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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

- This report provides an account of the research ‘Appreciative inquiry into the Diversity Strategy of HMP Wakefield’ funded in 2009 by the Economic & Social Research Council (ESRC)\(^1\).

Aims and Objectives

- The project was funded, and conducted, as a pilot study with the overall aims of developing and piloting a methodology that could develop a way of understanding the complexity of:
  - How diversity minority grouping prisoners experience prison life and the strategies designed to improve their quality of life.
  - The views of prison staff about issues of diversity and the prison’s Diversity Strategy
- The project extended over nine months from 1\(^{st}\) March 2009 to 30\(^{th}\) November 2009, and was undertaken by Professor Malcolm Cowburn (Principal Investigator), Dr Victoria Lavis (Co-investigator) and Dr Hayden Bird (Research Assistant). All researchers were fully security checked before the data collection started. Four phases of data collection were employed: analysis of prison documentation; interviews with twenty-three prisoners from B Wing; a survey of all prisoners on B Wing, and two staff focus groups. The data collection adopted an Appreciative Inquiry (AI) approach, which also informed the data analysis. This is discussed more fully throughout the report.

HMP Wakefield: Background and context

- It is important to clarify what we mean by diversity and more particularly ‘diversity minority identities’. Current legislation requires public bodies to promote equality and prevent discrimination in the following areas: age, disability, gender, race, religion and belief and sexual orientation. Each strand is covered by specific government legislation. In terms of ‘diversity minority identities’ in prison we are focussing on: Black & Minority Ethnic (BME) prisoners; older prisoners (over 60s); Disabled prisoners (with physical disabilities, learning difficulties; and mental health problems); Gay, Bi-sexual and Transgender prisoners; and prisoners affiliated to Faith groups.
- We are aware that National Offender Management Service (NOMS) refers to all people who are convicted of an offence as ‘offenders’, whether they are in the community or in custody. However, we feel this term ignores the wider humanity of people who have committed offences, naming them solely in relation to a crime for which they have been convicted. In our many formal and informal meetings with people living in the prison they expressed unhappiness with a term that tied them irrevocably to their past criminal actions; most people that we spoke to were happy to be called ‘in-mates’ or ‘prisoners’ as both terms reflected their current experience. In this report we will use the term ‘prisoner(s)’ in preference to the term ‘offender(s).
- The context in which the current research project has occurred: Wakefield is a prison with a very high proportion of prisoners serving very long sentences for serious offences of interpersonal violence. The research has shown that the prison population is multi-racial, and multi-faith. The age range of the population is very wide with 27 prisoners being under 25 years old and 23 prisoners being over 70 years old. No information was available about the profile of disabled prisoners. However, the population of the prison is very complex and has a wide range of diverse needs to be met within the scope of the Prison Service’s overall statement of purpose ‘Her Majesty’s Prison Service serves the public by keeping in custody those committed by the courts. Our duty is to look after them with humanity and help them lead law-abiding and useful lives in custody and after release.’ (HMPS 2004b).
- An additional part of the context of study are the findings from earlier external scrutinies of the practices of Wakefield prison (Her Majesty’s Chief Inspector of Prisons and Probation & the Measurement of the Quality of Prison Life reports). Although a range of concerns were highlighted in these reports, the most consistent theme concerned staff prisoner relationships, which were an area of

---

\(^1\) ESRC Award number RES-000-22-3441.
concern in all of the sources reviewed. However, there were indications of slight improvements in this area in more recent reports.

- Additionally, since the completion of this report, we are aware that HMP Wakefield has received H.M. Prison Service award: ‘High Security Team of the Year (2010) Award - Decency and Diversity’.

Methodology

- The project began with a personal conversation between the Principal Investigator and the Diversity Governor. It ended up as a fully funded Research Council project. This transformation incorporated liaison with staff from across the functional areas of the prison [achieved by the development of a research Steering Group] and most importantly with prisoners. A Prisoner Advisory Group was developed, enabling prisoners to play a central role in both the design and the ongoing development of the research. It is a practice that we would strongly recommend in the development of future research of prisoners’ experiences.

- The issue of building and sustaining trust has been key to the progress of this project. Trust is developed through providing clear information, being available to answer questions and being honest in how the questions are answered. It is also developed through processes (for example, this research developed both prisoner and staff advisory groups) and being clear about how dilemmas are handled (for example, not taking sides). Throughout, the researchers have tried to listen to everyone, prisoners and prison staff, respectfully and at length. Issues that have highlighted the ongoing challenge of appearing to be independent are: researchers wearing keys; researchers not acting as advocates for prisoners and researchers reporting threats to prison security.

- The research was carried out using an Appreciative Inquiry (AI) approach, which has four distinct phases; discovery, dreaming, designing and destiny (Reed, 1997). ‘Discovery’ is the start of the inquiry and is concerned with identifying best experiences rather than commencing from a problem focus. Although this phase aims at best experience, it inevitably also gathers information about experiences that are not ‘best’. ‘Dreaming’ moves the inquiry on and changes the focus; it asks research participants to imagine how the subject under inquiry (for example, the prison’s response to diversity) might be improved. This enables the research participant to link their ‘best’ experience to how things may be further enhanced thereby highlighting elements and issues which are important to the research participant. ‘Designing’ involves the research participant in identifying practices, relationships and processes which might be necessary to support the ideas outlined in dreaming and articulated as ‘best’ in discovery. The final phase of AI ‘Destiny’ concentrates on what is needed to maintain and sustain the changes that have been dreamed about and designed.

- AI guided the design and collection of data in each of the four phases of the research; analysis of prison documents, 23 interviews with diversity prisoners from B wing, a 54 item survey of all prisoners on B wing, one focus group with staff from functional areas of the prison and one focus group with B wing staff. These formal stages of data collection were supplemented by informal observations of daily life on B wing. B wing was identified as a suitable location for the pilot as it houses a diverse mix of ethnicities and dual national prisoners, and contains accommodation for disabled prisoners, and older prisoners.

Findings: Documentary Analysis

- This section of the research aimed to:
  - Create a ‘road map’ of the documents that relate to diversity across the different functional areas of the prison
  - Illustrate within the ‘map’ which documents are policies, which are procedures following from specific policies and which are practices arising out of specific procedures.
  - Indicate where documents ‘intersect’ either across functions or across diversity groups, and
  - Provide a critical account of how the response to diversity is generated by policy, guided into practice by procedures and evidenced in documented practice.

- The first three of these aims have been fulfilled. A visual representation has been developed to illustrate the documents that guide the response to diversity across the prison (see 4.2). This map depicts
functional areas as cogs and gears, illustrating how policies, procedures and practices within functional areas intersect.

- However, it was not possible in the time allocated to this element of the research to record and analyse in detail all the documents gathered, nor was it possible within the time frame to gain access to all functional areas. Table 7 illustrates the level of recording and analysis in each functional area and can be found in section 4.1.1. The remaining documents will be captured and analysed in the full prison study.

- A number of key findings arise from documentary analysis which intersect with those raised by prisoners, and prisoners and staff and generated action points. These included:
  - The Prison has made significant and extensive advances in responding to diversity at a documentary and recorded practice level; such as the institution of a Diversity Governor and dedicated staff team [see 4.3.1]
  - Further investigation is needed to ascertain how far substantive issues raised in Racial Incident Reporting Forms (RIRF) relate to its official function of identifying and responding to issues associated with race related discrimination [see 4.3.1a].
  - Documents indicate concerns that the number of RIRFs submitted may be inflated by the use of the RIRF for reporting non-racially motivated discrimination [see 4.3.1b].
  - Action points arising from the minutes of some diversity related meetings appear, on some occasions, to be repeatedly rolled over from one meeting to another without being addressed [see 4.4.2 and 4.7.2].
  - Analysis of documents guiding the response to Foreign National Prisoners revealed extensive consideration of the needs of this group and indicated a range of practices embedded in and arising out of policy [see 4.5].
  - The response to the faith needs of prisoners could be tracked directly from policy through procedure and into practice at a surface level and appeared well embedded intersecting across functional areas, for example the Wing, AIC, ALS. Detailed analysis of these documents did not take place. However, the analysis undertaken did indicate that a procedure to guide the practices of individual chaplains in relation to how the arrangements for organising food for religious festivals were operationalised help to ensure consistency [see 4.6.2b]
  - The draft NTO/NTS re the DHL catalogue being developed at the time of the documentary analysis is an example of development of procedures which intersect across functional areas. This procedure should allow religious objects and artefacts to be obtained from faith specific suppliers and allow the local DHL list to increase its stock of general canteen items [see 4.6.2c].
  - The documents guiding the response to disability and older prisoners are comprehensive, appearing appropriately grounded in policy and illustrate clearly the ways in which procedure guides practice across functional areas, for example the Wing and Activities, Learning and Skills. However, we would highlight the potential tensions that could occur from linking these two groups together too closely at a procedural or practice level, as this may lead to disengagement with support mechanisms from young prisoners with disabilities and older prisoners who are not disabled or ‘infirm’ [see 4.7].
  - The mapping exercise revealed that documents guiding the response to sexualities were the most scarce of all the areas of diversity considered. It was particularly noted that there was an absence of some key issues in the National Policy documents. In turn, there was an absence of procedural documentation to which staff could refer to guide their practice. A full and detailed analysis of the ways in which policy is proceduralised and practiced is necessary, as this was not undertaken. However, there was evidence of good practice in relation to the support mechanisms provided for Gay Offenders in the minutes of the Forum and Question Time minutes [see 4.8].

Findings: Discovering the best about responding to diversity

- This section of the research aimed to identify good practice and practice in need of improvement in relation to: race and ethnicities, foreign and dual nationality prisoners, faith, disabled and older
prisoners, sexualities, and, more generally, practice on the wing. Our findings draw on the analysis of data from the prisoner interviews and survey, and the staff focus groups.

- The following areas of best practice were identified including:
  - Efforts to develop a calm, non-confrontational atmosphere on the Wing [see 5.2.1a]
  - Prisoners having some freedom to make choices about how they spend their free time [see 5.2.1b]
  - Developing constructive relationships within the prison officer role [see 5.2.1c]
  - The contribution of prisoner representatives to best practice [5.2.1d]
  - Responding positively to racial bullying [see 5.3.1a]
  - The importance of staff prisoner relationships in helping Foreign National prisoners adjust to prison life [see 5.4.1a]
  - Responding effectively to breakdown communication barriers for Foreign National prisoners [see 5.4.1b]
  - Assisting foreign national prisoners to maintain familial relationships [see 5.4.1c]
  - Regular access to additional faith-related activities [see 5.5.1a]
  - Staff support in faith-related matters [see 5.5.1b]
  - Adaptations to respond to the diverse faith needs of prisoners [see 5.5.1c]
  - Addressing prisoner to prisoner discrimination arising from faith [see 5.5.1d]
  - Benefits of a dedicated Disability Liaison Team [see 5.6.1a]
  - Adaptations across functional areas to accommodate elderly and disabled prisoners [see 5.6.1b]
  - Specific social activities for the over 60s [see 5.6.1b]
  - Action taken to protect older and disabled prisoners [see 5.6.1c]
  - Effectiveness of the Gay Offender Representative role [see 5.7.1a] and Gay Offender Forum [see 5.7.1b]

- The following areas were highlighted as areas for improvement and closely relate to the findings from the Dreaming, Designing and Destiny section below. They include:
  - Fears about personal safety [see 5.2.2a]
  - The importance of respectful communication [see 5.2.2b]
  - Complications and tensions in the staff-prisoner relationship [5.2.2c]
  - Achieving balance and avoiding resentment when delivering diversity [5.2.2d]
  - Difficulties in delivering diversity: communication and access to information [5.2.2e]
  - Raising awareness as a means for addressing areas of concern [see 5.2.2f]
  - Practices perceived to be racially discriminatory [see 5.3.2a]
  - The procedures and processes designed to deal with complaints of racial discrimination [see 5.3.2b]
  - Perceived ineffectiveness of the Foreign Nationals Representative [see 5.4.2a]
  - Responding to appearance change related to religious practice [see 5.5.2a]
  - Ensuring that all members of all religions feel that they are treated equally [see 5.5.2b]
  - Responding to uncommon or infrequent disabilities [see 5.6.2a]
  - Access to external healthcare for older and disabled prisoners [see 5.6.2b]
  - Investigating allegations of homophobia [see 5.7.1a]
  - Responding sensitively to the needs of transgender/transsexual prisoners [see 5.7.1b]
  - Unnecessary highlighting of sexuality in staff prisoner interactions [see 5.7.1c]

Findings: Dreaming, Designing and Destiny: thinking about improved responses

- This section of the research aimed to identify ideas of prisoners and prison staff about how good practice can be sustained and how improvements in practices can be supported and developed. Unlike the previous section we have not structured the findings around individual dimensions of diversity. We decided to present the findings using the final three phases of Appreciative Inquiry – dreaming,
designing and destiny. We made this decision because many of the elements in each of these phases are common to all of the aspects of diversity.

- Dreaming is thinking how things can be different in an ideal world. Asking people to think about an ideal world allows them to look beyond the constraints of everyday life in the prison and to imagine how things could be better. Prisoners did not indulge in wild dreaming of a prison without bars (security), a regime without rules (good order), or a system that privileged individual preferences over group stability (good order). These issues were of central importance to their visions. Similarly prison staff from the wing and from the various functions ensured that their dreams were linked in some way to their current experience. They did not seek to rewrite their work environment, merely to restructure and rephrase parts of it. From all our data sources it was clear that there were three consistently mentioned features of the ideal world.
  - Equal treatment [see 6.2.1]
  - Personal safety [6.2.2]
  - Respectful communication [6.3.3]

- Designing is concerned with finding ways to make the ideal world become a reality. It involves thinking about what practices and resources are needed, identifying obstacles to achieving the ideal and particularly, it requires imaginative thinking to find ways of overcoming the obstacles. In engaging with how to design a changed environment staff and prisoners identified strategies, many of which overlap, but all of which clearly relate to how the three elements identified in the dreaming section might be achieved.
  - Equal treatment
    - Equality in the allocation of resources [see 6.3.1a]
    - Acknowledging and working with the difference between equity and equality [6.3.1b]
    - Developing staff awareness and skills in relation to specific diversity issues [see 6.3.1c]
    - Clearer communication regarding security re-categorisation in relation to BME prisoners [see 6.3.1d]
    - Improving the nature and context of personal communication [see 6.3.1e]
    - Developing a consistent response to disrespectful practice [see 6.3.1f]
  - Personal safety
    - The benefits of recruiting a diverse staff group [see 6.3.2a]
    - Cohesion: improving the willingness of staff to work together to respond to diversity [see 6.3.2b]
  - Respectful communication [see 6.3.3]
  - Prisoners and staff also worked hard to identify potential barriers to change and generate ideas for how these might be overcome. These included common barriers such as time, money and issues of trust. However they also included more complex barriers
    - Managing conflict in a world of scare resources and industrial relations [see 6.3.4]
    - Prison Officer culture [see 6.3.4a]
    - Staff training and vulnerabilities when working with diversities [6.3.4b]

- Destiny relates to the process by which change can be sustained; alterations to practices, relationships and day-to-day conduct are not maintained merely by saying that they should continue. Moreover, they also often require structural change to enable them to develop and become embedded. Our findings in relation to this area are the briefest, however prisoners and staff identified the following as relevant to enabling the prison to continue refining, improving and developing its practice with minority diversity groups.
  - Accountability in relation to diversity and ongoing, detailed staff training in specific areas [see 6.4.1]
  - Developing an infrastructure to support and maintain change before implementing changes [see 6.4.2]
Reflecting on Methodological Issues

- As mentioned earlier in this summary the research was funded by the ESRC as a pilot project to develop and pilot a methodology. Our attention has therefore been as much focused on the conduct of the research as it has been on the findings. Below we highlight issues relating to the design of the project particularly the impact and effectiveness of Appreciative Inquiry (AI), before considering matters relating to the delivery of the project, including issues that helped or hindered the project to keep to schedule and complete all tasks on time.

  - **Design**
    - Appreciative inquiry
      - As anticipated AI permitted the expression of contentment and discontent whilst also actively engaging participants in thinking about how things can be different
      - Enabled prisoners from diversity groupings to talk about both their experiences and their aspirations for social justice in their current environment.
      - AI does curtail participants’ freedom to move outside of the structure it imposes and reflect in more detail on issues of importance to them.
    - Documentary analysis
      - This stage of the research has proved its utility in enabling us to track how the practices that we observed, or were told about by prisoners and staff, were or in some cases were not guided by policy and procedure.
      - Whilst the documentary mapping phase is complete, a full analysis of all the documents was not undertaken and we believe there is additional value in completing this work either as part of the full study or as an interim piece of work.
    - Prisoner interviews
      - The use of a return interview process was a useful tool. However, adaptations and changes would be made to the second interview schedule in further research [see 7.2.3a]
      - The interviews were carried out by the Principal and Co-Investigator due to their previous experience working with prisoners in high security environments. However, this made the project expensive and future research should explore the possibility of recruiting research assistants with experience of high security environments to work with the Principal and/or Co-investigator research teams [see 7.2.3c].
    - Survey
      - Extensive and detailed strategies were employed to ensure the validity and rigour of the survey design, which was sufficient to offer descriptive data for contextualising the prisoner interviews. [see 7.2.4a]
      - The return rate of the survey is low, but this is consistent with other surveys conducted in the Prison. However, the return rate does indicate that should a full prison study take place, a sufficient number of surveys would be returned to allow a detailed inferential analysis to be undertaken\(^2\).
      - The contextual nature of the survey [with items being developed from interviews with prisoners from only one wing of the prison] means that a new version of the survey with statements elicited from interviews across the prison would need to be developed for a full prison study.
    - Focus groups
      - The decision to use focus groups rather than individual interviews to explore the experiences of staff was supported by the detail and quality of discussion which took place during the groups [see 7.2.5].

\(^2\) It should be noted that the survey was not and would not in a full prison study be developed as a predictive measure. Its function is to offer supportive data allowing the issues from the prisoner interviews to be appropriately contextualised across the wider population of the prison.
• The decision to divide staff from the wing and other functional areas was prudent and we would recommend this as practice for future research. It enabled staff to feel comfortable to share experiences freely without fear of reprisal or reproach [see 7.2.5]

• Delivery
  – Working in a high security environment
    ▪ This environment poses specific challenges for externally funded research since research assistants cannot be recruited prior to the award of funding and this combined with the lengthy time for security clearance can act to constrain progress on research [see 7.3.1 for details]
    ▪ The arrangements developed for ensuring the security of audio files arising from the prisoner interviews and staff focus groups during data collection and transcription generated a huge time lag for the research [see 7.3.1 for details]
    ▪ Future research should consider alternative arrangements for both these issues [see 7.3.1 for details]
  – Underestimating the workload
    ▪ The requirement to gain funding prior to gaining access to the prison to complete the full design and delivery of the research created a number of issues contributing to underestimating the workload associated with the research
    ▪ Many aspects of the research were unquantifiable at the time of applying for funding, for example the extent and nature of the documents, the impact of security restrictions on the storage of and arrangements for transcription of the audio data.
    ▪ A number of measures have been identified which can address these issues in further research. These are outlined in detail in section 7.3.2.

Summary of Suggested Action Points

Concerning local prison practice
• HMP Wakefield to quarterly collate a profile of the prison population in relation to age and race/ethnicity.
• HMP Wakefield to collate data concerning the age, ethnicity and type of disability of its disabled prisoner population. This information to be up-dated quarterly.
• Pilot of proposed Diversity Incident Reporting Procedure and form to ascertain its utility in (1) addressing perceived inequalities about the response to reported discrimination and (2) its impact on the RIRF system.
• Development of a warning system that prevents repeated rollover of unaddressed action points.
• Develop a procedure to guide the way in which arrangements for organising food for religious festivals is operationalised at a Chaplaincy level.
• Investigate prisoner perceptions of safety/vulnerability further in the full study using a representative sample to gain a clearer picture of this issue.
• More widely advertise and encourage participation in Diversity week. Suggest diversity representatives’ champion the week during association and elsewhere.
• Develop strategies to increase the perceived effectiveness of committees on which prisoner representatives sit, with a view to increasing prisoners’ perceptions of the effectiveness of their own representatives.
• Action is needed to improve the confidence of BME prisoners in the systems for reporting/complaining, investigating and adjudicating complaints relating to allegations of racism.

3 Some action points have both local and national relevance and therefore appear in both lists.
• Initial and ongoing specialised staff training to enable staff to understand and interpret Islamic religious codes and practices.
• To counteract suspicions and jealousies within the prison population that certain groups receive preferential treatment, a transparent system of accountability needs to be further developed. This may require national advice and guidance.
• Develop a clear overview of both the profile of the older population and those with disabilities as distinct groups within the prisoner population.
• Monitor the processes whereby prisoners are referred to Health Care; how long they have to wait before being seen and how frequently escort arrangements prevent them from keeping appointments. It may be that this is a Primary Care trust responsibility.
• Consider making ‘Diversity Week’ a bi-annual event and encourage the diversity representatives to take an active role in advertising the workshops and events to prisoners on each wing.
• Consider making provision for Wing based staff to have an annual away day event with guest speakers to discuss specific areas of concern regarding diversity.
• Specific (national and local) guidance is issued in relation to the treatment, including searching of transgender prisoners⁴.

Concerning national advice
• Explore the potential for developing ‘mediatory’ rather than ‘adversarial’ methods of dispute resolution. This may need raising at a national level.
• Specific (national and local) guidance is issued in relation to the treatment, including searching of transgender prisoners.

Concerning research practice
• Seek the active involvement of prisoners in the design of future prison research
• Future research would benefit from the development of a steering group with membership of Governor or senior grades of staff from functional areas across the prison to offer advice and disseminate information about the ongoing research.
• Future research would benefit from incorporating informal and unscheduled observations of daily life in prison to assist with contextualising findings from other methods of data collection.
• Further work is required to provide a comprehensive picture of the documentary context of working with diversity in a high security prison. This would be addressed in the full prison study.
• Further collection and analysis of raw data arising from the documents that guide the response to diversity across the prison
• Qualitative analysis of RIRFs should form part of the documentary analysis in the total prison study in order to ascertain how far substantive issues raised in the RIRF relate to its key function of identifying and responding to issues relating to race related discrimination.
• Investigate prisoner perceptions of safety/vulnerability further in the full study using a representative sample to gain a clearer picture of this issue.

---

⁴ It is recognised that development of local and national guidance in this area are necessarily interrelated.
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In this space we cannot name everyone who has shown us kindness and support but we feel that we must give a ‘special mention’ to the following: Governor Chris Robinson who played a significant role in getting the project off the ground and throughout our work has been a source of practical wisdom and support. Governor Simon McDonnell took over responsibility for the management of Diversity issues in the prison; he amazed us with the speed at which he ‘took over the reins’ and was able to provide us with well-informed practical help. Principal Officer Jerry Hollis, Shirley Hill and Rae-Michelle Bright provided us with an immeasurable amount of their time – so much in fact that the Prison decided to allocate us keys to reduce the burden of escorting us – but it was not only their time that we valued it was their knowledge of the prison and the ways in which diversity was managed. Frequently they helped us identify (too many) key documents for analysis. Additionally, they managed much of the underlying organisation, particularly in relation to organising rooms and minute taking for the meetings of the Project Steering Group (PSG) and Prisoner Advisory Group (PAG). The Senior Management Team of the prison have allowed us the space to undertake our research without interference and yet when we needed help in organising staff focus groups they responded swiftly and with great effect. We are particularly grateful for the use of a room (which we called our ‘research suite’); this enabled us to gather and analyse materials in relative comfort. Without this facility the work would not have progressed as efficiently. We owe a special ‘thank you’ to all of the staff on ‘B’ Wing; we disturbed their daily routines for substantial periods of time during the summer of 2009. They brought us prisoners to interview, but as we got to know each other, staff would also make informal and helpful comments about the conduct and content of the research. Many informal conversations have deepened our understanding of what it is like to live and work in one part of a maximum-security prison.

In many ways we owe at least as big a debt of thanks to all of the prisoners on B wing. We intruded on prison staff’s place of employment, but in the case of prisoners on B wing we intruded on their daily living space. Again, as prisoners became aware of what we were doing and got used to us being on the Wing many would come and talk to us about our work and what life was like on the Wing. We owe special thanks to the ‘B’ Wing kitchen orderly, whom we will not name because we do not have permission to do so, for keeping us supplied with refreshments during our interviews – this helped us greatly!

Outside of the prison we would like to recognise the help and support given to this project from its formative stages to its completion by Christopher Barnett-Page Head of Performance Monitoring and Data Analysis in H.M. Prison Service, Race and Equalities Action Group. Also, Dr Muzammil Quraishi, Senior Lecturer in Criminology at the University of Salford, who as a member of the PSG gave us the benefit of his experience in researching race and faith issues in prison.

Two separate advisory groups – the PSG and the PAG, guided the project from the outset. The PSG was made up of: the Race Equalities Officer; B Wing Managers; Wing Staff; Psychology; the Imam; the Chaplain; and Nasim Aslam from the Independent Monitoring Board at the prison. Additionally, a representative from Wakefield Age concern and an Academic with specialist knowledge from another University were invited to participate in the group. The PAG was made up of all prisoner diversity representatives from ‘B’ wing plus two diversity representatives from each of the other wings. Additionally PAG included prisoners who joined a group that we ran in Diversity week (November 2008). To both groups we owe thanks for supporting our efforts constructively and in an encouraging manner. However, we must give a special mention to the PAG whose commitment to the research was 110%! This group of prisoners engaged with a range issues related to designing and implementing the various aspects of the research in an enthusiastic and challenging manner. Their efforts in helping us to design the survey were exceptional and we wish to offer a very special vote of thanks to this group of people – you know who you are!!
The last, but by no means least, group that we wish to thank for making the research possible is everyone who gave up their time to respond to our research questions – the twenty three prisoners who we interviewed on two occasions, the prisoners who replied to our survey and the prison staff from B wing and beyond who participated in the focus groups. We have learned a lot from all of you, thank you.

Our final acknowledgement of thanks must go the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) without their financial aid this research would not have been possible.
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

This report provides an account of the research ‘Appreciative inquiry into the Diversity Strategy of HMP Wakefield’ funded in 2009 by the Economic & Social Research Council (ESRC). The project was funded, and conducted, as a pilot study with the overall aims of:

- Developing/piloting a methodology that could develop a way of understanding the complexity of:
  - How diverse minority grouping prisoners experience prison life and the strategies designed to improve their quality of life.
  - The views of prison staff about issues of diversity and the prison’s diversity strategy.

The project extended over nine months from 1st March 2009 to 30th November 2009, and was undertaken by Professor Malcolm Cowburn (Principal Investigator), Dr Victoria Lavis (Co-investigator) and Dr Hayden Bird (Research Assistant). All researchers were fully security checked before the data collection started. There were four forms of data collection: prison documentation; interviews with twenty-three prisoners from B Wing; a survey of all prisoners on B Wing, and two staff focus groups. The data collection adopted an Appreciative Inquiry (AI) approach, which also informed the data analysis. This is discussed more fully throughout the report.

1.1 Terminology

It is important here to clarify what we mean by diversity and more particularly ‘diverse minority identities’. Current legislation requires public bodies to promote equality and prevent discrimination in the following areas: age, disability, gender, race, religion and belief and sexual orientation. Each strand is covered by specific government legislation. In terms of ‘diverse minority identities’ in prison we are focussing on: Black & Minority Ethnic (BME) prisoners; older prisoners (over 60s); Disabled prisoners (with physical disabilities, learning difficulties; and mental health problems); Gay, Bi-sexual and Transgender prisoners; and prisoners affiliated to Faith groups.

We are aware that the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) refers to all people who are convicted of an offence as ‘offenders’, whether they are in the community or in custody. However, we have come, through the research, to appreciate that this term ignores the wider humanity of people who have committed offences, naming them solely in relation to a crime for which they have been convicted. In our many formal and informal meetings with people living in the prison they expressed unhappiness with a term that tied them irrevocably to their past criminal actions; most people that we spoke to were happy to be called ‘in-mates’ or ‘prisoners’ as both terms reflected their current experience. In this report we will use the term ‘prisoner(s)’ in preference to the term ‘offender(s). Moreover, throughout this report the names and identities of those participating in the research and whose words are quoted has been protected by the use of false names.

1.2 The structure of the report

The report opens with consideration of Diversity in HMP Wakefield; particular attention is paid to the demographic profile of the prison in relation to the diversity strands and also offences and sentences. It then considers recent external studies of the prison – particularly the reports of the Chief Inspector of Prisons and the Measurement of the Quality of Prison Life studies. The section concludes with a brief consideration of a phrase that we encountered frequently during our time in the prison – ‘the Wakefield way’.

The next chapter addresses the origins of the study, our methodological approach – Appreciative Inquiry (AI) and how we collected our data in the prison; it also explores the issue of objectivity in prison research. Chapter four presents material from our analysis of prison documents; chapters five and six present material.

---

5 ESRC Award number RES-000-22-3441.
from the interviews, the survey and the staff focus groups and our recommendations in light of these. We have already noted that the study is also a pilot project aimed at developing a way of researching diversity in prisons, the report concludes with methodological reflections on the project and suggested ways forward.
CHAPTER TWO: HMP WAKEFIELD AND DIVERSITY

2.1 Introduction
At the outset of this report it is important to establish some contextual facts concerning H.M. Prison Wakefield. These data provide a backdrop from which to understand subsequent materials in this report. No two prisons are identical; they may differ in (long-term and recent) history, security status, the nature and make up of the prisoner population, and the nature and make up of the staff population. Additionally, establishments vary in how they are resourced and managed. Local interpretations of national guidance vary across establishments and within individual establishments across time.

In this chapter we present data in relation to the complex intersections of identity that are involved in making up Wakefield prison. These intersections are related to different aspects of the identities of the prisoner population. This research has not considered the demographics of the staff population.

The aspects of the prisoner population that we present are related to five of the six strands of diversity – ethnicity, disability, age, sexuality and faith. We have not collected data on gender in relation to the prisoner population because all the prisoners are male. In addition to diversity related data we have collected information related both to the main offence and sentence of prisoners. Wakefield, generally, houses prisoners who are serving long prison sentences having committed very serious crimes. These factors raise particular issues for prison managers, prison staff and the prisoners themselves. It is important to establish these elements of the prisoner population.

