violence, overcrowding, bullying, intimidation and so on) that they face whilst in prison will likely be more impactful on the individual's mental health when compared to someone who has developed good social and coping skills (Link et al., 2016; Johnson Listwan et al., 2010).

Other prisoners who previously showed no sign of ill mental health may develop poor mental health once they are incarcerated (Hassan et al., 2011; Butler et al., 2005). Prisons can be traumatising for some individuals. They are depriving. They house people who have a background in violence, bullying and predatory behaviour (Edgar et al., 2003). The stress and anxiety that this can cause for some prisoners can lead them to poor mental health. Nurse, Woodcock and Ormsby (2003) found "that long periods of isolation with little mental stimulus contributed to poor mental health and led to intense feelings of anger, frustration, and anxiety" (p.1). This will have been the case for many prisoners due to the strict regimes imposed during Covid-19. As of writing, many prisoners are still being subjected to long periods of lock-up of up to 23 hours a day which takes a significant toll on their mental health (Bulman, 2022). What has been shown to contribute to inmate mental decline are strains such as "overcrowding, prison violence, isolation from previous social contacts, insecurities surrounding employment and relationship opportunities on release from prison, poor health and mental health service provision during imprisonment, and a general lack of privacy or forced solitary confinement" (Armour, 2012:888). Issues around overcrowding and mental

health support in E&W prisons have been identified as an overwhelming concern (MacDonald, 2018; Johnson et al., 2021). E&W prisons' failure to adequately manage overcrowding rates and improve mental health support/treatment will result in serious adverse outcomes (Johnson et al., 2021). Prisoners will continue to cope poorly. More specifically, they may cope by behaving violently due to their declining mental health (Toch and Kupers, 2007). This will be explored in more detail in the following paragraphs.

In recent years there has been a growing amount of research looking into the correlation between mental illness and prison violence (Toch and Kupers, 2007; Skar et al., 2019). What needs to be highlighted is that there are different types/degrees of mental illness. Individuals who have mental health conditions will not all exhibit the same emotional difficulties or behavioural problems. Examples of serious psychosis suffered by some individuals in prison are paranoia, command hallucinations and PTSD (Wood and Dennard, 2017). In a recent study, Darrell-Berry, Berry and Bucci (2016) found an association between paranoia and aggression. They explain that paranoid individuals are likely to resort to aggression as a safety response or as a means of retaliating against perceived threat. Paranoid people are instinctively more inclined to perceive others as threats and are likely to jump to unreasonable conclusions (Darrell-Berry et al., 2016). When perceived threats emerge there will be a desire to remove that threat through physical retaliation. Aggression, and perhaps the use of violence as a result, is a means of comfort and safety for those burdened by paranoid thoughts.

PTSD has been intensively researched because of its connections with prisoner experiences and violent behaviour. This condition is triggered by the experience of a traumatic event or multiple traumatic events. Evidence suggests that prisoners are disproportionately more likely to be suffering from PTSD than the general population and women prisoners are more likely to have PTSD than male prisoners (Sindicich et al., 2014; Allely and Allely, 2020). As stated in Baranyi et al.'s (2018) research "PTSD in female prisoners is approximately 3 times more frequent than in male prisoners" (p.142). This disparity is partially explained by the types of traumas women experience and the coping strategies they employ. Prior to prison women have a high chance of being victimised in their childhood and sexual assaulted in their lives (Baranyi et al., 2018). It is explained that the way these women cope tends to be maladaptive. For example, they tend to exhibit "more frequent and heavier use of substances, and passive and avoidance-focused coping styles" (Baranyi et al., 2018:143). It should be noted however, that many male prisoners, prior to imprisonment, will also have disproportionately endured traumatic events when compared to the general population (Baranyi et al., 2018). Whilst there are significant numbers of individuals going to prison with

diagnosed or undiagnosed PTSD, some others may develop PTSD whilst in prison. As has been mentioned prisons are typically characterised as unsafe places populated by individuals some of whom have violent backgrounds. The prevalence of inmate violence/assaults is a trauma that is heavily linked to the development of PTSD in prisoners (Armour, 2012).

As with both paranoia and command hallucinations, PTSD has been shown to be positively correlated with aggressive and violent behaviour (Facer-Irwin et al., 2019). Interestingly, Facer-Irwin et al.'s (2019) sample found that this was particularly true with adult prisoners suffering from PTSD when compared to youth prisoners. Many of those who have been shown to exhibit anti-social and violent behaviour are those who experienced trauma, victimisation, and neglect as a child (McCallum, 2018). Those who have experienced childhood trauma tend to find stressors more difficult to manage/cope with compared to those who did not experience trauma as a child. As such, these individuals are more likely to find the prison experience more challenging and traumatic. Aspects of the prison environment such as abusive staff members and inmates that remind them of their past abusers may trigger their PTSD, resulting in their feeling anxiety and anger (McCallum, 2018). The anger they feel may in turn lead to violence against their perceived abusers.

There is also research that indicates that those who suffer from a mental disorder are more vulnerable and more likely to be victims of violence than those who are mentally well. Daquin and Daigle (2018) found that "prisoners with depression and/or personality disorder were more vulnerable than prisoners without disorder" (p.148). However, "those who reported depressive conditions, paranoia, and/or hallucinations were more vulnerable" (Daquin and Daigle, 2018:148). In a different study similar results were found. Blitz, Wolff and Shi (2008) found that "rates of physical victimisation for males with any mental disorder were 1.6 times (inmate-on-inmate) and 1.2 times (staff-on-inmate) higher than that of males with no mental disorder" (p.391). The evidence suggests that these individuals are disproportionately vulnerable to attacks and as such need extra support from prison staff members. There are many reasons why those suffering from mental illnesses are disproportionately victimised. One reason is that their disorder/illness is perceived and labelled as weak by their peers (Haney, 2017; Schnittker and Bacak, 2016). Typically, in a male prison toughness and strength are highly valued (Kupers, 2005). Controlling one's emotions and feelings is important to survive the ordeal of prison. Those who are viewed as "weak in the head" go against those values and therefore, in the eyes of more hardened prisoners, they may be seen to deserve to be targeted and victimised (Kupers, 2005:720). Some prisoners simply find the behaviour of prisoners with mental health conditions annoying, making them either

frustrated or angry enough to assault these individuals (Haney, 2017). As a result of being persistently targeted by other inmates those prisoners with mental health conditions tend to become more conscious of their declining mental state but often suffer in silence without notifying the staff members (Haney, 2017).

However, it should be said that having a mental illness and/or suffering from poor mental health does not necessarily mean that individuals will decide to cope by committing violence on others. Many individuals are likely to become depressed or suffer from anxiety due to their declining mental health and become more reclusive (Harris and Lovell, 2001). Some may decide to self-harm or commit suicide due to their declining mental health (Gates et al., 2017). Others may decide to cope with their mental health problems through seeking and consuming illegal substances (Fazel et al., 2016). However, by trying to cope with poor mental health through the consumption of illicit substances such as spice, these prisoners are inadvertently increasing their chances of being assaulted by getting into debt (Ralphs et al., 2017). The consumption of spice has become increasingly common in the E&W prison system and has been linked to increased levels of prisoner aggression and violent behaviour (Norton, 2019; Grace, Lloyd and Perry, 2020; Ralphs et al., 2017). Therefore, poor mental health increases prisoners' chances of being assaulted or of assaulting others, due to poor coping methods which have violent risks associated with them.

2.1.5. Links Between Violent Criminal History and Prison Violence

In 2016, 13% of those in E&W who were sent to prison had committed a violence against a person offence (Cuthbertson, 2017:6). This percentage of prisoners would be classified as high risk due to the violent nature of their crime and the perceived threat they pose inside prison (Maguire, 2021). A prisoner's history of violent crime has often been associated with prison violence (Cunnigham et al., 2011; Gendreau et al., 1997). In Drury and DeLisi (2010) research they found that males who have a criminal history of violence were likely to engage in major institutional misconduct. However, that was not the case for female prisoners who have similar violent criminal pasts. Their justification for this unexpected finding is that it is either "a result of the classification instrument segregating females who have a history of violence into restrictive confinement spaces" or it is perhaps simply a statistical anomaly (Drury and DeLisi, 2010:347). Furthermore, it has been found that individuals that have a more recent history of violence are more at risk of being violent in prison (Austin, 2003). It is perhaps understandable that individuals that have a violent crime history but have refrained from violence for a number of years would be less likely to commit violent acts in prison.

However, those who have committed violence recently have demonstrated that they are less able to cope in a non-aggressive manner. It has also been found that individuals who have a long/extensive history of violent crimes are more likely to commit violence in prison (Berg and DeLisi, 2006). Also, individuals who have extensive histories of being in gangs prior to incarceration are more likely to be involved in violent misconduct in prison (MacDonald, 1999).

What can be inferred from these findings is that individuals that have only demonstrated violent/criminal behaviour a handful of times are not necessarily prone to violence. Consistent patterns of deviant/criminal behaviour on the other hand do appear to have an impact on an individual's ability to adjust adequately to the prison environment. In the hyper-masculine prison culture, there is an expectation that prisoners demonstrate "a capacity for 'masculine dominance', toughness, physical prowess, aggressiveness and even 'breadwinning' through institutional employment" (Michalski, 2017:50). Individuals that have prior histories of being violent are more likely to adapt and conform to these expectations of displaying a hyper-masculine violent persona as they have previous experience of displaying these behaviours (Maguire, 2021). In Reidy, Sorensen and Cunningham's (2012) research they highlighted different violent crimes that they found to be related to violent behaviour in prison. For example, those who committed assaults prior to arrest were more likely to exhibit violent behaviour in prisons (Reidy et al., 2012). However, those who had committed murder prior to imprisonment were not associated with violent misconduct in prison. Furthermore, robbery was also found to be associated with violent misconduct. Individuals who have a current conviction of robbery are more likely to exhibit violent behaviour than those who have a prior history of robbery (Reidy et al., 2012). These findings indicate that the types of crimes committed affect a prisoner's behaviour, as well as the recency of the conviction for that crime.

2.2. How do E&W Prisons Manage Violence?

However, in order for prison violence not to become an endemic issue, the prison must maintain order and control (Sparks, Bottoms and Hay, 1996). Along with security, good order within prisons is a priority task for the prison administration (Coyle, 2005). Without good order, prison staff, visitors and prisoners themselves could not expect to feel safe within the prison environment (Coyle, 2005). For researchers such as Sparks et al. (1996), violence is absent when social order is maintained. They define social order thus:

"An orderly situation is any long-standing pattern of social relations (characterised by a minimum level of respect for persons) in which the expectations that participants have of one another are commonly met, though not necessarily without contestation. Order can also, in part, be defined negatively as the absence of violence, overt conflict or the imminent threat of the chaotic breakdown of social routines" (Sparks et al., 1996:119).

It should be noted that this conception of prison order is by no means universally agreed upon. Furthermore, how the Criminal Justice System (CJS) decide to achieve good order also differs depending on the prison system (i.e., categorisation) and the time period (Sparks et al., 1996). To compartmentalise the various means by which prison systems have attempted to achieve order and control, it is also important to divide them into two categories: "reactive" and "proactive" (Bennett, 2007:521). Reactive measures attempt to "reassert control after an incident" whereas proactive measures attempt to prevent disorder from occurring in the first place (Bennett, 2007:521). In this section, various types of reactive and/or proactive measures are analysed to explain their role in quelling violence and maintaining order and control. The measures include prison officers, IEP scheme, family contact methods, penal management, rehabilitation methods and prison design.

2.2.1. The Role of the Prison Officer in Managing Violence

One of the key figures within the prison system that acts as both a passive and reactive means of providing good order, by either preventing or punishing prison violence, is the prison officer (Arnold, 2016). Fundamentally the central role of a prison officer has always been one of control, with the intention of eliminating disorder and providing security within the complex (Liebling, Price and Shefer, 2011). However, the ways in which prison officers have sought to achieve control and order within prison have varied historically as their roles have become increasingly more complex since their initial conception (Home Office, 2009).

The presence of prison officers in any prison institution serves as a form of deterrent against violence and misconduct (Coyle, 2005). If prisoners are aware that they are being watched by officers they will be less likely to deviate from their tasks and get up to mischief (Foucault, 1977). Prison officers' duties were originally straightforward with little doubt as to what was expected from them - to maintain order and ensure that no one escapes. However, as the mid 20th century saw the CJS change its emphasis from deterrence and hard punishment towards a rehabilitative ideal, prisons saw corresponding changes in the functions and roles

of the prison officer (Home Office, 2009). As such, in the latter half of the 20th century and early 21st century, prison officers are expected to operate a system of rehabilitation as well as maintaining order and security. These two ideals are believed by some academics and prison officers to be at odds with one another, potentially impinging on the original expectations of the prison officer as the one who maintains control and security within the prison system (Coyle, 2005). Whilst in the 19th century, prison officers were not supposed to interact with prisoners, nowadays they are the prisoners' first point of contact for support and help (Johnston, 2008; Hobbs and Dear, 2000). Prison officers therefore have become more central to the progression of a prisoner's journey back into the community (Hobbs and Dear, 2000). The Howard League's (2017) research found that many of the officers considered that the numerous tasks that they are responsible for and the limited number of resources that they have at their disposal result in their not being able to do their jobs effectively, i.e., a "Jack of all trades, master of none" (p.3).

In many ways this shift towards prisoners and prison officers having increased levels of (positive) interaction has arguably helped with the management of order and violence within prison (Hearn, Joseph and Fitzpatrick, 2021). In one regard, the positive attribute to this change has been the potential for prisoners to view prison officers as someone they can, to some extent, trust and not to see them as a continual source of conflict (Bennett and Shuker, 2010). They can be considered by prisoners as support mechanisms rather than aggressive authority figures who add to inmates' deprivations and pains (Hobbs and Dear, 2000). Positive relationships between inmates and prison officers are thus an important contributor to the maintenance of order. But for prisoners to comply positively with prison officers' commands, their relationships must be based on consent and respect (Drake, 2008). When prison officers use their authority and power it must be seen as justifiable. The over-use of their power, such as use of unnecessary force, compromises any respect that prisoners may have towards prison officers. The same, however, can be said about the under-use of their power (Drake, 2008). Prison officers must show that they have the authority to take control of a violent situation (Steiner and Wooldredge, 2018). As such, if prison officers under-utilise the powers afforded to them then disorder can still be the result. Balance must be struck between authority and inmate respect if we are to expect prisoners to remain orderly and non-violent (Steiner and Wooldredge, 2018).

A key example of prison officers being expected to create a positive relationship with E&W prisoners can be seen with the introduction of the key worker scheme in 2018 (HM Inspectorate of Probation, 2022). The key worker role involves each prison officer supervising and supporting five or six prisoners, and provides a new method of offender

management, with the emphasis placed on prisoners and prison officers engaging with each other in a non-conflict scenario (HM Inspectorate of Probation, 2022; Leeming, 2019). Each prisoner should be given an average of 45 minutes each week with their dedicated key worker (PRT, 2023g). These sessions are tailored to the prisoner's particular needs at that time (Leeming, 2019). Prisoners may discuss aspects of their week which have caused them stress or strain. They may also highlight if they have been getting into fights, have been consuming drugs or are feeling suicidal. It is the key worker's duty to guide these prisoners to the programmes and treatments that they need based on this information (Pike and George, 2019). It was expected that this consistent support provided by key workers would alleviate some of the stressors that prisoners deal with whilst in prison and would help reduce violence in prison (Leeming, 2019). However, due to a variety of factors such as the impact of the pandemic the scheme has been fraught with issues. At the height of the pandemic the key worker scheme was suspended due to the need for limited physical contact between prisoners and staff members (Criminal Justice Joint Inspection, 2022). This has resulted in prison officers being less able to create positive relationships with prisoners. Recent reports have criticised the handling of the key worker scheme since its re-introduction for being "far too limited" (HM Inspectorate of Prisons, 2023d:23). In Pentonville, Birmingham, Stocken and Preston prisons for example, the reports have found that there are very few key worker sessions being conducted (HM Inspectorate of Prisons, 2023c; HM Inspectorate of Prisons, 2023d; HM Inspectorate of Prisons, 2023e; HM Inspectorate of Prisons, 2023g). Many prisoners in Birmingham and Stocken prison are unaware of who their key workers are and this has resulted in many prisoners viewing the scheme as not being beneficial with some refusing to participate (HM Inspectorate of Prisons, 2023d; HM Inspectorate of Prisons, 2023e). For the key worker scheme to improve violent behaviour key workers must provide support to their allocated prisoners consistently throughout their sentence otherwise it is unlikely that positive improvements will be made.

Though there are many proactive measures used to prevent violence from occurring, there will be some occasions in the work of a prison officer when they will have to react to a violent incident (Liebling et al., 2011). When a prisoner dispute escalates in a violent manner, prison officers have various methods to employ to resolve this conflict. One simple method is for the officers to communicate with the inmates and try to reason with them and calm them down (Crawley, 2004). Their use of language can help deescalate a situation without using force. As Liebling (2011) argues, "being a good prison officer involves being good at not using force, but still getting things done" (p.496). However, in trying to deescalate a violent dispute prison officers can make the situation worse if they do not follow their training (Koedijk et al., 2019). Body language and tone is a vital consideration (Ministry of Justice

(MoJ), 2006). Officers are advised that they must appear confident to the prisoner in order to display their authority (MoJ, 2006). When communicating, they should lower their voice and speak calmly and clearly (MoJ, 2006). And most importantly when trying to resolve the situation they should not threaten inmates because of the likelihood this will intensify the situation (MoJ, 2006). Being an effective prison officer therefore requires being a skilled communicator who is able to manage their emotions in hostile situations (Arnold, 2016).

However, there will be instances where this method will not resolve the situation and physical force must be used. In order for prisoner officers to apply their physical force effectively they undergo strict regimented training for many weeks (Bolger and Bennett, 2008). Prior to "the mid-1970s prison staff did not receive specific training in riot control and training in how to subdue a violent prisoner was very limited" (Coyle, 2005:150). Inadequate training results in violent incidents being increasingly met with excessive use of force (Coyle, 2005). Therefore, there was a call for prison staff to be better trained in dealing with violent incidents. This led to the introduction of a method of subduing violent prisoners with the reduced possibility of injury. This technique is called control and restraint (Arnold, 2008). Four members of staff are required to apply this restraint. Coyle (2005) explains the process as follows: "one holds his head, two others take an arm each while one holds both legs, with the two holding his hands applying the wrist locks" (p.151). If the prisoner calms down the officers must reduce the pressure, they are placing on the individual. If the inmate continues their resistance, they will apply more pressure which will eventually become unbearable for the recipient (Coyle, 2005). It is argued that, if done properly, the advantage of this technique is that there will be no long-lasting harm to the inmate (Coyle, 2005).

However, despite this advanced training and technique there remains the risk of officers over-using force (Liebling and Crewe, 2012; Liebling, Price and Elliot, 1999). In the 1980s and early 1990s in particular, prison officers were criticised for their negative attitudes and use of force towards prisoners (Liebling and Crewe, 2012). If prison officers become too reliant on using physical force to subdue prisoners in the pursuit of maintaining order, this can have a negative effect on prisoner behaviour. As stated by Steiner and Wooldredge (2018) "an overreliance on coercion or force can promote defiance and resistance among inmates" (p.754). If prisoners perceive that officers are abusing the powers afforded to them then their perception of them as legitimate authority figures is damaged, thereby justifying defiant/violent behaviour towards untrustworthy prison staff (Steiner and Wooldredge, 2018). It is therefore important that order is maintained through the legitimate balance between the use of language and force. This requires competent discretionary decision-making on the part of prison officers (Liebling, 2000).

2.2.2. The Role of Incentives in the Proactive Management of Violence

In 1995, a new method of managing behaviour called the Incentives and Earned Privileges (IEP) Scheme was introduced (Pratt and Grimwood, 2014). The IEP scheme aims to encourage good behaviour (PRT, 2020a). Prisoners are incentivised to conform because of the rewards they can attain by doing so. To obtain these privileges, the inmates need to show levels of participation in constructive activity, which both helps them at an individual level through gaining skills and knowledge, but also helps at the macro institutional level by maintaining a sense of order and control (Liebling, 2008). However, while inmates can be rewarded for good behaviour, they can also be punished through loss of privileges under this scheme. Recently four levels have been introduced (prior to this change there were three). Prisoners are placed in a level according to their behaviour. These four levels are "Basic, Entry (the new level), Standard and Enhanced" (Pratt and Grimwood, 2014:2). The guidelines show that the scheme is based on the pursuit of order and rehabilitation. In order to achieve the desired enhanced package a prisoner must "have demonstrated for a minimum of three months a commitment to their rehabilitation and adherence to the regime" (Pratt and Grimwood, 2014:2), whereas to be reduced from entry level to basic level prisoners must "have not demonstrated a sufficient commitment to rehabilitation or … have behaved badly" (Pratt and Grimwood, 2014:2). When prisoners are placed on a basic package, they are only entitled to the goods and services that the law says they must have such as some letters, visits, and the minimum spending limit of £27.50 for un-convicted prisoners and £5.50 for convicted prisoners (MoJ, 2022a:11; PRT, 2023f). Currently the type of privileges that prisoners can earn are – "be allowed to wear your own clothes, have more visits, a TV in your cell, or to spend more of your money" (PRT, 2023d:1). All these privileges are subject to being removed if the individual breaks the rules or participates insufficiently in their rehabilitation programmes. The idea is that prisoners will think twice about acting aggressively in the prison environment because of the potential of losing their privileges (Khan, 2022). This line of thinking is based on concepts such as rationality (Scott, 2000).

Rational Choice Theory argues the case that all individuals make decisions based on reason (Scott, 2000). We weigh up the benefits and consequences of our decided actions, whether we are demonstrating good behaviour or bad behaviour (Scott, 2000). However, there are problems with Rational Choice Theory. For example, it does not take into account how much emotions and impulsivity play a part in acts of deviancy and misbehaviour (Walters, 2015). Emotions can in many cases "interfere with decision making" (Walters, 2015:3). It is difficult

to believe that all acts that humans commit are done with complete rationality. This will especially be the case in a prison environment, an environment where feelings of insecurity for many prisoners will be near constant, resulting in negative emotions such as fear and aggression (Crewe et al., 2014; Blevins et al., 2010). This raises the question of whether we should expect prisoners to act rationally by making good behavioural decisions in such hostile environments, and therefore, whether it is fair to have a system where privileges are unequally distributed based on behavioural decision-making.

The following section explores a key example of a coping mechanism which HMPPS considers to be, to some extent, a privilege that must be earned (McCarthy and Adams, 2017). This privilege is regular family contact for prisoners.

2.2.3. The Provision of Family Contact in Managing Violence

An important service that prisons provide for prisoners is the means to contact their family members. All prisoners are deprived of their liberty (Sykes, 1958). Their ability to communicate with family and friends becomes limited which is a painful fact for many prisoners (Dixey and Woodall, 2012). Family members and friends can stay in touch with the prisoner by sending a letter, receiving a phone/video call, and/or visiting the individual in prison (PRT, 2023e). All these contact methods are valued and significantly help maintain relations between both parties.

In recent decades, both the prison service and the research literature have placed more emphasis on the importance of maintaining prisoner relationships with family members and friends (Dixey and Woodall, 2012). This is because research has shown that "the existence and maintenance of strong interpersonal relationships with friends or family reduces the likelihood of re-offending and successful reintegration into the community" (De Claire and Dixon, 2017:185). Strong family ties help facilitate housing for many prisoners once they are sent back into the community. Those who find themselves homeless, on the other hand, will more likely find it difficult to cope without resorting to criminal acts (Fischer et al., 2008). Prison visits can also have a strong positive effect on a prisoner's behaviour and overall well-being (De Claire and Dixon, 2017). There are several explanations as to why prisoner violent behaviour can be influenced by visits. For example, social bonds (i.e., family and friends) can act as informal social control for prisoners as they may help discourage them from violent behaviour (Berghuis et al., 2021). Visits and other contact methods are important in maintaining/improving these bonds. However, this argument only applies if the

social bonds they have encourage moral behaviour (Berghuis et al., 2021). Some prisoners' family and friends may not be a positive influence and may instead advocate poor/aggressive behaviour (Berghuis et al., 2021). Visits can also help prisoners cope with the prison strains, such as feelings of isolation and loss (Cochran and Mears, 2013). Prisoners who can cope better with strains due to having social support networks are more likely to avoid illegitimate behaviour such as violence (Rocheleau, 2015).

To some extent prison visits have become a regulatory tool used by the prison service to manage behaviour. Whilst in prison, every prisoner has a statutory entitlement to visits from family members and friends. However, some prisoners may be given more time with their family and friends than others, as well as a better-quality visit under the IEP scheme. As stated in the IEP Scheme framework "prisoners on Standard, Enhanced or levels above Enhanced may receive improved visits, which could include additional visits over their statutory entitlement, visits in better surroundings, or longer visits" (MoJ, 2022a:13). Basic level prisoners therefore miss out on quality time with their family compared to their peers due to their misbehaviour. Questions therefore are raised as to whether this leads to basic level prisoners feeling emotions such as envy, frustration and/or anger towards the prison service and other prisoners. It can be assumed that for many prisoners, missing out on quality time with family members will be painful (McCarthy and Adams, 2017). Visits are a chance for prisoners to express themselves emotionally and to feel safe in an otherwise intimidating environment (Crewe, 2014). It is possible, as the prison service hopes, that prisoners will decide to improve their behaviour (i.e., commit fewer violent acts) in order to be given more visits (Hutton, 2017). However, the opposite could also be true. Feeling that the system is unfair, some prisoners may lose the motivation to improve themselves or lash out. There have been cases of male prisoners having their visiting time with their children reduced to just two hours a month due to their behaviour (Allison, 2015). Not only does that punish the prisoner but it also punishes the children who already have limited time to spend with their parent. The harmful effects of children and parents being separated are known to be severe (Murray, 2013). The prison service recognises this to some extent as they do not allow for the adjustment of women prisoners' visits, as they consider it to be a human right for both women and their children (McCarthy and Adams, 2017). However, this does not apply to male prisoners. This gendered difference in contacts and visits with children further compounds the unfairness of the prison service's IEP system (McCarthy and Adams, 2017). The IEP agenda risks harming the efforts made to maintain prisoner-family relationships. For McCarthy and Adams (2017) visits in E&W prisons need to be reframed less as a privilege and more as a right. If incentives are required to help prisoners make better choices, then there is an argument for the existence of IEP. However, using visits as a

privilege/punishment comes with potential risks and harms. Harm could be done to both prisoners' families and to the offender's rehabilitation efforts (McCarthy and Adams, 2017).

2.2.4. The Role of Penal Management: Security, Risk, and Categorisations

In the pursuit of addressing violence the E&W prison system proactively manages prisoners through categorisations and risk assessments (Shingler, Sonnenberg and Needs., 2020; Drake, 2012).

2.2.4.1. Prison Categorisations

The allocation of individuals to a certain category of prison is partly based on security risk, in other words the risk to public safety posed by an individual if they were to escape (Drake, 2012; MoJ, 2021a). In total there are four different prison categories in E&W, those being A, B, C and D (MoJ, 2021a). Category D prisons are for prisoners posing the lowest security risk, whereas category A prisoners require maximum security as they are deemed a significant threat to the public if they were to escape (Drake, 2012; MoJ, 2021a). This is why a large number of those housed in category A prisons are those presenting a terrorist threat. However, whilst the risk to national security is certainly a significant factor in the staff's decision-making and assessments, consideration is also given concerning their risk to prison order (Drake, 2012). The Ministry of Justice (MoJ) state that part of the staff's decision to allocate a prisoner to a category will be dependent on whether that individual might harm others - both staff members and other inmates (MoJ, 2021a). Prisoners' history of violence therefore contributes to their freedoms and pains in prison as it dictates whether they are housed in more open prison conditions or more oppressive restrictive prison environments. Their risk of harm is measured through the method of risk assessments as will be discussed in the following section.

2.2.4.2. Risk Assessments and Violence

A key method of managing violent individuals in prisons has been through the use of risk assessments (Cooke, Wozniak and Johnstone, 2008; Axelsson, Eriksson and Grip, 2023). Risk assessments inform decisions made in the prison system and impact prisoners' experience in both positive and negative ways. These assessments are considered an important tool for the purpose of risk management (Shingler et al., 2020). They inform parole

decisions and help decide whether Indeterminate Sentenced Prisoners[2] can be considered safe for release. The purpose of risk assessments in prison is to predict whether an individual will pose a threat in the future through their behaviour in prison or in the community once released (Fernandez and Lasala, 2021). Violent offending, for example, is considered a type of behaviour that can cause serious harm (traumatic/life threatening) to others therefore HMPPS aims to reduce the likelihood of that offence reoccurring and thus aims to protect potential victims (GOV.UK, 2022c).

Risk assessment tools predict the chances of an individual committing future offences by collecting information on their characteristics (age, medical history etc); past criminality; current attitudes and behaviour; and their environment (Meredith, Speir and Johnson, 2007). Once individuals who pose a risk of violence in prison are identified, then appropriate security measures and interventions can be applied to that prisoner (Cunningham, Sorensen and Reidy, 2005; Abbiati et al., 2019). Risk factors associated with an individual can be either static or dynamic. Static measures such as "personality disorder, previous convictions for violence or violence at a young age" are factors that are unchangeable and cannot be completely corrected (Constantinou et al., 2015:7511). Dynamic measures on the other hand "such as criminal networks, substance use/misuse, or serious mental illness" are instead considered amenable to treatment/intervention (Constantinou et al., 2015:7511). By identifying dynamic/amenable variables that are related to a prisoner's violent behaviour the prison system can treat and/or manage those risk factors (Polaschek, Yesberg and Chauhan, 2018). Treatments such as Cognitive Behavioural Therapy (CBT) will be offered in the attempt to improve the offender's coping behaviour and to reduce their considered risk. Ideally, from the perspective of HMPPS, a prisoner can be transformed from a high-risk offender to an offender that can be considered for release (Polaschek et al., 2018). It is argued that the ideal management and treatment of offenders involves targeting individual risks (identified dynamic risk factors) (Maguire and Raynor, 2017). However, prison programmes such as Enhanced Thinking Skills and Reasoning and Rehabilitation have been criticised for such a "one size fits all" approach in the past rather than addressing individual specific needs (Maguire and Raynor, 2017:152). It can be argued that risk assessments can serve the interest of offenders by identifying their needs to be addressed through rehabilitation but can also serve as an oppressive means of categorising prisoners (Crewe, 2011a).

---

[2] Indeterminate Sentenced Prisoners do not have a fixed release because they are viewed as a danger to the public (MoJ, 2023). Prisoners serving this sentence either have a "life sentence", "an imprisonment for Public Protection Sentence" or a "Detention for Public Protection (DPP) sentence" (PRT, 2023h:1).

Indeed, Crewe (2011a) identifies psychological assessments as being another example of prison pains. Some prisoners view risk assessments as a dehumanising process, through which their characters are being measured, labelled, and scrutinised (Crewe, 2011a). Prisoners argue that their past and current personal vulnerabilities are turned against them and viewed as risks rather than something that could be overcome through support (Maruna, 2011). Prisoners have also voiced concern that too much emphasis is placed on their past wrongdoings, instead of what they have been able to achieve whilst in prison (Maruna, 2011; Shingler et al., 2020). This form of mindset has the destructive potential of devaluing positive behavioural changes.

On the other hand, HMPPS see their duty to "protect the public" as of the utmost importance (Karthaus, Block and Hu, 2019:195). Protecting the public from offenders can be achieved in multiple ways. Either they keep 'risky' offenders in prison indefinitely (i.e., Indeterminate Sentenced Prisoners) or eventually release these risky offenders after they have completed their prescribed treatments/programmes and have demonstrated positive behavioural changes. Both come with risk and ethical concerns. However, when it comes to positively impacting prison behaviour/violence, prisoners must believe they have a goal they can achieve without it being unjustly blocked (Blevins et al., 2010). For most, that goal would be eventual release. If they believe the process is unfairly rigged against them they are less likely to conform to acceptable behaviour (Blevins et al., 2010). The hopelessness and stress that many Indeterminate Sentenced Prisoners feel, for example, regarding risk assessments and parole boards, have taken a toll on their emotional/mental well-being (Shingler et al., 2020; Annison, 2018).

2.2.5. The Role of Rehabilitation in Reducing Violence

Although punishment and the assessment of risks play a role in managing and maintaining order in prison, rehabilitation also plays an important role. This section will specifically look at how the provision of CBT programmes and education in E&W prison can help reduce violent incidents.

2.2.5.1. CBT Programmes

In the 1970s rehabilitation as an ideal was on the decline because research was producing evidence of ineffective offender treatment and rehabilitation (Cullen, 2013). Thus, there was little confidence by both liberals and conservatives that rehabilitation should be a priority in

offender management (Cullen, 2013). As a result, it was considered for a period that retributive and punitive measures were the only means by which to effectively reduce crime (Hollin and Bilby, 2007). However, since the 1990s there has been a push back from this by researchers, who argue that "poor methodologies could be responsible, at least in part, for the nothing works findings" (Hollin and Bilby, 2007:610). As a result, more research has been done on "What Works" when it comes to inmate rehabilitation (Hollin and Bilby, 2007:613). Based on meta-analysis research conducted in the 1980s, new forms of programmes were developed in the early 1990s in E&W prisons to help tackle inmate behavioural issues (including violence) (Hollin and Bibly, 2007:613).

The two CBT programmes that were first introduced in E&W prisons were Reasoning & Rehabilitation in 1992 and Thinking Skills in 1993 (which was later renamed Enhanced Thinking Skills) (Clarke, Simmonds and Wydall, 2004). Reasoning and Rehabilitation, for example, aimed to address areas of prisoners' social cognitive functioning such as: "self-control and self-management; interpersonal problem-solving and social interaction; rigid/inflexible thinking; social perspective taking; analytical thinking; and moral reasoning" (Clarke et al., 2004:1). By providing prisoners with these skills, it is hoped that they can manage and cope with their lives better inside prison and in the community. These programmes are based on Social Learning Theory which argues that some individuals have not attained the necessary cognitive and social skills to deal with social situations in a positive manner (Berman, 2004). Studies have shown that offenders generally have "ineffective problem-solving skills" (Palmer, 2003:20). Programmes mainly target "youth offenders, drug users, violent offenders and sex offenders" (Berman, 2004:86). It is hoped that by learning these skills these individuals will lead more legitimate (and less violent) lifestyles, which will therefore reduce reconviction rates at a national level (Pullen, 1996). Since the introduction of Reasoning & Rehabilitation and Enhanced Thinking Skills in E&W prisons, CBT programmes have grown both in popularity and in quantity as a means to address specific behavioural issues (Maguire and Raynor, 2017). Examples of recently run programmes offered in prisons which are tailor-made for managing violent behaviours are:

- Choices, Actions, Relationships and Emotions,
- Chromis,
- Cognitive Self Change Programme,
- RESOLVE,
- Self-Change Programme (MoJ, 2020a).

Each programme is designed for different types of offenders who have certain needs or problems. Chromis, for example, is designed for offenders who pose a high risk of violence and display psychopathic traits (MoJ, 2020a). Unlike other behavioural therapies, Chromis "does not aim to change personality traits but to work with these to reduce individuals' risk of violent reoffending" (Tew and Atkinson, 2013:417). Positive findings have been revealed in relation to Chromis's effectiveness. Most importantly it was found that when individuals took part in the programmes there was "a reduction in actual acts of physical and verbal aggression" (Tew and Atkinson, 2013:427).

Overall, CBT can be useful in providing prisoners with the skills that they need to cope effectively and legitimately. Research evidence suggests that behavioural programmes can have a positive effect on inmate anger and violent behaviour when applied correctly in a way that targets the specific needs of the individual prisoner (i.e., substance/alcohol abuse, personality disorder) (Auty et al., 2017; Blacker, Watson and Beech, 2008). CBT programmes when delivered effectively have been found to be more effective than educational/vocation programmes in reducing institutional violence (Auty et al., 2017). However, it has been argued that the delivery of these CBT programmes is negatively affected due to a lack of experienced and trained psychology/mental health staff, frequent session cancellations (as a consequence of staff shortages and lockdowns) and a reduction in what is being offered (HM Inspectorate of Prisons, 2023f; Pratt et al., 2016). This is problematic because it results in a greater waiting period for prisoners to gain access to programmes they need in order to progress and results in many inmates feeling frustrated and angry towards the institution (HM Inspectorate of Prisons, 2023f). What these findings suggest is that although CBT programmes can be effective in reducing prison violence, if they are, however, not properly resourced they will fail in the pursuit of improving prisoners' behaviour.

2.2.5.2. Prison Education

It is important to note that CBT is not the only rehabilitative method that prisons employ to manage and reduce violence. Another method is the provision of education (Blakey, 2017). Each prison in E&W provides some education but that does not mean that all prisoners attend (Czerniawski, 2016; Ellison et al., 2017). For nearly two decades, prison policy has been focused "on improving the literacy and numeracy rates of prisoners" (Ellison et al., 2017:110). The focus on improving literacy and numeracy is to ensure that prisoners have the basic skills to find employment once released from prison (Crabbe, 2016). This is important because reports show that "half of Britain's prisoners are functionally illiterate"

(Moss, 2017:1). Also, it has been identified that two-thirds of offenders in custody have numeracy skills at or below the level expected of an 11-year-old (Crabbe, 2016:1). Based on these statistics it is clear that many individuals in prison, if they do not receive help to improve these skills and gain qualifications, will struggle once released.

It has long been expressed by researchers that providing offenders with good quality education will help reduce recidivism, which is a much sought-after goal of any criminal justice institution (Crabbe, 2016). Education equips offenders with the knowledge and qualifications to find employment. However, the benefits of education go deeper than that. Education also helps improve inmate behaviour. Gaining qualifications boosts inmates' confidence and self-esteem (Vandala, 2019). Having low self-esteem or a poor sense of self-worth has a multitude of negative effects. These negative effects have been listed as "psychological distress, depression, and antisocial behaviour" (Debowska, Boduszek and Sherretts, 2017:1240). Improving self-esteem helps inmates to cope better with the various strains they will face within the prison environment and in the outside world (Debowska et al., 2017). Prisoners who cannot cope because of their low self-esteem can become violent/aggressive (Baumeister, Bushman and Campbell, 2000). Therefore, providing prisoners with goals and achievements such as education and qualifications is important for prisons to manage violent behaviour.

Another purpose of prison education is to reduce boredom and frustration (Rocheleau, 2013). Prison education therefore can be used as a tool to prevent violence both inside and outside prison. This line of thinking is comparable to the hard labour, hard board and hard fare policies that existed in the 19th century Victorian era. Keeping prisoners busy with work will prevent them from misbehaving (Adamson, 1984). However, education is clearly a more positive distraction with good psychological benefits, when compared with hard labour (Baranger et al., 2018). Furthermore, the goal of finding means to quell boredom has credibility. For example, Rocheleau (2013) found that "prisoners who found it particularly difficult to deal with boredom … were more likely at risk of serious misconduct and violence" (p.354). It is argued that prisoners who are segregated or are in their cells for long hours have too much time to reflect on their negative life experiences, leaving them frustrated, upset and angry (Rocheleau, 2013). Because of this there is a risk that they will react violently towards themselves and/or others (Blevins et al., 2010).

Recent reports, however, indicate that education in most E&W prisons does not meet good standards (House of Commons, 2022; HM Inspectorate of Prisons, 2023a). For example, it was reported by Ofsted on December 2020 "that nearly two-thirds of inspections showed

poor management of the quality of education, skills, and work in the custodial estate" (House of Commons, 2022:3). Education is poor in E&W prisons for several reasons; it is not considered a priority by governors; there is a lack of funding; constant changes in educational management and conditions for teachers; lack of prisoner participation; the curriculum is poor; and there is a lack of accountability for the quality of education (Czerniawski, 2016; HM Inspectorate of Prisons, 2023a). The issue surrounding education in prisons is that when compared to matters of safety and security it is often viewed by governors as less of a concern (HM Inspectorate of Prisons, 2023a). This prioritisation is problematic because, as highlighted earlier, quality education indirectly improves prisoner behaviour, thereby making the prison environment safer and more secure.

2.2.6. The Role of Prison Design in Violence Management

A determining factor in prisoner behaviour is the design and architecture of the prison environment itself (Useem and Piehl, 2006). It is argued that at the macro level, how prison architecture is designed provides a lens which reveals the ways in which the state perceives and values its citizens either controlling them through strict/depriving regimes or offering decent standards of living and opportunity for them to grow as moral people (Weinrath, Budzinski and Melnyk, 2016). On a micro level, prison architectural design shapes the daily lives of those housed there, both prisoners and staff (Weinrath et al., 2016). How the architecture of the prison is designed has serious consequences on individuals' ability to cope, their self-esteem and their relationships with staff and other prisoners (Jewkes, 2018). The harsher the environment the more strain will be put onto the prisoners which will impact their mental and physical well-being. Jewkes (2018) argues that hard architecture such as "bars on windows, concrete walls, hard-surface floors, drab colours, indestructible and uncomfortable furniture" has a substantial negative impact on prisoner emotions and behaviour (p.321). It is increasingly viewed by researchers that this type of architecture is inadvisable. Instead, good architecture according to Fikfak et al. (2015) "allows for the development of good relationship between staff and prisoners, provides space and opportunity for a full range of activities, and offers decent working and living conditions" (p.27). Good prison architecture will have a positive impact on prisoner's health, relationships, and behaviour. Therefore, finding ways to improve the design of the prison should be a goal for the prison service.

The types of stress that the physical environment can place on an individual can range from "sensory deprivation, extreme heat or cold, and lack of privacy" (Krancer, 1980:95). Of these

stressors, temperature, in particular, has been linked to violence. Research has shown, for example, that when individuals are in hotter environments, they are more likely to exhibit aggressive behaviour (Anderson et al., 2000). Steinke (1991) found a significant trend of prisoner aggression increasing in hot climates. Prison architecture significantly influences temperature (Atlas, 1984). The building's design, size and materials affect the humidity, air movement and temperature (Atlas, 1984). When compared to other countries such as the U.S. and France, E&W have cooler climates. However, recent reports have expressed concern over E&W prisoners being locked up in solitary confinement in extreme heat. In the summer of 2020 E&W was suffering from a heatwave and prisoners were stuck in their cells for 23 hours a day during Covid-19 lockdown (HM Inspectorate of Prisons, 2021c). Some cells are cramped and poorly ventilated which adds to feelings of discomfort and frustration in summer periods (HM Inspectorate of Prisons, 2017). Older prisons tend to be poorly ventilated and have cramped cells. With the trend of average temperatures rising in recent years, this threat to prisoner well-being and behaviour should be considered a concern (Gayle and Grierson, 2022).

Another strain that is influenced by the design of prisons is unwanted noise. Loud unwanted noises, particularly in large prisons, is a type of pain that prisoners are subjected to constantly (Engstrom and Van Ginneken, 2022). Noise can come from various sources such as prisoners' music and televisions, officers and prisoners shouting and alarms going off. Consistent and/or loud unwanted noise has been linked to prisoners developing physical and psychological health problems such as sleep deprivation, high stress, and heart disease (Bierie, 2012; Moran, 2019; Dewa et al., 2017). These health effects are a burden on prisoner's mental well-being and can negatively affect their behaviour (Bierie, 2012). Vogler et al.'s (2014) findings indicate that poor sleep quality is linked to prisoners becoming more aggressive. Lack of sleep fuels aggression due to increasing feelings of irritation, anxiety, fatigue, and pain (Krizan and Herlache, 2016). All these factors increase the likelihood of prisoners reacting to stress-induced situations with anger, thereby causing conflict with other inmates and staff (Vogler et al., 2014). One way to minimise noise is through better prison design. But the design of many E&W prisons often exacerbates the issue of noise. Prisons are typically constructed with hard materials and hard surfaces such as concrete and brick which "are covered with a minimum amount of sound absorbing materials" (Wener, 2012:191). Hard materials are ineffective in absorbing noise, and this negatively impacts prisoners' cell experience. The alternative would be for prisons to incorporate into their designs softer materials such as carpets and fabric which have better sound absorption compared to hard materials (Wener, 2012). However, they are often deemed too costly by policy makers due to how prone they are to damage and wear (Wener, 2012). Furthermore,

the recent history of severe prison cost-cutting measures enacted by the Conservative Government begs the question of whether there would be enough value placed on incorporating costly soft materials for the physical and mental well-being of prisoners (Ismail, 2020a).

2.3. Conclusion

This chapter has established which types of prisoners are most likely to commit violence and how E&W prisons manage violence. When it comes to which types of prisoners are most likely to commit violence, imported variables such as age, sentence length, substance misuse, mental health/illness and violent criminal history play a significant role. All these factors affect how prisoners adapt to the prison environment. They affect how likely prisoners are to cope through legitimate or illegitimate means. Young prisoners, for example, struggle to adapt and cope through non-violent means due to factors such as heightened aggression, immaturity, and inexperience. Furthermore, evidence suggests that they are more likely to commit violence during the initial period of a long-term sentence and when they are nearing the end of their sentence. Also, prisoners who are using substances such as illicit drugs and alcohol problematically are more likely to be dependent on these substances as coping mechanisms and may become involved in violence to acquire them. Those that are suffering from mental health issues/illness will find stressors difficult to cope with and will therefore be more likely to react violently. All these factors are important considerations for this research. Not all prisoners are equally likely to commit violence and therefore it is important to be able to identify and categorise differences between the participants in terms of whether they have for example poor mental health or issues with drugs and/or alcohol. And finally, if prisoners have a violent criminal history, they are more likely to exhibit similar behaviour in the prison environment. Violent individuals who are sent to prison will most likely import violent coping behaviour.

E&W prisons have sought to manage prison violence and prisoners they perceive as risky through the implementation of various powers, policies, technologies, and support. Violence management methods covered in this chapter involve prison officers, key workers, IEP scheme, family contact methods, substance management, penal management, rehabilitation methods and prison design. The presence of prison officers act as both a proactive management of violence and a reactive one in that the officer has the power and capability to react to violent behaviour. However modern prison officer training has arguably resulted in a more humane, relaxed interaction between staff and prisoners, with the aim of defusing

possible tensions between them which could lead to aggression and violence. This is demonstrated by the introduction of the key worker scheme in which prisoners now have more opportunities to communicate/confide with an assigned officer. Other forms of proactive and reactive measures come in the form of incentives. The rationale of incentive schemes is based on the premise that inmates will behave well in the knowledge that they can attain an increased level of goods and services. However, while they can be given more goods and services they can equally be deprived of them if their behaviour or attendance at rehabilitation programmes is lacking. Therefore, through the use of the IEP scheme the government has tried to manage prisoner behaviour by either improving or limiting prisoners' opportunities to have visits from family members. It is believed that incentivising more opportunities for visits will result in prisoners responding positively by improving their behaviour. However, those on basic or standard privileges are missing out on an important coping mechanism which they need to maintain relationships. This scheme can inadvertently therefore harm their rehabilitation efforts.

What can be seen in recent history, is that the CJS has also reacted to security threats on a larger scale. This came in the form of the introduction of prison categorisations. This is where the rise of the management of violence through risk assessments and categorisations began. At the other end of the spectrum is the management of violence through rehabilitation. This can come in the form of CBT or education, which offer the inmates new opportunities, skills and coping mechanisms. What the literature also indicates is the significant impact that prison design has on prisoner violent behaviour. Two examples of noxious stimuli that have been linked to prison violence are high temperatures and unwanted noise, which are both by-products of poor prison design.

In the following chapter, the theoretical framework of Blevins et al.'s (2010) application of GST in conjunction with three prison models will be explained in detail. The chapter will also highlight the limitations of current prison research that has utilised a GST framework.

Chapter 3. General Strain Theory and Prison Violence

The main aim of this thesis is to explain what role strains and negative emotions play in prison violence and to identify how strains and coping mechanisms can be translated into specific policy recommendations. GST provides the core theoretical context for the research, having long been used in criminological research to understand the connection between strains, negative emotions, poor coping behaviour and violence (Warner and Fowler, 2003; James, Bunch and Clay-Warner, 2015; Agnew, 2007). However, it is only recently in the last decade or so that GST has been used to understand and analyse prison violence (Blevins et al., 2010; Morris et al., 2012; Zweig et al., 2015).

Since the publication of Blevins et al.'s (2010) article, researchers have increasingly theorised and tested GST's utility in explaining violence and misconduct within prison (Blevins et al., 2010; Morris et al., 2012; Zweig et al., 2015; Joon Jang, 2020). The GST framework offers an interesting and logical perspective on why violent behaviour manifests itself. For individuals to commit violence it is reasonable to assume that they have been affected by some form of stressor which has altered their emotional state (Agnew, 2007). Negative life events, such as being assaulted, financial strain or losing a family member, are going to affect an individual's ability to cope legitimately (Agnew, 2013). The reason why some individuals struggle to cope non-violently is that they are not able to manage the negative emotions of anger, frustration or fear produced as a response to strain (Agnew, 2007). The more intense the negative emotion the more likely they are to behave violently. This rationale is especially compelling when applied to prison violence.

Prison is a stressful/painful environment which will contain numerous examples of strains that prisoners are struggling to cope with legitimately. Traditionally prison research has labelled what this research would classify as 'strains' as 'pains' or 'deprivations' that prisoners have experienced inside the prison complex. This is because of the long-standing influence of Sykes' (1958) "pains of imprisonment" in academic research (p.63). In fairness, these terms could certainly be used interchangeably. However, looking at these pains through the lens of GST rather than just through the deprivations model, using Agnew's (2006) and Blevins et al.'s (2010) frameworks, offers more versatility and depth when exploring behaviours such as violence. And as will be explained, the GST framework provides examples of types of strains that will impact people emotionally and behaviourally (Agnew, 2008). However, how prisoners adapt and cope with strains will differ depending on a wide range of factors which both the importation and coping model literature highlights and

explains (Ricciardelli, 2014; Randol and Campbell, 2017). These factors will be explained in detail in Section 3.2.2. of this chapter.

This chapter provides the foundations of this thesis by giving a detailed explanation of GST as a criminological framework, how it can be applied to prison violence, and how the use of this framework in this thesis differs from other prison GST research. This chapter will first discuss the foundations of Agnew's GST, covering the origins of the framework and the developments that have been made in the past few decades. Secondly, it will discuss how GST can be applied to prison violence. This will involve interpreting Blevins et al.'s (2010) prison violence GST framework and providing examples of strains that prisoners face and explaining how these can result in violent coping behaviour. Furthermore, in this section there will be an explanation of how the prison violence GST framework concepts can be applied qualitatively. The third section will explain why this thesis has selected the GST framework to analyse prison violence. The final section will analyse prison research that has utilised a GST framework. Highlighting the limitations of prior GST research in this section will further justify the need for this research's qualitative methodological approach to using this framework.

3.1. The Foundations of Agnew's GST

For the past few decades, since Agnew (1992) laid the foundations, GST has played a pivotal role in understanding human behaviour and what might lead individuals to crime and delinquency. This framework was in part designed to be an alternative to classical strain theories which have been criticised for having a lack of empirical validity when testing for delinquency and drug use behaviours (Merton, 2002; Cohen, 1955; Cloward and Ohlin, 1960; Agnew, 1992; Broidy and Agnew, 1997). Perhaps because of this critique, strain theory became less popular as a means to explore criminal behaviour, while theories such as social control and differential association came more to the fore (Agnew, 1992). Reacting to these criticisms of the theory, Agnew (1992) argued that strain theory needed to be revised to overcome its past issues and limitations. In response to these limitations, Agnew (1992) developed a GST of delinquency and drug use.

One of the notable differences between GST and earlier strain theories is that Agnew's approach focuses more on the micro level (social psychological) rather than at the macro level (social structural) (Langton and Piquero, 2007). Previous strain theories were limited in their approach by their fundamental assumptions "that only the poor suffer from the

disjunction between wanting wealth and being able to actually acquire it" (Langton and Piquero, 2007:1). This assumption is flawed because it does not help explain crimes that are committed by other social groups (i.e., middle or upper class). Examining the social psychological aspects of strain (individual level) allows for a framework that is more capable of analysing and explaining a wide variety of crimes and deviant behaviour because it is not limited by cultural behavioural assumptions. Furthermore, previous strain theory frameworks have typically looked into how blocked access to desired goals contributes to the rise of crime and delinquency (Cohen, 1955; Cloward and Ohlin, 1960). Agnew (1992) views these past frameworks as limiting and argues that "strain may result not only from the failure to achieve positively valued goals, but also from the inability to escape legally from painful situations" (p.50). As such, Agnew (2006) developed a more comprehensive framework that further expands on what types of strains are likely to lead individuals to commit crimes.

It is important first to establish what Agnew means when referring to the concept of strain and why these pressures result in violent behaviours. The simplest definition offered by Agnew (2006) is that "strains refer to events or conditions that are disliked by individuals" (p.4). Based on this definition alone one can see that there can be an infinite number of strains. This is to some degree a valid argument. However, some strains are more conducive to crimes/violence than others (Agnew, 2013; Moon, Hays and Blurton, 2009). In essence, strains can vary from being perceived as a mild nuisance or as very painful, the latter having considerable negative consequences for the individual affected. A less serious type of strain (a nuisance) can come in the form of, for example, a minor illness (i.e., a headache), whereas a seriously negative strain can come in the form of parental abuse, bullying and/or death of a family member (Agnew, 2001; Agnew, 2002). However, how painful these strains are is dependent on the individual's subjective dislike of that stressor (Agnew, 2001). In other words, what is perceived as a less serious strain by one individual can be evaluated and experienced as deeply painful by others. Therefore, how individuals subjectively feel about the stressor will affect how they respond to it (Agnew, 2001).

Strains that individuals find painful and difficult to cope with will produce negative emotions (Agnew, 2006). GST argues that crime is a result of individuals trying to alleviate their negative emotions (which have resulted from strain/s) through illegitimate coping such as committing physical or psychological forms of violence (Ganem, 2010). There are a variety of negative emotions that one can consider when looking into violent behaviour. Experiencing negative emotions such as anger, fear and frustration can increase the likelihood of an individual reacting violently. Agnew (2008) explains that "*anger, for example, reduces the ability to engage in effective problem solving, reduces awareness of and*

concern for the costs of crime (individuals are "consumed with rage"), creates a desire for revenge, fosters the belief that crime is justified (since the crime is done to "right a perceived wrong"), and energises the individual for action" (p.104). These negative consequences of anger thereby heighten the risk of violence. The more intense the feelings of anger/rage the more difficult it is to cope non-violently.

Since the inception of the GST framework there have been three major categories of strain put forward by Agnew (1992). These major strains are "failure to achieve positively valued goals" (p.51); "removal of positively valued stimuli from the individual" (p.57); "presentation of noxious stimuli" (p.58) (Agnew, 1992). Each of these broad categories of strains can "encompass hundreds of more specific strains" (Agnew, 2008:102). All these major strains can cause stress and pain for individuals and make it difficult for them to cope legitimately. These major strains will be expanded upon in more detail in the following section of this chapter and examples of strains that are likely to result in violence will be provided for each category.

Agnew's GST framework has been empirically tested to understand a wide variety of crimes and behaviours since its introduction. For example, it has been tested with crimes such as terrorism, homicide, white-collar crime, bullying (traditional and cyber), and illicit drug use (Agnew, 2017; Eriksson and Mazerolle, 2013; Hay, Meldrum and Mann, 2010; Carson et al., 2008; Langton and Piquero, 2007). It is, however, only since the publication of Blevins et al.'s (2010) article which focuses on the application of the GST framework to prison violence that prison researchers have begun to explore the efficacy of GST in a prison setting.

3.2. Applying GST to Prison Violence: Blevins' Framework

In 2010 an article was published by Blevins et al. (2010) which offers a GST prison violence framework and provides the immediate theoretical context to this thesis. Blevins et al.'s (2010) framework is useful because it incorporates three key prison models into Agnew's GST to more comprehensively explain prison violence. These are the *deprivation model, importation model and the coping model.* All these models have been utilised in past prison research to explore prison violence (DeLisi et al., 2004; Gaes and McGuire, 1985; Rocheleau, 2015). There have been examples of research that have tested both the deprivation and importation models in the same study, however, the incorporation of all three models into one singular framework is both novel and useful (Tasca et al., 2010; Jiang and Fisher-Giorlando, 2002). Incorporating these models into Agnew's GST allows this research

51

to be informed by prison studies that have utilised these models. This is useful because the GST framework has not been used as frequently in the prison environment as these other prison models. Therefore, there is a larger variety of prison literature that the researcher can draw from when analysing prison violence behaviour. Furthermore, this incorporation of the three models means that the type of qualitative analysis that this research provides is one with significantly more depth and complexity compared to one that only seeks to discuss prison violence factors related to importation for example, because it is being informed by three differing theoretical prison perspectives. All these models are equally important when trying to understand prison violence because prison behaviour will be affected not only by the prison environment but also by prisoners' prior experiences and personal characteristics that affect how they adapt as well as factors such as the limited coping resources available to them.

The pains inflicted through deprivation are understood to have a profound effect on the individual's psychological state, thus affecting the inmate's behaviour and potentially leading to deviant acts within prison (Sykes, 1958). The importation model on the other hand, argues that an individual's behaviour and attitudes are not solely shaped by the prison environment, since the inmates bring their own developed characteristics and potentially violent tendencies into their allocated prison (Irwin and Cressey, 1962). And lastly, the coping model makes the argument that without support and the provision of coping mechanisms, deviant behaviour and violence can emerge (Blevins et al., 2010). Blevins et al.'s (2010) GST framework works as follows. Firstly, the deprivation model's explanations of violence are linked with Agnew's three main strains. These three major strains as previously explained are the "failure to achieve positively valued goals" (p.51), the "removal of positively valued stimuli" (p.57) and the "presentation of noxious stimuli" (p.58) (Agnew, 1992). The various deprivation variables (i.e., overcrowding, bullying, lost family contact) can fit into one or more of these major strains. These deprivations are in essence strains and can be categorised as either denied valued goals, removed positively valued stimuli or noxious stimuli (Agnew, 2006). Secondly, the importation model involves analysing how prisoners' values, associations, characteristics, and past experiences have influenced the way that prisoners react to strain through violence. Finally, the coping model works as an explanation of what types of coping mechanisms and social support prisoners need in the prison environment to avoid committing violence due to strains.

This research seeks to fully utilise GST's capabilities when using a qualitative analytical approach. In the following paragraphs these models will be explored in more depth in order

to explain the impact prison strains have on prisoners, why certain prisoners cope through violence and what coping mechanisms are required for prisoners to behave non-violently.

3.2.1. Deprivation Model and the Three Major Strains

As has been explained earlier, the deprivation model is interested in various 'pains' that prisoners experience within the prison environment. Prisoners are deprived and pained in many ways. Their pains result from being deprived of various human needs and desires (Sykes, 1958). For this section, examples of pains/strains that have been identified in prison research are categorised into the three major strains. This is in order to explain how the deprivation model's examples of prison pains can be applied to the GST framework. Furthermore, it will also be explained how some of these pains/strains can result in prison violence and how this has informed the research design.

The first major strain that prisoners will experience is the "failure to achieve positively valued goals" (Agnew, 1992:51). In the prison environment there can be a variety of opportunities and incentives for prisoners. If these opportunities and/or incentives are positively valued by prisoners, then they are more likely to consider it their goal to participate or obtain what they desire (Agnew, 2006). From a GST perspective if prisoners are either unfairly or unjustly blocked from achieving their desired goals then they are more likely to cope through acts of violence (Agnew and White, 1992). It is also arguably more emotionally painful to have goals unjustly and/or unfairly blocked than it is to be simply unable to achieve one's aspirations (Agnew and White, 1992). Unjust strains are linked to the negative emotion of anger which can result in violent behavioural outcomes (Agnew, 2013; Ousey, Wilcox and Schreck, 2015). Examples of goals in prisons that prisoners often value are getting parole, gaining access to illicit drugs, re-establishing relationships with family members, improving physical fitness, gaining greater autonomy, earning incentives, participating in work and education, and developing positive relationships with other prisoners and staff members (Liebling, 1999; Rubin, 2015; Binswanger et al., 2012; Khan, 2022; Larson and Nelson, 1984; Blagden, Winder and Hames, 2016; Jewkes, 2005; Christian, Mellow and Thomas, 2006). Gaining more incentives in prison, for example, is valued by prisoners because they feel less deprived of the goods and services that they desire (i.e., personal clothes, more family visits, spending money etc) (Liebling, 2008). To gain access to incentives, however, they must exhibit and maintain good behaviour (MoJ, 2022a). If prisoners do not maintain good behaviour, they are placed on the basic level of the IEP scheme by staff members (see section 2.2.2.) (Liebling, 2008). Those that have the goal of being on enhanced level will

likely experience being put on basic as frustrating and demoralising (Khan, 2022). However, as stated previously, if prisoners perceive that their goal of being on enhanced level has been blocked unjustly or unfairly this is more likely to result in criminal coping (i.e., violence) (Agnew, 2013). Khan (2022) for example, found that prisoners perceived the use of IEP warnings as unjustified when officers used them excessively as a punishment tool. This resulted in Khan's (2022) participants stating they felt frustrated and resentful towards the officers for how they utilised their power. However, it needs to be acknowledged that all these desirables/goals will not be valued equally by every prisoner. For example, prisoners who are not motivated by fitness are unlikely to feel pained by being denied access to the gym. Also, those who consider themselves not ready to be released or are institutionalised will not value being granted parole. If a prisoner does not value the goal then they are not going to exhibit anger, frustration, or violence when these opportunities/incentives are blocked (Agnew, 2006). In this research, it will be important to explore the goals that are perceived as valuable; why they are perceived as valuable and whether being deprived of those goals can lead to violence.

The second major strain that prisoners will experience is the "removal of positively valued stimuli" (Agnew, 1992:57). Compared to positively valued goals it can be argued that positively valued stimuli are more tangible. It is something that is already part of that individual's life. And if they are deprived of their stimuli then a great deal of pain and stress can be produced in the individual. The GST framework explains that individuals may turn to crime (or act violently) by trying to "prevent the loss of the positive stimuli, retrieve the lost stimuli or obtain substitute stimuli, seek revenge against those responsible for the loss, or manage the negative affect caused by the loss by taking illicit drugs" (Agnew, 1992:57-58). For prisoners, positively valued stimuli can be goods and services, safety, good physical and mental health, positive relationships with staff members, family members and other prisoners, and autonomy (Novisky, Narvey and Prost, 2022; Sykes, 1958; Blevins et al., 2010). Exercise, for example, is a positive stimulus in an environment that values toughness, thereby improving a prisoner's masculine status (Jewkes, 2005). Prisoners may not necessarily attach goals to the act of exercising but nevertheless value it as a positive aspect of their daily routines. Purposeful activities such as exercise help relieve boredom in prison as well as improving general physical and mental well-being (Cashin, Potter and Butler, 2008; Wolff et al., 2021; Fischer et al., 2012). Exercising also offers a distraction for those who are burdened by stressful (prison) events. To remove prisoners' ability to exercise while in prison, and thus remove a positively valued stimulus, would have the negative consequence of decreasing their quality of life, negatively affecting their mental and physical wellbeing and limiting their options in legitimately coping with prison strains (Buckaloo, Krug

and Nelson, 2009). However, not all positive stimuli will be viewed as being equally emotionally painful when removed. Certain positively valued stimuli are more likely to result in aggressive emotions such as anger when removed resulting in prisoners seeking revenge against those they blame. To determine whether this is a likely outcome is dependent on whether participants valued this stimulus and whether they can provide examples of when it has led to prisoners committing physical and psychological violence. Identifying which positive stimuli are deeply valued by prisoners based upon their explanations should help to determine policy solutions to prison violence.

The third and final major strain that prisoners will experience is the "presentation of noxious stimuli" (Agnew, 1992:58). In the prison environment there are numerous examples of noxious stimuli that are likely to be present. In GST noxious stimuli are circumstances that are perceived as disagreeable or negative for the individual (Paternoster and Mazerolle, 1994). Noxious stimuli can be both painful and upsetting depending on their magnitude. Agnew (1992) explains that, in the presence of noxious stimuli, individuals can turn to crime, or, significantly for this research, violence. In these circumstances they will try to "escape from or avoid the negative stimuli; terminate or alleviate the negative stimuli; seek revenge against the source of the negative stimuli or related targets" (Agnew, 1992:58). Noxious stimuli produced in the prison environment can come in the form of the threat of punishment for misconduct, overcrowding, loud noises, abuse/violence from prisoners or staff members, victimisation, bullying; poor conditions, parole and programme cancellations, distressing news and debt (Maziarka, 2013; Vigesaa, 2013; Liebling, 1999; Semenza and Grosholz, 2019; Pitts, Griffin III and Johnson, 2014; Blevins et al., 2010; Bierie, 2012; South and Wood, 2006; Levingston and Turetsky, 2007). Not all noxious stimuli are weighted equally in terms of the pain they cause for individuals (Capowich, Mazerolle and Piquero, 2001). For example, being threatened with a punishment such as added time on their sentence will not negatively impact prisoners equally. Some prisoners may not desire or feel ready to be released, so having time added to their sentence is less likely to affect their behaviour (Andvig et al., 2021). However, those who have a strong desire to be released will find such threats distressing and will therefore be more likely to react aggressively in response to that strain. To answer the research questions, noxious strains are highlighted in the findings based upon whether there is a perceived link between them and violent emotions/behaviour.

To sum up, for this research consideration needed to be given to each major strain. To differentiate between the various pains/deprivations/strains and their effects on inmate violence it has been important to understand how they should be viewed and categorised. To be able to highlight these differing types of strains the questions for the participants

needed to be devised so that they related to prisoners' goals being blocked, valued stimuli being removed and the presence of various noxious stimuli. As a result, these major strains played a fundamental role in shaping the topic guide. Creating questions based on these major strains ensured that all key aspects of the framework were covered.

3.2.2. Importation and Coping Models and GST – Adapting and Coping with Strain

As stated earlier, importation models can be linked to GST by analysing the imported variables that prisoners bring into the prison environment. These variables comprise the prisoners age, mental health, criminal history, substance addiction, sentence length, education background and so on (see section 2.1.) (Walters and Crawford, 2013; DeLisi et al., 2004; Schenk and Fremouw, 2012). All these factors affect how likely prisoners are to cope with strains through legitimate (non-criminal) or illegitimate behaviours (violence). The coping model's concepts, on the other hand, can be used to analyse what coping mechanisms and resources prisoners need in order to emotionally cope with strains non-violently in the prison environment. These two models are connected because what prisoners import into the prison environment affects what types of support they need to cope. For example, those that have a history of poor mental health will need extra support compared to those who are mentally well (Rocheleau, 2014). Without this support provided by the prison service they are more likely to behave violently (see section 2.1.4.).

The GST framework argues that there are five key factors which dictate the likelihood of individuals coping with strains though violence (Agnew and Brezina, 2010). These factors are "poor coping skills and resources"; "low conventional social support"; "low social control"; "association with criminal others/beliefs favourable to crime"; and "exposure to situations where the costs of crime are seen as low and the benefits as high" (Agnew and Brezina, 2010:105-106). Poor coping skills and resources, low conventional social support and association with criminal others/beliefs favourable to crime are influenced by background experiences such as the imported variables listed above. Some prisoners may already have coping strategies/mechanisms that do not necessarily rely on support/assistance from the institution. For example, those who hold religious beliefs tend to cope with prison life more optimally than those who do not (Clear and Sumter, 2002). Belief in religious values is argued to result in prisoners having a healthier self-esteem/mood, thereby decreasing the likelihood of their being involved in illegitimate acts (Clear and Sumter, 2002). Furthermore, some prisoners may cope independently by using avoidance strategies (Luke et al., 2021; Wilkinson, Walford and Espnes, 2000). For example, a victimised prisoner may choose to

avoid a prison bully in order to cope better and feel safe (Adams and Ireland, 2018). This method, however, is argued by Wilkinson et al. (2000) to be a sub-optimal means of coping. This is because using avoidance strategies has been found to result "in poorer psychological outcomes" (Wilkinson et al., 2000:159). By merely avoiding the stressor the individual has not eliminated the possibility of it negatively affecting their life in the future (Luke et al., 2021). This can cause some degree of psychological distress due to the anticipation of its eventual appearance/effects (Agnew, 2002). Therefore, all prisoners will need some degree of assistance from the institution.

