

The challenges and needs of people serving long life sentences from a young age



Dr Serena Wright
Royal Holloway
University of London
August 2021

Dr Susie Hulley
University of
Cambridge

Prof. Ben Crewe
University of
Cambridge

CLINKS
Supporting the voluntary sector
working in the criminal justice system

About the authors



Dr Serena Wright is Lecturer in Criminology in the Department of Law and Criminology, Royal Holloway, University of London, UK. Her research focuses on the lived experience of life imprisonment from a young age, and on women's experiences of repeat criminalisation and 'frustrated desistance' across the life course.



Dr Susie Hulley is Senior Research Associate at the Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge, UK. She is particularly interested in young people's experiences of the criminal justice system, the legal doctrine of joint enterprise (secondary liability), the process of criminalisation, and the experience of life imprisonment.



Professor Ben Crewe is Professor of Penology and Criminal Justice, and Deputy Director of the Prisons Research Centre, at the Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge, UK. He is interested in all aspects of prison life, including prison management, staff-prisoner relationships, public and private sector imprisonment, penal power and prisoner social life.

The authors of this report are the principal researchers and joint authors of a major study on men and women serving life imprisonment from an early age, the findings of which were published in [Life Imprisonment from Young Adulthood: Adaptation, Identity and Time](#) (published 2020, Palgrave MacMillan). They have recently been awarded funding from the Economic and Social Research Council to conduct a longitudinal study, following up their original 147 life-sentenced interviewees, both in custody as well as now in the community, following release.

Published by Clinks © 2021. All rights reserved.

Unless otherwise indicated, no part of this publication may be stored in a retrievable system or reproduced in any form without prior written permission from Clinks. Clinks will give sympathetic consideration to requests from small organisations for permission to reproduce this publication in whole or in part but the terms upon which such reproduction may be permitted will remain at Clinks' discretion. Clinks and the author are not legally trained or qualified. Any information or guidance given in this publication should not be taken as a substitute for professional legal advice. Clinks is unable to accept liability for any loss or damage or inconvenience arising as a consequence of the use of any information provided in this guide.



**EVIDENCE
LIBRARY**

The challenges and needs of people
serving long life sentences from a young age

CLINKS

Why read this evidence review?

In recent decades, a clear legislative trend has emerged towards increasingly long minimum tariffs for people serving life imprisonment in England and Wales. However, little is known about the short- and long-term effects of long periods of confinement in prison.

This evidence review provides an in-depth look at the specific challenges and needs of the significant number of people already serving long life sentences from a young age in England and Wales. The authors of this report are the joint architects of a major research study into the experiences of people serving these sentences in England and Wales, a study described by one reviewer as “the deepest empirical look at adaptation and survival in long-term imprisonment for over forty years.”

This review covers a wide range of issues including:

- The sentencing context and the growing numbers of people serving long life sentences
- The impact of life imprisonment for murder on people sentenced at a young age
- The broad ‘stages’ experienced during such long life sentences
- The challenges of ‘uncertainty’, in terms of the lack of a fixed release date
- The particular needs and challenges for women serving life sentences
- Suggestions for how to respond to the specific needs of long-term life sentenced prisoners.



Context: The rise in long life sentences

Following the partial abolition of capital punishment in England and Wales in 1965,¹ 'imprisonment for life' became the mandatory sentence for individuals convicted of murder. Since this time, the number of life sentences imposed, as well as the minimum period of custody set at trial and the average number of years served, have all increased significantly.²

In 1968, just 489 people were serving life sentences, and custodial terms in excess of 10 years were relatively rare (at that time, only two life sentenced prisoners had served more than 15 years of continuous custody, while only six men had served over 12 years) (Radzinowicz, 1968). Now, fifty years later, the life sentenced prison population of England and Wales stands at almost 7,000 men and women, with the majority of these individuals (51%) now facing minimum 'tariffs'³ of 10-20 years in custody, while almost a third (29%) will serve at least 20 years (Prison Reform Trust, 2021). One of the most significant increases within the long-term life sentenced population has occurred among young people, with men and women sentenced to at least 15 years when they were aged 25 years or younger increasing by more than half between 2013 and 2020 (from 917 to 1,394 people) (FOIA Ref: 201117009).

Importantly, this growing population is being held in a system that was never designed to cater for their needs and which has 'little insight' (Flanagan, 1995: xi) into effective sentence planning for custodial sentences that, until relatively recently, were considered barely survivable.