Apart from these ‘internal’ sources of information, it is important to recognise that Wakefield prison, along with the other prisons in England and Wales, is regularly subject to external scrutiny. The two main sources of external scrutiny are inspections conducted by Her Majesty’s Chief Inspector of Prisons and Probation – these reports are published and freely available – and research conducted under the auspices of the University of Cambridge ‘the Measurement of the Quality of Prison Life’ (MQPL) who prepare an internal report for the Prison Service. Both of these sources have commented on issues related to the management of diversity in Wakefield prison.

Any research at HMP Wakefield cannot avoid frequently encountering the phrase ‘the Wakefield way’; the final part of this chapter gives some brief consideration of this term and of different ways that it can be interpreted.

2.2 Demographic profile of the prison population of HMP Wakefield
This section presents data relating to the five strands of diversity identified above. Unless it is stated to the contrary the data was obtained on 25th January 2010 and it relates to the total prison population on that date, which was 735 prisoners.

2.2.1 Race & Ethnicities
The terms ‘race’ and ‘ethnicities’ focus on different issues: ‘race’ is defined solely on the basis of physical criteria such as skin colour and facial characteristics. Ethnicity, however, focuses on issues, such as history/tradition, faiths and associated cultural practices. Often the terms are used interchangeably, but they refer to very different aspects of identity. The terms ‘Race’ and ‘racial’, by generally categorising people according to their physical appearance, have a notorious pedigree (for example in apartheid South

---

6 This does not take account of any individual subjective gendered identification.

7 Additionally, since the completion of this report, we are aware that HMP Wakefield has received H.M. Prison Service award: ‘High Security Team of the Year (2010) Award - Decency and Diversity’.
Africa). However using ‘racial’ categories as a vehicle for analysing populations and practices can also highlight racial discrimination (i.e. people of certain physical appearances appear to be receiving adverse treatment compared to people with different physical appearances). ‘Ethnicity’, on the other hand highlights, to a greater or lesser extent, the historical, geographic and cultural specificity of a person’s origins, and knowledge of such potentially provides a means of responding to individuals in a culturally sensitive manner. Ethnic categories vary in their ability to identify smaller groupings. The Prison Service primarily records race.

The Prison Service collects racial data using sixteen specific racial categories with three additional categories that relate to cases where either a prisoner does not identify with any of the established categories or refuses to classify themselves (see appendix one for a list of these groupings). For the purpose of looking at race and race relations, these sixteen categories are grouped into five main clusters relating to: Asian, Black, Mixed, Other and White. Table 1 shows the ethnic profile of the prison in relation to the main ethnic clusters. Appendix 1 highlights that the racial composition of the prisoner population is more complex.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial cluster</th>
<th>Number of prisoners</th>
<th>Percentage of overall prison population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Racial profile of HMP Wakefield prisoners

The categories shown in Appendix 1 point towards ethnicities – geographic origins are highlighted, and these are a key part of an ethnic identity. The implications of the distinction between race and ethnicity for the management of prisoner populations are that whilst a focus on ‘race’ may highlight discriminatory racially based practices, a focus on ethnicities may point to more complex needs of a multi-ethnic population.

2.2.2 Age

Data concerning the age profile of the prisoner population is presented in Table 2. Sixteen percent of the population is aged over 60. We were not able to obtain details of age and race within this subgroup but it is likely, given indications from our previous research (Cowburn, Lavis et al 2008; p. 22) that the BME population will be younger than the White group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Grouping</th>
<th>Number of offenders</th>
<th>Percentage of Prison population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 - 20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 59</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 64</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 - 69</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70+</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Age profile of HMP Wakefield prisoners

All demographic information in tables in this chapter was collected 15\textsuperscript{th} January, 2010 unless otherwise specified.
Information about this intersection of age and race may be important for developing future strategies in relation to diversity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HMP Wakefield to quarterly collate a profile of the prison population in relation to age and race/ethnicity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.2.3 Faith

In relation to faith, thirty different affiliations were identified (see Appendix 2 for the full listing), of these four were not identified as religious faiths (agnostic, atheist, no religion, not specified). Of the twenty-six faiths remaining, seventeen were identified as being Christian. All of the world’s major religions (Buddhism, Christianity, Hinduism and Islam) are characterised by a variety of sub-groupings (e.g. sects, schools) that may have semi-independent identifications. Whilst the data identified separate forms of Christianity, it did not distinguish between different forms of the other major religions. Therefore, for the purposes of presenting this data in the main body of the report we are showing the various forms of Christianity under a single label. Table 3 provides a profile of the faith/non-faith profile of HMP Wakefield.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faith or non-faith category</th>
<th>Number of prisoners</th>
<th>Percentage of prison population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agnostic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religion</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pagan</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rastafarian</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikh</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taoist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>735</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Profile of faiths & non-faiths in HMP Wakefield

### 2.2.4 Disabilities

At the time of writing (March 2010) we have not received any demographic data concerning the disabled prisoner population at HMP Wakefield.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HMP Wakefield to collate data concerning the age, ethnicity and type of disability of its disabled prisoner population. This information to be up-dated quarterly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.2.5 Sexualities

This is a very difficult area to quantify. The Prison Service does not currently gather this information and there are many factors (relating to privacy and personal safety) that deter people from publically identifying themselves as anything but ‘heterosexual’. HM Prison Service website notes ‘GALIPS is the Prison Service LGBT (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual & Transgender) Staff Support Network. It supports all staff and managers, regardless of their sexual orientation, with advice on LGBT issues.’ (HMPS, 2004a). Craig Halligan, the GALIPS
representative at HMP Wakefield states, ‘As you’re aware there is no way of knowing for sure whether anyone identifies as LGB or T, unless this information is volunteered, even then, there is no way of substantiating it. So perhaps it might be just as accurate to look at official estimates. The Government estimates that around 6% of the UK population identify as LGB. Stonewall estimates this figure to be closer to 10%. These estimates suggest that around 50 offenders identify as LGB’. (Halligan, 2010).

2.2.6 Sentence length
On 9th February 2010 the profile of the prison population, in relation to the sentences being served shows that the vast majority of prisoners (almost 70%) are serving life sentences (see Table 4 below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence length</th>
<th>Adult prisoner</th>
<th>Young prisoner</th>
<th>Total &amp; percentage of population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to less than 10 years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years or more but less</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>202 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifers</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>498 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No sentence</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Profile of prisoner population of HMP by sentence

Whilst, the length of the sentences being served points to the serious nature of the crimes committed by the in-mate population, it also indicates the particular nature of the prison population. Many, if not most, prisoners will not be released from prison in the near future, thus issues about the quality of prison life may have greater importance to this group of men than it would for prisoners serving short sentences.

2.2.7 Offence profile
Table 5, illustrates that prisoners in HMP Wakefield are serving sentences for a range of offences (52 offences are listed on the Prison Service database C-Nomis). Although prisoners may have been convicted for a range of offences, for the purposes of recording offences on the Prison database, they are usually identified by their most serious offence (main offence). For the purposes of this report we have clustered these offences under three broad categories – violence, sexual, and theft or other offences (the main focus of which is obtaining goods illegally). This broad classification has a number of difficulties, particularly in relation to the boundary between sexual and violent offences. All sexual offences are violent, insofar as they violate the victim(s). Many violent offences may have sexual elements and motivations (e.g. murder). Within both of these categories closer analysis is likely to reveal hidden nuances and complexity that confounds our simple taxonomy. However, the purpose of our classification is not to deny the complexity and problematic nature of the population of HMP Wakefield, it is rather to find a simple way of identifying and recognising the unusual nature of this in-mate population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence type</th>
<th>Percentage of overall list of offences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual offences</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft or other offences the main focus of which is obtaining</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goods illegally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Profile of prisoner population of HMP by offence type
Looking at the range of crimes listed in relation to the prisoner population of HMP Wakefield, it would appear that, in the light of the sentence profile for this group, the majority of inmates have committed crimes of serious interpersonal violence. Appendix 3 provides a full list of the offences related to the above broad categories.

2.3 Recent Inspectorate of Prisons Reports
The 2003 report of Her Majesty’s Chief Inspector of Prisons (HMCIP) on an unannounced inspection of HMP Wakefield noted that prisoners, both individually and in groups, commented on the existence of a culture of staff-prisoner relationships characterised by disengagement amounting to disrespect (HMCIP, 2003). There were reports of some officers being intimidating towards prisoners as well as prisoner perceptions that there were racist staff members. It was pointed out, indeed even by a number of White prisoners, that there were no Black security or wing staff. It stated that “[i]n monitoring staff-prisoner relationships and reinforcing the personal officer scheme, managers should pay particular attention to staff interaction with Black and Minority Ethnic prisoners” (HMCIP, 2003:46). However, all of the alleged 20 racial incidents, which the Inspectorate looked at, were found to be appropriately investigated. The Race Relations Management Team (RRMT) met regularly and there was also judged to be 'good' ethnic monitoring, using a traffic light system and the minutes of notes from RRMT and representative meetings pointed to action points being set and followed up. The prison also gained recognition that it had considered certain diversity issues. There was, for instance, an Asian cook employed in the prison kitchen and Asian food featured as an 'integral part' of the prison's catering strategy. Yet for certain groups there was concern that they were largely ignored. African and Caribbean prisoners remained relatively poorly catered for despite this population being one of the largest BME groups in the prison. Hence, the recommendation for a broader range of dishes was made. Whilst there was a Race Relations Liaison Officer (RRLO) and Assistant RRLO's, photographs of these staff were not presented across the prison - apparently due to 'security issues'. Nonetheless, it was recommended that this be rectified.

Further criticism and recommendations included that Racist Incident Reporting Forms (RIRFs) should be supplied with envelopes to maintain confidentiality and that management should also take steps to enhance prisoner confidence in the complaints system. Whilst there were positive images of Black people displayed in the Education Department there were specific deficiencies regarding Foreign National prisoners. There was no FN policy or services in place to help them maintain contact with family and friends. With the exception of an Imam, there were no translation services for speakers of non-English languages. At the time of this inspection there was also not a FN liaison officer in post. The Inspectorate recommended that a model of support used in HMP Wandsworth should be drawn on and adapted for use in Wakefield and that language support services be put in place, including signs being displayed in languages other than English.

Additionally, the Inspectorate expressed concern about the growing number of older and disabled prisoners who were in the prison and in-particular that provision for these was lacking (concerns which were also mirrored in the HMCIP Thematic reviews on Older Prisoners (see HMCIP, 2004). Disabled Prisoners were also highlighted as feeling unsafe and intimidated (HMCIP, 2009a). Examples included prisoners being locked up for 20 hours a day and the absence of gym/physical education for older and infirm prisoners. Although the renovation of B Wing underway at the time would partially address this, there was an absence of activities in employment and recreation. This resulted in individuals spending considerable time on the wing and being disadvantaged in the incentives and earned privileges scheme.

Although a number of the above points continued to feature in the 2005 HMCIP review, there were noteworthy improvements and findings, even though these still took place within a patchwork of positive and negative issues. For instance, the prison should be credited in that 48% of staff had completed the half-day diversity training (see HMCIP, 2005). However there were still problems with prisoners' confidence in the complaints system for racist incidents and though there were some very good individual resources for
disabled prisoners these remained limited, as did activities for older and infirm prisoners. Translation services were still not adequate for the level of prisoner and visitor need. Though there were developments in Race Relations Management Team (RRMT) meetings, with prisoner reps being present at meetings, BME prisoners were still judged to be lacking confidence in RRMT, and procedures and systems more generally, remained a problem. Other measures that were called for included a more substantial survey on canteen provision that should be representative of the population in all areas of the prison.

The 2009 announced inspection (HMCIP, 2009b) revealed that there had been continuing improvements in challenging the earlier identified ‘over controlled’ and ‘negative’ culture of the prison. Despite this the Inspectorate concurred that, in general, prisoners remained negative about relationships, though there were individual staff members who were mentioned as being positive and helpful. Staff-prisoner relationships were even more relevant when considering the views of minority populations. The Inspectorate stated a “great deal of commendable and positive work was taking place in race relations and diversity, though Black and Minority Ethnic prisoners surveyed were more negative than White prisoners in relation to relationships with staff” (HMCIP, 2009b:5). It is particularly important to note that these relationships (or absence of relationships) and disengagement with prisoners (such as wing staff remaining in their offices and not interacting with prisoners) was considered to be a particularly salient issue when matched with the observation that a large proportion of prisoners were in denial of their offences and lacking motivation to take part in rehabilitative work. Managers were specifically directed to consider how they could work with BME prisoners to address the finding that BME prisoners held ‘significantly poorer perceptions, of their treatment when compared to their White counterparts’. In addition, it is also the case that Wakefield had a cohort of staff which had been in the prison for some time. Indeed, about 30% of officers and senior officers had worked at Wakefield for over 15 years. This percentage rose to 40% for those who had been at the gaol for over 10 years (HMCIP, 2009b).

A core summary of Wakefield was that, in general, it remained a safe prison. In respect to diversity issues specifically, the report concluded that “[t]here was no overarching diversity policy, but diversity was well promoted through a range of meetings and activities. Diversity management meetings were often poorly attended. Disability and older prisoners’ policies had been published with objectives, but they were not based on a needs analysis. Prisoners and staff knew the disability liaison office, wing prisoner and officer representatives. Some adaptations had been made, but many older prisoners and those with disabilities were dissatisfied with the support they received” (HMCIP, 2009b:35). This was despite the improvements in the number and quality of activities.

### 2.4 Measuring the Quality of Prisoner Life (MQPL)

MQPL is a survey originally developed by the Prisons Research Centre, University of Cambridge to evaluate hard to measure variables associated with imprisonment and prisoner perceptions of quality of life issues at individual establishments. MQPL survey methodology at individual prisons seeks to gain a representative sample of 120 prisoners. These are recruited to take part in group sessions, comprising approximately 10 people, to complete questionnaires and discuss issues which are important to them in the gaol. The MQPL carried out at Wakefield between 6 and 9 June 2005 (HMPS Standards Audit Unit, 2005) had a questionnaire that had 96 statements, which linked to form 16 dimensions. Each statement has a 5-point Likert scale which ranges from ‘strongly agree’ to ‘strongly disagree’. The survey also asks for prisoners to document their three most positive and three most negative elements of prison life. Space is also given for prisoners to make any additional comments. There are weightings for BME populations and data is tested for statistical significance at the p<0.05 level.

In the 2005 survey dimension scores were compared to what might be expected at a ‘typical’ prison (HMPS Standards Audit Unit, 2005:3), recording that "Compared to the sample of 104 other surveys, Wakefield’s scores that most obviously relate to the staff-prisoner interface (Relationships with Staff 1 and 2, Inclusion,
Comparisons were also made between Wakefield and the other High Security prisons. This comparison would appear to offer a more ‘contextualised’ comparison, given the nature of Wakefield’s prisoner population. Healthcare was a key issue, with scores falling well below the bottom of the ‘typical’ range. Scores were similarly low for Order. Better results for Wellbeing and Inclusion, Rehabilitation, Outside Relationships and Race Equality. Hence, the Race Equality findings would seem to present a slightly different picture to those of the HMCIP. Prisoners’ most positive aspects of the gaol centred on leisure activities and the ability to keep fit, comments about family contact (visits) and educational courses. Access to phones was judged to be good and prisoners were appreciative of the opportunity to complete courses. Negative aspects focussed on staff-prisoner relationships with the report suggesting there was a need to enhance staff-prisoner communication. Concerns were expressed regarding prisoners spending too much time locked up and the consequent inability to achieve 'enhanced' status on the Incentives and Earned Privileges regime. Financial issues such as the price of canteen goods and the level of wages too were also not viewed favourably.

A number of the aforementioned themes remained significant in a subsequent MQPL survey carried out in 2007 with 94 prisoners taking part. The 2007 report stated a “comparison to two previous surveys at Wakefield showed that prisoners’ rating of the ‘overall quality life’ [...] and their level of agreement that Wakefield was a ‘decent prison’ had not changed from June 2004 to June 2005 but then increased from June 2005. There was no statistically significant change in any of the 9 dimension scores that could be compared (although it was possible that those prisoners who took them became less positive about OB Programmes). From June 2005 to April 2007 there were changes in three of the dimension scores that could be compared: scores for Entry into Custody and Healthcare increased but the score for Race Equality decreased” (HMPS Standards Audit Unit, 2007:4). Despite, the increased scores for Health care, this area still attracted negative views. Findings of this most recent MQPL exercise were congruent with some of those in prior HMCIP and MQPL; staff-prisoner relationships were again an issue with both dimensions receiving 'unusually low' or bordering on 'unusually low' scores. Indeed, of the sample, over three quarters of comments about staff were negative and a number of comments were made about 'disrespectful' staff attitudes and treatment. Views on leisure activities and the gym in particular were more positive.

2.5 ‘The Wakefield way’
During this research, in our conversations with staff and prisoners the phrase ‘the Wakefield way’ occurred frequently. Generally, the phrase referred to a harsh or inflexible/insensitive way of behaving, sometimes seen as historical or old fashioned. Although some evidence of intractable behaviours emerged during the research, it also important to note that reference to a different ‘Wakefield way’ also asserted its presence. These references illustrated where time and thought was given to addressing issues of diversity in culturally sensitive ways. Not all staff subscribed to the first version of the ‘Wakefield way’ and similarly not all staff were identified as contributing to the newly emerging ‘Wakefield way’.

Summary
This chapter has established the context in which the current research project has occurred. It has presented a profile of Wakefield as a prison with a very high proportion of prisoners serving very long sentences for serious offences of interpersonal violence. It has shown that the prison population is multi-
racial, and multi-faith. The age range of the population is very wide with 27 prisoners being under 25 years old and 23 prisoners being over 70 years old. No information was available about the profile of disabled prisoners. However, the population of the prison is very complex and has a wide range of diverse needs to be met within the scope of the Prison Service’s overall statement of purpose: ‘Her Majesty’s Prison Service serves the public by keeping in custody those committed by the courts. Our duty is to look after them with humanity and help them lead law-abiding and useful lives in custody and after release.’ (HMPS 2004b). The chapter also highlighted findings from earlier external scrutinies of the practices of Wakefield prison. Concerns highlighted about the staff prisoner relationships remained an area of concern in all of the sources reviewed, although there were indications of slight improvement in this area in more recent reports.
CHAPTER THREE: THE STUDY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter introduces the study. Although the research was only funded for nine months the project had a much longer ‘lead in’ period. Informal discussions led to more formal meetings and as the project developed, applications were required to a range of outside organisation for approval and support. Undertaking research in prison is difficult; prisons can be said to be made up of one group of people who are locked up and another group of people who lock them up, but it is never that simple. People that are locked up are variously able to access a range of services and provisions in custody and the people responsible for security (locking up) do more than turn keys; they communicate to a wide range of people about many issues in order to ensure that the good order of the prison is maintained and that security is not breached. Moreover there is a group of people who work in prison whose main concern is not security, but delivering the range of services and provisions mentioned above. All of these groups have different ways of talking about their lives in prison. Everybody’s story says something about prison life, and yet when researchers start talking to people in prison there is a sense that they are looking for the ‘one’, ‘true’, story of life in prison; this leads to suspicion and mistrust. The challenge for researchers is to develop the trust of everyone in prison and report what they hear faithfully.

In this chapter we outline the origins of the project, how it commenced and was developed, particularly by necessary application to outside bodies and purposefully by referring to ‘inside’ perspectives. We also explore a key issue for any researchers in prison; ‘whose side are you on?’ and discuss how trust was developed and sustained during this piece of prison research.

3.2 Origin of study
The origins of this project date back to 2007 when Professor Cowburn (at the time a member of the Independent Monitoring Board at the prison) and Governor Robinson (the, then, Diversity Governor) discussed Wakefield Prison’s developing strategy for working with diversity. Governor Robinson noted that whilst the practices of the prison were subjected to a range of scrutiny, most of this was brief in nature and failed to capture the ongoing efforts of some prison staff to work positively with prisoners from a variety of minority groupings. Additionally, it was noted that the Prison’s ‘Diversity Strategy’ was only recently developed and had not time to impact on the daily life of prisoners.

Following this discussion a series of meetings occurred between Professor Cowburn, Dr Lavis, Governor Robinson and the Head of the Assessments, Interventions and Courses (AIC) Jane Reed to develop a research project that would investigate in more depth the experiences of prisoners and prison staff in relation to how diversity was responded to in HMP Wakefield.

Before an application to carry out the research could be submitted to the Prison Service, a formal research proposal had to be submitted to an independent body to check that what we were proposing was ethical and did not harm anyone (particularly prisoners and prison staff). Our work was scrutinised by the National Health Service Research Ethics Service (NRES). This body required the researchers to prepare detailed documentation about the project, and to attend a committee meeting in York where we were cross-examined by a committee of approximately twenty people. The committee required us to provide them with further assurances concerning arrangements for ensuring the anonymity of research participants and the secure storage of data; after which they approved our project. Having received ethical approval, our proposal was further checked by the Prison Service to obtain research approval and access into the prison. Having secured ethical approval and Prison Service approval we then applied to the Economic and Social Science Research Council for funding. Securing funding is very competitive; in our case we had
approximately a 17% chance of being successful. Fortunately we were successful and the project commenced on 1\textsuperscript{st} March 2009.

3.3 An Appreciative Inquiry Approach

The research was carried out using an Appreciative Inquiry (AI) approach, which has its origins in action research, notably research focussing on organisational change and development. However the approach has also been used in a range of other areas, including research in prisons. Alison Liebling and others (Arnold & Barnett-Page 2006; Elliott, Liebling et al 2001; Liebling, Elliott et al 2001; Liebling, Price et al 1999) suggest that AI enables prisoners to describe their positive experiences in prison whilst also talking, often more freely than in problem-focussed interviews, about their negative experiences.

There are four phases to AI research; discovery, dreaming, designing and destiny (Reed, 1997). ‘Discovery’ is the start of the inquiry and is concerned with identifying best experiences rather than commencing from a problem focus. Although this phase aims at capturing best experience, it inevitably also gathers information about experiences that are not ‘best’. ‘Dreaming’ moves the inquiry on and changes the focus; it asks research participants to imagine how the subject under inquiry (for example, the prison’s response to diversity) might be improved. This enables the research participant to link their ‘best’ experience to how things may be further enhanced thereby highlighting elements and issues which are important to the research participant. ‘Designing’ involves the research participant in identifying practices, relationships and processes which might be necessary to support the ideas outlined in dreaming and articulated as ‘best’ in discovery. The final phase of AI ‘Destiny’ concentrates on what is needed to maintain and sustain the changes that have been dreamed about and designed. These elements guided the design and collection of data in each of the four phases of the research. Figure 1, below, represents these four elements and shows how they flow from one to the other.

![Diagram of the four phases of AI]

**Figure 1. Elements of Appreciative Inquiry**

A key element in AI research is involving those being researched in the design and ongoing management of the project. This was done primarily through the development of two groups – the Project Steering Group (PSG) and the Prisoner Advisory Group (PAG).

3.3.1 Involving research participants in the design of the project

Prior to receiving funding we were invited to give a presentation for prisoners during Diversity Week 2008. Approximately ten prisoners came to the event. We explained what we were hoping to do and began asking their advice on how we could develop the project. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the group was initially suspicious of us and asked us many challenging questions. Hopefully we answered the questions sufficiently well for the group agreed to engage with thinking about our project. The group had lots of ideas and we could not finish our discussion before the session had to end. We told the group that we would return when we knew
about our funding situation. After we heard that the project was to be funded we returned to the prison and continued our work with the group. The technique that we used in these two sessions is known as the ‘Wonderwall’. We asked the group to address two questions: ‘Which people should we talk to if we want to find out about diversity?’ and ‘What ways of finding out about diversity could we use?’ Using ‘post it notes’ and felt tip pens the group worked collaboratively to identify sources of information and ways of obtaining the information. Their responses to these two questions resulted in the development of a ‘Wonderwall’ that we mapped onto the aims of the project to develop a final design of the stages of data collection [See Appendix 2 for diagram].

The Wonderwall activity and its outcome were central in developing the trust of some prisoners and involving them in refining the design of the project. It is a practice that we would strongly recommend in the development of future research of prisoners’ experiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seek the active involvement of prisoners in the design of future prison research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was from this initial group that we developed our Prisoner Advisory Group (PAG) who provided help and support to the project throughout its duration. A key area that this group was particularly helpful with was in designing and reducing the length of the survey phase of the research. Their assistance was invaluable and greatly increased the rigour of the final instrument. We also developed another advisory group – the Project Steering Committee. This group was mainly made up of staff from the prison – B Wing, the key functional areas, and Governor grades. This group also provided us with advice and guidance, meeting three times throughout the project. We were also fortunate, to receive additional advice from a wide range of staff during our informal conversations at different points during the research. Whilst Steering Committees might be seen as standard practice, they perform a vital function in prison research, enabling the dissemination of information down to functional areas and facilitating access to those areas. In our experience, such practice increases transparency and consequently trust.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future research would benefit from the development of a steering group with membership of Governor or senior grades of staff from functional areas across the prison to offer advice and disseminate information about the ongoing research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We are very impressed how both prisoners and staff that we worked with seemed to be seriously engaged in helping the research gather data.

### 3.3.2 Identifying the pilot wing

In chapter one, we noted that the study was funded as a pilot study to develop ways of researching diversity issues in prisons. When we knew that the project was to be funded, we met with the Diversity and Security Managers to discuss which Wing would be most appropriate to use for the study. It was recognised that all four wings had their own distinct character. However, given that the study was exploratory in nature we needed a location that accommodated the greatest range of diversities in the prison. This led to the selection of B wing, which houses a diverse mix of ethnicities and dual national prisoners, and contains accommodation for disabled prisoners, and older prisoners.

The prison database was used to identify all potential research participants on the pilot Wing who fell within the diversity strategy because of their ethnicity, status as a foreign national, sexuality, age, religion or level of disability. This revealed a total sample of 84 out of the possible 172 prisoners on the wing. All of the
prisoners in this group were invited by letter to participate in a one to one interview. Twenty three prisoners self selected to take part and were interviewed on two occasions (see Table 6 below for a breakdown by diversity strand).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diversity grouping</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traveller</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 60</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexuality</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declared Islam</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pagan</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rastafarian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic group A1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Breakdown of prisoners interviewed by diversity strand

3.4 Implementing the data collection: spending time in prison

As we mentioned above, the research was concerned with four data sources: documentation, interviews with prisoners, a survey of prisoners and two staff focus groups. However, alongside these main sources of data collection we were also familiarising ourselves with some of the prison meetings where diversity issues were addressed. We refer to this as ‘informal observations’ and we start this section with a brief description of these activities.

3.4.1 Informal observations

There are two kinds of informal observation to note: visits to various diversity focussed meetings and casual conversations with staff and prisoners. In relation to the various meetings, we attended the following events:

- Whole prison Social Inclusion Question Time: ‘Are your faith needs being met?’
- Wing Social Inclusion meetings (old format) on A, B, C, and D Wings
- Gay Offender Forum
- Race Equality Representatives meeting
- Race Equality Action Team meeting
- Racist Incident Report Form – External Scrutiny meeting
- Travellers Drop-in meeting

Additionally, we had a number of informal conversations with disabled and older prisoners and their representatives whilst observing practice on B Wing.

\(^9\) The categories listed here reflect those used by the prison service. A key can be found in appendix one.
As the research progressed, we became familiar figures on B Wing, both staff and prisoners would stop to talk to us about the research or about issues that related to the research. Thus we spoke to a range of people in more relaxed and informal settings. The detail of these conversations is not referred to in this report – we did not record the conversations and we did not have permissions to report them – however these contacts were invaluable to us in widening and deepening our understanding of life on B Wing.

**Action Point**

Future research would benefit from incorporating informal and unscheduled observations of daily life in prison to assist with contextualising findings from other methods of data collection.

### 3.4.2 Documentation

This was the most problematic area of the study for a number of reasons: (i) a record of documents relevant to diversity within functional areas of the prison did not exist prior to our research, (ii) the vast amount of material generated, (iii) practical difficulties in accessing and extracting data, and (iv) the time available to analyse the data collected. In chapter seven we reflect more fully on methodological issues, here we briefly describe the implementation of this part of the project. Shortly after the start of the project, we met with prison governors on two occasions to develop a possible list of relevant documents. We categorised the documents into three types: policies, procedures and practices. ‘Policies’ relates to national and local guidance and, sometimes legislation that framed how the prisons of England and Wales were to operate in given areas (for example ‘race relations’). ‘Procedures’ refers to how national guidance is interpreted and recorded at local level – here we examined documents that related to how HMP Wakefield framed its response to national and local issues. ‘Practices’ point to documentation that describes or records what is actually done in the prison (for example RIRF forms or prisoners records). Having identified the huge number of documents, we engaged in a reduction exercise. This related mainly to practice level documents and involved identifying the frequency of occurrence of documents and generating a sample from across relevant historical time. However, accessing the identified documents was often problematic and impacted significantly on the workload of prison staff in the Diversity unit. Some documents were mobile or could be photocopied and brought to the research room. However, others were only available electronically or ‘in situ’ in functional areas. In these cases, special permissions were sought to enable us to record data at various prison locations. Given the unanticipated enormity of this task, most of our work in this area is of a descriptive rather than analytical nature. However, it produced a number of hitherto unavailable outcomes which are discussed in detail in Chapter 4.

**Action point**

Further work is required to provide a comprehensive picture of the documentary context of working with diversity in a high security prison. This would aim to be addressed in the full prison study.

### 3.4.3 AI interviews with prisoners

The 23 prisoners who volunteered for interview, were interviewed twice using schedules developed to conform to the AI methodology. This is illustrated in Figure 2 below. Most interviews lasted in between one hour and ninety minutes and were audio recorded with prisoners’ words being transcribed later. The interviews took place in a private room on the Wing. Most prisoners spoke freely and at length. All prisoners quoted in this report have been given false names to protect their identity.
3.4.4 The survey
The aim of the survey was to collect the views of all prisoners on B Wing about the prison’s response to diversity. The survey was designed using material from the prisoner interviews which generated an initial 148 items, across the four AI elements. Since this was too lengthy to expect prisoners to complete a systematic item reduction process was undertaken with the help of the PAG. The PAG members individually completed the full 148-item version of the survey, ranking and providing feedback on each of the items. The ranking process enabled the reduction of the survey to a final 54 items. Additionally, strategies for distributing and collecting the survey were discussed with the Steering and Prisoner Advisory Groups. We received particular help from ‘B’ Wing prisoner representatives in encouraging prisoners to respond to the survey. A total of 31 completed responses were received\(^{10}\).