The factors listed above that dictate the likelihood of prisoners coping through violence could be mitigated by competent and consistent support provided by prisons. Previous research has identified a range of coping mechanisms and support offered in prisons such as key workers, television, prison officers, games consoles, listeners, the mental health team, family/friends, and books (PRT, 2023d; Dixey and Woodall, 2012; Crane et al., 2019; Knight, 2012; Ribbens and Malliet, 2015; Canning and Buchanan, 2021). However, the quality of these coping mechanisms will vary between institutions. Furthermore, some prisoners will value certain coping mechanisms more than others. What has been important for this research is to identify which types of coping mechanisms prisoners see as beneficial, how they explain the process of coping and the strategies they use. If, however, the prison institution provides inadequate support for prisoners then they are more likely to demonstrate a deviant type of coping behaviour such as physical and psychological forms of violence (Rocheleau, 2015).

In sum, the importation and coping model concepts above are important considerations for this thesis. As is highlighted by importation research, how prisoners react to strain is deeply affected by prisoners' characteristics and background experiences. Violent outcomes are significantly affected by factors such as age, mental health, sentence length, substance misuse and violent criminal history (see section 2.1.). Therefore, to provide effective explanations and solutions to violence, imported factors need to be considered in the design of the research tools. Furthermore, it is also important to identify the most valued coping mechanisms offered in prison as certain coping mechanisms are viewed as more essential for them to be able to cope legitimately. Also, to understand how prisoners can more effectively avoid coping through violent behaviour, prison-provided coping mechanisms and prison violence management methods are scrutinised for their quality and service.

3.2.3. Experienced, Vicarious, and Anticipated Prison Strains

Strain theorists have typically focused on people's personal experience of strain and how they coped with it (Agnew, 2006). So, for example, in prison research, participants are asked questions such as how being victimised affected them personally or how they coped with feelings of isolation. These are examples of direct strains. They are hurt and put under stress because they themselves are the targets of the strain. It has been argued that personal experiences of strain are most likely linked to criminal activity (Agnew, 2006; McGrath, Marcum and Copes, 2012). Therefore, it can be assumed that prisoners are more likely to commit violence if they themselves are the ones who are subject to the strain. However, it has also been stressed that it is important to consider indirect forms of stressors such as vicarious and anticipated strains.

Vicarious strains are pains and stressors affecting people around the individual (Agnew, 2002). How the individual experiences the strain vicariously can vary. Agnew (2002) specifies that "the individual may directly witness the strain experienced by these others (such as an assault), may hear these others experience strain (e.g., gunshots, screams), or may hear about the strain of these others (e.g., from victims or in the media)" (p.604). It is explained that these vicarious experiences can have a negative impact on the individual. Witnessing or hearing others under stress or in pain, especially those close to the individual, is argued to be upsetting and will therefore affect their well-being (Zavala and Spohn, 2013). Furthermore, as highlighted by Lin, Cochran and Mieczkowski (2011), vicariously experiencing the victimisation of others can lead that individual to believe that they may also be victimised in the future. Like the effects of personally experiencing strain, vicarious experiences of strain may lead to individuals committing violent acts. Prisoners may for example feel the effects of vicarious strains by witnessing prisoner friends being victimised by other prisoners or staff members. This vicarious strain could result in the angered prisoner seeking revenge for their friend by assaulting the perpetrators.

Anticipated strains, on the other hand, "refers to the individual's expectation that the current strain will continue into the future or that new strains will be experienced" (Froggio, 2007:389). Similar to both experienced and vicarious strains, anticipating a strain can be upsetting and lead to deviant coping. Agnew (2002) argues that although classical strain theory research into the correlation between criminal behaviour and the anticipated failure in achieving educational and occupational goals found no statistical significance, there are other anticipated strains that can lead to criminal conduct. Individuals may engage in violence or other criminal acts as a means of preventing the strain that they anticipate will

occur (Agnew, 2002). Agnew (2002) gives the example of an individual "engaging in pre-emptive attacks against neighbourhood predators" (p.609). This is an example of a person becoming aggressive as a response to a perceived threat, thereby discouraging/preventing the potential outcome of the strain as a means of coping (Agnew, 2002). Prisoners have many potential threats that they will likely fear or be wary of. Prisoners are known at times to assault others to prevent inmates perceiving them as weak and therefore easy targets (Michalski, 2017; Sykes; 1958). By taking measures to demonstrate their strength to others they are seeking to minimise the possibility of the anticipated strain of being victimised.

For this research all three of these types of strains (experienced, vicarious and anticipated) need to be considered and differentiated. Limiting the discussion to only experienced strains reduces the various ways that prisoners could be physically and psychologically negatively affected. It is important to identify whether prisoners are seriously emotionally affected by vicarious or anticipated strains and whether these strains result in their responding with violent behaviour.

3.2.4. Strain Factors Increasing the Likelihood of Prison Violence

What has been established so far is that strains experienced in the prison environment affect whether prisoners are able to cope legitimately. The GST framework, however, specifies that not all strains are conducive to violence. Strains that are likely to result in violent behaviour are those that are "high in magnitude, seen as unjust, associated with low social control, and create some incentive or pressure for criminal coping" (Thaxton and Agnew, 2018:889). All these types of strains are important contributors to violent behaviour and therefore need to be considered in this research.

Firstly, strains that are *high in magnitude* have a more severe and mentally burdening impact, making it more difficult for the individual to legitimately cope (Agnew, 2001). Severe strains are more likely to result in negative emotions such as anger which, under GST logic, will increase the likelihood of violent behaviour (Agnew, 2001). How severe the strain is, is dependent on each prisoner's subjective feelings towards that pain. Furthermore, it is argued that the recency of the strain may be more impactful on the individual than older events as the effect of the strain should diminish over time (Jang and Rhoades, 2012; Agnew, 1992). How long depends on the magnitude/severity of the strain. However, Jang and Rhoades (2012) argue that older events (that are high in magnitude) can have a significant impact on the individual if they have substantially affected their core values and needs. Furthermore,

the magnitude of the strain may be increased when painful events are clustered in a single period of time (Agnew, 1992). Negative events that are clustered are more likely to impact individuals' behaviour as they can be overwhelmed by their current situation which will elevate negative emotions and increase the chances of criminal coping (Botchkovar and Broidy, 2013). Prisoners are likely to be subjected to several strains at once whilst in prison. Prisoners that have poor coping capabilities are more likely to find it overwhelming when they experience multiple strains that they perceive as severe (Agnew, 2006). Therefore, the magnitude, recency, and clustering of strains need to be considered when testing GST and violence.

The second type of strain that will increase the likelihood of crime is strain that is *perceived as unjust*. As explained previously, feelings of injustice can increase feelings of harm, thereby heightening the risk of the development of negative emotions. Whilst initially Agnew (1992) only made the connection between injustice and the major strain of "failure to achieve positively valued goals", more recently he has emphasised that perceived injustice is correlated with all types of strains (p.51). The negative emotion that Agnew (2001) and other researchers have argued as being strongly linked to perceived injustice is anger (James et al., 2015; Kennedy, Homant and Homant, 2004). This is notable because it has long been acknowledged and understood that anger is an important factor in the committing of acts of violence. Therefore, it will be important to consider aspects of perceived (in)justice in the research design.

The third factor that will affect the likelihood of criminal actions is *social control* (Agnew, 2001). Agnew (2001) explains that *"certain strains are caused by or associated with low social control, such as the strain caused by erratic parental discipline (low direct social control), parental rejection (low attachment), work in the secondary labour market (low commitment), or homelessness (low direct control, attachment, and commitment)"* (p.335). Prisoners, for example, that have no family connections lack the necessary social support and resources and this negatively affects their coping capabilities (Christian et al., 2006). Furthermore, individuals that have low social control (i.e., lack support) are less likely to be concerned about the ramifications of their actions, thereby reducing the costs of the crime in their minds (Agnew, 2001). This is because they have fewer attachments/supporters to control their actions and will feel less emotionally burdened by the guilt of disappointing them (Agnew, 2008).

The final factor to consider, Agnew (2001) argues, "is the extent to which the strain creates some pressure or incentive to engage in criminal coping" (p.336). If the strain is not easily

resolved through legitimate methods, then this creates an incentive to resolve it through illegitimate/deviant behaviour (Agnew, 2006). For example, prisoners that are being bullied and do not have legitimate alternative methods to resolve the noxious stimuli such as receiving prison staff support, may therefore feel incentivised/pressured into committing violence against the perpetrator (Ireland, 2002).

All these factors explained above are the tools needed to help categorise and analyse the qualitative data. They help to justify the argument that violent behaviour is a likely outcome when an individual is under the pressure of certain strains and therefore need to be identified in order to answer the research questions. Therefore, it was necessary for this research to develop a comprehensive understanding of the concepts that increase the likelihood of violence occurring. Having done so, the following section will discuss the limitations of previous GST research, how this research's use of the framework differs, and why it is necessary.

3.3. The Limitations of Previous Prison GST Research

Researchers have tested GST in the prison environment in the last decade and new insights have emerged as a result. GST has been used to understand the impact of prison strains on recidivism; prison misconduct; prisoner victimisation; prisoner substance use; the effectiveness of prison programmes; prisoner adaptation; and the importance of family visits (Mears et al., 2012; Wulf-Ludden, 2016; Listwan et al., 2013; Leban et al., 2016; Thomas, 2022; Morris et al., 2012; Zweig et al., 2015). These studies have helped to further justify the use of GST in prison research. It is the aim of this section both to identify the limitations of these studies and to explain why the GST approach of this thesis is valid and necessary.

What links most GST prison research is the use of a quantitative approach to data collection and analysis. Through this method GST researchers have been able to test whether certain strains result in violent behaviour in prison. Morris et al.'s (2012) research, which used "archival records representing the population of male inmates from a large southern states primary correction agency", was able to conclude that "prison strain was positively associated with violent prison misconduct" (p.199). Although their testing was limited by not being able to measure certain important variables such as negative emotionality, their findings do help validate Blevins et al.'s (2010) prison GST framework when analysing violent behaviour. Further quantitative research has helped shine light on prison violence-

related variables that Morris et al. (2012) was not able to fully explore in their initial testing of the framework. Joon Jang's (2020) article for example explored the effects of prisoner negative emotions that are produced by strains in prison. Their research used secondary survey data which included 31 male Korean prisons with a sample size of 986 adult male inmates with the purpose of having a diverse sample. Joon Jang (2020) discovered that "the outer-directed emotion (anger) was positively related to outer-directed deviance (aggressive and property misconduct and anticipated reoffending after release from prison)" (p.1625). In simpler terms the negative emotion of anger produced by prison strains is correlated with prisoner aggressive behaviour. This finding further justifies the importance of negative emotions as a variable when testing the relationship between strain and violence.

What can be inferred from these studies is that quantitative GST prison research has the benefit of being able to measure many different variables that relate to the GST framework and prison violence, and thereby make conclusive generalisable statements based on statistical evidence (Ochieng, 2009). However, what these quantitative studies lack is the more detailed narrative-based discussion of GST and prison violence that a qualitative study can provide. By conducting a qualitative based method/analysis, a researcher can explore prison-related factors (policies, environment and practices) that cause strains and the emotional/psychological impact that they have on prisoners through the participants' own understandings and experiences. Survey-based quantitative research provides limited depth when it comes to exploring individuals' experiences and interpretations of a phenomenon such as prison violence and/or strain due to its rigid design (Choy, 2014). Quantitative research does not give participants the opportunity to offer a detailed and open-ended explanation of their own lived experience (Queirós, Faria and Almeida, 2017). A key aim for this research therefore is to uncover recently released prisoners' understandings and explanations of prison violence. Qualitative methods, such as semi-structured interviews, which facilitate open-ended discussions, are more appropriate because they are better suited to answering the question of why prisoners decide to cope through violence (Tenny et al., 2017). Furthermore, a qualitative methodology is better suited when exploring the compounded nature of strain. Through being able to develop a narrative from the plethora of text that has been collected from participants the researcher is more able to highlight how the number of strains that prisoners will be coping with affect one another. Strains such as bullying, living in poor conditions, developing poor mental health, and deciding to cope through consuming illicit substances can all be factors that contribute to the reasons why a prisoner is acting violently (see chapter 2). A qualitative discussion can better explain how these factors interact with one another and result in violence because of the more detailed

explanations offered by participants when compared to methodologies that primarily focus on numbers/statistics.

As far as the researcher is aware only a few qualitative studies have been conducted utilising GST in their prison research. Two examples found are Leban et al.'s (2016) research on how prisoners cope with strains and Novisky and Peralta's (2020) study on "returning citizens' experiences with secondary violence exposure in prison" (p.594). Both these studies provide valuable insight on how GST concepts can be applied in qualitative prison research. Like this thesis both researchers used semi-structured interviews with sample sizes between 30 to 40 participants. Their decision to utilise an interview-based qualitative approach matches this research's reasoning which is to provide a more in-depth narrative when compared to quantitative research, that explores the effects and reactions to strains (emotional, behavioural, and coping) in the prison environment.

However, although there are similarities in their approaches to this thesis, how they decided to apply GST does differ. Leban et al.'s (2016) research focussed primarily on coping strategies rather than on the stressors that produce the need to cope. The strains they do specify are limited to "thefts and violation of personal space" (Leban et al., 2016:951). Most of their analysis discusses general coping strategies in response to strains such as "retaliation", "escape", "seek help", "minimise the importance of strain", "empathy" and "accept responsibility" (Leban et al., 2016:952-955). In comparison to the aims of this thesis, their study is less concerned with fully testing the framework qualitatively as it is primarily focused on prisoner coping responses to strains. It is the desire of this thesis to identify a greater variety of strains that are specifically linked to E&W prisons and discuss what is necessary for these prisoners to cope legitimately. Leban et al.'s (2016) research in comparison takes a more generalist approach with little mention of stressors that are specifically produced by cultural, policy and structural factors. The strength of their research is that since they are making a more general list of coping strategies that can be deployed as a response to strains, their findings become more applicable/relevant to all types of prison environments and can helpfully inform future quantitative prison GST research. The limitation of this generalist approach, however, is that it is less conducive to meaningful policy recommendations, which is one of the aims of this thesis.

Novisky's and Peralta's (2020) use of GST differs from Leban et al.'s (2016) in that their work focuses on the vicarious strain of witnessing various forms of violence. Through this focus they can provide a rich narrative of the various emotional, behavioural, and mental health impacts that these vicarious strains have on prisoners. The article, however, uses not

only GST but also Social Learning Theory as theoretical frameworks. This approach arguably has the drawback of limiting the discussion that the researcher can have when utilising the GST framework. By drawing from two different theoretical frameworks GST becomes a less important part of the driving narrative. In contrast, this research's findings will be completely shaped by the concepts of GST. By doing so, this will provide more of a focus to the overall narrative and can offer more of a comprehensive critique of GST as a framework when applied qualitatively and as a tool for making policy recommendations.

One significant aspect of this research that differs from all other prison GST articles is that it is being tested on participants that have lived in E&W prisons. Most GST prison research has been conducted using U.S. participants (Morris et al., 2012; Leban et al., 2016). This previous research is therefore less helpful when it comes to explaining why violence occurs in E&W prisons. What this research hopes to uncover are the stressors that are unique to E&W prisons and that are resulting in violent behaviour. U.S. prison strains and how prisoners decide to cope with them will differ from E&W prison strains and prisoner coping behaviour. This is because strains and coping behaviour are affected by various variables such as cultural, structural, environmental and policy factors (Agnew, 2006). To make reasonable policy recommendations using the GST framework to help address violent behaviour in prison, the framework needs to be tested with individuals that have experience of England and/or Wales prisons.

3.4. Conclusion

The aim of this chapter has been to explain and justify the selected framework. The various different strains caused by the prison environment can fit into GST's three major strains. These types of painful strains make it difficult for individuals to cope legitimately. How prisoners cope with strains is largely affected by the variables that they import into the prison environment such as past experiences and personal characteristics. Some prisoners will have the skills and tools to cope well whereas others will seek illegitimate means to deal with their negative emotions. Prisoners that have poor coping abilities need the prison service to provide support for them to avoid violent behaviour. The concepts of all three models (deprivation, importation and coping), together with GST, are important for this research in order to understand and provide solutions to prison violence.

Furthermore, since Blevins et al.'s (2010) article was published, an increasing number of prison researchers have used a GST framework. Their research studies have shown GST's

utility and benefit in understanding prisoner behaviour. However, these published articles have not been produced in a E&W prison context. These articles therefore do not highlight the specific strains that cause E&W prisoners to cope illegitimately/violently. And this study is therefore required in order to reveal the stressors and poor coping methods/mechanisms that are creating violent incidents within this context. To accomplish this, qualitative research is necessary because it is more able than quantitative research to uncover the reasons why strains are manifesting themselves, what forms they take, and what impact they are having on prisoners' behaviour. Therefore, the types of strains that will be explored are those that are explicitly connected to violence by the participants, are viewed as "high in magnitude, seen as unjust, associated with low social control, and create some incentive or pressure for criminal coping", and have connections in the literature to violent behaviour (Thaxton and Agnew, 2018:889). This is important in order to legitimise the arguments made, without using quantitative data, that these strains will result in violent outcomes.

Now that the theoretical framework has been explained, the following chapter will cover the methodological approach of this thesis.

Chapter 4. Methodology

This chapter will cover the following: The first section provides the research questions and aims of this thesis. The second section will explain the design of this research by clarifying my meta-theoretical position and explaining what a qualitative type of methodology offers for prison research. The third section will explain the institutional setting of this research and the reasons behind this choice. The fourth section breaks down the data collection process by explaining the interview method, the sampling of participants, how I gained access to the institution, how I recruited the participants, and how the interviews were conducted. The fifth section explains, step by step, the analysis of the data that was collected. The sixth section explains the ethical considerations for conducting this research. The seventh section provides a reflexive account of how my own personal characteristics and experiences may have affected this research. The eighth and final section considers the limitations of this research whilst also noting the advantages that research involving recently released prisoners can provide.

4.1. Research Questions and Aims

As highlighted in chapter 1, this thesis aims to:

- Use GST as a framework for understanding prison violence. GST is a theory that aims to provide an explanation as to why people commit different types of crimes and misbehaviours, including violence. It explains how the strains (stressors) that individuals face in their daily lives can make it difficult for them to cope effectively. Without the proper tools and support systems, some individuals may respond to accumulated negative emotions with illegal behaviour to relieve the stress they are under.
- Generate qualitative data on GST. This is an innovative approach as other research studies that have explored prison culture using GST as a framework have only used quantitative methods.
- Identify both the structural and individual level strains from the perspective of the participants. In particular, explore which strains are perceived as more emotionally impactful than others.
- Explore the negative emotions produced by these stressors and whether these negative emotions resulted in conflict.

- Provide a reflective account of my experience of conducting the research, thereby providing a review of the difficulties that I personally faced and thus offer advice to future HM Prison & Probation Service (HMPPS) researchers.

The research questions for this qualitative research are:

- What role do experiences of strain and negative emotions, as outlined in Blevins et al.'s (2010:148) comprehensive strain framework, play in the understanding of prison violence?
- What are the explanations for prison violence from the perspective of recently released prisoners?
- What are the potential solutions for prison violence that can be interpreted from recently released prisoners' accounts, using GST as a framework?
- Which parts of the prison structure are considered to be most conducive to strain for prisoners?
- What positive coping methods could prisoners employ to help them avoid violence?

These research aims and questions have been designed with the purpose of testing Blevins et al. (2010) application of prison models with GST to understand and provide solutions to prison violence. As these questions/aims highlight, this involves identifying both the individual and structural factors that contribute to violent coping in E&W prisons. And it is my position that a qualitative methodology is the ideal means of getting to the root of this phenomenon.

4.2. Research Design

To clarify one's own philosophical way of thinking is an advisable endeavour in social science research as it directly informs the design decision-making for this research. Before a researcher can come to choose the appropriate methods and the means of analysing the data, they must identify their own ontological and epistemological position for their research. Ontology is understood as the nature of being, whereas epistemology is understood as the study of knowledge. These are linked and inform one another. Moon and Blackman (2014) consider ontology as important "because it helps researchers recognise how certain they can be about the (nature or existence of) objects they are researching" (p.1170). Different philosophers and researchers have differing views on the extent to which we can make claims concerning our understanding of reality (Walliman, 2006). In research, there are two

major differing positions on the nature of reality, realism, and relativism. Realist ontology argues "that one reality exists that can be studied, understood, and experienced as a truth; a real world exists independent of human existence" (Moon and Blackman, 2014:1170). Relativists on the other hand view reality as a human construction. There is not one single true reality, "instead, reality is relative according to each individual who experiences it at a given time and place" (Moon and Blackman, 2014:1170). It should be noted that there are more ontologies than these with which individuals can associate themselves, such as Naïve Realism, Structural Realism, Critical Realism, Bounded Relativism and Relativism (Moon and Blackman, 2014). Each ontological viewpoint has subtle differences but what connects them is that all realist perspectives believe in one reality and all relative perspectives believe in multiple realities. A realist perspective is commonly associated with objectivism. Since a single reality is not affected by social actors, it is believed that there are objective truths that can be attained through rigorous scientific methods (i.e., experiments, quantitative methods, observation and so on) (Fletcher, 1996). However, from a relativist's perspective, if there are multiple realities that are shaped by the human mind, then reality and knowledge are constructed. This is what is known as constructivism (Pegues, 2007).

As explained previously in chapter 3, this research design seeks to differ from the standard GST framework approach. Traditionally, a GST approach to finding new forms of knowledge has, for the most part, been interested in seeking objective truths (Agnew, 1992). This is the case because most GST studies have involved researchers using quantitative methods to explore various phenomena (Aseltine, Gore and Gordon, 2000; Hay and Meldrum, 2010; Joon Jang, 2007; Morris et al., 2012). Quantitative methods have been understood by researchers as fundamental to a positivist approach. Positivism, as explained by Bryman (1984) is "characterised typically in the methodological literature as exhibiting a preoccupation with operational definitions, objectivity, replicability, causality, and the like" (p.77). A positivist approach adheres to the application of natural science methods as a means of attaining objective knowledge. Through social surveys and quantitative analysis, research based on a positivist approach seeks generalisable understanding and explanations on topics of interest (objective knowledge) (Park, Konge and Artino, 2020). Ontologically, positivism appears to be a realist perspective rather than a relativist perspective. The reason for this is that for there to be objective generalisable truths, one must believe in one singular reality in which the human experience bears little importance in the quest for knowledge. Critically, although quantitative research can allow researchers to make inferences at a national level, the data arguably has less depth. As Bryman (1984) argues, *"survey data are typically seen as deficient in this respect for they provide superficial evidence on the social world, winkling out the causal relationships between arbitrarily chosen*

variables which have little or no meaning to those individuals whose social worlds they are meant to represent" (p.79).

On the other hand, whilst quantitative research is objectivist, qualitative research is constructivist. This type of research is more interested in providing an in-depth exploration into human/lived experiences by the means of, for example, interviewing former prisoners (Yilmaz, 2013). Understanding human experiences is important for qualitative researchers because for them reality is a human construction. Where it is important for quantitative/positivist researchers to be at a distance from the human participants that they are observing, it is the opposite for qualitative researchers (Robson, 2002). Human experiences, thoughts and feelings have value from a qualitative researcher's point of view (Yilmaz, 2013). If reality differs between human minds, then it is important for the researcher to connect with individuals to explore new forms of knowledge that can be only acquired through long periods of communication and/or observation (Yilmaz, 2013).

Fundamentally, both types of research, whether it be quantitative or qualitative, have their validity depending on people's ontological viewpoints. When it comes to GST, this framework has been dominated by positivist thought (Morris et al., 2012; Zweig et al., 2015; Joon Jang., 2020). Whilst this is a valid means of gaining knowledge, from a relativist perspective I believe these findings do not provide a detailed enough picture of the strains that prisoners experience. This is why this research attempts to provide a richer narrative insight into how strains, coping behaviours and negative emotions result in violent behaviour in E&W prisons. This has been achieved through the means of analysing the lived experience of recently released prisoners. Their insights and experiences are a valuable source of knowledge that not many people in this country can provide as only a certain number of individuals have experienced the various stressors of living in prison.

Furthermore, I decided that a qualitative research design was necessary to answer the research questions and aims. As emphasised in the aims and objectives and research questions section, I wanted to develop new forms of understanding why prison violence emerges in English and Welsh prisons, what types of positive coping mechanisms prisoners require to behave legitimately, as well as what solutions can be provided as a result of these explanations. In order to best achieve this goal, I decided that a qualitative methodology would be more effective in unearthing new forms of knowledge regarding the particular phenomenon of English and Welsh prison violence. Through detailed discussions with research participants rather than through the means of surveys and/or statistics this research is more capable of identifying and explaining the strains affecting English and

Welsh prisoners and how that is manifesting itself as violent behaviour. This is because giving the participants voice prominence allows them to lead on to what they see as important stressors, whereas a quantitative approach applies an arguably restrictive framework to which respondents must reply without flexibility. A qualitative approach is able to explore the reasons why the participants feel negatively about certain strains – giving rich insightful data that goes beyond statistics. Furthermore, through a qualitative approach I have been able to explore the relationships between different strains rather than presenting them separately as survey results would.

4.3. Institutional Setting

Participants in this research were all residents in Approved Premises (AP) and, crucially, had recent prison experience. However, the original intention (pre-Covid19) was to conduct face-to-face interviews with prisoners and prison staff in two contrasting closed prison settings. Selecting one category B and one category C prison could have helped shine some light on the different strains that can emerge from two types of category prisons. However, at the height of the Covid-19 pandemic (between 2020 and 2022), the HMPPS was blocking or significantly limiting the number of applications for prison research. PhD research was low on their priority list. As a consequence, I had to reimagine the research design.

As the restrictions started to lift across the probation service, it was apparent that I could be in a position to access AP. AP are hostels for recently released prisoners managed by the Probation Service (PRT, 2023a). Recently released prisoners residing in these AP are considered to be at high or very high risk of causing serious harm and need to be supervised in these buildings usually for 3 to 12 months after release (PRT, 2023a). Therefore, these residents had the recent lived experience of prison that my research was interested to explore.

The probation service is divided into 12 divisions across E&W (London, South West, Greater Manchester and so on) (GOV.UK, 2023b). In each of these divisions there are various numbers of AP. For ethical reasons I am unable to specify which AP I conducted my research in. For reasons of expediency, including continuing concerns around Covid-19, the sample of AP was restricted to the North of England across 3 divisions, where there are a total of 31 AP. Interviews were conducted across 11 of these AP. I decided to visit a variety of AP as it allowed for a more diverse range of perspectives. It also increased the chances

that the residents interviewed had experienced different prisons recently, each of which might have different strains and rates of violence.

The institutional setting of AP proved to be a successful and, compared to prisons, accessible method of obtaining participants. The limitations and strengths of conducting research in AP in comparison to prisons is provided in depth in section 4.8. of this thesis. In the following section there will be a discussion of the methods employed to collect the data.

4.4. Data Collection

This section's purpose is to explain the type of interviewing method that this research has selected, what type of participants this research sought to sample, how I recruited the participants and an explanation of how I went about interviewing the recently released prisoners.

4.4.1. Interview Method

The method used for the purpose of this research was semi-structured interviews. This style of interviewing involved asking the participants pre-determined questions based on the research questions. Unlike structured interviews, semi-structured interviewing offers the user the opportunity to ask follow-up questions dependent on the answers given by the participants (Longhurst, 2003). If the interviewer deems it necessary to change the order of the questions they can, which at times will be useful (Longhurst, 2003). The main purpose of semi-structured interviews is to acquire data that has a depth of information (Robson, 2002). For this research the interviews needed to be able to capture a wide variety of strains and types of coping and emotional responses to be able to highlight the various factors that contribute to violence in prison. Therefore, the questions were designed to be open-ended, allowing the participants to give responses beyond simply yes or no answers (see appendix 1) (McIntosh and Morse, 2015). Instead, they were allowed to provide their own opinions and interpretations on certain matters or events that are of interest to the researcher.

As highlighted, a significant strength of semi-structured interviews is that they allow for more flexibility when compared to structured interviews whilst still maintaining a form of coherent structure which this research needs because in order to fully test the GST framework, it was important that the majority of my questions were asked in a consistent way so as not to neglect the concepts and queries that I considered important in answering my research

questions. For this reason, I decided that the unpredictability of unstructured interviews would not be optimal for my research (Alsaawi, 2014). Furthermore, my ability to explore deeply by asking probing questions was fundamentally important in order for me to understand how my participants' life experiences have impacted them (deMarrais, 2004). However, I was conscious that probing required a degree of skill on my part as an interviewer. I made sure to stay on topic whilst probing, and gently moved the participant on if I thought that too much time was being spent on a single topic because any misjudgement could result in time running out before being able to ask all of the desired questions. I wanted to avoid making up questions on the spot and instead tried to stick to my pre-determined questions which were carefully crafted to ensure to mitigate harm, distress or confusion on the part of the interviewee. If worded without care, the probes made in the interview could cause the interviewee to feel offended or confused (Harrell and Bradley, 2009).

I considered other data collection methods that can produce rich data such as focus groups. Focus groups are beneficial because they facilitate group discussion (Acocella, 2012). Focus group are also a time efficient method as they allow for diverse and differing perspectives on a desired topic in a short period of time (Smithson, 2008). Furthermore, by having a group discussion rather than a one-to-one interview, participants can challenge each other's perceptions and beliefs on a particular phenomenon which can lead to rich and interesting results (Kitzinger, 1995). These debates can help unearth new understandings on a phenomenon which is the desired outcome of this research (Acocella, 2012). However, I decided that focus groups would not be appropriate for this research. There are for example, ethical concerns when it comes to discussing the sensitive topic of prison violence and strains with AP residents. It is vitally important that the discussions held are not overheard by outside parties due to the sensitive nature of the data and it is questionable whether other AP residents should hear about other participants' experiences in prisons as they could potentially break the confidentiality of these experiences. Furthermore, the sensitivity of the topics to be explored carried the risk that participants could experience negative emotions, possibly leading to verbal and/or physical conflict within the group which would likely prove too challenging for me to mediate. Therefore, even though hypothetically focus groups could have been effective in achieving the objectives of this thesis, the various ethical concerns linked with focus groups mean that I chose interviews as the most appropriate qualitative method for uncovering AP residents' understandings of prison violence.

The development of the topic guide was a long process that lasted several months. The questions were developed with GST and prison violence models in mind throughout the

process. I first began by listing twenty questions that I had developed after writing a draft chapter on the history of GST (see Appendix 5). These questions helped me to map out my initial thoughts on what types of topics might need to be discussed in the interviews. Initially it was planned that I would interview prison staff as well as prisoners. However, as this research ended up interviewing only AP residents it was important that the questions were appropriately designed to be answerable by those that are not employed by the prison institution (see Appendix 1). At the start of the topic guide there are a list of background questions that I asked each participant. These background questions were carefully crafted so as not to risk ethical complications. Questions such as what type of crime they committed were not asked as this can be considered a delicate matter for both the HMPPS and the individual. What I wanted to know were factors such as age, which prison(s) they stayed at, sentence length and their country of origin, since these factors might influence their coping experience.

What proved a challenge with developing the topic guide, however, was how to effectively translate a typically quantitative framework into qualitative questions that would allow for an open-ended discussion. This involved using the GST terminology and explanations of coping violence behaviour, highlighted in chapter 3, to help create the questions. For example, what informed many of the questions were the three major strains: those being "failure to achieve positively valued goals" (p.51), the "removal of positively valued stimuli" (p.57) and the "presentation of noxious stimuli" (p.58) (Agnew, 1992). Therefore, I asked questions related to what goals they had in prison and what blocked them from achieving their goals, what did they value in prison (i.e., good relations with staff members) and what types of negative stressors did they experience (i.e., lack of safety) and how it affected them and others. Such questions ensured that I was fully covering the foundational principles of the GST framework. Furthermore, many of the questions were created based on the prison violence management methods outlined in chapter 2 such as the effects of IEP, officer treatment of prisoners and the design of prisons. These questions helped to highlight which management methods are causing strain and negatively affecting coping behaviour, thereby informing my policy recommendations. Lastly, I asked further questions about how they and others individually coped/responded to stressful events and negative emotions.

All the interviews were conducted face-to-face. Although there were risks in regard to the spreading of Covid-19 it was important and unavoidable that they were conducted this way, firstly because interviews with AP residents are highly regulated and secondly because face-to-face interviews are more viable since AP residents have limited access to computers. Furthermore, face-to-face interviews do not suffer from the technical issues which can arise

with video calls such as poor internet connections (Gray et al., 2020). Also, how comfortable the participants feel with video calls will likely vary as some of the participants have been in prison for a significant period of their lives. Those that are not confident with computers may feel uncomfortable with the interview which could have damaged the rapport between myself and the participant (Gray et al., 2020).

4.4.2. Sampling of Participants

This research used a convenience type sample. A convenience sampling method involves finding participants who are conveniently accessible to the researcher, for example those who live relatively close to the researcher and are willing to participate in the research (Robinson, 2014). In this project, the research took place in probation divisions that are relatively close to my university institution. Due to money and time constraints, and partly because of Covid-19, the researcher needed to access participants as realistically and conveniently as possible without compromising the quality of the data. This makes it difficult for the researcher to make broad claims about the findings because the research was restricted to the North of England (Etikan, Musa and Alkassim, 2016). However, as Robinson (2014) suggests, if the researcher identifies that this research is locally based then the validity of their claims still has weight.

Furthermore, due to time limitations, ethical complications and convenience, this research did not plan to select participation based on specific characteristics such as age, ethnic background and so on. Those housed in a male AP who were willing to participate would be accepted (Etikan et al., 2016). This is partially because this research planned to use primarily posters as a method of recruitment, which makes it difficult to control which types of AP residents decide to participate in the research (see section 4.4.3.). This therefore tends to result in a less evenly diverse sample. It would be ideal for this research to have a representative spread of ages, sentence lengths, ethnicity, category prison history and so on, in order to get a varied perspective on prison violence. However, being able to control who participates in AP research based on these factors is not feasible. Each AP has a limited number of residents and does not diversely represent those housed in prisons (see section 4.8.). This is why this research did not employ a non-random purposive sampling. In theory it would more likely result in a non-biased sample but would be practically dysfunctional (Etikan et al., 2016).

However, there are certain factors that this research can control and was aiming for, such as the participants' gender and the number of interviewees. This research sought only male participants, as was also going to be the case if I had been able to conduct the interviews in prisons. AP female residents will have likely experienced different types of strains in prison compared to the male prison population. The male and female population behaves and adapts to prisons differently to some degree which results in different forms of strains and coping responses in the prison environment (MacKenzie, Robinson and Campbell, 1989). The number of participants that this research was aiming to recruit was between 30 to 40 participants. This range would allow for 'diversity' across prisoner experience as far as possible (whilst using a convenience sample) to reflect some of the key characteristics identified in chapter 2. Furthermore, although there was not a specific outlined number, this research was aiming for a diverse range of ages between participants. This is because as explained in chapter 2, a prisoner's age significantly effects how they adapt and cope with strains in the prison environment (Leban et al., 2016; Morris et al., 2012). This varied perspective allows a more nuanced perspective on prison strains and violence. What this research also aimed for was to interview at several different AP. By going to different AP, it is more likely that those interviewed have experienced a range of different types of prisons. On average I interviewed 3 residents per AP.

4.4.3. Gaining Access/Recruitment

To gain access to AP, the researcher must first apply to the HMPPS National Research Committee (NRC) (GOV.UK, 2023d). At the time when I applied this involved completing a number of documents for them to review: An HMPPS application form, Covid-19 screening form, Covid-19 risk assessment, NRC risk assessment form, information sheet, topic guide, consent form, data management plan and my designed poster. After their initial review, the HMPPS NRC had several follow up questions. Once these were answered the HMPPS NRC sent me an approval letter allowing me to contact my requested probation divisions. I was required to email each probation division regarding my research. Once they received my email, a lead researcher associated with that division reviewed the documents I sent to the HMPPS NRC and later granted me access to AP in their area.

To recruit participants, AP managers were emailed with the help of the residential Head of Public Protection for each Probation Division. In each email a brief explanation of the methodology was included so that the manager could understand the aims of the research and decide whether it could be held at their AP. Those that accepted were emailed an

information sheet and a poster (see appendix 2 and 6). Recruiting participants through advertisement worked by asking participants to self-respond to carefully designed posters (Abbott et al., 2018). These posters included a brief description of what the interview was about, how much time it would take, what their rights of consent were, and information about the incentive for attending. The participant information sheet on the other hand provided more in-depth information concerning the research, their rights in participating and data protection. It was left to AP staff members to decide how to present these posters and information sheets. A few AP decided to stick the posters on their walls for potential participants to read. Those who decided to attend as a result of these posters were asked to notify one of the staff members (Cohen and Arieli, 2011). The benefit of this method is that it removes potential bias in the selection of participants (Abbott et al., 2018).

Some other AP, however, thought it would be better to hand out the posters and information sheets to potential participants that they selected. This method does risk bias in participant selection due to staff members potentially selecting participants who they think would be appropriate for participation in the interviews (Abbott et al., 2018). However, the benefit of this method is that the staff members were sometimes able to personally explain the research to the residents.

There were also some AP that invited me to attend one of their resident meetings to help them advertise the interviews. Resident meetings are held once a week in each AP where residents can voice their concerns and are made aware of safety measures and opportunities. In these meetings I was able to explain in roughly five minutes my research and the potential impacts of the thesis. The merit of being invited to a resident meeting is that the participants were able to meet me in advance of the interview. Those that have been through the prison system can be wary of researchers, so being able to meet the researcher before the interview can be beneficial (Copes, Brookman and Brown, 2013a; Copes, Hochstetler and Brown, 2013b). AP residents that were interested in the interviews were given the posters and information sheets by the staff members. Most often, the interviews occurred on the same day as the resident meetings, some on a more convenient later date.

In total the number of participants recruited for this research was 41 AP residents. This figure is close to the desired sample that I specified in the previous section (see section 4.4.2.). The age of the participants varied widely. These are the ages captured:

Table 1: Participants' Ages

Age groups	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79
Number of participants	6	10	11	9	4	1

As explained previously, having a diverse range of ages was necessary for this research because different age groups tend to react to strains differently (Leban et al., 2016; Morris et al., 2012). This variation in age groups was captured organically without any need for specific methods for recruiting younger or older participants. Compared to recent prison population figures a reasonable variety of ages was captured (Sturge, 2022). All the participants interviewed originated from the UK and so my sample lacked diverse ethnic perspectives. When it comes to sentence length this is what was captured:

Table 2: Participants' Sentence Length

Sentence Length	Less than 1 year	1 to 4 years	4+ years
Number of participants	5	16	20

The number of prisoners per sentence length is as expected. There are far more prisoners serving 4+ years sentences than 1 year or less according to prison population statistics (Sturge, 2022). It was important to get a varied perspective from participants who have served different types of sentence lengths. This is because, as with age, sentence length affects violence rates and coping behaviour in prison (Toman et al., 2015; Lahm, 2009). The final table showing the number of repeat offenders shows the following:

Table 3: Participants' Number of Offences

Number of offences	First-time offenders	Second offence or more
Number of participants	15	26

This table is considerably skewed towards people who have committed two or more offences. There is a strong likelihood that selecting individuals housed in AP has resulted in interviewing more repeat offenders than first-time offenders. Collecting information related to whether they have been incarcerated once or multiple times was considered necessary as this affects how well prisoners adjust and cope in prisons. Those that have served more than one sentence tend to have developed coping techniques from experience that they will employ once they are back in prison and are therefore less likely to be fearful and vulnerable (Rogers, 2019). The insight and knowledge of these experienced individuals are valuable for this research.

4.4.4. Interviews

All the interviews were held inside the AP where the participants were residing. The staff members provided rooms that only the researcher and the participant were allowed to be in throughout the interview, to maintain confidentiality and for there to be minimal noise (Longhurst, 2003). This allowed for the data to be recorded without unwanted noise. In each interview I brought with me my topic guide that I would use to ask questions throughout the interview, two consent forms for the participant to sign and an information sheet if they wished to read through it for a second time before the interview began. For this research each interview was recorded using a Dictaphone so that the data could be transcribed with accuracy. Most interviews averaged between 45 minutes to 1-hour. This length of time usually allowed for all the questions in the topic guide to be answered fully and in depth by the participants. Those that spoke slowly or needed more time to formulate their arguments were asked if they were fine with going over the 1-hour mark. If any participants wanted the interview to end after 1-hour then I did not proceed with further questions and turned off the Dictaphone. Most often the participants that did need more time to go through the topic guide agreed, and the longest interview lasted 1-hour and 25-minutes.

4.4.5. Research Adaptations

As has been established, this research required a number of revisions/adaptations in light of the Covid-19 pandemic, such as conducting the interviews in AP instead of prisons, abandoning the idea of interviewing prison staff, and following Covid-19 regulations/guidance in each AP. Once I had decided to interview a specific population (AP residents) in a highly controlled and moderated setting further, more minor adaptations were still required. Firstly, there were times when an AP was not able to recruit residents due to a lack of interest. This occurred for example in the first AP I contacted. After emailing the AP manager and receiving a confirmation that they would use my posters to recruit participants they confirmed three weeks later that they were unsuccessful in attracting interest. I felt that I had no choice but to accept this outcome and I thanked them for their efforts. I felt it that this AP had already spent a significant period of time attempting to recruit and any further pressure would risk overburdening them with my research. Instead, I approached another AP and asked if they would allow me to conduct my interviews with their residents. Fortunately, overall, there was only a small number of AP in which I was unable to recruit

any participants or in which only one resident was willing to participate. The rest provided a positive response.

The other significant adaptation that this research required, as mentioned in section 4.4.3, was regarding the way that participants were recruited. This differed slightly from the original plan, because each AP had their own preference in terms of how they wished to help with this research and I thought it was important to respect their preferences as much as possible as long as it did not compromise the research. Some AP wanted to give the posters and information sheets to residents in their one-to-one meetings. Other AP instead wanted to stick the posters onto walls and allow residents to let them know in their own time that they wished to participate. And lastly, other AP wanted me to attend their resident meetings to help explain the research so as to both lessen the burden on staff members and to improve participation. It was important that I accepted and followed the desires of the AP staff members when it came to recruitment as they were the gatekeepers to the participants. Therefore, it proved necessary to adapt to a recruitment strategy that best suited each AP.

4.5. Data Analysis

The data that was collected was analysed using Braun and Clarkes' (2012) framework for thematic analysis. Braun and Clarke (2012) explain that thematic analysis "is a method for systematically identifying, organising, and offering insight into patterns of meaning (themes) across a data set" (p.57). To put it simply, through thematic analysis, an analyst can apply meaning to the patterns/themes identified within the data. The themes identified should be relevant and help to answer the research questions that have been set out by the researcher. For this research, the themes were linked to both violence and GST. In comparison to other qualitative theories such as grounded theory and discourse analysis, thematic analysis is more flexible and easy-to-learn/easy-to-understand as it does not require theoretical background knowledge to effectively examine the dataset (Kiger and Varpio, 2020; Nowell et al., 2017; Braun and Clarke, 2012; Clarke and Braun, 2013). It also makes it easier for a lay reader to understand the information. This is desirable since this research is interested in impacting policy changes. However, there are disadvantages with this analytical method. For example, its flexibility can "lead to inconsistency and a lack of coherence when developing themes derived from the research data" (Nowell et al., 2017:2). This issue can be mitigated by making clear one's epistemological and ontological position, which was expressed earlier in this chapter. Secondly, it was important that I evaluated whether the themes identified through my analysis directly were linked to my research

questions. Lastly, this research closely followed Braun and Clarke's (2012) thematic analysis framework which helped me produce logical and relevant themes.

I analysed my dataset as follows. Firstly, I personally transcribed each interview without the assistance of any transcription software. Next, I uploaded the transcripts into NVivo which is qualitative software designed to ease and improve the efficiency of the coding and theming process. I then proceeded to generate "initial codes" from all the transcripts using NVivo (Braun and Clarke, 2012:61). These codes were the initial building blocks utilised to help create the desired sub-themes and major themes identified in the following phases. I then searched for themes. Generating the themes involved finding similarities and overlap between the codes that were created in the previous phase. The major themes and sub-themes must create a consistent logical narrative which is why this exercise requires the researcher to think critically about the dataset (Braun and Clarke, 2012). The researcher must consider how these codes link to create the major themes and sub-themes and whether these themes are relevant. The relevancy of these themes, as explained previously, depends on whether they answer the researcher's thesis questions. I firstly used NVivo to connect my codes together into sub-themes. Putting these codes into categories in NVivo makes it a lot clearer for the researcher how to formulate an argument using these codes (see appendix 7). Creating these sub-themes using the codes proved to be a long but rewarding process. All of the sub-themes were linked to the GST framework and the different forms of prison violence management methods. For example, there are categories such as prison coping, negative emotions, prison pains, mental health support, prison staff and so on. At this stage, as advised, I created thematic maps to help generate my themes, which I produced by hand (Braun and Clarke, 2012). Creating thematic maps helped simplify the process. I was able to view in a few separate A3 documents how these sub-themes could be linked. From this I was able to connect the sub-themes together in order to produce and name my three major themes (labelled as systemic strains) (see chapter 5) (Braun and Clarke, 2012:66). In this phase the researcher must outline the differences between the selected themes and decide what makes the themes selected unique and worth exploring. It was also in this phase where data extracts were gathered for the purpose of explaining and justifying the selected major themes.

Once this process was complete and all my codes and themes were checked, I began writing up the findings. Extracts/quotes from the data have been used throughout the findings to back up my arguments. The quotes were selected based on their relevance to my argument. Quotes were also selected for their depth and narrative weight (Lingard, 2019). Although there may have been some quotes that express similar arguments, if they were

difficult to understand, or lacked in-depth information, they were less likely to be selected. Also, as much as possible I made sure also to select some data that provided a differing viewpoint to the arguments that I made based on my GST analysis. Furthermore, as much as possible the quotes selected came from different participants for the purpose of having a varied perspective on these topics. The result is that all of the participants voices/viewpoints are acknowledged and analysed in the findings.

4.6. Ethical Considerations

This research was ethically approved by the HMPPS NRC (approved 10th June 2022). Since I was approved by the HMPPS NRC, I was not required to go through my universities ethics approval system. However, researching those involved in the CJS brings about unique types of risk that needed to be considered (Overholser, 1987).

4.6.1. Participants' Wellbeing

Firstly, it is the responsibility of the researcher that the physical and psychological wellbeing of participants is not affected by the research. This research interviewed those who can be considered as "powerless" and vulnerable (former prisoners) (BSA, 2017:5). Since the participants were recently released prisoners, consideration was given to the fact that the interviews might be distressing because participants were reflecting on potentially painful experiences of being in prison and of violence, bullying, intimidation and harmful relationships. It was made clear to interviewees that it was at their discretion what information they decided to reveal. If the participant was too emotionally sensitive to a particular question, then I moved on to another question. The participants were also informed that they had the right to leave the research process at any point (Borrill et al., 2005). The questions that were asked had also been carefully designed to mitigate potential distress and harm (Allmark et al., 2009). However, because the topics involved strain, violence, and negative emotions it would be disingenuous to say that distress in the participants could be completely avoided. If the participants showed significant signs of distress, I would have offered them the contact details of the Samaritans for emotional support. This support service's contact details were also included on the information sheet. Participants were also told that they did not have to say anything that made them feel uncomfortable and they could refuse to answer any individual question during the interview. Furthermore, if they felt that the research had been conducted improperly, they would have the right to complain to the ethics committee. This information was provided on the

information sheet. Also, at the end of the interview the participants were asked if they felt any negative emotions due to any of the questions. If they were distressed as a result of the interview, I would again have offered them the contact details of the Samaritans.

4.6.2. Researcher Wellbeing

While it is essential to consider the participants' well-being, it is also important to mitigate the risks for the researcher. For this research I made sure to familiarise myself with all the health and safety procedures of each AP that I visited and also made myself aware of the emergency procedures. When it comes to recruiting participants, the researcher must proceed with caution. The researcher must not be too assertive when recruiting and should give the participant time to decide if they wish to be interviewed. Applying too much pressure on individuals could not only have negative emotional consequences but also potentially put the researcher at risk (St Andrews, 2023). Feelings of anger, for example, resulting from the recruitment process, could lead to verbal and physical abuse. Therefore, the researcher must be mindful of their own conduct and take the individual's feelings into account. I decided that if the individuals who participated in my interviews became antagonistic, I would ask for the help of staff members to de-escalate the situation. Again, it is important that the researcher is careful with their use of language. Using stigmatizing language such as the words criminal and offender for example, could lead to the participant feeling hurt and angry towards the interviewer (Muraglia, Vasquez and Reichert, 2021).

There are also risks for the researcher when interviewing the participants. The interview process could take a negative psychological toll on the researcher as they will be discussing potentially sensitive topics. I decided therefore that If I felt after the interview that my well-being had been negatively affected, I would seek help and advice from my supervisors. The room selected by the researcher would help mitigate risks to the well-being of both the researcher and participants. These rooms were provided by the AP, so that staff members were at hand if the interview became dangerous. Since these rooms were in a building with which the participant was familiar, they should have felt comfortable, knowing that staff members were at hand. Furthermore, it was decided that if the interview became too heated and the researcher felt that their well-being was at risk, the interview would be stopped, and staff members would be notified. Fortunately, this potential risk did not occur in any of the interviews. Furthermore, for my own well-being the AP staff gave me an alarm to keep on my person in case I felt my safety was at risk whilst in the building. However, there were no situations during the research in which the alarm was used.

4.6.3. Consent

In any type of qualitative research, it is highly important that the participant gives informed consent (see appendix 3). Participants were asked to complete written consent forms and were made aware of "what the research is about, who is undertaking and financing it, why it is being undertaken, and how it is to be distributed and used", so they properly understood the purpose of this research (BSA, 2017:5). Also, as well as receiving consent forms, participants were given information sheets that provided a more in-depth explanation of what the research entailed. In case the participant decided that they no longer wished to proceed with the interviews before or after giving consent, they were made aware that no negative consequences would come about as a result of this decision. It was therefore important to ensure that the participants did not in any way feel pressurised to join the interviews (Copes et al., 2013b). If there was a disclosure of unreported offences and/or risk of harm by the participant, then the staff members at the AP would have been notified by the researcher. The consent forms for the interview stated that confidentiality would not be in effect if they disclosed harm to others. I also informed them this fact before the interview proceeded.

4.6.4. Security/Anonymity

It was also important that the data collected remained secure and the identities of the participants were kept anonymous. The participants' names were not discussed whilst recording the interview, thereby minimising the impact of a data breach (Roberts and Indermaur, 2008). When writing up the results, pseudonyms were used to ensure anonymity. The data was collected using an encrypted Dictaphone and was properly stored, secured, and always remained on my person whilst on fieldwork research. The data was put on a University of York managed internal server, under a secure password and all recordings and transcripts will be destroyed once they are no longer required (BSA, 2017:7). No one else had the right to see or use my data during the project other than the data extracts presented in my findings. It was also important to make it clear that the participants would not be asked to disclose any illegal behaviour that they had committed if they did not wish to, such as past violent behaviour (Matfin, 2000). It was at the discretion of the participant whether they wanted to discuss past misbehaviours. However, they were told before the interview began that if the researcher was led to believe that any future physical harm could be committed against a certain individual then confidentiality may have to be broken for the safety of others.

4.7. Reflexivity: Impact of Personal Characteristics and Experiences

It is increasingly emphasised in research that it is important for the researcher to be transparent about their own values, cultural experiences and personal characteristics that inform their personal biases and assumptions (Reid et al., 2018). There are many different ways in which a researcher can interpret qualitative data. Attitudes, personal experiences and biases influence what the researcher decides to identify as important themes. Furthermore, the researcher's personal experience and characteristics can significantly affect the relationship/rapport between the participant and the researcher (Berger, 2015). Certain personal characteristics such as age and gender, it is argued, can affect the types of information a participant would be willing to divulge. Berger (2015) for example, argues that "a woman may feel more comfortable discussing experiences with another woman than with a man" (p.220).

In my research there are various factors that will probably have shaped the findings and how the AP residents responded to me. I am a 26-year-old white middle class male PhD student. The participants were all E&W former prisoners residing in AP with varied background experiences and personal characteristics. Upon reflection, being male informed to a degree the direction of my PhD. For example, it is a significant reason why I decided to interview male rather than female former prisoners. I considered it would be perhaps easier to connect and understand male participants' issues and needs. Also, as argued by Berger (2015) I thought it would be in some ways less troubling for participants of the same sex to open up on certain topics. My age will also have affected to a certain degree the dynamics between myself and each participant (Underwood, Satterthwait and Bartlett, 2010). The fact that I was relatively young could have impacted how the participants perceived and how they engaged with me. It is possible they viewed me as inexperienced and so deserving of less respect than a senior researcher, particularly older participants. Opening up about certain sensitive topics is likely to be uncomfortable and difficult for an older individual when speaking to a young person, whereas the younger participants may have found it easier to open up to an individual of a similar age (Underwood et al., 2010). Generally, I did not perceive the participants' age to have a significant impact on the rapport that I had with them. Furthermore, it seems likely that one personal characteristic of mine would have been seen positively by the participants in that I, like them, come from the North of England. Folkes (2022) ethnographic research on Welsh residents discusses the feeling of being 'othered' in their research based on having a Southern English (Non-Welsh) accent. Sharing the

similarity with many of the participants of being raised in the north and having a northern accent reduces the feeling of being an outsider and could have played a part in improving rapport outcomes.

My position as the researcher is that I am an outsider to these participants' personal experiences of being a former prisoner (Dodgson, 2019). The participants could have viewed me as a PhD student who had no idea of the realities of prison life. To a large extent this is true. An individual has no full understanding of the "pains of imprisonment" without experiencing it themselves (Sykes, 1958:63). The participants' perception of me therefore could be one of naivety. It is therefore important that I did not present myself as someone who knew better than them, which, besides not being true, would negatively affect the discourse and trust between participant and researcher. Clearly, it was also important that I was aware of my own unconscious views and bias towards those who have been in prison. Unconsciously my views will have been shaped by the media and other research that has reported that prisoners are on average less well educated than non-offenders (Crabbe, 2016; Moss, 2017). However, viewing the participants as being less knowledgeable or uninformed is not helpful and is likely to be a fallacy. From my research experience the participants provided rich accounts of their life experience in prison. They were able to articulate in-depth complex issues around prison politics, mental health, officer behaviour and other prison strains. Therefore, it is indeed important for researchers to not assume that former prisoners would not be able to articulate their life experiences in detail because from my experience this has not been the case.

4.8. Research Limitations

There are a number of limitations associated with this research methodology that need to be acknowledged. As highlighted in section 4.2. the fact that I was not able to conduct interviews in prisons comes with downsides. Since my interviews took place in AP which house high-risk offenders, my sample does not include recently released prisoners that are classified by the HMPPS as low risk. This affects the characteristics of my sample in terms of sentence length and seriousness of offence for example. Furthermore, since I was not able to interview in prisons the participants had not experienced the strains of prison life as recently as those still incarcerated. Relying on their memory of how the prison experience affected them could to some degree distort their responses. Memories of previous life events are not always accurate and can become distorted (Loftus, 1996; Brainerd, Reyna and Ceci, 2008). This limitation of memory, however, would to some extent still be applicable even if I

interviewed individuals currently incarcerated. Prisoners would still be required to remember their prison life past events, which they might not remember completely accurately.

Doubts about the accuracy of memory raises the issue of whether the data being collected is truthful. This, of course, would lead to questions concerning the validity of the claims offered by this research (Kuzmanić, 2009). There is particular scepticism regarding interview data collected from offenders. As highlighted in Lucic-Catic (2011), "prison administrators are often sceptical of the objectivity of inmates in assessing their current situation in prison" (p.33). The view is often expressed that prisoners (or former prisoners) are more likely to be biased towards viewing the prison system in a negative light and disregarding the positive aspects of the regime. Lucic-Catic (2011), however, argues that "research has demonstrated that inmate perceptions vary systemically across prisons" (p.33). Therefore, it is perhaps unreasonable to argue that they would universally provide similar negative opinions towards their prison experience. Also, as emphasised by Sandberg (2010), even false information (or lies) provided by interview participants can "still be interesting" and there we will likely be questions to which they do not fully know the answers (p.462). From a social constructivist's lens, notions of true knowledge as a means to achieve validity are questionable as there exist multiple truths and understandings that the participants can present/offer (Kuzmanić, 2009). As argued by Kuzmanić (2009) "valid qualitative research is about credibly representing different social worlds or different interpretations to the readers", rather than seeking supposed objective universal truths (p.43). Or as stated by Sandberg (2010) "instead of always searching for 'the truth' one should appreciate the multitude of stories present in a social context, whether these are the product of years of fieldwork, a few meetings on the street, or interviews arranged by others or in prisons … these complex narratives teach us a great deal about people, culture, and society" (p.462). The argued issues surrounding validity and truth when it comes to interview data, however, can be minimised through different approaches. One approach is for researchers to make their research accountable by publishing their data for others to view and scrutinise, which I intend to do (Sandberg, 2010). Furthermore, as I originally planned, interviewing prison staff members could have also served to highlight various truths and understandings regarding prison violence in England and Wales. Prison staff have knowledge of the prison system that former prisoners likely do not have. The extra data that could have been collected from the views of prison staff would have contributed to the validity of this research.

A further unfortunate outcome of not conducting interviews in prison, is the loss of being able to observe the prison environment. Observation research provides a deeper insight into the culture and behaviours of the environment/people being researched (Ciesielska, Boström

and Öhlander, 2018). Although there are risks associated with prison observation research, observing the prisons at first hand would have provided me with a direct insight into the state of these environments and the strains prisoners are under (Jacobs, 1974). This would result in a deeper understanding of the state of prisons. However, even if I were to have conducted my research in prisons, the opportunities for observation would have been limited. The data collected would still largely have been through interviews. Therefore, not observing the prison environment did not significantly impact my research's aims and outcomes.

However, although this observation has been lost by not going into the prison environment there are several positives gained by interviewing recently released prisoners. One notable positive is that the participants that I interviewed came from numerous types of prisons and had a more varied perspective and experience to share. Furthermore, this project was not required to overcome the specific challenges that prison research entails. For example, one issue identified in prison research is that some prisoners may feel less inclined to participate in interviews for fear of being labelled by other prisoners as a "snitch" or "grass" by doing so (Copes et al., 2013a:842; Copes et al., 2013b). In E&W prisons, many prisoners conform to and value what is termed the "convict code" (or the "inmate code") which emphasises the importance of prisoners not giving information to authority figures which I the interviewer/outsider could be seen to represent (Copes et al., 2013a:842). Prisoners that do not conform to this culturally accepted practice may as a result be ostracised and/or harmed by other prisoners (Copes et al., 2013b). This therefore could limit the number of participants that this research could have recruited. This is not as much of an issue when interviewing recently released prisoners. Since they are not in a prison environment, they are no longer beholden to the "convict code" (Copes et al., 2013a:842). Therefore, they are less likely to be concerned for their own safety when participating in interviews. Another issue with conducting interviews in prison is the risk of their being disrupted or cancelled due to order or safety concerns caused by "facility related constraints such as lockdowns, turnover of contact people, shift changes, lack of a private interview area, and escort status of visitors" (Cislo and Trestman, 2013:307). Therefore, it should be expected that interviews conducted in prison have a greater chance of delays compared to research within the probation service.

As such, although there are limitations with not being able to conduct prison research such as being unable to observe/experience the prison environment and only interviewing participants that were categorised as high risk, there are notable benefits that AP research can provide, and future researchers should consider it as a methodological possibility.

4.9. Conclusion

To summarise, this chapter has outlined and explained the research aims and questions, the research design, the institutional setting, the data collection methods, the ethical considerations, and the data analysis, as well as providing various different critical and reflexive thoughts concerning my research journey.

With the methodology outlined the following chapters will provide the findings of this research. The findings section of this thesis covers three major themes.

- The costly desire for prison goods and its links to coping, bullying, theft and debt.
- The strain of prison staff disrespect, declining support, misuse of power and its links to inmate violence.
- Are stricter measures better for the management of violence?

The findings chapters are primarily informed by the GST framework provided by Agnew (1992) and later developed for a prison context by Blevins et al. (2010) (see chapter 3). Each chapter will discuss examples of systemic strains that are increasingly of greater magnitude due to various factors, including the recent pandemic, policy decisions, deteriorating conditions and lack of staff. These systemic strains are as follows: the strain of blocked desired costly goods, strain caused by prison staff attitudes, disrespect, lack of support and misuse of power and the strain of a strict regime. These systemic strains create smaller persistent strains that negatively affect prisoners' ability to cope legitimately. This will be discussed in greater detail in the respective chapters.

Chapter 5. The Costly Desire for Prison Goods and Its Links to Coping, Bullying, Theft and Debt

This chapter is the first of three substantive findings chapters that explore particular themes arising from the data. As explained in section 4.9. each chapter highlights and explains the detrimental effects of systemic strains on prison violence that have been identified in the data. These systemic strains are the strain of blocked desired costly goods, strain caused by prison staff attitudes, disrespect, lack of support and misuse of power and the strain of a strict regime. These systemic strains produce various types of strains in the prison environment that are highlighted by the participants quotes, strains such as those that block desired goals, remove positive valued stimuli, and produce noxious stimuli (Agnew, 2006). By exploring these systemic strains these chapters seek to highlight the root causes of prison violence. The first of these systemic strains that will be discussed in this chapter is the strain of blocked desired costly goods.

Since the works of Sykes (1958) it is well understood that a pain that prisoners will suffer from is the deprivation of goods and many participants stressed the importance of such goods which can be seen as a loss of valued stimuli (Agnew, 2006). Goods that prisoners will be accustomed to in the outside world provide a source of comfort and a means of coping with life's stressors. The more they are pained by the deprivation of these desired goods the more they will seek ways to obtain them, through legitimate or illegitimate means. In the prison environment there are goods that can be categorised as either licit or illicit products that help prisoners cope with various strains. This chapter will primarily be focusing on licit goods that can be acquired through the canteen and will uncover the reasons why prisoners will act illegitimately to obtain them.

This chapter is primarily informed by the GST major strains of the "failure to achieve positively valued goals" (p.51) and the "removal of positively valued stimuli" (p.57) (Agnew, 1992). The licit goods that will be covered are positively valued stimuli for prisoners that are increasingly difficult to obtain. This chapter argues that prisoners are required to work hard, maintain healthy family connections, and learn how to adequately manage their income in order to cope properly. However, the findings indicate that some prisoners do not have the adequate coping mechanisms and abilities to handle blockages such as lost family contact, a lack of purposeful job opportunities, the problems caused by the IEP scheme and the rising cost of goods, without resorting to illegitimate means of obtaining them such as bullying, theft and/or getting into debt. This chapter argues that these illegitimate acts

increase the potential for physical and psychological violence in prison. Unless there is an understanding of the underlying root of what drives prisoners to behave violently, such as being blocked from obtaining their desired stimuli, effective policy changes, such as those suggested later in chapter 8, cannot be implemented.

5.1. Desired Prison Goods and Their Coping Effects

According to the participants there were several licit goods that could be acquired legitimately in prison that they deeply valued and which made them feel stressed when they had difficulty in accessing them or when their quality did not meet their expectations. The goods that will be discussed are vapes, food, electric fans, DVD players and games consoles. There are several reasons why these goods were selected specifically from the interview data. The first reason is their connection to causing or reducing either stress and/or aggressive behaviour. The second reason is the frequency with which participants referred to these goods, thereby indicating their significance. Some of these goods are viewed as a constant need for prisoners, whereas others are more situational but are nevertheless viewed as necessary and important stress/pain relievers. These products, however, are costly for prisoners. Some are an expensive one-time expense (unless stolen), whereas others become a regular purchase that they buy weekly (food and/or vapes). The challenge prisoners must cope with is how to adequately manage their money by only purchasing the goods that they need. As will be argued in this chapter, some will find this more difficult than others.

5.1.1. Vapes and Coping

One of the most commonly mentioned desired goods that can be acquired at the prison's canteen were vapes (E-cigarettes). Studies have found that in 2019 80% of E&W prisoners were classified as smokers (Jayes et al., 2019:1). Most prisoners therefore desire substances that they can smoke whether that be tobacco or vapes. In recent years E&W closed prisons have adopted a smoke-free policy in which the purchase of tobacco is prohibited due to the adverse health risks (MoJ, 2020c; Jayes et al., 2019). Vapes as a result have become increasingly popular as an alternative to tobacco (Brown et al., 2019). Vapes act as a primary stress reliever for many in prison. For example, as explained by Braiden:

"If you haven't got a vape in jail like, you get stressed to the max. You get stressed to death. Like really stressed. Like behind your door with one of your vapes and that. I've been behind the door on the canteen day, canteen waiting, because they don't give the canteen out until about 6 o'clock at night. So, I would be behind my door and then, obviously like no vapes and that, after my tea, thinking fucking hell waiting and that, it would be like an hour until they give the vapes out, do you know what I mean. And you cannot wait. First thing you do when the canteen comes, bang, vapes, vapes straight on your pens, do you know what I mean. It's one of the first things you do like. Vapes causes stress to a lot of people if they haven't got a vape in jail. They stress to bits. Everyone's going round like on the day before canteen like no haven't got no vapes. The day before canteen. There are only a few people with vapes on the wing. So, there is people running round like have you got vape, have you got a bit a vape. Have you got this" (Braiden).

What Braiden highlights is that vapes act as both stress relievers and stress causers. At times when prisoners were locked up in their cells for long periods of time, vapes helped deal with the stress and frustration of the ensuing boredom (Brown et al., 2021). However, the addictive nature of vapes will have the negative consequences of producing the stress that prisoners seek to avoid (Brown et al., 2021). Also, as will be highlighted later in this section, there will be a variety of situations in which they could be prevented from obtaining their desired vapes, resulting in serious negative consequences for inmate safety (see section 5.3.3.).

5.1.2. Food and Coping

Several participants also cited good quality food as a highly desirable commodity because of the comfort that it brings.

"When people eat good in prison, you see a big change. People are quieter. They are happier" (Enzo).

Prisoners' quality of life is argued to be heavily influenced by the quantity and quality of food offered by prisons (Møller et al., 2007; Vanhouche, 2015). Good quality food is vitally important for prisoners' "physical, mental and emotional well-being" (HM Inspectorate of Prisons, 2016b:3). Mealtimes are periods of the day that most individuals look forward to as one of life's greatest pleasures (Belasco, 1999). However, in a similar way to vapes,

because food is a source of pleasure and can often act as a coping mechanism, it is painful for prisoners when the quality is poor and the quantity is small.

"Eating cold food all the time. Absolutely atrocious. Some of it you wouldn't even feed your dog, while some of it you would actually look at it and think that's dog food that. It literally looks like dog food that's been put into a pie … Some people are complaining that you wouldn't even feed your child that because there is not enough. So, they give people like 8 or 9 chips. A couple of peas" (Simon).

"Yeah, everyone was bothered. Obviously when you first get there and you eat for a couple of weeks your dietary doesn't really function properly because it's not used to that type of food because it's high calories, just to keep cost down most likely. Everyone either because you only get fed twice a day because they go on like they give you breakfast but they give you these little fucking children's cereals in the morning. And then eventually because everyone kept nicking loads of them they just stopped giving them out. So, everyone just never got any breakfast anyway, so it was only 2 meals a day" (Charlie).