The impact and challenges of very long-term life imprisonment

For individuals serving very long life sentences, the conventional 'pains of imprisonment'⁴ morph with time, transforming them into 'problems of *survival*' (Flanagan 1981: 212; emphasis added). Indeed, one of the greatest struggles for prisoners serving long, indeterminate sentences is coming to terms with the overwhelming nature of the time that lies ahead. This feels particularly difficult to manage at the early stage of such sentences. Young lifers have described the impact of receiving a conviction for murder and a life sentence as analogous to 'drowning', as they become submerged in an acute emotional response, particularly when facing a sentence that is often longer than the number of years that they have lived (Wright, Crewe & Hulley, 2017). Those who dispute committing the murder for which they have been convicted experience feelings of resentment and injustice. Such sentiments predominate in cases where the prosecution have used the doctrine of 'joint enterprise' to convict multiple people for a single offence.⁵ In such instances, individuals who are secondary parties (did not commit the act of murder) feel particularly aggrieved at being labelled as 'a murderer' and sentenced to life with a very long minimum tariff (see Hulley, Crewe & Wright, 2019).⁶ Feelings of anger, guilt



and shame are often expressed or 'defended against' in those early years through substance use, aggression and violence to others, social withdrawal, excessive sleeping, and self-harm (Wright et al., 2017).

'Lifers' also report struggling with the inherent uncertainty generated by the absence of a guaranteed release date (indeed, Kummerlowe has suggested that it is this which contributes 'more than any other factor' to the 'debilitating effects' of long-term indeterminate sentences) (1995: 42). This ambiguity makes it difficult, at least initially, for young lifers to find meaning and purpose, instead focusing on doing their sentence 'one day at a time'. Feelings of hopelessness and an almost total absence of control are pervasive. Many also struggle with intrusive memories, flashbacks and nightmares about the offence itself. Reports of depression and suicidal ideation are widespread in the initial years as prisoners question whether they can survive the sentence (Wright et al., 2017).

Over time, the impact of the sentence may appear to lessen as individuals learn to limit their temporal horizons, and to focus on 'managing the present'. Crewe, Hulley and Wright (2017a) indicate that this shift from 'survival' to 'coping' is often precipitated by other phenomena, for instance, the conclusion of an unsuccessful appeal, hitting 'rock bottom', dealing with mental health or addiction issues, or simply a growing realisation that the sentence *must* be served. The mid-years of a lengthy life sentence often engender a significant shift, as prisoners learn to 'swim with the tide' rather than 'against it'. Education, faith, therapy or creative pursuits help life-sentenced prisoners to find meaning and purpose in their situation, providing them with a 'hook for change', and a means of dealing with feelings of guilt and shame (Crewe et al., 2017a). Many such prisoners develop 'scripts of redemption' (Schinkel, 2014; Munn & Bruckert, 2013), seeking out opportunities to help others or 'give something back' through mentoring or support services (such as becoming a Listener), often as a way of atoning for their offence.

Yet as the long-term prisoner approaches the tariff endpoint, they find themselves unable to continue taking psychological refuge in the present and must instead confront the future. For some, this was an opportunity to begin to nurture hopes about life post-release. Yet for others, this was a period of 'trepidation' and renewed uncertainty (see O'Donnell, 2014: 207). Many begin to see the evidence of institutionalisation within their behaviours and experiences (Crewe et al., 2020), often regarding the outside world with a combination of fear, suspicion, and 'technophobia' (Woodrow, 2016). The process of pursuing release at this point was fraught with obstacles, and late-stage life sentenced prisoners could descend into fatalism and despair as their tariff point passed and their pathways to release become unclear. For those individuals furthest beyond their tariff expiry, some retreated from the pursuit of release altogether (Wright et al., under review; see also Woodrow, 2016).

Such studies (see also: Toch, 2010; Liem & Kunst, 2013) have challenged earlier assessments of long-term imprisonment as having no 'cumulative or progressive effects' on individuals (Richards, 1978: 166). Instead, this more recent body of work highlights the 'profound existential implications' of prolonged confinement, particularly from a young age (Crewe et al., 2017a: 519), arguing that individuals become adapted over time to the terms of their confinement in ways which are likely to be deeply damaging for their re-entry into the community. Such concerns are central to Liem



and Kunst's (2013) identification of 'post-incarceration syndrome'; a set of behaviours following release from long-term confinement akin to post-traumatic stress disorder, including hypervigilance, social withdrawal, the suppression of emotion, avoidance of communication and a distrust of the world (see also: Haney, 2003; Grounds, 2005).