3.4.5 Staff focus groups
We conducted two focus groups with staff: one with ‘B’ Wing staff and one with staff from the various functional areas of the prison that deal with ‘B’ Wing prisoners; including Assessments, Interventions and Courses, Activities, Learning and Skills, and the Offender Management Unit. Twelve members of ‘B’ Wing staff attended the Wing group and eight functional staff attended the other group. Both focus groups were structured using the four phases of AI, audio recorded and later transcribed. In both groups staff participated actively and with commitment\(^{11}\).

3.4.6 Data analysis
As mentioned above, the documentary data collected was not systematically analysed and a fuller account of our reflections on this can be found in Chapter 7. However, a proforma was produced which allowed the collection of raw data recording the functions of each document, the associated resources, the activities which arose from or related to those functions or resources and the systems by which such activities are

---

\(^{10}\) It is recognised that this is a low return rate, but it is consistent with the return rates of other surveys within the prison. Moreover, it represents a return rate of 1 in 5.5. If this return rate were to be repeated in a full prison study this would generate a return of 124 surveys; sufficient to enable a detailed analysis of the data.

\(^{11}\) The identities of all staff quoted in this report have been protected by the use of code identifiers. Speakers from the Wing staff focus group are identified as W1 – W12 and speakers from the Functional staff focus groups are identified as F1 – F8.
organised and communicated to others. From this raw data a descriptive representation was developed illustrating the interrelation of documents which guide and record the prison’s response to diversity across its different functional areas [see Figure 3 for a full illustration and Chapter 4 for illustrations of individual functional areas and diversity strands]. Thematic analysis was used to code the interviews and focus groups; the AI phases were employed as a super ordinate structure and the software package NVivo was used to organise and collate material. The survey data was analysed using SPSS. This analysis was descriptive, in line with the low number of responses associated with the pilot nature of the tool.

3.5 A research conundrum - 'whose side are we on?' – the building of trust.

In a paper published in 2001, Alison Liebling, a Professor of Criminology at the University of Cambridge asked the question ‘Whose side are we on?’ The ‘we’ she referred to were academic researchers in prisons and the choice of sides she suggested was either ‘prisoners’ or ‘prison staff’. As researchers in Wakefield prison between March 2009 and November 2009 we felt that staff and prisoners were silently asking the same question. At the outset of the research both prisoners and prison staff were suspicious of us. Prison staff have substantial prior experience of academic researchers visiting the prison briefly and producing reports that were only critical of their work and did not recognise their good practice; they seemed to see research as a ‘lose lose’ situation. Prisoners tended to see us as engaged in an activity from which only we and the prison would benefit; many prisoners asked the simple question ‘what’s in it for me/us?’

A key part of our responses to both the staff and prisoners was that the prison management had invited us to explore whether and how the diversity strategy was working. The prison were also very keen to make it clear that the research was independently funded and not under the management control of the prison. Additionally, however, prison managers believed that there was good work occurring in Wakefield but that most research seemed to miss it. They hoped that our being in the prison for nine months would enable us to see positive practice, but they also added that if things were not working as well as intended they also needed to know about this.

The advisory groups, apart from giving us good advice, allowed us to clarify uncertainties about our independence and absence of allegiances. For example, at the first meeting of the PAG a number of prisoners said that they would bring papers relating to their personal situations for us to express an opinion on. We made it very clear that as researchers we could not express opinions on individual cases and could not be advocates for individual prisoners. We also reiterated this position to a number of individual prisoners that we spoke to on the Wing.

Although we received advice from both the ‘sides’ Liebing mentions, in this project, what was surprising was how often the advice from both groups overlapped. One example will suffice: in designing the survey questionnaire, we initially used the general word ‘staff’ to explore a range of prisoner attitudes about relationships. Both the Prisoner Advisory Group and the Project Steering Group independently advised us that the term was too generalised and that we should, in each case, specify which group of staff we were referring to. This contributed to making the survey larger in size, but resulted in the information about staff–prisoner relationships being more precise.

In addition to keeping the Steering and Advisory groups informed about the project, we also presented information about our progress to staff at a range of meetings; probably the most important meetings were those that we held on B wing. Again, staff were initially suspicious of us, and what we may say about their work. A key part of our work with in generating relationships with staff involved being regularly in the prison and on the Wing. Seeing them work in a range of settings under various pressures probably helped them to be less suspicious of us and greatly enhanced our understanding of the context in which their role is performed. Also our regular presence on the wing certainly helped staff and prisoners become familiar with us, if not trust us completely.
An important part of the research process was our ability to move about the prison when and where we wanted to. In the early stages of the project, prison staff (uniformed and non-uniformed) would collect us and deliver us to various parts of the prison to undertake previously agreed activities. It quickly became clear to all that this was a very expensive, unexpected and inefficient use of staff time. A decision was made that we would be allocated keys. We were unsure about how our having keys would be viewed by the prisoners – would it appear to compromise our independence? However, the practicalities of the research project – in a high security prison – meant that there was no other way in which the research could have been completed. Ultimately, the freedom that keys provided enabled us greater informal access to the wing and enhanced our comprehension of daily life there.

One other area where the issue of ‘sides’ is potentially problematic is how interview material is dealt with. In interview people may disclose information that indicates a threat to themselves, other people or to the establishment. We made it very clear from the beginning of our interviews that we could not hold such information as confidential. In our information sheet we outlined the boundaries of confidentiality and all people interviewed understood and accepted our position. Although very few problematic issues arose during the research, the way we dealt with them seemed to enhance the way both prison staff and prisoners viewed us. Again, one example will illustrate; in interview we were told how a prisoner had previously experienced being coerced to do something that threatened the security of the prison. We made it clear to the prisoner that if he provided specific details we would have to report the event. The prisoner chose to provide specific details and we reported the incident to the prison, with his full knowledge. The outcome being that both the prisoner and the prison staff were pleased with what we had done.

In our practice we hopefully showed interest in everyone’s perspective on prison life. We listened without judgement to both staff and prisoners alike. We made it clear that our role and task was research; we were not in the prison to take a partisan role. We were in the prison to observe, to listen and to try to understand what was happening. We will close this section with the words of Alison Liebling that echo our own experience:

‘In my experience it is possible to take more than one side seriously, to find merit in more than one perspective, and to do this without causing outrage on the side of officials or prisoners, but this is a precarious position with a high emotional price to pay’ (Liebling, 2001:473).

Summary
The chapter has outlined the origin and development of the project, from a personal conversation to a fully funded Research Council project. It has also outlined the methodological approach – Appreciative Inquiry – which guided the project. Details of data collection and data analysis have been highlighted and some of the processes (advisory groups) and dilemmas (not taking sides) that the research has struggled with have been reflected upon. Issues relating to researchers holding keys, not acting as advocates for prisoners and reporting threats to prison security are all examples of the issues that we struggled with in establishing and maintaining the trust of (some) prisoners and (some) staff.
CHAPTER FOUR: DISCOVERING RESPONSES TO DIVERSITY: THE CONTEXT OF DOCUMENTS

4.1 Introduction
This chapter presents the outcomes arising from the documentary phase of the research. As we identified earlier, this phase of the research was the most testing phase of the pilot. Although the prison had a Diversity Strategy and a dedicated team of staff working to ensure that the strategy was effective, little was known about how the response to diversity was guided at a procedural and practice level across different functional areas of the prison. Key aims arising from this phase of the research were to:

- Create a ‘road map’ of the documents that relate to diversity across the different functional areas of the prison
- Illustrate within the ‘map’ which documents are policies, which are procedures following from specific policies and which are practices arising out of specific procedures.
- Indicate where documents ‘intersect’ either across functions or across diversity groups, and
- Provide a critical account of how the response to diversity is generated by policy, guided into practice by procedures and evidenced in documented practice.

The chapter begins with an account of how the documents were identified and a method of recording information was developed. We then discuss the ‘map’ developed and proceed to explore the documents which guide the response to each area of diversity; generic documents, race and ethnicities, foreign and dual national prisoners, faith, disabled and older prisoners, sexualities and finally those which guide the response to diversity at a wing level.

4.1.1 Identifying documents and developing a framework for capturing their impact
Our initial approach to identifying documents was to work closely with the then Diversity and Security Governors to establish an initial list of documents that might be relevant to diversity across the various functional areas of the prison. This initial list was generated in early April and following the first Prison Steering Group (PSG) meeting was emailed to PSG members working across the prison. Members were asked to review, with colleagues, the documents listed from their functional area and reply with any corrections or omissions. This process took some time and responses from functional areas did not begin arriving until mid May. In the intervening period, the research team, working with members of the diversity team, began collating documents arising from the Diversity function itself. Once a total list of documents had been established these were categorised into documents relating to policy, those which provided procedural guidance and documents recording actual practice. A process of consultation followed to reduce the need to look at all the documents; this was achieved by establishing the frequency of occurrence of practice documents and the development of an appropriate sampling frame. One example will serve to illustrate the importance of this process; Minutes of diversity meetings take place monthly, whereas the Diversity Action Plan is an annual event.

A small sample of documents was examined to assist the team in developing a method of capturing relevant data. Following the AI framework a pro-forma developed to record the following information about each document:

- ‘Official’ function: for example, a PSO will have an official function to ensure that certain base lines are met.
- ‘Unofficial’ function: for example, are any unofficial functions present? If so, what and what benefits/difficulties do these present to the delivery of diversity?
- Resources associated with the function: identification of resources both ‘human’ and ‘material’. For example Race Relations Officers are human. Particular attention was paid to looking for resources which might be necessary for a function to be successful, or for an activity to be carried out, but
which might be hidden or unacknowledged. This was considered important in order to assist the prison in making their strategies sustainable.

- **Activities which relate to or arise from the ‘Official’ function**: single or multiple activities may arise from a function. For example, conducting an investigation is an activity arising from the RIRF form, but there are also likely to be other associated activities.

- **Activities which arise from the ‘unofficial’ function**: for example, the original Wing based Social Inclusion Forums (SIF) were an activity whose function was to help identify diversity issues, examine and respond to them. But our observation of the wing based SIFs, suggested that a common unofficial activity was the airing of non-diversity issues.

- **Systems which organise the function or activity**: for example, the ‘processes’ through which the prison organises its activities and communicates it’s functions to staff and prisoners, such as the Wing based diversity notice boards and the staff intranet.

- **Mechanisms for communicating the function or activity to others**: communications mechanisms may be ‘processes’ or they may be ‘activities’. For example, the new ‘Challenge it, Change it’ training package is a mechanism for communicating functions to others, as are minutes and action plans.

Where possible data collection was organised by functional area, starting with the policy, then any procedural documents arising from that policy, and finally the practice documents relating to those procedures. However, this was not always possible, particularly where the team had to visit a functional area to gain access to documents and time in the function was limited.

As indicated earlier in this document, it was not possible in the time allocated to this element of the research to record information from all the documents gathered, nor was it possible within the time frame to gain access to all functional areas. These remain areas to be addressed in the full prison study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Further collection and analysis of raw data arising from the documents that guide the response to diversity across the prison</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 below illustrates the functional areas and the level of recording achieved in each functional area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Areas</th>
<th>Documents collected</th>
<th>Raw data collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Generic</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Race and ethnicity</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Faith</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Older and Disability</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sexualities</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Foreign Nationals</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender Management Unit</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments, Interventions and Courses</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities, Learning and Skills</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Wing</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Scrutiny</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer Prisons</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Collection of documents and raw data from functional areas.
4.2 Diversity map

Figure 3 overleaf illustrates the map of documents generated through the research. Initially it had been anticipated that this might be presented as a ‘road map’, illustrating the journey of diversity through functional areas. However, it was clear from the documentary analysis that a visual representation of the documents as gears and cogs would better illustrate their intersecting nature in contributing to the response to diversity across the prison.

Each individual cog illustrates in the innermost ring the policies relating to diversity within the function. The next outer ring illustrates procedures arising from those policies and the outermost ring illustrates documented practices arising from the policies and procedures.\(^{12}\)

The remainder of the chapter focuses on a providing a descriptive account of the interrelationship between policy, procedure and practice in the completed areas, with reference to its gear from the map.\(^{13}\)

---

\(^{12}\) In some functional areas there were no policies, or procedures to guide practice and this explains any absences on the illustration.

\(^{13}\) It is usual in academic reports and papers to provide full references for documents; allowing the reader to identify the document, track their location and review the primary source themselves. Where possible, for example in relation to numbered PSO/PSIs and dated Minutes of Meetings, this practice has been followed. However, such referencing is not possible in relation to the majority of local documents. Many documents are only identifiable by their title, being undated and not having individual referents or dates. In these cases we have denoted the document by title in italics.
Figure 3. Diversity documents map
4.3 **Generic Diversity**

Figure 4 below illustrates the local policies, procedures and practice documents relating to diversity in general as part of the documentary phase of the research. In this section we comment upon the national policy context which aims to guide the response to this area of diversity at HMP Wakefield. We also identify and comment upon some aspects of local procedures and practice.

![Figure 4: Illustrating the interrelation of documentary policies, procedures and practices which guide the response to diversity in general.](image)

Responsibility for national Prison Service Diversity and Equality policies is split across several policy groups that are based at Prison Service Headquarters. These are the Race and Equalities Action Group (REAG) for all offender Race Equality and Diversity Policies, the Chaplaincy Unit for all offender religion policy, the Staff Diversity and Equality Team which cover all staff equality strands and policy, the Offender Policy and Rights Unit (OPRU) which cover offender disability, transgender and foreign nationals policy and the Women and Young Peoples Group.

4.3.1 **HMP Wakefield Diversity and Equality Strategy**

At a local policy level, the HMP Wakefield Diversity and Equality Strategy (HMP Wakefield, 2008a) has seven objectives:

1. Develop a consistent implementation of Diversity and Equality
2. Develop staff social awareness and confidence
3. Achieve and develop a socially inclusive workforce
4. Integrate diversity and equality within business and performance
5. Ensure participation, communication and access to services
6. Ensure compliance on all HMPS Diversity Policy and wider legislation
7. Establish HMP Wakefield as Best Practice in delivering diversity.
These aims clearly address a number of the issues raised in Chapter one arising from the HMCIP and MQPL reports. The strategy document analysed related to the period 2008-2010. The Diversity and Race Equality Action Team (DREAT), which is a sub-group of the establishment’s Senior Management Team (SMT), hold responsibility for the management and oversight of the strategy. The strategy is monitored through scrutiny of the formal minutes of both the Race Equality Action Team (REAT) meetings and the DREAT meetings. Additionally, these minutes are forwarded to the Prison Service Directorate and the Race Equalities Action Group. Additionally, six monthly progress reports are submitted to the Directorate and key stakeholders. The administration and co-ordination of the Strategy is done through the development of a Diversity Action Plan. The establishment Diversity lead holds the responsibility for this. Throughout the lifetime of the research this has been a Governor grade posting and our observations are that this grading is significant in enabling diversity to hold an equal footing with other functional areas. However, recent conversations have indicated that the weighting/grading of the post might change. Whilst such matters are for the prison to decide, it is relevant to comment that Governor level grading would seem to be important if diversity is to become embedded and HMP Wakefield is to achieve objective no7 of its strategy.

The 2008 strategy document notes that the prison has made good progress on race equality issues, whilst simultaneously identifying that further work is required in the following areas; staff equal opportunities, offender disability, religion and foreign nationals.

4.3.1a Minutes of the DREAT and RIRFs
The minutes of the DREAT indicated that these meetings had a consistent SMT presence. The Diversity meetings differ from other forums and meetings in that they are not held as frequently, e.g. on a monthly basis. The minutes indicated that they address a range of issues including the violence reduction strategy, and RIRFs. Analysis of the minutes over time, indicates that on two months out of the last twelve, RIRF figures were higher than usual. This arose as a consequence of a small number of individual prisoners flooding the system with many reports. The minutes suggest that this may explain why RIRF submissions may be higher when compared to other establishments and raise questions about whether the nature of incidents being recorded on a significant number of RIRFs relate to issues of race and racism. This highlights the difficulties which can arise if performance is measured only in numeric terms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative analysis of RIRFs should form part of the documentary analysis in the total prison study in order to ascertain how far substantive issues raised in the RIRF relate to its key function of identifying and responding to issues relating to race related discrimination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.1b Reporting of non racial discrimination
In the latter part of 2009 in PSI25/2009 the need for Prison headquarters and individual establishments to undertake Equality Impact Assessments on any new or revised policy was identified. Correspondence with staff at HMP Wakefield indicates that work will commence on this early in 2010. In line with the change from specific diversity focus to generic focus, there may be a move towards developing a Diversity Incident Reporting Procedure and Diversity Incident Reporting Form, although at the time of writing this had not yet emerged. The potential of such a system is significant. It holds the potential to divert the reporting of non race related, but other diversity related discrimination, out of the RIRF system. This may impact to make more transparent which complaints relate specifically to issues of racial discrimination. Moreover, it addresses perceptions of inequality in the status afforded to different types of discrimination. Analysis arising from the interviews illustrates that some prisoners perceive that the tackling of racially motivated discrimination is unfairly privileged over discrimination arising from disability, age and sexuality.
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4.3.1c Social Inclusion Forums
A feature of the Diversity strategy was the establishment of a ‘Social Inclusion Forum’ on each wing that met once a month. All prisoners were eligible to attend these meetings but attendance varied across the Wings. Analysis of the minutes of these events reveals that they do not appear to have clear terms of reference and the issues raised do not commonly have a diversity related focus. For example, minutes frequently reported general prisoner complaints that ranged from the fixtures and fittings of the prison building, the possibility of supplying breakfast packs at night and reporting on fridge repairs. Whilst such issues are of importance to prisoners and staff alike, it was not possible to identify their contribution to the Diversity strategy. This suggests that the original function of the Social Inclusion Forums to promote understanding and awareness of diversity had been subverted by an unofficial ‘complaints’ function. This finding was discussed informally with the diversity team during the lifetime of the research and the Wing based forums were replaced in Autumn 2009 with prison wide ‘themed’ Social Inclusion meetings which prisoners from each wing could register to attend.

4.4 Race and ethnicities
Figure 5 below illustrates the national and local policies, procedures and practice documents relating to race and ethnicities as part of the documentary phase of the research. In this section we comment upon the national policy context which aims to guide the response to this area of diversity at HMP Wakefield. We also identify and comment upon some aspects of local procedures and practice.

4.4.1 National Context
In the introduction to this report we clarified the relationship between the terms ‘race’ and ‘ethnicity’, the former term relating to the physical appearance of different groupings and the latter term introducing cultural aspects of identities. Generally, Government departments, including the Prison Service have been concerned with identifying ‘racial’ groupings within the populations that they work with, in order to identify discriminatory and possibly racist practices. Terms used to describe racial groupings – for example, White, Black, Asian and Black, Minority Ethnic (BME) – tended to be very wide and although they are useful in identifying patterns of discrimination they ignore significant cultural variations within these groupings. The term ‘BME’ has in the past been used by the Prison Service to refer to Black and Asian Minority Ethnic prisoners. However, the Prison Service recognises that the term has limited value, particularly in distinguishing particular ethnic groups; thus from the second quarter of 2008 it introduced a new database (SMART II) which enables more sophisticated analysis of ethnic groupings (it uses six categories – Asian, Black, Mixed, Other, White British and White Other). These terms contain elements that focus on ‘race’ (physical appearance) and elements that reflect cultural dimensions (‘British’, ‘Asian’, both draw attention to a geographical location). Prison policies are concerned with ‘race’ insofar as they seek to identify and eliminate racial prejudice and discrimination, but they also focus on developing ‘ethnically sensitive’ practice that ensures that individuals’ dietary, linguistic and faith needs are not ignored.

The aims of the Prison Service Race Equality Strategy are that all prison establishments: "must work to ensure that:
- Direct discrimination, harassment, victimisation and incitement to racial hatred are prevented and tackled and good relations between people of different racial groups promoted
- Indirect discrimination is prevented and tackled and equality of opportunity promoted" (HMPS, 2006:3)
A revised national policy in relation to race and ethnicities in prison was set out in 2006 in Prison Service Order 2800 ‘Race Equality’ (PSO 2800). The PSO establishes common structures of management, monitoring and practices for engaging with race equality issues.

At a national level the Race Equality Action Group (REAG) is responsible for race equality issues for the Prison Service. Supporting this group, with specifically identified responsibilities are:

- the Programmes and Communication Team which has the core responsibilities of developing the Prison Service REAP and manages the business support needs of REAG, it deals with all briefing requests and also has duties relating to the Groups communications strategy;
- the Race Issues Team is responsible for race equality policy and achieving compliance with the RR(A)A 2000;
- the Service Delivery and Implementation Team is made-up of REAG members and operational staff on secondment
- the Community Links Team which works with ‘external’ agencies who may have a role in aiding prisons to meet the requirement to be compliant with the RR(A)A 2000.

In relation to monitoring performance, PSO 2800, chapter 4 (Management of Information) notes that:

‘The Key Performance Target (KPT) on Race Equality (Operational) has been constructed to give an assessment that reflects a balance of processes, outcomes and perceptions’.

This KPT was subsequently revised in April 2008. Currently, the scoring for the target is configured with the following weightings: ‘Outcomes: 15%, Process 40% and Perceptions 45%). The data for outcomes is

---

15 Race Relations Amendment Act, 2000
obtained from the SMART II database, for process from the Standards Audit and for perceptions from the Measurement of Quality of Prison Life (MQPL) survey and the National Visitor Survey (Barnett-Page, 2009).

Since its introduction in 2006, and subsequent revision in 2007, there is evidence that the KPT is having an impact on what is done in prisons; the quantitative measure and the grading and reporting of performance has led to improved scores of individual prisons (NOMS 2008:31).

Another means of measuring aspects of race relations in prison was introduced with PSO 2800:

*The impact assessment process provides the means by which the Prison Service:*

- assesses proposed and current policies for any effects they might have on the promotion of race equality;
- consults people who are likely to be affected by those policies;
- monitors policies for any adverse effects they might have on people from different racial groups;
- takes action to correct any adverse impact found, through timed action plans. (para 5.2; 12)

KPTs help prison managers to focus on making what is done in Prison Service establishments congruent with the expressed objectives of the Prison Service. Impact Assessments highlight areas where different racial groups receive different treatment. However, Liebling and Arnold (2005: 68-70) point to the dangers that an over-preoccupation with counting that things have (or have not) been done potentially ignores how things are done.16 This relates to our discussion earlier in 4.3.2 in relation to the RIRF. It is in the next chapter that our attention is focused more directly on practices.

### 4.4.2 Local Procedures & Practices

PSO 2800 requires Governors of establishments to identify a sub-group from the Senior Management Team (SMT) known as the Race Equality Action Team (REAT). The REAT should meet and provide a formal report to the SMT at least quarterly. PSO 2800 additionally requires local establishments to produce policy in the form of the Race Equality Action Plan (REAP). The REAP is constructed out of a number of action plans which are developed to address discrimination and equality issues in the operation of specific policies and practices. All quarterly reports on the REAP, from January-March 2008 to January-March 2009 were read as part of the documentary analysis. Whilst the format of the report became more established from December 2008, each quarterly report read, broadly, contained:

- progress reports on the REAP and the implementation of policies and practices,
- use of the 'traffic light' system to ascertain areas of compliance and non-compliance with policy and business plan,
- comments on main actions arising, and
- reported any feedback from REAG regarding the terms of reference of the REAT

It is also the responsibility of the Governor to appoint a Race Equality Officer (REO):

"The Race Equality Officer’s main role is to support the Governor and the Race Equality Action Team in taking forward the programme of work to achieve compliance with this order and the RR(A) A 2000 [Race Relations Amendment Act, 2000]" (PSO 2800: 8)

The PSO states that in larger establishments the REO may be supported by Assistant REO’s (AREO’s) who represent each wing or house block and are appointed by the Chair of the REAT. These in turn are intended to provide a link between prisoners and the REO.

In the 2008 ‘Race Equality Action Report (HMP Wakefield 2008b) the appointment of the Diversity Manager at operational managerial grade F is noted. During the course of the research we were told that the Diversity team at HMP Wakefield was amongst the highest resourced in the High Security Estate. This goes some way

---

to perhaps accounting for the significant advances the Prison has made in responding to diversity since the development of the Diversity Strategy in 2007. However, it also emerged towards the end of the research that this funding and staffing might possibly be subject to reduction. As we noted earlier in section 4.3.1 the Governor grading and current staffing signposts the significance of diversity as a key issue for the Prison and would seem to be necessary if the response to diversity is to become embedded firmly within the remit of the SMT and wider functional areas.

The same report (HPM Wakefield, 2008b) also comments on areas needing further development and outlines action already underway. For instance, it identifies the need to further work in relation to the Community Engagement Strategy. This report also notes that action points indicated in minutes from REAT meetings are sometimes rolled over, without action, from one meeting to the next. This is an issue that is also highlighted in the prisoner interviews and may undermine prisoner confidence in key parts of the strategy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of a warning system which records and prevents repeated rollover of unaddressed action points.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.2a Race Equality Induction

PSO 2800 states that prisoners' race equality induction should be recorded on every prisoner's F2050A (history sheet). It gives guidance to prisoners as to how they should fill in a RIRF and outlines the process of investigation and feedback to the prisoner regarding the findings of the investigation. It suggest that feedback should take the form of a letter from the REO or an AREO which also gives details of how to appeal against the findings. The investigation's findings are also submitted to the Governing Governor. Protection and other measures available for those complainants who are being victimized are also outlined in the document. The guidance document prisoners receive also has a policy statement on race equality, which is available in several languages. Obligations under the RR(A)A 2000 and a definition of a 'racist incident' are also cited.

4.4.2b Racial Incident Reporting Form's (RIRFs)

PSO 2800 states that RIRFs must be made readily available throughout the gaol. The profile and outcome of RIRFs is reported in the Race Equality Action Plan. RIRFs are discussed in REAT meetings and are also the subject of scrutiny panel meetings, which should be attended by prisoner representatives. RIRFs are scrutinised by the REO/AREO’s to check that the process of investigation and the outcomes, such as the feedback to the complainant, are justified. A governor-grade staff member should witness this audit process.

The Race Equality Action Report (HMP Wakefield 2008b) notes the incidence of RIRF submissions for 2007, recording that a total of 350 were raised. 49% were via the direct submission of a RIRF, 51% were raised following submission of a COMP 1 Formal Complaint form that had the ‘racial aspect’ box ticked. 276 reports were from prisoners and 74 from staff. Table 8 below gives a further breakdown of the nature of the RIRFs submitted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Complaint</th>
<th>Number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff on staff:</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoner on staff:</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff on prisoner:</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoner on prisoners:</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Breakdown of RIRFs submitted in 2007 by nature of complaint
The documentary analysis revealed that the REO along with other staff in the prison had observed that individual prisoners submitting multiple RIRFs skewed the figures for RIRF submission. In some instances it was the case that the RIRF process was being used to vent non-‘racial’ issues. As noted in section 4.3.2 analysis of a sample of RIRF documents should be undertaken as part of the full prison study in order to consider the outcomes relating to each category of report.

4.4.2c Community Engagement Strategy

A Community Engagement Strategy (CES) should be developed locally reflecting the prison’s interaction with the local community on equality and diversity issues and identifying any gaps between the Prisons’s existing provision and it’s Business Plan. At HMP Wakefield progress and commentary on the CES is documented in their REAP. The REAP (2008) charts the progress of the strategy by adopting a traffic light system whereby those areas marked red are yet to be achieved. The lead person(s) responsible for each action point is/are identified, as is information on outcomes relating to these actions. The CES has the following ‘high level objectives’:

- “to build the trust and confidence of local community support including the voluntary sector communities in the area;
- consulting meaningfully on policies and functions, the impact on people within different groups, including the older and disabled and those with other specialist needs;
- increasing mutual understanding between the establishment, local support groups, and other minority communities;
- developing and sustaining good relations with a diverse range of organisations and representatives form the voluntary, community and faith organisations” (HMP Wakefield, 2008: 7)

Additionally, the 2008 Plan notes that a mapping process took place in 2007 to aid the identification of potential partners specifically with Race Equalities and the needs of HMP Wakefield BME populations. Good evidence of effective community engagement can been seen in the ways in which the Prison is working with Age Concern regarding the Dignity Toolkit and its recruitment of independent experts to its Scrutiny Panels.

4.5 Foreign and Dual Nationality Prisoners

Figure 6 below illustrates the national and local policies, procedures and practice documents relating to foreign and dual national prisoners which have been identified as part of the documentary phase of the research. In this section we comment upon the national policy context which aims to guide the response to this area of diversity at HMP Wakefield. We also identify and comment upon some aspects of local procedures and practices.

4.5.1 National Context

The core national policy document on Foreign Nationals is PSO 4630 (HMPS, 2008). The PSO utilises a definition of a foreign national as someone who is not a ‘British citizen’. The purported outcome is to ensure that “all staff who deal with foreign national prisoners and immigration detainees understand and comply with the processes agreed with the Border and Immigration Agency (BIA)” (HMPS 2008: 1) and those processes defined in the policy document. The PSO highlights the importance that prisons ensure foreign nationals are rapidly identified and referred to the BIA. Moreover, it indicates that prisons should communicate ‘necessary’ information to the BIA and Population Management Section (PMS) and vet cases according to mandatory actions. The PSO also places a responsibility on individual establishments to put in place a local policy.

The PSO also outlines foreign national prisoner’s rights, for example that on reception all foreign nationals should be informed that they have a right to consular notification and this activity must be recorded on the prisoner’s record. Embassies should also be notified by prisons of the reception of a foreign national prisoner if the prisoner is from a country whereby a bilateral Consular Convention is in place. Where there is
no bilateral Consular Convention, but where countries have signed the Vienna convention, prisons must not communicate information on a prisoner to the embassy unless the individual grants permission.

Figure 6. Illustrating the interrelation of documentary policies, procedures and practices which guide the response to foreign and dual national prisoners

The PSO further outlines foreign national prisoner’s right to anonymity under Article 36 (1) (c). However, it suggests that the BIA should be informed of dual nationality prisoners, as there is sometimes a possibility of deprivation of British citizenship. Also, it is recommended that where immigration status is unclear the BIA should be informed as a means of ensuring that prisoners’ immigration status is ascertained. The PSO also gives guidance on the actions to be taken prior to the release of a foreign national prisoner. The Order states that "prisons must notify the Population Management Section (PMS) and CCD [Criminal Casework Directorate] of immigration cases at least twenty weeks prior to the release date of the sentence" (HMPS 2008:6).