"Well, they were different everyday but it were potatoes. I mean jacket potatoes they stopped selling them because there were worms in them. I was like what's that hole in them pulled it out and it was a worm. It put me right off jacket potatoes and they would come with soil on them it was awful" (Rory).

As highlighted in the quotes above, key frustrations, when it comes to quality of food, concern unhealthy meals, poor taste, the temperature of the food when served and its physical appearance. One of the participants who was a servery worker during his sentence shed light on the reason why food comes out cold and the taste does not meet the prisoners' expectations.

"People that are working on servery and are not giving the right portion of food. You wait a long time for your tea and when you get it, you only get a little portion, it's not great is it. One jail that I was in we got pizza, jacket potato and peas. That's not a meal to me. It doesn't go together. In another prison we got cheeseburger, mash potato and sweetcorn. It's food but it doesn't go together. Like the curries they don't taste of nothing. The lasagne is like water. The mash potato I don't eat the mash potatoes. The chips are cold, they are rock hard. The foods are cooked alright in the kitchen because I've worked in the kitchen and they taste a lot better when it's freshly made, it's the amount of time that it's spent in the trollies to transfer the food to the wings. They spend like 2 to 3 hours in the trolley and then the food

gets picked up at like 4 o'clock, 5 o'clock to get down to the wings. And then it's that cold when it gets there" (Aidan).

According to participants, the freshness and the temperature of the food is primarily compromised by the gap between the time it has been cooked and the time it is served to the prisoners. For the servery workers this can be frustrating as the participants often praised their work, arguing that they did a good job cooking but the quality is negatively affected by staff demands and the regimes set by prisons.

"See when I worked in kitchens. I was down there with a good set of people, and we used to cook the food good. Like see the staff, they are just tutors, they are not even officers. So, they just come in to get paid, when we are cooking curries and that, they are like yeah, water it down a bit. It needs to feed more people. Put some peas and sweet corn. In the chicken korma? It doesn't need peas and sweet corn, but they need to fill it up, it just tastes like crap. When we were down there, we are cooking things good. How we want to eat it but it's disgusting as well" (Joshua).

Participants stated that they felt angry and frustrated because of the hunger they experienced due to small food portions and the quality of the food served. The effect that this had on prisoners' emotional and physical well-being can also have negative consequences for prisoners' behaviour (HM Inspectorate of Prisons, 2016b). And the unfortunate outcome is that it is the servery/staff members who can become targeted for verbal or physical abuse because they are perceived to be the reason for their hunger and the poor quality of the food, even though, as previously mentioned, these negative meal outcomes can often be out of the control of staff and servers (Godderis, 2006; Struthers Montford, 2022). The stress and feelings of frustration over food delivered from the servery caused some participants to cope by purchasing and cooking their own food.

"That's why most people have turned to cooking themselves. Like cooking food in their kettles and that. Buying food from the canteen. I know the majority of people on the wing that I was on before I got released was cooking themselves. Were just buying all their food from the canteen and just eat from their money and no eating from the servery" (Aidan).

"And also, with the Category C prison, one thing that really made a difference was the fact that they got self-cook kitchens on each unit. So you don't always have to eat servery food and you can actually opt out from the servery food and they'll give you some money because you're not getting fed by the prison and you can then buy your own food from the little shop

that they had in the prison, so then you can cook your own food so you never eat prison food. And it's all those little things that make a difference … For me I think just some of the old draconian ways. Prison food on the servery. I think the idea of the opt out where you can actually cater for yourself and take more responsibility for your own, sort of wellbeing. I think that needs to be done more" (Archie).

The option to buy and cook their own food provided both a sense of enjoyment and autonomy for these participants. One of the main benefits is that it allows them to avoid foods that they dislike and manage their food quality and quantity themselves. As Archie highlights, allowing prisoners to cook for themselves gives prisoners power to manage their own well-being and indirectly teaches them the importance of personal responsibility. What the prison service should seek to avoid is for prisoners to become dependent on others. The more they are deprived of autonomy the more likely they are to become institutionalised over time (Haney, 2003). Some participants expressed the feeling that they had indeed become institutionalised in this way.

"I'm institutionalised so, I don't really care. That's horrible to say. I can cope in prison very well. I can't cope out of here. Prison is easy for me because prisons built me. The amount of shit I've gone through. Yeah, I'm not bothered. And that's a sad answer really" (Gavin).

"I was institutionalised me. Everything was hard. I didn't know how to get a house, I didn't know how to sign on or look for jobs, I just couldn't do nothing like" (Peter).

5.1.3. Electric Fans and Coping

Other goods that some participants identified as desirable were products that can be used to make the cell experience more comfortable. For example, Rory and Mike described desiring and needing electric fans in their cells during the hot summer periods.

"Very hot. In our room, the boiler was there. So, they had the heating on, even though it was summer, so no matter what it was the heater were coming through when it was red hot. It was scorching. It was a sweat box. We had a fan in there, we ended up getting a fan, but the fan was on constant" (Rory).

"It was just warm. There was nothing they could do. Well, they probably could have done, they could have brought some fans onto the landings and stuff. Yeah, it was just warm" (Mike).

Participants had experienced extremely uncomfortable temperatures while locked in their cells. This noxious strain has been greater in magnitude for many prisoners both because of the rising temperatures that E&W has experienced in the last few years and the fact that prisoners have had to deal with longer bang up during the stricter measures imposed during Covid-19. With many prisoners having to cope with being stuck in their cells up to 23 hours each day they got little reprieve from the heat. Participants explained that the cells become far hotter than the landings or outside during the summer periods. As argued by Mike:

"During the summer and that. When it's 25, 26 degrees. Probably feels like 35 in the pad. And you've got somebody living on top of you. I can probably put my hand from there to there and touch each wall. That's how narrow it is" (Mike).

Most of the participants who expressed this viewpoint argued that this is because the cells are not well designed for high temperatures and are not well ventilated. They also argue that, perhaps due to safety concerns, the windows do not open far enough for the necessary airflow.

"Not good. The ventilation in the cells isn't great. Clearly, they are worried about people trying to escape because the windows only opened about that far. And on the other wings, on the main wings, they've got like these grills up with just holes in and there's just no ventilation comes in through them at all" (Kallum).

"Like a greenhouse, literally like a greenhouse. Especially when you can't open your windows very far, you've got an inch of gap. So luckily there is two windows but even then, you are still not getting enough airflow. And if you're in a cell where your door is locked, it doesn't draw air through" (Simon).

This lack of airflow results in the cell experience being considered unbearable. The Howard League (2021) argue that the newly planned E&W prisons are not taking poor ventilation and high temperatures into proper consideration. E&W prison designs will need to adapt to adjust for the rising temperatures because many prisoners will find coping increasingly difficult. A few participants highlighted that there were very few options to cope with the heat when locked in their cells. It is either wear fewer clothes, ask for guards to unlock their cell, or buy

a fan. If these legitimate coping methods are not sufficient or are blocked, then participants suggested that prisoners are more likely to cope poorly as a result.

"There were loads of fights and people falling out when it was hot and that because you were banged up for so long. Loads of fights going on. Small conditions, hot, you know. You didn't get a respite from it, the sun would come up, like spend all day shining on your side of the house block and it sort of like your pad acted like a kiln like it was absorbing the heat into the brick and when the sun had gone down you were hoping it was going to be a bit cooler, and obviously it was just releasing the heat back into the pad from the brick. So yeah, it was fucking awful" (Morgan).

"Some people yeah. They got a bit violent with the hot weather" (Bruce).

The strain of being locked in cells during heatwaves will have negative consequences on individuals' mental, physical, and/or emotional well-being. Joshua was the minority that did not consider heat to be a contributor to violence in prison.

"I think it's more unnecessarily uncomfortable because people don't have the energy to kick off because of the heat itself, most of the time you just want to go back to the pad" (Joshua).

Research, however, indicates that hot temperatures increase aggressive behaviour (Anderson, 2001). If they are unable to escape or alleviate the pain of heat some prisoners could cope poorly and violently lash out. Therefore, it is important that measures are taken to reduce the strain of heat for prisoners.

5.1.4. DVD Players, Game Consoles and Coping

The final two goods to be discussed that significantly helped some participants cope with long periods of bang-up are DVD-players and games consoles. The following participants considered these two goods to be fundamental for relieving boredom and reducing stress.

"I used to spend a lot of time with a DVD player. In 3 and a half years I was in jail I thought I'd say yeah it went by quite quick. There were times it dragged yeah, but there was a lot of times it went just like, but that was only because I could take myself out of the situation, put a film on, just watch the film. While you are watching that film, you are not thinking about your next-door neighbour, you're not thinking about what is happening in jail, you're not

thinking about this, that and the other. It's just you and your own thoughts. And that's how I tackle things by getting a DVD player" (Lawrence).

"I liked my PS2 console and the motor racing games on that. Other people liked football games or golf was surprisingly popular. The consoles are very helpful for lots of people" (Henry).

DVD players and games consoles are desired because they allow prisoners freedom of choice in what they watch/play and when to watch/play it. This freedom is limited by what the library offers and will vary according to the options available in each prison. Nevertheless, they are considered a preferable alternative to the limited number of TV channels offered which was a commonly cited frustration (see section 7.2.3.1.). DVD players and games consoles benefited participants who coped with prison by staying awake during the night. A few participants like Aidan, preferred being asleep during the day to avoid socialising with other prisoners who were viewed as annoyances and anticipated risks. These devices offered the freedom to pass time in whatever way desired without needing to be awake during the day.

"Just like playing on my Xbox, listening to music … I was just like trying to pass the time so, I was just doing whatever I could just to pass a couple of hours. I'd draw, I'd write, I'd play on the computer, listen to music, watch a boxset. I finished Game of Thrones within about 2 weeks. I watched Stranger Things in a couple of weeks. Just stay up all night and sleep through the day" (Aidan).

Seven participants described games consoles as devices that benefit the mental health of those who enjoyed them. Playing video games has been shown in the literature to help reduce stress and improve people's mood (Ajmal et al., 2022; Russoniello, O'Brien and Parks, 2009). This is especially the case for games that are designed to be accessible and played casually and which require little to no experience of previous video games. In the study it was highlighted that prisoners liked playing games because it helped them forget about their daily stressors and also improved their self-esteem when they are able to overcome challenges (Ribbens and Malliet, 2015). For Luke, playing war video games was a mechanism to mentally transport him back to his life before being incarcerated. This therefore provided him some relief from the monotony of prison life.

"Lock myself in my cell and turn on my games console. Something with a bit of war in it so you actually feel like you are in there … yeah get into your own zone. Like I said for me it

was playing war games. Being ex-military, I find it more relaxing it puts me back to when I was working in the military, I know it sounds stupid, but it is what worked for me" (Luke).

"Obviously, people that were fortunate enough to have PlayStations like myself, obviously that helps your mental health" (Desmond).

5.1.5. The Importance of Prison Goods

To sum up, based on the explanations made by the participants, these licit goods are necessary for prisoners to cope legitimately with various stressors. However, in E&W prisons there are barriers to obtaining these goods as the following will highlight.

5.2 Barriers Preventing the Legitimate Purchase of Desired Goods

As in wider society E&W prisons have their own formal economy. This economy is set up in part for prisoners so they can acquire desired non-essential goods and thereby help relieve the depriving prison environment. Each prisoner is granted a weekly allowance that they can use to purchase goods from the canteen (Walker, 2015). However, for many individuals the unemployed weekly allowance (minimum £2.50 per week) is not enough to legitimately acquire desired goods (MoJ, 2020b:17). Therefore, they must find other means of acquiring money and/or goods through legitimate or illegitimate methods.

5.2.1. Barriers to Family Financial Support

Participants made it clear that the means of acquiring money is not equal for everyone. The prison life experience to some degree reflects life outside where economic and family background affects people's financial means (Bowles, Gintis and Groves, 2005). Some prisoners will be more privileged than others through the amount of emotional and financial support they receive from family members and friends. Prisons allow for prisoners' family members and friends to send them additional money to help them pay for goods and services (Webster, 2016). The HM Inspectorate of Prisons (2016a) report found that "many prisoners identify the importance of having family who can send in additional money to help them afford items from the canteen" (p.9). The following reflect participants' feelings towards family financial support.

"There was canteen once a week but that was expensive for what they were paying you. They were paying you £1.90. You can't get nothing with it. Nothing at all. It's wrong, it's wrong. I got money sent in for me, so I was ok but for these lads who didn't have anything, £1.90 is a bit of insult" (Rory).

"You got people who do get sent in, not much, so you got the price of the canteen. And you got people who got loads, and you got people who got nothing, who just relied on the prison wage. So, they like sort of struggle" (Lenny).

Prisoners who receive support from their family members are more likely to cope better and "less likely to be involved in serious misbehaviour, including violence" (Rocheleau, 2014:165). They are more likely to be able to purchase what they view as essential for their happiness without feeling obligated to participate in prison education or work, which some may wish to avoid for personal reasons. Rory for example felt financially secure because of the monetary support from his family members. Whereas Lenny argues those who only rely on wages tend to 'struggle'. Only a few participants stated that they received financial support. There are many reasons why family members might choose not to, or be able to, send money. Some participants' family members, like Gavin's, are not financially and/or mentally capable enough to support them.

"Some people are lucky in jail where they can sit behind a door and their family will give them money. For me that's not the case. My family are sad to say drug addicts, alcoholics, apart for my sister and my uncle. So, I don't have the luxury, so I have to work, I have to put the work in to get the best job in the prison" (Gavin).

On average prisoners come from poor socio-economic backgrounds (Williams, Papadopoulou and Booth, 2012). The likelihood that their family members are in the financial position to send in money regularly is therefore not high and will likely decrease during periods of nationwide economic instability (BBC News, 2023b). At the present time UK families are struggling to pay for essentials such as food and gas and electric due to rising inflation (Partington, 2022). The added cost of sending money to an incarcerated family member is an extra, unaffordable expense during this period. The macro-level strain of rising inflation, therefore, could have an impact on prisoners' financial support from family members and on their ability to cope inside prison.

Participants also highlighted the fact that financial help is not possible if family contact is lost. Some participants' relationships with their family members and friends had broken down prior to prison whereas others had lost contact during their sentence.

"Category B prison, yes. category C prison no. My mum used to come and visit every week and as soon as I went to the category C prison that were it. We lost contact. I've not seen my family for over 2 and half years now. We had family problems which led to that" (Simon).

"Well, it broke down family contact. So, I am not going to start from scratch again" (Luke).

For many of the participants, losing contact with their family was very painful, not just due to the financial loss but also because they missed the emotional support they once received. Some participants, like Gavin, felt strained by seeing others who had the emotional and financial support hat he did not.

"Don't get nothing. No letters, no phone calls, yeah nothing. Yeah, it's hard man. That part of it is hard when you see people going out on visits or they get their money. Yeah of course it's fucking hard man. Like sit behind my door because I've worked my way up to get a single cell, so I'm on my own, yeah man I'm sitting in my cell, there's times where I've had to, you just turn everything off into silence and you sit there and you think, why the fuck am I here? But I'm here again. Yeah, I miss my family. Of course, man" (Gavin).

The stress, pain, and the loss of needed financial and emotional support highlight why it is imperative that prisoners are given the means to maintain and/or repair these relationships if they can be salvaged. However, according to some participants' experiences there are barriers that affect prisoners' ability to maintain contact. For example, Covid-19 lockdown measures were a major barrier that disrupted many of the participants' contact with family members and friends. At the height of Covid-19, prisoners were unable to have face-to-face visits. As a result, many participants did not see their loved ones for a significant period of time.

"With the lockdowns there was no visits, so for 2 years I haven't seen friends, family, children, nobody" (Riley).

"Up until Covid I had one of my friends because of my crime a lot of my friends and family didn't want to know which is fair enough, everyone has got to deal with it in their own way. But I had one friend that used to see me every month. And I don't know if you know where

the category C prison is but it's quite a long way up. But because of the journey, for an hour long visit he was on the road for 7 and a half hours. And then when Covid hit, I didn't get any visits for 2 years" (Kallum).

Face-to-face visits play an important role in the maintenance of family and friends' relationships, in the lowering of prisoner violent misconduct and in improving prisoners' overall well-being (De Claire and Dixon, 2017). They are valued by prisoners as they offer much needed human contact with their family members and/or friends. The loss of this valued stimulus of human contact caused some prisoners to feel stressed and pained during the pandemic and had a negative effect on their mental health. As highlighted by Archie:

"That social interaction and that contact with your family. So over Covid of course with the social distancing that was introduced again you could see that guys found that difficult because they've got their partner and child and they can't even have a hug with them. So that's something that had a big impact on people's mental health" (Archie).

Since the start of the pandemic, to minimise the strain and potential consequences of this loss, prisons in E&W now offer more ways to contact family members. Since 2018, landline phones in cells have been introduced in E&W prisons primarily to help reduce recidivism (MoJ, 2018). The pandemic served to further justify the need for phones in cells and therefore the implementation of them has continued (HM Inspectorate of Prisons, 2021c). And as stated by a recent report most prisons now have in-cell telephones installed (HM Inspectorate of Prisons, 2023b). Many of the participants that were interviewed said that they had phones in their cells and valued them because they helped to maintain their relationships/support and reduce feelings of isolation during long-periods of lock-up.

"Now I know there are risks and that. I was like 14 months behind my door in the category C prison. And watching people dying on TV through Covid and stuff. I didn't have a phone in my cell in that prison. I did in the category B prison and that was great for keeping in touch with my family and my daughter and that, having a phone in your cell. A proper phone I mean" (John).

"I used to be very violent but that was my way of dealing with it and adjusting because I was frustrated. I didn't want to be in jail, so I was always fighting or smashing my pad or needing to let that anger out but after a bit, phone calls they helped me cope" (Joseph).

A significant barrier that prisoners have to contend with however, on top of the cost of canteen goods, is the cost of making phone calls. This proved a challenge for some participants because eventually they were unable to make any phone calls until they received more money the following week. Thus, those who have less money due to not receiving financial aid or not participating in work/education will have less opportunity to maintain their family ties. For Joseph, only being able to afford a relatively small period during the week to phone his family was frustrating and burdensome. Before prison life, he was used to being able to call for long stretches of time, however, the substantial costs prevented him from being able to do so.

"And the credit as well, see out here, I'll be on the phone for hours, in there 20 minutes it's like £1.40. So just think an hour phone call that's let's say £4 and you only get to spend £25 a week. So, if I'm paying £10 credit on an hour phone call at £4, I get two phone calls per week" (Joseph).

During the Covid-19 pandemic HMPPS helped mitigate this burden by giving "all prisoners £5 weekly phone credit" (Suhomlinova et al., 2022:282). However, this supplementary help was dropped in late 2021 for prisoners, thereby making contact with family members and purchasing their desired goods more difficult (Inside Times, 2021).

The other option given to prisoners during the pandemic were video calls through the service Purple Visits (MoJ, 2022b). Purple Visits is a video calling platform which was rolled out across all prisons in early 2021 to help reduce the blockages prisoners were experiencing in maintaining family ties (MoJ, 2021b). For the most part, the participants viewed video calls as beneficial in maintaining ties. Being able to see their family members via video calls was seen as an improvement over phone calls in terms of coping better mentally.

"But yeah, you still can't beat seeing people face-to-face, which is why when the Purple Visits came in and visits were on hold because of Covid, at least guys had that video chat to them to see people and that helps" (Archie).

However, some participants criticised the use of this technology. For example, Harrison argued that that they were only "given half an hour a time" (less than half the usual face-to-face visit length) per month and he was left feeling "agitated and frustrated" when the video call he was having with his child was not working. Harrison's view is supported by reports highlighting that "prisoners reported frequent technical problems" with the video call technology (HM Inspectorate of Prisons, 2021c:15). Limited time spent with family on video

calls as well as inadequate technology are areas that need to be addressed (Suhomlinova et al., 2022:282). Also, video calls and phone calls lack the positively valued stimulus of human contact. As argued in Fulcher's (2013) research, contact between parent and child benefits more from face-to-face visits. This is because face-to-face visits offer better bonding opportunities between parent and child and significantly help normalise their relationship (Fulcher, 2013). Furthermore, research has also found that many prisoners are of the opinion that the "intimacy provided by face-to-face visits allows for stronger maintenance of social ties" (Duwe and McNeeley, 2021:479). The longer loved ones are physically separated from each other the more likely their relationship will become strained. The more strained their relationship becomes the less likely prisoners will receive the emotional and financial support they may need and/or desire. Therefore, both during the pandemic and moving forward some prisoners may have less contact with their family members and are less likely to receive financial support as a result.

5.2.2. Barriers to Job Participation

Those prisoners who find themselves without the emotional and financial support of family members will have greater pressure to seek other means of gaining money. Legitimately that would involve prisoners participating in prison work and/or education (PRT, 2023c). Between these two options, work is often expressed as the most desirable. Some participants valued jobs because the wages they earned enabled them to purchase their desired goods and to save some money for future expenses. Compared to education, work is more desirable if the primary goal is to earn money.

 "*Yeah, my personal goals always is get a job. Get the best job. Try and save some money*" *(Gavin).*

"*Yeah 100%. You know money is tight, so you are going to get paid more for doing some work, they are just going to do that instead*" *(Mike).*

Participants also highly valued jobs because it got them out of their cells for long periods of the day. Therefore, prisoners' desires and goals of getting out of their cell to relieve the noxious stimulus of bang up inadvertently increases prisoners' participation in work and other prison activities. For example, as stated by Enzo and Joseph:

"Oh yeah, I would rather work. I would rather be out my cell, doing something. Instead of just sat there stewing. It's not good. It just winds your head. You end up going insane" (Enzo).

"Yeah, I've got ADHD. Even the officers say I'm a good person. I've got a very good heart but I'm always in trouble, I'm always down for something. And that's because of my ADHD. I will be chilled but I need something to do. I can't just be in a box all the time. And I need something to do and I'm telling them I need something to do, get me a job. Yeah, mental health is a big factor like" (Joseph).

What can prevent some individuals from wishing to participate in work, however, is poor pay. Prison work pay is an area of contention because some view it as being inadequate considering the current cost of goods (Inside Times, 2022). Poor pay was a noxious strain and blockage for job participation for some participants as they perceived their labour as worth more than the wages they were being offered. Research indicates that poor pay affects overall job satisfaction and increases the likelihood of people quitting (Clark, 2015). If prisoners feel that their wages do not enable them to buy enough prison goods, then the incentive to work is reduced.

"Long before Covid. It's always been bad. Wages are shite, if you are lucky you would get 84p a session. So 84p, so £1.08 maybe double if you are doing double sessions. £3 a day. Per week you could probably do all 13 hours. But for £4 an hour, not a lot" (Enzo).

"You get £15 a week. You don't want to be working 8 hours a day for £15 a week" (Joseph).

From Fred's perspective however, the lack of motivation to work due to poor pay is only an excuse made by those who only want an easy prison life. What can be understood from his perspective is that better pay may not be completely effective for those who only wish to do the bare minimum in prison.

Whether it's, the average comment in prison is, I'm not doing that for £2.40 a day. Well, sorry, you are in prison. Do you want to earn money or not? … And all they want to do is do nothing and get paid. Go to the gym, take drugs and lie in the bed. They don't want to work (Fred).

Another barrier to income, as expressed by many participants, is the limited number of jobs. It is argued that the jobs supplied in some prisons cannot meet the demand. As stated by Peter:

"They couldn't facilitate the amount of people that were still in there. They built too much, they built for too many people to stay, not enough jobs for people, so most people were just sitting behind the door" (Peter).

As of 2019-20, 12,500 prisoners were working out of a population of 83,116 in E&W prisons (MoJ, 2019:4; GOV.UK, 2023a:1). That means roughly 70,000 prisoners were out of work and many would therefore likely be receiving only the basic weekly wage. Furthermore, the more overcrowded a prison becomes the more difficult it is to provide opportunities for all prisoners. Prisoners who are housed in prisons with high levels of overcrowding will therefore be more likely to find it challenging to earn money in prison. Also, as highlighted by Riley below, those that are on short sentences will be less likely to obtain work in prison compared to those on longer sentences.

"What they say they offer, like if you went on the category C prison website, for what you read they say like their facilities are great, there is so much to do, if all of them things they talk about was available to do on a day-to-day basis it would help a lot of people in a lot of different ways. But they are running only a small percentage of that stuff, you get what I mean. Even though they are telling the community that there is this many things, they are only using 10% of it. So, what they are offering if they used it all would be great but they are not using it … Yeah, like a lot of it is shit, say like because you only have so much agency for people to actually work. So, if there's even other prisoners, not just the category C prison now, like this category B prison, it's a remand jail and short sentenced. So, like only 50% of the jail is working, so 50% are all locked up" (Riley).

What also can prevent some prisoners getting into work is the lack of variety in jobs. The participants tended to say they preferred creative type jobs that challenge them, where they can feel a sense of satisfaction in their work. If they feel as if the work does not transfer well into outside society, then some individuals question the merits of working in prison at all:

"More opportunities to get jobs. A lot of stuff in there man, you can't really do, it's probably stuff you don't want to do, you need stuff that is going to excite you. I'm not going to do stuff if I don't like it" (Peter).

"There should be more practical hands-on activities like trades. And to at least what you call not just specialist level but some intermediate level. Because that's the possibly one of the best routes people can have to get into good productive lives. Car maintenance and stuff like

that. Quite specialist nowadays, it used to be fairly simple car engines. Nowadays they are quite technical. But that would be a good driver. If the opportunities were there for people to actually learn and absorb the necessary minimum education, they need. At the moment what you get is catering from your kitchens. Warehousing. There is some sewing, textile industries. But there is not, outside there is nothing that makes any of those sort of stand out to inspire people's imaginations. Specialisations, that is more likely to get that spark" (Henry).

To a significant degree the number and variety of jobs offered to prisoners had been affected by the pandemic which in turn would have impacted most participants' experiences with work inside prisons. Non-essential work was suspended for a significant period of time leaving very few jobs left for prisoners to apply for (Brennan, 2020). This resulted in most individuals receiving limited rehabilitative experiences and opportunities to make more money when incarcerated during this period (HM Inspectorate of Prisons, 2021c). As stated by Aidan:

"Employment. Because of Covid a lot of contracts have been lost, so there's not as many jobs as there used to be. So, your basic jobs now is either kitchens, bakery, or a wing cleaner, or education. And there's a couple of contract jobs but not as much as what they had before Covid. The majority of the lads, if you haven't got a job or you're not in education or anything, you're locked behind the door" (Aidan).

Lastly a significant factor that will affect prisoners' ability to work is their physical and mental health. A few participants explained that their physical and/or mental health declined over time in prison which resulted in them quitting their jobs. This will disproportionately affect older and disabled prisoners.

"There is work there but not everybody is able to do that work or in a position to ask for that work. So, it could vary widely. Again, I'm somebody who was lucky where I've always managed to get good jobs but I know people who were unable to, either just because their face didn't fit and the staff didn't like them or if you've got any sort of disability or impairments that limits your ability to work, then some prisons don't make those adjustments, so things like being the wing laundry orderly. Somebody who is elderly it is something they could do, you put stuff in the washing machine press the button and then later it comes out" (Carlton).

"Started off just doing a bit of work but cost me physical problems I couldn't carry on doing that" (Theo).

"Last year I ended up jacking my cleaning job … Because it was affecting my mental health" (Bruce).

Prisons, however, recognise this barrier and pay those who are of retirement age or are medically certified as long-term sick the minimum rate of pay (HM Prison Service, 2020). As a result, they are better off financially than those who are physically and mentally capable but still do not have work. However, they might still find being limited to the minimum rate of pay difficult because as previously mentioned it is not generally recognised as being sufficient to pay for their desired prison goods.

5.2.3. Barriers to Incentives and Privileges

In conjunction with job barriers, what also affects individuals' ability to collect and spend money is the IEP Scheme. Pay in prison is affected by prisoners' behaviour under the IEP scheme (MoJ, 2020b). Well-behaved prisoners are given extra privileges when it comes to how much they can spend. An enhanced prisoner is entitled to transfer more to their spending account than those who are on standard or basic (MoJ, 2022a). This incentive affected some participants as one of their goals was to become enhanced as quickly as possible.

"I'm always getting enhanced me because if you get enhanced you get a single cell and there's privileges that come with it. You can spend more money on the canteen" (Gavin).

"It's through my mistakes that's put me in jail. So, it is up to me to look after me. So, what I do, I'll get a job and you're on standard pay. Which is I don't know, say it's £11. That's your week's work. But if you're enhanced, it could be £18 to £19. And that's a big difference that. You keep your head down, you knuckle down. You get enhanced and say you're on £18 a week. £18 a week is liveable. Because I used to spend about 75% of it on vapes. And then what's left is for sugar, my coffee, a bit of juice and a few little treats. It's like, I don't know I think they need to look at it again. Because other than the pay being different, on your canteen sheet as well. If you're an enhanced, you can spend £65 a week. And if you've got it, then you can spend it" (Lawrence).

The negative impact of being put on basic is severe for those who seek to purchase canteen items. As stated by Isaac:

"If you are on basic, you are getting little money. Not even enough to get a pack of vapes and no one wants to be on basic. But a lot of people still go to basic because they think that they are hard men or whatever. But it's their own fault for going on basic. Standard you get like £5 a week so you have a few things you can do like, order certain things and that … I was an enhanced prisoner, so it looked good on my record. You can have a certain amount of money sent in. A bit more than standard" (Isaac).

If their goal is to become enhanced in order to purchase more goods, then for some prisoners that could indeed have a positive impact on their behaviour, as long as they wish to avoid illegitimate methods of accessing goods. Some, however, do not share that goal. If so, then this incentive is unlikely to affect their behaviour. As stated in Khan (2022), the rationale of material incentives having a positive impact on prisoners' behaviour "is dependent on prisoners' subjective value placed on the extra benefits to be gained" (p.111). Not all prisoners will view being put on basic as equally as noxious as others.

"I think if someone is going to be that way in prison they are going to be that way in prison regardless of incentives or not. And people who have got issues and stuff like that, it will just go over their head, any incentives or anything. They are not doing their prison like that. They are just in this hole. They are not bothered about the consequences. It's like you say to a, behave yourself you are going to get us all banged up early or something. They are not bothered about what might happen to you guys. All they are focused upon is themselves, what is going on for themselves" (John).

Prisoners who do not consider the consequences of their actions will still likely desire some goods in prison, whether that be vapes, food or electronic items. If they are not able to buy the goods legitimately because they have been put on basic, that could steer them towards illegitimate methods to reduce the impact of the strain of having limited privileges. Participants also argued that some prisoners will not be incentivised to become enhanced because purchasing desired goods relies on family financially support.

"The enhanced is only good if you've got your own family sending your own money in" (Lawrence).

"No, not really. It is just ignored. No one is bothered about getting enhanced because the only difference when you get enhanced is you can spend more money on your canteen that's the only difference. If you are not getting money sent in, you haven't got that money to spend on the canteen anyways. Why behave yourself to get enhanced?" (Gary).

For some participants what they make in prison through work or education does not meet the purchase limit offered through being enhanced (see appendix 4). If they can purchase the same number of items on standard as they can on enhanced than there is less incentive to behave non-violently. What can also block prisoners' goal of maintaining enhanced status is what they perceive as unfair decisions leading to them being put on basic.

"And you get someone else who's been in 20 year or whatever, who's never been enhanced and can't get enhanced. All it takes is one person who has an argument with you, so that person could be jealous of you being enhanced for instance and they suddenly take it away from you because you have tried to defend yourself or whatever. That's the thing about being enhanced" (Arthur).

"Like I was saying earlier they don't reward good behaviour. They just punish bad behaviour. So, IEP systems in their favour to punish people. Because let's say you get to enhanced, they are always on your case. I'll take your enhanced off you. Say you're on standard, you're just on normal but you can go to basic. And basic you get no television. You don't even get library until once a week, so you are just sat in your cell thinking, what should I do" (Joseph).

Participants argued that it was challenging to maintain enhanced status both because of the threat of prison violence and because officers constantly threaten them with IEP warnings. In situations where prisoners are threatened, harassed or and/or assaulted they are likely to respond to the noxious stimulus with equally aggressive behaviour. This is because they are under pressure to protect themselves physically and to protect their status as non-weak men in a hyper-masculine environment (Toch, 1998). It is therefore perceived as unfair to be punished and stripped of their desired goods because they stood up for themselves. And because of the strain they feel from officers wanting to take away their enhanced status some argue that it becomes inevitable that they will be on standard or basic despite their perceived reasonable actions. If prisoners become increasingly disillusioned by the IEP scheme, then the likelihood of their complying legitimately decreases (Khan, 2022).

5.2.4. Summing Up: The Outcome of These Barriers

In short there are unfair/unjust blockages prisoners are facing in their pursuit of earning money through legitimate means such as via family financial support, participating in work, and getting enhanced through the IEP scheme. However, the participants argue that all these blockages become greater in magnitude because of the rise in the cost of living that prisoners and the wider E&W society are currently facing. With this structural strain comes the increasing pressure for some prisoners to bully, thieve and get into debt. And prisoners pursuing these illegitimates methods of attaining goods creates the heightened risk of violent behaviour.

5.3. The Strain of Poor Wages and the Rising Cost of Living: The Increasing Pressure to Bully, Thieve and Get into Debt

As highlighted earlier a structural strain that was consistently raised by participants was the increased cost of goods and the failure of wages to meet these new cost demands:

"And the cost of living is going up, but the wages are staying the same … It's like what I said to the governor what I used to be able to get say for £65 two months ago, I can only get half that now, it used to be £50 spend a week. But because they were putting the prices up, they put, they capped it to £65. But really you're not better off, they are just covering the inflation. Drug users. Wages are crap in prison. When I came into prison in 1993 I think I was on £12.50. They are still on £12.50, they only just last week put it up. And they only got put up £4. So, when I first started working at a category D prison which was 2 years ago. I was on £12.50, so after 29 years nothing's changed. All the prices outside have changed. Everything else has gone up as the cost of living has but your wages haven't. So, if you're on £15 in 1993 you can get a lot more than what you could for £15 in 2022" (Edward).

The strains discussed here are many and varied - the inability to get financial help from family members; a lack of jobs; poor wages; remaining on basic or standard at a time of rising inflation. All this means that the desire for goods becomes increasingly blocked and frustrated. Many prisoners are required to be more selective regarding the goods they buy at the canteen. This leads them to seriously question what they should purchase to cope with day-to-day life in prison.

"So, like the price of everything has gone up hasn't it, so the wages you used to get £20 wages a week but now they have dropped it to like £6.50. So, like if you smoke, you'll have to choose between like your smokes or phone calls with your family or some canteen food" (Peter).

"If you were really rich you can afford an Xbox. So, we are talking an Xbox 360 for £200. That's a 15-year-old machine. If you go to cash convertors now you can probably pick one up for £40 plus games. And if you wanted anything, a television, a DVD player, whatever, if you are only earning £22 a week, that is, anything electrical, is just out of reach unless you've got parents or you are in money or you know, or whether you are dealing drugs or whatever you are doing. On the basic wage, £30 DVD is classed a luxury item" (Reece).

Vapes, canteen food, electric fans, video game consoles, DVD players, television and family phone calls all serve a purpose for prisoners in coping with boredom, stress, noise, heat, hunger, loneliness and/or addiction. They are therefore all understandably desirable but not many prisoners will be able to afford all of them legitimately. Some will respond to this macro level strain by managing their income wisely and only buying goods that they can afford, even if what they can afford is minimal. According to GST these are individuals that are likely to have good coping skills/strategies and are receiving lots of support in prison whether that be via staff members or from family members (Agnew and Brezina, 2010). However, a disproportionately high number of prisoners will not have the skillset/resources to cope legitimately and are poor at managing their money (Meadows et al., 2010; Rocheleau, 2014). Furthermore, as was highlighted in the previous section, prisoners that receive no family support, do not have a prison job and are on basic are more likely to cope poorly. Some of those who cope poorly will decide that what they can afford is not enough for them to feel comfortable/content whilst in prison. As a result, they may be more likely to employ illegitimate methods to gain goods to relieve both the loss of positively valued stimuli and the pains of noxious stimuli (Agnew, 2006).

5.3.1. Bullying for Desired Goods

One method described by the participants is for prisoners to bully individuals to gain money or goods. For example, they may verbally bully/harass family members into sending money.

"It's like torture. They will be on the phones, torturing their mums, their dads, their sisters, brothers for money. It's fucking terrible to tell you the truth. I've never ever been into anything like that" (Macauley).

As previously highlighted the easiest and most lucrative legitimate method of obtaining money in prison is for family members to give financial support. However, this method becomes illegitimate when prisoners harass and pressurise family into sending them money. Family members may not be able to afford to send money in but do so anyway because of either a concern for their family member's well-being or due to feeling pressurised into it (Dixey and Woodall, 2012). Research indicates "that women, in particular, may feel a responsibility to care and provide for their relatives in prison" (Dixey and Woodall, 2012:41). When family members send money, they put further strains on themselves financially even without being further coerced into sending amounts beyond their means.

Prisoners who do not have family members to finance them may, however, target other prisoners for their goods.

"Yeah, because some would jump on the weakest and bully him for his canteen. Take all his shit off him, you know, get his people sending money in and all that carry on. It can be a scary place for people. If you don't know that world, if you don't know anyone on the wing because there's rules do you know what I mean. It's like a different world mate. If you fucking don't know mate you can be vulnerable. Some people pay people to look after them. They might buy them a little bit of canteen say just so you can have my back" (Noah).

"The old guys they are bullied for their meds and food stuff like that" (Luke).

"I used to get my canteen and go back to my pad and just, I would leave it under my bed until I was locked up on my own. Because there were people who used to come around saying what have you got for me. Nothing. You've got to have something" (Kallum).

Many participants state that it is those that are 'vulnerable' who are targeted and bullied for their goods. Those who are said to bully are primarily young people who target people who are mentally unwell, weak, inexperienced in the prison environment and/or old (Ireland, 2012). Bullying behaviour is a significant problem because it risks escalating into physical violence in prison (Ireland, 2012). The bully can threaten physical violence which they may act on if the victim does not heed their demands.

"Threatening and bullying, I'm going to take your head off if you don't do this or you don't do that ... That's the other thing, getting bullied for their money, on the kiosk. They say right if they don't get their vapes or I like them trainers you are going to get battered" (Oliver).

Participants explained that clothing is targeted by bullies because of its high monetary value it gives prisoners more autonomy and identity compared to wearing prison clothing (Ash, 2009). As Tyson puts it, it makes them feel more 'human'. However, this desire for expensive clothing can result in theft and violent incidents.

"If I'm honest it's all of it. Just so you feel a bit more human in prison. For me it was having more of my own clothing. So, I didn't wear prison clothing. The less prison clothing I wore, the more human I felt still" (Tyson).

"There are times where people get assaulted because they've got a pair of trainers that they want or somebody else wants" (Morgan).

In other instances, the victim may decide they want to get rid of the noxious stimuli of bullies to protect themselves and/or their goods. Some victims may choose the non-violent legitimate option and seek help from prison staff. The prison staff may decide to move the bullied victim and/or punish the bully to help resolve the situation. However, by doing so the victim risks being labelled as a grass which could escalate the level of bullying and victimisation if the situation is not properly managed.

"You say take the cowardice route and go to the screws. Maybe, they can try to help you out but you've got to realise their hands are tied. There are only certain things they can do. They can only move you really or they can put you on bang up. Unless you go in there and you sing like a fucking canary and even if you sing like a canary, what are the chances they are going to do something about it, very slim" (Harrison).

"Yeah, he was hit by somebody that he grassed up. And there was an officer who saw it happen and just went, the officer didn't do a thing about it. Maybe's he thought the lad deserved it" (Kallum).

"And you can't tell the staff, then you're a snitch. You're going to get stabbed" (Joseph).

Others instead may decide to get rid of the noxious stimuli by assaulting the bully to either make them reconsider their actions, for revenge or out of desperation (Ireland, 2012). For

some of the participants this was the optimal measure to stop bullies if they are not supported.

"There's a lot of people in there trying to act the big lad and they sharp get put down a peg or two … well they tried to bully older men and that, and the older blokes end up snapping and doing them in properly. Kids that have not had a proper hiding, you know what I mean. They think that a fight is two or three punches" (Gary).

"It can range from like I said, I remember a lad who wouldn't say a thing to a goose, and he was padded up to this lad and unknown to us he was getting bullied by this other lad … And he just kept bullying by taking dinners off him and in the end this lad just snapped and then just battered him. It can range from anybody violence do you know what I mean" (Morgan).

An interesting finding was that many of the participants stated that in their prison wings bullying was not tolerated by other prisoners.

"Again, it's hard to say. No one likes bullies. If someone is going on bullying people, all the time then the majority of people won't like it" (John).

"And to be honest, a lot of the guys on the wings I was on you didn't like bullies sometimes it will be dealt with the lads" (Theo).

The anti-bullying sentiments that participants described are contrary to the traditional notion that prisoners disregard the weak (Ireland, 2000). Instead, many felt empathy for those who found themselves being bullied because of their inexperience, age, and/or mental illness. This is a type of vicarious strain that some prisoners are said to experience, which results in them feeling negative emotions such as anger, sadness and/or disgust (Agnew, 2002). This compassion for those who are being bullied therefore leads to some prisoners taking care of the victim by offering friendship and/or trying to resolve the bullying themselves. Some participants said they were able to resolve bullying situations by communicating with the individual peacefully and thereby deescalating the situation legitimately.

"Normally if some lad comes up to us and said I'm getting bullied, we would have a quiet word with the lad that it's not tolerated on the wing. Pack it in" (Morgan).

However, others stated that they resolved bullying for the victims through threats and violence. For example, Luke who was taking care of elderly prisoners stated that on many

occasions he took it upon himself to help such vulnerable individuals by fighting off bullies who targeted their medication.

"I used to look after the old guys who were vulnerable. The amount of times I have gotten into someone's cell and took meds back and have to fight back for it" (Luke).

Similarly, Leo resolved bullying for an individual who needed significant help with day-to-day tasks and was being relieved of his canteen goods by bullies. He threatened the perpetrators:

"So, after about 2 weeks, 3 weeks he kept coming up with the same lists he wanted ordered. I says are you sure you want some of this again? He says yeah. I says lets go to your cell, come on. So, we went to his cell. Open your cupboards up. Flipping hell, I says you don't want coffee, you don't want powder and milk, you don't want tea bags, you don't want sugar. I says why do you keep ordering for? He says I have to do. I says why? He says so and so comes to borrow sometimes off me and his mates. I says and do they pay you back. He says well sometimes. Oh, I says well they won't be coming again, don't you worry. Anyways I says you're not doing that. Anyway, by the time this lad came back, he said I'm back Leo I'll take over. I said nah I will have a word with him myself. I said I will tell you now I says if I see you or your mates go to his cell or even talk to him I says I will personally break your necks" (Leo).

Ideally, prisoners who deescalate bullying situations through non-threatening discourse should be acknowledged and rewarded. The more anti-bullying sentiments that can be fostered throughout the prison wings the less likely that prisoners will lose their prison goods or become victims of violence. If, however, bullying is allowed to become commonplace and persistent then prisoners such as Leo and Luke may take it upon themselves to resolve the noxious act via illegitimate means if it means the victim is protected.

5.3.2. Cell Thieving for Desired Goods

Another illegitimate way for some prisoners to obtain more goods is to steal from cells while the victim is away. In comparison to bullying for goods, cell thieves employ no threats or intimidation, but they are perhaps equally or even more hated by the victims.

"Pad thieves because at the end of the day all of us are in there with next to nothing and then someone thinks oh, I'll help myself to so and so stuff" (Kallum).

"I know some people keep meds in their cells. And you get the odd cell thief that will go in and nick it. And that would trigger off violence" (Tyson).

Five participants expressed a distain for pad-thieves because in prison they already have very little positive stimuli in the form of goods. Prisoners who steal their goods cause them further unnecessary pain/strain. If the cell-thieves steal expensive items such as games consoles or DVD players, it will be a long time before the victims can afford them again. Therefore, they will have to manage for a significant time with fewer coping mechanisms which leaves them feeling frustrated and angry. If they know who the culprit is, they can take action themselves to get their items back which can in some instances involve physical violence. However, there will be many instances where the cell thief will be unknown which, as Simon argues below, will result in staff not taking action (O'Donnell and Edgar, 1998).

"There were a group in the category B prison, young lads, I'm guessing they were Cody's, co-defendants, and they always choose to hang out together and they target the older generation, try to take their PlayStations, their Xbox's and that lot. It's because they knew they could get away with it. And it was easy to sell. And if nobody knew where it was, officers wouldn't give a damn, they would have to start searching all the cells. They've got to do some work haven't they. So, they just leave it" (Simon).

One non-violent solution highlighted by the participants, if they have the option, is to lock their cell door when they go out for association, exercise, or work. If their cell door is left unlocked while they are out, then that poses a significant risk of their goods being stolen. However, the ability to lock your door is mainly reserved for those on enhanced status. Other' prisoners therefore become more "dependent on staff to defend their property and keep their cell doors locked" (O'Donnell and Edgar, 1998:274; MoJ, 2022a). If staff are negligent or unable to consistently act in a responsible way, then prisoners will likely accept the inevitability of losing their goods (O'Donnell and Edgar, 1998). However, those who have the ability to lock their cell can be responsible for their own goods and limit the chances significantly of their items being stolen, as long as they remember or care to lock it. As stated by Charlie:

"If someone else goes inside your pad, like most of the time you don't have keys for your own door basically. So, when we was on the enhanced wing you had a key for your door, so

you would lock it when you go to work or when you go to dinner or something like that. You'd lock it but on other wings you didn't have a key. So, if you didn't lock your door someone walks in and nicks all your stuff, I'd say it's gone because they are not going to care. If you go, oh my mate's watch has gone missing, obviously you're going to be classed as a grass then inside the whole wing. So, you can't go and say my Xbox is gone. And then if you do say that it just goes into one of those things where you are going to get done either way. Like I say if you're on your own, it's a bit different. Because if you do find out who it is and they have a lot of boys, you know what I mean" (Charlie).

The ability to get a key for their door is a privilege that was not often mentioned by participants when referring to the benefits of being enhanced. However, for Charlie, the extra security that this privilege offered was a necessity to combat the noxious threat of cell-thieves and was therefore valued positively.

5.3.3. Debt for Desired Goods

The third and final non-legitimate way to relieve the strain of limited goods is to ask for goods from other prisoners. If they are good friends, then they may part with some of their goods without any repercussions. However, a significant problem in E&W prisons is the debt that results from prisoners asking for goods from others who do not have their best interests at heart (Crewe, 2006; Laws, 2019; Edgar and O'Donnell, 1998). Those who go down this route will find themselves in debt as they are required to pay back the cost of the goods they borrowed plus interest. This interest can increase to the extent that many prisoners will find it impossible to pay back and can lead to their being violently victimised (Edgar and O'Donnell, 1998).

"People get in debt and say, I haven't got this can you lend me, yeah but you've got to pay me double. And of course, that guy can't pay double. You've got another week and that will treble. It gets worse and worse and worse. He will not be able to pay so he gets beaten up" (Joey).

It is argued by the participants that poor wages and the rise in the cost of goods are the prime reasons that prisoners get into debt in prison. This is because lenders prey on people who have less than others. And the more people in prison that cannot afford the goods in the canteen, the more opportunity for prisoners to get into debt (Hammill and Newby, 2015). For example, as stated by Leo:

"Now when I first went to the Category A prison, wages wasn't big. Ok, things weren't as dear either. But when things went up your wages didn't go up. So, they used to go oh somebody might come and see us, oh what's up? You've got no burn left? They said no. Do you want an ounce or half ounce till pay day. Oh well what will it cost me? Well, if you borrow a half ounce I want an ounce back. Go on then. And they used to do it. Trouble is when it came to pay day they were paying them back but then when they smoked what they had left they were out again. So, they were going back to them. So, they kept going to them" (Leo).

It was argued by participants that most prisoners are at greater risk of getting themselves into debt due to the prison economy. Prisoners who have money being sent in by family members or have relatively well-paid jobs can be assumed to be less likely to get themselves into debt. This is because they are less likely to be impacted by the rising costs of goods and can afford the canteen goods. As explained by the participants:

"Well, it used to be just people who smoked Spice and take drugs and that but now it's like anybody do you know what I mean, if you don't get any money sent in and you get £6.90 a week, it's not going to last them" (Peter).

"Could be anyone. Obviously, drug addicts come in, you know they end up looking for a substitute fix and get into debt. Lads who haven't got anybody to send them money in from outside, so they end up getting into debt with vapes and stuff. It's a wide range of anything really" (Morgan).

One of the most common goods that cause individuals to get into debt are illicit drugs (Crewe, 2005; Tompkins, 2016). For obvious reasons those who seek illicit drugs will have limited means of acquiring them and will only be able to gain access to them illegitimately via prison drug dealers (Tompkins, 2016). However, there are a range of licit goods that can be bought in the canteen which can also lead to debt. For example, participants mentioned seeing prisoners getting into debt because of items such as clothes and food products.

"And that wasn't just for tobacco. That were also for sugar, tea and coffee and that lot. Things like that" (Leo).

"People selling clothes to people and not being able to pay them … I say if you come in and you've got no clothes and people are selling clothes on the wing, you might go, go on then, I'll buy them off you and I'll pay them next week. And next week your canteen does not turn

up and then that geezer will double it, double your debt and it's just a spiral down from there"
(Tyson).

However, the licit goods most often mentioned as the products that cause debt are vapes. Vapes are highly valued and are used as currency in the illegitimate prisoner-led market (see section 5.1.1.).

"And that's from vapes you know what I mean, vapes. Give us a vape, one or two back. Or there's three vapes in a pack, you got to pay more, I'll lend you two, but I want a pack back. And once you get on that wheel it's hard to get off because you know you are forever borrowing, paying back, borrowing paying back. You never get off of it. I never got on that. I never got on the wheel. But I've seen people who has. I'm not sitting in anyone's pockets"
(Reece).

As with illicit drugs, prisoners are more likely to get into debt through vapes because of addiction (See section 5.1.1.). Prisoners who smoke vapes will probably smoke one vape capsule a day which becomes a costly habit, especially for those who rely on prison wages. If they smoke a lot which has become more likely because of increasing feelings of boredom from long hours of lock up, then that will take up most of their wage leaving them very little money to pay for other goods that could help them cope such as food and electronic items (Spinks and Khwaja, 2022; Schliehe, Laursen and Crewe, 2022). For example, as explained by Joseph and Kallum:

"Yeah, It's not. A vape habit, let's say one vape a day. It's £2.70 for a box of 3 vapes. So, say you get 3 packs that's £8.10. That's half your wages gone. And you can't get stuff like coffee, cereal, noodles, shampoo, conditioner, toothpaste because it's all prices out here. Imagine going shopping with £20 thinking I need to do a shopping list" (Joseph).

"I suppose with anything it's like if you've got a dependency, you'll feed your dependency whether it's drugs or alcohol or smoking. Without thinking the consequences, so they'll just get themselves into debt. If somebody, there was one lad he got himself into trouble so many times because he was always unemployed because he was a security risk. And somebody said oh I'll give you a packet of vapes if you go and punch him. He just walked up and punched him. For no apparent reason. It was almost like some lads used to play with other lads. Sort of, I wonder if he would do it. And he used to do it all the time. Right, punch him. They sort of, they get clued up on who needs what and if they know that they can provide what they need, they basically got them on a piece of string. So, you do end up with

like a hierarchy in there, people who know how to push people's buttons. And quite often have the financial backing from outside prison to provide what they need to retain their position of power" (Kallum).

Key phrases that are worth highlighting from Kallum's words are 'dependency', 'heavy smoker', 'unemployed' and 'security risk'. What's notable is prisoners are said to be blocked from participating in prison work if they are categorised as a 'security risk'. If these prisoners are blocked from these work opportunities, they are left less able to purchase the vapes which help them cope and, the prison service is leaving these 'security risk' 'heavy smoking' prisoners vulnerable to tempting offers from debt collector prisoners. Debtors will pray on individuals that have these strong desires but lack the means to purchase them legitimately. Based on Kallum's comments it can be interpreted that they can become the debtor's puppet and behave (sometimes violently) how the debtor wishes in order for them to gain desired vapes. Because of prisons blocking their ability to work therefore, these security risk prisoners become more dangerous and/or more at risk by getting themselves into debt.

The optimal means of avoiding getting into debt is for prisoners to learn how to properly manage their vapes by only smoking the number of vapes that they were able to purchase from the canteen. Some participants, like Ramsay, wisely opted to cut down significantly on the number of vapes they smoked, and this proved beneficial for them.

"Depends on your smoking habit. I cut right down the smoking. Before I went to jail, I smoked 40 cigarettes a day. And obviously I went vapes, you can only smoke vapes in there now. At first doing about 6 boxes a weekend. And I managed to get it down to about 3. And things started going a bit better. When I first started smoking it was too much. You've got to learn to adapt to what you can get" (Ramsey).

If, however, prisoners are not able to adequately manage their vapes until canteen day, they have two options. First option is to wait until the next canteen day and cope with not having any vapes or any other goods. This is the sensible option where they put themselves at far less risk of violence. Those that have this strong willpower are more likely to cope legitimately and thereby avoid getting into debt. For example, as stated by Joey and Ramsay:

"Don't get into debt. Avoid debt, do what I did, if I couldn't avoid it, I would go without. Even if I was hungry, I would go without" (Joey).

"Don't get into debt. That's the main one. If I ran out of vapes, I Just go without it. Or go and see a mate, you know what I mean, someone I can trust. And usually then you would give a vape back" (Ramsey).

Not all prisoners, however, have the mental strength or the necessary support to handle their need for vapes. For some the desire for vapes outmatches the potential consequences of debt. In other words, they cope poorly because the cost of the crime (getting into debt) is seen as low in comparison to the benefits which are seen as high (attaining vapes) (Agnew and Brezina, 2010). Vapes are such a positively valued stimuli that when some prisoners run out, they can make irrational and dangerous decisions. Therefore, prisoners that do not value their own safety and the consequences of debt are more likely to seek these illegitimate methods of acquiring goods.

"That's where a lot of your debt will come from. Because people will borrow, they will run out of vapes on a, I don't know, let's say they run out of vapes on a Wednesday and canteen is not on until Friday. And you've got to borrow a pack, you can get 3 capsules in a pack. And some lads will charge you double back. Now if you've only got £12 and vapes are £2.70. And you've got 3 packets of vapes, that's £8 odd. And you've got to give 2 packs of those vapes out. And you've just got 1 packet. It's not going to work, is it?" (Lawrence).

The consequences of getting into debt in prison are severe. Debt, as argued by the participants, is a significant contributor to prison violence (Smith et al., 2022; Crewe, 2005). Those who cannot pay their debts are at significant risk of being violently assaulted, sometimes with a lethal weapon. According to the participants the amount of money that the individual owes does not matter when it comes to whether they will be assaulted. It could be a £5 or £50 debt, either way their physical health is at risk.

"But in most times 9 out of 10 it was people who was in debt with somebody. They owed them vapes or something or done some canteen and never paid. And they got a good hiding for it aye … if you are debted up, they'll come up behind you and just cut you with something or do you in from behind you know" (Gary).

"But you know I have seen somebody have their back opened up, over a £5 debt while I was in prison. He just went like that on his back and his back just folded over, over a £5" (Morgan).

The amount the individual owes does affect however the likelihood of the individual being able to pay them off. If they find themselves owing substantial amounts of money, then they are unlikely to pay that debt off without financial help. The strain of debt and the outcome of anticipated violence results in prisoners seeking methods of avoiding or preventing the noxious threat because of feelings of fear and anxiety. One method that participants suggested, if they or someone else felt threatened, was to acquire a weapon.

"I did ask for a knife to be made once because there was two people staring at me and I thought I cannot take it anymore I'm going to do them. I'll set a precedent, so everybody else knows don't mess with him. So, it was more fear to get people leave me alone sort of thing" (Miles).

It was argued by participants that weapons such as makeshift shanks are easily accessible in prison. Those who are competent at sharpening accessible items such as wood or plastic can fashion themselves a weapon. Individuals who do not have this skill can pick up items that can be utilised as lethal weapons such as kettles, knives, pool balls and cues. The final option is to purchase a weapon from a dealer which as Noah suggests below can be priced at £25 which is a steep price for many prisoners.

"They are getting knives. In the category C prison, first thing I hear they said to me, I'll get you a knife for £25. I went you what? Fucking hell. It's just madness" (Noah).

"Now I can make a shank very quickly. Well, I don't even have to make a shank I can just pick one up. And that's a plastic knife. Plastic knives you go straight it'll never snap. But if you go in straight then snap, you'll left it inside of him. And I've seen it, it works. Straight in, snap, left it inside of him. Fucked off. This man is now bleeding out" (Enzo).

"Yeah, like I say they can get craft knives. That's fair enough, but you've got razors that you can pull apart. You have matchstick cutters, and you have a blade like that in it" (Theo).

The fear of being violently assaulted due to debt therefore can cause an escalation in prisoners' seeking means of arming themselves. The more individuals feel they need to arm themselves the more likely it is for there to be examples of extreme/lethal violence. As was found in Hallsworth and Silverstone's (2009) research, UK interviewees considered the carrying of weapons acceptable when they are involved in illegal activities. This increases their risk of becoming victims of violence. This can be compared with the situation in the U.S. where citizens are fearful of being a victim of gun crime (Phillips and Maume, 2007). This

fear leads to an escalation in citizens purchasing firearms which contributes to increasing levels of extreme conflict (Phillips and Maume, 2007). It is also argued by the participants however that the rising number of individuals arming themselves is in part an outcome of youths importing their ways of coping with dangerous situations in their own community.

"But lately there has been a lot of shanking. Ever since knife crime got a little bit iffy out here. It was a bit odd. Because knife crime started out there, there has always been knife crime in prison don't get me wrong, but it spiked … I noticed a lot of things happening in prison when I'm watching news and things, shit like that and I'm like, there's a lot of knifings out there and there's a lot of knifing in here as well. There's a lot of things that happen outside affects prison inside. A lot of people don't know that, but it does" (Enzo).

"Because that's the youth of today isn't it. They all carry a knife don't they" (Noah).

In E&W, the level of knife crime committed mainly by youths has been rising for the past several years (Hendry, 2022). According to the importation model prisoners import their values and ways of coping from their community (I.e., carrying knives for protection) (DeLisi et al., 2011). Therefore, there is a reasonable assumption that as knife crime committed by youths goes up in the community, so does the number of young prisoners who wield weapons in the prison environment.

The other method of avoiding or preventing debt violence is to get moved to a different wing or prison. Some prisoners may merely tell prison staff that they are under stress/danger from being in debt and require to be moved. As stated by Morgan:

"So, you know you can't go running to the screws going oh I'm going to get beaten up. Some lads will go and ask to be moved off the wing because they are under threat but 90% of the lads will stand and face it" (Morgan).

Others, however, may seek out more extreme methods of getting moved into a different wing or prison if they feel like they are not going to be taken seriously. For example, some prisoners may damage their pads, self-harm or jump onto the netting.

"I knew one lad he wrapped up about £50 worth of debt. Which is a lot in prison. The day canteen come, that morning before it come. He burned his cell out so he can get taken down to the block. So, he didn't have to pay the debt and he was out 2 days later. He was getting released on the Friday, burned his cell out on Wednesday morning and then yeah" (Tyson).

"Two people in the same landing sliced their self. That is to be put on protection because they have gone into debt. There is a lot of that happens, people cut themselves, well not real cuts, if you are going to do it, you do it you know, but just little fanny cuts, spray a little blood about the cell, so they get put on the protection wing" (Gary).

"They know if they don't pay their debt in jail, it causes problems do you know what I mean, you get like fighting and all that, violence. So, they just jump on the netting and get off the wing" (Braiden).

To go as far as self-harming, jumping into the netting or destroying their own personal property highlights the desperation that some prisoners feel when under the noxious strain of debt. However, some of the prisoners point out that this method of moving wings or prisons does not necessarily remove the potential outcome of violence. This is because as they put it, 'debt follows you'. Prisoners who are owed money have the power to hire other prisoners from different wings to harm the individual that owes them money by using modern communication methods (Gooch and Treadwell, 2020).

"And when you move to the next wing, that person that you've had a bit of a grump with, he's probably paid someone else off to take it over or to buy the debt or whatever it was and that's what happens, that's how it escalates. You get moved about, only because them prison officers can't be bothered to sort it out, in a civil way, they would rather then move one away thinking that covered it all up you know what I mean. That has made it even worse because then this person is that frustrated, he is going to get someone else to sort his business out, that's violence" (Arthur).

Another issue of moving prisoners to a different wing due to debt is that it does not tackle the root cause of why they got into debt in the first place. In most of this chapter, it has been argued that illegitimate prisoner decision-making is largely influenced by systemic level stressors. There is an argument to be made, however, that on an individual level certain prisoners are more likely to get themselves into debt due to being more impulsive, lacking fear of potential consequences and being poor at managing their income/goods. If they do not learn to manage their income or desires, they are likely to repeat the same mistakes.

"You go from house block to house block to house block. But if you are that way inclined of keep building up debt, then he's going to be moved to another nick. And the same thing happens again and again and again" (Reece).

In a recent report it was found that "nearly 20% of prisoners reported that they entered prison with money worries and a study by Unlock found that, in their sample, over half of prisoners entered prison with debt and a third of prisoners did not have a bank account when they entered prison" (HM Inspectorate of Prisons, 2016a:4). Clearly these individuals are at greater risk of getting into debt. Those who lack the skill of managing their own money and bank account will need in prison further help/education in financial management. Without this support they are likely to keep demonstrating poor coping behaviour in the prison environment and indeed, once released. However, on a more systemic level, as has been articulated in the sections above, there needs to be improvements made in terms of prisoners' ability to contact family members and gain access to purposeful jobs. IEP need to be more cautiously utilised by officers and the wages offered to prisoners also need to be more in line with the rising cost of goods. Those who are prone to illegitimate coping behaviours will feel more compelled to repeat these problematic decisions if they perceive the system to be unfair and stressful.

5.4. Concluding Remarks

In sum, according to the participants' experiences and understanding, debt, bullying, theft and violence are partly an outcome of the increasing unaffordability of their desired goods such as vapes, food and electronic items. The strains of not receiving financial help from family members, lack of jobs, poor pay and the rising costs of goods cause these illegitimate acts to become increasingly more likely. Furthermore, what can be inferred from these findings is that prisoners who are more likely to struggle to adapt and cope non-violently are those that receive minimal to no emotional and/or financial support from family members, are unable to participate in jobs and thereby receive an income, have poor financial management skills, and are addicted to vapes. These variables can be affected by either prisoners' characters or experiences before (importation) and/or during (deprivation) their prison sentence. For example, their ability to participate in work can be blocked due to factors such as their age, physical health and mental health. Prisoners' physical and mental health can either have been in a poor state prior to their sentence or it can be harmed due to the depriving/painful prison environment. Those that have or develop poor physical and mental health are disadvantaged if they cannot participate in work that provides them with compensation as well as time out of their cell which provides stress relief for many.

For prisoners to cope with these strains' they need the following coping mechanisms and support. Prisoners need as much opportunity as possible to connect with their family and friends. Maintaining these relationships is essential for prisoners to behave legitimately due to the emotional and sometimes financial support they receive. In-person visits, video call visits and phone calls are necessary in maintaining and strengthening these relationships. For those financially struggling due to limited job opportunities or limited financial support from family members, greater help with the cost of phone calls and increased time spent on video calls would help many prisoners and family members who are less financially fortunate. Furthermore, all prisoners who are physically and mentally capable need to have access to opportunities that provide more money than the standard weekly wage. Preferably, the jobs offered should be varied to increase prisoner interest and satisfaction. Pay and/or weekly income should increase so that prisoners can pay for some of the goods that help them cope especially through long periods of lock-up. Alternatively, or in conjunction, the incentives offered to prisoners should be linked to goods that prisoners desire the most and which are consequently more likely to get them into debt, for example vapes and food products. If they run out of vapes during the week and have to wait a significant period of time for the canteen it is more likely that some prisoners will seek illegitimate methods of obtaining those goods. If they are, however, aware that they can obtain those goods through good behaviour during the week then that will help lessen the impact of the strain of costly vapes.

The following chapter will explain the strains and violent coping behaviours caused by staff disrespect, declining support of prisoners and officers misuse of power.

Chapter 6. The Strains of Prison Staff Disrespect, Declining Support, Misuse of Power, and Their Effects on Inmate Violence

The development of a positive relationship between prisoners and staff members has been stressed in recent research for its importance in creating a good and well-ordered prison environment (Bullock and Bunce, 2020; Crewe, 2011b; Molleman and van Ginneken, 2015). For such relationships to be considered positive, the staff's use of authority and power must be led by notions such as respect and fairness towards the prisoners (Molleman and van Ginneken, 2015; Crewe, Liebling and Hulley, 2015). If staff, however, do not follow these principles then the prisoners' quality of life will likely be marred (Crewe et al., 2015). And as prisoners' quality of life decreases the likelihood of prisoners rebelling and demonstrating poor behaviour (i.e., violence) increases (Alzua, Rodriguez and Villa, 2010; Miller, 1991).

In this chapter, the relationships between E&W prison staff and prisoners will be explored to understand the strains prisoners are experiencing that are directly caused by staff actions and attitudes. Firstly, this chapter will analyse participants' experiences of staff attitudes and disrespect towards prisoners. Secondly, current staff support for those who are mentally suffering will be scrutinised for its perceived inadequacy. The final section of this chapter will explore staff's misuse of power and how this directly impacts prisoners' quality of life and behaviour.

What has largely informed this chapter from the GST framework is the major strain "presentation of noxious stimuli" (p.58) and, to a lesser extent, "removal of positively valued stimuli" (p.57) (Agnew, 1992) The chapter gives many examples of noxious stimuli produced by staff behaviours, attitudes, disrespect, and misuse of power. All these noxious stimuli risk creating resentment, frustration, and aggression towards staff members. Therefore, it is important to identify and unpack these problematic attitudes and behaviours that result in prisoners becoming discontented and frustrated with the prison system. The chapter also explores an argument concerning prisoners' need for positive stimuli in the form of greater support by staff members. Without this positive stimulus, prisoners become increasingly vulnerable and more likely to seek illegitimate methods of coping such as committing violence.

6.1. The Strain of Prison Staff Attitudes and Disrespect Towards Prisoners

For many participants a deeply valued positive stimulus was being treated with respect. Being respected means that you have worth as an individual and are therefore valued by others. In the process of being imprisoned prisoners lose fundamental rights (i.e., liberty) and are placed in an environment where they are subjected to dehumanising experiences (Butler, 2008). The effects of these experiences mean, at least for some, that their self-esteem has been put under significant strain (Greve and Enzmann, 2003). This is problematic because those who have developed low self-esteem are more likely to cope poorly and display "psychological distress, depression, and anti-social behaviour" (Debowska et al., 2017:1240). It is argued that displaying aggression and engaging in violence can help increase prisoners' self-esteem (Oser, 2006). In a hyper-masculine environment such as a prison, creating a hardened violent persona is likely to earn a degree of respect which could thereby improve a prisoner's own perception of themselves (De Viggiani, 2012).

"Yeah, and there is a lot of guys that don't have a lot of self-esteem. They will look for reasons, oh he's got something against me. It won't be the case but or even something as simple as, there is also a lot of disrespect in prison. In the fact that guys are all standing there queuing and you will get a larger guy coming along just jump the queue for the food for example. So, there is that disrespect and everyone wanting to be top dog. A lot of that will also come down to mental health. Because people in prison, a lot of them have had a rough time in life. When you dig deeper you find that there is a lot of unresolved issues that have been going on in the past that have never been dealt with or recognised" (Archie).

In contrast, however, it has also been found that individuals who display a narcissistically high view of themselves are also more likely to be strained by disrespect (Baumeister et al., 2000). If their egos are threatened aggression and violence can be the response to remove the noxious stimulus (Baumeister et al., 2000). In prison showing respect to prisoners can mean the difference between being assaulted or getting along with others (Butler, 2008).

