UNIVERSITY OF PLYMOUTH
School of Law, Criminology and Government

Dartmoor Dialogues: An Exploration of HMP Dartmoor's Journey towards becoming an Integrated Prison Underpinned by Restorative Practices

30 June 2020

A Report by Dr Patricia Gray, Reader in Criminology and Criminal Justice, with Dr Gisella Hanley Santos, Dr Arta Jalili Idrissi and Christine Kennedy

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

First, we would like to thank the Governing Governor of HMP Dartmoor, Bridie Oakes-Richards, who initiated this research and supported its progress throughout.

Special thanks to Maria Arpa, the Founder of the Centre for Peaceful Solutions, for her inspirational insight in foreseeing the value of introducing the Dialogue Road Map into a prison setting.

Special thanks also to the senior management team and all the prison officers at HMP Dartmoor, who gave up their time to talk to the research team.

Special thanks must particularly go to Lee Middleton, the Prison Co-ordinator of the Restorative Practice Project at HMP Dartmoor, who made the practical arrangements for the prisoner focus groups and smoothed the way for the research team.

The research team would like to thank the transcriber Karen Giles, who so brilliantly turned voices into words and provided such a powerful tool to appreciate the views of the research participants.

But none of this would have been possible without the frankness and openness of the prisoners who participated in the focus groups. We are extremely grateful for their willingness to share their experiences and insights into prison life. We hope that we have adequately reflected the strong and memorable impression their voices made on the research team.

Executive Summary

Research Context

Recent research and prison inspections have argued that prisons in England and Wales are in a state of crisis with repeated accounts of overcrowding, rising levels of violence and self-harm, and concerns about safety, substance misuse, deteriorating physical conditions and poor-quality resettlement provision. This has been during an era of significant cuts in prison budgets and staffing levels (HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, 2019; House of Commons Justice Committee [HCJC], 2019a and b; Prison Reform Trust, 2019). Amidst this crisis the HCJC (2019a) has called for a prison policy that aims to reform and to rehabilitate offenders as well as punish. In early 2017 academics from the School of Law, Criminology and Government at the University of Plymouth were invited by the Governor of HMP Dartmoor to research how the rehabilitation environment in the prison could be strengthened.

In 2015 HMP Dartmoor established itself as an integrated prison. This set in place a series of changes described by the Governor as the 'Dartmoor Journey'. Since 2017, as part of these changes, the *'Dialogue Road Map'* (DRM) model of conflict resolution and non-violent communication has been progressively introduced. This involved training prisoners and prison officers as facilitators to support non-violent conflict resolution. Ultimately, the DRM project at Dartmoor seeks to build a whole-prison approach which improves mental health with fewer incidents of self-harm and suicide and leads to less violence and safer custody in prison. The achievement of such goals is expected to create an 'enabling environment' in the prison for rehabilitation to flourish and so reduce rates of reoffending. The DRM model has so far been implemented in two wings of the prison.

Research Design and Methodology

The research set out as a scoping exercise, and it was intended that the research team would secure funding from the main research councils once the feasibility of a larger scale study and the research questions to be addressed had been clarified. Exploratory qualitative research was carried out between November 2017 and June 2018 to understand the process and impact of HMP Dartmoor becoming an integrated prison regime underpinned by restorative practices. This report explores the 'rehabilitation culture' that was being created at HMP Dartmoor at the time, focusing on how an integrated whole prison regime was experienced by prisoners. Ethnographic observations, individual interviews with prison staff and focus group interviews with prisoners were undertaken. This report is largely based on the analysis of the 19 focus group interviews carried out with prisoners.

It should be noted that the DRM was just being introduced into the prison at the time the research was ongoing. Therefore, the research made no attempt to evaluate the project, but it does explore its initial potential from mainly the prisoners' point of view

Rehabilitation and Desistance Research

Research on rehabilitation and desistance highlights that prison regimes can hinder desistance because of the oppressive nature of being confined, the rupture from social ties and the impact on mental health (Jewkes and Gooch, 2019; McNeill and Schinkel, 2016). Nevertheless, research also shows that for some offenders certain aspects of imprisonment can be a 'hook for change' or 'turning point' in the desistance journey (McNeill and Schinkel,

2016). McNeill and Schinkel (2016: 615) contend, based on the research evidence, that regimes which are 'characterised both by the availability of practical help, and by relationships and processes that are legitimate and consistent' are more likely to support desistance.

Shaping these processes is the wider socio-political and economic context. In recent years the prison service has faced several challenges which have disrupted the development of a rehabilitative environment in prisons. These include rising rates of imprisonment and overcrowding; concerns about safety in prisons because of high levels of debt, bullying and violence often linked to the availability of psychoactive substances such as Spice (a synthetic cannabinoid); and the fact that prisoners have increasingly complex health and social needs. These problems are all compounded by cuts to prison budgets and staffing levels and the high turnover of new prison staff.

Legitimacy and the Moral Performance of Prisons

Research shows that the extent to which prisoners regard a regime to be 'legitimate' is a crucial factor in producing a positive rehabilitation environment. This includes how prisoners perceive the 'fairness of procedures' and the 'quality' and 'manner of their treatment' (Sparks and Bottoms, 1995: 54). Research on the 'moral performance of the prison' offers powerful insights into what makes a 'legitimate' culture in the eyes of prisoners. Liebling (2004, 2011a) adopts the concept of the 'moral performance' of the prison to refer to the social and emotional climate and quality of life and culture inside the prison. Relationships between prisoners and staff and the style of regime have been shown to have a significant impact on the quality of life in prisons (Crewe and Liebling, 2017).

The Moral Performance of HMP Dartmoor

The thematic analysis of the focus group data revealed themes that resonated with the literature on legitimacy and moral performance:

'Respectful treatment and professionalism' - The relationship with prison officers was a fundamental component of life for prisoners. The ideal qualities of a prison officer included someone who treated them with respect and empathy; was kind and caring; acted justly, fairly and honestly; was open-minded, trustworthy and easy-going; and was professional in the way they performed their job. The most common concern raised by the prisoners related to the way some staff antagonised or provoked prisoners through what was felt to be unprofessional attitudes and behaviour, especially during 'pad-searches' or 'cell spinning'. In contrast, prison officers tended to think that staff-prisoner relations were much better than expressed by prisoners and felt that it was not in their interests to antagonise relations with prisoners.

'Dynamic authority and the regime at Dartmoor' - Prisoners did comment about several prison staff at Dartmoor who displayed what could be described as 'dynamic authority' and this behaviour was highly commended. However, many prisoners expressed disappointment in the way some prison staff exercised their authority and were especially critical of the impact of 'red regimes' and staff shortages with some believing that red regimes were not simply created by lack of staff but also by the attitude of staff who were 'hiding away in their offices' and taking advantage of the 'myth' of staff shortages to avoid doing their job. The main concern was that prison officers were seen to be 'absent and not present' on the wing.

Some prisoners attributed what they saw as staff reluctance to interact with prisoners on the wing as reflecting the lack of a 'work ethic'. Prisoners also expressed concerns that some prison officers were inconsistent in the way that they exercised authority and applied the rules.

The Pains of Imprisonment

Sykes (1958) refers to the 'pains of imprisonment' as what prisoners perceive to be the psychological and social pressures of imprisonment. Crewe (2011a and 2015) has further extended this work to develop a conceptual framework with four dimensions:

- The *'weight'* of imprisonment - 'the almost palpable burden of certain kinds of prison regimes' (Crewe, 2015: 56);
- The *'depth'* of imprisonment - 'the degree to which the prison is psychologically onerous and oppressive' (Crewe, 2015: 54);
- The *'breadth'* of imprisonment - 'the reach and impact of penal sanctions *beyond* the prison' (Crewe, 2015: 60); and
- The *'tightness'* of imprisonment - how control is exercised indirectly through the psychological regulation of ways of thinking and behaviour (Crewe, 2011b).

The Pains of Imprisonment at HMP Dartmoor

The thematic analysis of the focus group data revealed themes that resonated with this literature:

'*The weight of imprisonment'* - The three main tensions most commonly mentioned by prisoners in the Dartmoor focus groups, which from their perspective accentuated the 'weight' or burden of imprisonment, were 'living in an integrated prison', the 'fall out from Spice attacks and self-harm incidents' and 'debt'.

- *'Living in an integrated prison':* Most prisoners in this research commented that what made Dartmoor different was that it was 'less violent' than other prisons and they felt that the main reason for this was because it was integrated. Nevertheless, prisoners felt that an undercurrent of conflict and tension towards sex offenders remained, with many sex offenders experiencing bullying.

- The *'fall out from Spice attacks and self-harm incidents':* Such incidents were viewed as troublesome and disruptive because they often led to lockdowns or 'red regimes' as prison officers were diverted to deal with them.

- *'Debt':* Many prisoners talked about how easy it was to fall into debt due to Spice use because of the informal prisoner code of 'double bubble' or double repayment for a debt. This negatively impacts both on those in debt because it leads to bullying and those around them because of 'pad-thieving'. Debt collection can also have repercussions for the prisoner's family as prisoners may be forced to get their families involved to pay off debts on the outside.

'*The depth of imprisonment'* - Three key issues emerged from the focus groups relating to what Crewe (2011a; 2015) describes as the 'depth' of imprisonment or the psychological

pressures of prison life – 'being banged up', 'being kept in the dark' and 'deteriorating mental wellbeing'.

- *'Being banged up':* Many prisoners commented that the amount of time spent 'banged up' was increasing because of the large number of 'red regimes' caused by staff shortages, and Spice and self-harm incidents. This impacted on prisoners in different ways.

- *'Being kept in the dark':* One of the key factors that exacerbated 'being banged up' was lack of communication about what was going on and why there was a lockdown.

- *'Deteriorating mental wellbeing':* For some prisoners 'being banged up' accentuated existing mental health problems, and for others it brought on new ones. Some argued that they resorted to Spice use and self-harm as a means of escaping the psychological pressures of 'being banged up'.

'The breadth of imprisonment' - A key factor referred to by Crewe (2011b; 2015) relating to the 'breadth' of imprisonment was the extent to which prisoners were able to maintain contact with the outside world. Many prisoners argued that the frequent 'red regimes' had severely curtailed their ability to make phone calls. But being in contact with the outside world could also have drawbacks which intensified the 'pains of imprisonment', such as getting bad news and being unable to cope with the resulting emotional strain.

'The tightness of imprisonment' - Prisoners spent some time talking about the 'tightness' of imprisonment as reflected in their experiences of the Incentives and Earned Privileges (IEP) scheme. They found the rules by which this scheme operated to be ambiguous and unclear, and that prison officers were inconsistent in the way they administered it. Most also felt that instead of offering rewards for responsible behaviour, this scheme was mainly used as a form of punishment. Overall, prisoners argued that the IEP scheme and offending behaviour programmes tighten the 'grip' of imprisonment because they fail to provide any forward planning. Many expressed that they wanted to have goals to work towards, and to receive acknowledgement for progress made.

Prisoners' Views of the Dialogue Road Map (DRM)

Although the aim of this exploratory research project was not to evaluate the DRM programme, focus group participants were asked whether they had heard of the DRM, what they knew about it and what they thought about it. Only a few members of the focus groups had had experience of the DRM in action at the time of the research fieldwork. However, most focus groups included a trained DRM prisoner facilitator and they stressed five main features of the DRM to participants:

- it opens up communication between prisoners themselves and prisoner to prison officer;
- it provides the opportunity to address the conflicts and tensions experienced by prisoners through dialogue and non-violent communication;
- it offers prisoners an element of power and control over their daily life in the prison;
- it creates a type of therapeutic community or enabling environment on the wings in which 'troubled' prisoners, particularly those with substance misuse, debt,

> bullying or self-harm problems can obtain emotional and practical support either through individual mediation or 'circles';
> - it can be used to repair and mediate damaged family relations through family mediations.

Prisoners' Perceptions of the Strengths of the DRM

Based either on their own personal experience of the DRM in action or on what they had been told by prisoner DRM facilitators, focus group participants generally agreed that the five key features of the DRM outlined above represented its core strengths. They especially spoke of giving prisoners a voice, problem solving issues, and empowering and restoring damaged relationships.

Prisoners' Perceptions of the Limitations of the DRM

Two key limitations of the DRM were voiced by prisoners. These related to trust, confidentiality and the integrity of the DRM facilitators and the power imbalance between themselves and prison officers in 'circles'.

Conclusion: Strengthening the Rehabilitation Culture at Dartmoor

The extent to which prisoners assess a regime to be 'legitimate' is fundamental in creating a positive rehabilitation environment. Achieving 'legitimacy' in the eyes of prisoners is a complex issue but the 'moral performance' of the prison regime and how prisoners experience the 'pains of imprisonment' are paramount.

Moral Performance and Imprisonment

Prisoners' relations with prison staff lie at the heart of their assessment of the *'moral performance'* of the Dartmoor regime. Prisoners' expectations in this respect were:

- that prison staff would treat them not only with respect and empathy, but also act professionally by offering practical and emotional support;

- that prison staff would exercise their authority fairly and judiciously – a style of leadership described by Crewe, Liebling and Hulley (2014) as 'dynamic authority';

- that rules and regulations (particularly regarding the *Incentives and Earned Privileges* scheme) would be administered openly and consistently.

Three recommendations to meet these expectations:

- more presence of prison officers on the wings interacting with prisoners. This is not an easy matter to resolve at a time when significant cuts in staffing levels have taken place, although there has been a recent commitment from HMPPS to turn this around;

- improve the quality of the professional training of prison staff particularly as regards the use of 'dynamic authority';

- improve communication with prisoners on how the revised *Incentives Policy Framework,* published in July 2019, operates and ensure that it is being consistently administered.

The Pains of Imprisonment

From the research there was an expectation from prisoners that:

- during lockdowns there needs to be more open communication with prisoners about why there is a lockdown, how long it is likely to last and how practical matters like showers and phone calls will be organised;

- IEP schemes should be more orientated to rewarding responsible behaviour and that the rules and regulations by which they operate will be made clearer and administered more consistently;

- offending behaviour programmes needed to be overhauled to ensure that they offer 'meaningful' and progressive rehabilitation opportunities;

- opportunities were available to mediate and resolve tensions and conflicts with families to maintain smooth relations with the outside world.

Prisoners raised several tensions and conflicts that intensified the *'weight of imprisonment'*, e.g. bullying arising from life in an integrated prison; the aftermath of Spice attacks and self-harm incidents on the wings; and getting into debt. Two possible solutions could soften the 'burden' of such concerns and so produce a culture more conducive to rehabilitation:

- prison wide programmes to address bullying, Spice and self-harm incidents; and debt;

- prison staff – prisoner forums to consider ways to address these problems on the wings.

The role of the DRM in strengthening the rehabilitation environment in Dartmoor

Despite an element of scepticism among prisoners about issues of 'trust' and 'the power imbalance' there was, in general, a willingness to give the DRM a try because it has the potential to bring about change. From the prisoners' perspective it offers opportunities to strengthen communication between prisoners, and prisoners and prison officers; air and resolve tensions and conflicts either through individual mediation or problem-solving type 'circles'; and finally by building the skills of prison officers to effectively exercise 'dynamic authority'.

In addition, by creating an 'enabling', 'therapeutic' environment on some wings, the DRM could go some way to alleviating the 'pains of imprisonment' by giving prisoners an element of power and control over their daily lives; by creating a 'supportive' environment for 'troubled' and 'vulnerable' prisoners to sort out bullying, mental health and substance misuse issues; and finally to facilitate 'the resolution of family disputes'.

See section 8 for a discussion of the follow up to the research.

1. Research Context

Recent research and prison inspections have argued that prisons in England and Wales are in a state of crisis with repeated accounts of overcrowding, rising levels of violence and self-harm, and concerns about safety, substance misuse, deteriorating physical conditions and poor-quality resettlement provision. This has been during an era of significant cuts in prison budgets and staffing levels (HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, 2019; House of Commons Justice Committee [HCJC], 2019a and b; Prison Reform Trust, 2019). Amidst this crisis the HCJC (2019a: 16 and 17) has called for 'the sustained implementation of an overarching strategic approach to prisons policy' which clarifies that 'a key purpose of prison is to reform and rehabilitate offenders, as well as punish them for the crimes they have committed'. This mission to reform and to rehabilitate has intensified since the publication in 2013 of *'Transforming Rehabilitation: A Strategy for Reform'* which outlined government plans to transform the delivery of rehabilitation services in the community. These plans led to the 2016 White Paper *'Prison Safety and Reform'*, and in April 2017 HM Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS) was created with its core mission:

> 'to drive the biggest reform of the prison system in a generation. Across the UK, we're committed to improving how we rehabilitate offenders and protect the public.'[1]

As part of this reform agenda prison governors were to be given greater autonomy to pioneer new initiatives in how they ran their prisons (HCJC, 2019b). In early 2017 academics from the School of Law, Criminology and Government at the University of Plymouth were invited by the Governor of HMP Dartmoor to research how the rehabilitation environment in the prison could be strengthened. Since 2015 the prison had introduced an integrated regime which ended the segregation of vulnerable prisoners such as sex offenders from the general prison population.[2] These changes were described by the Governor as the 'Dartmoor Journey' and as part of the ongoing change process a new restorative type programme based on the *'Dialogue Road Map'* (DRM) model was to be progressively introduced from 2017 by a charity called the *Centre for Peaceful Solutions* (CPS). Our initial research remit was simply to explore the changes taking place at Dartmoor from the perspective of key stakeholders as it established itself as an integrated prison underpinned by restorative practices.