The PSO also clarifies differences between key terms such as detention, repatriation and removal. Details of deportation procedures for sentenced ‘offenders’ are outlined; for example, if the deportee is given a sentence of between 12 months and 4 years deportation may take place at the half-way point of his or her sentence. The principal difference between deportation and removal is that a deportee can never return to the UK unless the deportation order is revoked. Removal is quicker than deportation yet it does not bar people from returning to the country. This measure is often used where the individual does not have permission to stay in the UK and is serving a short sentence. Detention is outlined as occurring when the Home Office orders that someone is kept in custody after the end of a sentence. "This is until officials decide whether or not to deport, the Immigration Service makes arrangements for deportation or a decision is being made about asylum status" (HMPS 2008:7). Repatriation is defined as the process which allows a foreign national to return to their own country to serve their sentence or remainder of their sentence. This happens in circumstances only where the receiving country has an agreement with the UK.
A mandatory condition set out in the PSO is the requirement for each prison to develop and maintain a local policy to guide the management of foreign national prisoners. It also suggests that in prisons where the numbers of foreign national prisoners are significant, a Foreign Nationals Committee, can be established to supervise the policy. The PSO also provides guidelines for establishing nationality and immigration status and outlines the measures to take when this cannot be ascertained or verified by the prison or the BIA. It specifies what should be recorded in the absence of this information on bail report sheets. Other guidance included in the PSO includes advice on the transfer, storage and communication of information between Agencies and Departments.

4.5.2 Local Procedures & Practices
HMP Wakefield’s Foreign National Policy Document (HMP Wakefield, 2009) identifies the core needs and problems which may be faced by such prisoners. It states that many foreign nationals do not have adequate information on the workings of the UK Criminal Justice System, including prison procedures and rules. It also highlights the potential language barriers and communication issues which may occur between foreign national prisoners and staff.

The local document outlines the specific entitlements of foreign national prisoners which include:
- being able to make a phone call to a next of kin in a foreign country, for a duration of up to five minutes. This is facilitated through a Blue Card system which allows cheaper calls to be made abroad. Prisoners can also purchase additional minutes from their private cash.
- Details of clothing and reports which are to be made available to these prisoners on their release

4.5.2a Translation services
To aid communication between foreign nationals and other prisoners, staff and visitors, there is a register of staff and prisoners at the gaol who speak another language and are willing to translate. Other translation services that are available are also noted, including telephone based services, for which the prison will accrue a charge.

4.5.2b Fellowship and association opportunities
Weekly meetings held for foreign national prisoners, the ‘Foreign Nationals Drop-in’, which provides an opportunity for foreign national prisoners located on different wings to associate with one another. The foreign nationals meeting minutes indicate that these are generally attended by between 17 and 25 prisoners. Attendance by staff varies, though the documents indicate that staff at Officer and Senior Officer grades are generally present. A forum is held during the meeting on the last Thursday of each month which takes the form of a question and answer session and formal minutes of these are taken. The forum also, on occasion, has guest speakers from relevant organisations outside the prison. The minutes reveal that certain issues are regularly discussed in these meetings – for example, the sourcing of Russian books, Passport photographs and the Blue Card System.

4.5.2c Representation, communication and support
Each Wing elects a foreign national prisoner representative, and has a member of staff identified as the Foreign National Liaison Officer (FNLO). In addition to their prisoner support role, the duties of the FNLO also includes liaison with the BIA and CCD staff on matters such as deportation and repatriation queries. In addition, each Wing has a foreign national prisoner notice board which presents information relevant to this group of prisoners, including details about who to contact with concerns, and events and activities held in the gaol.
4.6 Faith

Figure 7 below illustrates the national and local policies, procedures and practice documents relating to faith which have been identified as part of the documentary phase of the research. In this section we comment upon the national policy context which aims to guide the response to this area of diversity at HMP Wakefield. We also identify and comment upon some aspects of local procedures and practices.
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Figure 7. Illustrating the interrelation of documentary policies, procedures and practices which guide the response to faith

4.6.1 National Context

National policy in relation to Faith is set out in Prison Service Order 4550 – the ‘Religion Manual’. The PSO was originally issued in October 2000, but has been amended eight times since then (once in 2002, three times in 2003, twice in 2005, and once in 2007 and 2009). It is a substantial and detailed document being 159 pages long. It has four chapters, but each of these chapters has a number of appendices and within the appendices there are often a number of annexes. In this section we will provide a broad overview of the scope and extent of the PSO.

The first chapter establishes ‘general principles’ in relation to: the appointment of Chaplains & Ministers; Religious registrations; Changes of Religious registrations, Places of Worship; Corporate worship; Pastoral Care; Chaplains and Ministers; Religious Education Classes; Young Offenders; Juveniles; Pastoral Visits; Religious Observance; Diet, Dress and Religious Artefacts and Visits by a Chaplain or a Minister. The chapter also has four appendices, addressing the following issues: Notification of Change to Religious Registration; Guidelines on the Provision of Multi-Faith rooms; Practice of Veganism in prison; and Summary of Religious artefacts prisoners are allowed in their possession. There are eight annexes to this chapter that provide
specific information about particular religions and how they are practiced. The religions that are identified are: Buddhism; Christianity; Hinduism; Islam; Judaism; Sikhism; the Church of the Latter Day Saints (Mormon); and Paganism.

Chapter two of the PSO addresses ‘Security Issues’ and considers: Searches of the Person; Searches using Dogs; Religious Books and Artefacts; Corporate and Private Worship (in groups); and Food for Religious Services and Festivals. In relation to this last item, cross reference is made to PSO 5000 (Catering) paragraph 3.23.51.

Chapter three is primarily concerned with identifying the multi-faith advice and support available for individual establishments. It explicitly links to chapter 3 PSO 4500 (PSO 4500 Use of incense for private religious practice) to highlight ‘Religious Consultative Services to the Prison Service. The chapter contains one annex that lists ‘Faith Advisers to the Prison Service (revised May 2005). T

The final chapter of the PSO is concerned with the ‘Religion Card for use in Reception Departments’. This specifically introduces the use of a card that ‘displays universal symbols representing the world’s main faiths to help ensure that those prisoners who do not understand English are able to correctly identify their religion to reception staff’ (PSO 4550; p. 9). The chapter contains two annexes, one that contains a list of languages and the second providing a list of prisons that take prisoners straight from court. The PSO identifies the following ‘mandatory actions’ – the numbers are paragraph referents from the original document:

**Mandatory Action**
6. Governing governors, directors and controllers of contracted out prisons must ensure that all staff working with prisoners, especially religious Ministers (ie Chaplains and Visiting Ministers) and RRLOs are aware of the content of this PSO.

**Mandatory Action**
8. This Order contains mandatory instructions and advice.
9. This Order must be held by Chaplaincy Teams and RRLOs, and should be available to all staff. Chapter 4 must be also be made available to reception staff.

**Mandatory Action**
3.4 Where establishments have a query relating to the specific religious needs of prisoners from the above faiths they would normally be expected to raise this with their locally appointed Minister for that faith. **Where further advice is required, or where there is no minister appointed for that faith, establishments must consult the appropriate RCS.**
3.5 For the Islamic faith, where following consultation with the prison Imam, further advice is required, establishments must contact the Prison Service Muslim Adviser, Maqsood Ahmed, in the first instance. He will contact the National Council for the Welfare of Muslim Prisoners (NCWMP), the Muslim RCS, as appropriate. If the Muslim Adviser is not available, the NCWMP may be approached direct but a copy of any correspondence to the NCWMP should be sent to the Muslim Adviser.

**Mandatory Action**
4.10 Governing Governors and Controllers of contracted out prisons which take new receptions from court must ensure that religion cards are available in Reception Departments. They must also ensure that staff who need to know, including Reception staff, Chaplains of all faith traditions (full-time, part-time and sessional) and Race Relations Liaison Officers are aware of the contents of this instruction.

PSO 4550 sets the framework within which local practice occurs. The next section identifies some local procedures and associated practices.
4.6.2  Local Procedures & Practices
This section reflects upon a number of the localised procedures that arise from the PSO.

4.6.2a  Activity Allocation to Faith Based Activities
This procedure governs the recording of religious affiliation and the automatic allocation of prisoners to C-Nomis so they may attend the worship service which corresponds to their religious affiliation. Prisoners can then self select to opt in and out of attending services on a weekly basis. Provision is available for prisoners to ‘try out’ other religions by attending religious services which do not correspond to their recorded religious affiliation. This is permitted on two occasions only. After that period if the prisoner wishes to continue to attend the new service they must complete a ‘change of faith form’. This form registers their intent at a Prison Service level to belong to a different faith, but in order to practice that faith they may be required to engage in religious training or initiation ceremonies [e.g. baptism and confirmation in the case of Christianity]. The process takes one day to arrange. This procedure is a particularly important aspect of the response to diversity given the number of prisoners we came across during the research who had converted to a different religion whilst in prison.

4.6.2b  PSI Religious Festivals
The Prison Service Instruction [PSI] on Religious Festivals is received annually in December and provides the chaplaincy team with the official feast and festival days for each religious group. This procedure gives rise to the practice of making arrangements for religious festivals whose celebration requires food. Many religions have multiple festivals, for example the Pagan religion has eight, but within prison each religious group may choose only two to celebrate as their food festivals. The faith specific Chaplain liaises with the prisoners belonging to that faith to create a request for food to be served at their selected festivals. The chaplain then liaises with Catering who work out a cost per head. However, analysis of the procedures book held within the Chaplaincy reveals that present there is no procedure to guide the way in which arrangements for organising food for religious festivals is operationalised at a Chaplaincy level. It is clear that negotiation takes place with prisoners and Catering with regard to this, but the practice appears to be reliant on individual chaplains rather than driven by procedure. This means that in the event of a change of chaplain or a period of unexpected absence such negotiations could be missed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop a procedure to guide the way in which arrangements for organising food for religious festivals is operationalised at a Chaplaincy level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The PSI indicates that the cost per head should be consistent across faith groups. However, this is clearly difficult to achieve in practice due to obvious differences in requirements of different faiths. For example, faiths which specify a vegetarian diet are likely to cost less per head than those faiths whose celebrations might include meat for festival celebrations. Analysis of current practice at the prison shows that some faith groups opt not to have a food based festival but ask for sweets instead. Examples of this include Hindu and Sikh religions which are a numeric minority. This document has particular relevance to issues discussed by prisoners and staff in sections 5.5 and 6.3.1 of the report. Analysis of their comments reveals considerable tension regarding this procedure. For some, the procedure is cited as part of what the prison does ‘best’ in responding to diversity. However, other prisoners and also staff from one of the focus groups identified it as a procedure which generated inequity. Action points in relation to this issue are highlighted in the relevant sections.

The PSI also generates the practice of recording which faith festivals are to be celebrated and indicates on which days prisoners from specific faiths must be excused from work. Analysis of current practice indicates
that each prisoner is asked to determine in advance which faith related leave days they wish to take annually and this is entered onto C-Nomis by the Chaplaincy.

4.6.2c Draft NTO/NTS re DHL Catalogue procedure

A further faith related procedure is the draft NTO/NTS re DHL Catalogue process. At the time of the documentary analysis [August, 2009] items needed to practice or observe the practices of all religions had been added to the Local DHL list. One consequence of this practice was that it limited what general non-religious items were available on the canteen list, as each prison has an upper limit of items which can be added to their local list. The prison are developing a new procedure which will allow religious objects and artefacts to be obtained from faith specific suppliers. At the time of the analysis it was anticipated that this new procedure would be ready for implementation in January 2010 enabling religious items to be removed from the Local DHL list, freeing up that list for a greater number of general canteen items. This set of circumstances illustrates clearly an attempt by the prison to respond to faith needs. However, it also illustrates how such accommodation can generate tensions with prisoners who do not practice a religious faith, as their access to everyday items is reduced in order to accommodate the needs of others. This was an issue cited by prisoners during the AI interviews, see for example section 5.5.

4.6.2d Communication of arrangements for religious matters

Changes to arrangement for religious matters appear well communicated being notified to prisoners through local Prison Notices. These are developed by Chaplaincy and then displayed for offenders on the wing notice boards. Staff are notified electronically when they log into an IT terminal on site.

4.7 Disabled and Older Prisoners

Figure 8 below illustrates the national and local policies, procedures and practice documents relating to disabled and older prisoners which have been identified as part of the documentary phase of the research. This section reports on issues relating to older and disabled prisoners together because the Prison has linked the two groups together. However, we recognise that the needs of these two groups are not automatically the same. Whilst some disabled prisoners may be older, not all disabled prisoners are aged over 60. Similarly, whilst some disabled prisoners are aged over 60 not all older prisoner have a disability. Although, the specific needs of older prisoners have been highlighted by the Chief Inspector of prisons and Probation, (HMCIP, 2004), the Prison Reform Trust (2006) and the prisoner newspaper ‘Inside Times’ (Richards, 2010), there is not a separate PSO relating to the specific needs of this group

The central (HMPS) and local (HMP) policy documents which were accessed are:

- PSO 2855 'Prisoners with disabilities',
- Quality of life for disabled prisoners,
- Quality of life for older prisoners, and the
- Reasonable adjustment log

One document illustrated in the cog, but not analysed was the ‘Disability Audit’. This document was difficult to track down and an analysis of its contents will be undertaken in the full prison study.

4.7.1 National Context

The national context for responding to disabled prisoners is set in PSO 2855 ‘Prisoners with Disabilities’ and PSI 31/2008 – ‘Allocation of prisoners with disabilities’. The PSO considers: The Disability Discrimination Act 1995, as amended by the Disability Discrimination Act 2005 (chapter 2); Prison Service Policy & Legal Obligations (chapter 3); Actions arising from the Ministry of Justice Disability Equality Scheme (chapter 4); Management of disability in establishments (chapter 5) The prisoner experience (chapter 6); Older prisoners (chapter 7); and Reasonable adjustments (chapter 8). It contains ten annexes which provide: a sample local policy document (annex A); a sample ‘Reception disability questionnaire’ (annex B); consideration of
different disabilities and possible adjustments (annex C); consideration of ‘good practice generally’; a draft Establishment Action Plan (annex E); advice on ‘entering disability codes on LIDS (annex F); advice on ‘access to external agencies and information (annex G); a Disability Liaison Officer Draft Job Description (annex H); a full Impact Assessment template (annex I) and guidance for completing the Impact Assessment (annex J).

Figure 8. Illustrating the interrelation of documentary policies, procedures and practices which guide the response to older and disabled prisoners

It also outlines eight mandatory actions:

Governors Managers and staff must comply with the requirements set out in the DDA;

• Governors and Managers must ensure that procedures exist in prisons for prisoners to be able to disclose disability both on reception and subsequently and this must be recorded on LIDs; (or its replacement when available)

• Governors must ensure that a local policy is in place to ensure that prisoners with disabilities are treated in accordance with PS policy and this local policy must include how equality of opportunity for disabled prisoners will be promoted;

• The Governor must nominate as Disability Liaison Officer a suitable member of staff who has regular contact with prisoners and is given sufficient time to act as a contact point to receive information on policy issues and good practice, act as an adviser on disability issues and ensuring that disabled prisoners’ needs are met.

• Governors and policy leads must ensure that policies are impact assessed for disability and that any adverse impact on disabled prisoners is addressed.

• The Prison will ensure that the escort contractor is advised, in advance, of any prisoner required at court that has a disability. The escort contractor will be provided with the details of the disability and the needs of the prisoner.
• The prison will ensure that where a disabled prisoner is required at court, the Clerk of Court will be advised of the disability and needs of the prisoner who is to be produced.

• Governors must ensure that an action plan is completed for the establishment which identifies any barriers to equality of opportunity for disabled prisoners;

The PSI 31/2008 similarly notes a number of mandatory actions:

11. Governors (and Directors of Contracted Prisons) must put in place arrangements to ensure that any problems in allocating a prisoner with a disability to appropriate accommodation are raised at the earliest opportunity with the Area Manager and PMS

12. Governors (and Directors of Contracted Prisons) must ensure that prisoners with disabilities are able to access the regime and appropriate interventions. Where this is not possible at a particular establishment because appropriate accommodation is not available, and reasonable adjustments cannot be made, the prison should contact the PMS to identify another establishment with the appropriate accommodation and courses.

13. Governors (and Directors of Contracted Prisons) must ensure that prisoners are not prevented from being transferred, either as a result of recategorisation or in order to access particular courses as part of their sentence plan, solely because they have a disability.

14. Governors (and Directors of Contracted Prisons) must ensure that transfer requests to their establishment are not refused solely on the basis of a disability unless the prison legitimately cannot provide the appropriate accommodation and care.

4.7.2 Local Procedures & Practices

It is important to open this section with noting that HMP Wakefield’s work in this area has received extremely positive national recognition. The Prison Service News (2009) reports that Senior Officer Fiona Brown won the innovation award at the Civil Service Diversity and Equality Awards. It is worth quoting a substantial piece of the reporting of this award:

The system in place to help offenders at Wakefield seems straightforward. Each prisoner is assessed. Elderly prisoners are given the choice to join an elderly register, disabled prisoners a disabled register. The needs of a prisoner on either, or both, registers are then addressed individually. Fiona says: “I wrote a policy document for the elderly and one for disabled prisoners, but they tend to be quite generic – I found that even if two men have the same disability their needs will differ. And that could be anything from their culture to their age.”

Involving the offender is an important part of the process. Fiona says: “Before we make a care plan we say to the prisoner, ‘what do you need? what do you think you need?’ So that we aren’t actually assuming anything, we are actually asking him, and giving him a choice to self help and to be independent.”

It’s when you start looking at just what this means that the size of the complex task becomes clear. Fiona says: “I started looking at disability as in mobility. If you think of a man in a wheelchair, he has to have access so you have to make changes.

“But then you’ve got things like mental health issues and learning difficulties, and ongoing illnesses like diabetes that could lead to disabilities. And when you’re looking at a man that has learning difficulties or mental health issues his needs are going to be more discrete.”

Building a network of knowledge and contacts has been an important part of the team’s success. Fiona says: “I’m a big ‘asker’. I email people and I get lots of information – people are very willing to give you
help if you ask.” Some of the numerous outside links include the Dyslexia Society; the Royal National Institutes for the Blind and Deaf; and Age Concern.

An officer from the team works on each wing and takes the lead in a specific area. At the moment, for example, one is looking at learning difficulties, another at the Expert Patient Programme (a Department of Health programme for people with long-term conditions). Meanwhile, prisoner reps are trained and employed to give advice on the wings, and further prisoners are trained as carers for prisoners who have specific needs.

Wakefield holds over 700 offenders. Two years ago around 80 were on each of the registers. Now 115 are on the disabled register, 102 on the elderly register. “We’re living longer,” says Fiona, “So each year we’re adding more men to the register.”

The High Security Estate (HSE) is traditionally competitive, with each establishment aiming for the highest standards. When Fiona became the HSE’s first full time disability officer, however, she was keen to start sharing their systems and knowledge: “I think being competitive is helpful, but when you’re dealing with human beings looking at giving prisoners a better life and treating them with humanity it shouldn’t be a competition. I’d like to see every prison in the HSE working to the same systems. That leads to a better life for the prisoners that we’re dealing with because they live in our estate not just in an individual prison.”

HMP Wakefield’s Quality of Life for Offenders with Disabilities (HMP Wakefield, undated, a.) outlines moral, practical and legal objectives in relation to work with prisoners. It stipulates the arrangements for prisoners with disabilities to gain access to specific areas within the prison, including residential accommodation, education, catering, gym and healthcare. The policy takes account of blindness, visual impairment and issues relating to older prisoners such as access to the gym for the over 50’s and 60’s.

There is a corresponding Quality of Life for Elderly Prisoners which outlines the response to older prisoners (HMP Wakefield, undated, b.). This policy defines ‘elderly’ as somebody who is over sixty years of age. The document similarly outlines the moral, legal and practical objectives relating to this group: ‘moral’ objectives are reported to be those which ‘maintain dignity and respect’; ‘practical’ objectives concern the provision of aids to enable maximum use of facilities. Each area of prison is discussed and any measurements to facilitate ‘elderly’ prisoner activity are documented. Details are also provided in relation to the arrangements for Core Day Unlock (CDU) which disabled and older prisoners can apply for. CDU is potentially available for prisoners who have reached retirement age and may be in danger of becoming isolated in their environment. This facility gives the prisoner time to shower, associate with peers and be on the wing.

4.7.2a Core Day Unlock: A Guide to Caring for the Elderly and Disabled

This local policy (HMP Wakefield, undated, d) gives further guidance on prisoner eligibility for the scheme and also outlines the responsibilities of Disability Liaison Adviser (DLA). According to the guidance, DLA officers should interact with CDU prisoners once a week, recording their interaction in the individual ‘Disability and Elderly file’ held in the DLA office. Each wing is issued with a register of prisoners on the CDU scheme and prisoners are notified by letter or form to verify that they are, or are not, of CDU status. Applications for CDU are signed off by a security SO and a Wing manager. Each prisoner has an individual ‘Disability and Elderly File’ containing a copy of their PEEP (Personal Emergency Evacuation Plan), an annual interview reviewing their continued care needs and any secondary or special needs assessments. Where relevant it may also include a ‘disability folder’ which documents observation of the prisoner and their current needs, for example, observation of the use of aids given to prisoners and measures of assistance. The disability folder also contains a ‘prisoners with specific needs’ letter, where prisoners can permit a card to be placed outside their cell to aid in an evacuation scenario.
4.7.2b  Personal Emergency Evacuation Plan [PEEP]
The PEEP categorises prisoner according to their levels of capability across a range of conditions, such as respiratory, mobility and visual problems, hearing impairments and cognitive disabilities. It also summarises an individual's ability to self-evacuate via a collated evacuation plan.

4.7.2c  Arrangements for reporting and referring disabilities
Prisoners are given the opportunity to self-report disabilities and any daily obstacles they encounter in the self referral disability form (also referred to as a Special Needs Assessment). It states the prisoners name and number, date of birth and location and enables prisoners to self report/request facilities to aid their 'normal day to day' activities. A document also exists to offer guidance on the storage and use of wheelchairs issued to prisoners by the Primary Care Trust.

4.7.2d  Single Assessment Process
Further information on prisoners health and social care needs can be found in the single assessment process. This file has space on the cover for an NHS number, persons name and preferred name and their date of birth. It provides details on a named care co-ordinator and an emergency contact (if different from the above). The file has two parts. Part A has sections regarding confidentiality agreements, overview and contact assessments, risk assessments, summary of needs and summary care plan, reviews, messages, comments and letters and correspondence. Part B details any specialist medical, nursing, therapy and social care notes and other specialist notes. The back cover has space for the recording of directory of services.

4.7.2e  Secondary Assessment
The Secondary Assessment summarises the primary self assessment. An interviewing officer collects data on whether the individual states that their disability is medically diagnosed by a specialist and gives space for identified needs to be documented. It defines 'levels' of disability into 'limited', 'moderate' and 'extensive' classifications. Similarly the document gives options on levels of mobility and further gives space to highlight benefits to the prisoner if they were to be supplied with aids or equipment. The form provides space to record the recommendations of the interviewing officer and is signed by the interviewing officer, the prisoner and the Disability and Elderly Co-ordinator.

4.7.2f  Adaptations to the prison environment to accommodate disability
Reponses to disabilities in the form of building/cell design and changes to the fabric of the building are identified in 'Cell living area and building and roadways adjustments. For each wing information is given on cells and facilities, including, for example: lowered beds, seven foot beds and reinforced beds; information on low rises; hand rails; 'paraplegic cells'; lifts; stairs with lower gradients; observation camera cells; emergency cell bells and cells with wider access. Information is also given on ramps, lifts and kerbs.

4.7.2g  Carers for the disabled
Disabled prisoners can be allocated carers. These posts are advertised through the Prison’s usual recruitment processes and any prisoner can apply to become a carer. The ‘Carer Job Description and Specification’ we examined cites key attributes of applicants which are:
- a willingness to undertake prisoner carer training,
- to enjoy looking after others, and
- to be able to communicate well

The main duties and expectations of carers are given in relation to disabled and older/infirm prisoners. Requirements are outlined including assessments and prisoner carer training. The form has a signature box for a prisoner to agree to consent for exchange of medical data. Carers are directly accountable to the Disability Liaison Officer.
A formal application form has been developed for those prisoners wishing to apply for the help of a carer. The form records the prisoner’s name, number location and the date. It has a perforated receipt which is completed by a staff member, such as a wing landing officer. The DLO replies to the prisoner on decisions regarding their application. A brief analysis of six applications would appear to indicate that they are dealt with rapidly, with a receipt being given on the same day and a reply given in one week.

The ‘Prisoner Carer: Contract of Work’, formally recognises the carer’s role and states the rate of pay. The prison has also made use of training packages, for example ‘Nutrition and Exercise for Older People’ (Age Concern). The package contains training course information which includes getting participants to keep a diary, setting of targets and maintaining momentum. Discussion points on exercise, healthy eating and motivation are facilitated by handouts. From analysis it was not clear, however, as to how far the package had been used nor how the success of the package was monitored and measured.

4.7.2h ‘Prisoners with Disabilities and the Elderly’ Meetings
The minutes of monthly ‘Prisoners with Disabilities and the Elderly’ meetings revealed that the meetings were highly focussed on relevant issues. Notes of the meeting tended to be brief and there was limited SMT involvement. The Chair of the group also appeared to maintain the focus of the meeting and firmly vetoed the possibility for individuals to use the time to air personal/individualised grievances. However, the minutes indicate that there were repeated incidents where one disabled prisoner was concerned with the risk of fire and evacuation. Eventually this issue was ‘closed’ by the Chair and the Disability team, although it was not clear what adjustments/investigations had been made (see minutes of Wednesday 5th November, 2008 and preceding forums).

4.8 Sexualities
Figure 8 below illustrates the national and local policies, procedures and practice documents relating to race and ethnicities as part of the documentary phase of the research. In this section we comment upon the national policy context which aims to guide the response to this area of diversity at HMP Wakefield. We also identify and comment upon some aspects of local procedures and practice.

4.8.1 National Context
During the course of our research we have been informed on a number of occasions that sexual activity in prisons is illegal because the prison is a public building. Thus far we have not been able to identify precisely where this is stipulated in national policy. National polices appear to refer obliquely to matters related to sexual practices.

PSO 4445 (HMPS, 2007) is concerned with Civil Partnerships. It indicates that to ensure the Prison Service fully meets its obligations under the Civil Partnership Act 2004 the Governors and/or Directors should consider requests from prisoners to register their partnership. The PSO also gives guidance on issues ranging from the rights and responsibilities of individuals involved in the civil partnership (including issues such as who should bear the cost of the service) through to security risk assessments that should be undertaken regarding the ceremony location and building. The PSO provides strong guidance regarding the possible involvement of organised religions in relation to civil partnerships, stating "[i]n view of the secular nature of civil partnership registration, and in some instances the fundamental religious objection to the creation of civil partnerships, it is recommended that chaplains have no direct involvement with civil partnership registration" (HMPS, 2007: 4). The PSO also notes that the chapel, multi-faith room or any other place of worship should not be used for the ceremony.
PSO 2750 Violence Reduction specifically aims at identifying homophobic prisoners through a process of risk assessment. Further examination of this policy and its impact on procedure and practice needs to be undertaken, as it was not one of the documents analysed in the pilot.

4.8.2 Local Policies, Procedures & Practices
There is a local policy on The Sexual Health Of Prisoners, The Issuing Of Condoms, Dental Dams And Lubricants (HMP Wakefield:2009). The policy places sexual health in the context of the Prisons Service’s ‘duty of care’ for prisoners. It avoids legitimising or accounting for sexual activity between prisoners and places its focus on health and wellbeing. It recognises that although sex in prison is illegal, prison officers can apply discretion in reporting of individuals found to be engaged in sexual activity. Consistent with this practice, the policy on the issuing of condoms, dental dams and lubricants aims to:

- reduce the incidence of sexually transmitted infections (STI’s) between sexually active offenders;
- encourage a healthier and open attitude to the responsibilities of the practice of safe sex;
- encourage offenders to address matters of their sexual health
- encourage offenders to be more proactive and more aware

The policy outlines a system whereby prisoners can obtain condoms, dams and lubricants; either through a Wing application or repeat prescription via Health Care. The items are obtained from the pharmacy department.

4.8.2a Arrangements for investigating allegations of rape and serious sexual assault
There is a local policy document on ‘The Investigation Of Allegations Of Rape And Serious Sexual Assault’. This policy sets out the roles and expected responses of staff if an allegation of rape or sexual assault is made. Staff identified include Orderly Officers, Healthcare, Safer Custody (e.g. completion of an anti-
bullying form), Dedicated Search Teams (DSTs), Security (completion of Security Incident Reports and subsequent investigations) and engagement with the police. The policy recognised that involvement of these staff groups may vary from case to case. For example if an incident is not reported immediately there is likely to be less need for the presence of DSTs. The research team was not able to identify any reported incidents or associated documentation.

4.8.2b Support systems for Gay Offenders

The Gay Offender Forums and Question Time Events are attended by Senior Management Team members, 'outside agencies' and at times guest speakers; for example one recent speaker was an openly gay police officer. Analysis of the minutes of these events suggest that, unlike some other forums, the official function of these events is fulfilled; issues discussed and the majority of action points addressed are generally in-keeping with expected business of the forum.

The minutes of 'Gay Offender Question Time' indicate that:

- An area of uncertainty raised by prisoners concerns the legality of sexual behaviours/relationships in prison (e.g. minutes of Gay Prisoner Forum 14th May 2008; Gay Offender Question Time December 2008). Also, commentary from Question Time Events indicates that prisoners report concerns that homophobic prison staff can report/reprimand prisoners if they are 'caught' involved in sex acts (see the minutes of Gay Prisoner Forum 14th May 2008; Gay Offender Question Time, December 2008).
- Positive staff practices do exist in relation to homophobia; for example a prisoner representative reported, at a Gay Offender Forum, the homophobic chanting of a fellow prisoner. This led to staff at the forum openly condemning such behaviour and reaffirming that there would be a new diversity complaint form that would enable prisoners to report such incidents. This relates back to the discussion in section 4.3.1 regarding the procedures for reporting non racial discrimination and the associated action point.
- Information on transgender/transsexual issues was discussed at several of these events (see Minutes). However, although transgender/transsexual issues were brought up it is unclear whether the discussion indicated an awareness of the needs of these prisoners. This issue is significant in that it intersects with the concerns of prisoners and staff themselves about awareness of and sensitivity in responding to transgender/transsexual issues (See section 5.7 of this report).