"Disrespect me I'm not going to give you respect back. That's going to make me look like a right pussy isn't it" (Morgan).

"Respect is very big in prison, people don't generally, they don't be rude to people generally speaking because there is a consequence. And like I say you just don't know who you are dealing with. So, the most insignificant looking person can turn violent" (Carlton).

"See what it is, at first, I didn't want to have to fight but you get used to it sort of thing. All you are going to do is get beat up a little bit. And I'd rather go in a pad and have a fight than get stabbed in the showers because if you are not fighting someone then they are going to try and disrespect you. That's how you get on, on the wing. When you have a fight and do alright people are like yeah, you've got yourself, you've got heart" (Joseph).

If prisoners feel disrespected by other prisoners, even slightly, they may feel obligated, as the participants often put it, 'to stand up for yourself' in order not to lose their own self-respect and gain a poor/weak reputation. And although the participants desired respect from other inmates they expressed feeling even more strained and frustrated by staff attitudes and lack of respect.

6.1.1. Staff's Dehumanising Language and Lack of Empathy

The HM Inspectorate of Prisons (2021a) insist that prisoners "are treated with respect by all staff, with proper regard for the uncertainty for their situation and their cultural backgrounds" (p.1). The experiences and perceptions of the participants, however, tell a different story.

"The first thing they are told is don't build relationships with prisoners. So, they don't treat us like humans … To them we are just a job … Learn how to speak to people properly. Even when they aren't prisoners. I think they need to be told or taught that they are still human beings even though they are in jail. How they speak to people is a bit disrespectful" (Joseph).

"Nowhere near enough empathy. They are just there for the pay checks. Some of the screws just speak to us like shit, even when we are polite to them. They still treat us like shit" (Tyson).

"If they're having a rough day already and they are stressed they won't take two seconds to say fuck off out my way, they have done it a few times where someone was trying to ask a question to the officers, say here fuck off" (Jamie).

There was an overall negative perception of staff, in particular prison officers. Participants felt at times dehumanised by staff members because of their use of language and lack of care/empathy. This is problematic because too little empathy, as argued by Arnold (2016), results "in a lack of 'duty of care', role detachment, the neglect of prisoners' emotional,

psychological and material welfare, and unprofessional conduct" (p.273). Arnold (2016) goes on to argue that for prison officers to see prisoners as individuals worthy of their time and empathy they must detach themselves from their previous attitudes towards prisoners that have been heavily influenced by cultural sources (i.e., the media). Prison officers who fail to do so risk harming and creating disorder in the prison environment (Arnold, 2016). In this study, officers speaking down to prisoners in an offensive manner left participants feeling resentful, angry, and distrusting. Some felt that the lack of respect shown when they are dehumanised or shouted at unfairly can lead to conflict with staff members.

"You get some officers where they stand and shout at you, tell you to do this and do that. And if you walk away they will follow you. So, that causes more of a conflict because you can only push a person so far" (Lenny).

"They do all sorts. Some bad shit as well. I've seen a screw go up to a door and said listen this is what's going to happen the doors going to open and I'm going to give you a slap, the screw was only messing about but the lad who he was talking to he wasn't. The moment that door got opened, he was like ahahah, and he went like that to shake him down, nah, the prisoner came up to him and went bang, he was right on the floor out cold. And I just looked to one of the other screws going down the stairs and I just said see what happens? They haven't got a clue" (Enzo).

Miles explains below that he was being disrespected by staff for his accent. He explained that feeling disrespected and discriminated against was a strain that he found difficult to cope with which would make him deeply frustrated and angry.

"I'm Scottish, I've been disrespected by staff. Speak English. I used to snap straight away. Not in a sense of shouting. Rather really low. Listen mate I'm speaking English. If you are too thick to understand it don't take it out on me. That's when I get dead serious. I can feel that I'm ready for this. And I hated all that. I hated being disrespected by staff" (Miles).

It was perceived that the lack of respect experienced by many of the participants was due to officers feeling morally superior. The authority bestowed on officers is viewed as the contributing factor for their poor attitude. Prison officers are given the right by the state to exercise power over prisoners in the pursuit of maintaining order and control in the prison environment (Akoensi, 2016). However, with power comes the risk of staff members becoming corrupted if they do not manage their own desires and prejudices (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2017). And since they are less in the public eye compared to

other authority figures such as the police, participants felt that their use of language and disrespect towards prisoners are less likely to be addressed:

"Professional standards, a bit like, I hesitate to use the example but when you get stopped by the police generally speaking, they are professional in the way they talk to you and deal with you. The difference is they are in a public street, they know they can be filmed. A lot of the time they are wearing body cam, so they are filming themselves. There are passers-by who can become involved. So, there is a level of automatic oversight. That they are aware of. In a prison there is no oversight. There are no cameras, nothing getting recorded, it is your words against theirs. Any other officer that is on duty is going to back them up" (Carlton).

"Well, have you seen the Stanford Prison Experiment. So, there's your answer you put a uniform on somebody and see how quick they change. The ego takes over" (Reece).

6.1.2. Staff Lying, False Promises and Lack of Consistency

One of the main contributors to prisoners' feelings of disrespect, according to the participants, is the noxious strain of being lied to (Agnew, 2006). Some participants such as Tyson expressed feeling negative emotions such as hatred towards liars. They disliked being deceived and felt anger towards those who deceived them.

"As long as they don't lie because that's the one thing that a lot of people hate in jail are liars … If you are a liar, I won't acknowledge you. It's one of them, you've got to be upfront with people. Obviously, you can hold some truths back, but you've got to be upfront with people. You've got to be on that level with them. Because if they catch you out lying it could get you in trouble" (Tyson).

The participants argued that they often felt lied to by staff members which they found aggravating and frustrating.

"Being lied to by the staff. When you know you have asked them can you put that app in. Yeah, yeah, I've done it and they've blatantly haven't. They just can't be arsed to do it. But you get to know after a while which officers to ask to see like who will do stuff" (Morgan).

"Officers saying they are going to do something and not doing it. And then saying that I didn't ask them to do it. If you don't want to do it, then don't do it. Just tell me. Don't leave me hanging on and then at the end of the day, oh I'll do it tomorrow. They are famous for saying that we will do it tomorrow, we will do it tomorrow. I've never met so many lazy staff in my life" (Noah).

Tyler, Feldman and Reichert (2006) argue "that lying is an undesirable behaviour that undermines respect and trust and thereby negatively affects the quality of interpersonal relationships" (p.69). Prisoners' hatred of the noxious stimulus of being lied to, is likely exacerbated by being in an environment in which some prisoners feel compelled to exaggerate/lie about their past crimes and behaviours (Crewe, 2014).

A common frustration that was highlighted by the participants is prison staff who promise to help them with their needs but who end up underdelivering. The participants often express a preference for staff to be honest if they were unable to complete a task that was asked of them. For staff to truly demonstrate respect towards prisoners it is essential that they are honest with them (Hulley, Liebling and Crewe, 2012). Prisoners' trust and respect decreases over time if staff members make false promises. As a result, prisoners increasingly start viewing such staff as lazy, untrustworthy, and/or incompetent. Some participants, on the other hand, acknowledge that the failure of officers to complete tasks does not necessarily result from wilful lying but rather from the fact that they are under-staffed. Staff shortages have been seen as a chronic issue in E&W prisons that severely limits officers' ability to maintain order and help prisoners with their needs (HM Inspectorate of Prisons, 2022). According to the participants, however, if staff are unable to perform a task due to staff shortages, then they expect and would appreciate the truth, so they are not kept waiting. As Liebling et al. (2011) state "prisoners preferred officers to be 'straight', even if they were giving unwelcome news or instructions" (p.93). The participants believed that being told that officers were not able to complete their task is unwelcome but being lied to is however, far worse. They argue that if officers are honest (straight) they will prevent or limit feelings of frustration towards them because prisoners will feel less manipulated and wound up (Liebling et al., 2011). For example, as stated by Archie:

"Guys getting frustrated because things not getting actioned, getting passed on. There was very rarely a proper hand over. So, if any member of staff promised you that they will do something, if they couldn't get it done in that time, you'd expect them to come and say look I haven't been able to do it, I've passed it on to so and so, and the next person will come in next day and they don't know anything about it. So, it's them kind of inconsistencies that

upset people. You know we all like consistency, we are all creatures of habit in that sense. So, if you're not getting what's been promised then that can cause a lot of friction" (Archie).

The often-mentioned desire in Archie's quote is 'consistency'. Prisoners need consistency to feel comfortable because as he states they can often be characterised as 'creatures of habit'. If officers, however, are inconsistent with their behaviours and promises, then it can be a painful noxious stimulus to prisoners because it is resulting in undesirable irregular outcomes. These irregular outcomes in reality are perhaps an inevitability in a role such as a prison officer who is required to manage large numbers of prisoners (Liebling et al., 2011). However, it is still nevertheless important for officers to be aware that repeated failed promises and lack of honesty will likely result in a decrease in trust and an increase in levels of hostility directed towards them.

6.1.3. Staff Age and Disrespect

According to the participants there are a few factors that have contributed to the decline of staff standards and respect towards prisoners, such as the increase in the number of inexperienced young officers being recruited and the decline in the number of older officers. For many of the participants younger officers are more likely considered to be disrespectful and insulting. This perception was most often held by the older participants who found that the younger officers were patronising and felt that it was demeaning and disrespectful for them to be spoken down to by staff that were many years younger than them.

"Because you get some new officers who come and you might be having banter with somebody who has been an officer for 15, 20 years and you feel that little banter thing, where you can take a little piss take with each other. I've seen it where a newbie will come, try taking the piss, and like are you for real? You're taking the piss out of me. You don't know me. If I took the piss out of you, you would nick me for it won't you. It's like you got to earn a bit of respect. And you'll find the new ones that start and because give it four weeks or so and because they've got a bit of power and a set of keys, they become either a bitch or a wanker do you know what I mean" (Lawrence).

"Some of these officers they've got the job during Covid. You know they are young and they think that the jail is calm, oh that's all the time, so you know. I remember this one officer, this lad he had a tattoo of his mate on his chest because he died in his arms sort of thing, best mates and that and one of the officers was like that's a shit tattoo and you know he was like

don't be disrespectful, that was my best mate he died in my arms. Why have you got his tattoo on your chest for, are you gay or something? And do you know what I mean, attitudes like that you just stand there thinking you know when the jail gets back to normal, talking to people like that you are going to get opened up you know what I mean. People won't tolerate it. The attitudes of the staff, not all of them, I found the younger ones had the attitude whereas the old school ones they obviously know what it's like before. They talk to you, you give them respect, they give it to you back" (Morgan).

There were those however, that considered young officers to be more approachable and therefore easier to get along with. In Ramsey's and Jamie's experience the older officers were in fact more confrontational and disrespectful than the younger officers.

"I find the young men in their 20s are the good ones. They are kind of just relaxed, let you crack on. The women in their 40s, they seem to be the bad ones like. Pure attitude on them like. No need for it. That officer she was just an absolute disaster. I will be released for meds and she would follow us. I would be like why are you following us? To make sure you aren't going anywhere. Where am I going to go? Just to make sure she locked us back up. I had many arguments with her like. Horrible. It's control you know what I mean. For the sake of it. She was doing it for the sake of it because she can. Rather than just go get your meds, crack on. She's like I'll follow him" (Ramsey).

"Yeah, some of the younger ones were pretty alright. And then more the older ones that has been there for a while they knew what like the system is and how they could push your buttons to make you like snap. I felt like they knew the system because they've been there for a while, know that we the officers, you're the prisoner, you know what I'm saying. I know like for a fact the younger ones would yes I'll go do it straight away, like open your door straight away. The older one's would just say no. And you don't tell me what to do sort of thing" (Jamie).

However, older officers in general were considered more respectful due to having developed the necessary communication skills. Those who lack experience in communicating properly with individuals from various backgrounds are more likely to be unaware of how their actions/words can cause disrespect. A common criticism argued by the participants was that this lack of life experience contributes to their poor communication skills. This is backed up in Worley, Worley and Lambert's (2021) research who that found that "seasoned officers with more life experiences … are more likely to have the social, communication, and vocational skills which are necessary to successfully manage offenders" (p.11). Furthermore,

Crewe, Liebling and Hulley (2011) research on private sector prisons found inexperience was "associated with significantly lower scores on relationships with prisoners" (p.105). They argued that the high number of inexperienced prison staff contributed significantly to prisoners' poor quality of life and participants agreed:

"Resources. Capable staff. Funding. You've got a lot of younger staff now. Obviously, the population of jail is quite widespread. Various ages, religions, whatever. But a lot of staff have left the prison service, experienced staff have left and have been replaced by inexperienced staff who, not all of them but a majority of the newer staff struggle to speak to people, they don't have the people skills to be able to talk to different types of people" (Mike).

"They think they are better than people. It's just looking down on people, thinking I'm never going to be where you are. But then the older generation of prison officers, I could have been you 5 years ago. Only I just didn't get caught for what I did. And that's the older generation of prison officer because they have gone through a lot more crap. And some of the officers we had to deal with there, they were old school as we called it. They'd been there 30 to 40 years. All it would have taken is one wrong step and we would have been the other side of the bars. So, we like to treat people with respect, yet they'd even say you can't treat prisoners like that" (Simon).

6.1.4. Staff Disrespect and Reduced Quality of Life

The participants believed that poor levels of respect and empathy had contributed to their reduced quality of life in prison. The strains highlighted in this section such as being dehumanised, being lied to and patronised are all types of noxious stimuli that erode prisoners' perceptions of, and trust in, staff members. These staff-produced noxious stimuli create negative emotions in prisoners such as feelings of frustration, anger, helplessness, and resentment. If unaddressed, the relationships between prisoners and staff members can deteriorate and become hostile. However, perhaps even more importantly, and as will be explored in the following sections, these negative attitudes towards certain prisoners can also significantly influence the degree to which officers offer support and use their power.

6.2. The Decline in Mental Health Support for Prisoners by Prison Staff and Its Effects on Violence

A positively valued stimulus that individuals need, especially in prison, is support to help them cope (Agnew, 2006). Some prisoners will receive support from their family members and friends. Other prisoners are less fortunate, however, and do not have access to that support. What all prisoners need, however, in various degrees, is the support from HMPPS staff members to help them cope with prison stressors that might impact their behaviour (Marzano, Ciclitira and Adler, 2012; Walker et al., 2017). In the participants' experience there were many prisoners in need of significant support, particularly regarding their mental health.

"I've seen people normal and then being alone with your thoughts all the time. You start winding yourself up and feeling crazy. I've seen people go into jail, normal as anything, go into the gym they are coming out smoking Spice, rattling, head gone, cutting their arms. Yeah, mental health is a big factor" (Joseph).

"I got my own demons with mental health. The last 2 years of my sentence, I've aged about 20 years" (Bruce).

6.2.1. Strict Prison Regime and Prisoner Mental Health/Illness

Prisoners' mental health has been a topic of concern in research (Birmingham, 2003; Fazel et al., 2016; Goomany and Dickinson, 2015). Many prisoners are likely to have suffered from mental health-related issues prior to incarceration and they are at risk of their health becoming worse in the prison environment (House of Commons, 2021). However, as Joseph highlights above there are those who may be mentally well before incarceration but, due to overwhelming stressors experienced in prison, they can end up coping poorly by turning to illicit drugs and self-harm due to their deteriorating mental health. Participants like Bruce explained that their mental health deteriorated greatly during the Covid-19 regime. The isolation and boredom experienced during this time had taken a significant toll on prisoners' mental health (Maruna et al., 2022). As explained by Ramsay:

"There wasn't as much violence, there was no drugs. Covid, they got a grip of things during it. But at the same time, it took away every single bit of freedom like. And eventually that gets to you, you know. 23 hours a day everyday. Like there is only so much daytime television that you can watch. You only get so many channels. There were times I watched grown men, proper lose the plot. A lad really lost his hair and everything. I was like wow. You've got to make sure it doesn't happen" (Ramsay).

The negative impact of Covid-19 is that there will be a significant number of individuals still incarcerated who are mentally suffering the effects of having to live for up to 23 hours a day for 2 years in either single or double cells whilst receiving limited socialising time (Johnson et al., 2021). The effect that this could have on inmate violence is a concern. The worse the individual's mental health becomes the more likely they are to react poorly and aggressively to strains and thereby increase the likelihood of their reacting violently (Link et al., 2016; Silver, Felson and Vaneseltine, 2008; Edgemon and Clay-Warner, 2019). Charlie explains how he struggled to hold back his frustration due to his deteriorating mental health during Covid-19:

"Well, it was different for me than it was for a lot of people because not only was I alone, secondly, I suffer with my mental health and that. So basically, if you told me to sit there, it's everything clouds your brain. So, if you're having a bad day, it's pretty much similar to that. So, if you have a bad phone call, with Mrs or whatever, they have an argument, you're sat there, and you don't want to turn your tv on because you'll end up smashing it up or something. You'll end up slashing your own pad up, if you're just so fuming at the time. So, then you sit there, and it works over and over and over and then you finally get let out, you're in a pissed off mood, so the entire hour you basically wasted it moping about, you come back in" (Charlie).

Being stuck inside his cell alone for a significant period only served to worsen Charlie's mental health. As his words indicate it only requires small stressors in that lonely environment to trigger violent impulsive feelings that he must try to suppress. If he is unable to cope due to having a 'bad day', then he is likely to smash his own cell to relieve his frustrating negative feelings. Furthermore, as acknowledged in the literature, aggressive and violent behaviour is more likely to occur for those who are suffering from a mental illness such as PTSD, hallucinations, or paranoia (Flórez et al., 2019; Facer-Irwin et al., 2019; Felson, Silver and Remster, 2012). And the mixture of suffering from a mental illness and deteriorating mental health is only likely to increase the likelihood of violent behaviour (Link et al., 2016; Felson et al., 2012). Participants describe knowing individuals in prison that have complex mental health conditions which they considered as a dangerous risk to other prisoners and staff members.

"There is a lot of people that you just know if you said anything to them they will kill you. It's so dangerous. And they shouldn't be in prison. They should be properly medicated in the proper environment. I mean they sit there for ages in jail and you know they shouldn't be there. And it's like your next-door neighbour. You are thinking he's in for killing a bunch of

priests … And you see his face. You can see his eyes there is nothing there. He's away somewhere else. You just say hi and then move on. Because you know they will just kill you. There are some right dangerous people" (Miles).

"Yeah. In some cases, yeah. I think it's more depression and anxiety than people realise. But there is also a lot more serious cases, you see it more and more in prison. There are guys that have quite complex issues. And that can make it hard for them, they don't have necessarily got a grasp on the reality of what is actually going on and that can actually distort their thinking. So, they then end up then reacting to it. And it almost causes a bit of paranoia as such. And the guys you do see, I think there is more now than when I came away 16 years ago. Way more" (Archie).

What can be seen from here is that there were prisoners with mental health conditions that the participants had to be wary/fearful of. They had to be cautious in how they interacted with them to avoid violent confrontations. In Miles' case it was matter of acknowledging them briefly but avoid staying in their space for a significant period believing that they could become violent without much provocation. This is an example of an anticipated noxious strain which can lead to individuals such as Miles to cope by avoiding prisoners that he perceives as dangerous to his physical and psychological health (Chubaty, 2001; Agnew, 2002).

To help reduce violence rates in E&W prisons consistent support from prison staff is required. However, participants did not consider this support to be sufficient for their needs. One major contributing factor for this is officers' attitude towards mental health. Some participants described experiences where the officers did not take their mental health crisis seriously and therefore had dismissed their cries for help.

"But when I was in the category C prison the staff there were awful. I hated them and I still hate them to this day. They lied on my parole boards, they just lie and they are not supportive. They seem to think that mental health is a joke. That's why I did what I did. One member of staff when I was self-harming was stood at my flap, at my cell window, at my door and was laughing at me when I was cutting my wrists" (Aidan).

"It's the staff. I blame the staff. I've seen people slash up and I've seen staff just look through the flap and that's it. In the category B prison, they don't do that. In any other prisons I've been to they just look through your flap and that's it. And then they'll come in and take all your stuff off you" (Ben).

"No because they don't know nothing about mental health. So, they need the training on that, definitely" (Rory).

6.2.2. Prisoners Neglect and Lack of Support

The inability of some officers to feel empathy for individuals who are suffering is an issue that affects how they conduct themselves towards prisoners who are experiencing mental ill-health (Tait, 2011; Brown, 2012). Participants explain it is partly because officers have a poor understanding of mental health and therefore cannot comprehend the degree to which an individual is suffering and/or cannot effectively identify whether an individual needs help. The negative affect that this has is that some prisoners feel that they are being neglected. Participants explained that the ones who are most often neglected are those who do not attract the attention of the officers. Prisoners who suffer quietly and act legitimately are less likely to be noticed by officers. Whereas those who are loud and/or act aggressively/violently are more likely to attract their attention. Participants viewed this as unfair because if they act legitimately, they are less likely to receive the support they need. The noxious strain of being neglected therefore can cause some to consider illegitimate methods such acting violently to attract the attention of officers and so get the support they desire (Agnew, 2006). As explained by the participants:

"Yeah, it is unfair because if you're known for causing problems and you kick off they don't do the proper things for it, they'll go well if we send him to segregation, he's still going to do it because that's how he is. But then if someone quiet does it then they'll go to segregation. Because he's clearly got anger issues or something like that. And you go no, he's not, he's kicking off being you've been ignoring him for 3 months compared to this bloke that's just kicked off today" (Charlie).

"Yeah. People get frustrated that they are not getting the help or the support they need so they resort to violence. Mainly just to get down to the block, it seems when you go down there you get to see a psychiatrist, you get to see psychologist, you get to see mental health team. When you are on the wings, they are non-existent" (Aidan).

"No. Not for people who slash up. The only time they act is when they hear the buzzer and actually tell them I'm slashed, I cut myself. There are some horrible scenes like. One of them

hit his vein. He was across from me, and I looked and there was blood everywhere, Jesus"
(Oliver).

The illegitimate actions that prisoners are resorting to for officers' attention according to the participants are self-harm and physical violence on others. As mentioned by Charlie these acts of physical violence can often result in their being in his opinion unfairly sent to segregation. He perceives this response as being unfair because staff were ignoring and not adequately supporting the quiet prisoners when they were suffering in their cells which has resulted in these violent responses/outcomes. It is however, argued by Aidan that being sent to segregation (the block) could be perceived by prisoners as being a desirable outcome. This is because he states that it results in these prisoners receiving support from the mental health team which they were not receiving before they were sent to segregation. This perspective gives further credibility to the argument that prisoners will resort to committing violence, including against themselves, if it results in the positive stimuli of support which they were otherwise being denied (Agnew, 2006). Some quiet prisoners like Bruce, however, might not necessarily resort to violence for officers' attention but their mental health will inevitably deteriorate without staff support. For Bruce, regular conversations with appropriate staff members would have been a significant help in reducing his mental strains:

"Depends who you are and if you are quiet on the wing, which is a bad thing sometimes because sometimes you are quiet because you need help, some of them can see that but others won't help you because they go home at 8 o'clock or something. Whereas if you are loud and people who kicked off get more attention with the officers, ended up doing more for them. Whereas the quiet ones are sort of left alone. And some of the quiet ones like myself suffering from mental health problems could have done with a chat now and then. That's all you need is a talk. It doesn't cost much" (Bruce).

6.2.3. The Importance of Prison Staff Confiding and Listening Skills

Like Bruce, other participants considered it to be helpful if there were more officers who were willing and able to listen. Prisoners need to be able to verbally express their complex emotions to help them cope. As explained by Edward:

"You get the odd, so let's say there's 50 prison officers in the prison. You would be lucky to get seven of them prison officers, in the prisons I've been in. You would be lucky to get seven that would have time to sit down and listen to you. It's alright hearing what someone is

saying but listening is something different. And having that time to sit down and listen, and even if they can't do anything, it makes you feel better. It's getting off your chest you know. I used to years ago write stuff down. And I would write angry fucking letters and I'd write hate words and everything because it's out then" (Edward).

In Tate, Blagden and Mann's (2017) research also they found that prisoners appreciate officers who demonstrate a willingness to listen. Prisoners are unlikely to approach and confide in officers who appear unapproachable and lacking in empathy and can tell if the officers have these qualities based on whether they keep eye contact and show an ability to pay attention (Tate et al., 2017). If officers can learn to listen and maintain interest, then this can have a positive impact on prisoners' quality of life. However, it is argued by the participants that due to the pressure of staff shortages, officers are becoming less willing to listen and help those who are suffering because it puts further strain on them, highlighting the need for additional staff.

"No. I think it's because of the staffing levels. Staff are becoming less tolerant to situations and less aware, less wanting to be aware of the problems. Because it makes their life difficult. So, they'll tend to ignore someone who's suffering and say go and talk to your listener when they could be far more helpful. If they are known for being totally detached from anybody's problems and are not willing to help, then they know that nobody are going to ask to help. It makes their life easier" (Joey).

"I think it all boils down to, under-staffing because if you're in a wing with 60 lads. They only have 2 people on. Two officers on. But if they had four on they'd be able to have a couple of chats or something like that. They'd be able to give you more time. And actually, being treated like a person, rather than oh I'm struggling they go yeah ok we'll note it and that's it. That's the end of the conversation. If say you say to someone and there's four people on, I'm struggling, they'll stand at your door, they'll have a chat with you. You know what I mean like they are not bad people themselves, but they have to be bad people because they have shit to do because they are under-staffed. And that's probably what it boils down to" (Charlie).

6.2.4. Insufficient Key Worker Support

Key workers in prison play a role that has been recently developed to help resolve the issue of prisoners needing staff members to listen to them on a one-to-one basis (Leeming, 2019).

A few participants explain that they had good experiences with key workers who were considered as supportive and helpful.

"When I was in the category B prison for instance, yeah. I wouldn't have got where I was without the key worker. He pushed hard to get me things. You do get some like that. You get some really good officers. But he was an older one. If it was young one, I probably would have still been in" (Arthur).

"The one I had at a category C prison were useless but the ones I had in a category B prison were quite useful … Regular contact, checking if you needed anything regularly. Listening to you, getting stuff done that you needed doing" (Morgan).

However, most participants did not consider the key worker support to be sufficient and some had had very poor support from key workers who they hardly saw. Charlie, for example, was not assigned one for almost a year. It is stated that prisoners should be meeting with their key workers for around 45 minutes per week as regular contact with key workers is important to develop rapport and trust (PRT, 2023g). However, perhaps due to understaffing and/or Covid-19, this has become less possible for many prisoners. Furthermore, what also appeared to be hindering the effectiveness of key worker support were the frequent changes in key workers for prisoners. Like the issue of lack of contact, if prisoners are getting constant changes in key workers, then they cannot develop the positive relationship that is needed to feel comfortable opening up about their issues.

"Yeah, I did but I hardly saw her. It was only like I think it was roughly about 4 or 5 times I saw her. They kept coming and asking is if I had any issues and I said no all the time. And they say oh you're easy. I wish everyone was like you. That's all they said" (Jamie).

"It is but only if you've got the same key worker. 9 times out of 10, some people had a key worker that was on another wing, on the other side of the jail. It helps if they are there … when you need to talk to them. Someone's working on another wing it's not going to work. And then they change. I am your key worker this week, so and so is on leave. So, you've built up this rapport and it's gone. It's a good idea but it's not thought out properly" (Joey).

There were however a few participants that mentioned receiving both positive and negative support from key workers. From these participants' experience, the quality of key worker support mostly depended on the prisons they were sent to. As stated by both Arthur and Morgan:

"I had three. I had one in a Category A prison, and he was brilliant, fantastic. And I had one in a Category B prison, he was the one that got me recategorized to go to a Category B prison. And while I was in a Category B prison, I got one in there. But that key worker in that Category B prison, pre-pandemic, I could hardly see him" (Arthur).

"Different prisons, different key workers. The one I had at the Category C prison were useless but the ones I had in a Category B prison were quite useful" (Morgan).

This evidence suggests that prisoners can expect a difference in the quality of key worker support in each prison they reside in. The discrepancy in quality could be due to the competence of individual staff members and/or because of how well the key worker service is being provided and managed by the prisons themselves. Recent prison inspectorate reports appear to agree with the latter point revealing that there are a significant number of English and Welsh prisons that are providing insufficient key worker support (HM Inspectorate of Prisons, 2023d).

6.2.5. Staff Shortages and Its Impact on Prisoner Support and Mental Health Services

The constant change in key worker support is partly the result of the fact that the role of prison officers is becoming more undesirable due to stress and safety concerns related to violence, illicit drugs, and Covid-19 (Forsyth, Shaw and Shepherd, 2022; HM Inspectorate of Prisons, 2022; Clements, Kinman and Hart, 2020). The overwhelming strains that officers are having to deal with has made the role less tenable, resulting in high rates of staff turnover (Clements et al., 2020). This has a significant detrimental effect on support because there are now fewer experienced officers who are capable of communicating with and supporting mentally unwell individuals.

"There is a lot of young staff now in prison because a lot of people don't want to work there because of the conditions. I was on a wing just before I come out, I was on that wing for about 9 months, I'm not even joking I've seen the wing staff change on there a good 6 to 7 times, people have come, done the four-week shadowing, done a couple of weeks and go fuck this is not for me, I'm leaving and just left. And then they have to recruit more staff. No one knows exactly what they are doing. There is no proper structure, no proper routine for them or us. If there is no routine for them, how are they going to offer us routine, they can't, can they" (Riley).

"And then during Covid you got a lot of good officers leave. Quite a few of them went onto the police force. And then you've got a load of, we used to see them as fresh-faced college students. They literally had just been out of college a day, maybe 2 days and they are going into a prison, and they are expecting older prisoners to treat them with a bit of dignity when they are talking down to people" (Simon).

Furthermore, the mental health staff who have the knowledge to deal with mentally unwell prisoners are said to be becoming increasingly less able to handle the number of prisoners who need support. Prisoners are said to be spending months waiting for mental health support. Patel, Harvey and Forrester's (2018) research found that "of the 52.8% of reports commenting on waiting times for access to mental health services, 57.9% reported lengthy waiting times and 36.8% reported waiting times equivalent to the community" (p.21). The danger of this is the longer prisoners spend waiting for that support the more likely their mental health is to deteriorate and for them to cope poorly. For example, as stated by Kallum and Joseph:

"But the mental health support, there's one time I needed counselling and I asked for counselling, it was 6 months before I got it. And when you need counselling you need it, you don't have to wait for it. Especially there's a lot of lads inside with a lot of mental health issues. You would think that mental health provision would be a lot stronger than it is. So yeah, that wasn't fun" (Kallum).

"Because the times where I needed to speak to mental health, I'm ringing them, I'm putting in apps, they are not coming in to see me. I'm telling them I'm bugging out and I've smashed my pad up" (Joseph).

6.2.6. Listener Scheme Support and Broken Confidentiality

The issues surrounding staff shortages, staff lacking in empathy and long waiting times to see the mental health team pressurised some individuals to seek support that they perceived as less optimal, such as confiding with prison listeners[3]. The listener scheme was in part designed to help alleviate the pressure on staff members who did not always have the time to communicate with individual prisoners (Jaffe, 2012). Previous research has found

---

[3] Listeners are prisoners that have been trained by Samaritan volunteers in order "to provide confidential emotional support to other prisoners" (Jaffe, 2012:i).

listeners to be beneficial for prisoners by improving their mental health and self-confidence (Dhaliwal and Harrower, 2009). A few participants in this study had experience of being listeners in their time in prison and said that they took the job seriously and considered it helpful for prisoners who were mentally unwell. For example, Noah was a listener during his sentence and felt that increasing prisoners' awareness of listener support could have prevented needless suicides.

"And through that time because I was listener, cleaners were allowed out you know to clean and all that. And I was supposed to be out but, like in the category B prison I couldn't get out. The staff wouldn't let me out. And as a result of that a lad ended up killing himself because he didn't know there were listeners on the wing. How do they know if there are listeners on the wing? I had to get my boss to come over from a different wing and tell the staff, listen let him out but certain staff come and say listen you are not coming out. You are coming out when I say you are coming out. Bad attitude" (Noah).

Some participants, on the other hand, expressed scepticism and concern over the listener scheme. This is because they had reason to distrust listeners. They argued that there are examples of information that was passed around to other prisoners, that could have only come from listeners. In the HM Inspectorate of Prisons (2016c) report found that there are incidents where confidentiality has been broken. Participants argued that this was due to listeners having to talk through locked cell doors which can be overheard by other prisoners.

"Never use it. Because it is never confidential. Never. They've got people supposedly trained as listeners in jail to make it look good from the outside. But out of the time of the 5 years I've been in jail I think I've probably seen one person that's a listener because the rest of them no, don't trust them. You cannot trust them because no matter what you say it will go round the jail in a space of a day or two" (Simon).

Issues around broken confidentiality also extend to staff members. Many participants argued they could not trust confiding in staff because they did not always keep the information to themselves. For example, as expressed by Ben, Archie, and Jamie:

"They tell people their sex offences and all that, I've been told all sorts by staff before. They tell the truth, but they shouldn't be telling people what they are in for. It's confidential isn't it" (Ben).

"Believe it or not actually one of the issues at a category B prison was staff talking too much. Saying things they shouldn't be saying. And guys hearing about whatever it might have been and then sort of acting on it and people getting hurt because staff would say too much. So, the confidentiality bit there that should have been there wasn't. Which is quite dangerous really" (Archie).

The harm of broken confidentiality does not only damage trust in staff members but it also, as Archie argues, puts the individual prisoner at risk. Information such as an individual's offence and mental health history needs to be kept confidential as it is significantly linked to the risk of being violently victimised (Howard et al., 2020). In particular, those who have committed sexual offences in the past are at greater risk of being violently victimised in prison due to the "stigma associated with their crimes" (Steiner et al., 2017:19). Broken confidentiality also takes a toll on the prisoner's mental health. Prisoners are likely to be stressed and concerned about their personal information due to their fear of being victimised (Hochstetler, Murphy and Simons, 2004). This fear of being victimised negatively affects prisoners' emotional well-being. And this noxious strain is likely to increase in magnitude if prisoners become aware of their personal information being leaked by staff members or other prisoners.

6.2.7. The Need for Improved Prison Staff Support

In sum, staff shortages, lack of experienced staff, broken confidentiality and long waiting times for mental health support is detrimentally affecting prisoners' ability to cope legitimately. Some staff members are not well equipped to identify, communicate with, and listen to individuals who have serious mental health issues. Prisons try to mitigate these problems by offering services such as the listener support. However, prisoners should not feel that this is their only option because of the issues surrounding staff support. According to the participants better staff support and mental health outcomes will only come about when certain areas are improved. These are some of their suggestions:

"Get more mental health staff in. Even if it means that they are going to be officers, get them trained properly. You want people that know what exactly to look for. Just before it starts, and they can say oh he is coming down with those problems. I will have a word with mental health team in healthcare about it and tell them what I'm seeing and then they can have a check-up on you. And they might catch it earlier" (Leo).

"Better training with mental health. Because a lot of them openly say we don't know about mental health issues. I have had chats with my key worker staff when I came back from hospital, it all sounds really good, Desmond, but I know nothing about mental health. So there needs to be more training on mental health" (Desmond).

"Massively. There is a lot of mental health problems like. There is a lot of people who shouldn't be in prisons. They should be in a mental health unit. My next-door neighbour in a category B prison … he thought he was in a game show, all night this bloke would scream on saying the process is starting again, this bloke was not a well man like. He should not have been in there. And you feel sorry for them. I was thinking dangerous him in prison, the category B prison didn't give a shit. They locked him behind his door there is something wrong with him like" (Ramsey).

Most participants believed that staff should have further training to gain a deeper understanding of mental health to help them in times of crisis. They also want further recruitment of mental health staff to help reduce waiting times for needed mental health support in prison. The final recommendation, as highlighted above by Ramsey, is for more prisoners with severe mental illnesses to be identified and moved to mental health units or hospitals, for the safety of the individual and for other prisoners. And yet hundreds of severely mentally unwell prisoners are currently being denied urgent hospital treatment because of bed shortages (Wall, 2022). It is argued that only the most extreme cases are referred due to this problem. In fact, "just over half of the 5,403 prisoners in England assessed by prison-based psychiatrists to require hospitalisation were not transferred between 2016 and 2021 - an 81% increase on the number of prisoners denied a transfer in the previous five years" (Wall, 2022:1). Greater investment is needed to improve and increase hospital facilities and beds for those who are seriously mentally unwell to help improve order and safety in the prison environment.

6.3. The Strain of Prison Officers' Misuse of Power: Inconsistent Rules, Staff Favouritism, Weaponization of IEP, and Overuse of Force

In E&W prisons, prison officers are afforded certain powers in the pursuit of maintaining order and control. For example, they are allowed to give out IEP for infractions or use force when there is a risk of violence from prisoners (Drake, 2008). According to the participants these powers can be misused causing various levels of strain and frustration, making it difficult to cope legitimately (i.e., non-violently). For officers to be able to use their powers

legitimately they are required to understand/interpret the rules set by policies and put them into practice (Liebling et al., 2011). How these rules are applied by prison officers, however, can cause confusion and frustration, according to participants. Prison officers, like police officers, largely use their own discretion as to when to enforce their power (Liebling, 2000). Some officers in practice will be more lenient and compassionate with their powers whereas others will be stricter/harsher (Liebling, 2000). The result, in prisoners' eyes is inconsistency in how rules and powers are enforced in prison.

"You know you get one officer saying one thing and then another one oh no you are doing it like that, you get the conflict there constantly. If you get a team, there that would actually work things out and all came up with the same answer it would be a lot better. It would cut down a great deal on violence. It is the inconsistencies throughout. Inconsistencies. Rules, work times, lock up times. It wasn't a case for one rule for all it was one rule for one and one for another" (Luke).

"Other people's behaviour not getting taken seriously. Rules being applied to one person and not being applied when it is too difficult to deal with" (Kallum).

6.3.1. Prison Officer Favouritism, Neglect, and Overuse of Force

For Luke and Kallum as shown above, there is a frustrating lack of consensus between officers when it comes to enforcing rules which can result in conflict between prisoners and staff members. This lack of consensus allows for officers to use their discretion in ways that causes pain for prisoners. For example, certain prisoners may be treated more favourably than others by officers. In Gariglio's (2019) research they argue that when prison officers are afforded a large degree of discretion without effective monitoring there is a significant risk that officers will discriminate against "low-ranking prisoners" and favour "high-ranking prisoners" (p.88). Which prisoners will be seen by officers as low or high ranking will vary. If the individual is disliked for their personality or behaviour, for example, it will be more likely that they will be treated poorly. As participants explain:

"No. Because certain attitudes to prisoners from prison officers, everybody should be treated as an equal. Certain prisoners get everything they want, when other prisoners are asking for stuff, they get nothing. If you're not liked, then you're not getting nothing" (Aidan).

"Like you would try and see one of the officers, you would try but some of them they don't do nothing for you. In there, especially if you act like an idiot in there, they won't do a thing for you. You go and shout your mouth off at an officer behind your door they will just shut the flap on you and walk away" (Braiden).

This results in multiple problems. Firstly, it is argued that if an individual is 'disliked', officers are more likely to neglect or target that individual, and not take immediate action when that person is being violently assaulted.

"There can be incidents where they target certain individuals. If that officer has a conflict with that individual, then they could get their little group and they can target that person. It's both ways on both sides" (Lenny).

"If they liked the person who is getting beaten up, they are there. But if they don't like them, they'll give them a few minutes, give him a good hiding" (Oliver).

"No because like for example a member of staff will be on a wing working for 6 months. Someone could be pissing him off every day, pressing his bell too much. They don't like him. So, as they do something, they go over the top with restraining them. You are meant to put your head down, put your arms at your back, they're standing on your neck and that. And then justify it by saying you were refusing to listen to them or do whatever. But they've got you handcuffed, you're twisted up, what more can you do? You're vulnerable when your hands are behind your back, your head is down towards the floor" (Riley).

Participants often mentioned that certain prison officers have an unhealthy desire to use force. They describe instances where officers have seriously injured prisoners far beyond reason. The corruption that comes with power and the desire to inflict harm are viewed as primary drives for officer mistreatment of prisoners. And if officers view an individual prisoner unfavourably, they are more likely to purposefully neglect them and/or use excessive force on that person to cause harm. As suggested by Riley, officers are more likely to dislike and, as a consequence, unnecessarily use force on that individual if he is consistently 'pressing his bell too much'. In the previous section of this chapter, it was established that mentally unwell, neglected prisoners will use illegitimate methods to get officers' attention (see section 6.2.2.). However, as this quote indicates illegitimate methods such as consistently pressing their cell bells for attention can have a negative effect on officers' emotions and use of force. Officers using an unreasonable amount of force is problematic not only from a human rights perspective but also in terms of maintaining order in prison. As explained by

Jackson et al. (2010) "it is likely that excessive use of force against prisoners who did not see the regime as legitimate would result in more rule-breaking, including a downward spiral of resistance and retribution" (p.5). Force used excessively against those who are viewed as low-ranking or dislikeable increases the perception of officer behaviour as illegitimate. From a GST perspective therefore the noxious strain of excessive force can create a desire in some individuals to take revenge on prison officers by means of violence (Agnew, 2006). Miles provides an example of this where a prisoner was put under heavy strain by an officer abusing their power which led to them assaulting the officer:

"I mean staff are human beings. There is only so much you can take. I think what would help is if every member of staff wore a camera it would make them think. You tend to think that the footage goes missing as well. I've seen one prisoner in front of a camera get abuse something rotten. The prisoner eventually snapped and punched an officer and they all jumped on him. And we all ran forward and says you started it. So, they all locked us up. We all came back he started it blah, blah, blah. He goaded him. The staff member eventually lost his job" (Miles).

Simon provided a balanced view on officers and their use of force, arguing that there are some officers in prisons that use their powers effectively and appropriately to resolve confrontations between prisoners. However, he also acknowledged that there are also officers that will misuse their power.

"It depends on what officers it is. Some officers are very easily able to stop confrontations. They are very well trained in how to break up arguments and disruptions. And then you've got some officers that just like a good scrap. So as soon as it starts kicking off, they just jump on them push them to the floor and twist them up. Because something to break up the day isn't it" (Simon).

Secondly, the knowledge that prison officers are swayed by their personal preferences regarding prisoners is argued to result in some prisoners taking advantage of that issue. The participants often label these individuals as 'screw boys' (derogatory term). These individuals were viewed negatively by participants because of the power they wield from getting close to prison staff members. It is said that they use tactics to build relationships with staff members for their own personal gain.

"Different rules for different people. I mean you get the screw boys who suck up with the officers and sit with them and talk to them, groom them with chocolates and that, are you ok

officer? I've got chocolate upstairs; I'll give you chocolates. Just keeping them sweet"
(Isaac).

Furthermore, it is argued that if you have a job working on the wings or on the servery then these individuals will likely be favoured by staff members. This is because these prisoners will have more interaction with officers compared to the average inmate which allows them to develop positive relationships. Participants suggest that these relationships come with benefits in that staff will be less strict and more proactively helpful towards these individuals.

"Favouritism, depending on say for example if you are a wing cleaner and you clean the wing, you are going to have a better relationship with staff, so they'll do a lot more for you. But it shouldn't be that way because you are only doing a job. You shouldn't be treated different because you are doing a job" (Riley).

"You got a little bit extra leniency when you were a wing worker. So, you would prefer to have a job then just sat behind your door locked up 24 hours a day. Or 23 hours a day as most people were … the servery workers, they got preferential treatment quite a lot of times. So, when I was working on the servery. You used to get away with everything, officers used to go back and get extras and then bring it all in and stick all underneath for them, but then officers at the end wouldn't want to eat it all, so there would always be some fresh food left over, so the servery workers would always get a bit of extra" (Simon).

Staff favouritism creates jealousy and resentment for those who are unable to develop those relationships and gain benefits such as extra support and more privileges (Scalpello, 2022). Preferential treatment creates division between (favoured and non-favoured) prisoners and potentially increases hostility. As the participants state, since they are all prisoners, they should all be treated equally even if they do not have a job or are unable to get along with certain staff members. In Ramsay's case he stated that he disliked the wing cleaner due to the preferential treatment that he witnessed. As he states:

"Aye it's kinda like, it's us and them situation. I'm not talking to him the prick. It creates a situation. I didn't get along with the number one cleaner of that wing because of it. And it was because of the way he goes in, uses staff to get what he wants, the staff shouldn't create that mess do you know what I mean. I should be equal. We are all criminals; we are all doing time. We should all be doing the same time in my eyes, but it is not like that" (Ramsay).

6.3.2. Prison Officer Harm Towards Prisoners' Family Members

What can also increase prisoners' frustration and likelihood of being aggressive towards officers is when their power is used in a way that harms their family. Harm that is inflicted on family members is often perceived by the participants as being more painful (vicarious strain) than if it was directed towards themselves. The risk of violence increases due to prisoners considering their family as an important valued stimulus. Such prisoners would therefore harm those that unjustly negatively affect them (Blevins et al., 2010). Charlie gives an example of how staff can be too strict in following certain rules at the expense of a prisoner's child. The offender, it is argued, was normally a non-confrontational individual but officers upsetting his child led to him feeling anger and frustration toward those responsible:

"There was a lad who was going into a visit, and I think it was his daughter, she dressed herself which is a big thing for a kid. So, when you explain it to one of the staff, I get that there is a dress code but the issue is, it was his daughter she dressed herself. I think she was wearing shorts and a t-shirt but because you are not allowed to wear shorts, you've got to wear trousers, he was not allowed to see his daughter. So, he basically says she's dressed herself mate, it's a big deal for her, so she can't see her dad because she dressed herself, so he was explaining that to them and that. And they were like no you can't see her now. They did let his partner in because she was dressed alright. He stayed calm and he was telling us, he's a calm dude the one I'm on about and he never really kicks off, so when he got back to the wing you can see that he was about to kick off and he never does. So, when he was in there and he didn't even kick off, he basically just explained to them that it's a big deal for her, she's dressed herself, it's meant to be a good day for her and now she can't see me. Because he raised his voice, four of them took him down in front of his daughter and his girlfriend. And they did in front of everyone. So, they like embarrassed him in front of everyone basically. So, when he came back onto the wing, they obviously brought him straight back, he didn't wait there or anything they just brought him straight back. So, we all started talking to him to calm him down and everything. We were just like well you can ring them and everything like that can't you. It's just shocking when you have to do that to someone because the staff has upset him. We have to look after ourselves to protect ourselves from them. It's not like the risk of danger or whatever but like if he kicks off he's going to get extra time, he's going to get put down to segregation and everything like that because of something that was so minute and it weren't really fair" (Charlie).

6.3.3. The Weaponization of IEP and Its Effects on Prisoner Behaviour

The final misuse of power that caused frustration and anger is the use of IEP. In part, the purpose of the IEP scheme is to incentivise good behaviour (non-violent) (McCarthy and Adams, 2017). As highlighted in the desire for prison goods section the participants argue that prisoners live constantly under the threat of their enhanced status being stripped away (see section 5.2.3.). IEP are viewed more as weapons to inflict pain rather than incentives for good behaviour. It was also perceived by the participants that IEP are handed out too often. What causes anger and frustration towards staff members is when IEP are handed out for petty infractions that do not warrant the consequences of being put on basic. This is similar to the findings of Vuolo and Kruttschnitt (2008) who found that prisoners would be left feeling pained and frustrated by officers writing up every minor infraction. Their study found that "ninety-one percent of inmates found this aspect of prison annoying" (Vuolo and Kruttschnitt, 2008:318). My participants shared similar sentiments:

"There are a few certain officers that was plotting against other officers, so not only would they grass on like prisoners for doing something so minor and handing them IEP, they would genuinely abuse it. So, if you was wearing a tank top at dinner. You've got to take it off because you've just been out on the yard on a workout going for dinner, IEP, I told you yesterday I told you not to wear it. I forgot, relax, I'll go change it. It's not a big deal is it? You can go change it, it's not a big problem. But yeah, you've still got an IEP even though you've gone back, have applied, changed done. There is no issue there is there? But you've still got an IEP for it. So, then they are doing that with a prisoner and then if one of the officers lets you go for something like that and they see him, they'll start grassing on the other officers to the warden. To work them ways up. And they are just being spiteful to everyone. So, everyone basically avoiding them then. It's not only a war between officers and the prisoners, it's a war between officers and officers as well" (Charlie).

"A lot. Yes, a lot of discrimination and things like that. I remember I was in a category B prison, I have osteoarthritis in my knees. So, I have got to hold onto the rail when I'm going up the stairs, little did I know just at the bottom of the rail, was the light switch. And I've clicked it as I've gone up. And the female officer turned round and said, who's turned that, I said oh it was me, she said IEP. I said hold on, I have struggled getting up, does it matter" (Arthur).

The more prison officers give out IEP for petty and unfair reasons the more the scheme loses its value in the eyes of the prisoners (Liebling, 2008). For example, Arthur viewed it

unfair for him to receive an IEP when his infraction was directly caused by his disability. Without officers being able to weigh up mitigating circumstances when utilising their powers then prisoners are more likely to view their decisions as unfair/unreasonable, which in Arthur's example led to a verbal disagreement between him and an officer. Furthermore, if prisoners are bound to get an IEP whatever they do, then they are unlikely to properly address their violent behaviour. However, those who value privileges offered by the scheme and consider the decisions made by officers to be unfair/unreasonable will be more prone to act aggressively against staff members.

"Not that I've seen to be honest. Only when you get dropped down to basic. I've seen kicking off yeah. You get like staff can give you a good or a bad thing they are quite quick to give you the bad ones but nowhere near quick to give you the good ones" (Morgan).

A few participants also mentioned the unfairness of at times not being informed about receiving an IEP. They argue that when officers write prisoners up without informing them, prisoners are not aware that they should address their behaviour. Therefore, if prisoners are not informed of their IEP there is a greater chance that they will be put on basic, leaving them with fewer positive stimuli in their cells and thereby reducing the quality of their lives in prison.

"They give you write ups now and they don't even have to tell you. So, you could do something wrong without knowing, (click) write up, (click) write up, normally you think what the fuck, just wow. If you're on basic you are not getting off because officers will just give you a write up, knocks you back, knocks you back, knocks you back and that's just how it is. They love it" (Noah).

For the participants, however, what is also frustrating is that the IEP scheme is not properly benefiting the well-behaved individuals. As with the issue of the neglect of quiet mentally unwell individuals (see section 6.2.2.), individuals who behave themselves in prison are not being properly recognised and rewarded for their behaviour. Similar findings were identified by Khan (2022) who stated that those who were quiet and well behaved were not properly recognised and rewarded for their good behaviour. Prisoners who are more introverted are often less able/willing to develop relationships with staff members and therefore more likely to be overlooked (Khan, 2022). According to the GST Framework individuals can cope poorly if there is low social control (Agnew, 2006). As stated by Agnew (2006) "individuals who are low in social control are more likely to cope with strains through crime because the costs of criminal coping are lower for them" (p.100). Many prisoners have very few emotional

bonds and little social support to help them control/maintain good behaviour. As a result, these individuals who have fewer opportunities to be taught necessary coping skills need extra measures to incentivise legitimate behaviours (Agnew, 2006). The IEP scheme is a type of formal social control purposely designed to incentivise good behaviour for all prisoners through rewards and punishment (Liebling, 2008). However, if prisoners perceive that the formal social control of the IEP scheme is not properly benefiting well behaved individuals, then rationally there is little merit to be non-violent for rewards. This rationale is reinforced by what they perceive as poorly behaved individuals receiving incentives as a means to keep them occupied and content. According to the participants this gives the wrong message and is insulting and aggravating. The strains associated with being a prison officer may be contributing to this problem. Officers can make their lives easier by providing incentives for poorly behaved prisoners, thereby making them more compliant. However, this has the potential consequence of frustrating and reducing the quality of life of those who are naturally more compliant and well-behaved.

"As time passed and staff got replaced and standards dropped then we got people in debt that had been in brought on. Instead of being proper enhanced prisoners. So, it just fell apart. What we found is the ones who behaved themselves and followed the rules got forgotten. And all the trouble causers and the people who were making life hard were the ones that got things like PlayStation's and stuff to keep them quiet. We are the ones that got nothing. The ones that behaved themselves, we didn't even get a thought" (Joey).

"Poor behaviour gets rewarded. The screws would rather not have to deal with you kicking off, they would give into you. Whereas if you are like oh yeah right go in here but can you get me changed into a better pad soon, you just get fucked off" (Morgan).

Most participants argue that IEP are unfairly weaponised and that there needs to be a change in how they are utilised by prison officers. For example:

"Rules being applied to one person and not being applied when it is too difficult to deal with. And things like you mentioned the IEP system at the start, it tends to only be used for negatives. Given people a red stick if they misbehave but there doesn't seem to be much praise driven from IEP work. I've never had a nicking, I've never had a red … I always behaved myself, I was always helpful and in 3 years and 8 months I got 2, 3 slips. And you're thinking well, and other lads who then were getting green slips for not being on basic for a fortnight. Well, I've never been on basic where's mine. And it makes you think well why

155

I am I bothering? If I'm not getting the positive aspects and he's basically kicked off every day for a year and because he's behaving for a fortnight, he's getting all this stuff" (Kallum).

"The prisons I went to they had a violence free thing where if you remained no violence for so long the prisons would actually brought in little perks for it and you would have a winner at the end of the month so to speak. It was helping, I mean yeah, the moment any violence started it was the case that you are back to zero in that particular wing and they had to start again to build up because it was all done like a points thing" (Luke).

Participants such as Kallum and Luke think that prisoners' good behaviour should be more recognised, and that positive IEP should be handed out more regularly. If the frequent use of IEP results in most prisoners feeling more deprived, there will as a result be more resentment and poor coping behaviour in those prisoners (Liebling, 1999; Liebling, 2008; Crewe, 2011b). Participants therefore wanted there to be more positive reinforcement. Prisoners want their good deeds to be recognised and rewarded. And they are more likely to be compliant and participate if they are consistently incentivised for demonstrating positive (non-violent) behaviour. Whereas if they are consistently/unfairly punished through the noxious strain of receiving negative IEP they are more likely to resent and become defiant against the reward scheme system.

6.4. Concluding Remarks

In sum, prisoners are strained by officers' disrespect, lack of support and misuse of power. Forms of staff disrespect highlighted by the participants are their discriminating use of language, making false promises, and younger staff patronising older prisoners. These examples of noxious stimuli negatively affect how prisoners perceive and respond to staff members. Staff that display these behaviours erode prisoners trust and increase the likelihood of their reacting aggressively. Staff harbouring negative perceptions of prisoners is problematic because it affects their offerings of support and how they utilise their power. How this links to GST is that support is an important positive stimulus for prisoners that is being removed/hindered by staff behaviour. Whereas the misuse of staff power produces various types of noxious stimulus for prisoners which they may seek to cope with through violence.

In terms of staff support of mentally unwell prisoners there are areas that need improvement. Officers for example need to be more capable of detecting and listening to mentally unwell

prisoners. Quiet and well-behaved prisoners are less able to acquire needed support because officers are more pre-occupied with disruptive prisoners. Prisoners that feel disregarded/neglected are more likely to engage in illegitimate behaviours such as violence and abusive language to gain officers' attention and as a means of relieving stress. A factor that also significantly affects support in prison is broken confidentiality. Prisoners are sceptical in confiding in officers, key workers, and listeners because they perceive them to be untrustworthy with this information. If certain information such as offence history is leaked to other inmates, then their physical safety is put at risk.

When it comes to misuse of power, inappropriate use of discretion by some officers has led to some prisoners being overly favoured and others being neglected, targeted, and disproportionately harmed by these officers' use of force. This increases resentment in prisoners and further divides those who are favoured by staff and those who are not. Furthermore, officers who use their power in a way that either intentionally or unintentionally harms a member of a prisoner's family run the risk of causing violent confrontations between prisoner and staff. Lastly, IEP are viewed as being unfairly weaponised by officers thereby increasing prisoners' feelings of frustration and anger towards them. It is suggested that IEP should be used less as a penal weapon and more as a positive reinforcement tool. It is argued that prisoners are more compliant if they are more often recognised for their good behaviour, rather than punished for their poor behaviour. There is a need for more balance between these two dichotomies to achieve positive behavioural outcomes.

The following chapter will analyse the various strains that are produced by a strict prison regime and how that contributes to violent coping behaviour.

Chapter 7. Are Stricter Regime Measures Better for the Management of Violence?

During the Covid-19 pandemic E&W prisons were required to greatly alter their typical regimes to limit the spread of the virus (GOV.UK, 2022a). Prisoners had to endure a more restrictive prison routine as a result. With that sizeable change came both positive and negative effects on individual prisoners, staff members, and the prison environment. All the participants interviewed had gone through prison life during the Covid-19 pandemic. As such their most recent experiences and understanding of prison life have been shaped by those stricter regimes. Most of the participants, however, also had an understanding of what prison life was like prior to Covid-19. This perspective offers an interesting insight into the merits and failings of both a less restrictive prison regime prior to Covid-19, and the more depriving/stricter Covid-19 prison regime. Regimes have strains that both affect the prisoner's ability to cope and have an impact on their behaviour and mental health.

For this chapter all three major strains have informed the analysis to a significant degree. Those major strains are the "failure to achieve positively valued goals" (p.51), "removal of positively valued stimuli" (p.57) and the "presentation of noxious stimuli" (p.58) (Agnew, 1992). A strict regime in which prisoners are locked in their cells for significant periods of the day results in prisoners losing positively valued stimuli such as being involved in activities away from their cell and time associating with friends. The loss of these stimuli has serious consequences for prisoners' mental-wellbeing and coping behaviour. Furthermore, this type of regime produces and further magnifies various types of noxious strains in the prison environment. Such a regime increases the pains of sharing a cell, unwanted noises and boredom. Lastly, a strict regime also creates for some prisoners the desire/goal to be let out of their cell or to be put in a single cell instead of a double cell. If these goals/desires are blocked, then the result can be conflict and violent outbursts.

In the following section a comparison will be made of the participants' experiences and typical days both before and during the pandemic. This is important to establish what has been gained and lost by moving away from the standard, less restrictive regime seen prior to Covid-19. The second section of this chapter unpacks the strains that make violent behaviour more likely when prisoners are placed in a strict regime. The strains that will be discussed vary widely and appear to become greater in magnitude under the stricter regime seen in Covid-19. Conclusions will be drawn on whether limiting prisoners' socialising time and increasing time in their cells is beneficial in the pursuit of reducing violence.

7.1. The Pre-Covid-19 Regime: Managing Violence

A significant part of the prison system's role is to offer prisoners a daily routine to follow during their sentence. The regime that is enforced will dictate when prisoners will be unlocked for mealtimes, work, programmes, healthcare, association, and canteen (PRT, 2022b). From the participants' description of life pre-Covid-19, their daily prison experience was largely shaped by their selected work and/or education, with a few hours available for association, showers, and gym.

"Well, if you are talking pre-Covid, we'd get up about 6 … We'd be opened up for work if you had a job at about 8, we'd leave the wing about quarter past 8. Go to your workplace till about quarter to 12. Come back get lunch. Some say they are allowed to eat it out, pre-Covid you could eat it out or you could go to your cell and eat it there. And you would be locked up at 1 o'clock or half past 12. Opened at about half past 1. Go back to work until quarter to 4. We'd have our meal, and we'd get locked up and be up again at 6 o'clock for association. And showers and locked up again at 7" (Joey).

The days described during pre-Covid-19 had structure. However, in contrast to the prisoner routines described above, the strict Covid-19 regime offered a more limiting prison experience by increasing time locked in cells and providing fewer activities and opportunities to socialise.

"During Covid wasn't very nice, I was banged up 24/7. Well, you got an hour out. Half an hour exercise, half an hour, they say it was association, but it wasn't because you weren't allowed association but like quick shower. That's it really. Quick shower. Half an hour on the yard and then you banged up" (Macauley).

"Lot more bang up and just getting half an hour a day exercise. Basically, just walking a little square yard. No gym like it used to be. No work. No programmes was running. No rehabilitation to be honest. It's been different you know what I mean" (Riley).

As argued above both regimes have strains that emerge which make it more likely that prisoners will act violently. Based on the quotes alone it can be interpreted that the strict regime measures caused stress and frustration for these participants as they were offered very little freedom and rehabilitation opportunities. However, during less strict regime periods

159

it can be argued that prisons are more difficult to control and manage compared to when prisoners are confined to their cells for long periods (Howard League, 2022; HM Inspectorate of Prisons, 2021c). Many participants did express the view that pre-Covid-19 times were also very stressful and painful due to the higher risk of violent incidents, large quantities of illegal substances such as Spice coming into prisons, and the constant alarm bells ringing due to prisoners overdosing.

"The wing that I was on, probably, one fight every 3 days. I've been in jails before where you've had kick offs every day, 3 to 4 fights a day on the wing. And some jails it doesn't kick off at all. Some might kick off once a month. It just depends on who is in them and what type of jail you're in" (Tyson).

"Alarm bells going off constantly due to people overdosing on Spice. Fights, this is before Covid. Fights, assaults on officers. Food being wrong. Healthcare being on the wing constantly because of the people going over on Spice. And then through Covid, because everyone was banged up, none of that shit was going on" (Aidan).

The perspective that the strict regime had a notable impact on violence rates has credibility. The GOV.UK's (2023c) statistics show that there was a sizeable drop in the numbers of violent assault incidents during the pandemic. For example, as of April 2019, to March 2020 there were 250 prisoner on prisoner assaults per 1000 prisoners whereas from to April 2020 to March 2021, a period of time when Covid-19 was at its height, there were 140 (GOV.UK, 2023c:1). The strict Covid-19 regime measures had brought the prisoner-on-prisoner assaults back to approximately the same levels of assaults shown in 2014-2015 (152 prisoner on prisoner assaults) (GOV.UK, 2023c:1). On a micro level, living under less violent, calmer prison conditions constitutes for some prisoners a more tolerable living experience because certain strains/stressors that they were experiencing day to day pre-Covid-19 had either been reduced or nullified.

7.1.1. The Consequences of Constant Prison Violence

The prevalence of the strain of violence in prison has huge consequences on prisoners both physically and mentally (Toch and Kupers, 2007; Byrne and Hummer, 2007). According to participants' explanations the types of violent incidents they can expect to hear and/or witness in E&W prisons can vary from fist fights to much more extreme kinds of violence involving weapons such as knives, pool cues, pool balls and kettles.

160

"Physical assault. You know there is obviously lots of threats and violent behaviour, but I think physical assault is when anything you can have from fisticuffs, people just punching each other and brawling, people getting stabbed, people getting sexually assaulted, raped, yeah the whole gamut of violence. Whatever you can think of as violence it happens in prison" (Carlton).

"When you first go in you do. But you kind of get used to it. It becomes the norm. When I first went in 2015, I was like how am I going to get through this. I had 16 months to do that time. And I was like seeing these fights and I was Jesus. For some reason your head just goes from it. You just take it on the chin, it becomes normal. Aye basically. Like when it kicks off in here it doesn't bother me. They are like were you not fucking scared, fucking hell like. No. You do, you desensitise" (Ramsey).

The high risk of violence in certain prisons is a type of noxious stimulus which causes prisoners to anticipate that they will either witness a violent event or they will be a victim of violence. One coping outcome as expressed by Ramsey is a feeling of violence becoming a normality, where prisoners accept that it is a fact of living in prison and are desensitised to its effects. As highlighted by Rocheleau (2013), to cope in a violent environment, one must become hardened to it and accept its inevitability. However, this not an ideal solution/outcome. If many prisoners become desensitised to violence because of its wide-scale prevalence in certain prisons or on certain wings, then that can have a negative effect on their behaviour and their ability to rehabilitate effectively. By becoming desensitised to violence, prisoners are potentially more likely to commit violent acts (Mrug, Madan and Windle, 2016). This is because they are less likely to exhibit emotional responses (i.e., guilt) if they commit immoral acts such physically assaulting another human being (Mrug et al., 2016). This concern about wide-scale violence resulting in prisoners becoming increasingly desensitised is shared in the work of Goulding (2007) in their study on violence in Australian prisons. As Goulding (2007) argues, "paradoxically, though, the constant threats of violence and environment of unrelenting fear brings with it a propensity towards an overwhelming desensitisation to violent acts against others" (p.400). If prisons do not effectively control violence in prison, then violence rates are more likely to increase and escalate due to the effects of desensitisation. Another unfortunate side effect of widespread violence in prison is the increased number of prisoners experiencing trauma. Both witnessing and being the victim of extreme violence resulted in some participants stating that they felt traumatised. Edward for example, described his encounter with violence as being serious enough to make a severe impact on his life moving forward.

"I got attacked at a Category C prison. That's where the PTSD comes from. I did and have always felt safe in prison. Now in the category C prison again it was just 2 units and you had like an exercise yard which wasn't much bigger than this to be fair. Me and a couple of my mates were walking round and this fella for whatever reason took a disliking to me. So, in kitchens like this you get industrial tins of beans or tomatoes, you know the big ones? He took the lid off that, bent over and put it down his trousers. As me and my mate were walking past, he's stood behind us and I've seen this on CCTV because they let me see it. As I was walking round, I'm the outside of my mate and another mate. He's kind of sneaked up behind us and cracked me from behind into my jaw which set me on my arse and glasses came off and everything. And I'm like, thankfully it didn't knock me out and thankfully he didn't just come behind me and go like that. So, I've got a lot to be thankful for. Mainly that he didn't do that and that I didn't get knocked out. But he's kind of dazed me obviously because I'm on my arse and that, I'm like what happened there? And he's gone come at me. I've got a scar down my leg. Down here, down there. He's got my eye. So, he's come at me because I'm still on my back and he's come at me hacking away at me. Again, for no reason, unprovoked. Nothing just had a bad day … there was no staff around, the staff were all at the office drinking coffee" (Edward).

Experiencing traumatic violent incidents in prison makes strains that are already prevalent increasingly more difficult to cope with legitimately and makes prisoners more vulnerable as a result (Maschi et al., 2011; Blevins et al., 2010). In the case of Edward his experience was so painful that he developed PTSD. This had reshaped how he managed prison life moving forward, and he described requiring more time in the yard as a means of escape from the stressors of being around other inmates and needing increased support from mental health services. He stated that when he lacked one of these two needs, he felt frustrated with the prison staff and suffered from declining mental health. Edward is but one of many of the participants that revealed that they either witnessed extreme violent attacks or were victims to violent attacks. Some participants expressed feeling shaken by these experiences. The danger is that if prisons in E&W continue the trajectory seen in 2020 of steadily increasingly violence rates then we will likely see an increase in prisoners developing complex disorders such as PTSD (Piper and Berle, 2019). Research has shown that "exposure to violence and PTSD has been associated with violent behaviour during imprisonment and elevated risks of reoffending afterward" (Baranyi et al., 2018:143). The high rates of violence during a pre-Covid-19 regime and the effects that violent trauma has on prisoners begs the question whether the strict regime seen during Covid-19 is preferable in the pursuit of managing

violence. It certainly was argued by participants that staff seemed to believe so and therefore desired the continuation of a stricter regime.

"During Covid the screws preferred it I think because obviously they got control of the jail back … So, they sort of like carried on that mentality you know Covid lifted, they'd rather just keep you banged up all the time because there's no issues" (Morgan).

"A lot of officers liked it with the lockdown. It's easier job for them" (Bruce).

As stricter measures are lifted in various prisons, it is likely that assault rates will increase, potentially back to levels seen pre-2020, as indicated by the most recent violence statistics (GOV.UK, 2023c). Therefore, some may question whether making the regime less strict will result in worse outcomes. To answer this question, the following section will explore the impact that increased security measures during the pandemic had on individual prisoners.