The DRM was developed by Maria Arpa who is the founder of the CPS. The DRM provides a restorative model of dispute resolution or a set of communication skills to deal with conflict, tensions and aggression without resort to violence. In its literature CPS describes its key aim as being to establish:

> 'projects that change attitudes to conflict and help to resolve disputes peacefully within communities. We focus on introducing conflict resolution and nonviolent communication to people living and working in marginalised, "hard to reach" and disempowered communities…We provide conflict resolution skills training through tailored workshops and one-to-one training and on-going support. Mediation cannot work effectively or be sustainable without members of the community being served becoming mediators themselves, so we support a number of individuals in each

---

[1] Ministry of Justice, Press Release, 2017.
[2] At the time the research was conducted between 2017 and 2018 there were 633 prisoners in Dartmoor, with 70% imprisoned for sex offences (HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, 2017: 7).

project to become fully trained mediators so the benefits of the projects are sustainable even after Peaceful Solutions has completed its work.'

During the fieldwork for this research between November 2017 and June 2018, the Restorative Practice Project at Dartmoor based on the DRM was steadily developed and strengthened by the CPS. Some staff and prisoners were being trained as facilitators to use the DRM as a conflict resolution tool and it was being adopted in some situations to reduce tensions and conflicts between prisoners and between staff and prisoners.[3] It was also being used to take a restorative approach to some adjudications and included in the induction programme for prisoners newly arriving at Dartmoor. Some 'dialogue circles' had also taken place where trained facilitators ran groups with prisoners to share feedback on issues of concern in the prison, such as Spice (a synthetic cannabinoid). A family mediation project had also been established to facilitate dispute resolution between prisoners and their families.

Ultimately, the DRM project at Dartmoor seeks to build a restorative whole-prison approach which improves mental health with fewer incidents of self-harm and suicide and leads to less violence and safer custody in prison. The achievement of such goals is expected to create an 'enabling environment' in the prison for rehabilitation to flourish and so reduce rates of reoffending. Since the fieldwork was completed the DRM model has been implemented in two wings of the prison, and at the end of this report an update of its current stage of implementation will be provided.

1.1 Scoping Research

The research set out as a scoping research to understand the process and impact of HMP Dartmoor becoming an integrated prison regime underpinned by restorative practices from the perspective of key stakeholders; its rationale and vision; the process of achieving integration; the journey of staff and prisoners through the integrated prison; and anticipated outcomes. It was intended as a scoping exercise to define the primary research questions for a larger study and identify the most appropriate methodologies for answering those questions. The scoping research was funded by a small facilitation grant from the University of Plymouth which paid for 3 part-time research assistants, a transcriber and the expenses of the principal researchers. It was expected that the research team would secure larger scale funding from the main research councils once the feasibility of a larger study and the research questions to be addressed had been clarified.

1.2 Approvals

The research team applied to HMPPS National Research Committee for permission to conduct the research and this was granted in September 2017. Ethical approval to conduct the research was also sought from the University of Plymouth Ethics Committee and was obtained in September 2017.

---

[3] By April 2018 three cohorts of prisoners and prison officers had been trained as DRM facilitators and prisoners had mediated 15 cases (data provided by CPS in a funding application to the Ministry of Justice).

1.3 Original Workstreams

An interdisciplinary team was established in spring 2017, comprising researchers from criminology, health, psychology and sociology at the University of Plymouth, to conduct the research. There were four workstreams:

- Health and mental well-being
- Rehabilitation, desistance and reducing reoffending
- Life narratives, personality and offending outcomes
- Drugs, violence and intimidation

However, for a variety of reasons relating to funding and staff deployment at the University of Plymouth, only the 'Rehabilitation, desistance and reducing reoffending' workstream was able to complete the scoping research. Therefore, this research report is based primarily on the data collated for this workstream.

2. Research Design and Methodology

2.1 Approach to Research:

The research design builds upon a qualitative exploratory framework informed by an eclectic mix of methodological approaches to explore the research questions. First, influenced by 'ethnography' which, according to Hall (2018: 388), aims 'to give insights into the everyday meanings and practices that allow individuals to live together in specific local contexts', the research team sought to understand and appreciate everyday life inside the prison through the eyes of both prisoners and prison staff. This meant ensuring that all stakeholders in the research were given the opportunity to voice their views and opinions.

Second, instead of adopting a 'traditional', 'problem-oriented' approach which sought out 'shortfalls and difficulties' in the attainment of a rehabilitative culture at HMP Dartmoor, the research team drew upon the principles of 'appreciative injury' to develop a more 'balanced picture' which identified 'strengths', 'achievements' and 'best practices' (Liebling, Elliott and Arnold, 2001: 162-163; see also Liebling *et al.*, 2019).

Third, however, as Scott (2013:30) points out, such an approach has 'drawbacks' and 'research must always aim to uncover the real, whatever this looks like'. Therefore, the research team was also guided by the principles of 'critical inquiry …to allow the respondents to detail their stories, whether positive or negative' so that their experiences of imprisonment could be 'critically interrogated'.

2.2 Aims: The Rehabilitation, Desistance and Reducing Reoffending Workstream

This work stream explored the 'rehabilitation culture' that was being created at HMP Dartmoor as its journey unfolded towards becoming an integrated prison regime based on restorative practices. It particularly focused on how an integrated whole prison regime was experienced by prisoners and its effects on how they negotiated pathways to desistance. More specifically the key aims of this workstream were:

(i) *Tensions, Conflicts and Solutions:*
- How do prisoners experience daily life in the prison, particularly the type of interpersonal conflicts and tensions that they encounter?
- How are these conflicts and tensions informally and formally dealt with?
- What do prison officers think are the main conflicts, tensions and solutions?

(ii) *Rehabilitative Culture:*
- What impact do these conflicts and tensions have on the rehabilitation culture at HMP Dartmoor?
- How could this culture be strengthened?

(iii) The *Dialogue Road Map (DRM):*
- To what extent could the DRM support the strengthening of this culture?
  (*It should be noted that the DRM was just being introduced into the prison at the time the research was ongoing. Therefore, the research made no attempt to evaluate the project, but it does explore its initial potential from mainly the prisoners' point of view*).

2.3 Data Collection Techniques and Sampling

The research team spent 6 months at Dartmoor Prison from November 2017 until the end of June 2018 undertaking interviews with prisoners and prison staff. This included ethnographic observation of everyday life in the prison and interaction between prisoners and prison staff. These observations were written up as field notes. We began the research by talking to senior prison officers and managers who delivered key services in the prison, e.g. those relating to restorative practices, education, mental health, rehabilitation and substance misuse. This included the Director of the DRM prison project. These interviews were primarily used to collect background contextual information and were not used in the compilation of this report. We also interviewed 8 prison officers (including senior managers) from across the prison, e.g. from the wings, adjudication, safer custody, education, and the DRM prison officer co-ordinator. In addition, 3 workers from the substance misuse unit were interviewed. These interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed with the consent of respondents (see *Prison Officer Information and Consent Form* in Appendix 3). However, the content of these interviews has only been minimally used in the data analysis to clarify the background context of certain aspects of the prison regime, e.g. adjudication and the Incentives and Earned Privileges scheme. It was felt that because only a small number of prison officers were interviewed these did not constitute a representative sample of their views on the research questions. Hence, the data analysis in this research report is predominantly focused on prisoners' perspectives and the interviews with prison officers mainly used to clarify factual data. To protect the confidentiality of the prison officers interviewed, their role in the prison is not identified.

The bulk of data collection centred on 19 focus groups with prisoners which were purposively sampled in order to represent such variables as wing of residence; experience of the DRM; experience of different types of rehabilitation programmes; prison experience; and age. Each focus group ran for two to three hours and had three to six participants. The first set of focus groups comprised prisoners who had trained to be DRM facilitators or who had experienced the DRM in the context of a family mediation or interpersonal conflict situation. The sampling criteria for the focus groups was then widened to include already formed groups, e.g. members of the prisoners' council or prisoners who had attended different kinds of programmes, e.g. substance misuse or offender management skills groups. Later we asked prisoner DRM facilitators to act as gatekeepers to create new focus groups representative of each of the 5 wings of the prison. Initially we tried to meet each focus group on three occasions to cover the interview topics. However, this proved to be difficult as the composition of the groups often changed between sessions. Therefore, in later focus groups we tried to cover all the interview topics in one session. Support in setting up the focus groups was also provided by the DRM prison officer co-ordinator. While the research team made every attempt to gather a purposive sample of prisoners, no claims are made that the sample was representative of all prisoners in HMP Dartmoor.

The research team comprised two researchers and two research assistants and one of each attended each focus group session. These took place in private rooms away from the main wings of the prison. Much effort was placed on ensuring that all participants had an opportunity and felt comfortable to contribute to the session. Discussion in the focus group was semi-structured and the topics raised by the researchers can be seen in the *Prisoner Focus Group Interview Topics* schedule in Appendix 1. Flip charts, coloured pens and memo notes were used to facilitate participants to elaborate on topics in depth and make the atmosphere interactive, lively and attractive. While researchers tried to create a relaxed

atmosphere, some participants might not have felt comfortable to openly share their experiences in this type of group setting. One factor that may have been relevant in this respect was that at the time of the research about 70% of prisoners in HMP Dartmoor were sentenced for sex offences (HMIP, 2017). The research made no attempt to engage with this issue and in the focus groups prisoners were never asked to reveal their offence. However, it is likely that as many of the prisoners in the groups were sex offenders and, as will be seen in the data analysis sections, this may have created an underlying tension which impacted on the dynamics and interaction between prisoners.

To protect the confidentiality of prisoners in the text the composition of the focus group is not stated. Otherwise the name of the prisoner quoted could be identified. Occasionally, if essential to the context of the discussion and if the individual prisoner cannot be identified, the role of a prisoner is stated, e.g. DRM prisoner facilitator. All the focus group sessions were digitally recorded with the consent of prisoners (see *Prisoner Information and Consent Form* in Appendix 2).

2.4 Thematic Data Analysis

All the focus group and individual interviews were transcribed verbatim, and the data entered into NVivo – a qualitative data analysis software package. This data was coded and thematically analysed drawing on a framework that was informed by the research literature and themes that emerged from the data and fieldwork. Three researchers coded the data, identified the themes and reflectively engaged in the thematic analysis of the data to ensure reliability (Davies, 2018). Each of the themes identified were present within and across several interviews and evidenced in the text through direct quotes from respondents. These quotes can be seen in sections 4, 5 and 6 and Appendix 4, and are considered to vividly articulate and enrich the depth of understanding of the themes that emerged from the data.

3. Rehabilitation and Desistance Research

Mann (2019:3) argues that a rehabilitative culture is 'a culture with a purpose' which seeks to create an enabling environment 'to support people in turning away from crime and toward a different life'. HMPPS states that it is committed to implement and develop a rehabilitative approach in prisons as this is an effective way of reducing reoffending (HCJC, 2019a). Critics of imprisonment, such as Jewkes and Gooch (2019: 154), argue that such a vision is impossible to achieve because:

> '…the coercive nature of confinement, the risk-laden prison environment and the government, media, and general public's insistence that prisons should be places of punishment, all mitigate against the implementation of rehabilitative ideals at a micro level.'

However, HMPPS disagrees with this argument and in their policy guidelines suggest that desistance theory and research might offer a constructive way forward in exploring how a rehabilitative culture could be developed in prisons (Mann, Howard and Tew, 2018).

Desistance is the term used by criminologists to describe and explain the challenges that offenders face and the processes that they navigate as they make the decision to cease offending (Shapland and Bottoms, 2017). Research suggests that desistance is a complex interactional process with some studies emphasising the 'subjective' or 'internal' aspects of the process and others the 'objective' or 'social' factors (see Maruna, 2001; McNeill, 2006; McNeill and Weaver, 2010; Farall, Bottoms and Shapland, 2010). While 'subjective' dimensions refer to psychological or individual changes in offenders' developmental maturity, cognitive and reasoning skills and self-identity, 'objective' factors include changes to offenders' social situation and social support network. Desistance research also highlights three main interdependent phases in the desistance journey that is 'primary' when the offender stops the act of offending, 'secondary' when the offender adopts a new self-identity as a non-offender and 'tertiary' when others recognise this changed identity (Nugent and Schinkel, 2016). Desistance theory and research, particularly in the way it has been interpreted by policy makers, has been heavily criticised for decontextualizing offending behaviour by over-emphasising the significance of individual change and downplaying or neglecting the impact of social constraints (Burke, Collet and McNeill, 2018).

Whilst 'most desistance researchers argue that prisons reflect an inherently problematic context in which to seek to support desistance' because they deprive people of responsibility, damage social ties and destroy already damaged identities, research shows that for some offenders certain aspects of imprisonment can be a 'hook for change' or 'turning point' in the desistance journey (McNeill and Schinkel, 2016: 612). So, what insights can desistance research offer on how to create a rehabilitative culture in prisons? McNeill and Schinkel (2016: 615) contend, based on the research evidence, that regimes which are 'characterised both by the availability of practical help, and by relationships and processes that are legitimate and consistent' are more likely to support desistance. Sections 4 and 5 of this report explore this research evidence in greater depth to consider how legitimate and consistent relationships and processes can be fostered in prisons in order to create a rehabilitative environment. The report then goes on to assess how such a rehabilitative culture could be strengthened at HMP Dartmoor drawing on the empirical findings from this research study.

3.1 Challenges Facing the Prison Service

In recent years the prison service has faced several challenges which have disrupted the development of a rehabilitative environment in prisons. The first relates to rising rates of imprisonment. Although the prison population has stabilised since 2010, over the past 25 years it has risen by 54%. This has meant that 61% of prisons (though not including HMP Dartmoor) are classified as overcrowded because they have 'exceeded their in-use certified accommodation threshold' (HCJC, 2019a: 22). Second, HM Chief Inspector of Prisons has raised numerous concerns about safety in prisons because of high levels of debt, bullying and violence often linked to the availability of psychoactive substances such as Spice (HMIP, 2019). Third, it is recognised that prisoners have increasingly complex health and social needs, with many 'facing multiple, overlapping vulnerabilities including mental ill health, trauma and substance misuse' (HCJC, 2019a: 25). Research highlighted by the Prison Reform Trust (2019: 13 and 44) shows that 43% of male prisoners 'surveyed by inspectors in prison reported having mental health problems' and rates of self-harm at 732 per 1000 prisoners are at the 'highest level ever recorded'.

Finally, all the above problems are compounded by cuts to prison budgets and staffing levels. Between 2015 and 2019 there was a 15% reduction in prison budgets which reduced resources to provide rehabilitative interventions (HCJC, 2019a) and the number of frontline prison staff was reduced by 26% between 2010 and 2017 (Prison Reform Trust, 2019: 17). While in 2016 HMPPS instigated a recruitment campaign to bolster staff numbers, retention, particularly of experienced staff, has been a problem, with turnover rates of 35% per year in some prisons (HCJC, 2019a). In 2018-2019 most prison officers (54%) who left the service had been in the role for less than two years (Prison Reform Trust, 2019). As the HCJC concludes (2019a:107):

> 'prisons are not currently maximising opportunities for rehabilitation. Regime restrictions related to staffing shortages and other disruptions severely undermine the delivery of rehabilitative services…'

The most recent Chief Inspector of Prisons Report (2017: 14, 20, 21 and 23) about HMP Dartmoor comments that while overcrowding did not seem to be an issue and that 'levels of violence were lower than we usually see in similar prisons', concerns were raised about significant curtailment of the prison regime due to staff shortages, the easy availability of psychoactive substances such as Spice, and increases in levels of self-harm which 'were higher than we would expect'. The Report also noted that the prison was having to deal with some very complex cases as more prisoners were saying 'they had emotional well-being or mental health problems' compared to the last inspection.

4. Legitimacy and the Moral Performance of Prisons

Research shows that the extent to which prisoners regard a regime to be 'legitimate' is a crucial factor in producing a positive rehabilitation environment. Auty and Liebling (2020: 377) argue:

> '"morally intelligible" or more legitimate prisons produce better outcomes and less legitimate prisons produce worse outcomes…More legitimate, and more legitimately used, prisons are more likely to help build a "disposition to desist".'

The meaning of the concept of legitimacy is complex and contested but two important factors are how prisoners perceive the 'fairness of procedures' and the 'quality' and 'manner of their treatment' (Sparks and Bottoms, 1995: 54). In this respect research on the 'moral performance of the prison' offers powerful insights into what makes a 'legitimate' culture in the eyes of prisoners to support desistance and rehabilitation.

Much of the research on the 'moral performance' of the prison has been conducted by the *Prisons Research Centre* at Cambridge University and specifically through the work of Professor Alison Liebling and her associates. Liebling (2004, 2011a) adopts the concept of the 'moral performance' of the prison to refer to the social and emotional climate and quality of life and culture inside the prison. There are two core strands to this research which are important for the analysis of the Dartmoor data.[4] First, relations between prisoners and prison officers and, second, how the prison regime is delivered and the way in which authority is exercised. Liebling and her associates have developed a tool to measure the quality of life, culture and values in prisons from the point of view of prisoners called the MQPL[5] survey. This tool shows how the style of regime and relationships between prisoners and staff have a significant impact on the quality of life in prisons (Crewe and Liebling, 2017: 903).

In recent research Auty and Liebling (2020) used the tool to analyse the rates of proven reoffending compiled by the Ministry of Justice against the 'moral performance' of 224 prisons between 2009 and 2013. They found that the higher the moral, social and organisational climate in the prison, as measured by the MQPL scores, the more likely it was to support better outcomes for prisoners, particularly lower levels of reoffending. Based on the findings from this research, Auty and Liebling (2020:313) suggest:

> 'where prisoners feel safe, treated fairly, and where their relationships with staff are both competent and supportive, they feel able to make progress, or find their way onto a positive trajectory according to their own understanding of their condition. These basic cultural conditions make it more likely that they will (a) have access to the necessary facilities and (b) respond positively to opportunities to improve their lives and well-being. A combination of the security dimensions, wellbeing and development dimensions and harming dimensions act together to create prison cultures that are more rehabilitatively-orientated.'