The ‘Cell Sharing Risk Assessment’ (CSRA), was a further document which denoted practice in relation to sexualities. This document emanates from National policy (PSO 2750). It is a further document that requires examination in the full prison study.

4.9 The Wing

The first phase of the documentary analysis (the identification of possible documents) revealed that there were no specific wing based policies relating to diversity. Procedures and practices carried out at a wing level were guided by the wider policies discussed in other sections of this report. An overview of how these intersect can be seen in the figure 9 below.

The response to diversity at a wing level is guided by three key procedures:

- the Case Officer File system,
- the First Night In procedure, and
- the Performance and Development Record.

Actual practice in relation to these procedures and diversity policies and PSOs can be tracked through a number of documents, mainly available in the Case Officer files, such as the ‘Reception Questionnaire’, including the ‘Page 1’, the ‘Cell Sharing Risk Assessment’, the recording of decisions relating to IEP status, and disability and Core Day Unlock notifications and registers. These documents were not analysed as part of the pilot but a more detailed analysis of them illustrating the functions, activities, resources, systems of
organisation and communication relating to them will be carried out as part of the proposed full prison version of the research.

Summary
This chapter has presented an account of the documents through which govern the management of diversities in HMP Wakefield. It has outlined the processes of identifying and mapping the interrelationship between the documents and provides an account of the ways in which these documents have begun to be analysed. It recognises that this area of the research generated significantly more material than was originally anticipated; thus the full analysis of the documentation remains to be completed. However, the chapter has presented the outcomes relating to three of the four aims providing a visual representation or ‘map’ of how national policies, local procedures and practices fit together in relation to the main areas of diversity. The chapter has also provided an account of national policy and local procedures and practices in relation to: generic diversity issues, race and ethnicity, foreign and dual nationality prisoners, faith, disabled and older prisoners and sexualities. In doing so it has drawn attention to the interrelationship between issues arising from analysis of the documents which govern and guide practice and the issues raised by prisoners and staff in reflection upon the response to diversity. This illustrates the importance and relevance of tracking ‘practice’ back through ‘procedure’ to ‘policy’. It is from this documentary account that we now move forward to consider in more detail practices in relation to diversity.
CHAPTER 5: DISCOVERING RESPONSES TO DIVERSITY: PRISON PRACTICES

5.1 Introduction
In this chapter we present data from the interviews, the survey and the staff focus groups. The broad concerns of the chapter are to identify good practice and practice in need of improvement in relation to: race and ethnicities, foreign and dual nationality prisoners, faith, disabled and older prisoners, sexualities, and, more generally, practice on the wing. All of the data was collected using the AI framework of Discovering, Dreaming, Designing and Destiny. The material relating to the final three phases is presented in chapter six. In this chapter we present what we ‘discovered’ about practice with diversity during the study. We first present data relating to issues that were common across all diversity groups, we then, in turn, present issues related specifically to Race & Ethnicities; Foreign and Dual Nationality prisoners, Faith, Disabled and Older Prisoners, Sexualities and conclude with considering issues that were specifically highlighted in relation to the Wing.

5.2 Common issues across all diversity groupings

5.2.1 Best Practice
In this section we provide examples and illustrations of good practice on the Wing and beyond and reflect on how such practice contributes to a positive atmosphere in which prisoners and staff can engage more fully in the tasks and routines of prison life.

5.2.1a The benefits of a calm, non-confrontational atmosphere on the Wing
During the AI interviews prisoners were asked to reflect on what life was like at its best at Wakefield. Prisoners reported that life was at its best when the atmosphere on the wing was calm, quiet and non-confrontational:

Garry  when life is at its best here at Wakefield you, things run smoothly. Erm, you know, you feel safer on the landings, erm and you know the staff is there, erm you know, you kind of feel comfortable talking to people, you know? Staff are approachable, erm it’s just a place, although it’s a prison, it’s a place where you think are we actually being punished for the offences that have been committed erm you know? and you can walk around the wing and everyone is happy and smiling and it’s as though - not like some big reward has been given, when it hasn’t, erm its quite strange, cos you kind of think ‘why is everybody being so happy and what’s happened?’. Erm because there’s a different atmosphere. You haven’t everybody running around, you haven’t got everybody stressed out, erm and it’s just kind of difficult to understand why it’s like that sometimes.

Prisoners clearly indicated that the atmosphere on the wing was related to the regime of the prison and depended upon that regime running smoothly:

Terrel  Some days when things seem to work and its manageable is when you get unlocked on time. There isn’t people, I mean, staff are not having meetings in your personal time. We get unlocked at the right time during the day rather than half an hour, forty-five minutes into our own time when we should be opened up. And staff are hospitable, respectful, approachable, that seems to be the best time when it seems that things are functioning.

The staff focus group also indicated a calm atmosphere as being part of life at its best, although rather than being linked to regime, for staff this related to the concept of dynamic security:
Good atmosphere on the wing, things like that and it’s better for those prisoners that are a little bit more challenging and at times like that they don’t seem to be as big an issue. It allows everybody to be relaxed and comfortable. It allows everybody to feel that the day can go with more ease when there’s not as pressure coming from all avenues.

Dynamic security was characterised by relaxed communication within a clear framework of professional boundaries:

It’s knowing your prisoners, getting them to know you, but maintaining that barrier between security and that professionalism where you can keep control of the unit without having draconian ways which that’s been dragged up here at Wakefield over last few years that it’s a draconian environment … it’s not that at all, we have that rapport with the prisoners which obviously keeps the lid on place.

In the above quotation there is recognition of the poor reputation that the prison had in the past and a distancing from such practices. When life is at its best staff engage in a skilful non-authoritarian manner with prisoners and this is an essential part of a positive wing environment.

Staff also identified that a positive atmosphere on the Wing directly influenced how well they and prisoners were able to engage with their work/tasks. Staff identified a calm atmosphere on the wing as assisting them in carrying out their duties:

when it’s settled you can do your job better, I agree what people say, banter and it’s just more easy going.

The wing was not the only location staff identified as benefiting from a relaxed atmosphere. Staff from AIC also reported that when prisoners and staff were happy all could engage in the programmes more effectively:

If they’re happier and feel confident in what they’re doing because they feel their needs are met, then it makes our work a lot easier to do what we’re trying to do.
If you recognise somebody’s diverse needs and they feel valued, they feel respected and are more likely to respect yourself so there’s a better engagement level all round. On a more practical note there’s less complaints to deal with ….

5.2.1b Having the freedom to make choices

During the interviews prisoners highlighted a rich diversity of activities which typified life at its best, many of which mirrored the taken for granted freedoms of life outside prison. These included being a listener, being able to participate in everyday activities like cooking and eating self prepared food with others, engaging with others or meeting new people, being on association and sharing jokes and good humour:

Oliver I like cook somebody because I can go down, not I, because I am disable - this is broke and I can’t walk about and I have many friends here and I have nice friends and two is cook together … and erm, morning, afternoon cook sometime spaghetti and Sunday morning breakfast, eggs, hotdog and erm beans four people sit together and eat

Lucas erm, I’ve cooked food, it’s a Saturday and my team have just won, probably had a couple of letters from outside and made a phone call to outside. That’s when life’s at its best

These quotes from prisoners illustrate the importance of being able to choose what they do with their free time. Analysis of the survey data supported this with 63.3% of prisoners agreeing or strongly agreeing that they could choose what to do with their free time. Of the remainder only 19.4% (6 prisoners) disagreed.
However, for some prisoners, a more solitary approach typified life at its best, for example reading or watching TV or playing games in their cell. For some this solitary approach to life included avoiding interaction with other prisoners and staff. Typically, this involved spending free time in their cell and making an active effort to avoid trouble when out of their cell:

**Malcolm**

So what you’re saying is you manage the good days, the days that are bearable

**Kyle**

As best as I can...I don’t always do it by withdrawing but that’s what tends to happen more often I do than talking to somebody, I don’t mean withdrawing as in suicidal sort of withdrawing...but taking myself out of it, putting myself somewhere where it’s quiet.

5.2.1c Developing constructive relationships within the prison officer role

The interviews also illustrated that some prisoners had productive relationships with staff on the wing. In these cases prisoners found staff helpful, approachable and that the personal officer system was effective for them:

**Victoria**

when you do have one to one time with your personal officer do you find that useful

**Andy**

erm .......yeah, my personal officer is very laid back, he’s alright, I’ve asked him to do stuff for me in the past and he’s just sorted them out, but that’s me

**Victoria**

so it’s helpful when you go and speak to your personal officer

**Andy**

well for me it’s just a quick thing cos he just does it, I don’t really have to ask him I can ask other ones, and they just seem to do it

When reflecting on life at its best, humour and sharing in activities with prisoners was part of what staff in the wing focus group identified:

**W**

Humorous

**Victoria**

Ok, in what way?

**W**

We talk about football or something like that, something you have in common and it’s funny, joking.

However, prison officers also recognised that their role and activities were complex and could not be simply reduced to one task:

**Malcolm:** What’s emerging for me here, which I think is interesting, is you’ve talked about the reforms and about relationship skills and you’re actually, you seem to be saying that the relationship skill are more important, your ability to relate to prisoners and work with them on informal levels, is that right?

**W(1):** Yeah, I’d say from experience

**W(2):** That’s what the whole job is turning into more and more each day. The rapport building between staff and prisoners. The communication skills is 95% of this job.

**W(3):** Because we’re with them so long. The police are with them for an hour or so aren’t they? Because we’re with them so long, a long period of time, we’ve got to have some kind of relationship with them, or it just wouldn’t work. They’d take the roof off wouldn’t they?

Examples of the wide range of roles required of the Wing are officer are provided by this member of the wing focus group:

**W:** Deaths in custody and things, and we’re first point of contact really. Chaplain comes round tells you your Mum’s died, your sister’s died or whatever. Off they go. Who’s helping him up next morning? Us. We’re dealing with it. We’re there for support. We can point ‘em in the right direction. Getting Listeners,
Samaritans access. And we’re there with a shoulder to cry on sometimes. You’re a social worker, probation worker. We’ve got many roles in one, and I think the prisoners can relate to that as well.

5.2.1d The contribution of prisoner representatives to best practice

Wing staff also identified the role of prisoner representatives in contributing to and sustaining a positive atmosphere on the Wing.

There are prisoner representatives for each diversity strand on each wing in the prison. Prisoners on each Wing elect them. There is no national procedure for nominating and electing people to these roles. At Wakefield a ‘Notice to Offenders’ is published when a vacancy exists for prisoners to nominate themselves as a potential representative; candidates are then voted upon by the prisoners on the Wing. A member of staff and an existing prisoner representative count the voting slips together to ensure transparency. The winner’s name is announced on Diversity notice boards. At Wakefield there are one or two representatives for each Diversity strand on each wing.

In addition to attending the various diversity meetings, the representatives have an informal role of advising and assisting other prisoners. Staff clearly value the representatives and are generally positive about the system, noting how these roles benefit both prisoners and staff. Wing staff, for example comment:

W(1): There’s a rep for every one of them now isn’t there? So they [prisoners] approach them, because sometimes they find it easier to approach a prisoner than a member of staff and the rep will come and speak to a member of staff, that is probably a good thing.
Malcolm: Is it a good thing?
W(1): Yeah, because some prisoners find it easier to speak to their peers than they do to a member of staff and that prisoner who’s the rep is obviously responsible prisoner and comes to speak to us. If there’s a confrontational situation it can be resolved through talking to people.
Malcolm: So the parties would talk to the rep who would talk to an officer?
(W1): Basically yeah, I’ve had that with a prisoner on B Wing, he’s a race rep who was complaining about the way things, some kind of searching technique or way a member of staff was acting and explaining he’s just doing his job, blah blah blah, he passed it back to the prisoner and it was resolved.

W(2): A lot of time the reps can actually resolve issues before it actually gets to the staff and that’s down to what the staff have built up with the reps, which is really good. Over a space of time that’s been built up and the trust that’s built up with the reps and what the reps are saying over the time they’ve been on here. Whereas if you’d have, a lot of problems that went to the reps, if they were coming to the staff all the time or into the SOs they would be dealing with so many different problems that you probably wouldn’t need to deal with ‘cause the reps could be dealing with it.
W(1): Plus the reps have heard a lot of complaints before and so they know the answer, it stops them complaining by a RIRF form or a complaint form or any other way they want to complain, because they’ve heard it and they’ll explain that’s what not happens.

In terms of overall response to diversity Wing staff were generally positive about how Wakefield managed matters:

W(2): For me, this is my third establishment I’ve worked in and under the diversity umbrella this is probably the best for giving support on the Wings and covering all avenues. I’ve worked in Newhall and Whitemoor and they didn’t have the support in and around the Wings to give access to staff. Whitemoor, if you wanted information you pulled it from PSOs and Newhall you just plodded on day-to-day.
Victoria: And is there time to go check for that stuff?
W(2): No, in Newhall not at all, you were lucky if you had time to open cell doors half the time
Victoria: So for you Wakefield’s the best?
Yeah, because at least at Wakefield each Wing does have an REO, a Disability liaison officer, a foreign nationals, they do have those, a designated member of staff to each Wing that you can at least get support and guidance from. Whereas in the other establishments where I’ve worked in the past – nothing. You might have a governor or a PO or an SO in those areas, but you never saw them.

However, some staff did comment that at times, they found the emphasis on diversity overpowering and held the potential to divert staff from essential work.

This is the first place that I’ve worked at that’s mentions it so much and courses on it and training and things like that. I’ve never worked anywhere else that’s rammed it down your throat basically. I am not saying it never worked in other places, whether there weren’t anything there. I’m sure there was, but I’ve never known ... This is the first time I was really aware of it really.

I think it’s only really said in last five years or so with the “PC” world that we’re living in now and they’re trying to push certain things. I think in four establishments I worked at Wakefield has made a big push in the past three or four years to do that. Some of it, I think’s been a very positive sign but also there’s negatives in the fact that we’re still pushing this work while we’re on with limited resources and limited staff or we’re dragging staff from other areas to cover the needs of diversity areas that they’re wanting to look at.

However, whilst prisoner representatives clearly provided an important contribution to the smooth running of the Wing, prisoners themselves were less positive about the role. In the specific diversity focussed sections we will discuss this further.

5.2.2 Practice in need of improvement

The issues highlighted in this section have been identified as problematic across all strands of diversity, rather than being specific to one area. The material is drawn from prisoner interviews, the staff focus groups and the survey of the Wing. Whilst these sources of data raise issues of concern, they cannot be considered to be automatically representative of all diversities or all prisoners on the Wing. However, on the other hand the views expressed cannot be simply dismissed – they point a direction to improving practice on the Wing and possibly in the prison.

Two areas were particularly highlighted as in need of further improvement – issues related to personal safety and matters linked to respectful communication. It is likely that these issues are interlinked – if prisoners feel that they are being communicated to respectfully, they will probably feel safer on the wing; this is certainly the conclusion that was reached by Butler and Drake (2007) in their study of respect in prisons.

5.2.2a Fears about personal safety

People from minority diversity groups are regularly targeted for attack in wider society. Analysis of the survey data illustrated that the atmosphere on the wing was, for some prisoners, at some points in time, calm and settled, with 56.7% of prisoners agreeing or strongly agreeing with this statement. 53.3% of prisoners also strongly agreed or agreed that they felt safe on the wing. However, it was clear from the survey that there were significant numbers of prisoners who did not share this experience (see table 8 below). It is recognised that this may or may not be an anomaly, perhaps arising from the unrepresentative nature of the pilot sample. Whilst some of the insecurity expressed may be linked to the nature of the offences some of the prisoners have committed (see Appendix Three) and the fear of reprisal attacks, it is clear that the issue needs further investigation in the full prison study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree %</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Agree %</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree %</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Disagree %</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Strongly disagree %</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I can feel safe on the wing</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The atmosphere on the wing is calm and settled</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Prisoner responses to statements about life at its best at Wakefield

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigate prisoner perceptions of safety/vulnerability further in the full study using a representative sample, to gain a clearer picture of this issue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.2b The importance of respectful communication

One member of the functional staff focus group, described respectful communication as:

**F:** ... you are polite with each other, that you interact equally, like you let them speak, they let you speak; you’re not there to offend either person. I guess if you’re working with offenders, then you’ve got to understand your boundaries and where they lie, and they need to understand their boundaries as well, but just ... taking that person as you find them as well I think, respecting them for the fact that they are people.

Similarly John a prisoner, identified the following as characteristics of a respectful relationship:

**John:** I’d have an honest relationship: first thing I wouldn’t do is treat them [prisoners] like animals. Right, the way I treat people ... would be exact same. No matter what these people are in for, they’ve being punished by taking away from society, some are horrendous, some not so horrendous, but I feel as if I did not have the right, as a prison officer or a prisoner, to judge anyone. I don’t have that right, only God has the right to do that. I will not judge him and I will treat him as a human being.

John’s quote illustrates an issue that was raised by a number of prisoners; being treated as a human being despite the offences that they may have committed. It may underlie some of the results of the survey, which, on the surface appear to be troubling. In relation to the statement ‘I am treated as a human being’ slightly less than a third (30%) of the group that responded to the survey indicated agreement, whilst 20% chose not to express an opinion either way. A further 50% disagreed or disagreed strongly with the statement. This quote from Joe again highlights the importance of professional behaviour that is polite and courteous and not informed by anger in relation to the offences committed by some prisoners:

**Joe** Treat, treat people as a person, forget that they’re in here for a crime, apart from the discipline side of thing but treat people as a person, and not as a non-entity

**Malcolm** Right, so what do you have to do to treat someone as a person?

**Joe** Be polite, carry out your duties properly

This issue was returned to with both staff and prisoners in the Dreaming section of the focus group and interviews, illustrating how respectful and effective relationships could be developed and maintained and will be discussed in the next chapter.
5.2.2c Complications and tensions in the staff-prisoner relationship

Another area linked to styles of communication that is an area of concern is how easy it is for prisoners to approach staff to discuss any issue. The survey results indicated that less than half of prisoners completing the survey considered Wing staff to be approachable (46.7%). Of the remainder, 20% neither agreed nor disagreed, and a third of the sample (33.3%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that staff were approachable.

The importance of staff being approachable is captured in this quotation from Terrel:

Terrel You know if an officer is not approachable then you are just not going to go and talk to him. That means you are going to hold back on what you really want to say. You may be ruminating on something and you know if something’s on your mind and you can’t get it out because it has to be a member of staff and it’s only that member of staff that’s there, you are not going to speak to that person because they are sort of stand-offish. They don’t care; they don’t listen to people so again you have to have that confidence with members of staff to go to them, to approach them so that you can explain what your problem is.

Terrel’s words point to considerable variations in how staff approach their work with prisoners; some staff are distant and make it clear to prisoners that they ‘don’t care’. Prisoners will avoid engagement with this type of staff member. Patrick confirms this view:

Patrick well there’s assistant personal officers and a set personal officer, the person you go to if you’re in trouble, erm but there are a lot of guys I talk to who wouldn’t speak to their personal officer if they were the last person on earth because nothing gets done.

Lucas also points to the importance of knowing which officers can and will help prisoners and which ones do not help prisoners:

Lucas: ... put it this way, I know who to go to. I don’t necessarily go to my personal officer or I just know the right people to go to. You get a group of officers and you know who aint that good at and who can help you. So you go to the right person, doesn’t necessarily have to be a personal officer. ... Some [staff] would, if you ask them, they will say ‘Haven’t you got a personal officer?’ . It’s just they don’t want to do the job for you.

A further complicating issue was that some prisoners experienced younger staff as lacking in the necessary life experience to understand and aid prisoners’ decision making:

Chris I’m not saying they’ve got to have family or anything but they just haven’t got experience to sit down and talk to people and I think that alienates a lot of older lads as well and you’ve got someone twenty one, twenty two telling them what they’ve got to do and this is what’s going to happen and it’s not, cos it’s that lad’s prison sentence, it’s up to that person to decide that they want to do it.

Some context to this background was provided through the wing staff focus group. Staff highlighted the tensions that they negotiate in developing effective working relationships with prisoners. As earlier, the tensions were linked to security, but also to the need to establish and maintain professional boundaries whilst at the same time developing a rapport with prisoners:

W:... it’s a case of when you interact with people you have to got to, as John says, you’ve got to remember there are professional boundaries, so you have got to sensor a lot of what you say with regards to, obviously you have your own personal details so it does help if you can enter that with offenders and you can get on with them quite well and obviously, when you start to build up those sort of relationships it does make it a lot easier, because you know what you can interact with certain people with.
However, the whole issue of professional relationship boundaries is not easy because it is, quite properly, set in a context of power and control. Relationships have to be negotiated and re-negotiated, Chris one of the prisoners we spoke to describes the difficulties of developing adequate relationships with prison officers:

*Chris* ... *professional relationship, not trying to be a friendly relationship. A prisoner is never going to tell an officer what they want to know anyway. They’re going to tell them what they think they want to know, and I don’t think they come to terms with that neither; and people who haven’t got life skills aren’t going to know that anyway...*

Chris, articulates his ideal relationship with officers as one which:

*Chris* ... *would be like the old system, prison officers and inmates; none of this crossing over kind of thing, because no-one knows where they stand. You’re never going to go for a pint with a prison officer even when you leave prison. You’re never going to want to associate with them when you leave prison cos it’s just going to be a bad memory. You want to put behind you and leave alone. So I just don’t understand why you would want to be friends with them on the wing or [why] they’re trying to make friends with you. It seems likely they are trying to gather information all the time, which isn’t their job. ... Yeah there is a big issues [about trust]; cos you can’t talk open to a prison officer, and lads learn that pretty quick cos lads which do talk openly to a prison officer end up in a lot of trouble basically.*

5.2.2d Achieving balance and avoiding resentment when delivering diversity

Another area where general prison practice may need further attention is staff relationships. Diversity, as an idea, highlights difference, and difference can be marked by how groups are treated. In the following extensive extract a range of dissatisfactions of Wing staff are brought sharply into focus as the group reflected on diversity. A key issue to consider is that delivering a diversity strategy needs to explicitly incorporate the needs and requirements of those responsible for delivering the work otherwise resentments may undermine the policy:

Staff gave a number of examples that illustrated this issue. One such example was around the limited arrangements for staff at Christmas time, in comparison to the arrangements for prisoners:

*Victoria:* I’ll just go back to that thing I was saying, somebody mentioned at the survey meeting about meals at Christmas, about staff at Christmas do.

W(1) There’s nothing
W(2) We have to bring our own stuff in.
W(3) There’s nothing at all.
W(1) Years ago we used to get a mince pie and an urn of tea on centre. *Since a certain governor came four years since, five years since we get nothing.*
W(4) You can’t buy anything either ’cause every where’s closed.
W(1) Every bank holiday it’s closed and you can’t get a hot meal on a 12 hour shift.

*Victoria:* So is there something about this that goes beyond... does it link into this I’m thinking? W(5) No they just, it’s just not open, they just don’t facilitate it.
W(1) There used to be vending machines.
W(6) Maybe if I was one of those groups they’d put something on for me but I’m not so I get nowt.
W(2) To be honest, I don’t think they would.

A further example centred on changes to staff access to facilities in order to accommodate the needs of some diversity groups:

W Going back to Muslims, we used to go to gym seven days a week on a dinner time, they’ve took it off us now on a Friday so they can accommodate Muslim service.
Staff indicated that the impact of situations such as these led them to feel undervalued and lacking a voice to bring about change, as this quote illustrates:

W(1) We had a ‘Listen to Improve’ workshop week, Head of Personnel, all these [issues] were put, not just by myself, but by other members of staff and ... ‘Listen to Improve’, I mean it’s not improved our quality of life, it’s just a thing that Wakefield ‘ Investors in People’ you know? They’re not investing in people and I think we’re the most valued resource, or should be, but I don’t feel I’m invested in.

W(2) A lot of time we’re more of a number than what the prisoners are.

W(1) As long as it’s a white shirt on a landing they’re not bothered, all right you’ve got 12 officers on B wing, they’re not looking for the quality of it, the fact that an officer’s set [unclear] his training on Sunday morning, finishes training Friday and he’s operational on Sunday, he can tell you about diversity and equal ops but he can’t tell you how landing’s going to run.

5.2.2e Difficulties in delivering diversity: communication and access to information

Staff in the wing focus groups pointed to a number of difficulties that contributed to their ability to effectively deliver not only diversity but other aspects of their role. These issues offer some context to the concerns expressed by prisoners about the effectiveness of new staff. One issue related to the mentoring system in place for new staff. Although new staff are paired with a more experienced mentor, they can often find themselves detailed different shift patterns. In the quote below, a member of the wing staff focus group highlights how restricted access to a mentor can be exacerbated by the difficulty in being able to access information quickly and easily:

W(1) It’s pathetic, you’re not working with the guy who you’re actually allocated to support you and help you through your initial training. Actually finding information out is quite difficult as well.

Malcolm: How you find out information?

W(1) Yeah

Victoria: Just say something more about that?

W(1) What’ll happen is they’ll put in on the actual intranet site, information that’s prevalent to us and that’ll be it, so if you’re not checking on a regular basis you might not find out they’ve changed the policy or what the policy is.

W(2) And it’s access to computers isn’t it?

W(1) Yeah if they’re changing anything for offenders they get a notice published out. It goes on every single landing so they’ve got all the relevant information, or it gets escalated down through their reps so they get access to the information. We don’t, it’s not as if we’ve got someone on the wing who gets told this new information so they can escalate it down to us, we’ve just got to find it out.

Victoria: So better communication?

W(1) Yeah

Additionally, there is the issue of effective communication between various grades of staff. There is some dissatisfaction that only criticism is conveyed effectively to all staff and that positive comments or praise are not noted or fed through to all staff, as this member of the wing focus group explains:

W Can I just add that you sent an email to the SMT probably a week or so ago that gave feedback and that you really enjoyed working with them and the staff were great and helped you out and everything and I managed to get a copy of that. It came to me from another governor who’s not head of my department any more and I actually sent it the PO and the SO and the member of staff who you actually mention in that email saying ‘thank you for your help’ and they came up to me and said ‘thank you very much for that’ because B wing haven’t actually got that email.
A surprising factor emerging from the research was that although we had anticipated that prisoners might express mistrust about how the research findings might be received by the prison, we had not anticipated such a strong reaction from prison staff:

W(1) I feel a bit sceptical that for all this you’re going to put the report into gaol, they’ll take out the bits like what we’re doing good for prisoners, but the things for staff, it’ll just get pushed under carpet and we’ll get no feedback on it personally.

Malcolm: We will send the report to the prison, they’ve said that they’ll make it available, copies will be on B wing and some in the library. Additionally however, there will be the report that we do for the funder... that will be available on the web. When we’ve done it we can let you know where it is, there’ll be an electronic link that people can click and download our report and we will write papers.

W(2) So they won’t be able to hide it?
Malcolm: No

Victoria: And to be fair right from the beginning we wouldn’t be here if they didn’t want, hadn’t wanted to be supportive and find out what is working and what could be improved.

Despite these concerns it was clear that staff did want to engage in discussions about their role and how they could share problems and best practice together and feed this back up to a higher managerial level:

W(1) It would be nice if we could have this sort of thing with governors because all we get is when we have a full staff briefing they’ll say ‘any questions?’ Well you’re not going to stick your hand up with 300 and odd members of staff there and governors that we know that can actually take it personally.

W(1): And pull you up afterwards and give you a bollocking.

Victoria: That’s why we did this separately rather than do it with governor grades here this morning.

W(2): Each wing has a monthly briefing and if it goes on just a little bit too long, I think it was the second last one and we got out and [unclear] down there looking at his watch. We’d only been up here about 10, 15 minutes. It’s pathetic, how can you talk about wing issues in such a short space of time. Sometimes there’s not a lot, but sometimes there is.

5.2.2 Raising awareness as a means for addressing areas of concern
A number of the issues highlighted in this section may be improved if there was a greater awareness of issues related to diversity both across the staff and the prisoner groupings. The Prison has recognised this, and as reported in Chapter 4, has instituted a number of prison-wide initiatives to develop awareness of diversity issues. One of these initiatives is ‘Diversity week’. Diversity week occurs annually in November. It features a range of speakers who are involved in diversity related issues from outside the prison, and internal diversity focussed events (for example focussing on various ethnic cultures and foods). It offers staff and prisoners an opportunity to learn about and experience diverse cultures, faiths and life-styles. As researchers, we introduced our project to prisoners in Diversity week 2008. However, at present, it appears that this event is having only a limited impact. From the results of the survey, less than half (38.5%) of respondents rate this event positively (although these are predominantly White prisoners), with a similar number expressing ambivalence about its effectiveness (38.5%). The majority of ethnic minority prisoners either rated it as neither effective nor ineffective (100% of respondents identifying as African or Caribbean) or as ineffective (66.6% of respondents identifying as Pakistani). However, the value of the event was recognised by at least one of our interview respondents:

Heath: They had all sorts of things like, you know, the Christians so you could go to that meeting. I think there was one on – oh, I can’t even remember myself now. I think there was one on homosexuality and issues thereof. Erm other gender based things. You know, I mean, I went to most of those. I couldn’t get to all of them, you know. I am fairly tolerant anyway, but I think it is good to get to learn or at least try and understand other cultures and other faiths.
Possible Action Point
More widely advertise and encourage participation in Diversity week. Suggest diversity representatives’ champion the week during association and elsewhere.

So, although this section has highlighted areas where practice across the diversity strands needs to be improved it is also important to recognise the context in which the dissatisfaction is expressed and to include this in devising more effective and respectful ways of communicating.

5.3 Race and Ethnicities
In this section we consider ‘race and ethnicities’, however, in some cases issues are intertwined with other aspects of diversity, particularly faith. In these instances we will make it clear where issues will be principally addressed.

5.3.1 Best Practice
The area that most Black and Minority Ethnic prisoners highlighted as being positive in the prison concerned the facilities to practice their religion. These issues will be discussed in the next section as they relate specifically to ‘faith’.