7.2. Strict Prison Regime and Its Effects on Violence, Socialisation, and the Cell Experience

The strict regime measures that prisoners encountered during the Covid-19 pandemic had a profound effect on their lived experience. The measures introduced, such as prisoners being required to stay in their cells for up to 23 hours of the day, resulted in increasing strains for prisoners (Suhomlinova et al., 2022). The resultant physical and psychological toll had a profound effect on their coping behaviour. The following sections will cover the ways in which a strict regime affects the stressors of sharing a cell and the strains of prison noise, what types of coping methods prisoners desire/need to relieve boredom when locked in their cell for significant periods of the day and lastly why socialisation between prisoners is important for prisoner well-being and good behaviour.

7.2.1. The Strains of Sharing a Prison Cell

In a stricter regime where prisoners are required to stay in their cells for long periods of their day there will be certain strains that will become greater in magnitude as a result. The greater the magnitude of the strain, the more difficult it is to cope (Agnew, 2006). One notable factor which will impact their longer bang-up experience is whether a prisoner is put in a single or a double cell. Living in a double cell was most commonly expressed to be the least desirable option by participants. Sharing a cell can be a painful and stressful

experience (Crewe et al., 2014). The prisoners often do not know the person they are sharing with, what they are in for and how that person is going to behave. These thoughts circulate in their minds causing uneasiness and tension - as expressed by several of the participants:

"And imagine he gets out next week and getting another pad-mate, and I don't have a clue who's coming in. That's like a worry, it could have been anyone, Tom Dick and Harry. Trust issues and you know what I mean. How they are going to be like" (Jamie).

"Like in the jails where you have to 2 up. It's a case of like hit or miss, if you get somebody who comes in and he's on Spice and drugs. And obviously are packing drugs. They use them and put you at risk as well" (Lenny).

If the prisoner perceives their cellmate (pad-mate) to be intolerable or difficult to trust, as argued by Jamie, then their time locked in their cell can make coping legitimately difficult. One of the noxious stimuli in the participant's prison life is therefore the cellmate that they are forced to live with during their sentence (Agnew, 1992).

7.2.1.1. Strict Prison Regime and Noxious Smells and Environments

Different prisoners will have different tolerances of what they find acceptable in their cellmates' behaviour. For example, a consistent theme that emerged was the participants' dislike/hatred of cellmates who do not keep their cell and themselves clean. These individuals are those who considered 'cleanliness' as being important positive stimuli. In the participants' minds the cell is the one area in the prison where they can have control over how it is maintained at least to some degree.

"Because see your pad, it's as clean as you keep it. Like you can go into a pad, and it will be disgusting. That's where you sleep so you've got to clean it. If you don't clean it, it's going to be dirty" (Joseph).

"You get the odd one or two people who are just pure scruffy cunts. They'll chuck everything on the floor" (Macauley).

It was frustrating for the participants that certain cellmates did not equally value the importance of cleanliness in their cells. Other research has found similar findings (Muirhead, Butler and Davidson, 2021). In Muirhead et al. (2021) they noted that individuals with

obsessive compulsive disorders will find it more difficult to accept why their cellmates do not share their desire for a clean and hygienic cell and will therefore, be more likely to be frustrated and angry towards their cellmate. In general, the participants describe some of the prison conditions that they had to experience as being poor and unhygienic. One participant describes how their health was put in danger because of the poor conditions:

"You had the cleaners out every day. But no still no. I got an infection on my leg, and I've got quite a bit, see that bit here that got infected that tiny red bit there and my whole leg blew up. Just through like hygienic. You try your best to keep your own cell clean. But as far as the showers are concerned and the main lobby area that was a bit iffy to be fair" (Reece).

In contrast, some participants, viewed the prison conditions, other than their cells, as being out of their control and therefore felt resigned to accepting them. This argument is supported by Mehay, Meek and Ogden's (2021) study who found that young male prisoners "felt there were high risks of diseases and infections which were hard to mitigate since much of the measures were out of their control" (p.103). If the cell is being poorly maintained, however, and they are locked in with another prisoner then they have an individual towards whom they can direct their frustrations and blame for the cell's current conditions. It can also be interpreted as a sign of disrespect if their cellmates are not pulling their weight in keeping their environment clean because it is not only putting themselves at risk but also their cellmate. This strain might increase the inmate's desire to enact violence because it is viewed as unjust (Agnew, 2001).

Another source of conflict, however, is if the cellmate does not maintain good personal hygiene.

"Nobody likes to sit in their own shit do they. There were fellas on the wing that liked being filthy and not getting showered and what not" (Reece).

The noxious stimuli of smells are a source of pain that most participants have to cope with to a certain degree because of being confined in what they describe as tiny cells where they are required to share a toilet with another individual.

"Especially in category B prison to start with. The cells are about 12 foot by 6 foot. And when the category B prison first opened every single cell was a single cell. It's not suitable for 2 people" (Simon).

165

"Definitely wrong to have a toilet in your pad where it stinks, each one every morning. Every morning and then you come back on again when he went to work, and it stunk. It absolutely stunk, every single morning it was awful" (Rory).

The noxious smells coming from the toilets are a deprivation that prisoners are required to cope with as part of prison life. The hygiene of the cellmate, however, is something that several participants viewed as being intolerable as it can be rectified by using the shower facilities. This creates a sense of unfairness in the prisoner's mind as to why these individuals are not keeping to a reasonable standard of hygiene, which is further adding to the noxious smells (Agnew, 2008). However, certain prisoners may neglect their hygiene due to feeling vulnerable in the showers with the knowledge that many of the extreme violent incidents are carried out in that area.

"The showers. That's where fights happen. It's just like you said the staff can't see you in the showers, so that's where it all happens" (Aidan).

It is well understood both in research and by prisoners that showers are one of the least safe areas in prison due to a lack of surveillance (Miller, 1999; O'Donnell and Edgar, 1999). The knowledge that violent incidents can often occur in showers can create a desire in some individuals to avoid the facilities or find solutions to mitigate the risk as a means of coping. One solution, as expressed by Simon is to negotiate with prison officers to let them use facilities when everyone else was locked in their cells, thereby avoiding the strain. This is one potential solution for those who feel vulnerable to these attacks. It is also worth noting that the strict regime seen during Covid-19 also had a significant impact on prisoners' shower routines that may lead to some choosing not to shower.

"You had some days you didn't get a shower because you would rather go on the yard. On other days you wouldn't get on the yard because you are having a shower, they didn't split it down, you can have this or that. It was one or the other. So that was hardcore" (Arthur).

"I was sleeping with this lad, and he would never come on the exercise yard. I think it was because he hated being round loads of people. He couldn't handle being around like, I don't know, his anxiety was really bad. He couldn't be round loads of people. So, he would, I would go on the yard, and he would ask the officers if he can jump in the shower because he wouldn't go in the shower if there was like, if we were all on association and there were a few lads in there or do you know what I mean" (Braiden).

A regime that severely limits shower times risks incentivising those who are anxious about that area in prison to avoid it. If the regime results in increasing numbers of prisoners showering at the same time this will cause anxious individuals, as highlighted by Braiden, to avoid that area. If the regime restricts their choices between showering or their preferred activities such as exercise, they are more likely to select the latter. Therefore, it is important that prisoners feel less restricted in having to choose between these two options. Furthermore, if prisoners are unable to find solutions to their concerns over showering, then that can cause their cellmates to become angry and resort to using threatening language to get rid of the noxious stimuli.

"Oh yeah there's fights all the time like, even myself, there is people coming into my pad and I can see straight away like, I'm like listen mate don't pack ya shit. The next time that door is open, you are going. They are like why, why. Because you fucking stink" (Macauley).

The use of threats and/or violence is consistently mentioned as a method of resolving the problem of the noxious stimulus that is an unpleasant cellmate. The threat of violence towards a cellmate is a warning to either alter their conduct or can lead to a request to move cells. Whatever the decision the noxious stimulus has been removed.

7.2.1.2. Cellmates and the Risk of Conflict

Further strain and conflict is caused by cellmates who are either taking illicit drugs or are perceived as mentally unstable.

"And there was another occasion later on where they asked if I would share the cell for the night with a person who was moving out the hospital. And there was an empty bed in my cell, I'd been on my own for a few weeks. And this fella moved in and his conversation was a bit weird he kept talking about what would be the effect of swallowing razorblades and you know would a person die if they swallowed razor blades. And the conversation would move on to something else and then a few hours later he'd be coming up with the razorblades again, so I thought this is a bit of an obsession here with this fella. Come bed time and I was just almost dozing off and he goes 'I've got something to tell you' and I said 'you're going to tell me you swallowed razorblades didn't you' and he said 'yes' so I jumped down, I pressed the alarm bell and the officer came to the door and I said right you better move this idiot out of here because he's telling me he swallowed razorblades, and he may well have done so I don't know, but shift him out because I'm in here for one murder I'm not going down for two, get him out. And they did. I'm not particularly proud about that but it's just I'd anticipated

what he was going to say, and I could see the way the situation was developing. And I think you have to, here was a fella who definitely needed some help, but I was the wrong person to be giving that help because there's no sympathetic or empathetic frame at that point" (Henry).

What can be interpreted from this quote is that threat escalations will occur when there is an anticipated risk of being harmed physically or being blamed for committing violence (Agnew, 2002). Henry describes himself as someone who would not be able to be 'sympathetic' towards the psychological strains that his cellmate was coping with so poorly. Like many prisoners, Henry is not able to provide support for someone that poses a threat to his own personal safety. It is instead the responsibility of officers and mental health staff who have received formal training to provide support for mentally unwell individuals (Birmingham, 2003; Bell, Hopkin and Forrester, 2019). If Henry had not taken the necessary step of demanding his cellmate be moved it would probably have resulted in one of them being physically and/or psychologically harmed.

7.2.1.3. The Effects of a Strict Prison Regime on Cellmates' Compromises

Not all participants, however, expressed that they had serious issues with their cellmates. Some instead argued for the importance of compromises and being considerate to the cellmate's needs as a method of avoiding conflict. These participants mainly used television and music as examples of where being considerate and having to compromise is essential.

"It's like at category C prison a lot of the double cells, you get a bed at this side and a bed that side. You walk in between. Whereas some cells, you've got bunk beds. And you can more or less touch your arms like that. Now for two people to live in such a small place, where it can get a bit, test your patience let's just say. It's like, we get a tv guide, what do you want to watch. We've got to compromise here. Well, I want to watch this at 9 o'clock, well I want to watch soaps between 7 and whatever. Alright you watch soaps, I'll just write a letter, you've got to compromise and if you can do that it's quite good" (Lawrence).

"You've got to consider your pad-mate as well. So, you can't, you've got to watch what music you're playing in case they don't like it. You've got to be considerate … He liked music that I really didn't, I like reggae, he liked rock. I don't like rock, he didn't really like reggae, so we come to a middle with punk. That worked. Yeah, and television wise and all that you know you've got to come to a compromise" (Reece).

Taste in both television and music between cellmates can often differ to some degree. This difference in taste can be frustrating as both music and television are viewed as the primary source of entertainment in their cells. Those who wish to avoid conflict by managing the strain will, as the participants mentioned above, seek alternative methods to ease the strain of being blocked from listening to desired music or blocked from watching desired television programmes. Lawrence's quote above, for example, highlights a type of compromise that utilises an accepted routine between the cellmates. Certain times of the day are scheduled for one of the cellmates to watch television. If the other cellmate is averse to the programme, then it is up to them to find other activities to keep them occupied. What's interesting about Reece's compromise, however, is that they found a way of getting round their musical differences through finding music they could both enjoy equally. They not only avoided conflict between each other but also the strain of having to stop listening to the medium that they both value. It is therefore important that in circumstances that are likely to cause conflict between cellmates, it should be recognised and rewarded when they are able to compromise effectively, thereby incentivising the continuation of this accommodating behaviour between the two cellmates. The strain of longer bang up, however, risks making compromises more difficult to achieve. As argued by Joshua:

"It's one of those situations where you have to compromise, or you have an argument, or we'd need more space or without the Covid you get a bit of space away from the person so maybe it's not as bad but with Covid it was awful" (Joshua).

As this quote suggests compromising becomes more difficult when cellmates are required to be in the same closed space for longer periods of time. Like with all relationships time apart from that same person is important for the individual's mental health. In the prison cell they are forced to maintain their prison façade for longer periods of the day when they are required to share (Schliehe and Crewe, 2022). Time away from that individual allows for that mask to be dropped for a while, thereby leaving them recharged for their time spent with other prisoners. The less time apart offered to cellmates, the more potential for conflict between them.

7.2.1.4. Strict Prison Regime and the Increasing Desire to be in Single Cells

There comes a point, however, when the arguments that cellmates are having escalate to a degree where the only solution is to separate them into different cells. Sometimes it is required for at least one of them to be housed in a single cell because of their inability to manage being housed in a double cell. This, however, causes some participants to question

169

the motives of some prisoners. This is because most prisoners will want to be put in single cells. Single cells offer more freedom for prisoners to decide what they wish to do during their bang-up without having to negotiate and compromise with anyone (Schliehe and Crewe, 2022). And they also do not have to live in the fear that they may be verbally or physically attacked while locked in their cells. Therefore, for many participants a single cell is a less stressful and more comfortable experience. As argued by the participants, for some prisoners the strain of having to share is too much for them so they will seek to be classified as high risk in order to be housed in single cells. This could be achieved through either self-harm, reporting of severe mental health issues, or committing violent acts towards their cellmates.

"Like I was saying that they were sick of their pad-mates, and I can just go to a single cell and then they were saying that I'm proper sick it is getting to me now. Can you not speak to the staff, to put him in a single cell. They say we can't do nothing at all about that. And then the next day, soon as we've mentioned it to them like they have done something to the pad-mate, you've told the mental health that you've been hearing voices, telling him to do something to his pad-mate and he was getting sick of him. It's just mad that, how can you not take into consideration what he has just said to them. He's going to commit harm to someone else" (Jamie).

"They tended to think that people are just saying that as an excuse to get a single room, that was the argument. And sometimes I'm sure people did say stuff to get a single room but speaking for myself I believed the guy, I believed he was genuinely distressed, I did go and have a look at the room and see who he was sharing with and I felt that he was doing what he said he was doing" (Carlton).

The utilisation of violence to attain a single cell has been labelled as a "fairly reliable" method in the literature (Ellis, 1984:300). Those who seek these extremes will have to be under extreme stress and/or perceive that whatever punishment they are to be given does not outweigh the benefits of being in a single cell. Rationally to them the noxious pains associated with sharing hurt more than the punishment of being put on 'basic' or getting added days on their sentence.

7.2.1.5. Prison Cell Sharing Solutions

Cellmate violence is a noxious strain that is a safety concern that needs to be carefully and thoroughly managed as it can lead to serious outcomes for the victims of such attacks. One

commonly cited example is the murder of Zahid Mubarek by his cellmate who, according to a 2006 official inquiry, was thought to be both harbouring racist beliefs and suffering from a mental illness (House of Commons, 2006). Preventing cellmate violence in a prison system that is strained by overcrowding and lack of experienced staff is a complicated and difficult issue to resolve (Keers et al., 2023; Schliehe and Crewe, 2022). Some of the older participants argued that there is a lack of substantive punishment in prisons for those who commit violent acts.

"It was a lot easier, but I think that's why people are not so bothered about going back now because I think it is too easy, there's no punishment and that, to be fair" (Gary).

"And there is also prisoners that have gotten away with a lesser charge than they should have got" (Luke).

This leads to the question of whether more consistent and harsher punishment would lead to a reduction in cellmate violence. This would require the benefits of single cells being perceived as greater than the punishment given. However, if prisoners are not influenced by the goal of getting out of prison, for example, then the blockage of punishments such as added days on their sentence is unlikely to sway their decisions to commit violence on their cellmate, themselves, or their cells. If harsher punishments do not affect their decisions to threaten or commit violence towards their cellmates, then the other solution is to reduce the pains/strains associated with sharing. A lot of that pain and increased likelihood of committing violence comes down to an incompatibility with the cellmate they are assigned to share with. As found by van Ginneken (2022) "participants who have a poor relationship with their cellmate are more likely to report misconduct than those with a neutral relationship" (p.57). In the same way that prisoners are assigned to single or double cells based on risk variables, greater consideration could be given to prisoners' personalities and tolerances when they are assigned to share with others (NOMS, 2015). Several factors should be considered when assigning individuals to share with others. These are their tolerance of noises and smells; the importance they place on cleanliness; the cellmates' offending history; their physical and mental health; and their personal characteristics such as age. Ideally, these considerations should be made before the prisoner has experienced being in a shared cell. Once the prisoner has developed a negative perception of sharing then their desire to get a single cell will likely remain. As it stands, not all prisoners can be assigned a single cell due to prison population rates. The more successful the prison is at assigning cellmates based on their tolerances and non-conflictual personalities then the more this should have a positive effect on prisoner behaviour, thereby reducing the number of inmates

demanding a single cell. Furthermore, this thesis agrees with the recommendation offered by Muirhead, Butler and Davidson (2020) to create a process that gives prisoners more of a voice in expressing their concerns about who they share their cell with. Prisoners are more likely to know their own tolerances and what types of personalities they can handle. By giving the prisoners more of a voice and autonomy in this matter the fairer they will perceive the decision-making process and will therefore be less likely to feel frustrated with the staff and those with whom they are required to share, thereby lowering the risk of violence towards cellmates and staff (Muirhead et al., 2020).

The desire/goal of getting housed in single cell will only become greater in a stricter regime, where the prisoners are required to stay in their cells for most of the day. Having to live in a double cell for 23 hours of the day took a significant toll on participants' mental health and feelings of stress. As stated by Joshua:

"It made it a bit stressful because there was a lot of bang-up. Some people didn't mind it, but I didn't have my own space because I was in category B prison. I was in category B prison when Covid hit and stuff, it's horrible in there because it was like 23 hour bang up. 23 and a half bang up every day when you are with someone else, so it would just get stressful" *(Joshua).*

The participants stressed that too long a bang-up impacted significantly on their mental health and their feelings of frustration and anger no matter whether they were to be placed in a single cell or double cell. The participants emphasised a greater need to be let out of the cell during the strict Covid-19 regime. If blocked this goal/desire can cause them to feel negative emotions towards the staff which risks escalating into conflict.

"Don't bother me. Other people though they get too much in their heads and that's when tempers flare" *(Tyson).*

"It can do yeah because you are all stressed out, you want to get out your cell. You're lockdown. You are arguing with staff. Then you are pissed off with each other. And it just escalates doesn't it" *(Riley).*

The noxious stimuli produced by sharing a cell during a strict regime has highlighted the dangers that prisoners have to cope with when locked in their cells for significant periods of time. Prisoners need time away from their cellmates, otherwise they become restless, agitated, and less able to compromise legitimately. Those that cannot cope/compromise

legitimately may seek illegitimate methods to deal with the noxious cellmate. This can come in the form of threatening or committing violence upon the cellmate in order for them to ask to be moved. Otherwise, they may utilise illegitimate methods to get placed in a single cell of which there is a limited supply.

The following section discusses a type of noxious stimulus that prisoners must cope with no matter if they are placed in a single or double cell. This is the issue of noise.

7.2.2. The Strain of Prison Noise

For many of the participants what makes bang-up a difficult experience is the strain of noise. Prisons have been widely characterised as noisy environments (Rice, 2016). Noise is a strain that comes from many different sources in prison and has the negative effect of causing stress for individual prisoners which can have an impact on their behaviour (Bierie, 2012). Therefore, undesired noise can be characterised as a noxious stimulus (Agnew, 1992). One of the biggest contributors to prisoners feeling frustrated due to noise is music.

"Obviously, like music, that's a good one to wind people up. Me included" (Theo).

"The cells were quite big, but you could hear people's music coming though the walls, people on the telephone you can hear what they were saying, coughing, so it was very, it wasn't very private. And it was very noisy. And I am getting to the point where you said what stresses people out" (Joey).

7.2.2.1. Music and Its Effect on Prisoner Stress and Coping Behaviour

Music in prison acts as both a source of conflict and a means of coping when locked in cells. Music was described by the participants as a means of de-stressing and relaxing after a painful day.

"Music, I listen to a lot of music here. I find listening to music relaxing. If I read, I tend to put classical music on and just have that on in the background" (Kallum).

"Just usually put a bit of music on and chill out" (Riley).

This perspective is backed up by Davis and Thaut (1989) who found that "listening to preferred music was effective in reducing state anxiety and in enhancing relaxation" (p.181). Similarly, Labbé et al. (2007) found that "individuals who are exposed to classical music or self-selected relaxing music after exposure to a stressor will demonstrate significant reductions in state anxiety and an increase in feelings of relaxation as compared to those who sit in silence or listen to heavy metal music" (p.167). The finding that music is an optimal means of lowering stress levels suggests that it is important that prisoners have access to this medium in order to cope better. For some of the participants music, and the means to listen to it, saved them during a period where they were locked in their cells for up to 23 hours of the day. As explained by Joey:

"I wanted something that I could carry round with me, it wasn't going to get in the way, so I wanted a ukulele and I've got that still upstairs. And I've just the learned the basic cords and I got sheet music from one of the teachers from one of the classrooms, downloaded some sheet music with taps and I started learning the tunes. And that saved my life during Covid because there was nothing. 23 hours bang up and nothing but, if you've got Covid it was worse because you were isolated and just got meals chucked through the door. So, if it hadn't been for that and a bit of radio, I would have drowned" (Joey).

However, as previously mentioned music also causes stress for many if the high volume is unwarranted. If an individual is under stress and they decide to play music to cope with the strains of a strict regime where they are locked in their cells for long periods of the day, it is more likely that they will not be as considerate to other prisoners as to the level of noise they produce. Because they are stuck in their cells for long periods they have less time to de-stress away from the noisy landing environment, and as a result they feel more irritated and frustrated by this noxious stimulus (Suhomlinova et al., 2022).

In contrast to this argument, however, Theo considered the covid regime change resulted in the prison environment becoming quieter and therefore more relaxing. This is perhaps due to there being fewer individuals out on the landings causing disturbances thereby making it a less noisy environment for those stuck in their cells.

"I think it seemed a lot more relaxed. In general. You know, once we got all the initial shock of it all. and being you know, locked down and people got into a bit of a routine. I think then it was a lot quieter" (Theo).

Generally though, through music, prisoners are perhaps trying to drown out other noises that are happening around the prison by increasing their music's volume. As argued by Hemsworth (2016) "attempts to drown out unwanted noise lead to new forms of acoustic overcrowding" (p.94). These arguments are further validated by the participants' experience:

"I think they do it through loud music, the only thing that is causing problems for other people is some people's way of dealing with stress. So, they blast their music out because it de-stresses them, but it stresses a whole lot of other people" (Joey).

"The way I just addressed it was just listen to music. Just to block it all out, block all the noise out" (Aidan).

Trying to block noise out with music leads to other prisoners getting frustrated by having to listen to other people's music, which they might have a distaste for. The risk is that the noxious noises coming from their devices become greater in magnitude because prisoners are trying to drown each other's sound out as a means of coping (Hemsworth, 2016; Agnew, 2008). Some, perhaps, as argued by Hemsworth (2016), increase their sound output as means of dominating the music landscape of their prison wing. By either trying to cope through increasing their music device's volume or by competing against each other's sound output, the outcome will result in greater pains and anger which can lead confrontations. Furthermore, when compared to other noises that cause irritation such as the sound of opening doors; alarm bells; and staff doing checks – loud music is something that they are more likely to perceive as unjust as it can be avoided (Agnew, 2006). This is because it is the prisoner's responsibility to control their noise output. This perceived unjustness will increase the desire to take action to remove the noxious stimuli (Agnew, 2006). In the attempt to remove the strain, the participants suggested that prisoners either initially bang on the culprit's wall and ask them to turn their music down or ask the prison officers to make them turn it down. Depending on the prisoner's mood, some will either comply with this request, turn their music up in protest or in spite, or start an argument.

"You bang on someone's door or bang on the wall. And you hope they are going to say, what? Your music is a bit loud. Can you turn it down a bit. Oh sorry. Not everybody is like that. If you knock on the wall and you say your music too loud, they'll turn it even louder" (Joey).

"Somebody might be playing their music loud and you know a lifer might come from a lifer's jail where that doesn't happen. Because lifers just like a quiet life. You know not to bother

them on the night. But a lifer comes to a local cat B. And you've got a young kid next door just blaring his music, he might come round and say listen shut that shit off and that can cause problems" (Noah).

If the individual does not comply with the request to turn the volume down, there is a risk that relationships will break down and potentially escalate into conflict. Conflict can also be caused by many other situations connected to noise. Prisoners needlessly banging on the walls to wind others up; the sound of prisoners doing exercise; phone calls and television can all lead to others getting angry and stressed. What all these have in common, as expressed earlier, is that the participants perceive that it is more the prisoners' responsibility to moderate their noise output. And if they decide not to moderate their noise then other prisoners may decide to confront the individual with threats of physical violence.

"Yeah, because everyone is banging on walls. Screaming, wait until I see you in the morning all that lot. It all kicks off like that. It's little things like that just kick everybody off. There's just so much tension in there anyway" (Charlie).

"Trust me, I was in with a guy who did triceps dips on his chair but the chair was wobbly. Every night at the time and hour. I would say shut the fuck up. I go ballistic. And eventually I got that pissed off I went to the cell upstairs and I said listen if you do that again I swear I'm going to find you and I'm going to level you. Use your fucking common sense do you know what I mean. Yeah, you are in by yourself but you got other people around you. Have some fucking decency. And then you had next door whatever bouncing his bloody music to 11 o'clock at night. For fuck's sake I'm trying to listen to this bloody documentary, whatever. It's just the little things" (Isaac).

7.2.2.2. Age and Noxious Noises

The younger generation of prisoners are often those who were blamed by participants for causing the most noise and disturbances. It is argued in the literature that younger prisoners desire noise because they are afraid of quietness as it makes them feel increasingly lonely (Kerbs and Jolley, 2007). Whereas, as shown in this study, older prisoners are more likely to crave quietness. This difference in noise preference can create resentment in older prisoners towards younger prisoners, in that they feel as though their time is made a great deal more difficult because of the actions of a certain generation. It is further emphasised in the literature that this feeling of resentment coming from the older population towards the younger population is also because they feel that they are particularly inconsiderate by

nature, especially when it comes to producing noise (Kerbs and Jolley, 2007; Kratcoski and Babb, 1990).

"Yeah, the younger ones were always too loud and too boisterous, wanted to do drugs and making hooch so you avoided them like the plague. That is what I am saying, the youngsters or the troublemakers put on their own wings. Let the quiet ones get on with it, the noisy misbehaving ones will soon change their ways if they are put with the same sort" (Luke).

"Because I was in with all the young offenders as well, so it was mixed and I was in with all the young offenders. So, you know what the teenagers are like. When they are locked up behind the door, bang, bang, shouting and swearing, it was part of life, part of that 12 month, I knew what I was getting into, you know what I mean. It was harsh, I'm never going back. Never go back" (Rory).

From these observations it is clear that older prisoners are more likely to feel sensitive and frustrated regarding loud noises and will therefore be more likely to seek means of removing the noxious stimuli either through reporting to staff members or confronting younger prisoners. Furthermore, as argued by one participant, some prisoners will be more sensitive to piercing sounds either because of having a hearing condition and/or being on the Autism Spectrum. Those who have an Autistic Spectrum Disorder diagnosis are more likely to find it difficult to cope legitimately with persistent noxious noises (Kuiper, Verhoeven and Geurts, 2019; Gunasekaran, 2012). As stated by Henry:

"I met somebody in category D prison, and he was explaining about the new hearing aids he'd just been fitted with and what they were to do was to correct the oversensitivity in his ears. He'd been diagnosed as someone on the autistic spectrum, but his condition was aggravated by that hearing sensitivity, and I thought they gave you 25 years in prison and that must've been rough going through that. And it's been very poorly understood and it's only quite recently people started picking up on these things" (Henry).

7.2.2.3. Sleep Deprivation and Its Effect on Prisoner Behaviour

One of the painful consequences of persistent noxious noise in prison is its effect on prisoners' ability to sleep. Those who are sharing cells sometimes have to deal with cellmates who sleep at different times of the day and/or have certain requirements in order to sleep. For example, one cellmate may wish to watch television or listen to their radio or music while the other is trying to sleep. If a compromise is not successfully reached between

the two cellmates, then the individual will either continue to find sleep difficult, request to change cells or they may have a potentially violent altercation.

"I had shared cell with a fella he would sleep all day and then he would expect to be up and be busy playing radio at the night-time when I wanted to sleep. And I said we are not doing this in shifts. I said either you move out or I do" (Henry).

Participants like Henry were angry at cellmates that blocked their sleep time because they valued sleep in prison so highly. Applying the GST Framework this is an example of the removal of a positively valued stimulus (sleep) as a result of a noxious stimulus (persistent noise) (Agnew, 2006). One of the main reasons why sleep is highly valued is because it makes prison time shorter. The longer prisoners are awake the more bang-up time they have to experience which therefore means increased boredom.

"It's like, the more time you're sleeping, the less jail you are doing. If you're awake 24 hours a day, you are doing double jail" (Lawrence).

There is also the well understood mental health consequences of sleep deprivation and its effects on human behaviour. Sleep deprivation has been linked to emotional instability which can result in short temperedness, aggression, and greater levels of irritation (Kamphuis, 2017). Furthermore, suggestive evidence indicates "that individuals with disrupted sleep (of various forms) are more likely to engage in verbal or physical reactive aggression once provoked" (Krizan and Herlache, 2016:543). Barker et al. (2016) also found in their prisoner study that "sleep quality, rather than quantity, is associated with aggression and more specifically that subjective perceptions of sleep quality are crucial in influencing aggressive behaviour" (p.119). What these findings suggest is that there should be greater levels of concern about prisoners being deprived of sleep as it may have an impact on prison violence rates. The more tired prisoners are, the more likely they are to lash out when put under strain without considering the consequences. And to improve prisoner sleep, noxious noise needs to be kept to a tolerable level.

7.2.2.4. Solutions to Noxious Noises

Some participants like Charlie and Joey blamed the design of the prison for contributing to noise affecting them to such a degree. Mainly, they blamed the cell walls for being too thin which therefore makes it easy to hear other prisoners' conversations and what they are watching on the tv.

"Thin walls. They should have built with thicker walls or at least some sort of damper if that makes sense because you put your tv on and I'm not joking on 2 volume and the next pad over can hear you. There's a massive bang on the wall, turn it down, and you go mate I'm on 2 fucking volume. Shut the fuck up, bang him back" (Charlie).

"The cells were quite big, but you could hear people's music coming though the walls, people on the telephone you can hear what they were saying, coughing, so it was very, it wasn't very private. And it was very noisy" (Joey).

Future prison designs should have greater consideration of how to minimise noise passing between each cell. This becomes especially important with the increasing use of technology (such as televisions and gaming consoles) and the implementation of phones in cells, on which prisoners will be having conversations with family members which they will likely desire to keep private. Currently prisons have limited options of how to minimise the impact of noise. One solution would be for each cell to be designed with noise reduction being a key consideration. Engstrom and Van Ginneken (2022) recommended integrating more soft materials such as "carpet, wood, and cork" because they are better at absorbing noise than the hard materials ("concrete, brick, and metal") that prisons typically use (p.489). However, considering the enormous cost of implementing that for each cell, government investment would be difficult to obtain (Engstrom and Van Ginneken, 2022). Other solutions that have been recommended by participants are to only allow music systems that can handle low noise levels and/or to make headphones a requirement or to make them more accessible to prisoners.

"You are allowed a music centre of up to 50 watts in a small little room … I said to governor before I left, I said if you want to improve people's mental health and have less attitudes towards your staff, go back to the system where you are only allowed up to 5-watt music systems" (Joey).

"Earplugs are quite a big thing yes and actual availability is very poor" (Henry).

"I always say to staff, if someone arrives on the wing with a big music system take the speaker off him and give him a pair of headphones. Job sorted" (Joey).

Making headphones a requirement during night-time hours would certainly help those who sleep during night hours. It is said that in some prisons in E&W they have rules for prisoners

on turning music down or putting headphones on during the night (Rice, 2016). For example, in "HMP Maidstone the rule was that music should be turned down after 10pm" (Rice, 2016:14). Some other prisons such as HMP Highpoint, however, had a similar rule but it was not regularly imposed (Rice, 2016). One difficulty, especially for prisons which are large buildings, is trying to regulate volume output from people's music and tv devices when there are staff shortages. A prison wing that only has a few officers patrolling landings will find it a near impossible challenge to enforce the lowering volume rule if it is not universally accepted by the prisoners. Ideally, prisons at a national level should have the same rule concerning acceptable volume levels during certain hours. If prisoners move between different prisons during their sentence, it is a challenge for them to accept and comprehend why they were allowed to behave in a certain way in one prison and not in the other. Making low volume output at night-time the same nationally can help create an understanding and consensus among the prisoners. Or, as stated by Joey, the devices provided should be low wattage thereby limiting the sound output, taking the decision away from them if such a night-time rule could not be maintained. These solutions, however, should not replace the important prisoner need of having a reasonable amount of time during the day away from their cells to de-stress from the noxious stimuli of noisy landings (Suhomlinova et al., 2022).

7.2.3. Boredom and Legitimate Coping Methods

Boredom was mentioned by more than a dozen participants as being a significant contributor to prisoners' pain and frustration. Not being able to pass the time effectively caused participants to feel angry at both the regime and staff members who they view as the ones responsible for keeping them locked in their cells. It is important that optimal legitimate methods of coping with long bang-up is offered because if not, some prisoners will find illegitimate means of relieving boredom, as explained by Edward:

"Yeah, because people are bored. People have got nothing to do, so they then turn to drugs or drink, especially in open prisons because it's widely available. So then that snowballs into debts and violence and what have you. It's horrible and if you are in that cycle and I have been, years and years and years ago, it's hard to get out of. It's like depression. You can fall into depression without knowing it. But can you fuck get out of it. It's so hard, it's like climbing up ice with just your fingernails it's horrible. So, it's kind of to use an analogy kind of like that. And you're in that cycle with the drugs and the drink. And you just want more because you're bored and then you haven't got any, but you've got some so I'll go take yours. And then he gets pissed off" (Edward).

Edward describes above the desire/goal to alleviate noxious boredom through drugs and alcohol as being a vicious 'cycle'. Bored prisoners using illicit substances will get themselves into continual conflict with other inmates (Woodall, 2011; Rocheleau, 2013). Illegitimating coping due to boredom becomes a high risk when prisoners are locked in their cells for 23 hours, especially if they have past histories of consuming substances such as alcohol and drugs (Duke, 2020; Norton, 2017). It is the responsibility of the prisons to provide activities that are going to challenge and interest the prisoners.

7.2.3.1 Technology and Boredom Management

How they decide to legitimately manage their time banged up in their cells varied among participants. Many of the participants managed the time in their cells by watching television and/or listening to music. Some found these activities relaxing and said they helped relieve boredom. However, participants also argued that there are very limited television programmes that they can watch and are often subjected to repeats.

"No. I did obviously. But as I say you've only got, you've got 20 channels, some of them are just plus ones so like channel 4 plus one. But the same films are on every week. So, it's like what do you want to do in with our time" (Isaac).

"We can watch TV, we've got TVs in our cells and that. Got Freeview but yeah some of the stuff is just mind numbing, same stuff. So, you just do something to occupy yourself" (Tyson).

Television can only relieve so much boredom in prison, therefore prisoners need other distractions to cope. Interestingly, the participants who expressed being able to cope legitimately tended to be creative. For example, prisoners like Gary who spend their time in their cell making objects out of matchsticks.

"Well, I think there is enough to do. People think there is not enough to do. But that's people who just sit and watch the tele. I bought matchsticks and glue, I made jewellery boxes, I made tower of London bridge, stuff like that. I painted a lot of pictures and that in my cell. There is enough to do … There is a company called jump shoe 42 running in there as well. Its ran by the church and that. And you apply to them, and they bring you an art pack. So, you can sit and doodle with art or matchstick models or something" (Gary).

7.2.3.2. Skilled Prisoners and Boredom Management

Skilled prisoners and those who can read and enjoy reading have an advantage over other inmates because of their increased cell activity options (Brewster, 2014). Prisoners can either import their skills into the prison environment such as their ability to craft/stitch items or they might educate themselves whilst in prison through, for example, job opportunities. These prisoners, like Gary, are more likely cope better in their cell due to having artistic skills to help preoccupy themselves. The teaching of art and crafts in prison therefore serves the purpose of helping prisoners cope legitimately during long bang-up as they can use their acquired skills while locked in their cells (Vozian, 2020). Therefore, it is important that prisoners are properly supplied with the necessary materials during lock up. Partaking in in-cell education can also provide a good means of alleviating boredom:

"Yeah. I did a lot of education. In-cell work education like distance learning stuff. Especially during the pandemic, just for something to do. But something I could possibly use in the future like, I wanted to pass this course before I came out, then it was like little goals like I wanted to save enough money, I'd give myself a target amount to save by the time I got released. I would set myself goals in the gym I wanted to lift so much by a certain time" (Mike).

7.2.3.3. In-Cell Education and Boredom Management

Concentrating on educational material helped time pass a lot quicker and made long bang-up more tolerable. Some participants expressed a distaste for doing education in groups making in-cell education a more desirable option. However, certain activities such as in-cell education become less desirable when put in a double cell. This is because any activity that requires concentration and deep thinking will likely be made much more difficult when sharing a cell, with the potential consequences of arguments and conflict between the two cellmates. As stated by Noah:

"They are doing education in their pad now through the fucking television. How's that learning? You've got a pad-mate there. So, your pad-mate's there, he might not be doing that group, he might have music on. Could be doing anything. And you've got to fucking watch the television. Madness" (Noah).

However, sharing a cell can come with some significant positives when it comes to relieving boredom. As stated by Isaac:

"If you are banged up with a cellmate, me and my old cellmate we used to sit and play cards for 3 hours on night-time. Just different card games" (Isaac).

Activities such as games that involve more than one person can be played in a two-man cell. This is beneficial because the more activity options the prisoners have the less likely they are to become bored. Having cellmates also has the benefit of having someone to talk to which both helps relieve boredom and reduces the feeling of isolation (Muirhead, 2019).

7.2.3.4. Distraction Packs and Infantilisation

Activities that were not viewed highly, however, by the participants were what they called 'distraction packs' or 'stress packs'. These packs included activities such as colouring books, word searches or crosswords.

"So, most of the distractions come from the distraction packs that they give you. Which is word searches and colouring, and obviously brings you back to 5 years old. So, you end up being bored after 2 minutes" (Charlie).

"Well, what they do is just chuck you a booklet and say do that literally. A stress pack, just a booklet, colouring do you know what I mean. I'm nearly 30, I don't want to be colouring a book do I?" (Riley).

As these comments suggest, these activity packs were viewed as more insulting than helpful by those who mentioned them. The sentiment towards them is that they are childish activities which are not able to maintain their interest. Prisoners often feel frustrated, patronised, and angry by being infantilised whilst incarcerated whether that is due to their lack of autonomy, or the way they are treated by staff or the fact that they are constantly under-surveillance (Crewe, Schliehe and Przybylska, 2023; Schmidt, 2016). Crossword sheets and colouring books add to their negative feelings of being infantilised. These activity packs encapsulated the decline of rehabilitation in prison in their minds. They saw them as an underwhelming replacement for what they desire which is purposeful activities and more time out for association to socialise.

7.2.4. Strain of Limited Socialising Time and Increased Desire to Get Out of the Cell

A well understood requirement for an individual to remain healthy is for them to have time to socialise (Lee and Kawachi, 2017; McKinlay, Fancourt and Burton, 2021). This fact remains true for prisoners, but in prison they are restricted to certain times when they can socialise in groups (PRT, 2022b; Stephenson et al., 2021). This can either be during association time, work, or exercise. One of the obvious impacts of increased bang-up for prisoners during a strict regime is the fact that their time to socialise becomes even more limited. During the Covid-19 pandemic, prisons in E&W required many non-working prisoners to be locked in their cells for up to 23 hours a day as a health measure (Suhomlinova et al., 2022). Reports from July 2022 indicated that prisoners were still enduring 23-hour bang-up periods (Bulman, 2022). What this indicates is that for many prisoners association and exercise time are restricted to just an hour a day. For many the loss of time to socialise was a painful experience:

"I think it was a bit shit an hour, you've got to have a shower and the yard" (Ramsey)

"An hour out of 24 hours is, what got me is the officers they were still on the wings, so why couldn't they let us out for a couple hours that was my thing" (Rory).

In a GST framework, the limitation of socialising time can be categorised as a loss of a positively valued stimulus (Agnew, 1992). Depending on the individual's experience and personality type it can be argued that some prisoners will be negatively affected more deeply by these limitations. For example, it is argued by participants such as Miles that prisoners who are more sociable and are younger are more likely to be hurt by these measures than loner/independent types. Therefore, these individuals are more likely to desire to be let out of the cell to socialise and feel frustrated and/or angry if denied that chance:

"But yeah, there is a lot of people that can't do it. And even if they have had like work all day, had their exercise they are still banging on the door, shouting out the windows all night. They still can't do it. But it's like they are more sociable. There is quite a lot of anti-social people who like their own space. The other guys, especially the young ones they are sociable. They've got lots of mates and they have stuff to chat about or whatever. So, they are sort of like, they hate it. They hate the lock up. The older guys, they love it because they are away from the young ones" (Miles).

It is suggested by the participants in this study that younger prisoners find limited socialising and longer bang-up more stressful because they have more energy that they need to burn off and do not have the necessary skills to manage their stress. Older prisoners on the other

hand with their longer years of experience can cope with boredom better and value being away from the chaos that can occur in association periods (Zamble, 1992). This is not to say, however, that older prisoners do not value the ability to socialise. It is more that they are more likely to be averse to environments that are shared with younger prisoners who are viewed as risks (Hayes et al., 2013).

"But the older generation I'm guessing they feel quite vulnerable because they are mixed in with all the younger generations as well. When technically you would want to see them on their own wing" (Simon).

"The majority of prisoners, young lads 20s, 30s. They've got a lot of energy to burn off. Let them burn it off for heaven's sakes, give everybody else a break. Otherwise, what are they going to do in their cell? Making noise and creating havoc" (Henry).

There were, however, a few participants such as Charlie who preferred to be by themselves and expressed feeling forced into socialising with other prisoners.

"I preferred to be by myself, I still do now. But when you go there, it's forced upon you to sort of mix and mingle and everything because you literally got like two neighbours straight away and then you've got everyone else like just straight there, do you know what I mean. Because the wing is so small, everyone can see you as soon as you walk in. It's like a forced environment to communicate with everyone and everything like that and it doesn't feel right when you first get there" (Charlie).

For those that do not value socialising with other prisoners, then the loss of the positive stimuli of socialising during the strict regime of Covid-19 would likely be less emotionally impactful for them. Therefore, this loss would also be less likely to affect their behaviour, compared to those that perceive that they need socialising with other prisoners for their emotional well-being.

7.2.4.1. Importance of Prisoner Friendships and Its Effects on Violence

Another aspect of prison life that is an important part of effectively coping with the loneliness of the environment is the development of positive valued friendships between prisoners. Many of the participants expressed that they had made friends or associates with whom they desired to spend time either on the exercise yard or by playing pool, table tennis and/or card games during association times. What longer bang-up risks doing is either blocking

prisoners from seeing their prison friendship groups, which is a loss of a positively valued stimuli; or preventing some prisoners from developing positive friendship groups to begin with, which can leave them vulnerable and isolated (Agnew, 2006).

"If you become more reclusive, people tend to sort of wonder why. When I first went into prison, I was shitting myself because obviously my experience was what I used to see in films. And within about 5 days because I basically just kept myself to myself there was rumours going around that I was an ex-copper or an ex-prison officer. So clearly, I was being talked about and targeted because I was keeping myself to myself. But I was keeping myself to myself because my depression and anxiety was just rampant at that time" (Kallum).

Isolated and lonely prisoners are at risk of developing both mental health issues and behavioural problems whilst in prison (Richie et al., 2021; Zinger, Wichmann and Andrews, 2001). They will therefore likely need greater amounts of support from staff members. Allowing prisoners to develop healthy relationships with fellow inmates, as will be argued, can help them adjust and avoid behavioural problems that emerge from a lack of social interaction. Positive friendship groups help in several ways. Friends can act as a positive support network when an individual is found in a troublesome situation. For example, when prisoners are caught up in heated confrontations with another prisoner, friends can help deescalate the situation and calm the prisoner down. This a desirable outcome which some participants said they had brought about on occasions by acting as a support network when their friend was frustrated and stuck in a potentially violent situation. Similarly, Wulf-Ludden's (2013) research findings indicated that prison friendships help individuals avoid conflict. By acting as the cooler minds, they can help their friend when they cannot help themselves, for example by helping them "manage their anger" (Wulf-Ludden, 2013:125).

"Like I say if your friends spot you, it is going to cause bother because you can hear their shouting and the stupid words and they'll say howay come down here keep it away. Or they say oh fight, fight, who's going to get clobbered. It is mostly the old timers that say that. They say come on get away. It is mostly the young'uns that enjoy it. The old timers say don't bother, howay come down, not worth it" (Oliver).

The quote suggests that again age could have an impact on whether friends decide to act responsibly. And while some friendship groups seek to de-escalate violent situations, others seek to do the opposite. The noxious stimulus of being involved in a fight is made more manageable for the individual by their friends fighting by their side. However, what can occur when more people join in is that the situation can become more dangerous for both the

prisoners and the staff members. It can make it more difficult for the staff to disperse fights if there are more people involved and this feeds into the problem of overcrowding on landings.

"Normally it's just one on one. But if you started on a couple of lads, then it could turn into a group. I know one of the lads he called one of the black fellows a couple of names that he shouldn't have done and four of his mates jumped him in his cell. So yeah" (Tyson).

"Nah there would be more than that like it was never just between 2 people, you get close to people doing it they are like friends. So, if one person is fighting one person then his mates will all jump in so it ends up like a couple of people" (Peter).

However, Wulf-Ludden's (2013) findings found that "the relationship between having one or more good friend and experiencing violence in prison remained non-significant" (p.130). Instead, they found that prison fighting was "caused by disrespect, retaliation, or money, not friends or social relationships" (Wulf-Ludden, 2013:130). This implies that prison friendships are not a significant factor in contributing towards prison violence. Furthermore, depending on how trusted the friendship group is, the individual prisoner may decide to confide in friends if their mind feels burdened and in mental distress.

"You get close to them do you know what I mean, there is a lot of good people in prison. Some people have just made mistakes. It's just my thing but you do get a lot of good people in there who can literally have your back. So, if you are feeling stressed and all that or angry, they are there for you" (Peter).

"Yes, there was probably I would say a handful of lads. Some obviously moved on, others that I do keep in touch with. I do speak to them on the phone quite regularly with we've got permissions from the probation to keep in touch. And they have been very supportive since I've been in and obviously since I've been out as well" (Desmond).

Many of the participants are wary, however, of confiding too much in their prison friends/associates. Expressing stress or feelings of unhappiness to any inmate comes with the risk of the information being passed on around the prison. As expressed in Ricciardelli's (2014) work, prisoners often say that they cannot fully trust their prison friends. As much as possible prisoners want to avoid being perceived as weak (Michalski, 2017). By stating that they are feeling negative emotions such as stress or sadness they are admitting that they are not strong enough to cope by themselves. It is dangerous therefore for that information

to passed round as it was argued by participants that those who are perceived to be weak tend to be those who are targeted and bullied in prison.

"If somebody finds someone weaker than them, that will be it. They'll be all around him" (Enzo).

"Well, it was anyone that looked weak I would say, they were prime targets" (Luke).

7.2.4.2. The Desire for Social Activities and Their Links to Violence

It is true that confiding in friends is not the only purpose for developing friendships. As stated previously, prisoners enjoy group activities that require social interaction. This is part of the prison experience that several participants mentioned they missed during the strict regime of Covid-19. They missed interacting with their friends, especially through activities such as playing pool.

"More time in association. That was one of the hardest things. Didn't have enough time. Because I liked to play pool, plus seeing my friends but you couldn't because they were all on different times. It got to is, after the last one I was in prison my head was battered, I says here I've got to get out of here. I've had enough. I spoke to my doctor. He says what's the matter, I says I cannot cope. I cannot see my friends. I'm stuck behind the door" (Oliver).

The game of pool is the non-purposeful activity that was the most often mentioned as being missed by the participants when it was taken away during Covid-19. Playing activities such as pool was regarded highly because it helped keep their minds occupied while also fulfilling their social interaction needs.

"You used to be able to play pool and table tennis with other people, there was no interaction in there whatsoever" (Riley).

"Pool's a big thing in jail. It's something to do and they took it away during Covid, so things weren't good. My first sentence I was like, work then doing pool, work then doing pool, and this sentence I was like I'm lost here" (Ramsey).

Some participants said that activities such as pool had still not yet returned in their prisons by the time of their release. Prison staff might be wary of bringing pool back because it is an

area that can often facilitate violence (Gooch, 2019). Indeed, a few participants had avoided pool to limit their chances of being caught up in violence.

"What they are going to do now is get rid of the pool tables because violence accumulates around those tables and stuff" (Rory).

"I didn't really play the pool table because there are a lot of fights happen over a game of pool. Just didn't play pool" (Gary).

The problem, however, with not allowing prisoners to have access to activities such as pool, table tennis and the gym for reasonable periods of time while they are out on the wing is that it can lead to an increase in prisoners harassing others because they are bored (Rocheleau, 2013). Without providing means of adequately occupying their bodies and minds, they may instead direct their attention to other prisoners who they judge as unusual and worth targeting - prisoners for example, who keep to themselves, perhaps for their own preference and/or safety.

"The problem with everyone having nothing to do is they are very nosy into everyone else's business. So, if you are stood there at your door and they'll come over and have a chat, everyone does that anyway, everyone susses everyone out eventually. But if you've already sussed and you stay in your pad, like I've noticed this, honestly, I just wanted to spend my time and fuck off back out, that's all I wanted to do, I'm not going back. But like the people who are in there for a long time and have been in there for a long time, they'll go here I'm a bit sussed about him because he's been at his door and he isn't talking to no one. He might be a paedophile or something like that. They are always like that. It's because they have nothing to do. Because once you start speaking to them, they end up being best mates with them and it's like because they've had fuck all to do. So, your minds playing tricks on you basically. Because we never had snooker, pool, nothing like that, we never had anything like that. Because of Covid obviously. I can pretty much guarantee that they are still not doing it now. It's more distraction than anything. Because if you're playing pool you are not going to notice that person at the door. But because you are stood at your door, looking out at the whole wing, you notice people stood at their door. So, because you've got nothing to do, you are just looking for problems at that point" (Charlie).

7.3. Concluding Remarks

To sum up, the positive aspect that a strict regime can potentially offer in the short-term is decreased assault rates and a greater sense of control for prison staff, due to there being fewer prisoners out on the landings at any one given time. However, the findings from this study suggest that a strict regime will inevitably produce both physical and psychological forms of violence such as threats, intimidation, and verbal abuse. A prison regime that keeps prisoners locked up for 23 hours of the day and limits their time out on association and exercise where they spend their time socialising with their prison friends/associates will likely only effectively function for a short period of time. Eventually the desire to be let out of their cell becomes for many prisoners too great for them to cope legitimately because they have been starved of socialising, association activities, and exercise.

"They don't want you to play cards on the landing, there is pool tables there, they are just taunting you, but they won't let you use them. So, the frustration is going to carry on building and building because of this lack of things to do and all it's going to take is for someone to be really frustrated one day and have a lot of pent-up anger and then for somebody to say something or do something and then he's going to flip" (Mike).

"What they are trying to do now is because it has been so chilled for the officers, I don't know if you have read it in anything, they want to keep it as it is because there are less violence, less drugs. Probably because we are behind the door. That can only last for so long. Until they click on, the inmates and get their heads together, they end up being like Manchester, end up being a big riot. That's what I believe is going to happen, in time, if they don't put it right again" (Arthur).

As the comments above suggest there is a risk of producing inmate aggression and frustration when prisons devise a regime that limits prisoners' ability to socialise and provides very few activities. The noxious stimuli associated with bang-up, such as poor cellmate behaviour, noise, and boredom and the "removal of positively valued stimuli" such as time spent with prison associates/friends and limited association activities only serve to maximise the prisoners' desire/goal to get out of their cell (Agnew, 1992:57). And if they are not allowed out legitimately for what they perceive is a reasonable amount of time then there is a risk of threats and violent behaviour towards staff members and other prisoners coming from those who cannot cope from the extreme strains that result from long bang-up.

Furthermore, for prisoners to cope in their cells with negative feelings/emotions of boredom and anger which can lead to violent behaviour they need a diverse range of activities. Technology such as music players and television offer some degree of boredom alleviation.

However, due to factors such as limited television channels and lower noise output there is only so much that these devices can do to mitigate prisoners' frustration and anger when locked in their cells for long periods. Prisoners that tend to cope better in their cell, however, are those that are interested in reading and/or artistically inclined/skilled. By diversifying their activities through, for example, model-making and other art-craft they are less emotionally burdened by the strain of boredom. The last activity that some participants mentioned as being beneficial during their time locked in their cells is in-cell education. However, this purposeful pastime is often emphasised as being only enjoyable/bearable when they are in a single cell. Having to concentrate on their work whilst having to compromise with their cellmate is difficult to balance and can therefore lead to confrontation.

However, the aforementioned downward trend of assault rates during covid-19 does raise the question whether it contradicts the argument that a strict regime and the stressors associated with that structural strain lead to violence (GOV.UK, 2023c). There are multiple points to consider. Firstly, it could be concluded from the statistics that although a strict regime can produce and increase in magnitude painful stains (i.e. boredom, noxious smells, noise and so on) that can lead to violence, a more open prison regime, which has its own associated stressors, is more likely to lead to conflict. As stated by Aidan:

"I can't say what people were like during covid because most of us was just banged up all day. I can imagine they were bored but there was less drugs going around, less people in debt, less people getting assaulted" (Aidan).

The implications of this are that although analysing the qualitative data using a GST framework provided evidence that indicated that the systemic strain of a strict regime is connected to violence it may not prove statistically significant when conducting a quantitative analysis comparing the two regime types. Future quantitative research therefore should consider comparing these two regime types and the strains associated with them and see whether these regimes are significantly related to violence and which of these two is more likely to produce violent behaviours in prisoners. If it is proven that a strict regime is not significantly associated with prison violence, then it can be argued that this is a clear limitation of analysing qualitative data through a GST lens.

There are, however, other means of rationalising these findings. For example, since the strict regime of Covid-19 involved confining prisoners in their cells for long periods of the day this had an effect on the environments/places in which violence would take place. As my research data indicates, violent behaviour during a strict regime would most likely take place

191

in prisoners' cells as this is the environment in which they are spending most of their time. Also, within that environment there are also various stressors that will increase in magnitude, thereby causing greater pressure to commit illegitimate acts. Violence that predominantly takes place in cells can have an effect on recorded violence rates since it is more difficult for prison staff to witness and take note of when compared to violence committed on the landings or in workshops as they are less hidden from their gaze. Physical and/or psychological violence that is not reported will not appear in official records. Therefore, this shift of violence to more hidden environments such as prison cells could be a significant factor as to why violence rates seemingly decreased during the pandemic.

Another factor to consider is the difference between how the prison system views and defines violence and how this research views and defines it. As mentioned in section 1.3. of this thesis, this research has taken a broad approach to its definition of violence, treating both physical and psychological harms as violent acts. The statistics provided earlier demonstrated that there had been a reduction in prisoner-on-prisoner assaults during the pandemic (GOV.UK, 2023c). However, it is worth questioning to what extent were verbal abuse, intimidation, bullying, vandalising of cells and so on affected by the pandemic. Was there a reduction or increase in these types of violent acts during the pandemic? If there was an increase it can be argued that the types of violent acts committed during a strict regime shift to different forms of violence when compared to a pre-pandemic regime. This would be worth exploring in future research.

Lastly, as previously explained we have limited knowledge of how prisoners' violent behaviour would have been affected if the regime had lasted a significantly longer period of time. Would prisoners accept a strict limited regime as the new norm or would they eventually violently rebel against such depriving conditions? If the latter is true, then it can be concluded that a strict regime is not effective in managing violence.

Overall, what these three chapters have found is that what has contributed significantly to prison violence are three systemic strains that are negatively affecting prisoners' coping behaviour. These systemic strains are the strain of blocked desired costly goods, the strain of prison staff attitudes, disrespect, lack of support and misuse of power and the strain of a strict regime. The various strains produced by these systemic strains, especially when clustered together, increase the likelihood that prisoners will feel emotionally pressured to act violently (Agnew, 2008). These systemic stressors are having a wide-ranging effect on the prison system and should all be viewed as equally important and need to be addressed via future policies (see section 8.3.).

Now that the findings have been presented and analysed, the following chapter will conclude this thesis by summarising the findings, by reviewing the selected framework, and by providing policy and research recommendations. It will then conclude with a final remark.

Chapter 8. Discussion and Conclusion

The purpose of this research was to provide explanations for, and solutions to, prison violence in E&W prisons. This research utilised Blevins et al.'s (2010) application of a GST framework to prison violence in order to understand and analyse the data that was collected from recently released prisoners. In this chapter, a summary of this research will be provided which seeks to answer the research questions. The framework of GST will be reviewed to explore its strengths and weaknesses as a qualitative tool for prison research. The third section will provide policy recommendations based upon the solutions discovered through the data analysis. The fourth section will cover what further research is necessary. And lastly, final remarks will be made to conclude this thesis.

8.1. Summary of the Research Findings: What Strains Cause Violence and What Positive Coping Methods do Prisoners Need?

This research has added to the understanding of E&W prison violence by analysing three major systemic strains highlighted in interviews with recently released prisoners. These systemic strains are as follows: the strain of blocked desired costly goods, the strain of prison staff attitudes, disrespect, lack of support and misuse of power and the strain of a strict regime. These systemic strains are problematic because they negatively affect prison conditions and thereby make it more difficult for prisoners to cope legitimately. In this way they increase the possibility that prisoners will experience painful negative emotions and behave violently/aggressively. The following discussion provides a summary of these systemic strains and explains how they result in prisoners coping through violence. And finally, there will be a detailed conclusion of what prisoners need in terms of support and coping mechanisms in order to behave non-violently.

8.1.1. The Strain of Blocked Desired Costly Goods

The first systemic strain explored in interviews was that caused by the barriers that prisoners face in acquiring desired goods legitimately. Prisoners desire certain goods available in the canteen that help them cope. The examples highlighted in the study were vapes, food, electric fans, DVD players and games consoles. These goods provide stress relief for prisoners. Not having access to vapes and good quality food was a strain that many participants highlighted as a frustrating experience in prison. Vapes help relieve prisoners'

addiction and boredom, whereas canteen food provides prisoners with an alternative to what participants classified as the small-portioned, poor-quality food served in the servery (Jayes et al., 2023). Electric fans were viewed by the participants as an increasing necessity due to the increasingly hot temperatures felt during the summer periods. Indeed, participants argued that being locked in their cells for long periods in high temperatures contributed to violent/disorderly behaviour. Extreme heat causes discomfort and thereby increases the likelihood of aggressive thoughts and behaviours (Anderson, 2001). This strain is further increased by the design of the cells, which are poorly ventilated. Poor ventilation in many cells causes the temperatures to become unbearable during lock-up. Buying an electronic fan significantly helps relieve this strain and so the participants valued them highly.

However, as previously mentioned, there are several barriers that prisoners must deal with to buy these goods legitimately. These barriers, as expressed in my data, can arise in areas such as family support, prison jobs, the IEP scheme, and the rising cost of living. Those who are fortunate to have a strong relationship with family members who can financially support them are less likely to feel the strains of these barriers. However, for many of my participants their family members were not in a financial position to offer support. Furthermore, difficulties in maintaining contact with family prevent many prisoners from receiving both emotional and financial support. Contact with family members especially through visits was negatively affected by the pandemic, which inevitably resulted in disrupted relationships between prisoners and their family members (Minson, 2021; Lockwood, 2021). What helped some participants cope with prison lockdown was the regular provision of video calls. However, video calls do not fully replace the need for in-person visits for prisoners. They do not provide physical contact and can be disrupted by technical issues (HM Inspectorate of Prisons, 2021c; Suhomlinova et al., 2022). Also, for those who do not earn or receive a significant income this creates further pressure on individuals who have to decide between paying for phone calls with family members and buying desired goods.

Prison jobs that provide income presented several barriers for prisoners. Participants explained that poor pay, a limited number of jobs, a lack of variety of jobs and prisoners' physical and mental health prevent and/or dissuade many from participating. This is problematic because without employment in prison individuals who do not have family support receive only the basic weekly allowance (minimum £2.50 per week), leaving them very little money to spend on what they regard as necessities (MoJ, 2020b:17). Another strain/barrier, as highlighted previously, is the IEP scheme. In order to spend the highest amount they are permitted each week, prisoners must have been awarded enhanced status due to good behaviour. For a few participants this does help incentivise good behaviour, as

long as their goal is to purchase goods through legitimate sources. Other prisoners, however, did not necessarily perceive the value of these extra benefits as being worth the effort of behaving according to prison rules. These individuals may still value acquiring goods in prison but since they have significantly less spending power on the basic weekly allowance, they are more likely to pursue illegitimate means of acquiring these goods. Furthermore, some participants felt that prison officers would unfairly strip their enhanced status from them. Some therefore felt disillusioned by the IEP scheme and did not see the merit of trying to achieve enhanced status if it was inevitable that they would lose that privilege.

The last major barrier which prevents prisoners from acquiring their desired goods is the rising cost of goods in prison. Goods in prison are becoming increasingly less affordable for prisoners according to the participants. Because of this they are having to be more selective in what they purchase. Some prisoners will cope with what they can afford legitimately whereas others will not cope as well. Some prisoners will instead find illegitimate means of acquiring goods. These illegitimate methods as highlighted in the findings come in the form of bullying, theft and getting into debt, all of which can result in both physical and psychological violence.

Prison bullies will target several groups to acquire desired goods. These victims can include the individual's family members and prisoners that are perceived as mentally unwell, weak, inexperienced and/or old. Those targeted by prison bullies for their personal goods are at risk from physical threats and assaults. This can result in an escalation in violence by either the perpetrator or the victim. The victim may seek to commit violence on the bully to gain respect, as well as to prevent them being victimised in the future (Ireland, 2012). It was highlighted, however, by the participants that there is an anti-bullying sentiment by other prisoners due to an increasing dislike of that behaviour. They explained that other prisoners will likely seek to resolve bullying through either negotiating with the perpetrator or by threatening them with violence.

It was clear from the interviews that bullies are clearly disliked by prisoners, but cell thieves are hated even more. Prisoners already have very little positive stimuli in the form of goods, so the act of stealing from them creates a deeper level of resentment and hatred towards the perpetrator. Some prisoners may take it upon themselves to find the perpetrator, hoping to take retribution and thereby running the risk of escalating the problem into conflict. A legitimate measure that some prisoners can take is to lock their cells regularly before leaving for association, exercise, or work. However, not all prisoners have the option to lock their cell

door and are therefore dependent on staff help, which, according to the participants, does not result in good outcomes as it is perceived as grassing/snitching on other prisoners which comes with the risk of being violently targeted for that action.

The final and arguably most dangerous illegitimate method of attaining desired goods is by obtaining them from other prisoners, thereby incurring debts with increasing interest. Those who are at greatest risk of getting into debt are vape smokers and prisoners who are poor at managing their income (HM Inspectorate of Prisons, 2016a; Jayes et al., 2023). The growing desire for vapes and their high value in the prison illicit market result in many prisoners falling into debt. Some participants described strategies to manage their vape consumption throughout the week. However, others will go through drug debtors because they find it impossible to last the week without vapes. The consequence of this action is that, due to unfair debt collector rules, poor prisoners are unable to repay their debts. According to participants, this led to a number of prisoners being assaulted, sometimes with a weapon. Prisoners who get into debt fear the likelihood of being assaulted. They therefore employ measures to avoid or get rid of this noxious threat. These measures, according to the participants, can come in the form of acquiring weapons to protect themselves, thereby increasing the chances of lethal violence being committed. Some will instead ask to be moved wings to avoid the debtors. If, however, that does not work they may decide to smash their pads, self-harm or jump the netting to force staff members to take action. Moving wings, however, does not necessarily keep prisoners safe. The participants argued that debt can follow you even if you are placed in a different wing or prison. The threat of violence will remain.

8.1.2. The Strain of Prison Staff Attitudes, Disrespect, Lack of Support and Misuse of Power

The second major systemic strain that the participants consistently viewed as a significant negative impact on their ability to cope legitimately was the strain caused by on-going staff disrespect, declining support, and misuse of power.

Participants emphasised that being respected is highly valued. Respect boosts prisoner self-esteem and improves how they are treated by other prisoners (Debowska et al., 2017; Greve and Enzmann, 2003). If they are treated with contempt or disrespect, they are typically viewed in this hyper-masculine environment as weak and thereby vulnerable to abuse (De Viggiani, 2012). It is particularly psychologically harmful/frustrating for prisoners to be

disrespected by staff members because of the difference in their power and status (Arnold, 2016). According to the participants there were several types of disrespect by staff members that caused them to feel angry and frustrated: their use of harmful language; lying; failed promises; and being patronised by younger staff members. These noxious stimuli can all increase the chances of prisoners becoming aggressive towards staff members. Participants emphasised that they respected staff who were honest in that they would let prisoners know if they were unable to complete a task. In contrast, prisoners left waiting for many hours without an update after being promised by a staff member that they would complete a task for them felt deeply frustrated and disrespected. It is argued by the participants that the main contributor to poor attitudes and behaviour is the increase in the number of younger inexperienced staff being hired. Younger staff members are viewed, especially by the older participants, as more patronising and generally poor communicators due to their lack of life experience.

A major downside of staff having a lack of respect and empathy for prisoners is that it puts further strain on support offered to prisoners. Prisoners need staff support to cope effectively in prison (Rocheleau, 2015; Marzano et al., 2012). The overwhelming strains placed on prisoners, because of the strict measures introduced during the pandemic, have taken a significant toll on many prisoners' mental health. This is problematic because worsening mental health/illness is linked to increases in violent behaviour in prison. This study found that those prisoners who are most likely to suffer and be neglected are those that are quiet and non-aggressive. It is believed by the participants that this is because they are less likely to attract the attention of officers. Furthermore, it is argued by the participants that this is because many of the younger/inexperienced officers do not have the skills and knowledge needed to identify when a prisoner is suffering, unless prisoners attract officers' attention through illegitimate means. This is frustrating for prisoners and leads normally well-behaved prisoners who are mentally suffering to behave illegitimately to attract prison officers' attention. If acting aggressively and/or violently results in their getting the support they need, then rationally a prisoner will see this behaviour as the optimal method for their situation.

What most prisoners need are staff who are willing to listen to them as a way of improving their quality of life (Tate et al., 2017). Ideally, for those who are mentally suffering, this support should be offered by a mental health team. However, due to staff shortages and longer waiting times this support is under threat (HM Inspectorate of Prisons, 2022; Patel et al., 2018). Other sources of potential listeners such as key workers and inmate listeners were valued by some participants as an alternative source. However, experiences of irregular contact and constant changes in key worker staff, and issues around broken

confidentiality have led to a reduced trust in these services according to the participants. Concerns and frustrations around broken confidentiality, however, also extend to regular staff who participants thought either purposely or accidentally leak personal information. Broken confidentiality is dangerous as it can lead to some prisoners being victimised if the leaked content contains information about a person's past crimes (i.e., sex crimes) that are viewed as morally deplorable by other prisoners (Steiner et al., 2017). The strain caused by broken confidentially leads to prisoners feeling negative emotions such as fear that they will eventually be violently victimised, which as a result takes a toll on their emotional well-being (Howard et al., 2020).