Responding to the specific needs of long-term life-sentenced prisoners

While research has found common patterns in the experience of serving a long life sentence from a young age, variations in such matters as sentence length and index offence, age, gender, mental wellbeing and the existence of pre-prison 'trauma' (particularly for women – see e.g. Crewe, Hulley & Wright, 2017b; Leigey & Reed, 2010) mean that approaches to managing such prisoners require individualised assessments of need. Life sentenced prisoners who are convicted later in life face different and unique challenges (Crawley, 2007) when compared to their younger counterparts (see Wright et al., in press), while women's experience of serving a long-term custodial sentence differs from that of their male counterparts, in part because of very common experiences of abuse and trauma (see e.g., Crewe et al., 2017b; Walker & Worrall, 2000; Genders & Player, 2020, 1990). For example, women find the lack of autonomy of imprisonment, and its infantilising and 'low trust' qualities, particularly painful, in ways that relate to their life experiences of erratic forms of authority and of often having had their own caring responsibilities from an early age (Crewe et al., 2017b). Recognising women's histories of trauma and specific life experiences is central to supporting them through a long life sentence. It is also important to consider that some life-sentenced prisoners will serve part of their sentence in the secure psychiatric estate, an experience which brings unique and additional challenges with regard to legitimacy, process and 'stuckness' (see Adshead, Ross & Salucci, forthcoming). However, far less is known about how issues relating to index offence, sentence stage, gender and mental ill health intersect and interact among these specific populations, highlighting an important focal point for future research. Nonetheless, a number of practices and interventions might be beneficial to most lifers.

First, broad access to clinical and therapeutic support would help prisoners deal with the acute emotional impact of having been present at or involved in a murder, and been given a life-changing sentence, as well as with pre-prison experiences of trauma and abuse. Life sentenced prisoners would benefit from having someone neutral and non-judgemental to talk to about their feelings, without their narratives being seen through the lens of risk. In working with young and early-stage lifers, practitioners could usefully acknowledge the emotional origins of the 'defence mechanisms' described above among young long-term life-sentenced prisoners and work towards developing ways to mitigate the adoption of harmful emotional-defence strategies. Such practices already exist on a localised and ad hoc basis – for example, HMYOI Cookham Wood recently piloted a 'Long Sentences Group', in which young men (aged 15-18 years) sentenced to life imprisonment were brought together to learn and draw strength from the experiences of their similarly situated peers (see Thomas & Sadie, forthcoming).



Second, prisons could offer prisoners at all stages (including the very early months and years) more productive ways to channel their difficult feelings, for example, by enabling and encouraging physical activities, creative pursuits, faith practices and meaningful educational opportunities. Such opportunities help life-sentenced prisoners convicted of murder deal with the burdens of time, provide emotional outlets, and offer important 'narrative lifeboats', at a time when they may be vulnerable to dangerous alternative narratives (Crewe et al., 2020). For later-stage lifers, talking therapies, such as one-to-one counselling and lifer peer group initiatives, or more creative activities, might help ameliorate the uncertainty, hopelessness and fatalism which may develop at this stage, without focusing solely on risk or offending behaviour work (see Wright et al., under review).

Lastly, from the outset, life-sentenced prisoners require greater provision to maintain meaningful relationships with loved ones throughout a long prison sentence. The practicalities of maintaining relationships with loved ones over several decades of incarceration are exceptionally challenging. Existing means of contact are costly in terms of time and resources (most notably visits and telephone calls) and offer little privacy and few opportunities for the maintenance of emotional intimacy over many years. Since most lifers say that family contact, along with faith and education, are their main sources of hope, enhancing the quality – as well as quantity – of contact opportunities is paramount (see Kotova, 2018). In particular, life sentenced prisoners crave opportunities to engage in 'normal' activities with their loved ones, and forge new memories with them over the course of a long term separation.

References

- Adshead, G., Ross, C. and Salucci, K. (forthcoming). *This time of my life: A note on the experiences of life sentenced male prisoners in high secure psychiatric care*. Prison Service Journal.
- Crawley, E. (2007). Imprisonment in old age. In Y. Jewkes [Eds.] *Handbook on Prisons* (First Ed.) (pp.224-244). Cullompton, UK: Willan.
- Crewe, B. (2011). Depth, weight, tightness: Revisiting the pains of imprisonment. *Punishment & Society*, 13(5), 509-529. <https://www.compen.crim.cam.ac.uk/PDFs/Revisitingthepainsofimprisonment.pdf>
- Crewe, B., Hulley, S., & Wright, S. (2020). *Life imprisonment from Young Adulthood: Adaptation, Identity and Time*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Crewe, B., Hulley, S., & Wright, S. (2017a). Swimming with the tide: Adapting to long term imprisonment. *Justice Quarterly*, 34 (3), 517–541. https://www.repository.cam.ac.uk/bitstream/handle/1810/255937/Crewe_et_al-2016-Justice_Quarterly-AM.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
- Crewe, B., Hulley, S., & Wright, S. (2017b). The gendered pains of life imprisonment. *British Journal of Criminology*, 57 (6), 1359–1378. https://www.repository.cam.ac.uk/bitstream/handle/1810/262180/Crewe_et_al-2017-The_British_Journal_of_Criminology-VoR.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y