5.3.1a Responding positively to bullying
One ethnic minority prisoner spoke positively about how the prison responded when he was being bullied by a group of Asian prisoners, and indicated that some prisoners use their ethnicity as a means of attempting to bully or manipulate staff:

_Dion_: I start writing, writing and use my dictionary and I wrote a letter to the governor and I told her that I don’t like to see bullied, I see bullied, people bully everywhere and I see that some people bullied, bully the staff, uses your colour and your race and ‘because I am …’ I don’t like that and she, she did visit and the governor come to see me and he say he gonna do, deal with this and it’s happened.

Good practice was also evident in relation to the delivery of programmes. One of the members of the functional staff focus group described how they responded to the cultural differences of a Black prisoner by adapting the groupwork programme:

_F_: I can recall delivering a group and we had an ethnic minority offender and a lot of the material that we presented in the group was specific to White offenders, so we adapted, because he actually complained that we weren’t … I think it was about alcohol use or something. He said ‘We don’t drink alcohol’. So we adapted the material so that, to make it more relevant for him as well and he appreciated that. And it worked better and he could relate to the material better, the. He said ‘well, I can’t relate to that because I cant …’. It was about perspective. [He could not] put himself in that position, so we had to quickly think on our feet. But we did learn from that, as well, because we did adapt that material to take into account for future reference, not just as it happens on the day.

Adding to this, the speaker gave an example of how other programmes were also adapted to facilitate cultural relevance:

_F_: ... a lot of the names, when we were delivering the ETS [Enhanced Thinking Skills] were very White British names, you suddenly realise in an ethnically diverse group that you were just not incorporating everybody that would be there. So I think it was about us being aware, as tutors on the programmes, about what we were saying, and ... making it relevant and appropriate to a wider audience.
There was also evidence of proactive activity to ensure the accommodation of ethnicity. This is evident below, as another member of the same focus group described how they prepared for the ethnic diversity of the membership of the various groupwork programmes:

F: I guess in terms of groupwork, it’s whoever’s involved in that group work, and the background work is collecting, viewing, filing information and talking to public teams that are involved in working with that… persons who’ve had recent contact. Asking the actual offender about it, in terms of what they feel their needs are, issues they think might come up in group. So I guess a lot of it’s done at the assessment stage before they get on the group.

F: I’m sure there’s been an occasion when I’ve been organising a group when there’s an offender from an ethnic minority group and he didn’t feel comfortable attending the group on his own with nine other White offenders. I think we didn’t put him on that group because he wouldn’t be comfortable.

Victoria: Was there a knock on impact for him in terms of his sentence planning or anything?
F: No
Victoria: Did it result in a delay or…?
F: It just meant he didn’t do the group then. It didn’t impact negatively on him, the fact that he couldn’t do it at that particular time. He just waited until he was able to join a group with others where he’d feel more confident.

5.3.2 Practice in need of improvement
In relation to practice in need of improvement, with specific bearing on issues connected with race and ethnicity, two major areas of concern emerged: (a) practices perceived to be discriminatory; and (b) the procedures and processes designed to deal with complaints of discrimination.

5.3.2a Practices perceived to be discriminatory
In relation to the survey item asking whether or not prisoners had experienced discrimination on grounds of faith, ethnicity, sexuality, disability or age it was clear that some BME prisoners did experience being discriminated against. For example, two out of the three Asian prisoners either disagreed or disagreed strongly that they were not discriminated against because of the diversity status. Similarly, one of the three respondents identifying as Black African or Black Caribbean, also disagreed.

Thinking about and responding to discrimination is not easy; the purpose of this research is not to identify what is and what is not discrimination. It is to identify the experience of people living and working in the prison. Whilst the survey provides indications that some minority ethnic prisoners do feel discriminated against, it does not identify the source of discrimination. The main area of discrimination highlighted in the data relates to perceptions around the equitable allocation of resources to groups on the basis ethnic/racial identity, as the examples below illustrate.

The concern most commonly raised in the interviews related to the process of categorising prisoners within a particular security classification. The issue is not merely one of changing labels; it has implications for where a prisoner may be accommodated within the Prison estate. Prisons with a lower security rating are believed to operate a more relaxed regime and offer more opportunities related to rehabilitation training. Black and Minority Ethnic prisoners generally perceived this process to be discriminatory:

Terrel: … we see White guys who have come into the prison after us, who have done less group work than us and then they get their ‘C’ cat. So we’re saying ‘What’s going on for us then? How can this be happening? You come here three years after me, you have done one piece of groupwork and you have been given a ‘C’ cat. I have done three sets of group work and I can’t get a ‘C’ cat’ So we see it in terms of there’s got to be something going on, somewhere, higher up, that is stopping us from going from ‘B’ to ‘C’. … I don’t know if
they feel there is an issue. I don’t believe that the Race Equality Action Team believe that there is an issue, you know, that’s my personal opinion.

From the interviews it was clear that some BME prisoners and their representatives were monitoring this situation and not seeing any changes; the collective frustration is both statistical and symbolic:

Terrel: ... what’s frustrating in this particular prison, [is] not being able to see, physically, BMEs leaving here going to ‘C’ cat prisons.

Black and Ethnic Minority prisoners also articulated how although Race Relations Representatives have repeatedly highlighted this issue nothing appeared to change:

Terrel: Nothing’s happening, I mean, they gave one BME a C Cat, but that was after we highlighted the situation, brought it to their attention, gave them statistics and they went away and did their impact assessment, realised that we was basically telling them something that they hadn’t looked at before. They agreed with what we were saying and said we will monitor it, but what they did in the meantime, they said ‘OK let’s give this BME a C Cat’

Leon highlights the personal situation for a prisoner nearing release after a long sentence, of being unable to access the rehabilitative preparation for release that is characteristic of category ‘C’ prisons:

Leon: I put in a transfer form to Belmarsh, and I didn’t really want to go to Belmarsh, but because I come from a Cat ‘A’ prison they want to send me to another ‘A’ cat prison, where I should, by rights, go to a prison [in] London like erm Wandsworth, Pentonville, Scrubs you know. All these prisons round vicinity because I’m a ‘B’ cat prisoner and, plus, I’m coming to the end of my sentence, right, they should be looking at that right, and they should listen – ‘This man has not got long left, he’s out in 2010 June you know, that’s not long. Why don’t we try, ...we should move this man, all this time, six, seven years but they haven’t done. They still keep him here. And this is what the solicitor are trying to find out – why they are still keeping him here. He should be in a ‘C’ cat prison or something like that.’ This is what they have said solicitors told me last. You know why his is not in a ‘C’ cat? Why he is still in Wakefield prison?

Another area of difficulty in the area of discrimination is related to how ethnic (faith) groups see the treatment of themselves in relation to what other groups receive. John, highlights a similar issue – the preference of one ethnic group (in this case closely linked to faith) above other ethnic groupings – and the worrying potential that widely held perceptions of preference may have for the prison regime:

John: What I would like to see is treated fairly. They can’t turn around, this is where resentment comes in, er, I’ve heard it on the Wing and I’ve heard it from Irish people which are not erm prejudice or anything else. Turn around and ... ‘Muslims, they get three thousand spent on their feast’ and I said [when] it comes to us, Irish food to celebrate St Patrick’s day and a day off work they puff. So we feel, not just me, the other Irish people, and there’s a fair few, felt that we were discriminated against and if you want to get anything in here to celebrate for your feast days you have to be a Muslim and there’s such a bad atmosphere going round in this prison and what they are saying is ‘If you’re a ... Muslim you can have it, you can get this, you can get that’, and it is cos we’re White and English we’re not allowed it. Erm this prison is building resentment, hatred and prejudice, it’s what they’re building here and it’s getting stronger and stronger and stronger.

Perceptions of discrimination also related to allocation to labour, in particular to jobs seen as implying that prisoners were ‘trusted’:

Lucas: ... This is a prime example now of this procedure to deal with those kind of thing now. When I come here, up until just recently, about two or three weeks ago, I never saw a Black person working on the hot
plate, right? Never, never, never, and it was only one Black cleaner, never, never never. I got a [trusted] job now, only over what happened, after that right. But there was never one working the [names landing] so we started to kick up a stink and wasn’t just this Wing. It was all the Wings, and they started to kick up a stink and then people got fed up. And it wasn’t just that it’s about people progressing though courses and everything like that, and people got fed up.

Although this section of the report has hitherto focussed on issues relating to prisoner-staff relationships, it is important to recognise that racial discrimination also occurs within the prisoner population as the quotation from Dion below indicates:

Malcolm: Right, so have you been treated unfairly by staff or prisoners because of how you look, because of your ethnicity?
Dion: From staff, no
Malcolm: From prisoners?
Dion: Yes

It is the task of prison staff and prison procedures to identify discriminatory and harmful practices both between prison staff and prisoners and between prisoners. The next section considers some of the procedures and processes currently in place at Wakefield to address these issues.

5.3.2b The procedures and processes designed to deal with complaints of discrimination
The system of Race representatives on each Wing and the Racial Incident Report Form (RIRF) are the main areas of consideration in this section. Although prison staff see a value in the prisoner representatives system, as illustrated earlier in this chapter, survey respondents were less positive in their assessment of the Race Equality representatives. Opinion was more or less equally divided between those considering the representatives to be effective, ineffective or not expressing an opinion. However, only two out of a possible six ethnic minority respondents rated the role positively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop strategies to increase the perceived effectiveness of committees on which prisoner representatives sit, with a view to increasing prisoners’ perceptions of the effectiveness of the their own representatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also no-one in interview spoke of this role as being effective. This appeared largely because the role was perceived as operating in a context that blocked issues rather that facilitated their resolution, as indicated in the earlier quotes from Terrel and Leon. This was also how the operation of the RIRF system was perceived. Although the survey results are not statistically representative of the wider Wing or the prison population, they reflect dissatisfaction with the RIRF system. The majority of survey respondents did not consider the RIRF to be effective (16.7 per cent considered it to be ‘ineffective’ and 25 per cent stated that it was very ineffective). Although twenty per cent of respondents rated it as ‘effective’ this group was solely made up of White prisoners. The quotations that follow reveal a common perception of a system that is not responsive to complaints about racism or racial discrimination:

Malcolm: Tell me about a time when the prison’s procedures for dealing with reports of unfair treatment arising from ethnicity … have been at their best
Adnan: I can’t recall one, I can’t recall one because here it’s a case of you go through the channel you hit one wall, you climb over that wall, hit another wall, climb over that wall, hit another wall and so on. And then it disappears into the background.

On being asked the same question, Norman answered:
Norman: Well the answer to that is never.
Malcolm: Ok, and how have you tested them?
Norman: Erm, I have sent in application forms, I have sent in complaint forms, I have had face to face discussion. I have instructed a solicitor to send letters of complaint to the Governor and err, it’s all been to no avail.

What is perhaps of interest here is that Norman is a White prisoner and his quote illustrates that Black and ethnic minority prisoners were not the only prisoners to express dissatisfaction with the complaints system.

Lucas similarly reported difficulties in obtaining what he would consider to be a fair hearing to his grievances:

Malcolm: What if someone’s treated you differently because of your ethnicity and you’ve reported that; do they deal with that well, has that happened?
Lucas: ... I haven’t really reported it cos I don’t see no point in this prison ... but my experience of what I’ve heard and what I’ve seen with my own eyes is not really good. Erm, a friend of mine, one of the officers, right, called him a monkey. He’s an Asian geyser, and, erm, he reported it and two other people who was there, they were nothing to do with it, they saw what happened and they reported and I said someone else came reported it as well, what they heard. Well, erm, the race relations people came and took statements from everyone and after they finished taking their statements they said there was no evidence, nothing to answer.
Malcolm: and that was while you were on this wing?
Lucas: Yeah.

This quotation points to an area of concern in interpreting statistics related to RIRFs – if the number of RIRFs decreases this may be due to an effective anti-racist strategy or it may be due to the fact that ethnic minority prisoners see no point in using a system that they perceive to be biased against them.

Terrel summarises this disenchantment with the ‘system’:

Terrel: Well, that’s here, no matter how many times we complain, whether it’s RIRFs - about racist incident reports - or if it’s about bullying we don’t see nothing positive. No positive outcomes come from those many RIRFs that we put in. There are instances when prisoners have put in RIRF forms about staff being, making inappropriate comments that were racial, derogatory terms towards them. Now it’s very difficult if there are no witnesses to verify what the inmate is saying the officer said to him. The system is 99.9% more likely to believe its staff.

This was also Wesley’s experience:

Malcolm: Earlier you mentioned an incident in the workshop where you thought you were being treated in a racist way. Have you ever reported such incidents and has there ever been a time when you think the prison has dealt with it well?
Wesley: Well they didn’t deal with it well because...
Malcolm: did you report it?
Wesley: Yeah, I did report it to racial discrimination and they didn’t treat it well. They didn’t believe me, they believe the staff.
Malcolm: Okay

Apart from not being believed, some prisoners noted that they experienced reprisals for indicating that they may make a complaint against a member of staff:
Malcolm: Have you reported anything where you think it’s been dealt with well?
Wesley: Well I was going to report something once. I said to the officer, ‘I’m going to report you, because you got a chip on your shoulder, because what you should have done was leave the chip at your home before you come inside the prison’ and I said ‘I’m going to report you.’ I wasn’t going to do it. He went straight downstairs and he report me and they give me IP for that and I said to them ‘Listen I only said I was going to report him because he had a chip on his shoulder. Don’t come here and take it out on me.’ Because I didn’t have a discussion with him I was speaking to another staff and he get in. Nothing ever come out of it. I get the worst.
Malcolm: But you didn’t report it?
Wesley: No, I didn’t but he reported it and they called me down.

Whilst this section is predominantly focused on the experiences of Black and Minority Ethnic prisoners, we would not want to give the impression that the mechanisms for reporting and responding to discrimination were universally perceived as ineffective. This quote from Garry illustrates that some White prisoners did experience the reporting systems as both thorough and effective:

Garry  erm here if you’ve got a problem and it’s one that needs to be reported on the erm racial discrimination form, you know, that is filled in and it’s sent off and an officer actually comes to see you and to see how things could be changed, erm and what you expect to come from that, erm and in a way you kind of feel, ‘yeah that officer has come to speak to me about it’, they’ve not just given me an answer on paper, you know. Here you get the sense that when they say they’ll investigate it, it’s been investigated. They’re not just going to say “we’ve looked into it, nothings been done” you know, and the officer will always say to you or it’s written on the bottom, if you’re nor satisfied, get back in touch with us and we’ll see what we can do, you know. Straight way they’ve looked into it, they’ve given you the answer. If you need it explaining they’ll come back erm.

Moreover, some prisoners also acknowledged that the newer system of reporting discrimination was more effective than the previous system, as this quote from John illustrates:

John  ... but I must admit they are a little bit better in a sense. Before, we had a general app which we filled out and gave it to them to sort out and quite a few they disappear along the line, so you wait and wait and wait and nothing happens. You go to check, you look in the book and yes it put in, there’s the number and things like that, and when you check, nobody can find it, it’s got lost, right. Now this Governor, she put one in that’s four or five pages and it prints right through and when you give it to the officers at night time on the wing, they give you back a cop. So, you’ve got the copy to explain what’s what and a copy goes to someone else, copy to someone else. You do actually get an answer back. Every now and then one goes missing, right, before it was a waste of time.

It is not the role of this research to establish the veracity of the various accounts that we heard. However, it is of concern that a number of ethnic minority prisoners were common in their description of a system that they believed would be unlikely to uphold any complaint made against a member of staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action is needed to improve the confidence of BME prisoners in the systems for reporting/complaining, investigating and adjudicating complaints relating to allegations of racism.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4 Foreign and Dual National Prisoners

5.4.1 Best Practice
Whilst there were only two foreign nationals who took part in the interview stage of the research it was of note that both of these prisoners reported having experienced positive relationships with wing staff.

5.4.1a The importance of staff prisoner relationships in adjusting to prison life
Both prisoners articulated these relationships as important in their adjustment to prison life, as illustrated below in the quote from Dion:

Dion: I think by listening, if I want to talk, if [night] I want to talk to any one of them they are good listeners and good advice, and we talk, we have, we talk, we, and I think they are really helpful for many things. I learn a lot from staff I didn’t know first time I came, how to iron my clothes, some staff teach me. I cook, some staff teach me ‘do this, do that, do that’ and I feel that I am a good cooking, I know how to iron my clothes and even I help other people to do.

Malcolm: So the staff have helped you?
Dion: They help for whatever you ask, they really, really helpful and friendly and anybody [shake their hands].

5.4.1b Responding effectively to break down communication barriers
Good practice with Foreign and Dual nationality prisoners is based on an awareness of their situation as being different from English prisoners. The difference is most clearly noted in the case of language, again something articulated by Dion:

Dion: When, when, because I didn’t [at this time], what I’m gonna do? I just learn from my mistake, and, as a positive side for that I didn’t have translator I, but the positive side that without translator let me have a determination to live, and I start do that. Some is tough in my landing and generally all the staff they really helpful, they understand me and they, I found the confident with them.

It was clear from the staff focus groups that seeking to enable communication was proactively responded to across a range of settings, not only on the wing. For example, in relation to group work programmes a group leader noted:

F: Thinking about groups that I’ve been involved in, people from different cultures, where English isn’t their first language, that’s kind of been a barrier in [the] group to making sure that that person feels understood. So just making sure they’re given the chance to join in equally in [the] group. Thinking about experiences I’ve had in group, people where English isn’t their first language, you’ve got to make an extra special effort to make sure that person can respond to what you’re doing and asking of them. And giving them enough time and trying to manage the dynamic between your other group members, you and them and you and that single person as well, and that is not easy, because you want to be really respectful and aware and inclusive of that person, whether the rest of your group members feel like that.

Planning ahead to accommodate foreign national status was also evident in the good practice of other functional areas, such as for example the Offender Management Unit. This is particularly important as it illustrates the support of Foreign Nationals when speaking in settings which are often pressurised for them, and may make them silent, as this quote from one focus group participant indicates:

F: ... our department has involvement in setting up interpreters and getting extra support for people who are on sentence planning boards, if they feel that they need that assistance from us, so that they can have an understanding and be fully involved in the sentence planning board. And it’s something that happens with them rather than around them and about them, they can really get involved and engaged by fully
understanding what’s being said about them. Because if they fully understand what the Board are saying to them, and the targets that are being set for them, then hopefully that’ll encourage their involvement and engagement with us.

5.4.1c Assisting foreign national prisoners to maintain familial relationships

Additionally, the problems that this group of prisoners have in maintaining contact with family and friends due to the cost of international phone calls has both been noted and a positive response provided:

W(1): Well foreign national prisoners and the blue pin form; that’s quite good. You get a telephone card, it’s a separate account and it costs them a little bit less, not a great deal, but costs them a little bit less to phone abroad. So there’s quite a few on that now and the class one nationals could be Ireland, everywhere, travellers, everything.
Malcolm: and that’s good because?
W(1): It gives them one account, one card that they can use to phone abroad and a decent rate for them and it’s run to ELA innit?
W(2): Run through the foreign nationals team
W(1): It’s good for them because it helps them keep contact with their family and keeps them happier.
W(2): Because they’re not getting as many visits. A lot of them are not getting any visits at all
Malcolm: And they’re not penalised by the phone charges?
W(1): No they’re not, it’s not as cheap as it could be like, but it’s cheaper for them.

5.4.2 Practice in need of improvement

5.4.2a Perceived ineffectiveness of the Foreign Nationals Representative

Foreign and dual nationality prisoners also have prisoner representatives. On ‘B’ Wing, at the time of this research, this role was carried out by the person who was also the Race relations Representative. The survey did not produce a clear picture of how prisoners viewed the effectiveness of the Foreign Nationals Representative role. Over half of the respondents (60.95%) chose not to express an opinion. Just over a quarter of respondents (26.1%) rated it as effective or very effective. When this was broken down to consider the responses of foreign national prisoners specifically, a mixed picture emerged with one respondent (33.3%) identifying the Foreign Nationals Representative as very effective, whilst the other two respondents rated them as neither effective nor ineffective (33.3%) or very ineffective (33.3%). So in many ways the survey results were inconclusive about the effectiveness of this role. It is for this reason that we have decided to include it in this section. Hopefully ways can be found to improve the perceived effectiveness of this response to the needs of this prisoner group.

In the interviews one prisoner expressed dissatisfaction with how prison staff address his needs as a foreign national prisoner; his main complaint is related to the fact that although there are staff designated to help foreign national prisoners, the help is continually deferred:

John: [the member of staff says] ‘Yes, I’ll do this for you. I’ll get this sorted out’, and then you wait two or three months and say ‘What happened?’ ‘Oh well we had a meeting with my boss and we’re still sorting it out.’ So you ask in another three months time. Erm ‘Yeah, we’re still waiting for so and so to get back. Nothing ever happens.

This interviewee was also unimpressed by what he considered to be the ineffectiveness of the drop in group for foreign and dual nationality prisoners.

Victoria: So, the foreign nationals group – what’s your experience of that?
John: A waste of time
Victoria: Okay would you like to say a bit about why?
John: You go down there on a Thursday, right, … they say ‘Anything you want? Just tell us, we’ll write it down …. and the rest [of the prisoners in the group] just sit there and they are playing cards, playing dominoes, erm listening to music and that’s it – that’s foreign nationals. Restricted, ‘cos to me foreign nationals are supposed to talk about what’s happened, about erm deportation, about repatriation, about the different governments – what they do, the rules...

Thus a complex picture appears to emerge in relation to foreign national provision, with foreign nationals from outside the EU such as Oliver and Dion reporting the mechanisms for supporting them as effective, whilst foreign nationals from within the EU, such as John, did not experience them as responsive to their needs.

5.5 Faith

5.5.1 Best Practice
The ability to practice their faith and attend faith-based activities was identified by a number of prisoners interviewed as a key part of life at its best at Wakefield.

5.5.1a Regular access to additional faith related activities
Prisoners cited the ability to go to the Chapel in the evening and attend faith related activities such as the weekly bible study programme as practices that enabled them to relax and overcome the frustrations of prison life:

Joe ‘cause I’m a Catholic and so, and I enjoy serving during the service, I enjoy singing ‘cause it’s, it’s me own tools I’ve put in place for relief sort of thing, of frustration so go and I’m singing [laughs]. So... I just find it relaxing down there and I go most evenings, most evenings I go down the chapel.

5.5.1b Staff support in faith related matters
It was clear from prisoners’ comments that relationships between many members of staff and prisoners were positive. In general there was little talk about faith as something around which staff prisoner relationships cohered, but some prisoners did indicate that not sharing their faith did not prevent staff being able to offer practical advice and guidance; as in this example about fasting:

Malcolm so he was able to reach out
Mike yeah he did, and you know a little bit about as well, you know the kind of longer it goes on it can get more difficult and stuff like, and that’s what it was, and what he actually said to me was, you know, if, if ‘you know it can get hard’ and he, he, he must of had experience of it to know, because I never knew it ...you know and he said to me, ‘you know when it gets to week three you can get moody and stuff like that’ and he said ‘if that happens, you know, come and have a chat with me’.

5.5.1c Adaptations to respond to the diverse faith needs of prisoners
Prisoners participating in the interviews articulated a wide range of adaptations and activities that illustrate the way in which the Prison had attempted to respond to the faith needs of prisoners. Examples included the adaptation of the chapel enabling it to be used by people of other faiths and changes to the routine or regime of the prison to enable prisoners to engage in practices relating to their religion, such as fasting and Friday prayers.

Interviewed prisoners from all faith groups identified the arrangements for celebrating religious festivals and cultural feasts, as a positive response to their faith needs. Speaking of arrangements for Rastafarian prisoners, Terrel notes:
where it comes to me practising my faith, my culture, my religion ... So again they put aside a budget, we can buy our cultural food that we normally eat on the out and share it with the guests that actually come to the celebration ...

Similarly, Lucas comments:

Lucas: I’m a Muslim. At around Ramadan time, we erm, they cater for, they cook food for us at the end of the festival ... Eid festival, and we all go down to the Chapel; all Muslims together and we eat food together and praying, and we’re all together. So they cater for that, and they leave us there, so yeah, that’s one of the best times.

The provision of notice boards for faith issues was also highlighted in the interviews as a positive practice, although it was noted that these needed to be updated and amended regularly to ensure that they were inclusive of information for all faith groups.

Prisoners identified that when searching cells officers are generally sensitive to religious items, for example not touching the Qur’an, rather asking prisoners to handle the text:

Mike ...normally I don’t, to be honest when they search my cell, they don’t touch my Qu’ran. I open it and do all that, you know
Malcolm spread the pages
Mike yeah, yeah and I do it nice and slow for them and they know that, erm fine with things like that.

Despite these positive adjustments to accommodate different faiths concern was expressed that these adjustments sometimes took time and considerable perseverance on the part of the prisoner, particularly where the adjustment was for a faith that less commonly shared by others within the prison population.

5.5.1d Addressing prisoner to prisoner discrimination arising from faith

Some prisoners pointed to being treated differently by other prisoners because of their faith. This was particularly notable in the case of conversion from one religion to another. For example two prisoners who had converted from Islam to Christianity articulated how they found it difficult to attend the chapel as often as they would have liked due to fear of intimidation from other Muslim prisoners. However, at least one of these prisoners had been able to speak to the Imam about this situation and elicited his support in relation to his conversion:

Oliver he not say anything. ‘Your choice’, he say ‘your choice’, say ‘thank you very much’, shake the hand. It’s good, good man, very good man.

Other prisoners commented on how the confined nature of movement around the wing during periods of unlock and during movement from the wing to labour or activities contributed to intimidation and verbal discrimination. A recurrent theme was friction between prisoners queuing for the gym and those queuing for the chapel. An example of good practice in responding to this was that the movement of prisoners to the gym and chapel had been separated to avoid confrontation:

Heath Erm, but er, as I say it doesn’t happen that often now and erm, I mean, now they have started.... because they take the church down separate from erm, the people that are going to the gym.

Some prisoners gave examples of how their personal officers or other staff had offered them help to practise their faith:
Mike and there was some staff who were great really supportive. I remember my first Ramadan fasting, a member of staff come up to me and he’s a good guy as well and he come up to me and he said ‘I know it can be difficult, you know, fasting and if you wanna talk’, blah blah, and you know he actually offered me support and that was, yeah that was quite touching, that was. Because it did feel like, it felt like I was doing something wrong that’s how it felt. I’d been thinking about it so long and to actually take that step to say ‘Can you put my name down for Muslim service’ was something I wanted to do for a while.

The survey, whilst asking about discrimination based on diversity in general, did not differentiate between faith and other aspects of diversity. However, it should be recognised that in balance to some of the examples illustrated here, many of those interviewed indicated that they had either not experienced discrimination in relation to their faith, or had not had experience of reporting it.

5.5.2 Practice in need of improvement
The two main areas that were highlighted as being in need of further development were (a) how to respond to Muslim prisoners who grew beards and wore non-western clothing as part of their religious practice; and (b) how to ensure that all members of all religions feel that they are treated equally.

5.5.2a Responding to appearance change related to religious practice
In interview, prisoners spoke about being treated differently by staff because of their religion. This was particularly marked in relation to Islam. Practices which were deemed to be atypical of an inmate were sometimes misconstrued by officers as examples of radicalisation – examples of these practices include new converts to the religion growing beards:

Mike: … being radical now, can be just down to how you look and that is strange. I’m supposed to grow a beard. It’s what they call ‘Sunnah’. It’s what the Prophet, peace be upon him. It’s what he done; that is all it is. But now if I grew a [beard] I’d be seen as an extremist.

The impact of this perception inhibited some Muslim prisoners from practicing their religion fully:

Floyd … I’ve got inmates coming now, soon they’ll be scared to practice their religion because they’ll be labelled extremist

Floyd: for Muslims, in particular, we’re always walking on eggshells because of our religion. For instance even like a Jewish person is to grow a beard and they wear a hat and erm, I don’t know how many times they pray, but we pray five times a day, and, of course, we go to Friday prayers. And so, the things we do, which are the basis of our religion - why, is for the Prison Service, extreme? So, by me growing a beard and by me praying and reading the Qur’an and not swearing at people and not walking around with a cigarette in my hand and swearing at him and saying he’s a …. that is seen as extremism! … A lot of Muslims hide because of this and they are really worried about it and that’s the part I find upsetting because I know it’s to do with, erm it’s mainly to do with the media. It’s what people see in the media, so it’s like every Muslim is an extremist.

Prisoners indicated that the problem is made more difficult when other non-Muslim prisoners express an interest in Islam:

Floyd: another gentleman on this wing who said he just come up one day, not to me, to another Muslim guy and he said ‘I’ve been reading a lot about Islam and I’m really, really interested, I want to convert to Islam’. So my fellow inmate told him what he had to do, which was, all he had to do was declare that there’s only one God, so he did do that. So after he had got himself back, he was pulled in his cell by, I don’t know which officers, but by officers … and he was asked if he was on something. If he was alright. If he’s been pressured
Malcolm could you say a bit more about the worry, cos you said your group is worried. What is that worry?
Floyd     I’ll give you a for instance - a guy who could be coming out in months time or six months time, if he has these written in his file, that he’s all of a sudden he’s praying and he’s growing a beard, but they don’t like that, that he’s practicing his religion, they write he’s become extreme. So he’s worried know when he comes for parole and something. So what he does, instead of growing a beard, instead of praying with us, he stays in his cell and he doesn’t practice his religion because he is so scared. I mean someone like me, I’m not afraid of that, I mean, I’m serving, I’m a long termer, but never the less, I wouldn’t let that scare me because, what I would think, even though it’s not true, what I think is you have to have proof to say that I’ve become an extremist. You have to have someone saying it that I’m preaching hate or you must have heard me preach it. But I know you don’t have to hear me or hear someone say that I have, for you to write in my file which is what happens. But that doesn’t scare me so much. But it scares a lot of other inmates, especially ones that are going home soon, and it’s been happening recently. One’s almost released, all of a sudden they’ve summoned the RAM board and they like, yeah, erm, we hear you’ve become extreme, we hear your becoming extremist and the reason for it normally is because, it’s written in the news paper. I’ve forgotten which paper it was, if it was inside the Time - what officers should look out for, for inmates becoming extreme, what they should look out for - and it mentioned they should look out for them growing a beard, them praying and wearing Muslim clothes and I thought to myself that’s a part of the religion, so you might as well call us all extremists and that’s major problem in every gaol I’ve been to … and here - that’s the only problems I’ve had, is to do with the, my religion. Not even to do with my colour anymore, it’s to do with my religion.