Another strain that is disproportionately negatively affecting prisoners is prison staff's discretional use of power. It is argued by the participants that certain prisoners are treated more favourably by staff than others. These favoured prisoners are the ones who receive extra privileges. According to the findings of this research, prisoners that are disliked for their personality and/or behaviour tend to be neglected, ignored when assaulted, and are subjected to excessive use of force. These noxious stimuli result in prisoners distrusting officers and produce an increasing desire to commit violence against them as a means of revenge. The ones who are most likely to benefit from staff favouritism are wing workers (i.e., cleaners) and servery workers. This is because they are more likely to build a positive relationship with staff as they have more time out of their cell than the average prisoner. Staff favouritism creates division between those that are favoured and those that are not (Gariglio, 2019). Some of those not in favour experience feelings such as jealousy and resentment towards those that benefit from positive relationships with staff. This as a result increases the risk of conflict between prisoners and staff.

What can also increase the likelihood of conflict between prisoners and staff members is if staff misuse their power in a way that directly or indirectly harms the prisoner's family members. Prisoners' family members are for many an important positive stimulus. Prison officers must be careful not to follow the rules too strictly if this risks psychologically harming the prisoner's family members. These instances are highly likely to cause typically non-confrontational prisoners to become verbally and/or physically aggressive. This is therefore an example of how the use of discretion is vital for the safety of family members and staff.

The final misuse of power analysed was the use of IEP. IEP were overwhelmingly viewed by the participants as being misused. For example, they complained that they were given out too frequently for petty infractions, that some were not informed about receiving an IEP, and that well-behaved prisoners do not receive enough positive IEP. Participants regarded IEP

more as weapons utilised by officers rather than tools to reinforce good behaviour. Prisoners who value the privileges gained through enhancement will likely be pained and feel anger and resentment towards staff if they believe that the rules have been applied unfairly (Khan, 2022). Most participants think that there should be more of a balance between punishing poor behaviour and rewarding good behaviour. The overuse of IEP as punishment results in more prisoners having fewer coping mechanisms that they need and value (i.e., more visits, electronic devices etc). On the other hand, the provision of more positive IEP would incentivise participation in programmes and education. Using IEP more regularly as positive reinforcement could encourage more non-violent behaviour (MoJ, 2022a).

8.1.3. The Strain of a Strict Prison Regime

The third and final systemic strain discussed concerned the effect of 'stricter regime measures' on prisoner violent behaviour. All those interviewed had experienced what can be classified as a strict prison regime at the height of the Covid-19 pandemic. This strict regime differed from how prisons operated prior to Covid-19 and from what most participants were used to. For example, all prisoners during this time experienced longer periods of time locked in their cells and significantly less time socialising and being involved in purposeful activities (Johnson et al., 2021; Hewson et al., 2020). In certain respects, this change provided relief for some prisoners (and perhaps even more so for staff members) as the strain of high rates of assaults towards staff and other inmates was reduced significantly, at least according to official statistics (GOV.UK, 2023c). It is argued by the participants that staff thrived during this period as they felt more in control of their prisons. Similarly, In Johnson et al.'s (2023) research they argue that staff well-being had likely benefited from managing an environment that had fewer violent and self-harm incidents. These benefits therefore beg the question whether such a regime can be beneficial in the pursuit of managing violence. However, the findings of this study indicate that strict measures such as long periods of lock-up and limited socialising results in serious consequences for prisoners' behaviour, safety, and mental health. These strict and debilitating rules further intensify the pain of the many different strains that prisoners were already having to cope with prior to the pandemic.

My research finds that when prisoners remain locked in their cells for up to 23 and a half hours a day, objective stressors such as sharing a cell, boredom and loud noises become even more unbearable. This, in turn, makes it more difficult to cope with strains legitimately. Those who are required to share a cell, for example, run the risk of being a danger to their

cellmate or of being victimised themselves. The findings highlight several different reasons why cellmates violently victimise each other. First, it is argued by the participants that prisoners who do not contribute to the maintenance of their cells and do not keep themselves clean place a major strain on their relationship with their cellmates. What links these two noxious stimuli is that those prisoners who value cleanliness see these strains as unjustified as they negatively affect their own physical and mental well-being. The resultant anger and frustration felt towards the individual creates a desire in some prisoners to get rid of this noxious stimulus. In some cases, this is achieved either by threatening violence to coercively change this behaviour, or by requesting to be moved cells. Furthermore, individuals who pose a risk to their cellmates through behaviour caused either by mental instability and/or by the consumption of illicit substances also increase the likelihood of conflict. Either out of a concern or fear that these individuals could threaten their safety, prisoners may seek ways to neutralise the threat. In Henry's case, for example, he came to the decision that if the mentally unstable individual was not moved by staff members, then he would be willing to threaten or use violence to prevent any anticipated violence from his cellmate.

Some participants were able to avoid potential conflicts by continually making compromises with their cellmates. In Schliehe and Crewe's (2022) research they found that cellmates identified their relationship as being similar to a marriage in which compromises and changing of habits are necessary in order to minimise the potential outcome of conflict. My research however finds that compromise as a coping technique becomes more difficult when prisoners are given limited time to spend away from their cellmates. Spending a significant amount of time with the same individual in an enclosed space has a negative impact on prisoners' mental health and causes normally minor strains to become increasingly more frustrating and difficult to cope with legitimately. All these strains led to many prisoners increasingly wishing to gain access to single cells as they are perceived as a less stress-inducing living environment. It is argued by the participants that to achieve this some use illegitimate methods so that prisoners can be classified as high risk. The participants argued that this can come in the form of self-harm, smashing their cells, reporting severe mental health issues, or committing violence towards their cellmates. Some of those who decide to cope through these methods will genuinely need be housed in single cells due to their declining mental health and increasing dangerousness. However, participants argue that some prisoners feel that the potential consequences of committing violent acts are outweighed by the benefits of being housed in a single cell. Punishments, therefore, such as being put on basic or an increase in sentence length, are for some a less painful experience than being housed in a double cell under a strict regime.

There is, however, a noxious strain that prisoners must cope with no matter if they are placed in a single or double cell. This is the strain caused by undesired noise which is made more unbearable for prisoners when under strict regime conditions since they have less time away from noisy conditions when locked in their cell for significant periods of the day. Consistently cited undesired noises by the participants during lock-up are music, banging on the walls, the sound of prisoners doing exercise, phone calls and television. To remove the noxious stimulus most prisoners would seek legitimate methods such as asking the individual to reduce their noise output or by seeking help from officers. If the undesired noise persists, however, then there is an increased chance of conflict between both parties. What can be inferred from the data is that certain prisoners will be more likely to be negatively impacted by loud noises and as a result become frustrated and angry. Examples of such prisoners as expressed by the participants would be the older generation, Autistic Spectrum Disorder prisoners and individuals with hearing conditions. One serious consequence of persistent undesired noises is the effect that it has on prisoners' ability to sleep. Prisoners that suffer from sleep deprivation are at greater risk of becoming mentally unwell, aggressive, and short-tempered (Barker et al., 2016; Krizan and Herlache, 2016; Kamphuis et al., 2012). In this way they may become a greater risk to themselves and to others.

As a result of the painful outcome of long lock-up periods prisoners increasingly desire to get out of their cells and to socialise with other prisoners. Socialising is a positive stimulus that many of the participants valued but which for obvious reasons became increasingly under threat during the Covid-19 pandemic. It is argued by the participants that younger and more sociable prisoners are more likely to be hurt and frustrated by this loss. The consequence of this limiting regime is that all prisoners become isolated and fail to create/maintain meaningful friendship groups. Generally, mental wellbeing will suffer as prisoners become depressed and frustrated and develop behavioural problems as a response to these strains. It was highlighted by participants that friendship between prisoners plays a significant role in both preventing and avoiding violence. Having trustworthy friends can help deescalate conflict situations, provide emotional support and protection from potential threats. However, the development of untrustworthy friendships can lead to the escalation of conflict through the unwelcome spreading of personal information such as the prisoner's offence history. The literature indicates that prisoners that have committed crimes that are viewed as being immoral and unmasculine by other prisoners such as those that have committed sexual offences are more likely to be violently assaulted (Michalski, 2017). These individuals therefore are more likely to be concerned about their private information being leaked to other prisoners, thereby threatening their safety.

The final positively valued stimuli discussed by participants were activities such as pool and table tennis. These were viewed as a painful loss by many during Covid-19. These activities are necessary because they help to reduce boredom. Bored prisoners are more likely to bully and harass others for entertainment as indicated in both my findings and the literature (Rocheleau, 2013). They need entertainment and purposeful activities that they value for their minds to be meaningfully occupied.

What can be concluded is that a strict regime in which prisoners are offered little time out of their cells and opportunities to socialise risks further exacerbating strains such as sharing cells, unwanted noises, sleep deprivation and so on. These issues have an undesirable effect on prisoners' mental health and behaviour. The fewer opportunities they have to socialise and take part in entertainment to relieve boredom the more likely they are to feel negative emotions such as frustration and anger, which in turn leads to some prisoners acting physically or psychologically violently towards both prisoners and staff members.

8.1.4. Concluding Thoughts: What do Prisoners Need to Cope Legitimately?

Through analysing these systemic strains that contemporary E&W prisoners have had to cope with, a variety of pains have been identified that make it more likely that prisoners will behave violently. However, although these systemic strains individually produce a number of problems, when working in conjunction with one another they can produce unbearable conditions for prisoners and staff. For example, when prisoners are under pressure from a strict regime where they are stuck in their cells for up to 23 hours of the day, they are more likely to desire and need prison goods/money and staff support. The greater need for prison goods and money would primarily be driven by the need to quell feelings of boredom and isolation. Prisoners will also desire more money so they can contact family members regularly to help combat the pains of isolation. Those therefore who are less likely to cope well in those strict regime situations are also those who are unable to afford these goods and services legitimately.

Furthermore, how well prisoners cope with strict regimes and lack of access to goods is heavily affected by staff attitudes, their offerings of support and how they decide to utilise their power. Prisoners who are mentally struggling with long lockups and lack of desired goods need greater staff support. However, as previously mentioned, the quality and consistency of this support is dependent on a wide range of factors such as the respect and

empathy of the staff member towards the prisoners, as well as their knowledge and job experience. Furthermore, prisoners' access to desired goods will also be negatively affected by staff disrespect, favouritism, and misuse of power. Those who are disliked by staff will be likely to receive less support and more negative IEP warnings. When prisoners are put on basic due to receiving too many IEP warnings, they are significantly limited in their spending capabilities which thereby reduces their access to desired goods. Staff members who are too heavy handed with their powers are thereby blocking the coping mechanisms that prisoners need to cope legitimately.

What can be inferred by analysing these systemic strains by themselves and in conjunction with each other is what prisoners fundamentally need to cope legitimately (non-violently) in prison. In terms of the prison regime, all prisoners need to have the option of being out of their cell for most of the day. Which according to the HM Inspectorate of Prisons (2021b) should be at least 10 hours on weekdays for prisoners to maintain good mental well-being (p.1). The painful/negative experiences of the participants who were subject to the strict regime during Covid-19 further justify this position. Prisoners need adequate time to socialise with their trusted friendship groups, be involved in activities (purposeful and/or entertainment) and to be away from their cellmates to de-stress. Without these coping mechanisms prisoners become bored, frustrated, lonely and/or vulnerable. Prisoners also need to have a greater voice in expressing their preferences and concerns early in the decision-making process about what types of prisoners they share their cell with. Offering this small power will more likely result in prisoners being more receptive and less hostile towards their cellmate.

Furthermore, all prisoners require some degree of access to coping mechanisms in the form of desired goods to relieve a variety of strains whether that be boredom, isolation, heat, hunger and/or addiction. What is however blocking them from getting their desired goods is a lack of purposeful job opportunities, poor wages, broken down family relations, weaponization of IEP, the rising cost of goods and poor financial management skills. In terms of jobs, prisoners prefer work that offers useful skills that are valued in the job market. Work that offers very little in terms of valued skills reduces the desire to participate. Similarly, if the wages attached to the work offered are viewed as poor then this also affects job participation. This is problematic because prisoners need jobs to improve their spending and saving capabilities and as a means of getting out of their cell. However, some prisoners are likely to be less motivated if they perceive the wages to be inadequate for their labour. The reassessment of wages and basic weekly incomes is particularly worth considering due to the increasing costs of goods. The fewer goods that prisoners can afford legitimately the

more pressure there is to cope illegitimately to acquire their needed items. Another method of improving prisoners' ability to cope with this strain is to improve their means of contact with their family members and friends so they can provide the emotional and/or financial support they need. The research found face-to-face visits, video calls and phone calls to all be important in maintaining family relationships. However, certain blockages such as technical issues with video calls, and having limited time to contact family members using that method, are areas that need to be improved to reduce prisoner stress. What many prisoners, however, will also need is help with improving their financial management skills. This is particularly true for prisoners with poor coping skills who have a strong likelihood and/or history of getting into debt inside and outside of prison. Prisoners that can manage their money/goods better throughout the week will be less likely to seek illegitimate methods. Whereas individuals that are poor at managing their goods/money find it difficult to only buy what they can afford/need and not be lured into problematic behaviours such as getting into debt.

There also needs to be further consideration by the Government in terms of how they design prison cells in the future. Specifically, cells should be designed in a way that reduces heat and noise output. The participants stressed that they struggled to cope physically and mentally in a prison cell environment that had poor ventilation. In future cells need to be designed in the knowledge that records show that the summer periods are becoming increasingly hotter for longer stretches of time. Alternatively, electric fans may need to be made more accessible for prisoners, especially for those who are locked in their cells for significant periods of time and who do not receive financial support. Electric fans are an expense that some prisoners are not able to afford as easily as others. Furthermore, when it comes to noxious noises these are pains that deeply negatively affect the cell experience. It has been suggested by Engstrom and Van Ginneken (2022) that future cell designs should include softer materials ("carpet, wood, and cork") rather than harder materials ("concrete, brick, and metal") to reduce the impact of noise coming from other cells (p.489). Alternatively, as with the recommendation to provide electric fans, prisons should consider making headphones less costly and more accessible. Another solution offered by a participant is to only provide music systems that are limited to low noise levels. A final recommendation on this matter is to make wearing headphones or lowering music/televisions at night standard practice to reduce the number of prisoners who are deprived of sleep.

The final coping mechanism that prisoners need is positive staff support. All prisoners need help from staff in a variety of ways, whether that be to provide information/advice, to be

someone who listens to them or helps them with certain tasks that they are unable to do themselves. This research, however, highlights several barriers that are preventing positive staff support. The participants point to a lack of trust between staff and prisoners, disrespect, favouritism, misuse of powers, false promises, inexperienced young staff and a lack of mental health knowledge. In particular, prisoners who are suffering from mental health difficulties need greater support and empathy from staff members. Staff need to be effective listeners so they can identify prisoners who are suffering. One recommended solution is to improve mental health training for all staff members. The participants also want an increase in the recruitment of mental health staff. This will hopefully reduce waiting times for mental health support, as well as reduce the pressure placed on prison officers. Finally, there needs to be more investment in hospital facilities so that more extremely mentally unwell prisoners are referred and treated. Keeping extremely mentally unwell prisoners who are a danger to themselves and to others in prison will only result in increasing numbers of violent incidents.

8.2. Review of GST: The Strengths and Limitations of Using This Framework Qualitatively in a Prison Context

This research sought to test the feasibility and efficacy of using GST in a qualitative way to explain prison violence. There have been both notable strengths and limitations to this approach. When it comes to the theoretical contribution of this thesis, I have sought to test the efficiency of Blevins (2010) application of GST and whether it can be effectively utilised with qualitative methods. There has been limited amount of GST research that has used this framework qualitatively in prison research (Leban et al.'s 2016; Novisky and Peralta's, 2020). And as far as I am aware no research has tested this framework qualitatively in an E&W prison setting. Exploring the strengths and limitations of Blevins et al. (2010) prison GST framework as a qualitative research tool for prison research will highlight whether this framework should be utilised in future prison qualitative research.

Firstly, a significant strength of utilising a GST framework for this thesis is that it provides a form of understanding of the nature of violence in many different contexts, including prisons. As has been mentioned, the GST framework was created with the purpose of exploring all different types of crimes. GST is not restricted to certain conditions, such as economic strains, or to certain cultures or groups, one of the issues surrounding previous strain theories. GST can be applied to a variety of different types of crimes as it focuses more on how individuals (micro level) are affected by strains rather than groups/cultures (macro-level) (Agnew, 1992). By exploring coping responses from an individual perspective this framework

becomes more generalisable to a variety of crimes, behaviours, and contexts (Agnew, 2006).

Using GST to explore violent behaviour specifically in a prison context specifically is justifiable. Indeed, when considering why individuals would react violently in contexts such as prisons, looking at that behaviour through the lens of GST is logical. For violent behaviour to be prevalent there often needs to be some form of pressure (strain) that causes this reaction. In a prison context there are numerous stressors that deeply affect prisoners' behaviour, whether that be the prevalence of noxious noises and threats of violence, loss of positive stimuli such as friends and family, or the blockages of desired goals such as parole. The qualitative type of research that this thesis has undertaken has shown itself to be well suited to the identification and analysis of these systemically produced strains. This has been demonstrated in my findings as I have been able to capture various causalities for violence from AP residents' perspectives by analysing the stressors and coping responses they experienced or witnessed in prison.

However, one limitation of using this framework qualitatively is that when analysing the participants' attitudes and feelings towards a strain there are occasions where the researcher must make inferences/interpretations. For example, trying to understand and highlight the participants' negative emotions towards a strain such as bullying/intimidation becomes difficult if they do not state outright that they felt angry, fearful, depressed, or frustrated. How they describe events and feelings can often be left open to interpretation, which could be described as a weakness of this type of methodology. Similarly, it is also difficult to assess which strains are viewed as more painful and/or more likely to result in violence. As explained previously, the aim of this research is to determine the values placed on strains and the likelihood of their leading to violence. This analysis was based upon a number of determining factors, such as how often they were mentioned by the participants, whether they explicitly stated that the strain led them, or others, to commit violence and whether the strain led to aggressive negative emotions such as anger and frustration. However, this does not necessarily result in a conclusive determination of which of the strains highlighted in the findings are the most important ones to tackle to reduce violence.

In comparison to the standard quantitative application of this framework there is, as demonstrated through this research, merit in using it qualitatively. To understand the complex multitude of causalities of violence in E&W prisons through the lens of GST, qualitative methods provide more depth and nuance in comparison to quantitative methodologies. Gathering the participants' insights and experiences through interviews can

allow for a more complex nuanced discussion of the stressors causing prisoners to cope illegitimately, a better understanding of who is more likely to cope poorly from their experience and why these factors result in violent behaviour (Ochieng, 2009). Surveys and statistics are useful in testing the statistical significance of various strains and their relation to violence. However, qualitative GST research is necessary to uncover the various stressors, coping responses and support needs that have been neglected in modern E&W prison research.

This framework is important for this research as it informs the way the findings are analysed and helps build a consistent narrative. Utilising the framework's terminology and understanding of deviant behaviour helps maintain structure and create a consistent argument. The GST framework has been continually developed since its inception (Agnew, 1992; Agnew, 2006, Agnew, 2008; Kushner and Fagan, 2022). During this time researchers have drawn upon a variety of sources to expand their understanding of the effects of strain, coping behaviour, and negative emotions. Without a detailed framework such as GST to guide and help shape the structure and arguments of the researcher's thesis, I would argue it would have resulted in a less compelling narrative and less structured findings.

An arguable weakness in the use of qualitative interviews to explore violence, strains and coping behaviour is that participants will not necessarily discuss their own violent behaviour. In the topic guide, participants were asked the question of "in times where you felt stressed or frustrated inside prison how would you deal with that"? Most participants answered this by stating legitimate coping responses such as locking themselves in their cells, listening to music, consuming vapes, meditation, confiding in friends and family and so on. A minority of participants, such as Enzo and Joseph, directly discussed non-legitimate coping behaviour such as using violence as a response to feeling stressed in prison. But in general, participants were more likely to disclose other prisoners' violent responses to strains in prisons. It is arguably more directly relevant to this research if participants were to disclose their own violent responses to strain rather than what they witnessed, because they are likely to have a deeper understanding their own emotions and reasons for their actions. There are several potential reasons for these outcomes. Firstly, it could be that the participants that I interviewed are those that would not typically respond to prison strains through physical or psychological violence and instead would seek legitimate coping mechanisms. Secondly, participants may not feel comfortable with stating their own violent behaviour in prison to a researcher and may find it easier to highlight other prisoners' violent behaviour. Lastly, it could also be a fault in how my questions were worded. On reflection, perhaps it would have been better to also ask whether they themselves have responded to

strains through violence. However, I considered that this question would be perceived by the participants as too directly accusatory/exposing resulting in a negative emotional response which I wanted to avoid. Nevertheless, I believe it is still useful and insightful to record the legitimate methods that participants employed in response to strain and their views on how others reacted to different strains through violence. Future qualitative prison violence GST research should consider how best to get participants to discuss their own prison violence behaviour, and/or could use a sampling method that includes individuals that specifically have a history of prison violence.

The most important previous study that inspired this thesis was Blevins et al.'s (2010) application of GST using three prison models (deprivation, importation, and coping). This framework provided this research with an important/useful guideline to inform the research design. For example, when devising a topic guide for the interviews Blevins et al.'s (2010) prison GST framework helped in deciding which questions needed to be prioritised. The topic guide was also shaped with the three main strains ("failure to achieve positively valued goals" (p.51), the "removal of positively valued stimuli" (p.57) and the "presentation of noxious stimuli" (p.58) (Agnew, 1992)) and three main prison theory models in mind (deprivation, importation, coping) (Blevins et al., 2010). For example, participants were asked questions in relation to their goals and values in prison and whether these were being blocked or removed. And if they were, how did they cope with the stress and pain they were feeling. Shaping the questions based on these theories helped maintain focus on relevant topics related to prison violence behaviour. Also, not only did it help inform how I structured the topic guide, but it also informed how I interpreted and analysed the data. From the start of the analysis process, my understanding of the framework/theory directly informed the codes and themes that were produced. This can be seen in the major theme that is titled 'the costly desire for prison goods and its links to coping, bullying, theft and debt'. The inspiration for this theme is the major strain "failure to achieve positively valued goals" (Agnew, 1992:51). The researcher's interpretation of the data concluded that prisoners have the goal of obtaining an income to purchase licit goods. If they are blocked, however, from being able to purchase goods legitimately some will cope poorly and try to obtain them through illegitimate methods (i.e., bullying, theft or getting into debt). Viewing and coding the data through GST terms such as 'desired goods' and 'poor coping behaviour' helped form this major theme.

It can be argued, however, that analysing the data strictly through the lens of GST would result in rigid thinking which could limit the potential of new ideas and ways of interpreting the data. However, in my opinion, the benefit of using the framework outweighs any

downside in that it provides more credibility and structure to one's own arguments. Thematically analysing the findings without using a theoretical framework such as GST makes it more difficult to maintain a consistent argument when analysing a vast topic such as prison violence. Using GST, however, results in certain prison violence theories such as hegemonic masculinity and Rational Choice Theory being less of a focal point in this research. Although aspects of different theories such as hegemonic masculinity do influence my research's understanding of prison violence behaviour, I do not consider it a detrimental issue that such theories are not equally considered in my research in comparison to the theories/models of GST, deprivation, importation, and coping. Trying to explore too many theories in the research risks convoluting the narrative and lessens the potential of exploring a select few theories in depth.

Overall, GST framework has been beneficial for this research. A qualitative application of GST provides a rich nuanced understanding of prison violence. Through interviewing the participants, I was able to gather a rich dataset that I was able to effectively utilise to highlight a variety of prison stressors, prisoner coping responses and needed support mechanisms. A qualitative analysis allowed for a more complex discussion of how these themes link together to provide an understanding of why prisoners become violent. I recommend that other prison researchers should consider applying this framework to their own qualitative analysis.

8.3. Recommendations for Prison Policies and Practice

This research makes several policy recommendations in the pursuit of lowering violence rates and improving coping behaviour. As highlighted in this research there have been three systemic stressors identified. These are the strain of blocked desired costly goods, the strain of prison staff attitudes, disrespect, lack of support and misuse of power and the strain of a strict regime. For each systemic strain there are a select number of policy recommendations provided that have the intended effect of reducing their painful consequences and thereby make it more likely that prisoners will cope through non-violent behaviour. Through a GST lens the final part of this section (8.3.4.) highlights and concludes how prison violence should be managed and which strains should be prioritised.

8.3.1. Responding to the Strain of Blocked Desired Costly Goods

1. Through analysing the systemic strain of blocked desired costly goods this research has shown that when prisoners are not able to legitimately purchase the goods that help them cope then there are some that will seek to obtain them through violent illegitimate means such as bullying and theft and by getting into debt. In order to reduce this systemic strain, I firstly recommend both increasing the basic weekly allowance and the wages offered to working prisoners. Currently, the basic weekly allowance is a minimum of £2.50 which according to the participants is not nearly enough to buy the few goods that they deem essential coping mechanisms (PRT, 2023c:1). Working prisoners can expect a minimum of £4 for a five-day work week (PRT, 2023c:1). Although this pay is preferable in comparison to the basic weekly allowance, it is however, a small, arguably exploitative wage for a full-week's work (Cole et al., 2022). Increasing prisoners' spending power would reduce the temptation for them to access licit goods illegitimately and would also reduce the risk of violent conflict between prisoners. Prisoners want to obtain legitimate goods that they can buy in the canteen such as vapes, food, DVD players and so on. Through this they gain positive coping effects which reduce stress.

2. The second measure to reduce the impact of this systemic stressor is to provide prisoners with greater numbers of purposeful 'skilled' job opportunities in order to increase prisoner work participation, thereby reducing the number of prisoners on basic weekly allowances (Cole, Heer and Zazai, 2022). As stated in the findings, as of 2019-20,12,500 prisoners were working out of a population of 83,116 in E&W prisons (MoJ, 2019:4; GOV.UK, 2023a:1). There are a variety of reasons why prisoners are not participating in prison employment - perceived poor pay, lack of motivation, poor physical and/or mental health and a lack of variety of jobs. By not participating in prison work prisoners have less spending power which limits the number of goods they can pay for legitimately. And as previously explained, prisoners who lack the means to pay for goods legitimately are more likely to cope by trying to obtain their desired goods illegitimately (i.e., bullying, theft and debt). Typical jobs offered in prison tend to be labouring jobs such as industrial workshops, gardening, cleaning, and working at the servery (PRT, 2023c). These jobs help many prisoners to cope by giving them an opportunity to earn a wage, relieve their boredom and to get out of their cell. However, many of these jobs can be classified as 'unskilled labour' which can discourage participation, reduce motivation, and offer little in the way of rehabilitation (Cole et al., 2022).

3. The third method is for the prison service to further help improve prisoner family relationships. This is important because as argued in section 5.2.1., prisoners that lack financial and emotional family support are more likely to cope through violence

(Rocheleau, 2014). All prisons need to continue to provide face-to-face visits, phone calls and video calls as family contact options for prisoner's post Covid-19. I recommend prisoner and family video call times to be increased from 30 minutes to 1 hour in length, matching the times afforded to face-to-face visitors (MoJ, 2022b:1). 30 minutes is not enough time for prisoners to develop and improve their relationships with their family and friends. Increasing the time should significantly help those who have family that are financially and/or physically incapable of visiting in person.

8.3.2. Responding to the Strain of Prison Staff Attitudes, Disrespect, Lack of Support and Misuse of Power

1. The second systemic stain, the strain of prison staff attitudes, disrespect, lack of support and misuse of power, can be reduced by improving the relationships between prisoners and staff members such as key workers. However, for the key worker scheme to succeed in one of its goals of helping reduce prison violence a more consistent approach with properly trained officers and clearly defined processes and practice to ensure regular meetings with the same officer needs to be applied. Under current policy key workers are supposed to have contact with each of their prisoners for 45 minutes every week (PRT, 2023g). However, both inspection reports and my findings suggest that this has not been the case. A recent HM Inspectorate of Prisons (2023b) report stated that effective key work was only found in two prisons in their inspection, "while elsewhere it was piecemeal or tokenistic at best and was usually reserved for only the most vulnerable" (p.7). What they argue to be the root cause of this ineffective key work is a lack of officers. As stated in my findings, the constant changes in key workers because of officers quitting or being moved to different wings, has a negative effect on prisoners being able to develop a positive relationship with them where they feel comfortable with opening up about their coping needs. Therefore, it is important that, when possible, prisoners retain the same key worker. Also, for officers to be able to effectively fulfil this role they need to be empathetic and capable listeners. If prisoners perceive that they are disinterested or lacking in empathy, then the key worker/prisoner relationship will be unable to develop positively.

2. There also needs to be a better balance between prison officers punishing prisoners through IEP warnings and incentivising good behaviour through positive feedback. Overusing IEP warnings unnecessarily results in more prisoners having fewer coping mechanisms available to them which can lead to feelings of anger and frustration

toward staff and result in a strain in their relationships (Liebling, 2008). It is highlighted in the incentives policy framework that "positive reinforcement is more effective at shaping people's behaviour than punishing them" (MoJ, 2022a:5). Participants viewed the use of IEP as being unfairly weaponised as a punishment tool instead of encouraging positive behaviour. Positive behaviour needs to be more regularly recognised and rewarded rather than poor behaviour being overly punished as it results in undesired outcomes such as prisoners becoming disadvantaged by having less access to goods and services.

8.3.3. Responding to the Strain of a Strict Regime

1. Through analysing the final systemic strain, 'the strain of a strict regime', it has been found important to reduce the stressors that prisoners encounter whilst living in their cells for long periods of the day. Some of these stressors are sensory pains which can affect prisoners' aggression levels and emotional well-being, increasing the likelihood of prisoners reacting through violence (Anderson, 2001; Bierie, 2012). These sensory pains come in the form of noxious loud noises and heat. In order to reduce noxious loud noises and heat I recommend future cells designs to have improved ventilation in light of the rising temperatures during E&W summer periods and to integrate soft materials ("carpet, wood, and cork") which are more effective in absorbing noises compared to traditionally used hard materials (Engstrom and Van Ginneken 2022:489). Prisons are typically constructed in E&W using hard materials such as brick and stone. These materials are poor at absorbing sound/noise. Noxious noises such as other prisoners' music and television negatively affect prisoners' mental well-being which can result in violent coping behaviour. Applying materials that can reduce noise in cells can mitigate those effects and could reduce these violent behaviours (Engstrom and Van Ginneken 2022). Also, Victorian prison designs have been criticised for being poorly ventilated and for preventing prisoners from being able to open their windows properly (Moran, Houlbrook and Jewkes, 2022). Old and new prisons need to be designed with the increasing temperatures in E&W in mind. Furthermore, for prisoners with less spending power (due to lack of family support) who are housed in noisy poorly ventilated cells, electric fans and headphones should be more easily accessible for those who have limited financial income. Music systems should be made available that can only output low noise levels to limit the amount of noise pollution prisoners can produce. Also, music and tv noise levels should be regulated during night-time in all prisons to lessen the

213

likelihood of prisoners being deprived of sleep. Sleep deprivation has been linked to individuals becoming more short-tempered, agitated, and aggressive which can lead to prisoners committing violence (Kampuis, 2017; Barker et al., 2016). As highlighted in chapter 7 certain prisons have had their own regulations when it comes to regulating music during night hours (see section 7.2.2.4.). For example, in HMP Maidstone and HMP Highpoint they have their own rules regarding prisoners needing to lower their music volume after a certain time of night (Rice, 2016). To normalise and simplify matters, the rules regarding how much music/tv noise prisoners are allowed to produce during night hours should be the same across all prisons in E&W.

2. Furthermore, through analysing the systemic strain of a strict regime it has become apparent that it is important for prisoners to have reasonable time out of their cells. In line with the recommendations of the HM Inspectorate of Prisons (2021b:1) report, all prisoners across E&W, regardless of their employment status, should have the option of being let out of their cell for 10 hours a day. For their physical and mental health prisoners need reasonable lengths of time for exercising and socialising moving forward post-pandemic. In practice, too many E&W prisoners are receiving inadequate time out of their cells because of a lack of staff, purposeful activities, and employment (HM Inspectorate of Prisons, 2023b; Bulman, 2022). The frustration of being locked in their cells for too long risks physical and/or psychological violence between cellmates and against staff as expressed by the participants in this research.

3. I also recommend researchers and policy makers use a wider definition of violence in order to capture behaviour that potentially has effects just as harmful as physical assault, for example. Both physical and psychological forms of violence should be considered such as bullying, intimidation, verbal abuse, smashing their cells and so on. The need for a wider definition became apparent through analysing the systemic strain of a strict regime. During times when prisoners are locked in their cells for long periods, the types of violent behaviour that are more likely to be committed shift to other forms of aggressive behaviour. Prisoners are still strained by the various pains of imprisonment and therefore some will desire to relieve their frustration and/or anger through violent means. However, since they are away from the landings and the yard, their violent options become limited and therefore physical assaults are likely to reduce, as shown in official statistics (GOV.UK, 2023c). However, there are other forms of aggressive behaviour (i.e. threats, intimidation and so on) that can manifest themselves during a strict regime which can physically and psychologically harm prisoner victims. These victims may respond to these strains through poor coping behaviour such as retaliative physical and psychological violence such as

threats, bullying, intimidation and so on. All of these violent behaviours should therefore be equally regarded as important when it comes to combating violence in prison and should be taken into account in future quantitative research.

8.3.4. GST Policy Recommendation

Overall, through the use of GST, this research highlights the importance of a more proactive approach to tackling prison violence rather than a reactive one. To a significant extent violence in prison is an outcome of prisoners coping poorly with various strains that they are unable to manage primarily due to a lack of formal and informal support and coping mechanisms. Future policies need to aim to reduce or remove unnecessary, painful strains that can be linked to violence. Furthermore, there is a need to increase the availability of coping mechanisms and support to help minimise the impact of stressors placed on prisoners. As has been highlighted in the findings, the types of strains that should be prioritised are long lockup, pains related to cell-sharing, noxious loud noises and heat, prison officer misuse of power/IEP, boredom, limited family contact and purposeful job opportunities, and lack of access to goods/income. The solutions provided above are positive changes that should increase the likelihood of prisoners coping non-violently whilst also reducing prison strains associated with violence. In general, many of these solutions provided above are changes that traditionally would be considered as means to improve prisoners' physical and mental health, such as reducing noxious noises and improving prisoner family contact. However, through the use of the GST framework this research finds that these solutions can also help reduce the impact of the stressors that are linked to violence. It is especially important to recognise the novel, pivotal role that GST can play in finding solutions to the issue of prison violence.

8.4. Recommendations for Future Research

Originally, this research sought to investigate both prisoners' and prison staff's (governors, officers, teachers, psychologists) understandings and perspectives of violence in E&W prisons using a GST framework. However, as previously explained, due to restrictions placed on access to prisons due to Covid-19, the design of this research had to be significantly adjusted to no longer include interviews with prison staff members. Interviewing prison staff such as governors, officers, psychologists, and teachers would offer a more comprehensive understanding of the structural strains that negatively affect prisoners. Their understanding of prison strains would also provide the counter perspective that this research

has offered. For example, providing prison staff's perspectives and understanding of staff attitudes/respect, support and misuse of power would likely yield contrasting results to those provided in this thesis. Further research could also consider quantitively testing which strains highlighted are more conducive towards violence in an E&W prison setting. It would also be interesting for quantitative research to analyse which coping mechanisms highlighted in this study are more important in leading prisoners towards legitimate behaviours.

8.5. Final Remarks

This thesis has achieved what it has set out to do, which is to provide explanations for prison violence and policy solutions to the reduction of violence in E&W Prisons. The qualitative application of the GST framework to this thesis has conclusively provided useful perspectives on prison violence. Viewing participants' experiences through the lens of GST has highlighted the structural/systemic level factors that produce poor coping and violent behaviour in prisons. The GST framework is therefore a practical, useful tool to highlight prison strains that are affecting prisoner violence behaviour and to identify needed coping mechanisms and support.

The process of researching and writing this thesis has admittedly been a challenging experience. As with many long projects such as this there were significant hurdles that had to be overcome to be able get to this point. The most daunting hurdle, which for a significant period of time felt insurmountable, was the research restrictions introduced at the height of the Covid-19 pandemic. For roughly two years I was unable to conduct any form of fieldwork due to restrictions placed by the HMPPS. However, what for a long time was perceived as a frustrating blockage has in hindsight resulted in a beneficial outcome/experience. Not only did it give me time to gain a comprehensive understanding of the literature on GST and prison violence, but it also led to interesting research findings and opportunities. The Covid-19 pandemic had a significant influence on the findings of this research in numerous ways. This can especially be seen in the findings section 'are stricter measures better for the management of violence' in which I evaluated/analysed the strains that prisoners were coping with during the pandemic. The seismic regime changes that all prisoners had to endure during that period resulted in data that would have been considerably different if I had collected the data before the pandemic. Some may argue that this could be a weakness of the thesis because the regime restrictions placed were finite and therefore the experiences of the participants in recent years will not necessarily be repeated for other prisoners moving forward. However, what this data offered was the opportunity for a

compelling narrative that highlights what prisoners or for that matter human beings fundamentally need to cope legitimately. Many prisoners were starved of basic human needs during this period. For example, they were unable to socialise, to have time away from cellmates, and to be involved in purposeful activities. These extreme deprivations serve to maximise and highlight specific strains that the participants viewed as painful, anger-inducing, and likely to result in deviant/violent behaviour. Prisoners have certain needs without which they cannot cope and that is what the pandemic and strict regime changes highlighted.

The second opportunity that the pandemic afforded this research was the possibility of rethinking its methodological approach. Specifically, what had to be rethought was who to recruit as participants and from which institutions. The change from the originally planned interviews inside two English prisons to interviewing recently released prisoners housed in AP was a novel and worthwhile decision. Not only did it benefit this thesis by solving the issue of being unable to conduct interviews in prisons during the pandemic, but it also provided an opportunity to conduct interviews in an institutional setting that is not commonly covered by other researchers. It is rare to find research papers that have interviewed AP residents about their experiences in E&W prisons. The positive experience that I have had due to helpful AP staff members and insightful AP residents leads me to recommend other E&W prison researchers to consider adopting this method. Although the opportunity to observe the prison environment is sacrificed by adopting this method, being able to converse with individuals that are not constrained by the psychological pressures of being still locked up in that environment offers a more relaxing/comfortable interviewing experience both for the researcher and, more importantly, for the participants, without compromising the quality of the data (see section 4.8.).

Finally, an important contribution of this research is the way in which it provides a voice to those who are typically neglected and voiceless in the criminal justice process. This is a significant strength of a qualitative type of research in comparison to quantitative methods. Many of my participants have been affected to some degree by an environment that is fraught with violent incidents. Their insights are important and valuable as they are the ones who have the knowledge and experience that is needed to understand why prison violence occurs. And giving these former prisoners a voice has provided them with an outlet to express their misgivings with the prison system and to hopefully as a result have a positive impact on our understanding of violence in E&W prisons. I am very grateful to all those who agreed to take part in this research and who were open and willing to discuss the difficult subject matter that is prison violence.

References

Abbiati, M., et al. (2019). Predicting physically violent misconduct in prison: A comparison of four risk assessment instruments. *Behavioral sciences & the law*, *37*(1), pp.61-77. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.2364

Abbott, P., et al. (2018). A scoping review of qualitative research methods used with people in prison. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *17*(1), pp.1-15. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406918803824

Acocella, I. (2012). The focus groups in social research: advantages and disadvantages. *Quality & Quantity*, *46*, pp.1125-1136. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-011-9600-4

Adams, C. and Ireland, J.L. (2018). The role of beliefs and trait aggression in prison bullying among young offenders. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*, *29*(3), pp.351-367. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/14789949.2017.1395060

Adamson, C.R. (1984). Hard labor and solitary confinement: Effects of the business cycle and labor supply on prison discipline in the United States, 1790-1835. *Rsch. L. Deviance & Soc. Control*, *6*, pp.19-56.

Agnew, R. (1992). Foundation for a general strain theory of crime and delinquency. *Criminology*, *30*(1), pp.47-88. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.1992.tb01093.x

Agnew, R. (2001). Building on the foundation of general strain theory: Specifying the types of strain most likely to lead to crime and delinquency. *Journal of research in crime and delinquency*, *38*(4), pp.319-361. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427801038004001

Agnew, R. (2002). Experienced, vicarious, and anticipated strain: An exploratory study on physical victimization and delinquency. *Justice quarterly*, *19*(4), pp.603-632. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/07418820200095371

Agnew, R. (2006). *Pressured into crime: An overview of general strain theory.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Agnew, R. (2007). Strain theory and violent behaviour. In: Flannery, D.J., Vazsonyi, A.T. and Waldman, I.D. (Eds.). *The Cambridge handbook of violent behaviour and aggression.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.519-529.

Agnew, R. (2008). General strain theory: Current status and directions for further research. In: Cullen, F.T., Wright, J.P and Blevins, K.R. (Eds.). *Taking stock: The status of criminological theory*. Oxon: Routledge, pp.101-126.

Agnew, R. (2013). When criminal coping is likely: An extension of general strain theory. *Deviant Behavior, 34*(8), pp.653-670. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.2013.766529

Agnew, R. (2017). General strain theory and terrorism. In: LaFree, G. and Freilich, J.D. (Eds.). *The handbook of the criminology of terrorism*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, pp.121-132.

Agnew, R. and White, H.R. (1992). An empirical test of general strain theory. *Criminology*, *30*(4), pp.475-500. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.1992.tb01113.x

Agnew, R. and Brezina, T. (2010). Strain theories. In: McLaughlin, E. and Newburn, T. (Eds.). *The sage handbook of criminological theory.* London: Sage Publications Ltd, pp.96-113.

Ajmal, A., et al. (2022). Stress-relieving video game and its effects: A POMS case study. *Computational Intelligence and Neuroscience*, *2022*. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1155/2023/9810102

Akoensi, T.D. (2016). Perceptions of self-legitimacy and audience legitimacy among prison officers in Ghana. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*, *40*(3), pp.245-261. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/01924036.2016.1165712

Allely, C.S. and Allely, B. (2020). Post-traumatic stress disorder in incarcerated populations: Current clinical considerations and recommendations. *Journal of Criminal Psychology*, 10(1), pp.30-42. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1108/JCP-09-2019-0044

Allen, R. (2016). The sentencing council for England and Wales: brake or accelerator on the use of prison?. *Transform Justice*, London, pp.1-16.

Allison, E. (2015). Children denied visits to fathers in jail after rule changes – charity. [Online]. The Guardian. Last updated: 3 December 2015. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/society/2015/dec/03/children-denied-visits-to-fathers-in-jail-after-prison-rule-changes [Accessed 25 February 2023].

Allmark, P., et al. (2009). Ethical issues in the use of in-depth interviews: Literature review and discussion. *Research Ethics*, *5*(2), pp.48-54. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/174701610900500203

Alsaawi, A. (2014). A critical review of qualitative interviews. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, *3*(4), pp.149-156. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2819536

Alzua, M.L., Rodriguez, C. and Villa, E. (2010). The quality of life in prisons: Do educational programs reduce in-prison conflicts?. In: Tella, R.D., Edwards, S. and Schargrodsky, E. (Eds.). *The economics of crime: Lessons for and from Latin America,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp.239-264

Anderson, C.A. (2001). Heat and violence. *Current directions in psychological science*, *10*(1), pp.33-38. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.00109

Anderson, C.A., et al. (2000). Temperature and aggression. In *Advances in experimental social psychology,* 32, pp.63-133. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(00)80004-0

Andvig, E., et al. (2021). Inmates' perceptions and experiences of how they were prepared for release from a Norwegian open prison. *Nordic journal of criminology*, *22*(2), pp.203-220. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/2578983X.2020.1847954

Annison, H. (2018). Tracing the Gordian knot: Indeterminate-sentenced prisoners and the pathologies of English penal politics. *The Political Quarterly*, *89*(2), pp.197-205. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-923X.12462

Armour, C. (2012). Mental health in prison: A trauma perspective on importation and deprivation. *International Journal of Criminology and Sociological Theory*, 5(2), pp.886-894.

Arnold, H. (2008). The experience of prison officer training. In: Bennett, J., Crewe, B. and Wahidin, A. (Eds.). *Understanding Prison Staff.* Cullompton: Willan Publishing, pp.399-420.

Arnold, H. (2016). The prison officer. In: Jewkes, Y., Crewe, B. and Bennett, J. (Eds.). *Handbook on prisons.* Second Edition. London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, pp.265-283.

Aseltine Jr, R.H., Gore, S. and Gordon, J. (2000). Life stress, anger and anxiety, and delinquency: An empirical test of general strain theory. *Journal of health and social behavior*, pp.256-275.

Ash, J. (2009). Dress behind bars: Prison clothing as criminality. Bloomsbury Publishing. [Online]. Available at: https://researchonline.rca.ac.uk/848/8/Ash_Crime%2C_Culture%2C_Media_review.pdf [Accessed 17 February 2023].

Atlas, R. (1984). Violence in prison: Environmental influences. *Environment and Behavior*, 16(3), pp.275-306. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916584163001

Austin, J. (2003). *Findings in prison classification and risk assessment*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Prisons.

Auty, K.M., Cope, A. and Liebling, A. (2017). Psychoeducational programs for reducing prison violence: A systematic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 33, pp.126-143. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2017.01.018

Axelsson, J., Eriksson, L. and Grip, L. (2023). Managing violent extremist clients in prison and probation services: A scoping review. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, pp.1-24. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/09546553.2023.2169144

Baranger, J., et al. (2018). Doing time wisely: The social and personal benefits of higher education in prison. *The Prison Journal*, 98(4), pp.490-513. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885518776380

Baranyi, G., et al. (2018). Prevalence of posttraumatic stress disorder in prisoners. *Epidemiologic reviews*, 40(1), pp.134-145. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1093/epirev/mxy007

Barker, L.F., et al. (2016). Sleep and its association with aggression among prisoners: Quantity or quality?. *International journal of law and psychiatry*, 47, pp.115-121. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlp.2016.02.014

Barling, J., Dupré, K.E. and Kelloway, E.K. (2009). Predicting workplace aggression and violence. *Annual review of psychology*, 60, pp.671-692. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163629

Baumeister, R.F., Bushman, B.J. and Campbell, W.K. (2000). Self-esteem, narcissism, and aggression: Does violence result from low self-esteem or from threatened egotism?. *Current directions in psychological science*, 9(1), pp.26-29. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.00053

BBC News. (2019). Prison assaults in England and Wales at record high. [Online]. Last updated: 31 January 2019. Available at: https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-47070713 [Accessed 8 March 2021].

BBC News. (2023a). Dorset prison violence concern after inmate's throat cut. [Online]. Last updated: 25 April 2023. Available at: https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-dorset-65384441 [Accessed 28 May 2023].

BBC News. (2023b). What is the UK inflation rate and why is the cost of living rising?. [Online]. Last updated: 28 July 2023. Available at: https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-12196322 [Accessed 2 August 2023].

Belasco, W. (1999). Why food matters. *Culture & Agriculture*, *21*(1), pp.27-34.

Bell, S., Hopkin, G. and Forrester, A. (2019). Exposure to traumatic events and the experience of burnout, compassion fatigue and compassion satisfaction among prison mental health staff: An exploratory survey. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, *40*(4), pp.304-309. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/01612840.2018.1534911

Bennett, J. (2007). Measuring order and control in the prison service. In: Jewkes, Y. (Ed.). *Handbook on Prisons.* First Edition. Cullompton: Willan Publishing, pp.518-542.

Bennett, P. and Shuker, R. (2010). Improving prisoner-staff relationships: Exporting Grendon's good practice. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, *49*(5), pp.491-502. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2311.2010.00639.x

Berg, M.T. and DeLisi, M. (2006). The correctional melting pot: Race, ethnicity, citizenship, and prison violence. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *34*(6), pp.631-642. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2006.09.016

Berger, R. (2015). Now I see it, now I don't: Researcher's position and reflexivity in qualitative research. *Qualitative research: QR*, 15 (2), pp.219-234. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794112468475

Berghuis, M.L., et al. (2021). Receiving visits in prison and aggressive and contraband misconduct among Dutch prisoners. *European Journal of Criminology*, 20(4), p.1369-1389. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/14773708211041016

Berman, A.H. (2004). The reasoning and rehabilitation program: Assessing short—And long-term outcomes among male Swedish prisoners. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, *40*(1-2), pp.85-103. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1300/J076v40n01_05

Bierie, D.M. (2012). Is tougher better? The impact of physical prison conditions on inmate violence. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *56*(3), pp.338-355. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X11405157

Binswanger, I.A., et al. (2012). Return to drug use and overdose after release from prison: A qualitative study of risk and protective factors. *Addiction science & clinical practice*, *7*(1), pp.1-9. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1186/1940-0640-7-3

Birmingham, L. (2003). The mental health of prisoners. *Advances in psychiatric treatment*, *9*(3), pp.191-199. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1192/apt.9.3.191

Blacker, J., Watson, A. and Beech, A.R. (2008). A combined drama-based and CBT approach to working with self-reported anger aggression. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, *18*(2), pp.129-137. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1002/cbm.686

Blagden, N., Winder, B. and Hames, C. (2016). "They treat us like human beings"— Experiencing a therapeutic sex offenders prison: Impact on prisoners and staff and implications for treatment. *International journal of offender therapy and comparative criminology*, *60*(4), pp.371-396. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X14553227

Blakey, R. (2017). Rehabilitation in prisons. [Online]. Available at: https://researchbriefings.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefing/Summary/LLN-2017-0102#fullreport [Accessed 6 March 2020].

Blevins, K.R., et al. (2010). A general strain theory of prison violence and misconduct: An integrated model of inmate behavior. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, *26*(2), pp.148-166. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1043986209359369

Blitz, C.L., Wolff, N. and Shi, J. (2008). Physical victimization in prison: The role of mental illness. *International journal of law and psychiatry*, *31*(5), pp.385-393. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlp.2008.08.005

Bolger, M. and Bennett, J. (2008). Training and developing prison staff. In: Bennett, J., Crewe, B. and Wahidin, A. (Eds.) *Understanding prison staff.* Cullompton: Willan Publishing, pp.386-397.

Borrill, J., et al. (2005). Learning from 'Near Misses': Interviews with women who survived an incident of severe self-harm in prison. *The Howard Journal of criminal justice*, *44*(1), pp.57-69. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2311.2005.00355.x

Botchkovar, E. and Broidy, L. (2013). Accumulated strain, negative emotions, and crime: A test of general strain theory in Russia. *Crime & Delinquency*, *59*(6), pp.837-860. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128710382346

Bottoms, A.E. (1999). Interpersonal violence and social order in prisons. *Crime and justice*, *26*, pp.205-281.

Bowles, S., Gintis, H. and Groves, M.O. (2005). Introduction. In: Bowles, S., Gintis, H. and Groves, M.O. (Eds). *Unequal chances: family background and economic success.* Oxfordshire: Princeton University Press, pp.1-22.

Brainerd, C.J., Reyna, V.F. and Ceci, S.J. (2008). Developmental reversals in false memory: A review of data and theory. *Psychological bulletin*, *134*(3), p.343-382. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.134.3.343

Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2012). Thematic analysis. In: Cooper, H., Camic, P.M., Long, D. L., Panter, A. T., Rindskopf, D. and Sher, K. J. (Eds.). *APA handbook of research methods in psychology.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, pp.57-71.

Brennan, P.K. (2020). Responses taken to mitigate COVID-19 in prisons in England and Wales. *Victims & Offenders*, *15*(7-8), pp.1-19. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2020.1832027

Brewster, L. (2014). The impact of prison arts programs on inmate attitudes and behavior: A quantitative evaluation. *Justice Policy Journal, 11*(2), pp.1-28.

Broidy, L. and Agnew, R. (1997). Gender and crime: A general strain theory perspective. *Journal of research in crime and delinquency*, *34*(3), pp.275-306. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427897034003001

Brown, A., et al. (2019). Prison staff and prisoner views on a prison smoking ban: Evidence from the tobacco in prisons study. *Nicotine and Tobacco Research*, *21*(8), pp.1027-1035. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1093/ntr/nty092

Brown, A., et al. (2021). Initial views and experiences of vaping in prisons: A qualitative study with people in custody preparing for the imminent implementation of Scotland's prison smokefree policy. *Nicotine and Tobacco Research*, *23*(3), pp.543-549. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1093/ntr/ntaa088

Brown, M. (2012). Empathy and punishment. *Punishment & society*, 14 (4), pp.383-401. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1462474512452507

Bryman, A. (1984). The debate about quantitative and qualitative research: A question of method or epistemology?. *British journal of Sociology*, pp.75-92. Available at: https://doi.org/10.2307/590553

BSA. (2017). BSA Statement of Ethical Practice. [Online]. Available at: https://www.britsoc.co.uk/media/24310/bsa_statement_of_ethical_practice.pdf [Accessed 21 July 2023].

Buckaloo, B.J., Krug, K.S. and Nelson, K.B. (2009). Exercise and the low-security inmate: Changes in depression, stress, and anxiety. *The Prison Journal*, *89*(3), pp.328-343. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885509339508

Bullock, K. and Bunce, A. (2020). 'The prison don't talk to you about getting out of prison': On why prisons in England and Wales fail to rehabilitate prisoners. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, *20*(1), pp.111-127. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1748895818800743

Bulman, M. (2019). Prisoner suicides surge by 23% official figures reveal. [Online]. The Independent. Last updated: 10 October 2019. Available at: https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/prison-suicide-rate-rise-jail-prison-probation-ombudsman-annual-report-a9150351.html [Accessed 27 Jan 2021].

Bulman, M. (2022). Prisoners still locked in cells for 23 hours a day despite lifting of covid restrictions. [Online]. The Independent. Last updated: 13 July 2022. Available at: https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/prisons-covid-inspector-report-uk-b2122149.html [Accessed 7 March 2023].

Burki, T. (2017). Crisis in UK prison mental health. *The Lancet Psychiatry*, *4*(12), p.904. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(17)30446-7

Burki, T. (2020). Prisons are "in no way equipped" to deal with COVID-19. *The Lancet*, *395*(10234), pp.1411-1412. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30984-3

Butler, M. (2008). What are you looking at? Prisoner confrontations and the search for respect. *The British Journal of Criminology*, *48*(6), pp.856-873. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azn053

Butler, T., et al. (2005). Mental disorder in the New South Wales prisoner population. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, *39*(5), pp.407-413. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/j.1440-1614.2005.01589.x

Byrne, J.M. and Hummer, D. (2007). Myths and realities of prison violence: A review of the evidence. *Victims and Offenders*, *2*(1), pp.77-90. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/15564880601087241

Campbell, M.A., French, S. and Gendreau, P. (2009). The prediction of violence in adult offenders: A meta-analytic comparison of instruments and methods of assessment. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *36*(6), pp.567-590. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854809333610

Canning, C. and Buchanan, S. (2021). Exploring the rehabilitative role of the prison library: Addressing sensitive information needs via cultural activities. In: Garner, J. (Ed.). *Exploring the Roles and Practices of Libraries in Prisons: International Perspectives.* Bingley: Emerald Publishing Limited, pp.11-37. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1108/S0065-283020210000049002

Cao, L., Zhao, J. and Van Dine, S. (1997). Prison disciplinary tickets: A test of the deprivation and importation models. *Journal of criminal justice*, *25*(2), pp.103-113. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2352(96)00054-2

Capowich, G.E., Mazerolle, P. and Piquero, A. (2001). General strain theory, situational anger, and social networks: An assessment of conditioning influences. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *29*(5), pp.445-461. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2352(01)00101-5

Carson, D.C., et al. (2008). General strain theory and the relationship between early victimization and drug use. *Deviant Behavior*, *30*(1), pp.54-88. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/01639620802050023

Cashin, A., Potter, E. and Butler, T. (2008). The relationship between exercise and hopelessness in prison. *Journal of psychiatric and mental health nursing*, 15 (1), pp.66-71. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2850.2007.01207.x

Cavadino, M., Dignan, J. and Mair, G. (2013). *The penal system: An introduction.* Fifth Edition. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Chamberlen, A. and Carvalho, H. (2019). The thrill of the chase: punishment, hostility and the prison crisis. *Social & Legal Studies*, *28*(1), pp.100-117. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0964663918759820

Choy, L.T. (2014). The strengths and weaknesses of research methodology: Comparison and complimentary between qualitative and quantitative approaches. *IOSR journal of humanities and social science*, *19*(4), pp.99-104.

Christian, J., Mellow, J. and Thomas, S. (2006). Social and economic implications of family connections to prisoners. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *34*(4), pp.443-452. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2006.05.010

Chubaty, D. (2001). *Victimization, fear, and coping in prison.* Published: University of Manitoba. PhD.

Ciesielska, M., Boström, K.W., Öhlander, M. (2018). Observation methods. In: Ciesielska, M., Jemielniak, D. (Eds.). *Qualitative methodologies in organization studies.* Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.33-52. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-65442-3_2

Cislo, A.M. and Trestman, R. (2013). Challenges and solutions for conducting research in correctional settings: The U.S. experience. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 36(3-4), pp.304-310. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlp.2013.04.002

Clark, A.E. (2015). What makes a good job? Job quality and job satisfaction. *IZA World of Labor*, 215, pp.1-10. Available at: doi:10.15185/izawol.215

Clarke, A., Simmonds, R. and Wydall, S. (2004). Delivering cognitive skills programmes in prison: A qualitative study. [Online]. Available at: https://www.bipsolutions.com/docstore/pdf/7385.pdf [Accessed 11 March 2020].

Clarke, V. and Braun, V. (2013). Teaching thematic analysis: Overcoming challenges and developing strategies for effective learning. *The psychologist*, 26(2), pp.1-12.

Clear, T. R., and Sumter, M. T. (2002). Prisoners, prison, and religion: Religion and adjustment to prison. Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 35, 125-156.

Clements, A.J., Kinman, G. and Hart, J. (2020). Stress and well-being in prison officers. In: Burke, R. and Pignata, S. (Eds.). *Handbook of research on stress and well-being in the public sector*. Cheltenham: Taylor and Francis, 2020: pp.137-151. Available at: doi:10.4337/9781788970358.00018

Cloward, R.A. and Ohlin, L.E. (1960). *Delinquency and opportunity: A theory of delinquent gangs.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Cochran, J.C. and Mears, D.P. (2013). Social isolation and inmate behavior: A conceptual framework for theorizing prison visitation and guiding and assessing research. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 41(4), pp.252-261. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2013.05.001

Cochran, J.C., et al. (2014). Does inmate behavior affect post-release offending? Investigating the misconduct-recidivism relationship among youth and adults. *Justice Quarterly*, 31(6), pp.1044-1073. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2012.736526

Codd, H. (2020). Prisons, older people, and age-friendly cities and communities: Towards an inclusive approach. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(24), pp.9200-9213. Available at: https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17249200

Cohen, A.K. (1955). *Delinquent Boys: The culture of the gang*. Glencoe: The Free Press.

Cohen, N. and Arieli, T. (2011). Field research in conflict environments: Methodological challenges and snowball sampling. *Journal of peace research*, 48(4), pp.423-435. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0022343311405698

Cole, R., Heer J., Zazai, W. (2022). Prison labour in the UK. [Online]. Available at: https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/law/research/projects/feminist-recovery-plan/teaching/policy-briefs/prison_labourin_the_uk_-_rebecca_cole_et_al.pdf [Accessed 9 July 2023].

Constantinou, A.C., et al. (2015). Risk assessment and risk management of violent reoffending among prisoners. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 42(21), pp.7511-7529. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2015.05.025

Cooke, D.J., Wozniak, E. and Johnstone, L. (2008). Casting light on prison violence in Scotland: Evaluating the impact of situational risk factors. *Criminal Justice and behavior*, *35*(8), pp.1065-1078. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854808318867

Coomber, A. (2022a). The impact of restriction on visits during the pandemic. [Online]. 22 April 2022. Howard League Blog. Available at: https://howardleague.org/blog/the-impact-of-restrictions-on-visits-during-the-pandemic/ [Accessed 12 June 2023].

Coomber, A. (2022b). The prison system after Covid-19. 26 May 2022. [Online]. Howard League Blog. Available at: https://howardleague.org/blog/the-prison-system-after-covid-19/ [Accessed 11 June 2023].

Copes, H., Brookman, F. and Brown, A. (2013a). Accounting for violations of the convict code. *Deviant Behavior*, *34*(10), pp.841-858. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.2013.781444

Copes, H., Hochstetler, A. and Brown, A. (2013b). Inmates' perceptions of the benefits and harm of prison interviews. *Field Methods*, *25*(2), pp.182-196. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X12465798

Coyle, A. (2005). *Understanding prisons: key issues in policy and practice*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Crabbe, M.J.C. (2016). Education for offenders in prison. *Journal of pedagogic development*, 6(3), pp.3-7.

Crane, L., et al. (2019). 'Something needs to change': Mental health experiences of young autistic adults in England. *Autism*, *23*(2), pp.477-493. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1362361318757048

Crawley, E.M. (2004). Emotion and performance: Prison officers and the presentation of self in prisons. *Punishment & society*, *6*(4), pp.411-427. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1462474504046121

Crewe, B. (2005). Prisoner society in the era of hard drugs. *Punishment & Society*, *7*(4), pp.457-481. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1462474505057122

Crewe, B. (2006). Prison drug dealing and the ethnographic lens. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, *45*(4), pp.347-368. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2311.2006.00428.x

Crewe, B. (2011a). Depth, weight, tightness: Revisiting the pains of imprisonment. *Punishment & society*, *13*(5), pp.509-529. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1462474511422172

Crewe, B. (2011b). Soft power in prison: Implications for staff–prisoner relationships, liberty and legitimacy. *European Journal of Criminology*, *8*(6), pp.455-468. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1477370811413805

Crewe, B. (2014). Not looking hard enough: Masculinity, emotion, and prison research. *Qualitative inquiry*, *20*(4), pp.392-403. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800413515829

Crewe, B., et al. (2014). The emotional geography of prison life. *Theoretical Criminology*, *18*(1), pp.56-74. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480613497778

Crewe, B., Liebling, A. and Hulley, S. (2011). Staff culture, use of authority and prisoner quality of life in public and private sector prisons. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, *44*(1), pp.94-115. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0004865810392681

Crewe, B., Liebling, A. and Hulley, S. (2015). Staff-prisoner relationships, staff professionalism, and the use of authority in public-and private-sector prisons. Law & Social Inquiry, 40(2), pp.309-344. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/lsi.12093

Crewe, B., Schliehe, A. and Przybylska, D.A. (2023). 'It causes a lot of problems': Relational ambiguities and dynamics between prisoners and staff in a women's prison. *European Journal of Criminology*, 20(3) pp.925-946. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/14773708221140870

Criminal Justice Joint Inspection. (2022). The impact of the covid-19 pandemic on the criminal justice system – a progress report. [Online]. Available at: https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/cjji/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2022/05/CJ-Covid-19-recovery-progress-report-web-2022.pdf [Accessed 20 June 2023].

Cullen, F.T. (2013). Rehabilitation: Beyond nothing works. *Crime and Justice*, *42*(1), pp.299-376.

Cunningham, M.D. and Sorensen, J.R. (2007). Predictive factors for violent misconduct in close custody. *The Prison Journal*, *87*(2), pp.241-253. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885507303752

Cunningham, M.D., et al. (2011). Correlates and actuarial models of assaultive prison misconduct among violence-predicted capital offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *38*(1), pp.5-25. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854810384830

Cunningham, M.D., Sorensen, J.R. and Reidy, T.J. (2005). An actuarial model for assessment of prison violence risk among maximum security inmates. *Assessment*, *12*(1), pp.40-49. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191104272815

Cuthbertson, P. (2017). Who goes to prison? An overview of the prison population of England and Wales. [Online]. Available at: http://civitas.org.uk/content/files/whogoestoprison.pdf [Accessed 31 July 2023].

Czerniawski, G. (2016). A race to the bottom–prison education and the English and Welsh policy context. *Journal of Education Policy*, *31*(2), pp.198-212. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2015.1062146

Daquin, J.C. and Daigle, L.E. (2018). Mental disorder and victimisation in prison: Examining the role of mental health treatment. *Criminal behaviour and mental health*, *28*(2), pp.141-151. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1002/cbm.2056

Darrell-Berry, H., Berry, K. and Bucci, S. (2016). The relationship between paranoia and aggression in psychosis: A systematic review. *Schizophrenia research*, *172*(1-3), pp.169-176. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2016.02.009

Davis, W.B. and Thaut, M.H. (1989). The influence of preferred relaxing music on measures of state anxiety, relaxation, and physiological responses. *Journal of music therapy*, *26*(4), pp.168-187. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1093/jmt/26.4.168

Dawson, P. (2022). Blog: Time out of cell. 26 April 2022. Peter Dawson Blog. [Online]. Available at: https://prisonreformtrust.org.uk/blog-time-out-of-cell/ [Accessed 7 March 2023].

De Claire, K. and Dixon, L. (2017). The effects of prison visits from family members on prisoners' well-being, prison rule breaking, and recidivism: A review of research since 1991. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, *18*(2), pp.185-199. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838015603209

De Viggiani, N. (2012). Trying to be something you are not: Masculine performances within a prison setting. *Men and masculinities*, *15*(3), pp.271-291. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X12448464

Dearden, L. (2018). Britain's prison crisis caused by 'poor political decisions' by conservatives and huge cuts, former head of jails says. [Online]. The Independent. Last updated: 23 June 2023. Available at: https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/prisons-uk-jails-crisis-cuts-conservatives-david-gauke-phil-wheatley-a8318806.html [Accessed 27 Jan 2021].

Debowska, A., Boduszek, D. and Sherretts, N. (2017). Self-esteem in adult prison population: The development and validation of the self-esteem measure for prisoners (SEM-P). *Deviant Behavior*, *38*(11), pp.1240-1251. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.2016.1246034

DeLisi, M., Berg, M.T. and Hochstetler, A. (2004). Gang members, career criminals and prison violence: Further specification of the importation model of inmate behavior. *Criminal Justice Studies*, *17*(4), pp.369-383. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/1478601042000314883

DeLisi, M., et al. (2011). Inside the prison black box: Toward a life course importation model of inmate behavior. *International journal of offender therapy and comparative criminology*, *55*(8), pp.1186-1207. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X11383956

deMarrais, K. (2004). Qualitative interview studies: Learning through experience. In: deMarrais, K. and Lapan, S.D. (Eds.). *Foundations for Research: Methods of inquiry in education and the social sciences.* London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp.67-84.

Dewa, L.H., et al. (2017). Trouble sleeping inside: a cross-sectional study of the prevalence and associated risk factors of insomnia in adult prison populations in England. *Sleep medicine*, *32*, pp.129-136. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sleep.2016.12.018

Dhaliwal, R. and Harrower, J. (2009). Reducing prisoner vulnerability and providing a means of empowerment: evaluating the impact of a Listener Scheme on the Listeners. *The British journal of forensic practice*, 11 (3), pp.35-43. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1108/14636646200900021

Dirkzwager, A.J. and Kruttschnitt, C. (2012). Prisoners' perceptions of correctional officers' behavior in English and Dutch prisons. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *40*(5), pp.404-412. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2012.06.004

Dixey, R. and Woodall, J. (2012). The significance of 'the visit' in an English category-B prison: Views from prisoners, prisoners' families and prison staff. *Community, Work & Family*, *15*(1), pp.29-47. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/13668803.2011.580125

Dodgson, J.E. (2019). Reflexivity in qualitative research. *Journal of Human Lactation*, *35*(2), pp.220-222. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0890334419830990

Drake, D.H. (2008). Staff and order in prisons. In: Bennett, J., Crewe, B., and Wahidin, A. (Eds.) *Understanding prison staff.* Cullompton: Willan Publishing, pp.153-167.