The relations between prisoners and prison officers lie 'at the heart' of the 'moral performance' of the prison in the eyes of the prisoners (Crewe, 2016; Bullock and Bunce,

---

[4] Dartmoor and HMP Dartmoor are used interchangeably in the text.
[5] *Measuring the Quality of Prison Life.*

2020). There are two core dimensions to this relationship, which is 'respectful treatment' and 'staff professionalism' (Crewe and Liebling, 2017). Prisoners expect to be treated with respect, honesty and fairness. However, 'respectful treatment' is not enough, as prison officers are also expected to act in a professional manner both by providing interpersonal, practical and emotional support and by being able to exercise their authority competently (Crewe, Liebling and Hulley, 2015). Indeed 'staff professionalism' was often so important to prisoners that it outweighed friendliness considerations. As Crewe, Liebling and Hulley (2015: 325) found in their research:

> 'prisoners reported the experience, knowledgeability, and general competence of public-sector staff as an important strength of the sector. Uniformed staff in public-sector prisons were not always proactive in developing relationships with prisoners and they were considered less friendly and informal than private-sector staff. Yet, on the whole, their interactions with prisoners were respectful and the competence with which they discharged their responsibilities offset their negative dispositions towards prisoners…'

Beyond relations between prison officers and prisoners, the way in which the prison regime is delivered, particularly through how prison staff exercise their authority, is another core feature of the 'moral performance' of the prison from the prisoners' viewpoint (Crewe, Liebling and Hulley, 2015). As well as the MQPL tool, the *Prisons Research Centre* at Cambridge University has also developed a four-quadrant framework to assess how penal authority is exercised in different types of prison regimes (Crewe, Liebling and Hulley, 2014). There are two core dimensions to this framework – 'heavy-light' and 'absent-present' (Crew and Liebling, 2017).

'Heavy' regimes are where prison staff overuse their authority and exercise it oppressively, unpredictably and provocatively, whereas in 'light' regimes power may be underused. Oppressive regimes may lead to a culture of disrespect and antagonism which in turn breeds tensions and violence. Lighter regimes may appear to be more humanitarian and allow more freedom but may also heighten prisoners' concerns about safety. 'Absent-present' relates to the availability and visibility of uniformed officers on the wings and the depth and quality of engagement with prisoners. According to Crewe, Liebling and Hulley's research (2014) the most constructive and legitimate regimes are described as 'light' and 'present'. In such regimes staff are present and willing to deploy power but do so competently, predictably, fairly and justly. Authority is less oppressive and more predictable. Liebling (2011b) defines this style of regulating prisoners as 'dynamic authority' which Crewe, Liebling and Hulley (2014: 404) consider to be the 'holy grail of prison management' because:

> 'When prison officers are at their best, in 'light-present' establishments, they use their discretion judiciously, as a form of managed peacekeeping, based in part on 'knowing their prisoners', i.e. their needs, norms and preferences. Outcomes are achieved actively but unobtrusively, without the need for those in authority to bare their coercive teeth. Power is on hand, but, for the most part (and as a result) it does not need to be directly employed.'

Unfortunately, Crewe and Liebling (2017) argue, the cuts in prison budgets, reductions in staffing levels and rising levels of imprisonment in recent years have had a significant impact on the 'moral performance' of prisons and the ability of prison officers to exercise 'dynamic

authority'. This has included reductions in the amount of time prisoners spend out of their cells and in the availability of work and educational courses. This means, according to Liebling and Crewe (2017: 909), that rehabilitation has become 'aspirational' rather than a reality.

4.1 The Moral Performance of HMP Dartmoor

This section explores how the prisoners in this research rate the 'moral performance' of Dartmoor as a prison. Although our thematic analysis did not use the tools created by the *Prisons Research Centre* at Cambridge University, there was enough resonance in the findings for a similar analytic framework to be used to discuss the data. The analysis is based on what prisoners told us about the types of interpersonal tensions and conflicts that they encounter in their daily lives and how these are formally and informally dealt with by prisoners and prison staff. The prisoners raised a wide range of tensions and conflicts. Many of these arise from 600 men living together in close proximity in a confined space. As one prisoner commented in response to the researcher's question: 'What causes tensions and fights?'

> **P4: '***To be fair, it can be anything. When you think about it and you've got like 100 people living in each other's pockets, day in, day out, that causes friction instantly without anything else involved. The amount of arguments I've had in my time in here, over petty, silly little things, just because you're living in each other's pockets, you know. You need to have stuff like your exercise, get outside, take in some sunlight, some fresh air and that. At the moment, there's not a lot of it going on for the main wings and that causes friction because you're all stuck in that one environment all the time.'* **(FG8)** [6]

In this report we focus on the most commonly raised concerns, particularly those which according to research (see previous section) are important to prisoners when assessing the 'moral performance' of a prison. These factors are also important indicators of the extent to which prisoners view the environment inside the prison as being conducive to rehabilitation.

4.1.1 'Respectful treatment and professionalism'

The Cambridge research found that the relationship with prison officers is very important in the lives of prisoners. Likewise, throughout all the focus groups in this research, prisoners agreed that the relationship with prison officers was the fundamental component of their life inside prison. The **ideal qualities** of a prison officer included someone who treated them with respect and empathy; was kind and caring; acted justly, fairly and honestly; was open-minded, trustworthy and easy-going. Below are some quotes from prisoners about the kind of qualities they appreciated in the prison officers at Dartmoor:

> **P1:** *'Honesty is the best one. Because when we're like banged-up all day, "are we banged-up today?" – "I don't know", they know if they're going to be short-staffed. Do you know what I mean? I don't expect them to go out of their way for me or nothing, but just a bit of honesty and that and fair treatment…'* **(FG18)**

---

[6] **P** is shorthand for 'prisoner' and **FG** denotes the focus group that he participated in. All prisoner names and the composition of the focus groups has been anonymised to protect confidentiality. See Research Design in Section 2.

P4: *'We had an officer who was absolutely amazing. At lunchtimes, as soon as food was served, he'd go and grab his lunchbox, unlock the door so we could all go outside on exercise, and sit and eat his lunch outside… just sitting on that grass, feeling the grass on your hands while the sun's shining for an hour was absolutely amazing. That one hour of time just made you feel better as a person for being in prison and having the respect for an officer who every time, without failure, you knew would go and open that yard.'* **(FG9)**

P2: *'… if you treat them with respect, you're polite to them, you don't cause them any trouble, they tend to be the same to you. They're pretty decent people. You do get the odd prison officer which isn't so good, but the majority of them, I found, have been pretty decent people. … it's always popular to be critical of the prison staff. You get good and bad. …you don't get things done as quickly as you want, but on the whole, most of them are pretty good. They can't have this friendly relationship with you because at the end of the day, they're a prison officer and you're the prisoner. You can't get too cosy.'* **(FG13)**

Nevertheless, it was not enough for prison officers to be nice, friendly people, they were also expected to have ***professional*** attributes in the way they performed their job. This included offering practical and emotional support so that if a prisoner had a problem the prison officer was able to get it sorted:

P4: *'He was one of the best officers I've ever witnessed because he was very harsh, but he was very fair at the same time, but if you had an issue and you went to him with an issue, he would bend over backwards to help people out and he was very good because he was the same with every type of prisoner.'* **(FG9)**

P6: *'there's certain officers I definitely wouldn't go to with any kind of complaint, but there are half a dozen officers that I know if I went and saw them, they would act on it. I know people are giving officers a bad name, but they're not all bad. There are officers that you can go to, talk to and things will happen…'* **(FG2)**

Voicing similar views as the respondents in this research, the inspection of Dartmoor by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons (2017:30) also found in their survey that 'most prisoners said that staff treated them with respect and that there was a member of staff they could turn to if they had problems'.

However, it was also recognised that prison officers are all different in the way they interact with prisoners and many prisoners questioned the professionalism of some staff at Dartmoor. The most common concern raised by the prisoners related to the way some ***staff antagonised or provoked prisoners*** through what was felt to be unprofessional attitudes and behaviour. Below are some examples of the types of behaviour that were seen to be provocative:

P1: *'Some of them get a bit power crazy because they've got keys, they think that they're king. That's the only way I can describe them, "do as I say, or else". It shouldn't be like that. We're human, if I told you "go and sit over there now" – "hang on a second, can you please go and sit over there for me?", it's slightly different, isn't it? You're more likely to oblige. If someone tells you to do something, it shouldn't be like that. At the end of the day we're still human, still got feelings and rights.'* **(FG11)**

P3: *'there are officers in here that'll wind people up, provoke prisoners on a daily basis, that'll go out of their way to be horrible people.'* **(FG1)**

P2: *'there's quite a few of them that are a bit old-school and they're there to antagonise the situation and try and get someone to kick-off so that they can move them off the wing to make the wing run the way they want it. So, you do get officers with attitudes and they will go around pushing peoples' buttons to try and get a reaction.'* **(FG16)**

'Pad-searches' or **'cell spinning'** were viewed as being particularly confrontational by prisoners because they were seen as an invasion of privacy:

P1: *'Well, basically that's your home. I kicked off, a while ago now, because they came in for a cell spin on me. It was seven in the morning, I was in bed, officers burst in my door, I'm laid in bed and they were [grunting noises] … don't come in my house and do that sort of thing, so, I've jumped up and started going nuts and then we're all fighting and all rolling around in the cell, the buzzer's going, all of that sort of thing, I'm holding on, they're punching me, going mad and that, but it's just the way they come in. If they come in like "cell search mate, have you got anything?". The way they come in is how the response is. I've had numerous cell searches, half the time officers have come in, "alright? cell search", I'm like "yeah, yeah, alright". If they come in [grunting noises], instantly your guard's up. It's like fight or flight. You either shit yourself or you don't. If they come in like that, I'll go mad. If they come in nice, "cell search mate", I'm like "yeah alright, cool". But I think it's how they approach the cell and go in there, is how you react to it, or, maybe the person's got something and he's agitated because he's going to get … I don't know. I've had loads of cell searches, never got anything in my cell. They just do it. Most of them are fine, it's just how they come in is how I gauge how I react and that's probably the same with other people.'* **(FG17)**

Prison officers disagreed that their attitudes and behaviour were in any way intentionally provocative or an attempt to 'wind prisoners up'. Indeed, it was felt that it was not in their interests to antagonise relations with prisoners. In general prison officers tended to think that staff-prisoner relations were much better than expressed by prisoners:

PO8[7]**:** *'if you looked at that logically, there is no point in provoking it because you are going to see that prisoner for 12 hours a day for the next five years, so, it makes no sense for a member of staff to be provoking all the time. It makes their job so hard; it would be pointless.'*

PO7: *'Most of the behaviour in prison is driven by the prisoners. I'm not saying there aren't … there will be a bad apple in everything, in every walk of life. I'm not naïve enough to say every prison officer is wonderful, but most of the people I've come across in my career just want to come in, do their job and go home. They're not in there to antagonise the situation and make it worse.'*

PO4: *'Yes. I've got to say the prisoners in this jail and the prisoner/staff relationship is very good. I have to say is very, very good here. There's a lot of prisoners who just don't like authority in general, have an issue with the police, got an issue with prison staff because they think we're all out to get them and make their life more difficult than obviously what it is already.'*

---

[7] **PO** is shorthand for 'prison officer' to protect his/her confidentiality. See Research Design in Section 2.

4.1.2 'Dynamic authority and the regime at Dartmoor'

The earlier discussion of the research findings from the Cambridge *Prisons Research Centre* suggests that the ideal regime is one where the prison officers exercise **'dynamic authority'** by being 'present' and 'interactive' on the wings and 'judicious' in their use of authority. Prisoners did comment about several prison staff at Dartmoor who displayed what could be described as 'dynamic authority' and this behaviour was highly commended as can be seen from the comments below:

> **P5:** *'We've got an officer that works on our wing and when it's 'red regime' and he's on his own… he will go along to every single cell, open the flap "are you alright? do you need to make a phone call?" – "yes", unlock the door, take you out of your cell to the phone and let you make the 10-minute phone call and then put you back in your cell. Nobody kicks off, nobody runs off around the wing or anything like that because there's that respect for the officer. Instead of sitting in the office and doing nothing, which he's entitled to do because it's on 'red regime', he's trying to make the wing better for everybody. If you have a family emergency and need to use the phone two or three times, he will facilitate that. He's very, very good at doing it.'* **(FG7)**

> **P3:** *'There's a big 'them and us' culture, xxx was an exception to that. There are a few that are. They feel like your peers, they're prison officers, but they're on your side working as a team on the wing. That environment is what you need.'* **(FG9)**

However, many prisoners expressed disappointment in the way some prison staff exercised their authority which they felt fell far short of the standards embedded in the concept of 'dynamic authority'. At the time the research was ongoing between November 2017 and June 2018 there were a number of 'red regimes' or lockdowns at Dartmoor when movement in the prison was restricted and prisoners were confined to their cells, often for up to 23 hours. During these periods prisoners' time out of cells to make phone calls and have showers were limited. 'Red regimes' may be instigated by several factors such as a 'Spice attack' (drug overdose) or 'self-harm incident' on the wing which prison officers had to attend to and so prisoners were locked down in their cells. But the main exacerbating factor at this time was related to staff shortages.[8] Below are some quotes reflecting prisoners' feelings about the **impact of ''red regimes' and staff shortages**:

> **P2:** *'Yeah. Sometimes you can be banged up all weekend if they haven't got the staff or when we had the bad snow and stuff, we were locked up a long time. So, in the week, in order to get yourself clean, you have what we call a pad-wash. We've all got sinks and toilets in our cells, so you have a good wash there and at the weekends if you want to have a shower, you can go and stay in the shower for as long as you want.* **P1:** *We've had a situation where the laundry hasn't been done, no laundry and that means not just personal kit, you're talking about your main kit, your bedding and stuff like that that's not getting done. So, you may be sleeping in that for over a week which personally I don't like myself, but it's not very nice. So, there's a lot of things that you are locked down on and you can't do when there's a shortage of staff.'* **(FG13)**

---

[8]See discussion in section 3 of 'Challenges Facing the Prison Service'.

P1: *'I've got a wing job, so, when it's 'red' regime we're banged-up. It makes me angry and frustrated. When I was doing education or in the kitchen, it didn't really bother me so much, but when you've got a wing job, they won't let you out. So, sometimes I really hustle to get out. On movement time, this time now, half-eight, for 10 minutes, I'll probably empty my bin and run around and that, get a bit of air, but sometimes they don't even let us do that, they go door-to-door. So, I'm banged-up from half-12 'til 4 o'clock, for treatments and tea and banged-up again about five. So, I'm banged-up from 5 o'clock, when there's 'red' regime, 'til about half-11 the next day. It's a long day. They expect us to be calm about it. They say "get your food and straight back up" … We want to make a phone call, we just like chilling, we've been locked in a box. They wouldn't keep a dog in conditions for that long.'* **(FG18)**

While prisoners were aware and sympathetic to the pressures created by staff shortages to the day to day operation of the prison, there was a strong feeling that the problems arising from red regimes were not simply created by lack of staff but also by the attitude of staff. The main concern was that prison officers were seen to be **'absent and not present'** [9] on the wing. Instead of communicating and interacting with prisoners it was felt that prison officers were simply 'hiding away in their offices' or 'in the tea-vault drinking tea' and taking advantage of the myth of staff shortages to avoid doing their job. Prisoners' thinking in this respect is reflected in the following comments:

P1: *'…the "tea- vault" … it's like a little staffroom where they sit and drink tea. It's like you find yourself locked up most of the time because they're saying they've got no staff, but you go to healthcare and you come back, you'll see about 10, 11 officers just sitting down having tea. We can't come out because they've got no staff, but there's more than enough staff there to control a wing. '(FG19)*

P4: *'The staff don't give a shit. As long as they're sat in their office and they're able to look on the internet at what they're going to buy at the weekend or whatever and drinking their coffee, they don't care what's going on, on the landings. That's been happening for years. To be fair, that isn't ever going to change. The only time they get word, is when a fight breaks out and they think "this might escalate into something a bit more" or "we'd better go out and sort it out" – "oh, it's alright, it's that nonce getting beaten up, we'll leave it a few minutes" and you see that all the time.'(FG8)*

P3: *'The problem is a lot of prisoners can see the staff on the wings and we're banged-up because it's short-staffed, but you can see five or six officers standing having a cup of tea or coffee and we're all banged-up. They're laughing and joking on the wings. They've got their own office they can go into, but they'll be standing on the wings laughing and joking and we're all behind doors thinking "I can't get to speak to my family today because we're banged-up", but there's five of them drinking tea and coffee.'* **(FG2)**

Some prisoners attributed what they saw as staff reluctance to interact with prisoners on the wing as reflecting the lack of a **'work ethic'** or a willingness to do their job properly:

---

[9] The Governing Governor gave the following feedback in response to prisoners' concerns in this section which she felt did not present the full picture. She commented that at the time of the research there were several reasons why prison officers were not interacting on the wings. There were severe staff shortages and staff were often called away to deal with vulnerable prisoners who, for example, had problems with Spice and mental health. Also, many prison officers felt 'burnt out', tired, distressed and traumatised by the number of Spice attacks. Many experienced officers chose to leave the service at this time as a result of these feelings.