This issue clearly has resonance given the concerns raised by the recent Brandon (2009) report about the potential radicalisation of Muslims within UK prisons. This quote echoes concerns raised in the report that, amongst other factors, instances of racism and discrimination by prison staff towards prisoners, could contribute to pushing Muslim prisoners towards radicalisation. This is an issue that clearly requires further investigation as part of the wider full prison study.

Action point

Initial and ongoing specialised staff training to enable staff to understand and interpret Islamic religious codes and practices.

5.5.2b Ensuring that all members of all religions feel that they are treated equally
Although the survey indicated that overall 57.7% of prisoners rated the arrangements for religious festivals as either effective or very effective, when this figure was broken down by individual religious groups it was clear that prisoners from some religious groups rated the arrangements for their festivals as less effective
(see table 9 below). This was particularly the case for the two Buddhist respondents who rated the arrangements as 'neither effective nor ineffective' or as 'not effective'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Not effective</th>
<th>Very ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pagan</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: What works well now: Arrangements for celebrating religious festivals

However, 33.3% of Christians also rated the arrangements as not effective and one Muslim prisoner rated the arrangements as very ineffective. From the interview data it was evident that tensions centred mainly on the perceived equity of resource allocations for funding such events.

A further issue of concern related to the change in canteen provider, which prisoners experienced as leading to a reduction and restriction in the range of religious artefacts available for them to purchase. This was voiced by some prisoners as restricting their ability to practice their religion effectively:

Mike: I’d say treat us all the same. So for example on a Saturday morning people go to church service. They go to church service, come back on the Wing. They get a rub down as they go off the Wing and wanded. Everyone gets that when you leave the wing. Erm so treat us the same. But, how it is when we go to Muslim service... we go down when the prisoners [are] locked up in the afternoon. So we get a rub down, wanded, we walk through to the gym. As we leave, we get rubbed down [and] wanded again. Last week we got into that sterile area. There they’ve searched and wanded us again, and I’d never have said anything, but I was fuming. And it was the first time I was really angry and I said ‘Gov, I’m not being funny. We’ve just had, we’ve walked through the gym, you know.’ And he went ‘Yeah, it’s just random’. I said ‘How can it be random, when it’s only Muslims coming back’? And they would not do that to people coming back from Church. Now I don’t see people coming back from church as any different from me, but what I do see is staff treat us differently.

A further issue was an expressed general disquiet relating to the perceived preferential treatment of some prisoners over others. The most common expression of this in the interviews related to the perceived preferential treatment of Muslim prisoners, as articulated below by Chris:

Chris: …being treat same as other prisoners, not, for Muslims... to be treat same as like English lads. There’s no difference across board, but there clearly is, erm, it does piss people off. It’s, just like Friday prayers for Muslims. Every other faith in prison is through their normal working routine and just like, I’m down as Buddhist, my daughters a Pagan and that’s their choice and we’re like pushed into like that particular morning. But like, on a Friday like, your Muslims, after lock up right, after lock up, which is very strange as well, with the sort of climate we are in. They are unlocked, they are taken down to Education block, right, and over that like hour and half period of bang up, that’s when they have their service, when prisoners are basically at their most vulnerable cos it’s got less staff in as well. So you’ve got like a big concentration of inmates together, not cos they are Muslims, but just inmate together and they are having it in that time period and a lot of lads are really pissed off about it, because it even effects them, not just mentally, it effects them physically, cos a lot of lads, especially older end will get their heads down in afternoon whatever, for an hour and half and they are coming back and doors are opening and you know
what that’s like. But when you’re in a cell it’s louder if you know what I mean, if it’s quiet and a door opens and a door slams you know about it.

However, disquiet was also expressed in relation to perceived preferential treatment of Minority Ethnic prisoners in contrast to White prisoners. The quote below from Patrick suggests that one potential reason for the inequity is a fear of being perceived as ‘racist’:

Patrick There seems to be a, erm, an innate fear in this place of being accused of racialism or discrimination. Like I was in the library a couple of weeks ago and we have Latvian and Romanian and they came in demanding, they’re wanting Romanian music, Romanian books, Romanian this, that and the next thing, and became quite vociferous, unpleasant about it and then the Latvian started shouting out “discrimination, discrimination” and when you try to explain that, ‘oh I don’t understand’, which then makes the indigenous population ‘ho yes here we go again’ and then we get people erm, someone wanted to have books on parsley I think it was and there’s another guy in here who’s British Asian I think, winding this new inmate up saying “it’s your right, you must tell them, they must do it, you must have it, it is your right” and that sort of thing goes on.

As we indicated in relation to concerns about race earlier it is not the purpose of the research to verify the veracity of such concerns, but we note that the perception of such inequity can be as damaging to the balance of relations on the wing, as any actuality.

### Action point

To counteract suspicions and jealousies within the prison population that certain groups receive preferential treatment, a transparent system of accountability needs to be further developed. This may require national advice and guidance.

---

**5.6 Disabled and Older Prisoners**

In this section we address issues in relation to both disabled and older prisoners. In many ways our justification for addressing these groups together is that they seem to be grouped together in terms of the practical response of the prison. Indeed many elements of policy and procedure for the two groups appear to overlap, for example, in relation to ‘core unlock’. As people age they become more likely to be disabled in one way or another, but many older people are not disabled. Similarly many disabled people are not in the older prisoner grouping, they can be of any age. We mentioned above that it is important for the prison to have a clear overview of both the profile of the older population and those with disabilities within the prison. This will enable a clearer strategy to be developed in relation to these two groups of prisoners. In the material that follows we provide examples of good practice and practice that needs improving, but it is worthy of note here that some prisoners pointed to specific types of bullying and harassment that disabled people experience. This may be an area for further investigation.

### Action point needed

Develop a clear overview of both the profile of the older population and those with disabilities as distinct groups within the prisoner population

---

**5.6.1 Best Practice**

In relation to daily life on the Wing, prison staff pointed to the special facilities and services available to physically disabled prisoners:
W: The less able prisoners, or disabled prisoners, whichever terminology people want to use. We’ve got facilities on B Wing now that can cater for some quite severe, amputees etc. and we’ve got prisoners now that’s designated as carers that can take their meals, give them a hand to clean their cells and things like that, and I think that it’s good to see.

Malcolm: Can you give me an example of that working really well?

W: We saw it when we give us meals out on a night, and we’ve got lads taking the trays and meals to their door. It’s room service basically, which we offer and they’ve got spacious cells with the en suite facility as well, so they’re not having to suffer the indignities of going to the normal shower location and undressing with just one leg or arm. So they’re not getting ridiculed by other prisoners.

5.6.1a Benefits of a dedicated Disability Liaison Team

It is interesting to note in the above quotation that officers were a little unsure as to what the appropriate terminology was in speaking of this group of prisoners. However, officers also pointed to the help that they receive from the Prison disability team. This team is an invaluable source of information to them both in relation to health related issues and practical adaptations:

W(1): With disability, now, we’ve got a disability team here who deal with it day in day out. I think that’s good practice we’ve got at Wakefield.

Malcolm: How does that work?

W(1): If we have a problem and we don’t know what to do we can speak to someone who does know what they’re doing and it’s like we’ve got an officer who’s an ex-nurse and works in Health Care environment, obviously her knowledge can come and help us no end.

W(2): They’ve got the contacts as well for adaptation needs, things like this. So that’s a resource really for us that we can tap into and utilise to make their quality of life a bit better.

5.6.1b Adaptations across functional areas to accommodate elderly and disabled prisoners

It was also clear that proactive arrangements to accommodate the needs of disabled prisoners were made within a range of functional areas. The quote below illustrates preparations in readiness for managing and running groupwork programmes:

F: Just down to what colour pens that we’d use. If people had visual impairments, we would be careful about what pens we wrote on flip charts with, when we were delivering the programmes.

F: Going back to groups again; my recent Foundation course, an offender was identified in his sentence plan to do the programme, but he’s partially blind, which makes it very difficult to attend groups if you can’t see all the information. So … one of the facilitators actually went through all the material and printed out everything in large print, just for that offender. But because we’ve got that now and we’ve adapted the material for him, we can then, other offenders who are partially blind, we’ve got facilities now and the material ready for them.

The area where disability and ageing overlap most noticeably is in relation to physical ability; as people age some become less mobile. One of the workers from the functional staff group spoke of how arrangements were made to enable older prisoners to attend sentence planning meetings:

F: The main thing that springs to mind really from our area is not something that perhaps we would initiate, but it happens within the function, in terms of sentence planning meetings, and if someone’s highlighted as having a disability or being over 60. Most sentence planning meetings are facilitated in a room that’s actually up two flights of stairs, so when the people who organise the sentence planning meetings do them, they check out whether someone can access that room or whether it would need to be moved to a room that’s accessible for someone who’s perhaps got problems with walking or is in a wheelchair, who can’t get to the room.
5.6.1c  **Specific social activities for the over 60s**

Older prisoners comments during the interviews indicated that the mechanisms put in place by the prison in relation to social activities such as the Over 60s group, were experienced positively:

**Victoria:** Do you like the over 60s meeting? Do you find it useful?

**Oliver:** Oh yeah! Because twenty people different. People different talk. I like quiet people. I like talk nice people. I don’t like shouting no, no, no. If shouting, I not go. I go somewhere, I have chapel, over 60, five people sit same table and play domino – all together, drink tea, coffee and talking, very nice. I like it yes!

This quotation highlights what may be an increasing environmental challenge for the Prison service more widely: providing secure accommodation for prisoners across the age range who have very different requirements for what they consider to be a reasonable living environment.

5.6.1d  **Action taken to protect older and disabled prisoners**

We mentioned above that older and disabled prisoners are vulnerable to bullying and exploitation by other prisoners. In the example that follows, Edward describes such a situation and how both officers and other prisoners combined to prevent the situation from continuing:

**Edward:** They get reported, either the person that’s getting ill-treated reports it or somebody that’s seen it reports it. People get moved.

**Victoria:** Can you give me a story about that without identifying anybody?

**Edward:** Well you got a man at the end here. He’s in a wheelchair, an electric wheelchair. He’s got one arm, one leg; there’s a lot of people take the Mickey out of him. He comes out, not his fault, erm but they take the Mickey out of him. It’s quietened down a lot, but when new people come in first they take the Mick out of him and things like this

**Victoria:** Are you talking about cons, are you? Taking the Mickey?

**Edward:** Cons, yeah! Other cons, when they first come here, one or two take the Mickey out of him. But somebody sees to them and it stops.

**Victoria:** You mean an officer speaks to them?

**Edward:** Either an officer or a con. I mean, two or three guys who – I got a blind man, couple of doors from me. I used to be his carer, but I cannot do it now myself. Erm, people used to try and take advantage of him, I spoke to a couple of people and said ‘No you don’t do this’ and they left him alone.

5.6.2  **Practice in need of improvement**

5.6.2a  **Responding to uncommon or infrequent disabilities**

In relation to practice that needs improvement prisoners highlighted that specific needs related to an uncommon disability (such as blindness or deafness, rather than partial sight or hearing loss) were often overlooked and prisoners in these groups felt excluded and unprotected, as this initial quote from Norman, illustrates:

**Norman**  Erm, I am really frightened to leave my cell unless it is absolutely essential to do so. So I end up spending twenty or twenty three hours a day in my cell

**Malcolm**  What is the basis of your fear? Where does it come from?

**Norman**  Erm, just people bumping into me or erm me walking into people. I was sworn at on one occasion err for not looking where I was going (laughs slightly) and erm yes it’s just I suppose it’s the indifference that most of the inmates to my situation that they don’t understand. You know they run around and err jostle each other and erm its difficult to say the least for me to try to push my way through this sort of a thrall and I just prefer not to do so.
5.6.2b Access to external healthcare

A further issue to be highlighted were the waiting times that older prisoners experience in relation to healthcare. Wesley was particularly concerned about this matter:

**Wesley:** How I see some of these elderly people in here, they are not getting the treatment that they should get because sometimes they put down for a doctor and you maybe wait two or three weeks before you get to see a doctor, for them to give you a prescription for treatment you’re supposed to get– right? I would really like to see more done about it.

This situation did not refer only to access to internal health care services but also access to external, specialist services, as the continuing quote from Wesley illustrates:

**Wesley** well I have a bad experience full stop. I had a slipped disc and I had a problem with that. The Dr. made appointment to go to outside hospital. The first appointment, they was fifteen minute late for the Dr. - start to take details and writing down reports. Then the second appointment they was fifteen minutes late again, so the Dr. let that go, but the third appointment they was completely late, so, I didn’t get to get my treatment, so it was cancelled. The Dr. didn’t see me after that.

**Malcolm** and you were late because you were not taken over in time is that what it was?

---

**Action point**

Monitor the processes whereby prisoners are referred to Health Care; how long they have to wait before being seen and how frequently escort arrangements prevent them from keeping appointments. It may be that this is a Primary Care trust responsibility.

5.7 Sexualities

Sexualities are a complex area. Generally we are speaking about issues in relation to a person’s sexual (and/or gender) orientation and how they feel that they are treated in Wakefield. However, because many prisoners in the gaol are convicted of sexual offences, sometimes this becomes a focus in social/personal interactions. As with the other areas considered in this chapter our focus is both on prisoner and staff relationships, but also on prisoner and prisoner relationships.

5.7.1 Best Practice

5.7.1a Effectiveness of the Gay Offender Representative role

As mentioned earlier in this report Wakefield has a system of prisoner representation that includes gay representatives on each Wing. In the Wing Staff focus group, staff were impressed that the prison could establish such an initiative:

**W:** Gay reps. I don’t think you ever get that tolerated in any other prison bar this one. It’s the first time I’ve … When I come from another prison to this one, I couldn’t believe it, that they had a rep for it and actually facilitate for him and things like that.

Additionally, they considered that the system fulfilled an important role in Wing life:

**Malcolm:** Does it work?

**W(1):** I don’t know if it works, but I think they have confidence enough to do it and people go and speak to him about things.

**W(2):** I think it does work. We’ve got the GALIPS reps through the Prison Service and they’re supported well through there and you’ve got a gay rep on each Wing so they’re utilised as a support mechanism on each of the Wings and like[anonymised] said, I don’t think that would be tolerated in most establishments.
The gay representative for the wing provided additional insight into how the role helped in the day-to-day life of the Wing. However to include that quote and provide his pseudonym would make his comments in other areas of the report highly identifiable. Therefore, we provide the quotation below without his pseudonym:

*I’m the gay rep on the wing. Erm, I’ve got officer come to me and say ‘Look this is what’s happened on the Wing. This has been reported. What do we need to do?’ You know, so that’s nice that officers are engaging with inmates who are reps and kind of saying ‘What would you do in this situation?’ You know, sometimes, it’s as easy as just saying ‘Well, I’ll go and speak to them and then you know what’s happened.’ You know or you get the officer, where they will say ‘If you’re going to speak to them, do you mind it we come along to see how its run?’ You know. … There’s a certain officer on today, he got, erm he didn’t get a package sent. An inmate on Remand Unit got a package sent in with all gay materials in, and this inmate took offence to that. And this officer said ‘Leave it with me. If I can take it, we have a gay rep on our Wing. Do you mind if I pass details onto him?’ And the officer called me down and he said ‘Don’t think I’m being funny, I know it’s your first couple of days in the role as gay rep, but an inmate has been given this – he doesn’t want it, but don’t think I’m being funny. And I said to the officer ‘In a way, I appreciate that you’ve had the decency to say to the inmate, ‘we’ll take it off you, we’ll pass it to the gay rep and he will do what he feels necessary with it.’ I said I don’t think you are being funny. I said in a way, I’m grateful for you doing that. ….  

5.7.1b Gay Offender Forum

As records of prisoners’ sexuality are not kept it was not possible to identify sexuality in the sample of prisoners we recruited for interview. Also, perhaps unsurprisingly, none of the prisoners interviewed volunteered information about their sexuality. However, the survey did ask respondents to indicate their sexuality. Of the 31 respondents, 3 prisoners identified as homosexual, 23 as heterosexual, 2 as bi-sexual and 1 respondent preferred not to answer. Clearly working with such small numbers it is not possible to claim in any way that the responses are representative of non-heterosexual prisoners across the wing. However, they do offer some important context to some of the mechanisms put in place by the prison to support gay, bisexual and transgender/transsexual prisoners. Analysis of the survey questions which related to sexuality illustrated that the Gay Offender Forum and the Prisoner Representative for Gay Prisoners were both generally perceived to be effective mechanisms for prisoners who were not heterosexual. The pattern of responses for both practices was identical, with both bisexual prisoners and one of the three homosexual prisoners rating the practices as very effective. Of the remaining homosexual prisoners, one rated both practices as neither effective nor ineffective and one declined to answer.

5.7.2 Practice in need of improvement

Three areas were highlighted as being in need of improvement - the investigation of allegations of homophobia, working sensitively to the needs of transgender prisoners and the general treatment of prisoners in relation to their sexuality.

5.7.1a Investigating allegations of homophobia

As we have indicated earlier in this section, prisoners participating in the interviews did not identify themselves with any of the non-heterosexual sexualities, but two prisoners did speak about the impact of homophobia, suggesting that this was not taken as seriously as it might be:

Malcolm: ... if you had an issue and you felt you were being treated unfairly, have you ever reported?
Heath: I have done, I mean, I got. I mean I had one back today. Again this was an officer. Apparently, they investigated it and again it came back and said ‘Cannot find any evidence to support it’. 
Malcolm: What was the nature of the unfairness you felt you had experienced?
Heath: Well, homosexual, homosexual comments.
Malcolm: So homophobia?
Heath: Well homophobia. Erm and this was reported not only by me, but by another offender as I said, erm but it still came back as erm...

The investigation of discriminatory and harmful behaviours based on a person’s identity is clearly an issue that crosses many of the diversity areas discussed in this chapter, and whilst we are not expressing any views on individual cases, there is an issue that requires further exploration if the confidence in the prison systems is to be improved. Our earlier action point regarding the proposed development of a Diversity Incident Reporting Form is one possible response. We also recognise that some of the processes guiding investigation may be nationally improved, but we suggest that consideration of other means of resolving disputes should be considered and developed. In the present research, both prisoners and staff have spoken positively about the effectiveness of mediatory, rather than adversarial means of dispute resolution. For example, Wing staff pointed to the benefits of using Prisoner representatives to mediate in difficult situations and some prisoners (see 5.2.1d). Similarly some prisoners spoke of preferring a non-written way of resolving difficult issues (see 5.3.2b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explore the potential for developing ‘mediatory’ rather than ‘adversarial’ methods of dispute resolution. This may need raising at a national level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.7.1b Responding sensitively to the needs of transgender/transsexual prisoners

Wing staff very clearly expressed their confusion and uncertainty in dealing with prisoners who are considering or engaged in the process of gender re-assignment:

W(1): We’ve had it with sexuality....
W(3) .....On that issue which I’ve had personal dealings with for four years now and I’m still asking for guidelines from senior management as to how we do ... so we’re wanting guidelines put in place from higher up the managerial ladder and none’s coming so we’re just in a no win situation.

What appears to be required here is much clearer guidance in relation to this specific group of prisoners. This is an issue which requires not only policy and procedural guidance but also training to help staff undertake their work in relation to security, both effectively and sensitively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific (national and local) guidance is issued in relation to the treatment, including searching, of transgender prisoners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.7.1c Unnecessary highlighting of sexuality

This broader issue of responding to prisoners in ways which do not unnecessarily highlight sexual issues is clearly an important issue in a prison with a population like Wakefield’s. Patrick gives an example practice that appears to be designed to humiliate the prisoner through using sexual references:

Patrick: well being so afraid of the staff I’ve always been reluctant to what they call engage with them, if you like, because I don’t want to be mocked, cos that’s what I felt like when I first went in erm and some hurtful things have been said, which they might have thought was amusing and not only has it been said to me, officer to me as an inmate, but the officers have said to me in front of other inmates and other officers including female officers.
Victoria: Could you give me an example if it’s not too sensitive an issue. If it is that’s fine.
Patrick: Oh well it wasn’t that, how can I put it, one of the occasions the officer said ‘oh by the way your
masturbation magazine has just arrived’, and these magazines don’t exist anyway and the officer was sitting there and the female officer was sitting there and I was called back to have this jibe thrown at me, because they know they scare me anyway, erm and I felt particularly hurt and aggrieved by that. But erm fortunately erm, those prisoners who were waiting to collect their medication or to go have an exercise were more sympathetic towards me than enjoying what members of staff were saying to me.

Victoria: Okay and did you feel you were able to report that incident
Patrick: Afraid to
Victoria: Afraid to okay
Patrick: Cos here you see we are, we can fear that the retribution that can come upon us, erm is far greater than anything that could be done to stop it,
Victoria: Right okay
Patrick: But my answer or my reaction to it and my treatment of it is, where possible, I can ignore that officer and walk passed him as if he doesn’t exist.
Victoria: Okay and is that, is it a common experience or if there are officers who behave differently?
Patrick: Other officers in the past have said it and said other rude things. Erm you see I don’t swear, I’ve never sworn erm, and someone joking like to hear me swear and as to use a prison expression ‘to kick off’ sometime and they do like to get me to say things, but I wouldn’t, so that’s the sort of thing that’s gone on.

Clearly this practice is hard to identify and very difficult to report. It may be that this is an area that requires further investigation.

Summary
This chapter has been concerned with discovering both best practice and practice in need of improvement. It has used evidence from interviews, the survey and the staff focus groups. It has considered in turn: issues common to all diversity strands, race and ethnicities, foreign and dual nationality prisoners, faith, disabled and older prisoners and sexualities. Moving on from discovery, the next chapter considers ways of improving matters in relation to diversity practice by looking at ways of designing and sustaining an improved ideal world.
CHAPTER SIX: DREAMING, DESIGNING AND DESTINY: WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE TO IMPROVE WAKEFIELD’S RESPONSE TO DIVERSITY

6.1 Introduction
The previous chapter was structured around specific aspects of diversity and it highlighted examples of good practice and areas where practice and provision need to be improved. In this chapter we present the ideas of prisoners and prison staff about how good practice can be sustained and how improvements in practices can be supported and developed. An interesting feature of our contact with all groups was that everyone gave time and thought to how life in the prison can be improved. However, unlike the previous chapter we are not structuring the presentation of findings around individual dimensions of diversity, we have decided to present the material in this section using the final three phases of Appreciative Inquiry – dreaming, designing and destiny. We have made this decision because many of the elements in each of these phases are common to all of the aspects of diversity.

6.2 Dreaming
Dreaming involves thinking about how things can be different in an ideal world. Asking people to think about an ideal world allows them to look beyond the constraints of everyday life in the prison and to imagine how things could be better. We did not define an ideal world and we did not ask any of our research respondents to define their ideal world. However, we suggested that the ideal world was a place where people could feel as respected and fairly treated as each other. In the interviews that we conducted we asked prisoners to identify aspects of an ideal world in prison, we asked them what their ideal dream of prison life would be. From the responses to these questions we created a list of elements that could be part of an ideal world. In the survey we asked respondents to rate the importance of these ideal world elements. From all of our data sources it was clear that there were three consistently mentioned features of the ideal world: equal treatment, personal safety and respectful communication. We will now address each of these items in turn. This section concludes by considering the barriers to implementing change and ways of overcoming these barriers.

6.2.1 Equal Treatment
Equality of treatment as a key element of the ‘ideal world’ was an issue raised by everyone interviewed or participating in a focus group. Their comments consequently generated four items referring to issues of equality in the prisoner survey; - Everyone would have equal opportunities, Prisoners would have equal access to religious documents/items, There would be equal access to extras – feasts and festivals and There would be more activities where everyone can get involved. The vast majority of survey respondents considered all of these statements to be of importance, as Table 10 below illustrates.

Interview and focus group participants also pointed out problems in achieving equality of treatment; problems relating to defining what equality means, how it is measured and the personal context in which it is delivered. In thinking about what equal treatment means respondents highlighted two different but interlinked elements: (i) the equal allocation of material resources as this quote from Joe illustrates:

Joe
If there’s a rule for one person it should be the same rule for everybody else. So, if they let you have a handkerchief, everybody else should be able to have a handkerchief. If it’s your religion to have some beads and it’s another person’s religion that they don’t have them beads, but they would like them, they should be allowed. There shouldn’t be any problems, it should be an equal playing field.
and (ii) equal demonstrations of personal respect, reflected in this quote from Terrel:

**Terrel** You know, we should be treated all with dignity, all with respect. But at the same time you have to earn that. It’s not just something that you are just going to be given a card and there’s your respect, there’s your... you know what I mean. You have to earn that. So again in an ideal world everyone within the system, prisoner and officer alike should be treating each other with that cordiality and fairness;

The first of these two elements includes immediate goods to enable a person to live satisfactorily from day to day, but also includes the allocation of benefits within the prison system – such as allocation to jobs and classifications which enable prisoners to progress ‘through the system’. The second element relates to interpersonal processes – how prisoners and staff relate to each other. These processes often underpin the outcomes of the first element. We return to the process issues below, when we consider ‘respectful communication’.

### 6.2.2 Personal safety

An experience that all minority diversity groups share, regardless of their location in the social world, is hostility from the dominant grouping. This is well documented in relation to issues of race, religion, and sexuality but additionally, as the recent HMCIP Thematic reviews on Older Prisoners (see HMCIP, 2004) and Disabled Prisoners (HMCIP, 2009a) has shown, these groups can also feel unsafe and intimidated in prison. Given the issues reported in the previous chapter, where data from the survey indicated that a small number of prisoners (16.5%) felt unsafe on the wing and a substantial minority of prisoners (29%) reported neither feeling safe nor feeling unsafe, it is not surprising that issues relating to personal safety rate highly in the ideal world. Two items from the survey are particularly relevant to this issue: Prisoners and staff would feel safe on the wing and There would be better information about what to do if you were being bullied. All but one prisoner rated these issues as being of importance, with the vast majority rating them as very important (72.4%) or important (24.1%). To emphasise the point, we note the words of Garry:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Very important %</th>
<th>Very important No</th>
<th>Important %</th>
<th>Important No</th>
<th>Neither important nor unimportant %</th>
<th>Neither important nor unimportant No</th>
<th>Not important %</th>
<th>Not important No</th>
<th>Very unimportant %</th>
<th>Very unimportant No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyone would have equal opportunities</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoners would have equal access to religious documents/items</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There would be equal access to ‘extras’ – like feasts and festivals</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There would be more activities where everyone can get involved</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 10: Prisoners responses to survey items about equality**
Garry: When life is at its best here at Wakefield you, things run smoothly. Erm, you know, you feel safer on the landings, erm and you know the staff is there, erm you know, you kind of feel comfortable talking to people, you know? Staff are approachable.

A key element in a safe environment that Garry highlights is communications with staff; this is the final element of the ideal world that we discuss in this section.

6.2.3 Respectful communication

Communication can take a range of forms: written, spoken or non-verbal. It may involve a combination of the forms – particularly the spoken and the non-verbal. The way in which a message is communicated can reinforce or negate the words of the message (for example saying ‘I am here to help’ may be reinforced with eye contact and appropriate body language, alternatively it can be undermined if it is said whilst looking away from the person being spoken to, or perhaps grinning to other people nearby). In respectful communication, positive and engaged statements are backed up by congruent body language, and sometimes non-verbal communication can set the tone for the subsequent verbal encounter, as these quotes from prisoners illustrate:

Malcolm: How would you know that [respectful communication] was happening - if you got this - you know?
Norman: Erm, one I think I would be able to tell by the tone of the officer’s voice and the way he was speaking and what he was saying to me.

Garry: Respect is treat people how you like to be treated, you know, not any different erm, you know. I go round the wing and I treat everybody how I like to be treated. If they’ve got a problem with that, that is their problem it’s not mine and I think as well, that is what officers should do. Erm rather than say ‘well you know I’ve TOLD you to do this’, or ‘GET this done’, if they said to you, ‘I asked you to do this you haven’t done it can we sit down and discuss why it’s not been done’. It makes them more likely to speak to you, rather than being backed into that corner.

Patrick: Some officers will shout into the machine, I mean, it’s like a railway station. They only have to speak into it and we can all hear erm, so I think that could be looked at, but there has to be more of a public relate because they are dealing with people.

Good communication is developed through social relationships. Again items in the survey, which arose from the interviews point to what is needed in the ideal world. Respondents were asked to rate the importance of the following statements on a five-point scale rating from ‘very important’ to ‘very unimportant’:

In an ideal world:

- I would feel able to ask [each of the identified] Staff for help
- Confident to talk to [each of the identified] staff about problems
- [Each of the identified] staff would not treat me differently because of my faith
- [Each of the identified] staff understanding with prisoners’ frustration about unresolved problems
- [Each of the identified] staff would not judge me by my offence
- Prisoners and [each of the identified] staff would help one another
- [Each of the identified] staff and prisoners would stick to the rules
- I would feel confident that [each of the identified] staff would give me good advice
- [Each of the identified] staff/prisoners treat each other as they’d expect to be treated
- [Each of the identified] staff have greater understanding of the needs of prisoners with disabilities/disabled prisoners
- [Each of the identified] staff willing to work with all prisoners even challenging ones
On the advice of the Prisoner Advisory Group (PAG), which was also supported by the project Steering Group (SG), we developed the survey to enable prisoners to differentiate between specifically identified staff groupings when reflecting on their ideal relationships. The identified staff groupings agreed with the PAG and the SG were: Wing, Work, Gym, Assessments, Interventions and Courses (AIC), Chaplaincy, Probation, Education, Healthcare, and Segregation. Respondents were also given an option to identify other staff groupings they wished to rate.

Surprisingly, there were only slight variations in response rate according to which staff grouping was being assessed. What was of greater significance was that the vast majority of all prisoners rated all of the above items as being of importance in their ideal world (Appendix 4 contains a table identifying the top and bottom two staff groups for each statement). Although, the survey findings are too few in number to be representative of the Wing or the wider prison population, they do provide indications of what aspects of prisoner-staff relationships might be important in an ideal world, and these in turn suggest areas for improvement in the real world.