- Feeley, M. M. and Simon, J. (1992). The new penology: Notes on the emerging strategy of corrections and its implications. *Criminology*, 30(4), 449–474.
- Flanagan, T. J. (1995). Preface. In T. Flanagan (Ed.) *Long-term imprisonment: Policy, science and correctional practice* (pp. xi–xiv). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Flanagan, T. J. (1981). Dealing with long-term confinement: Adaptive strategies and perspectives among long-term prisoners. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 8(2), 201-222.
- Garland, D. (2000). The culture of high crime societies. *British Journal of Criminology*, 40(3), 347–375. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23638937?seq=1>
- Genders, E. and Player, E. (2020). Long sentenced women prisoners: Rights, risks and rehabilitation. *Punishment & Society*. (doi: 1462474520933097). <https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10102491/>
- Genders, E. and Player, E. (1990). Women lifers: Assessing the experience. *The Prison Journal*, 70(1), 46-57.
- Grounds, A. T. (2005). Understanding the effects of wrongful imprisonment. *Crime and Justice*, 32, 1–58.
- Haney, C. (2003). The psychological impact of incarceration: Implications for post-prison adjustment. *Prisoners Once Removed: The Impact of Incarceration and Reentry on Children, Families, and Communities*, 33, 66.
- Hulley, S., Crewe, B. and Wright, S. (2016). Re-examining the problems of long-term imprisonment. *British Journal of Criminology*, 56 (4), 769–792. <https://www.repository.cam.ac.uk/handle/1810/267110>
- Hulley, S., Crewe, B. and Wright, S. (2019). Making sense of ‘joint enterprise’ for murder: Legal legitimacy or instrumental acquiescence? *British Journal of Criminology*, 59(6), 1328–1346. <https://www.repository.cam.ac.uk/handle/1810/289472>
- Kotova, A. (2019). ‘Time... lost time’: Exploring how partners of long-term prisoners experience the temporal pains of imprisonment. *Time & Society*, 28(2), 478-498. https://research.birmingham.ac.uk/portal/files/47705085/Kotova_Time_lost_time_exploring_how_Time_and_Society_2018.pdf
- Kummerlowe, C. (1995). Coping with imprisonment. In T.J. Flanagan (eds.) *Long-Term Imprisonment: Policy, Science and Correctional Practice* (pp.41-50). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Leigey, M. E. and Reed, K. L. (2010). A Woman’s Life Before Serving Life: Examining the Negative Pre-Incarceration Life Events of Female Life-Sentenced Inmates. *Women & Criminal Justice*, 20:4, 302-322
- Liem, M. and Kunst, M. (2013). Is there a recognizable post-incarceration syndrome among released “lifers”? *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 36 (3–4), 333–337.
- Ministry of Justice (2021). Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Request – 201117009 <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/foi-releases-for-december-2020>
- Munn, M. and Bruckert, C. (2013) *On the outside: From lengthy imprisonment to lasting freedom*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.



O'Donnell, I. (2014). *Prisoners, Solitude, and Time*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Prison Reform Trust. (2021). *Prison: The facts (Bromley Briefings Winter 2021)*. London: Prison Reform Trust.

<http://www.prisonreformtrust.org.uk/Portals/0/Documents/Bromley%20Briefings/Winter%202021%20Factfile%20final.pdf>

Radzinowicz, L. (1968). *Report of the Advisory Committee on Penal System on the regime for long-term prisoners in conditions of maximum security* (The Radzinowicz Report). London: HMSO.

Richards, B. (1978). The experience of long-term imprisonment: An exploratory investigation. *British Journal of Criminology*, 18, 162.

Schinkel, M. (2014). Punishment as moral communication: The experiences of long-term prisoners. *Punishment & Society*, 16(5), pp. 578-597. <http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/95368/1/95368.pdf>

Sykes, G. (1958/2007). *The Society of Captives: A Study of a Maximum Security Prison*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Thomas, H. and Sadie, C. (forthcoming). "We are the walking dead": Trauma-informed group therapy for adolescent boys serving life sentences. *Prison Service Journal*.