P4: *'The biggest issue, as prisoners, we've got with prison staff is the fact they've had too long and too many years of getting away with things and it's just progressed and progressed and now they're getting lazier and lazier. Now they're getting paid to sit on their backsides drinking cups of tea, whereas they should be out, they should be talking to prisoners, associating more with prisoners. That's what they're here for and what they're meant to be doing, but they don't. They hide away in their offices; they pretend to be on the computer doing stuff when they're actually looking for a new bicycle or whatever. There's no communication. I don't know how to put it really.'* **(FG9)**

Beyond criticisms about a lack of 'presence' on the wings, prisoners also expressed concerns that some prison officers were ***inconsistent in the way that they exercised authority*** and applied the rules. There are a variety of channels to process prisoners' complaints in the prison and of disciplinary procedures to regulate and sanction their behaviour (such as the Incentives and Earned Privileges [IEP] scheme, adjudication and segregation). In the focus group interviews it became clear that prisoners were sometimes confused about how these channels and procedures operated. A particular concern was expressed about the IEP scheme which they perceived to be inconsistently administered by prison officers on the wings.[10] This led to feelings that it was unjust and unfair because it was open to interpretation and abuse. This issue is further discussed in the next section:

P1: *'But, in this jail… they can put you from 'enhanced' to 'basic' like that. [clicks fingers] In this jail, they don't put people on 'standard', they just say "we know you're smoking Spice, you're on 'basic', we're taking your tv, put your clothes in a bag". If you don't and you sort of say "no", then they'll probably give you a hiding and bend you up and take it anyway. So, in this jail, a lot of screws, they bend the rules to suit them.'* **(FG18)**

P1*: 'The problem they have is a lot of the officers I know have threatened people with IEPs, "don't do that or you're going to get an IEP" – "yeah, whatever". Now, sometimes that officer will give that person an IEP, but not tell them and then nine times out of ten, they won't even bother because they can't be arsed to do the paperwork.* **P3:** *Yeah… they're not supposed to give you an IEP without giving you actual formal … showing you a slip …* **P1***: Yeah, that's how I always thought it worked… But here, I've known quite a few prisoners who's suddenly have got IEPs and they don't even know why they had them because they were issued two IEPs last month and they never had no paperwork. So, he thought "I've only got one IEP" and suddenly he's got three because a month ago he had two…* **P5:** *…basically there is no guidance on the IEP system. There is no rules and regulations on it, there is no standard. Some officers enforce it rigidly, some don't and it's whether your face fits on the wing.'* **(FG16)**

Prisoners' confusion is not unexpected as several prison officers stated that there is an element of ***discretion*** in how the IEP scheme operates:

PO7: *'So, something happens, I witness it, or it happens to me, I have a choice of how I deal with that as an officer. You would, as a member of staff coming into the prison, if a prisoner said something to you you didn't like, you have a choice of how you wish to deal with that. If you think that it's serious enough, then you could place him on report, and he would go to*

---

[10] A new revised *Incentives Policy Framework* was published in July 2019 to address these concerns about the scheme which have been raised by prisoners not only at Dartmoor but also nationally.

adjudication. If you don't think it's serious enough or you don't think that's the route to go down, then you can give him an IEP warning. If he gets two IEP warnings, then that triggers a review of his IEP level. Everybody that comes into our prison goes on 'standard' and you have 'basic' and 'enhanced'.'

PO4: *'The new staff which have come in, they're very keen, very pro-active, so they're very quick to place people on report, where a lot of the older staff, like myself and a few others, would probably say that's not worth an adjudication, it's more of a negative entry, then either keep them on 'basic' for longer because they're already on it, or that might be the crutch which then makes them go onto 'basic'. That's called 'jail craft' and they'll learn that once they get a little bit more time in service to how things should be done and how they shouldn't be done.'*

Finally, there were ***mixed views about how age and work experience impacted*** on prison officers. Some thought that newer, younger officers had a better attitude and were more capable of providing rehabilitation. However, others disagreed with this as they felt that older officers may have been stricter, but they were fairer, respectful and 'got things done'. Concerns were also expressed about the high rate of staff turnover which meant that newer staff did not have the experience or depth of knowledge to deal with problematic situations and there was no time to build up a bond between officers and prisoners before the staff left:

P5: *'…a lot of the old-school prison officers are almost … you could describe them as dinosaurs because the prison system and the prison service has moved on and they're still back 20, 30 years ago and it's all moved on from then. I spoke to a few young officers and they sort of said the old boys need to go because they are just holding things back. You get the younger officers, the newer officers with a different and a newer approach and then they go and have a few days off and then the old boys come back and they take us right back to the old days again. …I can't speak for the other guys here, but from my own perspective, when the younger blokes are on here, the newer officers, maybe they'll change over years, maybe they'll become more cynical, I don't know, but at the moment, the atmosphere for me on the wing is a lot better when those newer, younger guys …are on there. When the older ones are on there, the whole atmosphere of the wing changes and I tend to find that there's more inmates rebelling against what they're told to do when the older guys are on and they're being shouted at, than when the younger ones are on.'* **(FG14)**

P1: *'…old school officers, they actually talk to you like a human-being. If you go and ask them to do something, if they're busy, they'll say "sorry, I'm busy at the moment, come back in …", whatever. Some of the new screws, "yeah, no problem", they write it on a bit of paper and you walk away thinking and they just get the bit of paper and throw it in the bin and when you see them in the afternoon, "sir, did you have a chance to sort that out?" – "oh, no, I forgot" and you write it down on another bit of paper and you think "hang on, where's the bit of paper you had this morning?". The difference is old school will tell you "I'm busy, I haven't got around to doing it" and if they're passing you, "yeah, I'm sorting it in a minute for you", the new ones, like you said, if your face don't fit, they just won't bother. They just make excuses, excuses each time, "I'm busy". Yeah, I understand you're busy, but I asked you two days ago.'* **(FG16)**

P2: *'The turnover is pretty high. Not here so much. If you take it like it used to be, xxx, my old place, we only had probably two regular officers. The officers used to be shipped in pretty much on a daily or weekly basis and the problem with that is the officer doesn't get to know*

the prisoners. They get to know the prisoner's individual circumstances, problems, but when you're constantly getting new staff, they don't care because they're not forming that bond. There is a bond sometimes between an officer and a prisoner. They get to know you.' **(FG13)**

As this last quote indicates staff turnover does seem to be perceived as a problem by prisoners. Ministry of Justice statistics show that in 2019 well over a third (42%) of prison officers had been in post for less than 3 years and less than half (44.5%) had 10 years' experience or more (Prison Reform Trust, 2019). This seems to suggest that prisoners' concerns about a decline in staff experience or 'prison craft' are justified.

5. The Pains of Imprisonment

The second core field of research, which explores how the prison environment may undermine the legitimacy of imprisonment and the rehabilitative process, relates to what Sykes (1958) refers to as the 'pains of imprisonment' or what prisoners perceive to be the psychological and social pressures of imprisonment and how they deal with them. Crewe (2015: 53) argues that in recent years penal policy and practice have 'softened' as:

> '…psychological power has superseded coercion as the primary basis for control and compliance. Accordingly, many of the conventional pains of imprisonment – those shaped by austere and authoritarian regimes – have become less onerous and less conspicuous.'

As an extension of Sykes' work, Crewe (2011a and 2015) has developed an innovative conceptual framework to further analyse the experience of imprisonment from the point of view of prisoners which comprises four dimensions.

The first relates to the *'weight'* of imprisonment or 'the almost palpable burden of certain kinds of prison regimes' (Crewe, 2015: 56). This links to the earlier discussion of the 'moral performance of prisons', and the impact of the way prison officers exercise their authority and the effects of staff-prisoner relations on prisoners' experiences of imprisonment. However, other aspects of imprisonment at Dartmoor can intensify the burden such as the availability of Spice and life in an integrated prison. The second is described by Crewe (2015: 54) as the *'depth'* of imprisonment or 'the degree to which the prison is psychologically onerous and oppressive'. 'Depth' also relates to a 'sense of being buried way beneath the surface of freedom' and the actual and metaphysical distance between the prison and the outside world. The third dimension of Crewe's framework (2015: 60) is that of *'breadth'* which refers to 'the reach and impact of penal sanctions *beyond* the prison'. The concept of 'breadth' also encapsulates the prisoners' sense of ostracisation from family and friends and feelings about public labelling and exclusion because of their offence.

The *'tightness'* of imprisonment is the final dimension of Crew's (2015) framework. This concept conveys the notion of the 'grip' of imprisonment or how control is exercised indirectly through the psychological regulation of ways of thinking and behaviour (Crewe, 2011b). Here Crewe is referring to 'incentive and privilege schemes' and 'offending behaviour programmes' which seek to mobilise prisoners to take responsibility for their own self-governance and rehabilitation (Crewe, 2011a). Prisoners find the risk assessment and management tools in 'offending behaviour programmes' to be psychologically burdensome. 'Incentive and privilege schemes' are also seen to be equally problematic and anxiety provoking. Prisoners perceive these schemes to be 'ambiguous' and 'uncertain' as they are unclear about how they operate (Crewe, 2011a). However, prisoners' main concern, and one which psychologically 'creates significant insecurities', is about the 'unpredictable' way that these schemes are administered by prison officers (Crewe, 2011a: 514).

5.1 The Pains of Imprisonment at HMP Dartmoor

This section draws on Crewe's (2011a; 2015) analytic framework to explore how the tensions and conflicts raised by prisoners in the focus groups for this research are experienced as part of the 'pains of imprisonment'. The four dimensions of Crewe's 'pains of

imprisonment' framework – 'weight' 'depth', 'breadth' and 'tightness'– were discussed in more detail earlier.

5.1.1 'The weight of imprisonment'

The three main tensions most commonly mentioned by prisoners in the Dartmoor focus groups, which from their perspective accentuated the 'weight' or burden of imprisonment, were *'living in an integrated prison'*, the *'fall out from Spice attacks and self-harm incidents'* and *'debt'*. Prisoners had different experiences of being in an integrated prison. Some had been in Dartmoor when integration started in 2015; while others entered more recently after a period in a non-integrated prison. While reports from the Chief Inspector of Prisons in recent years have highlighted a dramatic increase in violence in most prisons,[11] the majority of prisoners in this research commented that what made Dartmoor different was that it was '*less violent*'[12] and they felt that the main reason for this was because it was integrated:

> **P1:** *'This jail used to be rough, but it's calmed down now because it's changed, it's integrated … When I was here last time, I saw people getting slashed-up and everything and that was for things that they were in for. Back in the day, if they ever found out … if you were on the wing now and it was a normal jail, not integrated and someone found out someone was in for a sexual offence, they'd get weighed in straightaway, they wouldn't still be on the wing.'* **(FG3)**

> **P2:** *'…coming to this prison from the previous one, I noticed the change immediately. It was a lot calmer. The prison staff were better. The inmates were better. It just made me laugh sometimes when I hear people whinging how grotty Dartmoor is, in my opinion it's a good prison.'* **(FG13)**

> **P5:** *'I suppose over the last three years what I have seen is a massive influx of older generation prisoners which is really turning this prison around because the levels of violence that we were getting, we're not getting anymore because the average age has gone up, which is a good thing. It does make the whole atmosphere of prison better. If we went back to 2015 again when the average age was probably 25 to 30, you've got more crime, more violence, more back-chatting to officers etc. So, I suppose when they say integration has introduced an older generation, then that's probably why it's a success.'* **(FG7)**

Nevertheless, while integration may have reduced the level of violence, prisoners felt that an ***undercurrent of conflict and tension towards sex offenders remained***. On entering Dartmoor prisoners must sign a compact in which they agree to live in an integrated prison, but it was obvious from the discussion in the focus groups that this does not totally stop the bullying and abuse of sex offenders. There was much talk about the subtle ways sex offenders were subject to mainly verbal and emotional, but sometimes physical, abuse on the wings. In the focus groups prisoners were never asked to reveal their crimes. However, the 'elephant in the room' or the issue that was never openly discussed but was always

---

[11]See Annual Reports 2016-2019. Available at :
https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/inspections?s&prison-inspection-type=annual-reports

[12] Those who had been in Dartmoor in 2015 when integration first began did comment that there was considerable violence at this time. The most recent inspection of Dartmoor by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons (2017:20) commented that 'levels of violence were much lower than we usually see in similar prisons'.

lurking below the surface was that many of the focus group members were likely to be in Dartmoor for sex offences, given the composition of the prison population.[13] While none of the group members admitted to being victims of abuse and most presented as simply being onlookers, the bullying of sex offenders was viewed as making a key contribution to the 'weight' of imprisonment as can be seen in the following exchanges:[14]

> **Researcher:** *'…is there any bullying going on in an integrated prison?* **P3:** *Yeah, a huge amount, but it's not necessarily physical.* **P2:** *It's very subtle.* **P3:** *It is often very subtle.* **Researcher:** *So, what is it then? Verbal?* **P1:** *It could be anything from people … say you've got a normal prisoner in one cell and then you've got a sex offender in the next one and he finds out something, he'll be tapping on the wall at night, it could be anything, it could be banging on the pipes to name-calling. We've seen a lot of it.* **P3:** *Just ignoring or pushing in front of them in the dinner queue, just lots of antagonising … somebody introduced me to a term recently called 'othering', it's to make somebody feel separate.* **P5:** *And they have a way where they can take liberties with people because they always pick on the vulnerable and the weak and their view is if he's obviously older and he's therefore a sex offender, if he gets his cell robbed, they just go "well, he's a sex offender, so what?". In other words, there's no tolerance for them. They're not treated the same and if they're robbed or someone has a go at them or if they're owed something and they're not paid for it, they just go "well, he's a sex offender, so he deserves it" and going on to what we were saying about disclosure or information about people, the way it works is if there's a particular person that anybody wants to check on, what they do is they speak to their friend on the outside, anybody, they just ring up and talk to somebody and they give them a name and they ask their friend out there to run that person's name through Google, so they can find out exactly what they're here for.* **P4:** *There was a game going around about a month ago amongst the younger offenders to punch a sex offender and I think that's how old XYZ got hit, wasn't it? It was a bit of a game for some of the younger offenders, for no reason whatsoever, to pick a random perceived sex offender and give him a thumping.* **P3:** *And that guy now is in hospital having had a heart attack.'***(FG14)**

> **P1***: 'So, you've got your direct bullying, like your physical bullying. You've got your gossip and then you've got your verbal bullying and then you've got people controlling other people's debts etc, etc, etc. Then, you've got your drugs and so.* **P4***: Then obviously, with the integration as well, you get the VP to mains bullying. Obviously, the mains bullying the VPs. The amount of times I've witnessed people going "oh look, another nonce", it's just no need of it. One guy on our wing, he's been on our wing for seven or eight months and he's only just started coming out of his cell. You never ever see him. He sits in his cell all day long and that's because as soon as he came over there was a little, small group that was there, most of them have gone, that used to pick on him and call him names and because they were living above him, were shouting down to him. It's just no need of it. If you sign the compact to say that you're willing to live with whoever's in prison, like most people have done, then just get on with it and do it. Why try and be this big hard man, because if you actually went into a proper mains jail, you'd be a nobody and that's what it comes down to.'***(FG8)**

---

[13] HM Chief Inspector of Prisons (2017) report on Dartmoor states that 70% of the prison population were convicted of sexual offences.

[14] Many prisoners shared in the focus groups that they saw the signing of the compact as an 'enforced choice' which further added to negativity towards sex offenders.