Drake, D.H. (2012). *Prisons, punishment and the pursuit of security*. Basinstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Drury, A.J. and DeLisi, M. (2010). The past is prologue: Prior adjustment to prison and institutional misconduct. *The Prison Journal*, *90*(3), pp.331-352. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885510375676

Duke, K. (2020). Producing the 'problem' of new psychoactive substances (NPS) in English prisons. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 102479(*80)*, pp.1-8. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2019.05.022

Duwe, G. and McNeeley, S. (2021). Just as good as the real thing? The effects of prison video visitation on recidivism. *Crime & Delinquency*, *67*(4), pp.475-497. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128720943168

Edgar, K. and O'Donnell, I. (1998). Assault in prison: The 'victim's' contribution. *British journal of criminology*, 38 (4), pp.635-650. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/38.4.635

Edgar, K., O'Donnell, I. and Martin, C. (2003). *Prison violence: The dynamics of conflict, fear and power.* Cullompton: Willan.

Edgemon, T.G. and Clay-Warner, J. (2019). Inmate mental health and the pains of imprisonment. *Society and Mental Health*, *9*(1), pp.33-50. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/2156869318785424

Elbogen, E. B. and Johnson, S. C. (2009). The intricate link between violence and mental disorder: Results from the national epidemiologic survey on alcohol and related conditions. *Archives of general psychiatry*, 66 (2), pp.152-161. Available at: doi:10.1001/archgenpsychiatry.2008.537.

Ellis, D. (1984). Crowding and prison violence. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *11*(3), 277-308. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854884011003003

Ellison, M., et al. (2017). A rapid evidence assessment of the effectiveness of prison education in reducing recidivism and increasing employment. *Probation Journal*, *64*(2), pp.108-128. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0264550517699290

Engstrom, K.V. and Van Ginneken, E.F. (2022). Ethical prison architecture: A systematic literature review of prison design features related to wellbeing. *Space and Culture*, *25*(3), pp.479-503. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/12063312221104211

Eriksson, L. and Mazerolle, P. (2013). A general strain theory of intimate partner homicide. *Aggression and violent behavior*, *18*(5), pp.462-470. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2013.07.002

Etikan, I., Musa, S.A. and Alkassim, R.S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American journal of theoretical and applied statistics*, *5*(1), pp.1-4. Available at: doi:10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11

Facer-Irwin, E., et al. (2019). PTSD in prison settings: A systematic review and meta-analysis of comorbid mental disorders and problematic behaviours. *PLoS one, 14*(9), pp.1-28. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal. pone.0222407

Fazel, S., et al. (2016). Mental health of prisoners: prevalence, adverse outcomes, and interventions. *The Lancet Psychiatry, 3*(9), pp.871-881. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(16)30142-0

Felson, R.B., Silver, E. and Remster, B. (2012). Mental disorder and offending in prison. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *39*(2), pp.125-143. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854811428565

Fernandez, C. and Lasala, F. (2021). Risk assessment in prison. [Online]. Available at: https://home-affairs.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2021-04/ran_cons_overv_pap_risk_assessment_in_prison_20210210_en.pdf [Accessed 17 July 2022].

Fikfak, A., et al. (2015). The contemporary model of prison architecture: Spatial response to the re-socialization programme. *Spatium*, (34), pp.27-34. Available at: https://doi.org/10.2298/SPAT1534027F

Fischer, J., et al. (2012). Fitness levels and physical activity among class A drug users entering prison. *British journal of sports medicine*, *46*(16), pp.1142-1144. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2011-090724

Fischer, S.N., et al. (2008). Homelessness, mental illness, and criminal activity: Examining patterns over time. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *42*, pp.251-265. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-008-9210-z

Fletcher, G.J. (1996). Realism versus relativism in psychology. *The American journal of psychology*, pp.409-429. Available at: https://doi.org/10.2307/1423014

Flórez, G., et al. (2019). Personality disorders, addictions and psychopathy as predictors of criminal behaviour in a prison sample. *Revista espanola de sanidad penitenciaria*, *21*(2), pp.62-79.

Folkes, L. (2022). Moving beyond 'shopping list' positionality: Using kitchen table reflexivity and in/visible tools to develop reflexive qualitative research. *Qualitative Research*, 0(0), pp.1-18. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/14687941221098922

Forrester, A., et al. (2013). Variations in prison mental health services in England and Wales. *International journal of law and psychiatry*, *36*(3-4), pp.326-332. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlp.2013.04.007

Forsyth, J., Shaw, J. and Shepherd, A. (2022). The support and supervision needs of prison officers working within prison environments. An empty systematic review. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*, 33(4) pp.475-490. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/14789949.2022.2085150

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison.* London: Penguin Books.

Franklin, R.D., Allison, D.B. and Sutton, T. (1992). Alcohol, substance abuse, and violence among North Carolina prison admissions, 1988. *Journal of offender rehabilitation*, *17*(3-4), pp.101-112. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1300/J076v17n03_07

Froggio, G. (2007). Strain and juvenile delinquency: A critical review of Agnew's general strain theory. *Journal of loss and trauma*, *12*(4), pp.383-418. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/15325020701249363

Fulcher, P.A. (2013). The double-edged sword of prison video visitation: Claiming to keep families together while furthering the aims of the prison industrial complex. *Fla. A & M UL Rev.*, *9*, pp.83-112.

Gaes, G.G. and McGuire, W.J. (1985). Prison violence: The contribution of crowding versus other determinants of prison assault rates. *Journal of research in crime and delinquency*, *22*(1), pp.41-65. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427885022001003

Ganem, N.M. (2010). The role of negative emotion in general strain theory. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, *26*(2), pp.167-185. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1043986209359558

Gariglio, L. (2019). Challenging prison officers' discretion: "good reasons" to treat courteously mafiosi in custody in Italy. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, *48*(1), pp.80-102. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0891241617749012

Gates, M.L., et al. (2017). Associations among substance use, mental health disorders, and self-harm in a prison population: examining group risk for suicide attempt. *International journal of environmental research and public health,* 14(3), pp.1-16. Available at: https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph14030317

Møller, L., et al. (Eds.). (2007). *Health in prisons: a WHO guide to the essentials in prison health*. Copenhagen: WHO Regional Office for Europe.

Gayle, D. and Grierson, J. (2022). Met Office to increase heatwave thresholds across parts of England. [Online]. The Guardian. Last updated: 29 March 2022. [https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2022/mar/29/met-office-increase-heatwave-threshold-across-parts-england]. [Accessed 19 February 2023].

Gendreau, P., Goggin, C.E. and Law, M.A. (1997). Predicting prison misconducts. *Criminal Justice and behavior*, *24*(4), pp.414-431. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854897024004002

Godderis, R. (2006). Dining in: The symbolic power of food in prison. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, *45*(3), pp.255-267. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2311.2006.00420.x

Gooch, K. (2019). Kidulthood': Ethnography, juvenile prison violence and the transition from 'boys' to 'men. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, *19*(1), pp.80-97. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1748895817741519

Gooch, K. and Treadwell, J. (2020). Prisoner society in an era of psychoactive substances, organized crime, new drug markets and austerity. *The British Journal of Criminology*, *60*(5), pp.1260-1281. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azaa019

Goomany, A. and Dickinson, T. (2015). The influence of prison climate on the mental health of adult prisoners: A literature review. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing*, *22*(6), pp.413-422. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/jpm.12231

Goulding, D. (2007). Violence and brutality in prisons: A West Australian context. *Current Issues in Criminal Justice*, *18*(3), pp.399-414. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/10345329.2007.12036401

GOV.UK. (2021). Violence involving prisoners. [Online]. Available at: https://www.ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk/crime-justice-and-the-law/prison-and-custody-incidents/violence-involving-prisoners/latest [Accessed 18 February 2023].

GOV.UK. (2022a). Coronavirus (COVID-19) and prisons. [Online]. Last updated: 19 January 2022. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/coronavirus-covid-19-and-prisons [Accessed 18 June 2023].

GOV.UK. (2022b). Prison Life. [Online]. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/life-in-prison/prisoner-privileges-and-rights [Accessed 18 February 2023].

GOV.UK. (2022c). Risk of serious harm guidance 2020. [Online]. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1060610/Risk_of_Serious_Harm_Guidance_March_2022.pdf [Accessed 23 July 2023].

GOV.UK. (2023a). Average prisoners working in prisons. [Online]. Available at: https://data.justice.gov.uk/prisons/prison-reform/prisoners-working [Accessed 9 January 2023].

GOV.UK. (2023b). Probation Service individual division maps. [Online]. Last updated: 2 December 2019. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-probation-service-individual-division-maps [Accessed 25 January 2023].

GOV.UK. (2023c). Prisons data: Safety and order. [Online]. Last updated: 22 July 2022. Available at: https://data.justice.gov.uk/prisons/safety-and-order [Accessed 14 February 2023].

GOV.UK. (2023d). Research at HMPPS. [Online]. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/hm-prison-and-probation-service/about/research [Accessed 17 August 2023].

Grace, S., Lloyd, C. and Perry, A. (2020). The spice trail: transitions in synthetic cannabis receptor agonists (SCRAs) use in English prisons and on release. *Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy*, *27*(4), pp.271-281. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/09687637.2019.1684878

Gray, L. M., et al. (2020). Expanding qualitative research interviewing strategies: Zoom video communications. The Qualitative Report, 25(5), 1292-1301. Available at: https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol25/iss5/9

Greve, W. and Enzmann, D. (2003). Self-esteem maintenance among incarcerated young males: Stabilisation through accommodative processes. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *27*(1), pp.12-20. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/01650250143000562

Gunasekaran, S. (2012). Assessment and management of risk in autism. *Advances in Mental Health and Intellectual Disabilities*, *6*(6), pp.314-320. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1108/20441281211285964

Hallsworth, S. and Silverstone, D. (2009). 'That's life innit' A British perspective on guns, crime and social order. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, *9*(3), pp.359-377. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1748895809336386

Hammill, A. and Newby, R. (2015). The illicit economy, debt and prison violence: Is prisoner debt inevitable. *Prison Journal: Reducing Violence.* [Online]. Available at: https://www.crimeandjustice.org.uk/sites/crimeandjustice.org.uk/files/PSJ%20221%2C%20The%20illicit%20economy.pdf [Accessed 10 January 2023].

Haney, C. (2003). The psychological impact of incarceration: Implications for post-prison adjustment. *Prisoners once removed: The impact of incarceration and re-entry on children, families, and communities*, *33*, pp.1-19.

Haney, C. (2017). "Madness" and penal confinement: Some observations on mental illness and prison pain. *Punishment & Society*, *19*(3), pp.310-326. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1462474517705389

Harrell, M.C. and Bradley, M. (2009). Data collection methods: Semi-structured interviews and focus groups. RAND Corporation. CA: Santa Monica.

Harris, V.L. and Lovell, D. (2001). Measuring level of function in mentally ill prison inmates: A preliminary study. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 29(1), pp.68-74.

Hassan, L., et al. (2011). Prospective cohort study of mental health during imprisonment. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, *198*(1), pp.37-42. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.bp.110.080333

Hausam, J., Lehmann, R.J. and Dahle, K.P. (2020). A person-centered approach to prison behavior based on officers' observations: Relations to risk, prison misconduct, and recidivism. *Frontiers in psychiatry*, 241(*11),* pp.1-14. Available at: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2020.00241

Hay, C. and Meldrum, R. (2010). Bullying victimization and adolescent self-harm: Testing hypotheses from general strain theory. *Journal of youth and adolescence*, *39*(5), pp.446-459. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-009-9502-0

Hay, C., Meldrum, R. and Mann, K. (2010). Traditional bullying, cyber bullying, and deviance: A general strain theory approach. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, *26*(2), pp.130-147. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1043986209359557

Hayes, A.J., et al. (2013). Social and custodial needs of older adults in prison. *Age and ageing*, *42*(5), pp.589-593. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/aft066

Hearn, N., Joseph, S. and Fitzpatrick, S. (2021). Post-traumatic growth in prisoners and its association with the quality of staff–prisoner relationships. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, *31*(1), pp.49-59. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1002/cbm.2173

Hemsworth, K. (2016). 'Feeling the range': Emotional geographies of sound in prisons. *Emotion, Space and Society*, *20,* pp.90-97. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emospa.2016.05.004

Hendry, J. (2022). 'The usual suspects': Knife crime prevention orders and the 'difficult' regulatory subject. *The British Journal of Criminology*, *62*(2), pp.378-395. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azab063

Hewson, T., et al. (2020). Effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on the mental health of prisoners. *The Lancet Psychiatry*, *7*(7), pp.568-570. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30241-8

HM Inspectorate of Prisons. (2016a). Life in prison: earning and spending money. [Online]. Available at: https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2016/01/Earning-and-spending-money-findings-paper-final-draft.pdf [Accessed 2 January 2023].

HM Inspectorate of Prisons. (2016b). Life in prison: food. A findings paper by HM Inspectorate of Prisons. [Online]. Available at: https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2016/09/Life-in-prison-Food-Web-2016.pdf [Accessed 29 December 2022].

HM Inspectorate of Prisons. (2016c). Life in prison: peer support. [Online]. Available at: https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2016/01/Peer-support-findings-paper-final-draft-1.pdf [Accessed 22 January 2023].

HM Inspectorate of Prisons. (2017). Life in prison: living conditions. [Online]. Available at: https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2017/10/Findings-paper-Living-conditions-FINAL-.pdf [Accessed 19 February 2023].

HM Inspectorate of Prisons. (2021a). Respect. [Online]. Available at: https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/our-expectations/prison-expectations/respect/ [Accessed 12 January 2023].

HM Inspectorate of Prisons. (2021b). Time out of cell. [Online]. Available at: https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/our-expectations/prison-expectations/purposeful-activity/time-out-of-cell/ [Accessed 6 March 2023].

HM Inspectorate of Prisons. (2021c). What happens to prisoners in a pandemic?. [Online]. Available at: https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2021/02/What-happens-to-prisoners-in-a-pandemic.pdf [Accessed18 February 2023].

HM Inspectorate of Prisons. (2022). Chief Inspector's blog: short staffing in prisons must be tackled. [Online]. Last updated: 11 October 2022. Available at: https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/chief-inspectors-blog/chief-inspectors-blog-short-staffing-in-prisons-must-be-tackled/ [Accessed 18 June 2023].

HM Inspectorate of Prisons. (2023a). Chief Inspector's blog: what's going wrong with education in prisons?. [Online]. Last updated: 24 January 2023. Available at: https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/chief-inspectors-blog/chief-inspectors-blog-whats-going-wrong-with-education-in-prisons/ [Accessed 26 May 2023].

HM Inspectorate of Prisons. (2023b). HM Chief Inspector of Prisons for England and Wales: Annual Report 2022-23. [Online]. Available at: https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2023/07/15.91_HMIP_HMI-Prisons_ARA-2022-23_Web-Accessible.pdf [Accessed 8 July 2023].

HM Inspectorate of Prisons. (2023c). Report of an independent review of progress at HMP Pentonville. [Online]. Available at: https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2023/05/Pentonville-IRP-web-2023.pdf [Accessed 20 July 2023].

HM Inspectorate of Prisons. (2023d). Report of an unannounced inspection of HMP Birmingham. [Online]. Available at: https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2023/05/Birmingham-web-2023.pdf [Accessed 20 July 2023].

HM Inspectorate of Prisons. (2023e). Report of an unannounced inspection of HMP Stocken. [Online]. Available at: https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2023/05/Stocken-web-2023.pdf [Accessed 20 July 2023].

HM Inspectorate of Prisons. (2023f). Report of an unannounced inspection of HMP Wakefield. [Online]. Available at: https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2023/02/Wakefield-web-2022.pdf]. [Accessed 26 May 2023].

HM Inspectorate of Prisons. (2023g). Report of an unannounced inspection of HMP Preston. [Online]. Available at: https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2023/06/Preston-web-2023.pdf [Accessed 22 July 2023].

HM Inspectorate of Probation. (2022). Effective practice guide OMIC. [Online]. Available at: https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprobation/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2022/11/v1.0-OMiC-EP-guide-1.pdf [Accessed 2 June 2023].

HM Prison Service. (2020). Prisoner' pay. [Online]. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/931684/pso-4460-prisoners-pay.pdf [Accessed 9 January 2023].

Hobbs, G.S. and Dear, G.E. (2000). Prisoners' perceptions of prison officers as sources of support. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 31(1-2), pp.127-142. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1300/J076v31n01_09

Hochstetler, A., Murphy, D.S. and Simons, R.L. (2004). Damaged goods: Exploring predictors of distress in prison inmates. *Crime & Delinquency*, *50*(3), pp.436-457. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128703257198

Hollin, C.R and Bilby, C. (2007). Addressing offending behaviour: 'What Works' and beyond. In: Jewkes, Y. (Ed.). *Handbook on prisons.* First Edition. Cullompton: Willan Publishing, pp.608-628.

Home Office. (2009). Role of the prison officer: Twelfth report of session 2008-09. [Online]. Available at: https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200809/cmselect/cmjust/361/361.pdf [Accessed 06 January 2020].

Hough, M. and Jacobson, J. (2008). Creating a sentencing commission for England and Wales: An opportunity to address the prisons crisis. Project Report. Prison Reform Trust, London.

House of Commons. (2006). Report of the Zahid Mubarek inquiry. London: The Stationery Office.

House of Commons. (2021). Mental health in prison: Fifth report of session 2021-22. [Online]. Available at: https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/7455/documents/78054/default/ [Accessed 21 January 2023].

House of Commons. (2022). Not just another brick in the wall: why prisoners need an education to climb the ladder of opportunity: First Report of Session 2022-23. [Online]. Available at: https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/22218/documents/164715/default/ [Accessed 26 May 2023].

Howard League. (2014). Breaking point: Understaffing and overcrowding in prisons. [Online]. Available at: https://howardleague.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Breaking-point-10.07.2014.pdf [Accessed 9 March 2021].

Howard League. (2017). The role of the prison officer: Research briefing. [Online]. Available at: https://howardleague.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/The-role-of-the-prison-officer.pdf [Accessed 10 January 2020].

Howard League. (2021). New prisons are not being built with rising temperatures in mind. [Online]. 3 August 2021. Howard League Blog. Available at: https://howardleague.org/blog/new-prisons-are-not-being-built-with-rising-temperatures-in-mind/ [Accessed 22 July 2023].

Howard League. (2022). Two years of lockdown in prison. [Online]. 23 March 2022. Howard League Blog. Available at: https://howardleague.org/blog/two-years-of-lockdown-in-prison/ [Accessed 23 July 2023].

Howard, M.V., et al. (2020). Maintaining safety in the prison environment: A multilevel analysis of inmate victimisation in assaults. *International journal of offender therapy and comparative criminology*, *64*(10-11), pp.1091-1113. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X19871633

Hulley, S., Liebling, A. and Crewe, B. (2012). Respect in prisons: Prisoners' experiences of respect in public and private sector prisons. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, *12*(1), pp.3-23. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1748895811423088

Humber, N., et al. (2011). Identifying, monitoring and managing prisoners at risk of self-harm/suicide in England and Wales. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*, *22*(1), pp.22-51. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/14789949.2010.518245

Hutton, M.A. (2017). Prison visits and desistance: A human rights perspective. In: Hart, E. and van Ginneken, E. (Eds.). *New perspectives on desistance: Theoretical and empirical developments*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.187-209. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-349-95185-7_9

Inside Times. (2021). No more free phone calls for men. [Online]. Last updated: 13 December 2021. Available at: https://insidetime.org/no-more-free-phone-calls-for-men-in-prison/ [Accessed 9 January 2023].

Inside Times. (2022). Prison wage atrocious. [Online]. Last updated: 26 May 2022. Available at: https://insidetime.org/prison-wages-atrocious/ [Accessed 9 January 2023].

Ireland, J.L. (2000). "Bullying" among prisoners: A review of research. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *5*(2), pp.201-215. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/S1359-1789(98)00031-7

Ireland, J.L. (2002). Bullying in. *Psychologist*, *15*(3), pp.130-133.

Ireland, J.L. (2012). *Bullying among prisoners: Evidence, research and intervention strategies.* Hove: Routledge.

Irwin, J. and Cressey, D.R. (1962). Thieves, convicts and the inmate culture. *Soc. Probs.*, *10*, pp.142-155.

Ismail, N. (2020a). Rolling back the prison estate: the pervasive impact of macroeconomic austerity on prisoner health in England. *Journal of public health*, *42*(3), pp.625-632. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1093/pubmed/fdz058

Ismail, N. (2020b). The politics of austerity, imprisonment and ignorance: A case study of English prisons. *Medicine, Science and the Law*, *60*(2), pp.89-92. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0025802419899744

Jackson, J., et al. (2010). Legitimacy and procedural justice in prisons. *Prison service journal*, *191*, pp.4-10.

Jackson, M. and Ashley, D. (2005). Physical and psychological violence in Jamaica's health sector. *Revista Panamericana de Salud Pública*, *18*, pp.114-121.

Jacobs, J.B. (1974). Participant observation in prison. *Urban Life and Culture*, *3*(2), pp.221-240.

Jacobson, J. and Hough, M. (2018). Missed Opportunities and New Risks: Penal Policy in England and Wales in the Past Twenty-Five Years. *The Political Quarterly*, *89*(2), pp.177-186. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-923X.12460

Jaffe, M. (2012). *Peer support and seeking help in prison: a study of the Listener scheme in four prisons in England.* Published: Keele University. PhD.

James, K., Bunch, J. and Clay-Warner, J. (2015). Perceived injustice and school violence: An application of general strain theory. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, *13*(2), pp.169-189. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1541204014521251

Jang, S.J. and Rhodes, J.R. (2012). General strain and non-strain theories: A study of crime in emerging adulthood. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *40*(3), pp.176-186. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2011.09.003

Jayes, L., et al. (2023). A qualitative study of the implementation and continued delivery of complete and partial smoke-free policies across England's prison estate. *Nicotine and Tobacco Research*, *25*(6), pp.1099-1108. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1093/ntr/ntac296

Jayes, L.R., et al. (2019). Smoke-free prisons in England: Indoor air quality before and after implementation of a comprehensive smoke-free policy. *BMJ open*, *9*(6), pp.1-8. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2018-025782

Jewkes, Y. (2005). Men behind bars: "Doing" masculinity as an adaptation to imprisonment. *Men and masculinities*, *8*(1), pp.44-63. Available at: doi:10.1177/1097184X03257452.

Jewkes, Y. (2018). Just design: Healthy prisons and the architecture of hope. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, *51*(3), pp.319-338. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0004865818766768

Jiang, S. and Fisher-Giorlando, M. (2002). Inmate misconduct: A test of the deprivation, importation, and situational models. *The Prison Journal*, *82*(3), pp.335-358. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/003288550208200303

Johnson Listwan, S., et al. (2010). Victimization, social support, and psychological well-being: A study of recently released prisoners. *Criminal justice and behavior*, *37*(10), pp.1140-1159. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854810376338

Johnson, L., et al. (2021). Scoping review of mental health in prisons through the COVID-19 pandemic. *BMJ open*, *11*(5), pp-1-8. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-046547

Johnson, L., et al. (2023). The mental wellbeing of prison staff in England during the COVID-19 pandemic: A cross-sectional study. *Frontiers in Public Health*, *11*, pp.1-10 Available at: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2023.1049497

Johnston, H. (2008). Moral Guardians? Prison officers, prison practice and ambiguity in the nineteenth century. In: Johnston, H. (Ed.). *Punishment and control in historical perspective.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.77-94.

Joon Jang, S. (2007). Gender differences in strain, negative emotions, and coping behaviors: A general strain theory approach. *Justice Quarterly*, *24*(3), pp.523-553. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/07418820701485486

Joon Jang, S. (2020). Prison strains, negative emotions, and deviance among prisoners in South Korea: A latent-variable modeling test of general strain theory. *International journal of offender therapy and comparative criminology*, *64*(15), pp.1607-1636. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X20928026

Jordaan, J. and Hesselink, A. (2022). Predictors of aggression among sample-specific young adult offenders: Continuation of violent behavior within South African correctional centers. *International Criminal Justice Review*, *32*(1), pp.68-87. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1057567721998431

Jordan, M. (2011). The prison setting as a place of enforced residence, its mental health effects, and the mental healthcare implications. *Health & place*, *17*(5), pp.1061-1066. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2011.06.006

Kamphuis, J. (2017). The relation between sleep and violent aggression. *Thesis fully internal (DIV), University of Groningen*. Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.

Kamphuis, J., et al. (2012). Poor sleep as a potential causal factor in aggression and violence. *Sleep medicine*, *13*(4), pp.327-334. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sleep.2011.12.006

Karthaus, R., Block, L. and Hu, A. (2019). Redesigning prison: The architecture and ethics of rehabilitation. *The Journal of Architecture*, *24*(2), pp.193-222. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/13602365.2019.1578072

Keers, R.N., et al. (2023). Defining avoidable healthcare-associated harm in prisons: A mixed-method development study. *Plos one*, *18*(3), pp.1-15. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0282021

Kennedy, D.B., Homant, R.J. and Homant, M.R. (2004). Perception of injustice as a predictor of support for workplace aggression. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *18*, pp.323-336. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1023/B:JOBU.0000016709.52870.2c

Kerbs, J.J. and Jolley, J.M. (2007). Inmate-on-inmate victimization among older male prisoners. *Crime & Delinquency*, *53*(2), pp.187-218. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128706294119

Khan, Z. (2022). A typology of prisoner compliance with the Incentives and Earned Privileges scheme: Theorising the neoliberal self and staff–prisoner relationships. *Criminology & criminal justice*, *22*(1), pp.97-114. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1748895820947456

Kiger, M.E. and Varpio, L. (2020). Thematic analysis of qualitative data: AMEE Guide No. 131. *Medical teacher*, *42*(8), pp.846-854. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2020.1755030

Kitzinger, J. (1995). Qualitative research: introducing focus groups. *Bmj*, *311*(7000), pp.299-302. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.311.7000.299

Knight, V. (2012). *A study of in-cell television in a closed adult male prison: Governing souls with in-cell television.* Published: De Montfort University. PhD.

Koedijk, M., et al. (2019). Training for the job: Evaluation of a self-defence training programme for correctional officers. *Ergonomics*, *62*(12), pp.1585-1597. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/00140139.2019.1677947

Krancer, B.A. (1980). *Prison design and prisoner behavior: philosophy, architecture, and violence.* Published: Oberlin College. PhD.

Kratcoski, P.C. and Babb, S. (1990). Adjustment of older inmates: an analysis by institutional structure and gender. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, *6*(4), pp.264-281.

Krizan, Z. and Herlache, A.D. (2016). Sleep disruption and aggression: Implications for violence and its prevention. *Psychology of Violence*, *6*(4), pp.542-552. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1037/vio0000018

Kuanliang, A. and Sorensen, J. (2008). Predictors of self-reported prison misconduct. *Criminal Justice Studies*, *21*(1), pp.27-35. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/14786010801972662

Kuiper, M.W., Verhoeven, E.W. and Geurts, H.M. (2019). Stop making noise! Auditory sensitivity in adults with an autism spectrum disorder diagnosis: Physiological habituation and subjective detection thresholds. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, *49*(5), pp.2116-2128. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-019-03890-9

Kupers, T.A. (2005). Toxic masculinity as a barrier to mental health treatment in prison. *Journal of clinical psychology*, *61*(6), pp.713-724. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.20105

Kushner, M. and Fagan, A.A. (2022). The effects of victimization on offending: An examination of general strain theory, criminal propensity, risk, protection, and resilience. *Victims & Offenders*, pp.1-21. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2022.2077495

Kuzmanić, M. (2009). Validity in qualitative research: Interview and the appearance of truth through dialogue. *Horizons of Psychology*, *18*(2), pp.39-50.

Labbé, E., et al. (2007). Coping with stress: The effectiveness of different types of music. *Applied psychophysiology and biofeedback*, *32*(3), pp.163-168. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10484-007-9043-9

Labrecque, R.M. and Smith, P. (2019). Reducing institutional disorder: Using the inmate risk assessment for segregation placement to triage treatment services at the front end of prison sentences. *Crime & Delinquency*, *65*(1), pp.3-25. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128717748946

Lahm, K.F. (2008). Inmate-on-inmate assault: A multilevel examination of prison violence. *Criminal justice and behavior*, *35*(1), pp.120-137. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854807308730

Lahm, K.F. (2009). Inmate assaults on prison staff: A multilevel examination of an overlooked form of prison violence. *The Prison Journal*, *89*(2), pp.131-150. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885509334743

Lai, Y.L. (2019). Determinants of importation and deprivation models on committed juvenile offenders' violent misconduct: A Taiwanese perspective. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *63*(8), pp.1242-1264. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X18815991

Langton, L. and Piquero, N.L. (2007). Can general strain theory explain white-collar crime? A preliminary investigation of the relationship between strain and select white-collar offenses. *Journal of criminal justice*, *35*(1), pp.1-15. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2006.11.011

Larson, J.H. and Nelson, J. (1984). Women, friendship, and adaptation to prison. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *12*(6), pp.601-615. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/0047-2352(84)90117-X

Laws, B. (2019). The return of the suppressed: Exploring how emotional suppression reappears as violence and pain among male and female prisoners. *Punishment & Society*, *21*(5), pp.560-577. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1462474518805071

Leban, L., et al. (2016). Adapting to prison life: A qualitative examination of the coping process among incarcerated offenders. *Justice Quarterly*, *33*(6), pp.943-969. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2015.1012096

Lee, M.A. and Kawachi, I. (2017). The company you keep: Is socialising with higher-status people bad for mental health?. *Sociology of health & illness*, *39*(7), pp.1206-1226. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9566.12580

Leeming. (2019). How one-to-one conversations are helping make prisons safer. 25 April 2019. Officer Leeming Blog. [Online]. Available at: https://prisonjobs.blog.gov.uk/2019/04/25/how-one-to-one-conversations-are-helping-make-prisons-safer/ [Accessed 13 February 2023].

Lerman, A.E., Harney, J. and Sadin, M. (2022). Prisons and mental health: Violence, organizational support, and the effects of correctional work. *Criminal justice and behavior*, *49*(2), pp.181-199. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/00938548211037718

Levingston, K.D. and Turetsky, V. (2007). Debtors' prison-prisoners' accumulation of debt as a barrier to reentry. *Clearinghouse Rev.*, *41*, pp.187-197.

Liebling, A. (1999). Prison suicide and prisoner coping. *Crime and justice*, *26*, pp.283-359.

Liebling, A. (2000). Prison officers, policing and the use of discretion. *Theoretical criminology*, *4*(3), pp.333-357. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480600004003005

Liebling, A. (2008). Incentives and earned privileges revisited: Fairness, discretion, and the quality of prison life. *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention*, *9*(S1), pp.25-41. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/14043850802450773

Liebling, A. (2011). Distinctions and distinctiveness in the work of prison officers: Legitimacy and authority revisited. *European journal of criminology*, 8 (6), pp.484-499. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1477370811413807

Liebling, A. and Crewe, B. (2012). Prisons beyond the new penology: The shifting moral foundations of prison management. In: Simon, J. and Sparks, R. (Eds.). *Handbook of punishment and society*. London: Sage, pp.283-307.

Liebling, A., Price, D. and Elliott, C. (1999). Appreciative inquiry and relationships in prison. *Punishment & Society*, *1*(1), pp.71-98. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/14624749922227711

Liebling, A., Price, D. and Shefer, G. (2011). *The prison officer.* Second Edition. Oxon: Willan Publishing.

Lin, W.H., Cochran, J.K. and Mieczkowski, T. (2011). Direct and vicarious violent victimization and juvenile delinquency: An application of general strain theory. *Sociological inquiry*, *81*(2), pp.195-222. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-682X.2011.00368.x

Lincoln, J.M., et al. (2006). Inmate-made weapons in prison facilities: assessing the injury risk. *Injury prevention*, *12*(3), pp.195-198. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/ip.2005.010405

Lingard, L. (2019). Beyond the default colon: effective use of quotes in qualitative research. *Perspectives on medical education*, *8*, pp.360-364. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s40037-019-00550-7

Link, N.W., et al. (2016). Can general strain theory help us understand violent behaviors among people with mental illnesses?. *Justice Quarterly*, *33*(4), pp.729-754. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2015.1005656

Listwan, S.J., et al. (2013). The pains of imprisonment revisited: The impact of strain on inmate recidivism. *Justice Quarterly*, *30*(1), pp.144-168. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2011.597772

Lockwood, K. (2021). 'Lockdown's changed everything': Mothering adult children in prison in the UK during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Probation Journal*, *68*(4), pp.458-475. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/02645505211050855

Loftus, E.F. (1996). Memory distortion and false memory creation. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law Online*, *24*(3), pp.281-295.

Longhurst, R. (2003). Semi-structured interviews and focus groups. *Key methods in geography*, *3*(2), pp.143-156.

Loucks, A.D. and Zamble, E. (2000). Predictors of criminal behavior and prison misconduct in serious female offenders. *Empirical and Applied Criminal Justice Review*, 1, pp.1-47.

Lucic-Catic, M. (2011). Challenges Conducting Prison Research. *Journal of Criminal Justice and Security, 11(5-6),* pp.31-45.

Luke, R.J., et al. (2021). The effect of time spent in prison and coping styles on psychological distress in inmates. *The Prison Journal*, *101*(1), pp.60-79. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885520978475

Lundholm, L., et al. (2013). The triggering effect of alcohol and illicit drugs on violent crime in a remand prison population: A case crossover study. *Drug and alcohol dependence*, *129*(1-2), pp.110-115. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2012.09.019

MacDonald, J.M. (1999). Violence and drug use in juvenile institutions. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *27*(1), pp.33-44. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2352(98)00033-6

MacDonald, M. (2018). Overcrowding and its impact on prison conditions and health. *International Journal of Prisoner Health*, *14*(2), pp.65-68. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPH-04-2018-0014

MacKenzie, D.L., Robinson, J.W. and Campbell, C.S. (1989). Long-term incarceration of female offenders: Prison adjustment and coping. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *16*(2), pp.223-238. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854889016002007

Maguire, D. (2021). Vulnerable prisoner masculinities in an English prison. *Men and Masculinities*, *24*(3), pp.501-518. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X19888966

Maguire, M. and Raynor, P. (2017). Offender management in and after prison: The end of 'end to end'?. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, *17*(2), pp.138-157. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1748895816665435

Martin, C. and Edgar, K. (2000). The social context of prison violence. *Criminal Justice Matters,* 42, pp.24-25. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/09627250008552883

Martin. (2022). Shocking 'crisis' in UK prisons: Staffing, violence, and inmate progression. [Online]. The Justice Gap. Last updated: 6 October 2022. Available at: https://www.thejusticegap.com/shocking-crisis-in-uk-prisons-staffing-violence-and-prisoner-progression/ [Accessed 18 June 2023].

Maruna, S. (2011). Why do they hate us? Making peace between prisoners and psychology. *International journal of offender therapy and comparative criminology*, *55*(5), pp.671-675. Available at: doi:10.1177/0306624X11414401

Maruna, S., McNaull, G. and O'Neill, N. (2022). The COVID-19 pandemic and the future of the prison. *Crime and Justice*, *51*(1), pp.59-103.

Marzano, L., Adler, J.R. and Ciclitira, K. (2015). Responding to repetitive, non-suicidal self-harm in an English male prison: Staff experiences, reactions, and concerns. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, *20*(2), pp.241-254. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/lcrp.12025

Marzano, L., Ciclitira, K. and Adler, J. (2012). The impact of prison staff responses on self-harming behaviours: Prisoners' perspectives. *British journal of clinical psychology*, *51*(1), pp.4-18. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8260.2010.02007.x

Maschi, T., et al. (2011). Trauma and life event stressors among young and older adult prisoners. *Journal of Correctional Health Care*, *17*(2), pp.160-172. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1078345810396682

Matfin, C. (2000). Doing research in a prison setting. In: Jupp, V., Davies, P. and Francis, P. (Eds.). *Doing Criminological Research*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd, pp.215-233.

Maziarka, K. (2013). Managing misconduct: Prison management meets inmate behavior. *JIJIS*, *13*, pp.141-148.

McCallum, K. (2018). Does PTSD predict institutional violence within a UK male prison population?. *Journal of Forensic Practice*, 20(4), pp.229-238. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1108/JFP-12-2017-0055

McCarthy, C.V., et al. (2022). The impact of COVID-19 vaccination in prisons in England and Wales: A metapopulation model. *BMC Public Health*, *22*(1), pp.1-17. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-022-13219-4

McCarthy, D. and Adams, M. (2017). Prison visitation as human 'right' or earned 'privilege'? The differing tales of England/Wales, and Scotland. *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law*, *39*(4), pp.403-416. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/09649069.2017.1390292

McCorkle, R.C. (1992). Personal precautions to violence in prison. *Criminal justice and behavior*, *19*(2), pp.160-173. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854892019002004

McCorkle, R.C., Miethe, T.D. and Drass, K.A. (1995). The roots of prison violence: A test of the deprivation, management, and "not-so-total" institution models. *Crime & Delinquency*, *41*(3), pp.317-331. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128795041003003

McGrath, S.A., Marcum, C.D. and Copes, H. (2012). The effects of experienced, vicarious, and anticipated strain on violence and drug use among inmates. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *37*, pp.60-75. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-011-9127-1

McGuire, J. (2018). Understanding prison violence: A rapid evidence assessment. *HM Prison & Probation Service analytical summary 2018.*

McIntosh, M.J. and Morse, J.M. (2015). Situating and constructing diversity in semi-structured interviews. *Global qualitative nursing research*, *2*, pp.1-12. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/2333393615597674

McKinlay, A.R., Fancourt, D. and Burton, A. (2021). A qualitative study about the mental health and wellbeing of older adults in the UK during the COVID-19 pandemic. *BMC geriatrics*, *21*(1), pp.1-10. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-021-02367-8

Meadows, L., et al. (2010). Investigating the prisoner finance gap across four prisons in the north-east. [Online]. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/214490/rrep715.pdf [Accessed 22 July 2023].

Mears, D.P., et al. (2012). Prison visitation and recidivism. *Justice Quarterly*, *29*(6), pp.888-918. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2011.583932

Mehay, A., Meek, R. and Ogden, J. (2021). Understanding and supporting the health literacy of young men in prison: a mixed-methods study. *Health Education*, *121*(1), pp.93-110. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1108/HE-08-2020-0076

Meredith, T., Speir, J.C. and Johnson, S. (2007). Developing and implementing automated risk assessments in parole. *Justice Research and Policy*, *9*(1), pp.1-24. Available at: https://doi.org/10.3818/JRP.9.1.2007.1

Mericle, A.A. and Havassy, B.E. (2008). Characteristics of recent violence among entrants to acute mental health and substance abuse services. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 43 (5), pp.392-402. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-008-0322-4

Merton, R.K. (2002). Social structure and anomie. In: Corte, S. (Ed.). *Criminological theories: Bridging the past to the future*. London: Sage Publications, pp.96-103.

Michalski, J.H. (2017). Status hierarchies and hegemonic masculinity: A general theory of prison violence. *British Journal of Criminology*, *57*(1), pp.40-60. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azv098

Miller, M.B. (1991). A heartless anatomy of five prison riots. *Social Justice, 18(3),* pp.230-238.

Miller, T.A. (1999). Sex & surveillance: Gender, privacy & the sexualization of power in prison. *Geo. Mason UCRLJ*, *10*, pp.291-356.

Ministry of Justice (MoJ). (2006). Use of force: Training manual. [Online]. Available at: https://www.statewatch.org/news/2012/jan/uk-prisons-use-of-force-manual.pdf [Accessed 28 January 2020].

Ministry of Justice (MoJ). (2018). In-cell phones for more prisons in drive to cut crime. [Online]. Last updated: 28 December 2018. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/news/in-cell-phones-for-more-prisons-in-drive-to-cut-crime [Accessed 3 January 2023].

Ministry of Justice (MoJ). (2019). Prison population projections 2019 to 2024, England and Wales. [Online]. Last updated: 29 August 2019. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/827791/prison-population-projections-2019-2024.pdf [Accessed 9 January 2023].

Ministry of Justice (MoJ). (2020a). Glossary or programmes. [Online]. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/449290/glossary-of-programmes.pdf [Accessed 14 February 2020].

Ministry of Justice (MoJ). (2020b). Prisoners' pay. [Online]. Last updated: 27 January 2020. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/931684/pso-4460-prisoners-pay.pdf [Accessed 4 January 2023].

Ministry of Justice (MoJ). (2020c). Smoke free policy framework. [Online]. Last updated: 27 January 2020. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/987122/smoke-free-pf.pdf [Accessed 17 March 2023].

Ministry of Justice (MoJ). (2021a). Policy name: Security categorisations policy framework. [Online]. Last updated: 17 August 2021. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1011502/security-categorisation-pf.pdf [Accessed 31 July 2023].

Ministry of Justice (MoJ). (2021b). Secure video calls help all prisoners maintain essential family ties during pandemic. [Online]. Last updated: 18 January 2021. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/news/secure-video-calls-help-all-prisoners-maintain-essential-family-ties-during-pandemic [Accessed 23 July 2023].

Ministry of Justice (MoJ). (2022a). Policy framework name: Incentives policy framework. [Online]. Last updated: 1 September 2022. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1105714/incentives-policy-framework.pdf [Accessed 27 April 2023].

Ministry of Justice (MoJ). (2022b). Secure video calls with prisoners. [Online]. Last updated: 14 October 2022. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/visit-a-prisoner-using-a-video-call [Accessed 4 July 2023].

Ministry of Justice (MoJ). (2023). Types of prison sentence. [Online]. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/types-of-prison-sentence/indeterminate-prison-sentences-no-fixed-length-of-time [Accessed 12 July 2023].

Minson, S. (2021). The impact of COVID-19 prison lockdowns on children with a parent in prison. [Online]. Available at: https://childhub.org/sites/default/files/library/attachments/the_impact_of_covid-19_prison_lockdowns_on_children_with_a_parent_in_prison.pdf [Accessed 25 February 2023].

Modvig, J. (2014). Violence, sexual abuse and torture in prisons. In: Enggist, S., Møller, L., Galea. And Udesen, C. (Eds.). *Prisons and health*. Marmorvej: WHO Regional Office for Europe, pp.19-26.

Molleman, T. and van Ginneken, E.F. (2015). A multilevel analysis of the relationship between cell sharing, staff–prisoner relationships, and prisoners' perceptions of prison quality. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *59*(10), pp.1029-1046. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X14525912

Moon, B., Hays, K. and Blurton, D. (2009). General strain theory, key strains, and deviance. *Journal of criminal justice*, *37*(1), pp.98-106. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2008.12.011

Moon, K. and Blackman, D. (2014). A guide to understanding social science research for natural scientists. *Conservation Biology*, *28*(5), pp.1167-1177. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12326

Moran, D. (2019). How the prison environment can support recovery. *Prison Service Journal, 242,* pp.44-49.

Moran, D., Houlbrook, M. and Jewkes, Y. (2022). The persistence of the Victorian prison: Alteration, inhabitation, obsolescence, and affirmative design. *Space and Culture*, *25*(3), pp.364-378. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/12063312211057036

Morris, R.G., et al. (2012). Does prison strain lead to prison misbehavior? An application of general strain theory to inmate misconduct. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *40*(3), pp.194-201. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2011.12.001

Moss, S. (2017). Half of Britain's prisoners are functionally illiterate. Can fellow inmates change that?. [Online]. The Guardian. Last updated: 15 June 2017. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/inequality/2017/jun/15/reading-for-freedom-life-changing-scheme-dreamt-up-by-prison-pen-pals-shannon-trust-action-for-equity-award [Accessed 19 February 2020].

Mrug, S., Madan, A. and Windle, M. (2016). Emotional desensitization to violence contributes to adolescents' violent behavior. *Journal of abnormal child psychology*, *44*(1), pp.75-86. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-015-9986-x

Muirhead, A. (2019). *Behind the door: A study of cell-sharing, wellbeing and coping in prison.* Published: Queen's University Belfast. Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences. PhD.

Muirhead, A., Butler, M. and Davidson, G. (2020). "You can't always pick your cellmate but if you can…. it is a bit better": Staff and prisoner perceptions of what factors matter in cell allocation decision-making. *Kriminologie-Das Online-Journal| Criminology-The Online Journal*, (2), pp.159-181. Available at: https://doi.org/10.18716/ojs/krimoj/2020.2.4

Muirhead, A., Butler, M. and Davidson, G. (2021). Behind closed doors: An exploration of cell-sharing and its relationship with wellbeing. *European Journal of Criminology*, 20(1), pp.335-355. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1477370821996905

Muraglia, S., Vasquez, A.L. and Reichert, J. (2021). Conducting research interviews on sensitive topics. *Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority.*

Murray, J. (2013). The effects of imprisonment on families and children of prisoners. In: Liebling, A. and Maruna, S. (Eds.). *The effects of imprisonment.* Cullompton: Willan, pp.462-482.

NOMS. (2015). The cell sharing risk assessment. [Online]. Last update: 11 May 2015. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/910904/PSI_20_2015_Cell_sharing.pdf [Accessed 4 July 2023].

Norton, A. (2017). Spicing up the subject. *Early Career Academics Network Bulletin*, 33, pp.21-33.

Norton, A. (2019). "Spicing up the subject": The recorded experiences of prisoners and prison staff on the subject: New psychoactive substance use in a North West prison. *Howard League for Penal Reform John Sunley Prize winning master's dissertation.*

Novisky, M.A. and Peralta, R.L. (2020). "Gladiator school: returning citizens' experiences with secondary violence exposure in prison". *Victims & offenders*, 15 (5), pp.594-618. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2020.1721387

Novisky, M.A., Narvey, C.S. and Prost, S.G. (2022). Older adults' perspectives on death and dying in prison. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 83, pp.1-10. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2022.101930

Nowell, L.S., et al. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International journal of qualitative methods*, *16*(1), pp.1-13. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847

Nurse, J., Woodcock, P. and Ormsby, J. (2003). Influence of environmental factors on mental health within prisons: focus group study. *Bmj*, *327*(7413), pp.1-5. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.327.7413.480

O'Donnell, I. (2001). The struggle for dominance: Prisons, power and sexual violence. *Criminal Law Forum*, 12 (2), Dordrecht: Springer Nature B.V., pp.277-286. Available at: doi:10.1023/A:1013003817534.

O'Donnell, I. and Edgar, K. (1998). Routine victimisation in prisons. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, *37*(3), pp.266-279. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2311.00097

O'Donnell, I. and Edgar, K. (1999). Fear in prison. *The Prison Journal, 79*(1), pp.90-99. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885599079001006

Ochieng, P.A. (2009). An analysis of the strengths and limitation of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century*, *13*, pp.13-18.

Oser, C.B. (2006). The criminal offending–self-esteem nexus: Which version of the self-esteem theory is supported?. *The Prison Journal*, *86*(3), pp.344-363. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885506291024

Ousey, G.C., Wilcox, P. and Schreck, C.J. (2015). Violent victimization, confluence of risks and the nature of criminal behavior: Testing main and interactive effects from Agnew's extension of general strain theory. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *43*(2), pp.164-173. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2015.02.006

Overholser, J.C. (1987). Ethical issues in prison research: A risk/benefit analysis. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, *5*(2), pp.187-202. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.2370050210

Palmer, E.J. (2003). *Offending behaviour: moral reasoning, criminal conduct and the rehabilitation of offenders*. Cullompton: Willan Publishing.

Park, Y.S., Konge, L. and Artino, A.R. (2020). The positivism paradigm of research. *Academic Medicine*, *95*(5), pp.690-694. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000003093

Parliament. (2020). Prison regime changes. [Online]. Available at: https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm5801/cmselect/cmjust/299/29905.htm [Accessed 18 February 2023].

Partington, R. (2022). Five charts that show the UK's economic prospects in 2023. [Online]. The Guardian. Last updated: 29 December 2022. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/business/2022/dec/29/five-charts-that-show-the-uks-economic-prospects-in-2023 [Accessed 2 January 2023].

Patel, R., Harvey, J. and Forrester, A. (2018). Systemic limitations in the delivery of mental health care in prisons in England. *International journal of law and psychiatry*, 60, pp.17-25. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlp.2018.06.003

Paternoster, R. and Mazerolle, P. (1994). General strain theory and delinquency: A replication and extension. *Journal of research in crime and delinquency*, *31*(3), pp.235-263. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427894031003001

Pegues, H. (2007). Of paradigm wars: Constructivism, objectivism, and postmodern stratagem. *Educational Forum.* 71(4), pp.316-330. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/00131720709335022

Phillips, S. and Maume, M.O. (2007). Have gun will shoot? Weapon instrumentality, intent, and the violent escalation of conflict. *Homicide studies*, *11*(4), pp.272-294. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1088767907306507

Pickard, H. and Fazel, S. (2013). Substance abuse as a risk factor for violence in mental illness: Some implications for forensic psychiatric practice and clinical ethics. *Current opinion in psychiatry*, *26*(4), pp.1-10. Available at: doi:10.1097/YCO.0b013e328361e798

Pike, S. and George, R. (2019). The Assessment, Care in Custody and Teamwork (ACCT) process in prison: Findings from qualitative research. [Online]. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/787778/acct-process-prison-findings-from-qualitative-research.pdf [Accessed 12 Jan 2021].

Piper, A. and Berle, D. (2019). The association between trauma experienced during incarceration and PTSD outcomes: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*, *30*(5), pp.854-875. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/14789949.2019.1639788

Pitts, J.M., Griffin III, O.H. and Johnson, W.W. (2014). Contemporary prison overcrowding: Short-term fixes to a perpetual problem. *Contemporary Justice Review*, *17*(1), pp.124-139. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/10282580.2014.883844

Polaschek, D.L., Yesberg, J.A. and Chauhan, P. (2018). A year without a conviction: An integrated examination of potential mechanisms for successful re-entry in high-risk violent prisoners. *Criminal justice and behavior*, *45*(4), pp.425-446. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854817752757

Pratt, A. and Grimwood, G.G. (2014). Prisoners: Incentives and earned privileges scheme. House of Commons. [Online]. Available at: https://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/SN06942/SN06942.pdf [Accessed 11 March 2020].

Pratt, D., et al. (2016). Cognitive behavioral suicide prevention for male prisoners: Case examples. *Cognitive and behavioral practice*, *23*(4), pp.485-501. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cbpra.2015.09.006

Prison Reform Trust (PRT). (2020a). Incentives and earned privileges review. [Online]. Available at: https://prisonreformtrust.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/old_files/Documents/IEP%20Briefing%20Prison%20Reform%20Trust.pdf [Accessed 29 January 2020].

Prison Reform Trust (PRT). (2020b). Speed up the video calls rollout in prison to ease families' lockdown anguish. [Online]. Available at: https://prisonreformtrust.org.uk/speed-up-video-calls-rollout-in-prison-to-ease-families-lockdown-anguish-2/ [Accessed 18 February 2023].

Prison Reform Trust (PRT). (2021). Prison: The facts: Bromley briefings summer 2021. [Online]. Available at: https://prisonreformtrust.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/Prison_the_facts_2021.pdf [Accessed 27 Jan 2021].

Prison Reform Trust (PRT). (2022a). New figures spark fears of a perfect storm in prisons. [Online]. Available at: https://prisonreformtrust.org.uk/new-figures-spark-fears-of-a-perfect-storm-in-prisons/ [Accessed 15 June 2023].

Prison Reform Trust (PRT). (2022b). Regime and time out of cell. [Online]. Available at: http://prisonreformtrust.org.uk/adviceguide/regime-and-time-out-of-cell/ [Accessed 09 December 2022].

Prison Reform Trust (PRT). (2023a). Approved premises. [Online]. Available at: http://prisonreformtrust.org.uk/adviceguide/approved-premises-ap/ [Accessed 25 January 2023].

Prison Reform Trust (PRT). (2023b). Crisis … what crisis? [Online]. Available at: https://prisonreformtrust.org.uk/crisis-what-crisis/ *[Accessed 18 June 2023].*

Prison Reform Trust (PRT). (2023c). Education and work in prison. [Online]. Available at: https://prisonreformtrust.org.uk/adviceguide/education-and-work-in-prison/ [Accessed 19 June 2023].

Prison Reform Trust (PRT). (2023d). Incentives. [Online]. Available at: https://prisonreformtrust.org.uk/adviceguide/incentives-and-earned-privileges/#:~:text=Basic%20level&text=To%20be%20considered%20suitable%20for,not%20be%20allowed%20anything%20extra [Accessed 22 July 2023].

Prison Reform Trust (PRT). (2023e). Keeping in contact with family and friends. [Online]. Available at: https://prisonreformtrust.org.uk/adviceguide/keeping-in-contact-with-family-and-friends/ [Accessed 14 February 2023].

Prison Reform Trust (PRT). (2023f). Money in prison. [Online]. Available at: [https://prisonreformtrust.org.uk/adviceguide/money-in-prison/ [Accessed 23 July 2023].

Prison Reform Trust (PRT). (2023g). People who can help you in prison. [Online]. Available at: http://prisonreformtrust.org.uk/adviceguide/people-who-can-help-you-in-prison/ [Accessed 21 January 2023].

Prison Reform Trust (PRT). (2023h). Understanding your sentence. [Online]. Available at: https://prisonreformtrust.org.uk/adviceguide/understanding-your-sentence/#:~:text=An%20indeterminate%20sentence%20is%20a,be%20set%20by%20the%20court. [Accessed 12 July 2023].

Pullen, S. (1996). Evaluation of the reasoning and rehabilitation cognitive skills development program as implemented in juvenile ISP in Colorado. [Online]. Available at: https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/Digitization/165183NCJRS.pdf [Accessed 12 February 2020].

Queirós, A., Faria, D. and Almeida, F. (2017). Strengths and limitations of qualitative and quantitative research methods. *European journal of education studies*, 3(9), pp.369-387. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.46827/ejes.v0i0.1017

Ralphs, R., et al. (2017). Adding spice to the porridge: the development of a synthetic cannabinoid market in an English prison. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, *40*, pp.57-69. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2016.10.003

Randol, B.M. and Campbell, C.M. (2017). Macro-correlates of inmate violence: The importance of programming in prison order. *The Prison Journal*, *97*(4), pp.451-474. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885517711975

Reid, A.M., et al. (2018). Ethical dilemmas and reflexivity in qualitative research. *Perspectives on medical education*, *7*, pp.69-75. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s40037-018-0412-2

Reidy, T.J., Sorensen, J.R. and Cunningham, M.D. (2012). Community violence to prison assault: A test of the behavioral continuity hypothesis. *Law and Human Behavior*, *36*(4), pp.356-363. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1037/h0093934

Ribbens, W. and Malliet, S. (2015). Exploring the appeal of digital games to male prisoners. *Poetics,* 48, pp.1-20. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2014.10.007

Ricciardelli, R. (2014). Coping strategies: Investigating how male prisoners manage the threat of victimization in federal prisons. *The Prison Journal*, *94*(4), pp.411-434. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885514548001

Rice, T. (2016). Sounds inside: Prison, prisoners and acoustical agency. *Sound Studies*, *2*(1), pp.6-20. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/20551940.2016.1214455

Richie, F.J., et al. (2021). Social support and suicidal ideation among prisoners with major depressive disorder. *Archives of Suicide Research*, *25*(1), pp.107-114. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/13811118.2019.1649773

Roberts, L. and Indermaur, D. (2008). The ethics of research with prisoners. *Current Issues in Criminal Justice*, *19*(3), pp.309-326. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/10345329.2008.12036436

Robinson, O.C. (2014). Sampling in interview-based qualitative research: A theoretical and practical guide. *Qualitative research in psychology*, *11*(1), pp.25-41. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2013.801543

Robson, C. (2002). *Real world research: A resource for social resource for social scientists and practitioner-researchers.* Second Edition. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Rocheleau, A.M. (2013). An empirical exploration of the "pains of imprisonment" and the level of prison misconduct and violence. *Criminal Justice Review,* *38*(3), pp.354-374. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0734016813494764

Rocheleau, A.M. (2014). Prisoners' coping skills and involvement in serious prison misconduct. *Victims & Offenders*, *9*(2), pp.149-177. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2013.866916

Rocheleau, A.M. (2015). Ways of coping and involvement in prison violence. *International journal of offender therapy and comparative criminology*, *59*(4), pp.359-383. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X13510275

Rogers, C. (2019). *Predictors of prison adjustment amongst male incarcerated offenders in a private maximum-security correctional centre.* Published: University of the Free State. PhD.

Rubin, A.T. (2015). Resistance or friction: Understanding the significance of prisoners' secondary adjustments. *Theoretical Criminology*, *19*(1), pp.23-42. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480614543320

Russoniello, C.V., O'Brien, K. and Parks, J.M. (2009). The effectiveness of casual video games in improving mood and decreasing stress. *Journal of CyberTherapy & Rehabilitation*, *2*(1), pp.53-66.

Rutherford, A., et al. (2007). Violence: A glossary. *Journal of epidemiology & community health*, *61*(8), pp.676-680. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/jech.2005.043711

Sandberg, S. (2010). What can "lies" tell us about life? Notes towards a framework of narrative criminology. *Journal of criminal justice education*, *21*(4), pp.447-465. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/10511253.2010.516564

Sazzad, H.M., et al. (2020). Violence and hepatitis C transmission in prison—A modified social ecological model. *Plos one*, *15*(12), pp.1-18. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0243106

Scalpello, M. (2022). Surviving in a small island state prison. Analysing prison officer support and assistance as narrated by people in prison. *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, *70*, pp.1-13. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlcj.2022.100545

Schenk, A.M. and Fremouw, W.J. (2012). Individual characteristics related to prison violence: A critical review of the literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *17*(5), pp.430-442. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2012.05.005

Schliehe, A. and Crewe, B. (2022). Top bunk, bottom bunk: Cellsharing in prisons. *The British Journal of Criminology*, *62*(2), pp.484-500. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azab053

Schliehe, A., Laursen, J. and Crewe, B. (2022). Loneliness in prison. *European Journal of Criminology*, *19*(6), pp.1595-1614. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1477370820988836

Schmidt, H. (2016). (In)justice in prison–a biographical perspective. In: Reeves, C. (Ed.). *Experiencing imprisonment: Research on the experience of living and working in carceral institutions.* Abingdon: Routledge, pp.63-80.

Schnittker, J. and Bacak, V. (2016). Orange is still pink: Mental illness, gender roles, and physical victimization in prisons. *Society and Mental Health*, *6*(1), pp.21-35. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/2156869315609733

Scott, J. (2000). Rational choice theory. In: Browning, G., Halcli, A. and Webster, F. (Eds.). *Understanding Contemporary Society: Theories of the Present.* CA: Sage, pp.126-138.

Semenza, D.C. and Grosholz, J.M. (2019). Mental and physical health in prison: how co-occurring conditions influence inmate misconduct. *Health & Justice*, *7*(1), pp.1-12. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1186/s40352-018-0082-5

Shaw, D. (2018): Prisons why are they in such a state. [Online]. BBC News. Last updated: 25 August 2018. Available at: https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-45247719 [Accessed 1 March 2021].

Shingler, J., Sonnenberg, S.J. and Needs, A. (2020). 'Their life in your hands': The experiences of prison-based psychologists conducting risk assessments with indeterminate

sentenced prisoners in the United Kingdom. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 26*(4), pp.311-326. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316X.2019.1652750

Siddique, H. (2019). Assaults and self-harm hit record new levels in jails in England and Wales. [Online]. The Guardian. Last updated: 25 July 2019. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/society/2019/jul/25/assault-self-harm-record-levels-jails-england-wales-prisons [Accessed 29th June 2022].

Silver, E., Felson, R. B. and Vaneseltine, M. (2008). The relationship between mental health problems and violence among criminal offenders. *Criminal justice and behavior*, 35 (4), pp.405-426. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854807312851

Simpson, P.L. and Butler, T.G. (2020). Covid-19, prison crowding, and release policies. *Bmj, 369,* pp.1-12. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m1551

Sindicich, N., et al. (2014). Offenders as victims: Post-traumatic stress disorder and substance use disorder among male prisoners. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology, 25*(1), pp.44-60. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/14789949.2013.877516

Skar, M., et al. (2019). Quality of prison life, violence and mental health in Dubrava prison. *International journal of prisoner health*. International Journal of Prisoner Health, 15(3), pp.262-272. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPH-10-2017-0047

Smith, L.R., Sharman, S. and Roberts, A. (2022). Gambling and crime: An exploration of gambling availability and culture in an English prison. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health, 32*(6), pp.389-403.

Smithson, J. (2008). Focus groups. In: Alasuutari, P., Bickman, L. and Brannen, J. (Eds.). *The SAGE handbook of social research methods*. London: SAGE, pp.357-370.

South, C.R. and Wood, J. (2006). Bullying in prisons: The importance of perceived social status, prisonization, and moral disengagement. *Aggressive Behavior: Official Journal of the International Society for Research on Aggression, 32*(5), pp.490-501.

Sparks, J.R. and Bottoms, A.E. (1995). Legitimacy and order in prisons. *British Journal of Sociology*, pp.45-62. Available at: https://doi.org/10.2307/591622

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

Spinks, M. and Khwaja, H. (2022). Smoking and vaping research in Herefordshire and Worcestershire. [Online]. Available at: https://councillors.herefordshire.gov.uk/documents/s50103787/Appendix%202%20Overall%20report%20on%20smoking%20and%20vaping%20research%20v%201.pdf [Accessed 3 March 2023].

St Andrews. (2023). Concerns on ethical issues in research involving humans. [Online]. Available at: https://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/research/integrity-ethics/humans/ethical-guidance/ [Accessed 21 July 2023].

Steiner, B. and Wooldredge, J. (2018). Prison officer legitimacy, their exercise of power, and inmate rule breaking. *Criminology, 56*(4), pp.750-779. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9125.12191

Steiner, B., et al. (2017). The impact of inmate and prison characteristics on prisoner victimization. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, *18*(1), pp.17-36. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838015588503

Steinke, P. (1991). Using situational factors to predict types of prison violence. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, *17*(1/2), pp.119-132.

Stephenson, T., et al. (2021). Time out of cell and time in purposeful activity and adverse mental health outcomes amongst people in prison: A literature review. *International Journal of Prisoner Health*, *17*(1), pp.54-68. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPH-06-2020-0037

Straub, C. and Annison, H. (2020). The mental health impact of parole on families of indeterminate-sentenced prisoners in England and Wales. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, *30*(6), pp.341-349. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1002/cbm.2184

Struthers Montford, K. (2022). The embodiment of contempt: Ontario provincial prison food. *Social & Legal Studies*, 32(2) pp.237-256. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/09646639221104253

Suhomlinova, O., et al. (2022). Locked up while locked down: Prisoners' experiences of the COVID-19 pandemic. *The British Journal of Criminology*, *62*(2), pp.279-298. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azab060

Sturge, G. (2022). UK prison population statistics. Available at: https://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/SN04334/SN04334.pdf [Accessed 20 August 2023].

Swanson, C., et al. (2012). Prisoners' perceptions of father-child relationships and social support. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *37*, pp.338-355. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-011-9132-4

Sykes, G.M. (1958). *The society of captives: A study of a maximum-security prison.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Tait, S. (2011). A typology of prison officer approaches to care. *European journal of criminology*, *8*(6), pp.440-454. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1477370811413804

Tasca, M., Griffin, M.L. and Rodriguez, N. (2010). The effect of importation and deprivation factors on violent misconduct: An examination of Black and Latino youth in prison. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, *8*(3), pp.234-249. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1541204010366619

Tate, H., Blagden, N. and Mann, R. (2017). Prisoners' perceptions of care and rehabilitation from prison officers trained as 5-minute interventionists: Analytical summary 2017. *HM Prison & Probation Service*

Taylor, S., et al. (2017). Transforming rehabilitation during a penal crisis: A case study of through the gate services in a resettlement prison in England and Wales. *European Journal of Probation*, *9*(2), pp.115-131. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/2066220317706438

Tenny, S., et al. (2017). Qualitative study. *StatPearls Publishing.* [Online]. Available at: https://europepmc.org/article/NBK/nbk470395 [Accessed 2 August 2023].

Tew, J. and Atkinson, R. (2013). The Chromis programme: From conception to evaluation. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 19(5-6), pp.415-431. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316X.2013.758967

Thaxton, S. and Agnew, R. (2018). When criminal coping is likely: An examination of conditioning effects in general strain theory. *Journal of quantitative criminology, 34*, pp.887-920. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10940-017-9358-5

Thomas, D.M. (2022). *Exploring the effectiveness of a life-skills program in a Florida prison through a social bond and general strain theory perspective.* Published: University of South Florida. PhD.

Toch, H. and Kupers, T.A. (2007). Violence in prisons, revisited. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 45(3-4), pp.1-28. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1300/J076v45n03_01

Toch, H. (1998). Hypermasculinity and prison violence. In Bowker, L.H. (Ed.). *Masculinities and violence.* Sage Publications, Inc, pp.168-178. Available at: https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483328010.n9

Toman, E.L., et al. (2015). The implications of sentence length for inmate adjustment to prison life. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 43(6), pp.510-521. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2015.11.002

Tompkins, C.N. (2016). "There's that many people selling it": Exploring the nature, organisation and maintenance of prison drug markets in England. *Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy*, 23(2), pp.144-153. Available at: https://doi.org/10.3109/09687637.2015.1085490

Tyler, J.M., Feldman, R.S. and Reichert, A. (2006). The price of deceptive behavior: Disliking and lying to people who lie to us. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 42(1), pp.69-77. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2005.02.003

Underwood, M., Satterthwait, L.D. and Bartlett, H.P. (2010). Reflexivity and minimization of the impact of age-cohort differences between researcher and research participants. *Qualitative Health Research*, 20(11), pp.1585-1595. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732310371102

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2017). Handbook on anti-corruption measures in prisons. [Online]. Available at: https://www.unodc.org/documents/justice-and-prison-reform/17-06140_HB_anti-corr_prisons_eBook.pdf [Accessed 20 January 2023].

Useem, B. and Piehl, A.M. (2006). Prison buildup and disorder. *Punishment & Society*, 8(1), pp.87-115. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1462474506059141

van Ginneken, E.F. (2022). Is cell sharing associated with wellbeing, misconduct and prison climate? Evidence from a Dutch study. *European Journal of Crime, Criminal Law and Criminal Justice*, 30(1), pp.41-68. Available at: doi:10.1163/15718174-bja10029

Vandala, N.G. (2019). The transformative effect of correctional education: A global perspective. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 5(1), pp.1-15. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2019.1677122

Vanhouche, A.S. (2015). Acceptance or refusal of convenience food in present-day prison. *Appetite*, 94, pp.47-53. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2015.04.047

Vigesaa, L.E. (2013). Abuse as a form of strain among Native American and white female prisoners: Predictors of substance-related offenses and recidivism. *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice*, *11*(1-2), pp.1-21. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/15377938.2013.739384

Vogler, N., et al. (2014). Sleep, aggression, and psychosocial adjustment in male prisoners. *Swiss journal of psychology*, 73(3), pp.167-176. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1024/1421-0185/a000137

Vozian, D. (2020). *The visiting art: A creative approach to rehabilitation and reintegration of the aging prison population.* Published: Concordia University. Master of Arts.

Vuolo, M. and Kruttschnitt, C. (2008). Prisoners' adjustment, correctional officers, and context: The foreground and background of punishment in late modernity. *Law & Society Review*, 42(2), pp.307-336. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5893.2008.00343.x

Wainwright, L., et al. (2023). "It was really poor prior to the pandemic. It got really bad after": A qualitative study of the impact of COVID-19 on prison healthcare in England. *Health & Justice*, *11*(1), pp.1-14. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1186/s40352-023-00212-1

Walker, D.F. (2015). The informal economy in prison: Studying prisoner trading can offer significant insights into prison life observes Dulcie Faure Walker. *Criminal Justice Matters*, *99*(1), pp.18-19. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/09627251.2015.1026564

Walker, T., et al. (2017). 'Coping with the job': Prison staff responding to self-harm in three English female prisons: a qualitative study. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*, *28*(6), pp.811-824. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/14789949.2017.1331369

Wall, T. (2022). Hundreds of mentally ill prisoners denied urgent treatment in England. [Online]. The Guardian. Last updated: 10 May 2022. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/society/2022/may/10/hundreds-mentally-ill-prisoners-denied-urgent-treatment-england [Accessed 22 January 2023].