Toch, H. (2010). "I am not now who I used to be then": Risk assessment and the maturation of long-term prison inmates. *The Prison Journal*, 90(1), 4-11.

Walker, S. and Worrall, A. (2000). Life as a woman. *Prison Service Journal*, 27-36.

Woodrow, S. (2016). *Retreat from Release by Adult Male Life Sentence Prisoners*. University of Cambridge, UK: Unpublished MSt thesis.

Wright, S., Crewe, B. and Hulley, S. (2017). Suppression, denial, sublimation: Defending against the initial pains of very long life sentences. *Theoretical Criminology*, 21(2), 225-246. <https://www.compen.crim.cam.ac.uk/system/files/documents/Suppressiondenialsublimation.pdf>

Wright, S., Hulley, S. and Crewe, B. (under review). Trajectories of hope and fatalism in the late stage of a life sentence. *Theoretical Criminology*.

Wright, S., Hulley, S. and Crewe, B. (in press, forthcoming June 2021). The pains of life imprisonment during late adolescence and emerging adulthood. In A. Cox and L. Abrams (Eds.) *The Palgrave International Handbook of Youth Imprisonment*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.



End notes

- 1 However, it was not until 1969 that capital punishment was fully abolished for murder convictions.
- 2 This is not a direct result of increases in the number of homicides but instead part of broader penal trends which involve greater use of 'expressive' forms of punishment and a political culture that is less resistant to punitive demands, particularly from the popular press (Feeley & Simon, 1992; Garland, 2000). The former Director-General of the National Offender Management Service has similarly argued that the 'currency' of sentencing has shifted; that what was once accepted as a 'long' (or perhaps long enough) sentence has increased inexorably in recent decades, within the context of a punitive and populist model of politics (Crewe, Hulley & Wright, 2020: 12).
- 3 The 'tariff' represents the minimum period of time that a life-sentenced prisoner must serve before being considered eligible for release (i.e., parole), under licence conditions. However, release is always conditional upon this, and therefore never guaranteed – this is reflected in the technical length of sentences of life imprisonment (99 years).
- 4 See Sykes (1958) for the seminal study on this. See also Crewe (2011) re the 'new' pains of imprisonment, Hulley, Crewe & Wright (2016) on re-examining the specific pains of long-term imprisonment, and Crewe, Hulley and Wright (2017a) for a consideration of the gendered nature of this phenomenon.
- 5 Joint enterprise is a doctrine of criminal law which permits multiple defendants to be convicted of the same criminal offence in relation to the same incident, even where they had different types or levels of involvement.
- 6 Life-sentenced prisoners convicted in trials in which joint enterprise has been used are disproportionately Black or Mixed-Race, resulting in such feeling of injustice being particularly prevalent among these groups (Hulley, Crewe and Wright 2019).

Our vision

Our vision is of a vibrant, independent and resilient voluntary sector that enables people to transform their lives.

Our mission

To support, represent and advocate for the voluntary sector in criminal justice, enabling it to provide the best possible opportunities for individuals and their families.

Join Clinks: be heard, informed, and supported


Are you a voluntary organisation supporting people in the criminal justice system?

Join our network of over 500 members. Clinks membership offers you:

- A voice to influence change
- Practical assistance to be effective and resilient
- Support from a community of like-minded professionals.

Membership starts at just £20 per year and is free for organisations with little income.

www.clinks.org/membership



An online evidence base for the voluntary sector working in the criminal justice system

This article forms part of a series from Clinks, created to develop a far-reaching and accessible evidence base covering the most common types of activity undertaken within the criminal justice system. There are two main aims of this online series:

- 1 To increase the extent to which the voluntary sector bases its services on the available evidence base
- 2 To encourage commissioners to award contracts to organisations delivering an evidence-based approach.

Each article has been written by a leading academic with particular expertise on the topic in question. The topics are selected by Clinks' members as areas of priority interest. Clinks intends to build a comprehensive directory of the best evidence available across a wide range of criminal justice topics within the next three years (2020-2023). The online evidence base is co-ordinated by Russell Webster on behalf of Clinks.

Clinks

Block C, 5th Floor, Tavistock House, Tavistock Square, London WC1H 9JJ

☎ 020 7383 0966 ✉ info@clinks.org 🐦 @Clinks_Tweets

🌐 www.clinks.org