Spice attacks and *self-harming incidents* were also seen by prisoners to further add to the 'weight' of imprisonment, particularly at times of staff shortages. Such incidents were viewed as *troublesome* and *disruptive* because they often led to lockdowns or 'red regimes' as prison officers were diverted to deal with them. The limited empathy towards prisoners '*messing about with Spice*' or self-harming for what was seen as attention seeking behaviour rather than as a result of a genuine mental health issue can be seen from the comments below:

> **Researcher:** *'In what ways does Spice create conflicts on the wing?* **P1***: It's right from the person who takes it, who basically overdoses on it and gets taken to hospital, you're taking officers off the wing, that means everybody's banged-up. If he is spiced out of his head on the wing and gets caught, everybody's banged-up while they sort him out because they've got to get healthcare over. Spice on its own is just the biggest problem on a wing, full-stop. It doesn't matter if you're taking it, selling it, o-d-ing on it or whatever, it affects everyone…* **P2:** *'… talking about conflicts and Spice, the conflict is the lads that are on Spice are taking up the officer's time, making us spend so much time behind our doors, that's the conflict point. It's that. I understand that they need their days out and stuff like that and you do empathize with them, I understand that, but the people that are on Spice are the ones that take up the resources.'* **(FG16)**

> **P1:** *'I'd say this last 12 months, the biggest problem this prison has is Spice. It's as simple as that. You'll have bullying on wings and that, but Spice, that's the one that shuts us all down. As soon as you get a Spice attack the alarm bell's off and you're out the door. If a fight breaks out, they split them up, put them in their rooms and everybody carries on. If there's a health issue and especially if they go to hospital, you lose six officers for every prisoner. If they go to hospital and they're bed-watched, two officers have to sit with them for eight hours, then they go home and another two take over and then another two take over. So, in that 24-hour space, we've lost six officers, so we get banged-up.'* **(FG7)**

> **P1:** *'…we had one yesterday and he threatened to hang himself, so he got a sheet out, tied it around the bar on level three, tied it around his throat and threatened to jump because he wanted some caps. So, basically, he was acting like a child, "if I don't get this, I'm going to do this" and that's what they did. So, they said "ok", came back and he calmed down in the end and they gave him his caps…If you've got mental health issues, you've got a mental health person and everything else like that. If you're a druggy and all that, this is where it all becomes a completely different thing because if you're screaming "my drugs, my drugs, I'm going insane", everyone's around there wiping your arse. You get someone like me, I sit in my cell, I do what I do, I work, I do everything else, they don't give a toss about me, they literally don't.'* **(FG13)**

Spice not only adds to the 'weight' of imprisonment by leading to lockdowns, it is also a major disruptive factor to prison life through the creation of *debt* which negatively impacts both on those in debt because it leads to *bullying* and those around them because of *'pad-thieving'*. Many prisoners talked about how easy it was to fall into debt because of the informal prisoner code of 'double bubble' or double repayment for a debt. Below prisoners explain how the accumulation of *debt* leads to *bullying*:

> **P2:** *'Drugs is the big thing. They do a huge amount of drugs in one go where they just can't stop themselves or whatever their motivation is, and then they end up in huge amounts of debt to people on the wings. Whether they then end up being constantly bullied until they*

pay their money back, whether they get beaten up and that's the end of it, whether they get told "you've got to go and rock him now to get my money". It doesn't matter what happens. When people are in debt and they don't do anything to get out of that debt, when they are unable to get out of that debt, it causes conflict all over the wing, especially if people start robbing people because then the staff end up getting involved.' **(FG8)**

P3: *'Oh god, yeah. I know people, I don't class those sorts of people as friends, more acquaintances. I know they do Spice, they don't do it in front of me, I don't do it, I don't touch the stuff because it's horrible, but I know they do it and then one day I'll see them and they've got a black eye or they've been cut and so I know that they obviously are unable to pay off someone, their canteen then comes or they get paid and then obviously they get beat-up because they are out. It's one of those things where that's where it turns into physical violence. '*(FG14)**

P1: *'I just think there's a problem with Spice and debt …The most conflicts I see is when people don't pay their debts and that. I've seen people, they'll go to someone and they'll ask them for something knowing that they can't pay for it and then the next minute, the person that they've asked it for has found out that they've took the thing off them and then they can't pay for it, so then they go and chin them. That's happened on our wing. There's about six people walking around with black eyes on our wing at the minute.'* **(FG3)**

However, debt has negative consequences both for the debtor and other prisoners on the wing through ***pad-thieving.*** This is when one prisoner steals from another prisoner's cell in order to pay off a debt, often relating to Spice. This leads to a lot of anger and frustration amongst prisoners as reflected in the following comment:

P5: *'… when someone steals from your cell it's the same as when someone burgles your home. That's your little space. When you go in there and find some stuff… has been taken and it's happened to me, just before Christmas '16, about two weeks before Christmas, somebody stole my kettle because they'd been using theirs to get a spark to have a cigarette and then blown their kettle, so they come and stole mine. I nearly didn't have a kettle over Christmas, that would've been quite devastating. So, when you get your cell broken into and someone goes in there, it's quite devastating, it's as if you were burgled in your own home. It's a violation of your little bit of space.'* **(FG14)**

Debt collection and bullying can also have repercussions for the prisoner's ***family*** as prisoners may be forced to get their families involved to pay off debts on the outside. The debt collectors threaten the family if they do not come up with the money to pay off debts and so families become embroiled in prisoners' debt and drug problems:

P3: *' … most people have mums and dads on the outside who will pay, so, it'll be like "we'll get him in the cell, get him on the phone, give him a mobile, ring your mum or dad and tell them you need the money otherwise we're going to kick your head in" and then they're like "mum, I need the money or else they're going to kill me" and so then they're worried about their son, so then they transfer money into people's banks. That's how it gets done.***' (FG4)**

5.1.2 'The depth of imprisonment'

Three key issues emerged from the focus groups relating to what Crewe (2011a; 2015) describes as the 'depth' of imprisonment or the psychological pressures of prison life – *'being banged up'*, *'being kept in the dark'* and *'deteriorating mental wellbeing'*. Many prisoners commented that the amount of time spent 'banged up' increased during the time of the research because of the large number of 'red regimes' caused by staff shortages, and Spice and self-harm incidents. ***'Being banged up'*** for long periods of time led to a mixed assortment of reactions from prisoners. Some felt it led to conflict, aggression and agitation, while others talked about the lack of control, loneliness and boredom. Many took drugs to pass the time of day. Some even enjoyed the opportunity to have time for themselves:

> **P3:** *'It's those little things, isn't it? It's those little things sometimes that they don't realise what an effect it actually has on people. Because you're not in control, you're in control in there to a certain degree of yourself, but you are not in control of other things. You have no control over it and that sometimes is hard work. To have to ask someone to do something all the time, you don't want to do it. You want to get out there and do it yourself. So, sometimes that's difficult and when someone's not doing it or being awkward about it, it's frustrating and that's obviously when you get tensions and that's when people kick-off. Half the people don't want to kick-off. You don't want to get up in the morning and have a go at people, but it's not having that control over anything, is it, to a certain point.'* **(FG16)**

> **P4:** *'On the outside there's several things you can do when you're angry and you're upset and that, you can take yourself away from the situation. In here, you can't. Even if you go to your cell, you've still got the echo of prison all around you, no matter what. You cannot shut down, switch off and let the situation just dissolve. You're constantly stuck in that situation the whole time and that's why you get a lot of fighting.'* **(FG8)**

> **P3:** *'Yeah. It's going to sound strange, but a lot of guys that come to prison who haven't taken drugs, have only started turning to drugs while they've been in prison because it's escapism. So, there's more people now going onto Spice because before if they were feeling stressed, they could have a cigarette, now, they've got nothing. So, they think "maybe if I have a bit of Spice, for half-an-hour I could be zonked out of it" and now they're turning to the drugs.'* **(FG2)**

> **P5***:' If you're alone in your cell, it doesn't mean you're lonely. Because if you can actually make best use of that time and actually enjoy that time … I think there's a difference between being alone and lonely.* **P1***: Come 5 o'clock on a Saturday, personally, I know a few others are like me, but come 5 o'clock on a Saturday, I'm glad that door's shut.* **P2***: Yeah, I am. I love my bang-up time. Close the door, read my books, bit of telly if you want to watch TV.'* **(FG13)**

However, one of the key factors that exacerbated 'being banged up' was lack of communication or ***'being kept in the dark'*** about what was going on and why there was a lockdown. Many prisoners commented in the focus groups about the dire lack of communication with them over what was going on or why they were locked in their cells. They felt that if they had been informed about why there was a lockdown, it would have helped them to better cope:

> **P5:** *'They need to have empathy to know … what it's like to be in the dark, to be alone, to be living in a dark world because let's face it, a prison is not a place of happiness, it's a place of*

pain and hurt. There's nothing happy about it. Some people will say "you've done wrong so you deserve to have pain and hurt", but should we suffer as well? I don't think so. Do we deserve to suffer as well? No, I don't think so.' **(FG14)**

P5: *'… whether it's prisoners and prisoners or prisoners and officers, communication is terrible. In the morning you can be sat in your chair, ready to go to work at 8.15, 9 o'clock comes and you're still sat there, your door's not open, it's a red regime, but nobody's told you. So, you're sat there, you're ready to go, but in that three-quarters-of-an-hour you could've written a letter to home, you could've done something very important, but you don't know. If somebody's had a bad phone call like a 'dear John' phone call and they're really upset, they might not want to tell nobody. Unfortunately, we had an incident on our wing where a kid hung himself because he didn't want to talk to anybody, which was a very sad thing for the wing, but if he had communicated and actually said to somebody, because he had quite lot of friends on the wing, "I've just had this really bad phone call", he could've had help.'***(FG7)**

P3: '…*if something happens and you've got to get banged away, all they say is "bang up". They don't give you a reason why and then people are like "well, we got banged up yesterday, why are we getting banged up today?". Whereas, if they come over the tannoy, for example, if it's someone needs to go out to hospital and it's a blue light or something like that, if they come on the tannoy and say "look guys, please get behind your doors because there's an escort going out, there's no staff" or whatever, then that's fine because you know what's going on. You don't have to know all the particulars, just the little bit of information to tell you this is the reason we're doing what we're doing and that's it. I think if there was more information off of the officers on the wing, then there'd be less conflict as well***.' (FG8)**

'Being banged up' also created other problems, particularly regarding a ***'deterioration in mental wellbeing'***. For some prisoners it accentuated existing mental health problems,[15] and for others it brought on new ones. While several prisoners talked about the availability of substance misuse and mental health support in the prison,[16] some argued that they resorted to Spice and self-harm as a means of escaping the psychological pressures of 'being banged up':

P1: *'Being locked up in your cell, your mind, if you've got no distractions or anything, your mind works overtime and that's where guilt, depression, anxiety, starts playing on your mind. You might find that someone will, if they're locked up in their cell, they'll concentrate on their guilt, feeling guilty about what they've done and that could lead then to depression. They'll start cutting-up because they're depressed or with the time thing, they're behind their door so much and then it all just escalates. So, your mind just rolls onto the next, onto the next, onto the next. Outside issues, they could have problems with their family where they're not speaking to them because of their crime and then that will lead onto the guilt, which again can lead onto depression. Coming to prison is a very traumatic experience. This is the first time I've ever been in prison and I can tell you the first month I was in prison, for want of better words, I was shitting myself. I'm a big bloke and all the rest of it, but you watch telly*

---

[15] Research shows that there is a higher level of mental health problems amongst males in prisons than their counterparts in the community (Prison Reform Trust, 2019).
[16] This includes *Distraction Packs* and the Assessment, Care in Custody and Teamwork (ACCT) process to reduce the risk of self-harm (see Pike and George, 2019).

and you hear all the horror stories about prison, you're expecting the worst when you come in. So, you're at a very vulnerable point in your life where you would get PTSD because it's traumatic and you're stressed.' **(FG13)**

P4: *'Depression is probably the worst one. The amount of people I see that are seriously depressed … because you've got this life on the outside, whether you committed a crime or not, you've ended up in jail. So, you're in jail and everything's taken away from you and I know for some people, they can't contact their families straightaway, which is the main thing, their kids and stuff like that. Even if it's just that week period, you need that contact, literally instantly… I've seen suicide in prison …, for many different reasons, but I've seen people right down, big people that you'd imagine on the outside would be the life and soul of every party, come to prison and they're nothing. They just sit in their cells and they're crying all day. You see that.'* **(FG8)**

P1: *'This prison causes mental health issues. If you're stuck in a room the size of your bathroom at home where you've got just your bath, toilet and a sink and a little area for a chair, you're stuck in that cell for 16 hours a day, your thoughts will take over you, end of. There's been times where I've sat there, and I've hurt myself. I'm not going to lie. There's been times when I've actually thought about topping myself. I have had thoughts of it. This causes mental health issues. Putting people in prison causes mental health … I understand that if you've done wrong you've got to be punished but look at what it does to people in the long run.'* **(FG11)**

5.1.3 'The breadth of imprisonment'

A key factor referred to by Crewe (2011b; 2015) relating to the 'breadth' of imprisonment was the extent to which prisoners were able to **maintain contact with the outside world**. Many prisoners argued that the frequent 'red regimes' at the time of the research had severely curtailed their ability to keep in contact with their families because they were often unable to make phone calls when confined to their cells. Below a prisoner shares the effects of being cut off from his family:

P2: *'…family are important for the general health of people in here…people are pulled out of their family situations and cut off from friends … they say a good part of rehabilitation is to have the support and be able to contact these people, but because you end up being locked up 21 hours out of 24 nearly every day, you can't maintain that, so whatever little bit of life you've got left, is inevitably taken away from you. So, they bring people in here, they take everything away and what happens when they go back out? They're homeless, they've got nothing, they've got no friends, they've got no family…'* **(FG14)**

But being in contact with the outside world could also have drawbacks which intensified the 'pains of imprisonment'. Getting bad news from outside such as breakdowns in personal and family relationships could cause upsets and tensions as some prisoners were unable to cope with the **emotional strain**:

Researcher: *'You say here outside influences cause tension. What do you mean?* **P5:** *Outside influences is people having bad phone calls, whether it be probation or home life, when relationships breakdown or you've had some bad news, there's lads coming out on the wing and then taking that aggression out and then try and force it onto other people. You do get that quite a lot...There's just certain prisoners that will literally become very volatile because*

they don't know how to deal with their emotions. Don't forget there's people that's been in for a while that are dealing with their emotional baggage and they're progressing, whereas some people come in and they don't know how to deal with their emotions, they don't know how to deal with modern day life, so they just have a hiccup and then they'll turn to fighting because that's all they've ever known. So, those are the conflicts that I'm on about.' **(FG16)**

5.1.4 'The tightness of imprisonment'

Earlier it was pointed out that by 'tightness' Crewe (2011b; 2015) was conceptualising the *'grip'* of imprisonment or how prisoners are managed psychologically through 'soft power' or the regulation of their attitudes and behaviour. Prisoners in the focus groups for this research spent some time talking about the 'grip' or 'tightness' of imprisonment as reflected in their experiences of the ***Incentives and Earned Privileges*** **(IEP)** scheme which they perceived to be psychologically burdensome. As found by Crewe and as discussed in the previous section on the moral performance of the regime at Dartmoor, prisoners found the rules by which this scheme operated to be ambiguous and unclear, and that prison officers were inconsistent in the way they administered it. Most also felt that instead of offering rewards for responsible behaviour, this scheme was mainly used as a form of punishment:[17]

> **P1:** *'So, the incentives and earned privilege system is something that they can reward and incentivise good behaviour with. That was the purpose of it…As far as the staff are concerned it's another form of punishment. It's not used as 'carrot and stick'…. I filled in my first application to be raised to an enhanced prisoner. Six months later I was told there was no application, so it had been lost. I filled in another one and it literally sat in a drawer. My landing officer put it in a drawer, and it stayed there for three months and then he gave it back and said "you'd better fill in another one". So, by that time, I got a bit wiser and I asked around and found out the best way to do it and so on. I took it to my boss, I took it to the gym, I took it to all these different people, didn't rely on the officers doing it and then I gave it to one officer and he said "wait until (whichever supervising officer) is in and then I'll give it to him and then I'll get it done for you" and it was all done in about three days. So, it was more about learning how the system works, than behaving properly. The incentivisation of your behaviour has no real relevance to whether you're an enhanced prisoner or not. That's how it feels.'* **(FG8)**

> **P2:** *'Just think of the change in attitude there could be for officers if all of a sudden they're saying to Prisoner X "well done, very good", because then his response comes back "thanks very much" and he'll do more. The officer will feel good as well because at the moment he's just seen as the 'big stick', but if he becomes a 'big kind stick', what a change in their life it would be in here because it's a pretty awful job, really. The way it runs, the way they make it run, so often, is all the negatives. The positives they could get out of just recognising the good that some prisoners do.'* **(FG6)**

---

[17] The HCJC report (2019a:66) states that 'since 2018 governors have been permitted to devise their own IEP policy' and a new revised *Incentives Policy Framework* was published in July 2019 which is based on the premise that positive reinforcement is more effective than punishment in shaping behaviour.

Similarly, prisoners found ***offending behaviour programmes*** to be psychologically burdensome.[18] They argued that these programmes were little more than tick box exercises that provided very limited or meaningful rehabilitation:

> **Researcher: '***What about these TSP** and 'Resolve' programmes? Are they worthwhile?* **P5:** *Just a tick box really. I was never really a violent offender…Like I said, I'm an addict… I was using quite heavily before I came and I did it cold turkey, I had no help whatsoever. I did it my way. With the rehab bit, I don't really think they help like that. I said I got a problem with crack-cocaine and opiates, they gave me a 10-page booklet. I filled it in, gave it back and they gave me a certificate like I'd achieved opiates. Basically, they're saying I'm a cured man. I know everything there is to know about opiates. I thought how the hell can a 10-page thing … it's a tick-box?'* **(FG6)**

> **P3:'** *I went on a TSP course or a positive thinking course and when we went out for our break there were some lads who were saying, I don't swear, but they were saying "let's get f-ing through this, it's another tick on our thing" and they don't really care less. They want to do it because it ticks off a box. I've come out with them after and they've been there "I can't wait to get out and get some drugs, I need some drugs" and they're punching and becoming aggressive and things like that and when they get back to the TSP class, it's "yes Miss, yes Miss". It's all a load of crap. They're only doing it for one purpose. They don't want to be rehabilitated.'* **(FG15)**

Bullock and Bunce (2020) also found in their research that prisoners felt offending behaviour programmes lacked depth, value and quality, with most attending as a tick box exercise purely to meet sentencing plans rather than having any relevance to their personal situation.

Overall, prisoners argue that the IEP scheme and offending behaviour programmes tighten the 'grip' of imprisonment because they fail to provide any direction or forward planning to support progressive movement towards rehabilitation. Many expressed that they wanted to have goals to work towards, and to receive acknowledgement for progress made. The exchange below between the participants in one of the focus groups illustrates how prisoners view the issue:

> **P5: '***… It's almost the time you're going to be released and you still don't know what you're doing, where you're going, what you're going to have. It's like we all had to drive here, we all probably drive cars, it's like driving down a country lane with your lights off, you don't know where you're going, you don't know where you are.* **P2:** *No direction.* **P3:** *But you know there's a cliff coming up somewhere.* **P2***: … from the time you come in here, whether it's 12 months or 12 years, there is no forward movement. It's like treading water until that day you step out through the gate again. Yet, supposedly, it's supposed to be a little bit of rehabilitation, a preparation to make you a wiser and better person.* **P5:** *This is why mentally it just flattens you out. In the end …* **P2:** *It destroys you.* **P5:** *Yeah. You just feel so weary, you just can't think anymore because if you keep thinking about it, you're going to go mad.* **P2:** *That's what the system does…* **P5:** *…where the prison harps on its mantra is rehabilitation, rehabilitation, to me everything about the prison system seems to be designed to break you and my argument is that some toys, once broken, can't be fixed.'* **(FG14)**

---

[18] While the research was ongoing the new *Offender Management in Custody* model was beginning to be introduced at Dartmoor. This was 'designed to give more time for interaction between staff and prisoners, including through one-to-one support' (HCJC, 2019a:53).