Walliman, N. (2006). *Social research methods.* London: Sage Publications.

Walters, G.D. (2015). Decision to commit crime: Rational or nonrational. *Criminology, Criminal Justice Law, & Society,* 16(3), pp.1-18. Available at: https://scholasticahq.com/criminology-criminal-justice-law-society/

Walters, G.D. and Crawford, G. (2013). In and out of prison: Do importation factors predict all forms of misconduct or just the more serious ones?. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *41*(6), pp.407-413.

Warner, B.D. and Fowler, S.K. (2003). Strain and violence: Testing a general strain theory model of community violence. *Journal of criminal justice*, *31*(6), pp.511-521. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2003.08.006

Webster, R. (2016). Life in prison. [Online]. Available at: https://www.russellwebster.com/earning-spending-money-prison/ [Accessed 9th January 2023].

Weinrath, M., Budzinski, C. and Melnyk, T. (2016). Visualizing prison life: Does prison architecture influence correctional officer behaviour? An exploratory study. *Annual Review of Interdisciplinary Justice Research*, *5,* pp.291-311.

Wener, R. (2012). *The environmental psychology of prisons and jails: Creating humane spaces in secure settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wilkinson, R. B., Walford, W. A. and Espnes, G. A. (2000). Coping styles and psychological health in adolescents and young adults: A comparison of moderator and main effects models. *Australian journal of psychology*, 52 (3), pp.155-162. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/00049530008255383

Williams, K., Papadopoulou, V. and Booth, N. (2012). Prisoners' childhood and family backgrounds: Results from the Surveying Prisoner Crime Reduction (SPCR) longitudinal cohort study of prisoners. [Online]. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_da ta/file/278837/prisoners-childhood-family-backgrounds.pdf [Accessed 9 January 2023].

Wolff, N., et al. (2007). Physical violence inside prisons: Rates of victimization. *Criminal justice and behavior*, *34*(5), pp.588-599. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854806296830

Wolff, W., et al. (2021). Too bored for sports? Adaptive and less-adaptive latent personality profiles for exercise behavior. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *53*, pp.1-40. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2020.101851

Wood, J. and Dennard, S. (2017). Gang membership: Links to violence exposure, paranoia, PTSD, anxiety, and forced control of behavior in prison. *Psychiatry*, *80*(1), pp.30-41. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/00332747.2016.1199185

Wood, S.R. and Buttaro Jr, A. (2013). Co-occurring severe mental illnesses and substance abuse disorders as predictors of state prison inmate assaults. *Crime & Delinquency*, *59*(4), pp.510-535. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128712470318

Woodall, J. (2011). Social and environmental factors influencing in-prison drug use. *Health Education*, *112*(1), pp.31-46. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1108/09654281211190245

Wooldredge, J. (2020). Prison culture, management, and in-prison violence. *Annual Review of Criminology*, *3*, pp.165-188. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-criminol-011419-041359

World Health Organisation. (2022). The VPA approach. [Online]. Available at: https://www.who.int/groups/violence-prevention-alliance/approach [Accessed 18 February 2023].

Worley, R.M., Worley, V.B. and Lambert, E.G. (2021). Deepening the guard-inmate divide: An exploratory analysis of the relationship between staff-inmate boundary violations and officer attitudes regarding the mistreatment of prisoners. *Deviant Behavior, 42*(4), pp.503-517. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.2019.1695470

Wright, O. (2021). Coronavirus: How the UK dealt with its first Covid case. [Online]. BBC News. Last updated: 29 January 2021. Available at: https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-55622386 [Accessed 12 March 2021].

Wulf-Ludden, T. (2013). Interpersonal relationships among inmates and prison violence. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, *36*(1), pp.116-136. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/0735648X.2012.755467

Wulf-Ludden, T. (2016). Pseudofamilies, misconduct, and the utility of general strain theory in a women's prison. *Women & Criminal Justice*, *26*(4), pp.233-259. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/08974454.2015.1113154

Yilmaz, K. (2013). Comparison of quantitative and qualitative research traditions: Epistemological, theoretical, and methodological differences. *European journal of education*, *48*(2), pp.311-325. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12014

Young, S., Wells, J. and Gudjonsson, G.H. (2011). Predictors of offending among prisoners: the role of attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder and substance use. *Journal of Psychopharmacology*, *25*(11), pp.1524-1532. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0269881110370502

Zamble, E. (1992). Behavior and adaptation in long-term prison inmates: Descriptive longitudinal results. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *19*(4), pp.409-425. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854892019004005

Zavala, E. and Spohn, R.E. (2013). The role of vicarious and anticipated strain on the overlap of violent perpetration and victimization: A test of general strain theory. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *38*(1), pp.119-140. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-012-9163-5

Zinger, I., Wichmann, C. and Andrews, D.A. (2001). The psychological effects of 60 days in administrative segregation. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, *43*(1), pp.47-83. Available at: https://doi.org/10.3138/cjcrim.43.1.47

Zweig, J.M., et al. (2015). Using general strain theory to explore the effects of prison victimization experiences on later offending and substance use. *The Prison Journal*, *95*(1), pp.84-113. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885514563283

Appendix 1: Interview Topic Guide

Before interview starts ask if they have seen the information sheet and whether they have had a chance to read it. Go over key content including limits of confidentiality. Ask the participant if they have any questions.

Participants Background: *Short/simple questions that will help with the analyses.*

Tell me about yourself:
- How old are you?
- How long did you serve?
- Where did you serve?
- Have you been in any other prison?
- Was it your first time inside?
- Country of Origin

Prison Life*: Aim is to ease the participant into the interview as well as getting a general view of the person's prison experience.*

- Thinking about your time in [specified prison] can you tell me what a typical day was like for you?

Probe:
- ○ *Programmes*
- ○ *Gym/exercise*
- ○ *Education*
- ○ *Work*
- ○ *Peers*
- ○ *Covid-19*
- ○ *Visits*
- ○ *Support*

Prison Environment: *Aim is to get an understanding of what their prison is like.*

- *What were the conditions like in prison?*

Probe:
- *Old or new?*
- *Walls*
- *Gates*
- *Cells*
- *Overcrowding*
- *Good places and bad places*
- *Greenspace/nature*

- *Do you think the conditions impacted your experience in anyway?*

Probe:

- *How do prisoners respond to poor conditions?*
- *Do poor conditions lead to some prisoners acting violently in your opinion?*

Prison Goals: *Aim is to find out whether the participant feels as though they were being impeded from achieving their goals/needs. If they had any goals.*

- Do you think there is enough to do in prison?

Probe:
  o *What did you enjoy doing in prison?*
  o *What did you dislike? And why?*
  o *What does the prison need to improve upon when it comes to activities/programmes?*
  o *Do you think that a lack of activities leads to misbehaviour?*

- Did you have any set personal goals that you would like to achieve whilst in prison? (Or a possible rephrasing: Is there anything about your life/situation that you would like to improve? That you can possibly improve?').

Probe:
  o *Why had you set those goals?*
  o *Did you believe there is anything stopping you from achieving those goals?*

Prison Safety: *Aim is to find out whether the participant considers the prison to be a safe environment.*

- Did you feel safe inside prison?

Probe:
  o *Did you think other prisoners feel safe?*
  o *What do you think makes prison an unsafe place for some prisoners?*
  o *Are there areas inside the prison that feel safe?*
  o *Which areas feel the least safe? Why?*
  o *In what ways does the prison try to keep people safe?*
  o *Is the prison doing enough to make prisoners feel safe?*
  o *What types of violence were most common in your experience? Which types of violence do you think is most harmful?*
  o *Do fights happen often in prison?*
  o *What causes fights/violence?*
  o *Where do acts of violence most often take place?*
  o *How do prisoners avoid getting into violence in prison?*
  o *What types of people are committing the violent acts in prison?*
  o *Is gang related violence a problem in prison?*
  o *Do prisoners fear violence in prison?*

Prison Strain and Coping: *Aim is to see what parts of prison life is stressful and causes a negative emotional reaction inside prisoners. And what ways they cope with that stress?*

- What parts of prison life made you feel angry or stressed?

Probe:
  o *Did you get along with other prisoners?*
  o *What type of prisoners do you get along with?*
  o *Why did you not get along with some prisoners?*
  o *What did you find difficult about prison life?*

- o *How would you cope from heated confrontations with other prisoners or staff members?*
- o *Did you find others being upset or stressed upsetting?*

- In times where you felt stressed or frustrated inside prison how would you deal with that?

Probe:
- o *Do you deal with stress well?*
- o *What makes you feel less stressed/angry?*
- o *Are there people that you were able to confide in?*
- o *Did you feel like you could seek help with prison staff if things are not going well?*
- o *What ways can the prison service help prisoners deal with stress and anger?*

- *Is mental health a concern in prison?*

Probe:
- o *Is it treated properly by staff members?*
- o *Do you think violence in prison is linked to poor mental health? Can you think of examples?*

Life before prison: *Aim is to find out how a prisoner's life before prison has potentially affected their experiences in prison. In other words, how their values and experiences have been imported into the prison environment.*

- Before you went to prison what did you like doing?

Probe:
- o *Work*
- o *Friends*
- o *Activities*

- What parts of life did you find difficult?

Probe:
- o *How did you deal with those difficulties?*
- o *Did you have any support?*
- o *Has any of this affected your life in prison?*

Prisoners and Prison staff: *Aim is to get a sense of how prisoners view their relationships with other staff members. And what ways can these relationships be improved.*

- Do you consider prison officer treatment of prisoners to be fair?

Probe:
- o Can you think of any examples of fair treatment?
- o Can you think of any examples of unfair treatment?
- o Do officers respond to confrontations between prisoners fairly?
- o How well did the key worker scheme work for you?
- o In what ways can prison officers improve their treatment of prisoners?
- o Are there types of staff members that you found more approachable than others? Why is that?

Prison Incentives: *Aim is to find out whether prisoners view incentives positively and does it contribute to good behaviour.*

- Do you think that the incentives offered to prisoners are helpful?

Probe:
- ○ Which incentives did you find important?
- ○ Do you think incentives help improve prisoner behaviour? What do you think is better at improving behaviour?
- ○ Do incentives cause problems?
- ○ Can you think of any examples?

Life after Prison: *Aim is to find out what the prisoner feels about life after prison. And how prison has prepared them for that transition into the community.*

- Did you feel ready to be released?

Probe:
- ○ Is there anything about leaving prison that worried you? Or still worries you?
- ○ What kinds of things had you done in prison that have helped you?
- ○ Do you feel that the prison service had done enough in preparing you for release? Do you think they could have done more?

Final Questioning: *Consider everything that has been said and check back to see if there are any questions that have not been answered. Furthermore, ask if the participants have any concerns or questions of their own.*

Appendix 2: Information Sheet

Participant Information Sheet

Research Project Title

In light of the 'Prison Crisis', what are the explanations of, and solutions to, violence within prison? A qualitative study of recently released prisoners' perceptions of the current prison environment within England and Wales using a GST theoretical framework.

Who is undertaking the study?

My name is Thomas Wells, and I am a PhD student from the University of York. My department is Social Policy and Social Work. My research is being supervised by Sharon Grace and Dr Lisa O'Malley.

What is the purpose of the study?

The aim of my thesis is to gain an understanding of why violence occurs in English prisons. Through this knowledge I hope to influence future policy and practice to help reduce violent incidents and keep prisoners safe.

Why have I been invited to take part?

You have been invited to take part because you have recent experiences inside the prison environment. The knowledge and experiences that you have gained will be extremely useful in informing my research and future policy measures.

What does taking part involve?

This research will entail attending a face-to-face interview with me where I will ask you questions about your experiences in prison. You will not be asked to give information about specific events or members of staff, only your opinions and feelings about your experiences. The interview should last about an hour and will be held in a room provided by the probation service or can be held via video call if you would prefer. Please make sure that you read this information sheet carefully and fully, and if there is anything further that you need to know or if you still have concerns about the research, please ask a staff member to email me or my supervisors.

Do I have to take part?

After reading this information, if you decide this project is not for you, you have the right not to take part. You are also permitted to leave the interview session at any point and/or not answer any questions. If you wish to take part, please let a member of staff know. You will also be provided with a consent form so that you can give your consent to be interviewed. There will also be an opportunity to ask any questions you might have about the study at this stage.

What are the benefits and risks of participating?

There are some minor risks you should be aware of. It is for example possible that accidentally questions may stray into areas which could cause you distress. In such cases there will be the opportunity to take time out and to consider whether to continue. The interviewer will direct you to sources of support if this situation occurs. The interview will be conducted in a socially distanced manner and all covid-related practices will be adhered to at all times. The benefits for participating however, is that your contribution will likely have a positive impact on future research and policies aimed at reducing prison violence.

Will I be identified in any research outputs?

It should be stressed that you will not be identified in any research outputs. When analysing the data all participants will be given pseudonyms (different names) in order for them to not be identifiable in the findings of the thesis.

How will you keep my data secure?
For how long will you keep my data?
Will you share my information with anyone else?

All data will be stored on the internal server of the University of York's Department of Social Policy and Social Work in a secure password protected area. Physical documents such as consent forms, transcripts and sheets containing personal information will be stored in a locked filling cabinet for which only the main researcher will have the key. Anonymised data transcripts will be kept for 10 years from the last requested access. They will also be archived in the UK Data Service by the request of the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) if consensually approved by participants. Consent forms will be disposed of three years after completing study. Both audio recordings and basic personal information documents will be disposed of at the end of study. Expected end of study is September 2023. Your names will not appear in the findings of my research. Instead, you will be given pseudonyms (alternative names). None of your personal information shall be shared with anyone else.

Who is funding the research?

Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC)

Who has given approval to conduct the research?

The approval has been given by the National Research Committee and the Her Majesty's Prison & Probation Service (HMPPS).

How do I find out more information?

Ask the staff members at the Approved Premises if you need more information. The staff members will direct your questions to the researcher.

Support Services

If you need general emotional support, call the Samaritans free 24/7 phone number '116 123' or email them at 'jo@samaritans.org'.

How do I make a complaint?

In the first instance complaints should be directed to an appropriate staff member within the probation service who will be directed to the researcher. If the participant is not satisfied, they may approach the Departmental Ethics Committee using the email address: spsw-ethics@york.ac.uk.

Data Information Sheet

Project Research Title

In light of the 'Prison Crisis', what are the explanations of, and solutions to, violence within prison? A qualitative study of prisoners' and prison staffs' perceptions of the current prison environment within England and Wales using a GST theoretical framework.

The purpose of this information sheet is to explain how your data will be used and protected, in line with General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).

On what basis will you process my data?

Under the GDPR, the University must identify a legal basis for processing personal data and, where appropriate, an additional condition for processing special category data.

In line with our charter which states that we advance learning and knowledge by teaching and research, the University processes personal data for research purposes under Article 6 (1) (e) of the GDPR:

Processing is necessary for the performance of a task carried out in the public interest

Research will only be undertaken where ethical approval has been obtained, where there is a clear public interest and where appropriate safeguards have been put in place to protect data.

In line with ethical expectations and to comply with common law duty of confidentiality, we will seek your consent to participate where appropriate. This consent will not, however, be our legal basis for processing your data under the GDPR.

How will you use my data?

Data will be processed for the purposes outlined in this notice and in the main information sheet. All interviews will be audio-recorded (with consent). The device used for audio-recording will be password protected; the audio file will be transferred to the secure University of York encrypted fileserver at the earliest opportunity and then deleted from the recording device. You will be required to provide informed consent for participation. This will include your signature. These consent forms will be kept in a locked cabinet that only the researcher has access to. The primary use of this research is to produce a PhD thesis. The anonymised findings will be analysed, and a research paper submitted to the University and to a journal with the aim of publication. A summary of the findings will also be shared with those who took part in the study and with the Her Majesty's Prison & Probation Service.

How will you keep my data secure?

The University will put in place appropriate technical and organisational measures to protect your personal data and/or special category data. For the purposes of this project, we will ensure that all audio files and interview transcripts are password protected and saved onto the secure University of York fileserver.

Information will be treated confidentiality and shared on a need-to-know basis only. The University is committed to the principle of data protection by design and default and will collect the minimum amount of data necessary for the project.

Will you share my data with 3rd parties?

Data will only be accessible to the principal researcher (Thomas Wells). I will request that other researchers have access to the anonymised transcript for future research, but you will have the opportunity to opt out of this at the consent stage.

Will I be identified in any research outputs?

You will not be identified in any research output. Names will not be used. Consent will be required for us to use direct quotes in publications, but these will be untraceable back to participants. Participants do not have to consent to this.

How long will you keep my data?

Data will be retained in line with legal requirements or where there is a business need. Retention timeframes will be determined in line with the University's Records Retention Schedule. Anonymised transcripts will be kept for ten years from the end of the study; consent forms will be kept for three years from the end of the study; audio recordings will be deleted at the end of the study.

What rights do I have in relation to my data?

Under the GDPR, you have a general right of access to your data, a right to rectification, erasure, restriction, objection or portability. You also have a right to withdrawal. Please note, not all rights apply where data is processed purely for research purposes. For further please contact the researcher.

For this particular study, you have the right to withdraw your data up to two weeks after your interview has taken place.

Questions

If you have any questions about this participant information sheet or concerns about how your data is being processed, please contact thomas.wells@york.ac.uk. If you are still dissatisfied, please contact the University's Acting Data Protection Officer at dataprotection@york.ac.uk.

If you are unhappy with the way in which the University has handled your personal data, you have a right to complain to the Information Commissioner's Office. For information on reporting a concern to the Information Commissioner's Office, see www.ico.org.uk/concerns.

Appendix 3: Consent Form

Project title: In light of the 'Prison Crisis', what are the explanations of, and solutions to, violence within prison? A qualitative study of recently released prisoners' perceptions of the current prison environment within England and Wales using a General Strain Theory theoretical framework.

		Please initial box
1	I have been told what this research is about and what it involves. I have been given an information sheet and have had opportunity to ask questions.	
2	I understand that I do not have to take part in the research. I am free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason and without affecting any of the services I receive.	
3	I will not be named in any research reports, and my personal information will remain confidential.	
4	I understand that if the researcher thinks that I, the participant or someone else might be at risk of harm, they may have to contact the relevant authorities. But they will try and talk to me first about the best thing to do.	
5	I agree to be audio-recorded.	
6	I understand that my words, but not my name, may be used in research reports.	
7	I understand that I will not be able to amend or withdraw information I provide after 2 weeks.	
8	I agree for my anonymous data to be archived at UK Data Service for 10 years, and to be used by other researchers or in future research studies	
9	I understand that information I provide will be used for a PhD thesis, a summary provided to the Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service and may be released in the form of a journal article.	
10	I agree to take part in the research	

Participant signature: _____   Date: _____
Researcher signature: _____   Date: _____

Appendix 4: Spending Account Table

Table 4: Spending Account Table (MoJ, 2022a:11)

Level	Un-convicted	Convicted
Basic	£27.50	£5.50
Standard	£60.50	£19.80
Enhanced	£66.00	£33.00

Table outlining how much prisoners can transfer to their spending account based upon their Incentives and Earned Privileges level (MoJ, 2022a:11).

Appendix 5: 20 Questions That Emerged Through Exploring GST

1. How can general strain theory be adapted to a qualitative analysis?

2. What methods am I going to use to measure magnitude?

3. How can I best discuss with prisoners their negative emotions without it becoming an ethical problem?

4. In what ways does the current English and Welsh social structure (macro level) tend to produce strain in individuals?

5. What are the various means of coping that prisoners will use?

6. Which emotions contribute the most towards violence within prison?

7. What are the legitimate and illegitimate means of coping in prison?

8. What interviewing technique is most suitable for a general strain theory approach?

9. Which prison strains are most associated with 'denial of positive goals'?

10. Which prison strains are most associated with 'removal of positive stimuli'?

11. Which prison strains are most associated with "presentation of noxious stimuli'?

12. Does prison categorisation matter when it comes to strain and prison violence?

13. How do race relations within prison factor into GST?

14. Would England and Wales prison strains differ from United States prison strains?

15. How much does drug taking factor into illegitimate prison coping?

16. What strains do people import into the prison environment?

17. Which England and Wales prison policies exacerbate strains?

18. Which England and Wales prison policies help alleviate strains?

19. Would prison GPs or psychologists be good to interview?

20. In what ways does IEP affect prisoner coping behaviour?

Appendix 6: Recruitment Poster

Thomas Wells

CAN YOU HELP? YOUR VIEWS ARE IMPORTANT!

1 HOUR INTERVIEW

UNIVERSITY of York

About Me

My name is Thomas Wells and I am doing research at the University of York. I would like to ask about your experiences and opinions on prison.

Why take part?

Your views will be part of the findings of the research which aims to suggest improvements to the prison service.

THE RESEARCH

The research topic

The project is looking into the stress caused by life in male prisons. You will be asked a variety of questions that are linked to your experiences before and during imprisonment.

Interviews

The interviews will last about 1 hour. Interviews will be recorded and take place in a private room at the Approved premises.

Consent

All interviews will be confidential and consent will be asked before the interviews begin. You are not obligated to answer any questions you are not comfortable with.

If you are interested in taking part, please ask one of the Approved Premises staff members to hand you an information sheet.

Appendix 7: NVivo Codebook

Table 5: NVivo Codebook

Name	Description	Files	References
Anticipated Violence		0	0
Anticipated Fights		3	4
Uneasy atmosphere		4	4
Avoidance Behaviour		0	0
Adapting smoking habits		1	1
Avoid 3 IEP		1	2
Avoid acting like a gangster		1	1
Avoid Aggressive Prisoners		2	2
Avoid bad mouthing inmates		1	1
Avoid being hopeful		1	1
Avoid big groups		2	3
Avoid confrontations		3	3
Avoid courses		2	2
Avoid Crowds		1	1
Avoid debt		5	5
Avoid dislikes		1	1
Avoid Drug Dealers		6	6
Avoid drug users		2	2
Avoid education		1	1
Avoid erratic prisoners		1	1
Avoid escalations		10	11
Avoid Foolish Prisoners		6	7
Avoid getting in trouble		1	2
Avoid IEP warnings		1	1
Avoid Making Friends		1	1
Avoid officer favouritism		1	1
Avoid Officers		1	1
Avoid reporting staff		2	2
Avoid seeking help in case it affects their release		1	2

Name	Description	Files	References
Avoid showering with others		1	1
Avoid spice		1	1
Avoid stress		2	2
Avoid taking drugs		4	4
Avoid thinking		1	1
Avoid thinking about family		4	5
Avoid violence		6	6
Avoid winding up officers		1	2
Avoid younger prisoners		1	2
Avoiding going outside		1	1
Aware of who can deal with stress well		1	1
Being careful around mentally unwell prisoners		1	2
Desire to avoid recall		2	2
Importance of avoiding violence		1	1
Importance of observation and avoiding violence		4	5
Keep yourself to yourself		11	12
Kept myself to myself		5	5
Make sure you've got an escape		1	1
Sleep during the day		2	3
Violence avoidance behaviour		1	1
Walk away from fights		2	2
Covid Impact		0	0
Covid affecting mental health		3	4
Covid Affecting Release		1	1
Covid and Boredom		6	6
Covid and concern for family		1	1
Covid and essential workers		1	1

Name	Description	Files	References
Covid blocked programmes		1	5
Covid blocking visits		8	10
Covid has made staff lazy		5	8
Covid increase in drug taking		1	1
Covid made drugs more expensive		2	2
Covid measures and prisoner frustration		2	2
Covid prison quieter		1	1
Covid reducing drugs		1	1
Covid servery worker		1	1
Covid stopped jobs		3	3
Covid stopping spice		2	2
Freedom and Covid		3	3
Freedom before covid		1	1
Impact of Covid		2	2
Lack of information during covid		1	1
Less drugs		2	2
Less violence		6	7
Officers don't care during covid		3	3
Post-covid officers not ready		2	3
Quieter during Covid		2	2
Taking back control of the prison		1	3
Enhanced Prisoners		0	0
Basic and mental health		1	1
Blocked from enhanced		1	1
Clean enhanced wing		1	1
Desire for enhanced		15	19
Enhanced and greenspace		1	1
Enhanced and increased wages		1	1

Name	Description	Files	References
Enhanced does not reduce violence		2	2
Enhanced for desired items		2	2
Enhanced for poor behaviour		2	3
Enhanced helps with parole		2	3
Enhanced is not worth it		8	10
Enhanced not help with parole		1	1
Enhanced only good if money is getting sent in		2	2
Enhanced to protect prisoners		1	1
Fewer fights in enhanced		1	1
Losing enhanced unfairly		4	4
Officers desire to take enhanced away		1	1
Refuse Enhancement		1	1
Family Connections		0	0
Family Strains		0	0
Change behaviour for family		1	1
Difficulties of keeping in touch with family		3	3
Family Financial Support		9	10
Lost Family Contact		10	11
No Family Financial Support		1	1
Prisoners demanding money from family		2	2
Stress from upset family member		12	18
Threats towards family members		1	1
Prison Phones		0	0
Blocked from family contact		1	3

Name	Description	Files	References
Importance of family connections		5	6
Importance of phone calls		9	11
Phones and frustration		5	6
Phones and Violence		3	3
Prison Visits		0	0
Anger at messed up visit		1	1
Desire more visits		3	4
Distance and Visits		7	9
Importance of physical contact with family		1	1
Less visits means less drugs		4	4
Look forward to visits		2	2
Purple Visits		3	5
Short sentence and visits		1	1
Visits and frustration		2	4
Visits and strip searches		1	2
Government Decisions		0	0
Government Corruption		1	1
Political penal popularism		1	1
Greenspace		0	0
Enjoy gardening		1	2
Good Greenspace		11	13
Greenspace not for prisoners		1	1
Limited Greenspace		9	10
Miss Greenspace		1	1
Novelty of Greenspace		4	4
PIPE and Greenspace		1	1
Therapeutic Greenspace		7	8
Pre and Post Prison		0	0
Desire for a CSC card		2	3
Desire for a job post-prison		1	1
Difficulties of release		1	1

Name	Description	Files	References
Difficulties with confrontation once released	275	1	1
Finished with prison life		1	1
No preparation for release		14	16
Post Prison Life Stress		9	10
Pre-prison life		8	8
Pre-prison stress and experience		10	12
Well prepared for release		1	1
Prison Activities		0	0
Association Activities		0	0
Importance of association		3	3
Importance of pool		5	7
Large numbers during association		1	1
Less time for association		1	2
Limited Association Time		3	3
Pool and Violence		5	6
Desire for activities		0	0
Activities access varies across prisons		1	1
Creativity vs boredom		6	8
Desire purposeful opportunities		1	1
False Advertisement of Activities		1	1
Freedom and Activities Pre-Covid		1	1
Kick off due to lack of activities		3	3
Less stress due to finding activities		1	2
Less to do in Some Prisons		1	1
Limited activities		8	8
Limited Purposeful Opportunities		8	10

Name	Description	Files	References
Loss of creative options	276	1	1
Not able to pursue passions in prison		1	1
Stress from lack of activities		5	6
Gym and Sport		0	0
Blocked from the gym		3	3
Covid Limited Exercising		1	1
Covid Tests Impacting Association		1	1
Desire for boxing		2	2
Desire for sports		1	1
Desire gym due to insecurity		1	1
Desire sporting activities		1	1
Gym and making friends		1	1
Gym and violence		3	3
Gym not for everybody		1	1
Importance of the gym		9	11
Limited gym time		3	3
More gym post-covid		1	1
No sport		1	1
Other wings got more exercise time		1	1
In-cell Activities		0	0
Childish activities		4	5
Enjoyed betting		1	1
Writing letters		3	3
Prison Apps		0	0
Apps and delays		1	1
Apps and frustration		1	1
Apps instead of officers		1	1
Apps used as communication		1	1
Unanswered Apps		4	5
Prison Bullying		0	0

Name	Description	Files	References
Anti-Bullying Courses		1	1
Anti-bullying prisoners		6	8
Bullied anti-social prisoners		1	1
Bullied for Items		1	1
Vulnerable bullied out of their items		2	2
Bullied for money at the kiosk		1	1
Bullied into a VP wing		1	1
Bullied Older Prisoners		5	5
Bullied Vulnerable		8	8
Bullies cause anger		1	1
Bullies unaware of their bullying behaviour		1	1
Bully cellmate to get single cell		1	1
Bully spice takers		1	1
Bullying and confidence		3	3
Bullying and Weakness		7	7
Bullying as violence		2	2
Bullying between officers		5	7
bullying causes violence		2	2
Bullying for Enjoyment		1	1
Bullying is not violence		1	1
Drug Dealers and Safety		2	2
High amounts of bullying in lower security prisons		1	1
Long-term sentenced bullies		2	2
Opportunistic Bullies		1	1
The bullied kept safe		1	1
The negative effects of 1 bully		1	3
Prison Cell		0	0
Bang up		0	0

Name	Description	Files	References
Bang up and alone in your thoughts		2	2
Bang up and frustration		6	8
Bang up and mental health		2	2
Don't mind bang up		2	2
Hated Bang-up		6	6
Jealousy of others not locked up		1	2
Locked up and boredom		3	3
Main wing longer lock up		1	1
Prefer bang up		2	2
Stuck in your cell		3	5
Too Long Lock-up		6	8
Too much lock up		12	17
Cell Activities		0	0
Challenges of in-cell work		2	2
Desire for in-cell work		2	2
In-cell education and boredom		6	6
More Activities in Cells		1	1
Cell Conditions		0	0
Benefits of shower in cell		1	1
Cell not safe		2	2
Mostly Single Cells		1	1
Phones in cell		5	5
Poor cell conditions		3	6
Poor cell design		2	3
Refuse poor cells		1	1
Shower in cell		1	1
Tiny Cell		7	8
Turning singles to doubles		6	7
Cell Safety and Coping		0	0

Name	Description	Files	References
Being considerate to pad mate		1	2
Cell Block Safe Space		13	21
Damage cell		1	1
Defending the cell		1	1
Getting along with pad mates		1	1
Importance of locking the cell		4	5
Locked in cell for safety		2	2
Sharing and compromises		2	3
Smash Pads		9	11
Stay in Cell to Cope		3	4
Keeping Cell Clean		0	0
Clean pad		2	3
Dirty Prisoners		5	7
Importance of cleanliness		7	9
Sharing and Conflict		0	0
Arguing pad mates		2	3
Bored of the same pad		1	1
Bully Pad Mate		8	8
Challenges of sharing cells		11	13
Changing Pad Mates		2	2
Desire for pad mate to be moved		1	3
Doesn't matter who your cell mate is		1	1
Double Cells		3	4
Fights in pad		1	1
Kick cell mate out		2	2
Officers purposefully putting people with unsuitable pad mates		2	3
Pad mate stealing meds		1	2
PTSD and Sharing		1	1

Name	Description	Files	References
Refusal to share cell		1	1
Scary pad mate		1	1
Sharing cell and Suicide		1	1
Sharing cell with friends		1	1
Sharing makes time drag		1	1
Sharing with an ADHD prisoner		1	1
Sharing with an unhygienic prisoner		3	3
Sharing with an unstable pad mate		1	1
Single cell for mental health		2	2
Stress of sharing		14	17
Violence against Cell mate		9	9
Single Cell		0	0
Benefits of single cells		6	8
Control who is in your room		1	1
Desire to be in a single cell		11	16
More reflective in a single cell		2	2
Single cell and declining mental health		1	1
Single cells for those at risk		1	1
Television		0	0
Frustrations over television		7	7
Limited tv channels		3	3
Television and Conflict		6	6
Television and coping		2	2
Television and Mental Health		3	4
Prison Communication		0	0

Name	Description	Files	References
Importance of Communicating Feelings	281	13	18
Importance of listening		7	8
Lack of communication		12	14
No Explanations		2	2
Prison Complex		0	0
English Prisons		0	0
Better Experience in Cat C prisons		1	1
Dangerous large prisons		1	1
Dangerous remand prisons		7	8
Dangers of the canteen		4	4
Desire to be in a low security prison		1	1
Freedom in open prisons		1	1
Frightening VP wing		1	2
Greater Freedoms in PIPEs		1	2
Higher Security Prisons Better Experience		2	2
Large prisons unsafe		1	1
Lower security prisons less secure		1	1
More humane wing		1	1
Pains of Lower Security Prisons		2	3
Prison design		1	1
Prisons were more violent in the past		1	2
Private vs HMP Prisons		5	6
Scary High-security prisons		5	5
Some prisons are more violent		1	1
Stitched up on VP wings		1	1
Unadaptable Prisons		1	2

Name	Description	Files	References
Category C Prison		1	9
Prison Conditions		0	0
Accepting poor prison conditions		1	1
Accepting Prison Conditions		4	4
Anger at poor conditions		2	2
Calmer prison conditions		1	1
Calmer prison conditions (2)		1	1
Conditions		25	33
Dirty Conditions		5	5
Dirty conditions and frustration		3	4
Disgusting Toilets		5	5
Category B prison		1	9
Good Conditions Poor Experience		1	1
Prison conditions and mental health		10	10
Prison conditions least of their concerns		1	1
Prisons Clean		5	5
Prisons will get worse		3	4
Rodents		5	7
Some prisons are worse than others		1	1
Victorian prison poor conditions		4	4
Prison Overcrowding		0	0
Little Overcrowding		2	2
Overcrowding and violence		12	15
Violence and Crowds		1	1
Prison Coping		0	0
Acupuncture		2	2
Art and Coping		2	3

Name	Description	Files	References
Benefits of reading		1	1
Benefits of yoga		1	1
Boredom and Drugs		4	5
Boredom and eating		1	1
Boredom and Frustration		14	18
Breathing techniques		1	1
Chapel and meditation		2	2
Coping and Masculinity		5	6
Coping strategies		4	4
Dangers of acting hard		1	1
Emotional management		1	1
Ex-Military and Coping		2	4
Exercise and Stress		1	1
Exercise to relieve stress		1	1
Faith and self-improvement		1	1
Gaming Destress		7	9
Handle Myself		1	1
Importance of being proactive		4	5
Importance of confidence		4	4
Importance of Passions		1	1
Importance of Patience		1	1
Jumping on the netting		5	7
Keep mind active		1	1
Learn to cope with prison		1	1
Must defend yourself		2	4
Must entertain yourself		1	1
Overly needy prisoners		1	1
Prisoners police themselves		1	1
Problem of prisoners lifting weights		1	2
Ramifications of jumping the netting		2	2
Religion and Stress		1	2
Safety and Body Size		1	1

Name	Description	Files	References
Self-Control		1	1
Self-defence		1	1
Self-harm and Coping		6	7
Self-harm for attention		3	3
Self-harm for help		4	4
Shower safety methods		2	2
Stand up for yourself		5	8
Stress Balls		1	1
Weapons as protection		1	1
Wear a mask		4	4
Yard as an escape		1	1
Prison Cost and Income		0	0
Charging for television		1	1
Cost of technology		1	1
Cost of televisions		1	1
Costly items		1	1
Costly Phone Calls		1	1
Desire for better pay		1	1
Difficulties choosing what to buy		1	1
Expensive desired items		3	3
Expensive products		2	2
Expensive vape habit		1	1
Family Financial Support		9	10
Feeling ripped off		1	1
Good wage		1	1
Income through creativity		2	2
Lack of income		6	7
Laundry worker and charging extra		1	1
Loss of income and misbehaviour		2	3
Need for phone credit		3	3
Not Paid Enough		1	1

Name	Description	Files	References
Not paid enough to buy vapes	285	2	2
Poor wages		6	7
Rise of cost of living		8	9
Rise of wages		3	3
The cost of addiction		5	5
Varying prisoner income		2	2
Wages and violence		1	2
Prison Debt		0	0
Anyone can get into Debt		3	3
Avoid debt		5	5
Clothes and Debt		1	1
Debt and pressing buzzer		1	1
Debt as bullying		2	2
Debt caused by lack of income		1	1
Debt follows you		1	1
Debt is their own fault		1	1
Debt target the vulnerable		1	2
Drugs and Debt		15	18
Less Debt		1	1
Measures to address debt		1	1
Naive prisoners and debt		1	1
New prisoners and debt		1	1
Vapes and Debt		13	14
Violence and Debt		18	29
Violence doesn't always resolve debt		1	1
Younger Prisoners and Debt		1	1
Prison Education		0	0
Art Education		5	7
Blocked education		1	1
Blocked from education		3	5
Dated Education		1	1

Name	Description	Files	References
Desire more education options		1	1
Education for targets		2	3
Education for the money		2	3
Education Goal		1	2
Education makes your day go slower		2	2
Education relieves boredom		1	1
Education Success and Mental health		9	13
Encouraged into education		2	2
Limited education attendance		1	1
Poor prison education		5	8
Strains of education		3	3
Uneducated prisoners		1	2
Prison Food		0	0
Desirability of cooking for yourself		2	2
Desire to buy food		4	5
Food and Frustration		16	21
Food Incentives		2	2
Good food cooks		1	1
Importance of food		1	1
Prisoners cooking their own food		4	5
Small Food Meals		4	5
Unhealthy Food		5	5
Unimproved Food		3	3
Wrong portions of food		1	1
Prison Gangs		0	0
Bullying gangs		1	1
Bully gangs		1	1
Muslims gangs and violence		2	3
No gangs		3	3
Safety and gang culture		18	24

Name	Description	Files	References
Separating Gang Members		5	5
Southern Gang Violence		7	7
Violent prison gangs		5	5
Young violent gangs		1	1
Prison Grassing		0	0
Dangers of Grassing		11	16
Dangers of working with Senior Officers		1	2
Get rid of the grassing stigma		1	1
Grassing between officers		1	1
Grassing to get friendly with officers		1	2
Screw Boys		2	3
Prison Health		0	0
Ill health and being viewed as a problem		1	1
Poor health and Limited opportunities		2	2
Prison Honesty and Trust		0	0
Difficulties of trust		7	9
Don't Trust Prisoners		4	4
Finding who to trust		5	5
Lack of honesty		5	6
Lying Authority Figures		4	5
Prisoners hate liars		2	5
Unkept promised courses		1	1
Prison Isolation		0	0
Dangers of isolation		1	1
Enjoy solitude		1	2
Isolation and coping		6	9
Loneliness		2	3
Prison Items		0	0
Accessible Weapons		10	11
Annoying prisoners asking for stuff from others		3	3

Name	Description	Files	References
Desire civilian clothes		1	1
Desire for a DVD player		5	7
Desire for Dictaphones		1	1
Desire for gaming consoles		1	2
Desire for Headphones		2	2
Desire kettle in cell		1	2
Desire to keep tvs		1	1
Desire weapon for safety		1	1
Desired items		1	4
Frustration of being unable to fix broken items		1	1
Increase Purchasable Products		1	1
Item delays cause kick offs		1	1
Long wait for desired items		2	2
Pain of losing items		9	9
Violence over clothes		1	1
Prison Jobs		0	0
Always Working		1	1
Better relationships with staff through jobs		1	1
Desire interesting jobs		1	1
Desire More Creative Options		4	4
Desire vocational work		1	1
Desire work not education		6	7
Differing job opportunities in different prisons		2	2
Enjoy creative jobs		5	6
Enjoy jobs that help people		1	1
Freedom of cleaning jobs		4	4
Given job due to mental health		1	1
Goal of getting a job		2	2
Importance of Enjoying Work		1	1

Name	Description	Files	References
Importance of jobs		20	33
Inactive Cleaners		6	7
Job for money		1	1
Job Jealousy		2	4
Job offers freedom		2	2
Job Pay		1	1
Job satisfaction		2	2
Job stress		1	1
Job Types		9	12
Job work		3	3
Jobs and Activities time went quick		2	2
Jobs and feeling normal		1	2
Jobs and mental health		1	1
Jobs and officer favouritism		6	7
Jobs and Power		3	5
Jobs get you out the cell		2	2
Limited Jobs		10	13
Lots of jobs		1	1
Lucky to have a job		1	1
Main wings got the best jobs		1	1
No guarantee of jobs		5	5
No Variation		2	2
No Variety of jobs		2	3
Only Allowed out for Work		1	1
Others affecting job experience		1	3
Physically unable to work		2	2
Quit job due to mental health		2	2
Route to work		2	3
Safe at work		1	1
Skilled prisoners		1	1
Turn over of Cleaners		1	1

Name	Description	Files	References
Work and mental health		1	1
Work Hours		2	2
Work Hours leads to not seeing friends		1	1
Work over bang up		6	7
Work that's not for him		2	2
Working kitchens during covid		1	1
Prison Kiosk		0	0
Ignored Apps on Kiosk		4	5
Kiosk and Frustration		1	2
Kiosk Items		1	1
Prison Meds		0	0
Blocked access to meds		2	2
Desire for meds		6	7
Illicit drugs instead of meds		1	2
Importance of meds		3	3
Meds are not enough		4	6
Meds arrive on time		1	1
Meds doesn't cure stress		2	3
Meds Waiting Time		4	5
Self-harm for meds		1	1
Stealing Meds		1	1
Prison Music		0	0
Importance of Music		6	7
Music and Frustration		5	7
Music refusing to work		1	1
Saved by Music		5	5
Prison Negative Emotions		0	0
Anger over officers		1	1
Anxiety around other prisoners		1	2
Anxiety disorder and sharing		1	1
Arguments playing on prisoners minds		1	1

Name	Description	Files	References
Being antagonised and frustration		1	1
Depression and anxiety		11	14
Emotional Explosion		1	3
Feeding off Negativity		1	1
Jealousy and Violence		1	1
Managing violent emotions		1	2
Moaning Prisoners		1	1
Pent up Anger		4	7
Short Tempered Prisoners		1	1
Why prisoners are aggressive		1	1
Worry about violence		1	1
Prison Outside Cell		0	0
Desire to be in the yard		4	6
Desire to be outside		11	15
Importance of being outside		1	1
Relief of being out the cell		1	1
Prison Pains		0	0
Being treated like a child		2	2
Belittlement		1	1
Bitter prisoners		1	1
Blocked from proving innocence		1	1
Danger of broken confidentiality		8	8
Dehumanisation and prejudices		4	5
Delays and Cancellations		3	3
Deprivation of autonomy		3	3
False allegations		1	1
Feeling Forgotten		1	1
Hate urine tests		1	1
Importance of being humanised		1	1

Name	Description	Files	References
Innocent		2	2
Institutionalised		5	7
Lack of privacy		1	1
Lack of self-esteem		1	1
Loss of dignity		2	2
Medical Cancellations		3	3
Miss Freedom		2	2
Missing outside world		1	1
No voice in prison		1	1
Pain of being labelled as a risk		1	3
Pain of being labelled as violent		1	2
Pain of being recalled		3	4
Pain of blocked release		8	15
Pain of broken promises		3	7
Pain of feeling innocent		1	2
Pain of inconsistencies		1	2
Pain of Isolation		6	8
Pain of locked cell door		2	2
Pain of losing a family member		4	6
Pain of losing your past life		1	1
Pain of loss of liberty		1	1
Pain of media attention		1	1
Pain of mental abuse		1	1
Pain of negative thoughts		1	1
Pain of not having a job		1	2
Pain of OMU decisions		1	2
Pain of Part-time work		2	2
Pain of Regime Changes		2	5
Pain of rejections		1	1
Pain of seeing others upset		4	4
Pain of social distance		1	1
Pain of witnessing violence		1	2

Name	Description	Files	References
Pains of first-time prisoners		7	7
Prison doesn't like prisoners to have an opinion		1	1
Prisoners neglecting themselves		1	1
Secondary victimisation		1	1
Stress of washing day		4	4
Suicide and no one caring		1	1
Trauma experiences in prison		12	19
Wasted Time		1	1
Prison Parole and Risks		0	0
False assessments of prisoners		1	2
Pain of being labelled as a risk		1	3
Programmes to reduce risk		1	1
The pain of parole and assessments		15	23
Unforeseen delays on progression		2	2
Prison Privileges		0	0
Basic and Frustration		4	6
Bribery Reward Scheme		1	1
Desire for library access		1	2
Detrimental effects of IEP		3	3
Different Privileges for different wings		2	2
Don't Care about IEP		7	8
IEP Infraction and Mental Health		1	1
IEP and Parole		2	2
IEP and prejudice		1	1
IEP and Probation		1	2
IEP and rewarding good behaviour		1	1

Name	Description	Files	References
IEP for bullies		1	1
IEP given out unfairly		12	17
IEP Weaponised		13	17
Negative Impact of IEP		7	8
Not informed on getting IEP		2	3
Overuse of IEP		4	5
Receiving good IEP		1	1
Red bands get more opportunity		4	6
Reviewing IEP Decisions		1	1
Struggle with IEP		1	1
Under privileged prisoners		1	1
Unequal Privileges		1	1
Prison Programmes		0	0
Behavioural Programmes		3	4
Benefits of programmes		3	4
Cancelled Courses		4	5
Course requirements harming mental health		1	1
Courses too short		1	1
Dangers of programmes		3	4
Desire to not do programmes		1	3
Ineffective Programmes		4	4
Intense Programme		1	2
Join programmes for early release		1	1
Learning bad behaviours		2	2
Long Waiting Times for Programmes		3	3
Move prison to do course		1	1
Moved prisons for programmes		1	3
Non-Applicable Programmes		1	1

Name	Description	Files	References
Pointless Courses		5	5
Problems with CBT		2	2
Programmes and broken confidentiality		1	1
Programmes causing stress		2	3
Put on the Wrong Course		1	1
RESOLVE		1	1
Stress of behavioural programmes		1	1
TC Course		2	2
Unnecessary courses		2	2
Prison Regime		0	0
Accepting Routine Change		3	4
Choosing between shower and exercise		3	6
Covid Typical Day		25	37
Dangers of having all wings open at once		1	1
Dangers of strict regimes		5	5
Desire for things to go back to normal		1	1
Desire straight answers		1	1
Desire to Maintain Strict Regime		4	6
Disorganised prison and stress		1	1
Give prisoners what they are entitled to		1	1
Importance of routine		7	8
Inconsistent regime		1	1
Limited regime		3	4
Limited Shower Time		2	2
No Regime		3	4
No routine		2	2
Post-covid officers desires to keep strict rules		12	13

Name	Description	Files	References
Post-covid officers desires to keep strict rules (2)		12	13
Prefer a more controlled wing		1	1
Prison Routines		1	2
Progressive regime		1	1
Strict Covid Measures		5	6
Strict Prison Regime		4	6
Typical Day Pre-Covid		12	12
Prison Rehabilitation		0	0
Better prison life		1	1
Blocked from self-improving		1	1
Desire to write better		1	2
Goal of being better		1	1
Goal of Getting Out		6	7
Have to rehabilitate yourself		4	4
Importance of personal responsibility		1	2
No punishments for bad officers		1	1
Prefer to be in prison		1	1
Prison does too much for prisoners		1	1
Prison is easy now		1	3
Prison is not rehabilitative		8	11
Prison not a deterrent		2	2
Prison offers too much		3	3
Prisons and Discipline		2	2
Prisons stricter back in the day		2	3
Prisons only care about targets		1	2
Revolving door		1	1
Small Achievable Goals		2	2
Prison Respect		0	0

Name	Description	Files	References
Disrespect and violence		7	14
Importance of respect		14	18
Officers and respect		9	9
Over emphasis on respect		1	1
Prisoners have no respect		1	1
Respect from Staff		3	3
Prison Rules		0	0
Clothing Rules and Frustration		1	2
Desire to Understand		3	3
Different officers means more or less bang up		1	1
Flexible with Rules		1	1
Importance of equal treatment		4	4
Inconsistent Rules		6	8
Irrational Rules		2	2
Non-Sensical Rules		4	5
Officers have different rules		1	1
Poorly Defined Rules		2	2
Post-covid officers desires to keep strict rules		12	13
Rules Varying from Prison to Prison		3	4
Rules Varying from Prison to Prison (2)		3	4
Same Rules for all Prisons		3	3
Strain of prison rules		1	1
Treating prisoners equally		4	4
Unclear rules		3	3
Prison Sentence Impact		0	0
Challenges of IPP sentence		6	10
Dangerous CSC prisoners		1	1
Dangerous prisoners		1	1

Name	Description	Files	References
Difference between longer and shorter sentences		1	2
Intimidating lifers		3	3
Lifers and violence		5	7
Lifers have nothing to lose		3	4
Quick Short Sentence		1	1
Sentence Length and Income		1	1
Prison Socialising		0	0
Can't get along with everyone		1	1
Card Games		2	2
Choose friends wisely		1	2
Dangers of not having friends		1	1
Difficulties socialising		1	1
Difficulties with Conversations		1	1
Forced to socialise		1	1
Friends and Coping		2	2
Friends calming prisoner down		1	2
Friends Joining Fights		3	3
Friends like themselves		1	1
Friendships through vapes		1	1
Get along with friendly prisoners		1	1
Importance of getting along with everyone		11	13
Importance of rapport		2	2
Limited Socialising Time		1	1
Loads of friends		1	1
Lose Friends		1	1
Make friends through jobs		2	3
Mates Pre-prison		3	5
Miss socialising		1	1

Name	Description	Files	References
Prison life seeing the same faces	299	1	1
Prisoner Social Circles		4	5
Small Friendship Group		10	11
Sociable prisoners hate bang up		1	1
Talked to everyone		1	1
Prison Staff		0	0
Good and Bad Staff		0	0
Bad prison officers getting management positions		1	1
Desire to get rid of bad staff		1	1
Fair Prison Officers		1	1
Good and Bad Officers		10	10
Good Officers		5	5
Humanising Officers		1	1
Officers - Not a job for earning money		2	2
Officers importance of integrity		1	1
Some officers are better than others		1	1
Governor		0	0
Uncaring governor		1	2
Inmate and Staff Conflict		0	0
Assaults on officers		4	5
Being careful of what you say to officers		2	2
Can't win against staff		3	4
Corrupt Officers		9	10
Dangers of confronting officers		2	4
Dangers of violence against an officer		1	2
Officer aggression and violence		1	1

Name	Description	Files	References
Officers escalating altercations		1	1
Officers hated prisoners enjoying themselves		1	2
Officers purposefully winding prisoners up		6	12
Officers scared of big prisoners		1	1
Officers want a fight		1	1
Scary Officers		2	2
Staff assaults		2	2
Staff bullying		12	12
Staff slandering prisoners		1	2
Unable to argue with officers		2	2
Unable to assault an officer		2	2
Violence against young officers		1	1
Violent Officers		5	8
Your word against theirs		1	1
Old Staff		0	0
Fair older prison officers		5	5
Older Officers Don't Care		1	2
Older officers listen to you		4	4
Older officers more violent		1	1
Respect and Older staff		4	4
Strict Older Officers		1	1
Probation		0	0
Benefits of having the same probation officer		1	1
Don't trust probation		1	1
Poor probation staff decisions		1	1
Probation Pressures		3	4

Name	Description	Files	References
Unfair Probation Decisions		2	4
Staff Attitude		0	0
Officers Attitude		14	16
Officers desire an easier time		3	4
Officers dislike idiots		1	2
Officers don't trust prisoners		1	2
Officers hate paperwork		4	4
Officers lack of sympathy		1	1
Officers more open to chat		1	1
Officers only there for money		1	1
Private Prison Staff Care Less		1	2
Staff assuming the worst of you		1	1
Staff Don't Care		13	17
Staff have no empathy		4	6
Staff Behaviour		0	0
Angry officers		1	1
Manipulative officers		1	1
Officer favouritism		15	27
Officer response delays		1	1
Officers favouritism and violence		6	6
Officers making fun of unwell prisoners		2	2
Officers turning a blind eye		2	3
Servery worker preferential treatment		1	1
Sit in the office		8	9
Staff favouritism and education success		1	1

Name	Description	Files	References
Staff favouritism causing animosity		2	2
Staff taking vouchers from prisoners		1	1
Staff Competence		0	0
Decline of officer standards		1	1
Indecisive officers		1	1
Lack of trying to understand prisoner issues		1	1
Officers upsetting prisoners		2	2
Staff Coping and Health		0	0
Officers concerned about their safety		2	2
Officers don't deserve abuse		1	1
Officers in danger		1	1
Painful environment for officers		1	2
Staff and Safety		1	1
Stressed officers		1	1
Staff Experience		0	0
Desire experienced officers		1	1
Inexperience unable to diffuse violence		1	1
Inexperienced young officers		12	12
Lack of Experience		4	5
Officers and Experience		3	4
Quick officer promotions		1	1
Staff Gender		0	0
Bad female and male officers		1	1
Defending female officers		1	1

Name	Description	Files	References
Empathetic Female Officers		2	2
Staff Help		0	0
Desire for a fair officer		1	1
Dismissive staff		10	10
Few helpful staff		7	8
Few Officers listen		5	5
Ignored by Officers		2	2
Inactive Staff		7	7
Incompetent Officers		8	8
Officers importing their own problems into prison		1	1
Officers taking too long		1	2
Officers take too long to do tasks		1	1
Poor Officer Advice		1	1
Prison officers need to get to know prisoners		1	1
Staff lack of patience		1	1
Staff negligence		4	4
Staff only act in extreme cases		1	1
Uncaring officers		5	5
Unhelpful Staff		11	16
Unmotivated Staff		2	2
Very few guards help		2	2
Staff Neglect		0	0
Loud prisoners get attention		2	2
Officers neglecting prisoners		6	7
Prisoner neglect		5	6
Quiet prisoners get neglected		5	8
Staff Numbers		0	0
Impact of staff shortages		4	8

Name	Description	Files	References
Lack of Staff		14	19
Lack of staff less time for prisoners		1	1
Lack of staff post covid		4	4
Need more staff		1	1
Non-accessible officers		1	1
Officers quitting job		8	8
See less staff in lower security prisons		1	1
Staff shortages means more bang up		7	8
Staff unavailable during fights		1	1
Too many young officers		5	5
Staff Power and Control		0	0
Covid reducing officer activity		1	1
Frustration at abuse of power		1	1
Importance of proactive officers		3	3
Importance of staff resolving prisoner issues quickly		1	1
Non-reactive officers		3	3
Officer safety routines		1	1
Officers and power		13	18
Officers deal with bullies		1	1
Officers resolved fights		1	2
Officers resolving confrontations		1	1
Officers scared to confront violence		2	2
Overly restraining prisoners		1	1
Overuse of Force		11	16
Overuse of force and injury		4	4

Name	Description	Files	References
Overuse of force and riots	305	1	1
Prison Officer Calm you Down		1	1
Reactive Prison Officers		5	6
Staff not proactive		1	2
Staff tackling bullying		1	1
Suspended for overuse of force		1	1
Unfair officer decisions		4	4
Staff Promises		0	0
Forgetful Officers		4	6
Officers failed promises		1	1
Young Staff		0	0
Helpful new officers		1	1
Nightmare Young Officers		3	3
Poor younger officer attitude		2	2
Prefer younger staff		4	5
Young officers at risk		1	1
Younger officers don't help		1	1
Younger officers looking down on prisoners		2	2
Prison Substances		0	0
Attaining Drugs		0	0
Desire to attain drugs and violence		4	5
Desire to go into prison to deal drugs		2	4
Lying to doctors for drugs		1	1
Avoiding Drugs		0	0
Drugs and Guilt		2	2
Goals of getting off drugs		5	8
Drugs and Coping		0	0

Name	Description	Files	References
Drugs and mental health		3	3
Drugs and Self-harm		2	3
Drugs relieve stress and boredom		4	5
Drugs Impact		0	0
Addiction and not considering consequences		1	1
Addiction and violence		1	1
Drugs and Lose Job		1	1
Drugs and violence		7	7
Negative effects of drug tests		1	1
Overdose during Covid		3	3
Other Drugs		0	0
Common Substances		2	2
Subutex		4	4
Prison Alcohol		0	0
Alcohol		2	2
Brew Hooch		2	2
Past Alcoholism		3	3
Stop Alcohol Drinking		1	1
Worried about alcohol		1	1
Spice		0	0
Dangers of spice		1	1
Spice and Mayhem		9	11
Spice and Paranoia		3	3
Spice and Violence		4	4
Spice and Well-being		11	12
Spice in envelopes		1	1
Spice is expensive		1	2
The Amount of Drugs		0	0
Drugs during covid		1	1
Limited drugs		1	1
Mass amount of Drugs		4	5

Name	Description	Files	References
Quantity of Drugs		4	4
Prison Support		0	0
Anger at lack of support		1	1
Befriending officers		2	4
Benefits of counselling		1	2
Benefits of Helping People		9	10
Benefits of Mentoring		1	1
Can't confide in anyone		9	10
Confide in Friends		5	6
Confide in good officers		5	6
Confide in Jehovah's witnesses		1	1
Confide in key worker		1	1
Confide in SMT		1	1
DART Team		3	9
Detrimental effects of asking for help		1	1
Disruptive prisoners get mental health support		1	1
Help prisoners with debt		1	1
Helpful OMU		2	4
Helping Others		10	15
Key Worker and Support		12	14
Lack of help and reoffending		1	1
Lack of support		3	4
Listeners support		10	16
Long waiting lists		4	8
Need for counselling		1	1
Need more support		3	3
No Key Worker Support		7	8
Only confide with your family		1	1
Poor Healthcare		5	8
Poor Mental Health Support		16	23

Name	Description	Files	References
Poor Support prior to Release		2	2
Support and Coping		1	1
Support by Doctors		1	1
Support Training		1	2
Supportive IPP wing		1	1
Unable to confide in officers		4	5
Unhelpful key worker support		1	1
Waiting lists		2	2
Prison Surveillance		0	0
Camera surveillance		1	1
Guard visibility		2	2
Officer surveillance		1	1
Surveillance and Violence		14	15
Prison Temperature		0	0
Extreme heat and coping		17	23
Freezing conditions		1	1
Heat and no violence		1	1
Heat and Violence		5	6
Poor ventilation		1	1
Prison Thieves		0	0
Hate Cell Thieves		5	6
Observing ATM Transactions		1	1
Robbed of canteen		2	2
Stealing and threatening for vapes		4	4
Stolen possessions		1	1
Violence on thieves		1	3
Prison Training		0	0
Improper Training		8	9
Mental Health Training		10	13
More Training		8	10

Name	Description	Files	References
Officers not trained to listen		1	1
Prison Vapes		0	0
Adapting smoking habits		1	1
Avoid borrowing vapes		1	1
Avoid lending vapes		1	2
Best to stop smoking		2	2
Desire for vapes		1	1
Frustration with being unable to buy vapes		1	1
Less time vaping when busy		1	1
Prisoners annoying others for vapes		2	3
Vapes and coping		4	8
Vapes causing more debt		3	4
Vapes is currency		2	2
Violence for vapes		6	7
Why fight for vapes		3	3
Prisoner Confidentiality		0	0
Broken Confidentiality		15	19
Importance of confidentiality		2	2
Prisoners gathering sensitive information		2	2
Prisoners Age		0	0
Age and managing stress		1	1
Assuming older prisoners as sex offenders		1	1
Impulsive Younger Prisoners		1	1
Macho young prisoners		4	4
Old timers' negative perceptions of modern prisons		2	2
Older prisoners love bang up		1	1

Name	Description	Files	References
Sensible Older Prisoners		1	1
Separate younger prisoners from older prisoners		2	3
Violence and younger prisoners		1	2
Violent young prisoners		2	6
Young friends enjoy fighting		1	1
Young prisoners need exercise		1	1
Younger ones on basic		1	1
Prisoners Attitudes		0	0
Cultural awareness		1	1
Do not care about consequences		1	1
False Perception of Prison		3	3
Goals once released		1	1
Hate sex offenders		1	2
Homophobia		3	3
Inactive Prisoners		2	2
Inconsiderate prisoners		1	1
Lazy prisoners		3	3
Let them fight		1	1
Not goal driven		3	3
Overly suspicious prisoners		3	3
Prisoners can't be bothered		1	1
Prisoners' expectations are too high		1	1
Race discrimination		1	2
Unmotivated Prisoners		5	5
Prisoners Mental Health		0	0
Deteriorating Mental Health		0	0
Inmates are getting worse		4	4
Mental health in prison		5	6

Name	Description	Files	References
Stressed Prisoners		3	3
Worsening mental health		5	6
False Mental Health		0	0
Falsely claiming mental health		1	1
Prisoners faking mental illness		1	1
Managing Mental Health		0	0
An Act and Mental Health		7	8
EDMR		1	4
Should be in a mental health unit		4	5
Mental Health and Coping		0	0
Accepting unwellness		1	1
Desire to understand oneself		1	2
Goals and suffering mental health		2	3
Importance of addressing mental health issues		1	1
Mental Health and Art		2	2
Mental health and poor coping		1	1
Mental Health Support		0	0
Blocked from mental health support		1	1
Desire for 1 to 1 support		1	1
Desire for therapy sessions		4	10
Desire more mental health staff		1	1
Diagnosis to help themself		1	1
Importance of a Psychologist		1	1
Lack of Mental Health Funding		1	1

Name	Description	Files	References
Limited time seeing mental health team	312	1	1
Long wait for mental health support		9	9
Mental health under-resourced		1	1
No mental health support at night		1	1
Not able to see mental health team		1	2
Positive mental health support		2	4
Mental Health Types		0	0
BPD		1	3
Claustrophobia		1	2
Negative effects of ADHD		2	3
Night Terrors		1	1
Personality Disorder and Frustration		4	9
PTSD		4	7
Serious Mental Illness		6	7
Prison Staff and Mental Health		0	0
Officers and prisoners mental health		1	1
Officers dismissive of mental health		1	1
Officers overwhelmed by mental health		1	1
Officers understanding of mental health		7	8
Scepticism and mental health		1	1
Staff against mediation		1	1
Staff mental health		1	1
Staff poor treatment of mentally ill		1	1

Name	Description	Files	References
They think mental health is a joke		1	2
Understanding of mental health		8	9
Violence and Mental Health		0	0
Dangerous mentally ill prisoners		1	1
Mental health and having a bad day		1	1
Mental health and violence		11	13
Rewarding Behaviour		0	0
Anti-violence rewards		1	2
Desire more incentives		7	9
Forgotten well behaved prisoners		2	2
IEP and rewarding good behaviour		1	1
Importance of recognising good deeds		1	1
Incentives does not reduce misbehaviour		1	1
Incentives given out too easily		4	4
No Incentive		4	5
No reward for working hard		1	1
Officers like well-behaved prisoners		1	1
Officers reward poor behaviour		2	2
Participate for Rewards		1	1
Problems with incentives		5	6
Rewards for good behaviour		5	6
Strain of Prison Noise		0	0
Anger and Loud Prisoners		6	6

Name	Description	Files	References
Autistic prisoners affected by noise	314	1	1
Certain landings are noisier than others		1	1
Constant Alarm Bells		8	8
Desire to be loud		1	1
Enjoy quietness		1	1
Hearing neighbours phone calls		1	1
Loud prisoners get attention		2	2
Loud Younger Prisoners		4	5
Lowering volume for neighbours		1	1
Methods of coping with noise		1	1
Music and Frustration		5	7
Noise Affecting Sleep		6	10
Noise and frustration		7	10
Non-Soundproof Walls		2	3
Prison horrendously noisy		1	2
Remove hearing aids to cancel noise		1	1
Thin Walls and frustration		1	2
Strain of Sleep Deprivation		0	0
Depression affecting sleep		1	2
Desire to sleep		5	6
Mental health and Poor Sleeping		1	1
Noise Affecting Sleep		6	10
Sleep and feelings of unsafety		1	1
Unsafe Prison Areas		0	0
Chaos Wings		1	1
Chapels and violence		1	2
Dangerous areas during covid		1	1

Name	Description	Files	References
Dangers of being moved from VP to mains		2	4
Dangers of moving to work		1	1
Dangers of stepping off the wing		1	1
Dinner cue and violence		1	1
Location and Violence		1	1
No prison is safe		2	2
Not safe anywhere		6	8
Queuing and Violence		2	2
Stabbings in Cat Cs		1	1
Unsafe Med Cues		4	5
Unsafe routes		1	1
Violence and showers		17	21
VP wings safer		1	1
Walk into violence		1	1
Wrong place wrong time		1	1
Yard least safe		3	4
Violence Behaviour		0	0
Accepting Prison Violence		2	4
Addressing offending behaviour		1	1
All areas are dangerous		2	2
Annoyance and violence		2	2
Anxiety and Violence		3	5
Anybody can be violent		1	1
Arguments and violence		2	3
Being assaulted is their own fault		1	1
Bribed to commit violence		2	2
Catch someone in a bad mood		1	1
Confrontations and anger		1	1
Constant violence		1	1
Daft Violence		1	1
Desire to fight		2	2

Name	Description	Files	References
Effects of past trauma		3	5
Extreme Violence		20	25
Fight off bullies		1	1
Fighting		1	1
Fights mostly between two people		2	2
Fist Fights		1	1
Frequent Violence		1	1
Gentlemen Violence		2	2
Harm those who hurt elderly		1	1
Hitman Violence		7	8
Knife crime importing into prison		2	4
Labels and violence		1	1
Looking at someone funny		1	1
Need to cause chaos		1	2
Persistent Violent Prisoner		1	1
Petty Violence		1	1
Pre-prison fighting experience		1	1
Premeditated violence		1	1
Pride and violence		1	1
Prisoner Power		2	2
Prisoners desires to cause disruptions		1	2
Prisoners winding each other up		1	1
Prisons more violent back in the day		1	1
Reactionary Violence		1	1
Sexual violence		1	3
Threats and Violence		5	5
Unnecessary violence		1	1
Verbal Abuse		4	5

Name	Description	Files	References
Violence against newcomers	317	1	1
Violence against prisoners spreading rumours		1	1
Violence against those acting hard		1	2
Violence and added sentence time		1	1
Violence and Blocked Release		1	1
Violence and grudges		1	1
Violence and Hierarchy		5	10
Violence and Lack of Patience		1	1
Violence and Religion		1	1
Violence and respect		1	1
Violence between enemies		1	1
Violence causing other inmates to be banged up		1	2
Violence Decrease		2	2
Violence depends on the jail and inmates		1	1
Violence due to fear		1	1
Violence During Covid		1	1
Violence escalation		3	3
Violence escalation post-covid		1	1
Violence for clothes and vapes		1	1
Violence for fun		2	2
Violence is frightening		1	1
Violence levels differs in different prisons		1	1
Violence on Landings		1	1
Violence on the Main Wings		1	1
Violence Rates		2	2

Name	Description	Files	References
Violence to future confrontations		2	2
Violence to relieve frustrations		1	1
Violence to transfer to other prisons		1	1
Violent attention seekers		1	1
Violent Drug Dealers		2	2
Violent Long-term prisoners		1	2
Violent Newbies		1	1
Violent Pasts		5	6
Violent poor copers		1	1
Violent prisoners found it difficult to find work		1	1
Violently Targeting Past Crimes		1	1
Violence Management		0	0
Advised not to get into debt		2	2
Banged up for fighting		1	1
Dangers of moving wings		9	12
Dangers of safer custody		1	1
Fewer people out on the landing at a time		1	1
Ineffective security measures		1	1
Lack of Punishment		4	8
Mediation for violence		2	2
Moved Wings		9	11
Prison advising against debt		1	1
Quiet prisoners more likely sent to segregation		1	1
Safety measures affecting quality of life		1	1
Separate violent prisoners		1	1
Separating prisoners by offence		1	1

Name	Description	Files	References
Technology and security measures		1	1
The block and debt		2	3
The block and moved prisons		2	2
Verbal Intervention and De-escalation		2	2
Zero tolerance punishment		2	5
Vulnerable prisoners		0	0
Attacked for past crime		1	1
Dealers taking advantage of vulnerable		1	1
Inmates weaponizing others past crimes		1	2
Newbies lacking confidence		1	2
Unsafe Non-violent Prisoners		1	1
Unsafe quiet prisoners		1	1
Unsafe Vulnerable		6	8
VP Prisoner		4	5
Vulnerable Drug Addicts		5	5
Vulnerable prisoners and numbers		3	3
Vulnerable Sex offences		2	2
Weakness		3	4
Weakness and accepting abuse		1	1