6. Prisoners' Views of the Dialogue Road Map (DRM)

As stated in section 1, at the time this research was conducted the DRM had not long been introduced at Dartmoor Prison, although it is now much more firmly integrated into the prison regime.[19] This research makes no attempt to evaluate this programme. However, at the end of each focus group participants were asked whether they had heard of the DRM, what they knew about it and what they thought about it. In most of the focus groups a prisoner DRM facilitator was present and he would explain the key features of the DRM programme to participants. If the facilitator was not present one of the researchers would take on this task. Also, in several of the focus groups some prisoners had had experience of the DRM through participation in individual mediation or training sessions. The aim of introducing the DRM at this point was to provide an opportunity for prisoners to discuss whether the programme would address some of the conflicts and tensions that they had raised in the focus groups and the extent to which they felt the DRM or similar programmes could strengthen the rehabilitative culture in the prison.

6.1 Prisoner Facilitators' Explanation of the DRM

As stated above, while the research was ongoing only a few members of the focus groups had had experience of the DRM in action and their views will be outlined later in this section. However, most focus groups included a trained DRM prisoner facilitator and they stressed five main features of the DRM to participants. First, as one facilitator explained, it **opened up communication** between prisoners themselves and prisoner-to-prison officer:

> **P5:** *'Basically, it's to try and get everyone talking, rather than fighting, to try and resolve conflict and things like that … part of it is letting people just air their grief because that's some of the reason why people get tension in prisons because no-one's listening. So, part of the reason is to just let them air their grief and then you've got the other 'circles' which would let you bring up issues and discuss amongst yourselves what the issue is and how you think it could be sorted, all those different aspects of the issue and depending on what is decided in the 'circle', is whether that gets taken to an officer or not trying to get stuff done.'* **(FG9)**

Second, the DRM provides the opportunity to **address the conflicts and tensions** experienced by prisoners **through dialogue and non-violent communication**. The DRM uses individual dialogues as well as 'circles'[20] as the key forums to air and resolve grievances, conflicts and tensions:

> **P4:** *'… if there's an issue between you and another prisoner or between you and a prison officer or a governor or whatever and it's causing conflict and all that and you want to talk about it, we provide a service where we'll … for example, you two are having issues. We'll have a one-to-one with you where we'll find your side of the story and all the rest of it, listen to you, repeat back what you say so they know we've heard what you've had to say and all the rest of that. There'll be two of us. We'll have a one-to-one with him and get his side of the story and let him get it off his chest. We'll do however many one-to-ones needs to be*

---

[19] See the update at the end of this Report.
[20] Circles are types of problem-solving groups (with more emphasis on dialogue) which may focus on either individual concerns or communal issues on the wing eg the IEP scheme or bullying. See explanation of the DRM in section 1 Research Context.

done until we think that it's the right time for you guys to sit in a room together and talk about it to try and resolve it. It's all completely voluntary. You don't have to do the one-to-ones. You don't have to do the mediation if you don't want to.' **(FG13)**

The DRM philosophy discourages the use of the word mediation as pointed out by one prisoner facilitator below. However, the term was often used by prisoners in the focus groups and prison officers in individual interviews to describe how the DRM operated:

> **P2:** *'I think one of the things (the Director of the DRM) said it was, was resolving conflict through dialogue and non-violent communication rather than mediation. So, actually opening a dialogue between the parties involved and getting them to talk rather than fight and doing that in a safe environment within the prison where there's no fighting, there's just talking.'* **(FG2)**

Third, the DRM offers prisoners an element of ***power and control*** over their daily life in the prison:

> **P5:** *'…give control and power back to the prisoners by trying to sort stuff out, get stuff sorted that can be sorted by us… what we're trying to do is try to give a bit more of that power back to the prisoners so that we can sort problems out amongst prisoners ourselves non-violently rather than always running to a member of staff, always running to a governor to try and sort stuff out and I know there is stuff that prisoners won't be able to sort out and all that. It's in its infancy stages, but this is what we're trying to start.'* **(FG9)**

Fourth, the DRM creates a type of therapeutic community or ***enabling environment*** on the wings in which *'troubled' prisoners*, particularly those with substance misuse, debt, bullying or self-harm problems can obtain emotional and practical support either through individual mediation or 'circles':

> **Researcher***: 'What does that mean, 'a well-being wing'?* **P4:** *Well, a well-being wing is where good prisoners and problem prisoners will be on that wing. The DRM will be run on there every single day, morning and afternoon. We'll be running 'circles' where there will be a subject. There will be two or three subjects, who wants to talk about which subject, if the room's split, what do you think we should do? Go around and it's all about you guys talking amongst yourselves in a circle to come to an agreement and say "right, this is the most important today for us to talk to, we can pick the other one up another day". YYY-wing is going to be turned into a feeder-wing for XXX- wing, eventually. It's going to take quite a bit of time, but what's going to happen is, people who want to positively give up Spice, don't want to be fighting, next, they'll want to sort their lives out and live better and everything. They'll go onto YYY-wing where people will work with them. Then they will go to XXX-wing for a couple of months to do all the contents of the DRM every day and 'circles' and mediations and things like that. They'll get trained up if they wish to in the mediation process and how it all works. Then they will go back to YYY-wing and they will help the new people coming onto YYY-wing with issues and stuff like that. It's completely confidential, the service. Whatever gets said in there does not get repeated to any officers or anybody else, unless you threaten yourself or someone else, violence. You threaten the security of the prison, then obviously an officer needs to be told. That's basically the bare bones about it.'* **(FG13)**

Fifth, the DRM can be used to ***repair and mediate damaged family relations*** through family mediations:

P3: *'It's not just non-violent communication within the prison, we also deal with family matters. A lot of prisoners, when they come to prison, they feel shame about the crime or their family or themselves and they lose contact with them because of those situations and because of the situation they find themselves in. They've left it that long when they're in prison, they contact them, so, what they do is they then don't know how to. You know, pick up a phone, what's the answer going to be, so, we're now offering a mediation service with the prisoners to their family. So, if a prisoner says "I'd really like to get back in contact with my mum, I haven't spoken to her for four years", we'll then have a one-to-one with them and then we'll feed that back to the (DRM team outside the prison) and then they'll contact the parent and get that person involved.'***(FG2)**

6.2 Prisoners' Perceptions of the Strengths of the DRM

Based either on their own personal experience of the DRM in action or on what they had been told by prisoner DRM facilitators, focus group participants generally agreed that the five key features of the DRM outlined above represented its core strengths. Below are some of their reflections on what they saw as particularly valuable about the DRM in strengthening the 'moral performance' of the prison and alleviating the 'pains of imprisonment', by giving prisoners a voice, problem solving, empowering and restoring damaged relationships:

P1: *'I think pretty much…it's giving people a chance to actually have their say, to be listened to and actually, hopefully sort it out, instead of going between different people moaning and groaning about it, there's a way that it can be sorted and resolved.'***(FG2)**

P6: *'Well, at the moment, we have no power. No matter what we say, we all feel nobody listens, but with this system, it does actually have a channel… this is going to be helpful. It'll give you some sort of a voice.'* **(FG15)**

P1: *'I've got a lot of problems with my family, my nephews and nieces. My nephews have got hatred against me because I've done some bad things, not hurting them, but drug wise and being angry and being nasty and things like that. My oldest nephew, he doesn't really like me. He used to love me when he was growing up, but he's come to hate me for the things I've done, but it's all drug related. That's why I wanted to do that 'Peaceful Solutions' just to try and make amends and that with my family. It's always felt like a divide between us because I'm the only person who's ever been in prison, I'm the youngest of the family, I'm the baby and I'm the only one who's ended up on drugs and things like that. I just want to try and put things back to how they were because I want to get out and change my life. My sister's all onboard with it. My mum is.'* **(FG3)**

6.3 Prisoners' Perceptions of the Limitations of the DRM

Two key limitations of the DRM were voiced by prisoners. The first related to **trust, confidentiality and the integrity** of the DRM facilitators. Several prisoners commented that the successful implementation of the DRM relied on such trust and integrity. Some of the facilitators were thought to be untrustworthy and likely to abuse their position of power. This linked to experiences with listeners who breached confidentiality and concerns about bullies taking over the group and becoming DRM facilitators:

P4: *'So, what's actually stopping this 'circle' turning into a bully group? Obviously, you're [inaudible] to people to be decent about it, but what's stopping some of these drug dealers and that going "all I want to be is DRM trained, I want to do this job" and then using that to*

carry on bullying. What procedures have been taken by the prison to stop that happening? …The thing is, it's alright as long as it doesn't end up like the listeners' job did. We had people doing listeners' jobs. They would go and sit and listen to somebody's problems and if somebody was there talking about their offence or whatever, then that listener is not meant to comment about anything, just listen and 10 minutes after he's had that conversation with the person, he's off telling all his mates what he's just been told.' **(FG9)**

Second, some prisoners expressed concerns about how the ***power imbalance*** between themselves and prison officers would be played out in the 'circles'. It was felt that some prison officers would be resistant / unwilling to give power to prisoners and this would mean that the 'circles' would have no real power to effect change and would simply become 'just a front to give the impression of doing something':

P2*: 'It just makes it very convoluted and if you put another thing between you and getting it possibly solved, do you still have to go all the way to the top of the chain to get some result? So, you have a grievance and you go through the DRM and they go "we don't actually have any power, we can't do anything about it" and you've just been fobbed off by "don't talk to me, talk to the DRM before you talk to a member of staff" and then you talk to DRM and they go "there's nothing we can actually do" and you go through to the member of staff and they go "there's nothing I can do, you've got to put in a complaint" and you put in your complaint … I think that would be fine for things like people who have issues from the outside where they've known each other, stuff like that, people talking to other people's missus's, but I don't think that it's going to help with bullying, it's not going to help people in debt with Spice, it's not going to help with things like that, is it? '* **(FG9)**

Prisoners' reservations that prison officers would be reluctant to relinquish power were also shared by several prison officers:

PO1*: 'Yeah. I think you have to look after each other and for us to go home at the end of each shift, kind of safe and well, a lot of the time prison officers don't want to risk empowering prisoners. If you give them back that extra bit of responsibility, that extra bit of trust, that extra bit of empowerment, potentially it can be thrown back in your face, potentially it's going to leave you unsafe… There is plenty of just reason for people to be resistant to something like the DRM.'*

In section 7 consideration will be given to how the DRM could strengthen the rehabilitation environment in HMP Dartmoor by improving the 'moral performance' of the prison regime and reducing the 'pains of imprisonment'.

7. Conclusion:Strengthening the Rehabilitation Culture at Dartmoor

Section 4 pointed out that research indicates that the extent to which prisoners assess a regime to be 'legitimate' is fundamental in creating a positive rehabilitation environment. Achieving 'legitimacy' in the eyes of prisoners is a complex issue but the 'moral performance' of the prison regime and how prisoners experience the 'pains of imprisonment' are paramount. So far this research report has explored the main tensions and conflicts raised by prisoners in the focus groups, which from their perspective undermined the 'moral performance' of the Dartmoor regime and intensified the 'pains of imprisonment' there.

7.1 Moral Performance and Imprisonment

This section will consider how the *'moral performance'* of Dartmoor could be improved in the eyes of the prisoners in order to strengthen the rehabilitation culture. As has been found to be the case in all research on imprisonment, prisoners' relations with prison staff lie at the heart of their assessment of the 'moral performance' of the Dartmoor regime. Prisoners' expectations in this respect were:

- that prison staff would treat them not only with respect and empathy, but also act professionally by offering practical and emotional support;

- that prison staff would exercise their authority fairly and judiciously – a style of leadership described by Crewe, Liebling and Hulley (2014) as 'dynamic authority';

- that rules and regulations (particularly regarding the *Incentives and Earned Privileges* scheme) would be administered openly and consistently.

Three recommendations to meet these expectations:

- more presence of prison officers on the wings interacting with prisoners. This is not an easy matter to resolve at a time when significant cuts in staffing levels have taken place, although there has been a recent commitment from HMPPS to turn this around;[21]

- improve the quality of the professional training of prison staff particularly as regards the use of 'dynamic authority';

- improve communication with prisoners on how the revised *Incentives Policy Framework,* published in July 2019, operates and ensure that it is being consistently administered (see footnote 17).

7.2 The Pains of Imprisonment

Turning to prisoners' perceptions of the *'pains of imprisonment'* at Dartmoor also raises several expectations about the style of the regime. First, *'being banged up'* following lockdowns or 'red regimes' was seen by prisoners to intensify the psychological pressures or *'depth of imprisonment'*. But what made 'being banged up' worse from their perspective was

---

[21] See discussion in section 3 about *Challenges Facing the Prison Service*.

not knowing what was going on or *'being kept in the dark'*. This raises the expectation that during lockdowns there needs to be:

- more open communication with prisoners about why there is a lockdown, how long it is likely to last and how practical matters like showers and phone calls will be organised.

Second, prisoners found the *Incentives and Earned Privileges* scheme to be psychologically manipulative and controlling, intensifying what Crewe (2015) refers to as the *'tightness of imprisonment'*. This raised the expectation that such schemes:

- should be more orientated to rewarding responsible behaviour and that the rules and regulations by which they operate will be made clearer and administered more consistently.

As mentioned earlier, since this research was completed there has been a review of *Incentives and Earned Privileges* schemes and a new scheme rolled out. The revised *Incentives Policy Framework* is based on the premise that positive reinforcement is more effective than punishment in shaping behaviour (HCJC, 2019a).

Prisoners' feedback about the psychological burden of the *Incentives and Earned Privileges* scheme extended to offending behaviour programmes. Focus group participants also gave these a poor assessment and commented that they found them to be little more than 'tick box exercises' which were seldom integrated into longer term rehabilitation plans. This reiterates what has been found in national research (see Bullock and Bunce, 2020). From the Dartmoor research there was an expectation from prisoners that:

- offending behaviour programmes needed to be overhauled to ensure that they offer 'meaningful' and progressive rehabilitation opportunities.

While this research was ongoing the new *Offender Management in Custody* model was beginning to be introduced at Dartmoor. This was 'designed to give more time for interaction between staff and prisoners, including through one-to-one support' (HCJC, 2019a:53). This may provide the opportunity to strengthen the meaningfulness of offending behaviour programmes from the perspective of prisoners and to integrate them more purposely into plans which provide explicit progressive movement towards the achievement of rehabilitative goals.

Third, prisoners' concerns about the burdens arising from the *'breadth of imprisonment'* centred on maintaining their links with family and the outside world. The key expectation here was that opportunities were available:

- to mediate and resolve tensions and conflicts with families to maintain smooth relations with the outside world.

Finally, prisoners raised several tensions and conflicts that intensified the *'weight of imprisonment'*. Key concerns here were: bullying arising from life in an integrated prison; getting into debt; and the aftermath of Spice attacks and self-harm incidents on the wings. Two possible solutions could soften the 'burden' of such concerns and so produce a culture more conducive to rehabilitation:

- prison wide programmes to address bullying; debt; Spice and self-harm incidents;

- prison staff – prisoner forums to problem solve ways to address bullying; debt; and the aftermath of Spice and self-harm incidents on the wings.

7.3 Could the DRM strengthen the rehabilitation environment in Dartmoor by improving the 'moral performance' of the prison regime and reducing the 'pains of imprisonment'?

Despite an element of scepticism among prisoners about issues of 'trust' and 'the power imbalance' (see section 6), in general there was a willingness to give the DRM a try because as some prisoners commented it has the potential to bring about change:

> **P3:** *'Even if you give the DRM option to 10 cons and one con takes it seriously, we'll say, that one con's worth that. Anything else is a blessing. Happy words will travel. So, start from the ground up, just do one person.* **P1***: 'Yeah, that's right, exactly. Just one con, that's all you need, one con to use the system and go "actually, I've learnt something from it". Then it's like a wave in this place, … like when you throw a stone in a pond, it'll do that. Alright, as P4 said, it'll take time, but what else have we got? Time is something we've got…If you don't try, then you're just going to be stuck in the same situation. If you're going to do something, plant the seed with this and give it a chance.'* **(FG13)**

> **P5:** *'The system could be brilliant, it could work, or it could potentially fail, but without ever trying it, you'll never know. I know that I'd want to do the DRM because it gives me better communication skills and it was something that I always struggled with in my life. So, that's why I want to do it and I think people are willing to …'* **(FG16)**

Therefore, from the prisoners' perspective the DRM was seen to offer opportunities to address some of their concerns about the 'moral performance' of the prison regime: by strengthening communication between prisoners, and prisoners and prison officers; by airing and resolving tensions and conflicts either through individual mediation or problem solving type 'circles'; and finally by building the skills of prison officers to effectively exercise 'dynamic authority'. In addition, by creating an 'enabling', 'therapeutic' environment on some wings, the DRM could go some way to alleviating the 'pains of imprisonment': by giving prisoners an element of power and control over their daily lives; by creating a 'supportive' environment for 'troubled' and 'vulnerable' prisoners to sort out bullying, mental health and substance misuse issues; and finally to facilitate the resolution of family disputes.

8. Follow Up to Research

8.1 The progressive integration of the DRM into the regime at HMP Dartmoor

The following is written by the Governing Governor Bridie Oakes-Richards in September 2020 and explains how the DRM model was progressively integrated into the Dartmoor regime:

Before the changes to the prison regime as a result of the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic a 'parent' (xxx) and a 'support' (yyy) wing were implementing the DRM model. The 'parent' wing was managed by staff who had either undergone DRM training and/or were culturally aligned to its ethos and approach. The 'support' wing was overseen by the Custodial Manager in charge of the 'parent' wing but containing staff not necessarily trained nor culturally aligned to the DRM.

The 'parent' (xxx) wing practised the DRM model, holding regular dialogue circles, co-ordinating the delivery of the 1:1 conflict mediation with prisoners and on occasion their families, as well as offering the opportunity to access and benefit from a 21-day residential programme hosted on the wing. Initially, 1:1 prisoner conflict mediation took place wherever there was space, but quite quickly it was necessary to have a dedicated location. To begin with classrooms based near the 'parent' wing were used for this purpose, but as demand for support grew across the prison, a DRM hub was set up in a more central spot in the Diversity Centre. The advantage of the Diversity Centre was that it afforded a much bigger area with an office from which co-ordination/administration could take place, conflict mediation rooms for individual support and a communal space for dialogue circles to occur.

The DRM Hub and the 'parent' (xxx) wing supported outreach to the 'support' (yyy) wing. There were DRM prisoner facilitators on both wings, whose role was to take part in dialogue circles, encourage prisoners to make use of the DRM conflict mediation service and influence the culture towards a DRM aligned ethos. In addition, and working with wing staff, the DRM facilitators helped identify, refer and support prisoners who required a more intensive experience from the DRM and who were assessed as suitable for the 21-day residential programme hosted on the 'parent' wing.

It was therefore necessary for staff and prisoner DRM facilitators from both the 'parent' (xxx) and 'support' (xxx) wings to work closely together to ensure prisoners wishing to undertake the 21-day residential programme were thoroughly tested as to their commitment to do the programme. A required couple of months on the 'support' wing was set as part of the criteria for selection. Potential residential candidates were enabled to focus on obtaining the support necessary to keep them stable and motivated to commit to change. Often, those selected for the residential programme were addicted, in debt and under threat, and suffering from trauma originating from their background and compounded by custody. Mental health, personality disorder and behavioural issues including self-harm, violence and a need for instant gratification were also commonplace.

The 'support' wing soon became the wing to accommodate some complex-needs prisoners from other wings, as it was found that the DRM offered potential support for the management of some rather difficult prisoners. As the 'support' wing housed the induction prisoners, the induction process became central to the DRM model. The induction experience was extended to two weeks and involved the DRM project co-ordinator and DRM prisoner facilitators who ran a dialogue circle as an introduction to the project and to Dartmoor. The DRM project co-ordinator contributed to the multi-agency step-up plan mapping the needs of the new arrivals; these identified needs were then built into individual sentence plans as part of an overall offender journey. Keyworkers and both prison and probation offender managers were given training in the DRM, took part in dialogue circles and were part of the management and actioning of the step-up and sentence plans.

Probation staff, and in particular the Senior Probation Officer, were keen to refer prisoners for support and were very much aligned to both its culture and ethos. Their centrality to offender management in custody meant they were a strong influence in getting the DRM embedded into the regime at Dartmoor.

Another early and powerful influencer was the Independent Adjudicator who as a Judge, regularly visited Dartmoor to carry out adjudications in the Segregation Unit. The Judge saw the potential of conflict mediation as an alternative to segregation, added days or other punitive awards; they actively supported the use of the 21-day residential programme again as an alternative to punishment for the more troubled and entrenched repeat offenders. Such advocacy for the DRM model served to legitimise its worth to those staff unconvinced by the project.

To strengthen the acceptance of the DRM model as an integral part of our integrated prison, work had begun on accrediting the 'parent' (xxx) wing and the DRM Hub as Enabling Environments. The longer-term aim was to become an Enabled Prison with both E/E accreditation and the DRM embedded on each wing.

8.2 Recent developments at Dartmoor

The following is written by the Governing Governor Bridie Oakes-Richards in September 2020 and explains recent developments at the prison:

Since the research concluded in June 2018 Dartmoor continued with normalising the custodial experience through continued full integration of prisoner lived experiences. On entry to Dartmoor prisoners are asked to sign an integrated living compact and to live by the principles of this normalisation. It is an approach requiring a security-harmony ethos to ensure safety and well-being. Order and a well-controlled regime contribute to enablement, single cell living is a right to offer the necessary headroom to accept a fully integrated prison, and access to mental health services, trauma informed approaches and talking therapies alongside mindfulness, mediation and yoga, art therapies, music/drama and pastoral care assist in well-being. The Chaplains have played a large role in supporting the DRM and through counselling placements with a local counselling provider and with St Mark and St John University.

The DRM model is another layer in the security, harmony mix required by integration. Post the research it had expanded into the Diversity Centre and set up as a DRM hub. Conflict mediation and the residential programme offered keyworkers, probation/prison offender managers and the Independent Adjudicator alternatives to resolve issues and facilitate the possibility of change and rehabilitation. Sentence plans, parole boards, CSIP and safer custody approaches have all benefitted from the continuation of the DRM at Dartmoor. The recent debt committee worked closely with prisoner DRM facilitators both to better understand the level, extent and impact of debt on prisoners and their families as well as a means of delivering accessible support.

The children and families services delivered via Choices in our visitor centre and through family days were increasing their input to conflict mediation. There had been some family input to DRM cases and there were plans to move towards family group conferencing as a means of building on conflict resolution within relationships/families.

The bid to gain E/E accreditation began after this research ended with visits to Grendon Underwood prison, a therapeutic prison with whole prison accreditation. 2019/20 saw a joint working group of staff and prisoner DRM facilitators working with the Centre for Peaceful Solutions to seek accreditation for the ''parent' (xxx) wing and the DRM hub in the Diversity Centre. The long-term aim was to be a fully integrated and enabled prison.

Becoming a fully integrated prison to normalise the custodial experience by having sex offenders and non-sex offenders living and working together has been difficult. Dartmoor took on this approach without additional resources or a change in its commissioned health, mental health and integrated substance misuse services. The single cell occupancy increased costs per prisoner and put pressure on budgets and performance as a result. Integration has been viewed as a barrier to prisoners transferring to Dartmoor, however, occupancy rates remained high at over 98% capacity. The ratio of sex offenders to non-sex offender prisoners needs to be regulated to an ideal of 60% to 40% respectively. The models for operational delivery under the Prison Transformation Programme made Dartmoor a Cat C adult male training prison, integration is not part of this and being seen as part of the male sex offender estate has been challenging. Post-Covid where prisoner flows did not match operating models, Dartmoor's ratio changed to 53% sex offenders to 47% non-sex offenders and is at a critical point where integration is under pressure and requiring additional vigilance in managing safety and well-being.

Dartmoor is under a closure notice scheduled to take effect in 2023, it has been subject to closure since 2013 and such a prolonged period of uncertainty has impacted on staff, partner and prisoner morale. The move to integrated status signalled to all players the resilience of Dartmoor to continue pushing forward in an attempt to normalise the custodial experience, to seek security-harmony solutions in finding the hooks for change in prisoner behaviours.

Perceived and real lack of investment to help Dartmoor progress and consolidate its determined attempt to be rehabilitative has hampered progress. It has made sustained change to establishment culture difficult to achieve and real energy, leadership and drive is needed to keep pushing forward despite setbacks. Time and again, Dartmoor staff, prisoners and partners have battled to be heard, to be supported and enabled to work on security-harmony approaches. The opportunity to work with the Centre for Peaceful Solutions in 2015 at nil cost to the establishment other than access to prisoners/staff and training hours, gave Dartmoor a real morale boost. It came at a time of integration and totally reflected our security-harmony ethos.

8.3 Future research and the impact of Covid-19

This research was intended as a 'scoping' or 'pilot' research to explore the process and impact of HMP Dartmoor becoming an integrated prison regime underpinned by restorative principles. It was expected that the baseline data collected from this scoping exercise could be used to inform a larger scale funding application from one of the academic research councils. However, it has now been decided, for two main reasons, that there will be no follow up research.

First, although the moratorium on primary research in prisons has now been lifted, restrictions continue to be in place as a result of the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on prison regimes (HMPPS, 2020). Second, it is likely that HMP Dartmoor will be closed by 2023 which would restrict the timespan for any research project.

The research was completed before the Covid-19 pandemic arrived in UK. Therefore, no attempt is made in this research report to speculate on how it may have impacted on prison regimes. However, the recent report by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons (2020) suggests that the severe regime restrictions set in place to stop the spread of the virus have had negative effects on the 'moral performance' of prisons and the 'pains of imprisonment', particularly on prisoners' mental health and wellbeing.

References

Auty, K. and Liebling, A. (2020) 'Exploring the relationship between prison social climate and reoffending', *Justice Quarterly*, 37(2): 358-381.

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 and Criminal Justice*, 20(1):111-127.

Burke, L., Collett, S. and McNeill, F. (2019) *Reimagining Rehabilitation: Beyond the Individual.* Routledge: London.

Crewe, B. (2011a) 'Depth, weight, tightness: Revisiting the pains of imprisonment', *Punishment and Society*, 13(5): 509-529.

Crewe, B. (2011b) 'Soft power in prison: Implications for staff-prisoner relationships, liberty and legitimacy', *European Journal of Criminology*, 8(6): 455-468.

Crewe, B., Liebling, A. and Hulley, S. (2014) 'Heavy–light, absent–present: Rethinking the "weight" of imprisonment', *British Journal of Sociology,* 65(3): 387-410.

Crewe, B. (2015) 'Inside the belly of the penal beast: Understanding the experience of imprisonment', *International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy*, 4(1): 50-65.

Crewe, B. (2016) 'The sociology of imprisonment', in Jewkes, Y., Bennett, J. and Crewe, B. (eds) *The Handbook of Prisons.* Routledge: London. (2nd edition)

Crewe, B. and Liebling, A. (2017) 'Reconfiguring penal power', in Liebling, A., Maruna, S. and McAra, L. (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology*. OUP: Oxford. (6th edition)

Crewe, B., Liebling, A., and Hulley, S. (2014) 'Heavy-light, absent-present: revisiting the weight of imprisonment', *British Journal of Sociology,* 65(3): 387-410.

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 and Social Inquiry*, 40(2): 309-344.

Davies, P. (2018) 'Doing qualitative data analysis in criminological research', in Davies, P. and Francis, P. (eds) *Doing Criminological Research.* Sage: London.

Farrall, S., Bottoms, A. and Shapland, J. (2010) 'Social structures and desistance from crime', *European Journal of Criminology*, 7(6): 546—570.

Hall, S. (2018) 'Doing ethnographic research in criminology', in Davies, P. and Francis, P. (eds) *Doing Criminological Research*. Sage: London.

HM Chief Inspector of Prisons (2017) *HMP Dartmoor: Report On An Unannounced Inspection of HMP Dartmoor.* HMIP: London.

HM Chief Inspector of Prisons (2019) *Annual Report 2018-2019.* HMSO: London.

HM Chief Inspector of Prisons (2020) *Aggregate Report on Short Scrutiny Visits.* HMIP: London.

House of Commons Justice Committee (HCJC) (2019a) *Prison Population 2022: Planning for the Future.* House of Commons: London.

House of Commons Justice Committee (HCJC) (2019b) *Prison Governance.* House of Commons: London.

HMPPS (2020) *Covid-19: The National Research Committees' Medium-Term Plan.* Ministry of Justice: London.

Jewkes, Y. and Gooch, K. (2019) 'The rehabilitative prison: An oxymoron, or an opportunity to radically reform the way we do punishment?' , in Ugwudike, P. et al. (eds) *The Routledge Companion to Rehabilitative Work in Criminal Justice.* Routledge: London.

Liebling, A., Elliott, C. and Arnold, H. (2001) 'Transforming the prison: Romantic optimism or appreciative realism', *Criminal Justice*, 1 (2): 161-180.

Liebling, A. (2004) *Prisons and their Moral Performance: A Study of the Values, Quality and Prison Life*. Clarendon Press: Oxford.

Liebling, A. (2011a) 'Moral performance, inhumane and degrading treatment and prison pain', *Punishment and Society*, 13(5): 530-550.

Liebling, A. (2011b) 'Distinctions and distinctiveness in the work of prison officers: Legitimacy and authority revisited', *European Journal of Criminology*, 8(6): 484-499.

Liebling A. et al. (2019) 'Are hope and possibility achievable in prison?', *Howard Journal of Crime and Justice,* 58(1): 104-126.

Mann, R., Fitzalan Howard, F. and Tew, J. (2018) 'What is a rehabilitative prison culture?', *Prison Service Journal*, No.234: 3-9.

Mann, R. (2019) 'Rehabilitative culture part 2: An update on evidence and practice', *Prison Service Journal*, No.244: 3-10.

Maruna, S. (2001) *Making Good: How Ex-Convicts Reform and Rebuild Their Lives.* American Psychological Association: Washington.

McNeill, F. (2006) 'A desistance paradigm for offender management', *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 6(1): 39-62.

McNeill, F. and Schinkel, M. (2016) 'Prisons and desistance', in Yewkes, Y., Crewe, B. and Bennett, J. (eds) *Handbook on Prisons.* Sage: London. (2nd edition)

McNeill, F. and Weaver, B. (2010) *Desistance Research and Offender Management*. Scottish Centre for Crime and Justice Research Report No.3.

Ministry of Justice (2013) *Transforming Rehabilitation: A Strategy for Reform.* HMSO: London.

Ministry of Justice (2016) *Prison Safety and Reform.* HMSO: London.

Nugent, B and Schinkel, M. (2016) 'The pains of desistance', *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 16(5): 568-584.

Pike, S. and George, R. (2019) *The Assessment, Care in Custody and Teamwork (ACCT) Process in Prison: Findings from Qualitative Research*. Ministry of Justice: London.

Prison Reform Trust (2019) *Bromley Briefings Prison Factfile Winter 2019*.PRT: London.

Scott, D. (2014) 'Prison research: appreciative or critical inquiry', *Criminal Justice Matters*, No.95: 30-31.

Shapland, J. and Bottoms, A. (2017) 'Desistance from crime and implications for offender rehabilitation', in Liebling, A., Maruna, S. and McAra, L. (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology*. Oxford University Press: Oxford. (6th edition)

Sparks, R. and Bottoms, A. (1995) ' Legitimacy and order in prisons', *British Journal of Criminology*, 46(1): 45-62.

Sykes, G. (1958) *The Society of Captives*. Princeton University Press: USA.

Appendix 1: Prisoner Focus Group Interview Topics

1. **Integrated Prison:**
   - What is an integrated prison?
   - How is it different to other prisons?
   - How does it affect day to day life on the wings?
   - How is it experienced by prisoners?

2. **Interpersonal conflicts and tensions:**
   - What kind of interpersonal conflicts/tensions arise in the prison?
   - Prisoner to prisoner; prisoner to staff; Spice; debt; being in an integrated prison; staff shortages; bullying; fighting.

3. **How are interpersonal conflicts and tensions dealt with? (Dealing with conflicts and tensions):**
   - Policies, practices, procedures
   e.g.   formally – adjudications; white and pink notes
             informally – 'fixers'
   - how do prisoners and staff manage problems/difficulties?

4. **What kind of effect do tensions/conflicts have on life inside the prison? (Impact of tensions and conflicts):**
   - ACCT process
   - Mental health and wellbeing
   - Substance misuse
   - Self-harm
   - Violence

5. **Dialogue Road Map:**
   - Where does the DRM fit into this story?
   - How would it deal with tensions and conflicts?
   - What do prisoners know about the DRM?
   - What do they think about it?
   - In what kind of situations could it be used?

6. **Purpose of Imprisonment:**
   - What is the purpose of imprisonment? What is the purpose of sending people to prison? Incapacitation, rehabilitation, punishment, deterrence?

7. **Rehabilitation Culture:**
   - What makes a good rehabilitation environment/ culture?
   - How well does Dartmoor achieve this?
   - How could the rehabilitation culture at Dartmoor be strengthened?

8. **The Research:**
   - What should we be looking at to improve the rehabilitation culture in Dartmoor?
   - What should be our priorities?
   - How should we do the research? e.g. individual group interviews; observation; taking part in activities; how can we involve prisoners as partners?

Appendix 2: Prisoner Information and Consent Form

What is the purpose of the study? In 2015 HMP Dartmoor introduced a new integrated prison regime and the changes brought about by this are still ongoing. Over the next few years a new restorative programme will be implemented as part of the change process. This study aims to explore the impact of these changes from the perspective of prisoners and prison staff. However, before we can begin this study, we need to do some background work to find out what changes have already been made, expectations for the future and what the best ways to conduct the study are. We call this scoping research.

Why have I been asked to take part? You have been asked to take part because you are a prisoner in HMP Dartmoor and have participated in some of the services that are run there, for example, those relating to substance misuse; mental health/wellbeing; rehabilitation; restorative practices. We would like to talk to you about your experience of any of these services that you have participated in and of life inside an integrated prison. We will also be asking you for any advice/suggestions you may have about how to conduct the impact study (we call this the methodology). This will help us to plan and develop the objectives and expected outcomes of the impact study, and to consider the best way to carry it out.

Do I have to take part?   No, it is up to you. If you do decide to take part, you will be asked to sign a consent form to show you have agreed to take part. You can withdraw at any time, without giving a reason. If you decide not to take part or later withdraw, it will not affect what happens to you, but any information you have already given will remain part of the research.

What will happen to me if I take part? If you agree to take part you will join a group of about 6 prisoners on 2-4 occasions to discuss your experiences of life inside an integrated prison, and share your views on the objectives, methodology and expected outcomes of the impact study. Each session will last for up to two hours, including breaks. The researcher will read questions to you and can help you if you have any difficulty understanding or answering the questions. We will record the interview using a digital audio recording device.

What are the possible benefits?   You will get the chance to talk directly to a researcher about your experiences of life and services in an integrated prison. You will also provide us with valuable information about how to conduct a larger scale impact study on how to explore the changes that are taking place at HMP Dartmoor. We hope this will lead to improvements in services and programmes inside all prisons.

What are the possible disadvantages? You will be asked to give up some of your time to take part. We do not see any serious risks in taking part in the study. Occasionally some people may experience some emotional distress when they are asked to think about their experiences. If you would prefer not to answer any individual questions just say so and we will move on to the next question. If you are upset, you will be able to talk to the researcher about it. If you feel you require further support, they will be able to tell you about other possible sources of help or advice.

Will my taking part in the study be kept confidential?   Any information which is collected about you will be kept strictly confidential and will not be disclosed outside the research team without your permission. We will not tell the prison what you have said to the researcher. Any personal information that we collect about you, and any consent forms or questionnaires that you complete, will be stored securely and will only be used for the purposes of the research.

Transcription of audio recordings of the interview will only be done by members of the research team or other individuals who have signed confidentiality agreements. Any quotations from research participants used in the project report will be anonymised and no real names will be used.

You have the right to check the accuracy of the data held about you and to correct any errors. Procedures for the handling, processing, storage and destruction of your data will be compliant with the Data Protection Act 1998.

Are there any circumstances in which confidentiality would be broken?

Please be aware that the researcher has a duty to inform the police or social services should you disclose any of the following:

a) Information that either indicates a risk or harm to yourself or others or refers to a new crime committed or plans to commit a new crime

b) Undisclosed illegal acts

c) Behaviour that is harmful to you (e.g. intention to self-harm or commit suicide)

d) Information that raises concerns about terrorist, radicalisations, or security issues.

What will happen to the results of the study? The results of this study may be published in a report and criminal justice and medical journals. If you would like a copy of any publication or a summary of the results, please let the researcher know. You will not be identified in any report or publication arising from the study.

Who will know if I am taking part in this study? Only researchers working on the study will know you are taking part in the focus groups. Some Prison Staff may also be aware that you are taking part in the research, but they will not have access to any of the information we collect.

Who has reviewed this study? This research has been reviewed by the University of Plymouth Research Ethics Committee to protect your safety, rights, wellbeing and dignity. The research has also been reviewed by the HMPPS National Research Committee.

Please
initial

1. I confirm that I have read (or had read to me) and understood the research information sheet and have been given the opportunity to ask questions.

2. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time, without giving any reason and without my medical care or my legal rights being affected.

3. I understand that the content of this interview is confidential but that the researcher has a duty to inform police or social services should I disclose:

   a) Information that either indicates a risk or harm to yourself or others or refers to a new crime committed or plans to commit a new crime

   b) Undisclosed illegal acts

   c) Information that raises concerns about terrorist, radicalisation, or security issues.

5. I understand that the interview will be recorded and transcribed for future use and that all transcriptions will be anonymous.

6. I understand that short sections of the interview may be played or used in writing to illustrate research findings. The playing of such sections and the use of any notes will be anonymous.

7. I agree to take part in the above study.

Sign below for participant completed consent form

Name of participant	Date	Signature
Name of researcher	Date	Signature

Sign below for researcher completed consent form

"I [researcher name] have read this form of consent to [participant name]
because [participant name] is not able to read this informed consent document.
I have asked [participant name] to make their mark to confirm that they have understood the informed consent document"

Name of participant	Date	Signature
Name of researcher	Date	Signature

Principal Investigator: Dr Patricia Gray

Appendix 3: Prison Officer Information and Consent Form

What is the purpose of the study? In 2015 HMP Dartmoor introduced a new integrated prison regime and the changes brought about by this are still ongoing. Over the next few years a new restorative programme will be implemented as part of the change process. This study aims to explore the impact of these changes from the perspective of prisoners and prison staff. However, before we can begin this study, we need to do some background work to find out what changes have already been made, expectations for the future and what the best ways to conduct the study are. We call this scoping research.

Why have I been asked to take part? You have been asked to take part because you are a member of staff in HMP Dartmoor and have been involved in implementing some of the services that are run there, for example those relating to substance misuse; mental health/wellbeing; rehabilitation; restorative practices. We would like to talk to you about your experience of running these services and generally about what it is like to work in an integrated prison. We will also be asking for your advice/suggestions about how to conduct the impact study (we call this the methodology). This will help us to plan and develop the objectives and expected outcomes of the impact study, and to consider the best way to carry it out.

Do I have to take part?   No. Your decision to participate, or not, will not affect your legal or employment rights. If you do wish to take part, you will be asked to sign a consent form. You can withdraw at any time, without reason, and it will not affect your legal or employment rights. If you do withdraw any information that you have already given will remain part of the study.

What will happen to me if I take part?   If you agree to take part you will join our researcher in an individual interview to discuss your experiences of working inside an integrated prison, and share your views on the research objectives, methodology and expected outcomes. The researcher will help you if you have any difficulty understanding or answering the questions. We will record the interview using a digital audio recording device.

What are the possible disadvantages? You will be asked to give up some of your time to take part. We do not envisage any serious risks in taking part in the study. Occasionally some people may experience some emotional distress when they are asked to think about their experiences. If you are upset, you will be able to talk to the researcher after the interview. If you feel you require further support, they will be able to tell you about other possible sources of help or advice.

What are the possible benefits?   You will get the chance to talk directly to a researcher about your experiences of working in an integrated prison. You will also provide us with valuable information about how to conduct a larger scale research on how to explore the changes that are taking place at HMP Dartmoor. We hope this will lead to improvements in services and programmes inside all prisons and in working arrangements for those delivering them.

What if there is a problem? If you have a complaint about the way you have been approached or treated during this study or a concern about any aspect of it you should contact Dr Patricia Gray, the Principal Researcher, School of Law, Criminology and Government , University of Plymouth, 20 Portland Villas, Drake Circus, Plymouth PL4 8AA. Telephone: 01752 585 782. Email: pgray@plymouth.ac.uk.

Will the information I provide be kept confidential?   Any information which is collected about you will be kept strictly confidential and will not be disclosed outside the research team without your permission. Any personal information that we collect about you, and any consent forms or questionnaires that you complete, will be stored securely and will only be used for the purposes of the research.

Transcription of audio recordings of the interview will only be done by members of the research team or other individuals who have signed confidentiality agreements. Any quotations from research participants used in the project report will be anonymised and no real names will be used.

You have the right to check the accuracy of the data held about you and to correct any errors. Procedures for the handling, processing, storage and destruction of your data will be compliant with the Data Protection Act 1998.

Some parts of the data collected for the study may be looked at by the authorised representatives of regulatory authorities to check the study is being correctly carried out. Should this occur, all such individuals will have a duty of confidentiality to you as a research participant, and data will remain anonymous.

Are there any circumstances in which confidentiality would be broken? Please be aware that the researcher has a duty to inform the police or social services should you disclose information indicating evidence of malpractice.

How will the results of the research study be used? Once the scoping research is complete, the results will be used to develop a funding bid for a larger research proposal to explore the impact of an integrated prison underpinned by restorative practices in action. The research results will also be written up for academic publications and conferences. If you would like a copy of any publication or a summary of the results, please let the researcher know.

Approval/review: The research has been reviewed and approved by the University of Plymouth Research Ethics Committee and HMPPS National Research Committee.

Please initial

1. I confirm that I have read and understood the research information sheet and have been given the opportunity to ask questions.

☐

2. I confirm that the purpose of this interview has been explained to me and that I have had the opportunity to ask questions about the interview process and what will happen to the information afterwards.

☐

3. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time, without giving any reason, without my legal or employment rights being affected.

☐

4. I understand that the interview will be digitally recorded and that when transcribed; any personal details will be removed so that I am not directly identifiable.

☐

5. I agree to short extracted transcriptions of the digital recording which will not reproduce my own voice being used for research and educational purposes (such as for conference presentations or publications).

☐

6. I agree to anonymised written quotes from the interview being used during communication of the research.

☐

7. I agree to take part in the above study.

☐

Sign below for participant completed consent form

Name of participant	Date	Signature
Name of researcher	Date	Signature

Sign below for researcher completed consent form

"I [researcher name] have read this form of consent to [participant name]
because [participant name] is not able to read this informed consent document.
I have asked [participant name] to make their mark to confirm that they have understood the informed consent document"

Name of participant	Date	Signature
Name of researcher	Date	Signature

Principal Investigator: Dr Patricia Gray

Appendix 4: Supplementary Quotes

Section 5: The Experience of Imprisonment at HMP Dartmoor

Researcher: '*What is different about an integrated prison?* **P2:** *I've put low levels of violence. Compared to the jails I've been to, this prison, you don't hardly see anything kicking-off. If it does kick-off it's usually in a cell. The majority of the time it's the mains prisoners fighting between themselves or someone's got wind of someone's crime and someone's took it upon themselves to go and fill them in or something. Yeah, low levels of violence here...'* **(FG17)**

P2: *'... once you're debted up, a lot of things are double-bubble. So, that basically means if I was to give you a packet of crisps now and you pay me back on Friday, the assumption would be that you'd give me two packets of crisps back. So, when you've got a controlled substance that's only available from the meds hatch, come Friday if you don't pay up and the debt becomes a certain value, you might owe me a tenners worth or something, but guess what, Mr X owes me 50 quids worth, I'll wipe your debt off if you smack him in the mouth. That's how it proliferates.'* **(FG7)**

P1: *'You've got to think, 21 hours of a day locked in, probably a room the size of your bathroom at home, it gets to you. Everyone's "you're in prison", this is our punishment being here, having our liberties taken away, not being punished again being locked in a cell constantly all the time, because they've got no staff.'* **(FG10)**

P2: *'A lot of 'red regimes', a lot of time spent behind the door and then you get the lads coming out very agitated, especially if you've got people with the mental age of a child. We've got quite a few on X wing and they'll come out and they will be extremely agitated, extremely aggressive and quite hard work. That's the people I deal with... basically, they struggle not having the luxury of the door open, so the more time they spend behind the door, the more agitated they are, so when they come out, that's when there's conflicts... They'll come out screaming, f-ing and blinding. They'll have a go at the buddies, they'll have a go at the officers, they're quite aggressive.'* **(FG16)**

P5: *'If the regime's curtailed, if there's something going on, someone's being shipped out or someone's got to be removed or there's been a fight or there's been an alarm bell, we all get banged up. If you lose a couple of days, with the snow, the weather, nobody's got a gripe with that, it's fairly clear why we're banged up, but if you're not given a reason why and you've lost a couple days of association, that's when tensions can come in. People start getting wound up. We've been behind the door, not been told why you're behind the door, it's not obvious.'* **(FG13)**

P1: *'People do drugs in here to get out of prison. I did. People do drugs in here to pass the day, just to get the day out of the way. People do drugs in here to cope with everyday life.'* **(FG11)**

P1: *'A lot of people are alcoholics outside the prison, why do people take drugs outside the prison? It's exactly the same reason why they take Spice in here, but the Spice is taken in here for even more purposes than normal because they can't cope with the bang-up, they can't cope with what they've done in life, so the only way they can do is get away from it and they*

think that's a good way of getting away from it … it's just because of the fact that they can't cope with life, full-stop, so, they take a bit of Spice, damn the consequences.' **(FG13)**

P5: *'So, basically when you first come into prison, it is the most degrading thing you'll ever go though in your life. You get literally stripped of everything. When you come through you'll be signing documents, you'll see mental health, you'll be stripped naked and you'll be told to squat, it is the most degrading experience of your life. When you then get into prison, you're going through the cycles of that every day. You're not talked to as a human-being, you're talked to as a number. For somebody to call me by my first name, that means a lot to me. There are a few staff members and a few of the healthcare people who call me by my first name and it's nice, but you're seen as a number, you're not seen as anything else. It's just not very nice.'* **(FG6)**

P5: *'…this is how sad it is right, when the clocks went back in October, we actually had exercise and it was the first time I'd actually been out in the yard in the dark in two years. The moon had started to rise early and it's the first time I'd actually seen the moon without a grill in the way for two years. I looked up at the moon as we were walking around the yard … I looked at the moon and I'm out in the dark for the first time in two years and I'm actually seeing the moon without a grill in the way. It sounds silly, but it's just little things.'* **(FG14)**

P1: *'…when I first come into jail, I felt I lost my identity, everything. I was living in rented accommodation. I was bringing up my children and everything else. All that life just completely ended, who I was… completely ended. So, I just literally felt like I'd died and that's how I felt for quite some time. Then, there was a course here 'Living with Loss', which is a pretty standard course in the prison system that I went on and it helped to understand and legitimise and then start to change the way I felt about all that, to actually process it. I was stuck. In that time, I could've easily had a label of having a mental health issue. Is grief a mental health issue? I don't know. So, when we start talking about mental health … we've all got varying degrees of quality of physical health, I'm quite happy to talk about that. I'm not so fit these days or whatever, but we see mental health as some sort of a separate thing, "he's got mental health", well, we've all got mental health. That's something that prison intensifies because you don't have anything to distract with.'* **(FG8)**

P3: *'…if you're banged-up in that cell all day, you're going to wind yourself up or do yourself some damage. I can understand why a lot of people do self-harm. You can drive yourself mad.'* **(FG17)**

P4: *'…I can probably get, if I'm lucky, one phone-call a day and sometimes it's a struggle to get that. There are so few phones and so many people that want to get to the phones. It's a little bit easier where we are on our particular landing… but you're still probably only going to get one call, if you're a fulltime worker, which means I have to pick and choose who I'm going to ring in my family. Shall I ring my missus? Shall I ring my sons? Shall I ring my brother? Shall I ring mum? My friends, I'm afraid, they just haven't got a chance… I have to really ration my phone calls … You're really restricted on maintaining your family ties. That's just one of my bug-bears.'* **(FG14)**

P1: *'In the prison things like you've had a bad phone call from your kids or your mum, even your mate (cause tension) … Your main frustration comes because you can't be there for*

them. You are powerless. What it is with me as well is when I hear my family are struggling, I don't like to feel powerless. I like to feel like I've got control, but when you're in the system, you're powerless. You can't do nothing.' **(FG19)**

Section 6: Prisoners' Views of the Dialogue Road Map (DRM)

P5: '*It gives people a chance to air their grievances, but unless the senior management are actually going to be able to change a certain amount of things, they can't change everything, but they can change a certain amount of things. If they're willing to embrace that change, then it could bring a little bit more stability to the prison. It's not going to cure everything… I think the DRM, because of the one-to-one scheme, is good in the mediation and it's good that they're trying to get it for the outside as well, so it can be done for the families. I think it's going to be good and it could work and that's why I've put my name down for it. But how it's embraced with the staff, we'll see. It has to be sold for both sides of the story.'* **(FG16)**

P5 (DRM trained): *'… if we had a 'circle' and you came to me and said "someone on the wing is bullying so-and-so", we discuss it amongst ourselves in the 'circle' and try and come to a resolution that we can do, rather than going to … so, it's about taking control back for our own landing.* **P1:** *… creating a supportive, positive environment …?'* **(FG9)**

P3: *'…we're trying to take the power back from the prison. Even though they tell us what time to get up, what time to go to bed, what time we eat, what time we shower, what time we go to work, it seems like they're the ones that's got the power, well actually, we've still got some power left. We've got the power to say "no, we're not doing it" and we've also got the power to go "well while I'm here, I'm going to educate myself, I'm going to turn this negative into a positive, I'm going to re-train as a carpenter or a plasterer or a painter and decorator", so we've got that power as well. We've got our own power to take it back from the prison officers by saying "listen, I'm sick of XXX kicking off with us on the wing every day, I want something done about it". So, then they'll come to us and us as a community we'll sit down, and we'll listen, and it'll come out either in a circle or it'll come out after the circle or it could come out as a one-to-one.'* **(FG2)**

P4: *'… if you've issues with family on the out and you want to reconcile and all the rest of it, we can help with that as well, possibly, where we'll have a one-to-one with you. There's a lady on the out called VVV. She'll have one-to-ones with the family member until either we get the agreement to go to mediation, the family member on the out agrees with it and all that, and we have actually done one and it's been positive or the family member on the out says no, they don't want to, then we'll have a one-to-one with you and inform you, how do you feel and yah-de-yah-de-yah-da. It can seem a bit like tree-hugging and all that sort of thing, but it does actually work.'* **(FG13)**

P1*: 'Now, I don't have any trust with anyone because I know the people are criminal. They are not entitled to be a listener or mediator. I don't think it is a good idea. It just maybe makes the sorting out the fight or problem between two people or two groups, but it doesn't reduce the crime, it doesn't reduce the bullying. They are hiding it. They don't clean it. They are hiding it. Same as this carpet. If it became dirty, which is better – to clean the dirt or to hide the dirt? Mediation, I believe, is to hide the dirt. One day this dirt is coming out. It may get worse.'* **(FG5)**

P5: *'…some people will do it because it's the way the prison says they're going to do this it's going to be a nicer place and all the rest of it. Prison's prison. It's not going to change.*

They're just going to get certain people running around for them doing this, that and the other, and then they'll go. They'll finish their sentence and then it'll be someone else taking over. Prison has been the same for about the last 30 years, so I can't see it changing because they're going to do a few 'circles'. That's just my views.' **(FG6)**

P3:*'Sadly, I think it will all very quickly become another front. It will be the thing the prison uses to say, "this is what we're using to sort all of these problems out, it works because it works for these 12 individuals", but they'll be the only 12.'* **(FG9)**

P1:*'…this DRM, maybe this can be another route to changing things. … I hope this is really powerful. I'm not trying to knock it at all when I'm saying about this particular character or this individual. My concern is, it has to be held up as a picture of integrity if it's going to succeed.'* **(FG9)**