During the focus groups staff also spoke of respectful communication as part of their ideal world, as this quote from a member of the functional staff focus group illustrates:

F: That you are polite with each other, that you interact equally, like you let them speak, they’ll let you speak. You’re not there to offend either person. I guess if you’re working with offenders then they’ve got to understand your boundaries and where they lie and they need to understand their boundaries as well. But just, I understand that we work with people that are here for a particular reason, but taking that person as you find them as well I think, respecting people for the fact that they are people. Just being about individual differences I think.

For wing staff what constituted respectful communication differed, with some staff identifying a more informal approach as desirable and others indicating that the need for discipline and boundaries may prevent that, as this exchange shows:

Victoria: Let me just take you back to this question about relationships, what would your ideal relationship with a prisoner be like on B wing, what kind of relationship do you want staff and prisoners to have?
W(1): Banter
Victoria: So there’d be banter in it.
W(2): Quiet and respectful.
Victoria: Quiet and respectful?
W(3): Disciplined
Victoria: What do you mean by disciplined?
W(4): Where they don’t get too familiar, know their boundaries.
W(5): You know you say you want banter, I wouldn’t want it like that me, I want it like me, I want more…
Victoria: Banter, but they know how far they can go.
Victoria: So boundaries are very important?

The world that prisoners and staff dreamt of was characterised by equal treatment of all groups. It was safe for both staff and prisoners, and all people in prison communicated to each other in a way that was engaged and respectful. It allowed the speaker to be heard and understood and similarly it allowed responses to be respectfully listened to. Given some of the results presented in the previous chapter designing this world may help to improve life for all parties in the prison.

6.3 Designing
Designing is concerned with finding ways to make the dream become a reality. It involves thinking about what is needed to make the dream real, identifying obstacles to achieving the dream and particularly, it
requires imaginative thinking to find ways of overcoming the obstacles. From the previous section it is clear that prisoners did not indulge in wild dreaming of a prison without bars (security), a regime without rules (good order), or a system that privileged individual preferences over group stability (good order). These issues were of central importance in their vision. Similarly prison staff from the wing and from the various functions ensured that their dreams were linked in some way to their current experience. They did not seek to re-write their work environment merely to restructure and rephrase parts of it.

In considering how our research respondents, staff and prisoners, struggled with designing a changed environment, we will again consider in turn, equal treatment, personal safety and respectful communication. In many ways these areas overlap but for the sake of clarity we will try to maintain the boundaries between them and note how issues may cross over to other areas.

6.3.1 Equal treatment
In the context of responding to the needs of different and diverse groups of prisoners the concept of equality needs further examination. Above we suggested that two distinct elements relating to ‘equal treatment’ emerged from this research – a material element and an interpersonal element.

6.3.1a Equality and the allocation of resources
In relation to the allocation of material resources there is not only a need to define what equality is but also to be able to display it in action. As the previous chapter has shown, this is most clearly noted in the allocation of resources to different religions/faiths and in relation to the cost of reasonable adjustments for disabled prisoners, as this quote from Norman highlights:

Norman: Erm, so it is very difficult and expensive for the prison service to make huge changes to accommodate [people with severe visual impairments] when they are only doing it for the odd person here and there, erm, and I can give an example. I keep going to Education here and then I have to keep stopping, because the Education Department either seems unwilling or incapable of supplying me with material in large print. They, they seem to start off very well, I can sit down and they have enlarged the print on the first few lessons and then after maybe a month, err, this becomes patchy and eventually it is withdrawn altogether erm and I am more or less told that erm I can’t be treated differently to other people erm and so I give up the education course.

In the previous chapter perceptions of preferential treatment to prisoners of the Muslim faith were noted. The following quotation from John highlights issues that are of importance in designing a transparent and fair system for the allocation of resources:

John: Everybody would be treated correctly and that includes religious festivals and things like that. It’s very important. We have our St Patricks day, we want to share with others if they want to and we’ve told them. So we’re not saying, he’s a Muslim or he’s Black he can’t have it, he’s orthodox and all this. Share it if they want to share. We’ll share it, and what we want to see is, we all get treated equal. So, when the Muslims have their day, have their feast, Ramadan, they have their feast. When it comes to Irish St Patrick’s day they should let them have it. And they can’t spend the equal amount of money because obviously there’s is a lot more Muslims than what there is Irish, but at least have the food is good quality.

Whilst he points to the issue that all faiths cannot be given the same allocation of resources (some have more followers than others), his quotation also raises a more problematic issue: the boundary between faith and nationality. In his quotation, he clearly identifies St Patrick’s Day as an Irish feast. Without wishing to become enmeshed in the troubled relationship between faith, culture and nationality in Ireland, the issue of cultural events such as national celebrations or religious celebrations is one that may need further exploration and clarification to ensure that some groups of prisoners do not feel unequally treated because of an aspect of their identity. A seeming positive resolution of this matter has been managed by the prison in relation to Rastafarianism:
Terrel: The best experiences for me personally in regards to my ethnicity and my beliefs, my culture, is the introduction of the Rastafarian meetings that we now have twice a month. When I first came here that wasn’t happening, so we wrote to the Governor expressing our concern that we weren’t able to practice our culture, our faith, our belief in Rastafarianism. In reply to that they said ‘OK, we can set aside a day for you lot to go down to the chapel and practice your beliefs.’ So for me that was a big step that something positive whereas before it wasn’t happening in this prison.

The interface between culture and religion is complex and needs to be further clarified in designing an ideal world of equal treatment in this area.

6.3.1b Equality or Equity: the importance of defining equality in an ideal world

However, the difficulties in identifying what constituted equality and therefore how it might best be responded to did not pertain only to the relationship between culture and religion and were the subject of prolonged discussion in the staff focus groups. In response to a question about relationships with prisoners from different diversity groups the following exchange took place:

W(1): Why would they be different
W(2): Exactly the same.
Victoria: Ok, does it need to be different?
W(3): That’s the question. No.
W(1): Everyone’s treated equally.
Victoria: Is equally the same as ‘the same’?
W(3): No
W(4): But it’s not is it, we don’t treat everyone the same. Depends how they treat us, that’s what it all boils down to in the end. They come in my face then I’ll get shirty with them straight away.
W(3): You can’t treat everyone the same...
W(4): If they come and talk to me then I’ll sit down, talk to them, no problem.
W(5): Every member of staff treats every prisoner differently because you’ve got a relationship with them.
W(4): That’s down to personalities as opposed to, it’s human nature, [name]’s going to get on with somebody better than [name], [name]’s going to get on with somebody better than [name], it’s human nature. But you still give them what they’re entitled to, nothing more, nothing less. With regards to whether it’s somebody that comes under the diversity umbrella or not, you’d still give them what they’re entitled to, nothing more, nothing less.
Victoria: So it’s not the same, it’s about what they’re entitled to
W(3): Yeah
Victoria: So we treat everybody according to what they’re entitled to?
W(3): Yeah
W(4): But I think that falls down a bit because there is appeasement, I know it goes on.
W(1): It’s total appeasement.
W(5): There is appeasement when there needs to be.
Malcolm: Is appeasement important?
W(2): No it shouldn’t be should it?
W(5): It shouldn’t be but...

This exchange illustrates the complexity of definitions of equality and the difficulties that can be encountered in achieving it. The issue was also explored in the survey when prisoners were asked to rate how strongly they agreed with the statements; Wing staff would need to treat all prisoners equally and The prison should not treat people the same, but treat them according to their specific need. Analysis of the
items, illustrated in Table 11 below, revealed that an overwhelming majority (92.9%) of prisoners agreed or strongly agreed that in order to create and maintain a more respectful environment wing staff would need to treat all prisoners equally. However, when asked to rate a statement which suggested that individual need might determine what was equitable a rather different picture emerged. The level of prisoners strongly agreeing and agreeing both decreased, leaving 78.6% in agreement and the number of prisoners unsure (7.1%) or in disagreement (13.3%) increased.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wing staff would need to treat all prisoners equally</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The prison should not treat people the same, but treat them according to their specific need.</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Prisoners responses to statements about how to achieved equality in designing an ideal world

This changing picture perhaps illustrates the need for greater awareness raising regarding the complex needs of some diversity groups. This might be achieved through a further suggestion explored in the survey: To create and maintain a more respectful environment the prison could put on more events where prisoners can find out about diversity and how it affects people. Analysis of responses to this statement revealed that 75% of respondents agreed (21.4) or strongly agreed (53.6%) that events promoting awareness of the specific needs of those of different diversity groups would be a positive step forward. Indeed, only 1 respondent (3.2%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that this would be valuable. It would seem that there is already some scope to achieve this with the prisoner population, perhaps through the ‘Question Time’ events or through a second annual ‘Diversity week’ event.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consider making the Diversity Week a bi-annual event and encourage the diversity representatives to take an active role in advertising the workshops and events to prisoners on each wing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.1c Strategies for developing staff awareness of specific diversity issues

In terms of developing staff awareness, the wing and functional staff focus groups both indicated that this might be achieved through access to more specialised training, or perhaps through an away day event with a specialist guest speaker, as these quotes illustrate:

Malcolm: How would you link it into thinking about practices with diversities?
W(1): Incorporate maybe a bit of training, an hour or so discussing such diversity issues, give us a bit of feedback and knowledge from somebody that’s got the knowledge to give us.
W(2): You could even have the staff that’s trained do a 15 minute presentation on it.
(W1): Yeah, because it’s, they do put training events on, but it’s having the time to go and access them. But if the prison shut down, like they do on some days ,people do have that opportunity where they’re not detailed somewhere else or they can generally come and sit and listen and get involved.
**F(1):** Not even a shut down, but a departmental rather than shut down, then you’re not affecting the full prison but concentrating in specific areas, at least you would keep the daily run of the prison....

**F(2):** Even down to inviting the people who represent the disabilities or whatever it may be to the forums or whatever, to have a question and answer kind of group.

**F(3):** I think it would be a good idea to get the people who know, to either give personal experience or examples of scenarios of what’s happened, what can be done and what can be done and what change can do would be a good idea.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consider making provision for Wing based staff to have an annual away day event with guest speakers to discuss specific issues of concern regarding diversity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.3.1d Security re-categorisation

Another complex area that was highlighted in the previous chapter is the security re-categorisation of prisoners. This is being monitored by the prison and by prisoners, but it remains a serious area of discontent. Whilst the various decisions that are being made may be appropriate, there needs to be a way of independently accounting for these decisions that reassures minority ethnic prisoners that the reasons for so few being re-categorised are not racially motivated. Again this points to the need for clearer and more credible lines of communication.

### 6.3.1e Improving the nature and context of personal communication

Communication, particularly the nature and context of personal communication, is the other area that is highlighted as relevant in designing the ideal world. The interpersonal element of being treated equally relates to how members of staff relate to prisoners in both their general day-to-day activities and in relation to specific issues: it is the quality of the personal communication which is the essential feature here. The earlier quotation from the wing focus group discussing the difficulties in defining and achieving equality also has resonance here, showing insight into the process of communication – equal treatment is not something that is delivered by robots. People deliver it to people and this involves complex processes including attitudes and emotions on both sides of communications. Whilst there are, quite properly rules and procedures that outline ways to treat all prisoners fairly, the interpersonal dynamics affect how the treatment is delivered and received. Floyd recognises the complexity of this situation in the following quotation:

**Floyd:** ...with different inmates you have them worry about something. You could have this one worrying about his children, this one about his wife, this one about his mother, so there’s always something, especially when you’re an inmate, there’s always something, so you could be so sensitive and just ready to snap so I reckon. But, of course, officers are human beings and they can slip as well, so I think for us as well we should have patience as well and realise as well they can make mistakes as well one day. But if, of course you can tell the difference between one slip up, which I’ve had with one officer, which I think he’s a decent officer, and a continuous, you know, being rude to people. You can tell the difference right away, you know ...

### 6.3.1f Developing a consistent response to disrespectful practice

Part of the challenge in designing sensitivity and respectful conduct into a system is first to recognise and reward its presence and to identify and remedy its absence. In the cases of systematic disrespectful behaviour, it would appear the prisoners and probably staff, recognise the individual perpetrators. One issue raised by prisoners was the need to respond to such discrimination consistently, with 92.6% of prisoners indicating agreement (33.3%) or strong agreement (59.3%) that this would help to create and maintain a more respectful environment. A problem which therefore requires addressing is how to encourage such individuals to change. Prison staff take great pride in their professional skills in working with...
very difficult people – this pride and these skills may provide the means to nurture change and make disrespectful communication professionally unacceptable.

6.3.2 Personal Safety
In thinking of design issues relating to personal safety and diversity three key issues have emerged, so far, from the research: (i) members of diverse minority groupings are subject to threats and violence in the communities outside prison, so it is likely that such people will be targeted within prison, (ii) the majority of prisoners in Wakefield are convicted of sex offences – and as such will have a heightened awareness of personal threat and danger; (iii) threats to personal safety may be perceived to come from other prisoners or, on some occasions, members of staff. We will briefly consider the implications of the above issues when thinking about designing an ‘ideal’ world,

6.3.2a The benefits of a diverse staff group
To be aware of threats posed by racism, homophobia, ageism and disablism, generally requires either heightened informed awareness and/or personal experience. Although we were not able to obtain a profile of the ethnic make up of the staff of Wakefield prison, our observations lead us to conclude that it is mostly made up of White people. We have noticed some Asian and African-Caribbean staff members but they appear to be very few in number and not always working in direct contact with the prisoner population. This perception is shared by the minority ethnic prisoners that we spoke to. There are a number of issues linked to having a staff group that is predominantly White; one highlighted by a number of prisoners, including Floyd, is that they tend to share a particular worldview have no experience of other life-styles:

Floyd: It’s not cos we only have White officers, but it’s because of this now so you don’t feel comfortable around that and I think when people are around different groups of people they act in different ways. I think if there was 25% Muslim officers on this Wing, 25% Jewish, 25% Christian and 25% Pagan they would all have to respect for, how can I say it? for inmates religion, and inmates ethnicity and because you can’t hide it. I mean you’re not amongst each other anymore. I am against a Muslim officer, a Jewish officer, I can’t say anything against that Jewish prisoner, I can’t treat him any differently, this officer’s going to pick me up and report me.

For Floyd one of the important benefits in having a multi-racial, multi-faith staff group is that it inhibits the expressed prejudices of the dominant group. For Lucas this has a direct link to understanding personal safety issues for minority ethnic prisoners. He suggests that some White staff are unable to identify racism or understand its impact, whereas he believes that staff from ethnic minority groupings will understand these issues:

Lucas: ... I’ve been talking to one officer and erm, talking to some Asian officer and he said to ‘yeah it’s very racist down there’ and I was talking to some Black officer and he said ‘it’s very racist down there’ and I was talking to a White officer and he goes he doesn’t see any kind of racist action or anything like that. But the thing about it is - know what he’s talking about is overtly racist and you don’t see that - but it’s the subtle one that really hard to detect, knowing the underlying one, right? That’s what gets on everyone’s nerves

Some gay prisoners highlighted that it was difficult to successfully report homophobic abuse because the investigation did not appear to understand what is entailed. Understanding prejudice and hate directed at minority groupings is not easy if an individual is not a member of any of the groupings. Some prisoners recognised the difficulties and saw the need for training:

Mike: it’s hard for the... oh God! You see that’s the thing I do understand – things I can see which I never had for so many years when I was driven by addiction. ...It’s hard for them as well - I understand that, but at the same time I think more could be done.
Floyd additionally considered that a more diverse staff group would help develop wider understandings of diversity and thereby improve practice:

**Floyd:** Not only that, they as well, as human beings, learn from each other, you know – ‘I like this Jewish guy, he’s Jewish but I like him; he’s Muslim, but I like him’ – you know things and things like that help. I believe it does help you start realising where you’re going wrong I suppose. You’re criticising a whole faith because of that person, your criticising a whole colour because [of] this person. And you know, and then you start learning, I think it will start with feeling not only ashamed of yourself, I think it will really put you down – if you are really a decent person.

Support for both of these issues as key elements of the ideal world was found from analysis of the survey responses to the following statements; *Prison Officers from all functions would need to go on regular training to be more aware of diversity issues, and, The Prison could recruit more staff from diversity groups (e.g. Black and ethnic minorities, different faiths, sexualities, etc.)* As table 12 below illustrates, just under three quarters of respondents agreed (22.2%) or strongly agreed (51.9%) that a more diverse staff group would help to create and maintain a more respectful environment. Moreover, a majority of 89.3% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that regular training in diversity awareness was necessary in an ideal world.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The prison could recruit more staff from diversity groups (e.g. Black and ethnic minorities, different faiths, sexualities etc.)</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison Officers from all functions would need to go on regular training to be more aware of diversity issues.</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 12:** Prisoners responses to statements about the recruitment and training of staff in designing the ideal world.

6.3.2b Cohesion: working together to respond to diversity

An important additional element in designing an environment that is safer for everyone is the willingness of staff to commit to understanding and working with diversity. A participant in the functional staff focus group made the following point:

**F:** It’s about understanding where people are at with diversity so it is something they appreciate, is it something that even matters to them or not, because you get some... recent experiences we’ve had in our department of staff training is that if people don’t appreciate what you’re talking about, you can talk at them for half a day because it’s mandatory, but whether they buy into that is completely different, and I think if they don’t buy into it you can have all the job specs and examples and do all the training but ultimately you
can prepare for an interview, you can give those answers if you’re good at doing that. Then depending on the type of assessment or whatever it is, I can imagine it would be quite difficult to catch somebody out. I think it is only when you see people day-to-day as to what their views are and I think, just from experience, I think that if people don’t value something, then they’re not really going to buy into it.

Thus, this participant suggests, a response that is only made up of brief mandatory training courses is unlikely to be sufficient to change the attitudes of some staff and more particularly how they communicate with each other and with prisoners.

### 6.3.3 Respectful communication

In the previous chapter, we noted that only a small proportion of survey respondents (30%) thought that they were treated as a human being. Whilst this finding cannot be taken as representative of the whole Wing – possibly most of the prisoners who did not complete the survey are happy with how they are treated – it does raise the question of how, in an ideal world prisoners might be treated more respectfully. It is important to make clear how we are using the term ‘respect’ and ‘respectful’. Butler & Drake (2007) have identified two distinct usages of the term respect – ‘respect as esteem’ and ‘respect as consideration’ – and have suggested that the latter usage is an appropriate aspiration for Prison Service.

‘Respect-as-consideration might be seen as the most basic form of respect and is the recognition that in a civil society we should treat one another in a polite, courteous and considerate manner. Respect defined in this way need not be earned; it is an implicit entitlement in good/right human relationships (Kant, 1964; Rawls, 1971; Hill, 2004)’. They go on to suggest that respect ‘as consideration’ could provide ‘guidelines on social interactions for both staff and inmates alike’ (p. 116) and could have a very positive influence ‘upon an inmate’s sense of self’ (p. 116). Citing the work of Edgar et al., 2002, Butler and Drake (2007) make the link between prisoners being treated disrespectfully and violence in prisons. Additionally, they make links between being treated respectfully, psychological well-being and social identity. Whilst it is not possible to go into detail about these links here, we nevertheless acknowledge their pertinence to our discussions.

Respectful communication is communication that takes into consideration the person being spoken to; it involves thinking about their circumstances, their identities and their sense of self. It is not a one-way process. Both prisoners and prison staff showed an awareness of what respectful communication involved. The quotation that follows from a Wing prison officer catches some of the essence of respectful communication:

**W:** It’s knowing your prisoners, getting them to know you, but maintaining that barrier between security and that professionalism where you can keep control of the unit without having draconian ways.

**John,** a prisoner, described respectful communication this way:

**John:** I’d have an honest relationship: first thing I wouldn’t do is treat them [prisoners] like animals. Right, the way I treat people would be exact same. No matter what these people are in for, they’ve been punished by taking away from society. Some are horrendous, some not so horrendous, but I feel as if I did not have the right, as a prison officer or a prisoner, to judge anyone. I don’t have that right, only God has the right to do that. I will not judge him and I will treat him as a human being.

For other prisoners too, the issue of the serious and often horrendous nature of people’s offences was something that should not be ignored, had to be included, but at the same time not orientate how prison officers respond to prisoners. Terrel offered this contribution to designing the ideal world:
Terrel: Just try and remember that they are human beings, that’s the simplest I can put it. In an ideal world everyone are human beings and they need - ok, I wanna say, but in reality there are some nasty vile, terrible individuals - we’re not shying away from that and an officer who is doing his job has to remember that.

In thinking about how this might be achieved Garry offered this suggestion:

Garry: If I was to train prison officers, the most emphasis I would put on is to basically treat prisoners like myself with the respect they deserve as an individual and treat prisoners how they expect to be treated by another human being. Erm, and basically at the end of the day, you know, prisoners may have done wrong, they may not have, but we are all human beings. Just because they wear the uniform, they are no different you know. Once they take that uniform off they are still a member of society, erm, they are not higher than anybody else, you know. Erm some officers like, they think ‘Because I wear this uniform, I’m in charge of everything, you know’. Erm if I was to train then basically, yeah, this is how I want to be treated, therefore in order for me to be treated that way I need to treat prisoners this way...

Similarly, a member of the functional staff focus group described what respectful communication would look like:

F: That you are polite with each other, that you interact equally, like you let them speak, they let you speak; you’re not there to offend either person. I guess if you’re working with offenders, then you’ve got to understand your boundaries and where they lie, and they need to understand their boundaries as well, but just … taking that person as you find them as well I think, respecting them for the fact that they are people.

As we discussed in chapter six, for prisoners, respectful communication was intimately tied to forms of address and terms used to refer to them in the third person. Thus, it is perhaps unsurprising that when asked to rate their agreement that in an ideal world ‘Prisoners should be referred to as ‘prisoners’ rather than ‘offenders’ and that ‘Wing staff would need to be more consistent in the way in which they address prisoners e.g. Mr or first name’, they expressed strong levels of agreement. Table 13 below illustrates that 81.5% of prisoners agree that the use of the term ‘prisoners’, rather than ‘offenders’ and 85.5% agree that consistency in the way in which they are individually addressed, would help to create and maintain a more respectful environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prisoners should be referred to as ‘Prisoners’ rather than being called ‘Offenders’</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wing staff would need to be more consistent about the way in which they address prisoners e.g. Mr or by the first name</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Prisoners responses to statements about forms of address in the ideal world
This section has considered issues of respectful communication. Clearly this is a two way process and is complicated by the fact that many prisoners have committed very serious offences. However, it is clear that some staff accept the importance of understanding prisoners in their complexity in order to respond to them both professionally and respectfully. The challenge is how to increase this awareness and more widely
develop good practice. The first part of this process is to identify barriers to change and think of ways of overcoming them.

6.3.4 Barriers to change and ways of overcoming them

All groups identified a range of different barriers to achieving change; including time, money, training, trust and mistrust. Prison officers pointed to an additional factor, related to maintaining good order and discipline in the prison. This highlighted that treating everyone equally is also affected by managing potential conflict in a world of scarce resources and industrial relations:

W(4): But I think that falls down a bit because there is appeasement, I know it goes on.

W(1): It’s total appeasement.

W(5): There is appeasement when there needs to be.

Malcolm: Is appeasement important?

W(2): No it shouldn’t be should it?

W(5): It shouldn’t be but...

Malcolm: So, in an ideal world?

W(5): No, not in an ideal world. It isn’t, because you’d have enough staff to deal with everything wouldn’t you, but you haven’t

Victoria: So appeasement is necessary because we haven’t got enough staff?

W(2): We haven’t got enough staff no.

W(4): And also Senior Management don’t want the confrontation...

W(3): We have the rules and regulations and we have an IEP system in place but we also give prisoners the facility to challenge them decisions. And if it goes to a governor grade, because a governor grade don’t want that confrontation, he’ll appease a prisoner and override us which then can make these barriers on the Wing with prisoners and relationships can be fragile at times.

6.3.4a Prison Officer culture(s)

An additional barrier identified by some prisoners was what can be described as prison officer culture(s) or group loyalties. Prisoners variously identified experienced or inexperienced officers as being more helpful, but many of the prisoners we interviewed would agree with John in his description of how group loyalties affect the way prison officers behave:

John: Some of the good ones, when they do come in you can see six, seven eight months down the line, you see a change in them and it’s like you’ve got a cult. Especially the older ones. If they start treating you like that [respectfully] then they come up and have a word ‘You’re either with us or you’re with them’. So its like the cons are here, screws are here, and they don’t mix; and those who try to mix and try to treat you with respect and understanding, you see they get pulled back and they get criticised from their own lot.

This is clearly a complex issue, as we indicated earlier prison staff take great pride in their professional skills in working with a very challenging population of people. Further investigation would seem warranted to explore the diverse culture(s) of prison officers, the impact of this upon their practice and perceptions of their role.

6.3.4b Presence of stereotypes

The above quotation highlights attitudes and group behaviours as a potential barrier to change. The power of the dominant group perception is illustrated in how Islamic practices are sometimes interpreted. Amongst the concerns identified were the widespread existence and acceptance of stereotypes about Islam:
Floyd: I’m used to diversity, that’s what I prefer, but if it couldn’t happen, right, then fine. But then when you’ve got officers going into people cells and telling them ‘You, are you alright? Why have you become Muslim? These days terrorists are rife’ and this and that, that’s what I’m not comfortable with.

Mike: Sometimes I find it difficult within prison, erm because of you know, Islam and what that sort of represents to, I suppose, non-Muslims at the moment. You know, that can be, that can be difficult....But I understand what’s going on at the minute, the Islamaphobia and I understand where it comes from you know. I’m from London. London was bombed you know. But that’s not Islam and there’s not many people in Islam that would go ‘yeah that was right’... So I also understood that there would be some kind of reaction and I, I accept that, I accept that.

6.3.4c Staff training and vulnerability when working with diversities
A key factor in addressing some of the barriers to implementing the ideal world was staff training. Both prison staff and prisoners identified this as important. Staff in the functional area focus group highlighted the importance of training in helping workers to recognise their feelings of vulnerability in working with diversities:

F(1): I think it is only when you see people day-to-day as to what their views are and I think, just from experience, I think that if people don’t value something, then they’re not really going to buy into it.
F(2): It’s about a lack of understanding though, it’s not always about not valuing, it’s about a lack of understanding and being afraid to ask questions.
Malcolm: How do you reduce people’s fear?
F(2): By giving examples that it’s OK to ask; or once one person sees somebody saying ‘hang on a minute’ in a training session ‘I’ve no idea what you’re talking about’ or ‘what does that mean?’ and I think when they see it’s okay to do that, but how do you do that is......
F(3): That’s what we get our offenders to do in groups, encourage then to put their hand up if they don’t understand something.
F(2): It makes a difference as to what your functions are like as well. I’ve worked in other prisons and before I came here it wasn’t safe to ask questions because if you were asking questions it was always thought that you were incompetent.
F(3): There’s a fear of people thinking that.
F(2): Whereas here, I’d say in my experience, you’re really encouraged to ask questions and I know I can ask anything and I won’t get laughed at and I won’t be seen as a fool and it’s nice to see people encouraging that I, I think it makes it a safer place.

However, Wing staff also recognised difficulties in being able to attend training and suggested solutions:

W(1): They do put training events on but it’s having the time to go and access them, but if the prison shut down like they do on some days, people do have that opportunity where they’re not detailed somewhere else or they can generally come and listen and get involved.
W(2): Not even a shut down, but departmental rather than shut down; then you’re not affecting the full prison but concentrating in specific areas. ...
W(3): More focus groups and getting people – I know the prison do have a lot of focus groups and I think as long as each Department’s represented; cascading information down from the Governor’s briefing, from all the meetings that people go to. We have functional briefings where we get information. That can be useful.
W(4): I think there should be more emphasis on training. It could be done either way, through departmental approach. I think that every member of staff should be allocated so many hours per year to training that’s a standard requirement.
It is clear that there is much possibility for work to be done in this area, issues of resourcing and industrial relations are beyond the scope of the present report but clearly they are the context in which prison work occurs and as such they cannot be ignored in designing a changed environment that is more respectful of diversity.

6.4 Destiny
Destiny is the final stage of the AI process. It recognises that that thinking about change and implementing change are not instantaneous processes that occur once. In considering the responses to diversity that we found on B Wing there was much good practice and there was much practice that could be improved. Exploring the obstacles to change and how they might be overcome, in the previous section, provides some clue as to what destiny is concerned with. Destiny relates to sustaining change; alterations to practices, relationships and day-to-day conduct are not maintained by merely saying that they should continue. Moreover, they also often require structural change to enable them to develop and become embedded. This section of the study is the briefest and in many ways early thinking about these issues was described in the previous section. However, respondents did attempt to think about what would be needed to enable the prison to continue refining, improving and developing its practice with minority diversity groups.

6.4.1 Accountability and ongoing staff training for diversity
Most of the staff responses pointed to developing an infrastructure of accountability for staff and to ongoing staff training. One member of the functional staff focus group suggested that including diversity related issues into annual staff appraisals may help sustain change. They did not think that a tokenistic approach to training would be sufficient.

F: For me, certainly in our organisation we work in, diversity is set as appraisal targets. You’ve got to provide examples of this, of good practice ... and therefore to encourage people to talk about it, to try and seek some understanding of that, to demonstrate more of an awareness of that and more importantly to provide examples of that. It should be a standard part of everyone’s appraisal objective or whatever it is, to provide three examples per year. It doesn’t have to be a significant amount but just enough so that people are thinking about that, demonstrating some awareness of that, so it isn’t just attending a mandatory half day course and ‘that’s that box ticked, let’s forget about that.’

Staff in the functional focus group also pointed to the need for both organisational and personal commitment to working with and developing practice with prisoners from all diversity groups:

F: Commitment - for me.
Malcolm: Describe what commitment is? From whom, by whom, to what?
F: By everybody, commitment from everybody that works in the establishment to have a shared understanding of what diversity is and a shared understanding of the dreaming and the design and awareness of that, to be motivated to do your bit within that.
F(1): It’s about maintaining that as well, because I think something like this [focus group], it brings it to the forefront of your mind. It’s about maintaining that commitment over six months, a year, two years.
F(2): For the establishment to put time, resources, whatever, into staff members’ continued professional development in terms of ... not just doing a one off thing and ‘that’s it! There you go – you’re diverse.’ It’s continuing to engage in that process.
F(3): ... make it more personal and individual as well.
Malcolm: Making it part of?
F(3): SPDR reviews, makes it more individual and personal, rather that it just being in a policy document, a PSO; it needs to be made more individual.
Malcolm: This is the same as the appraisal is it?
F(1): Yeah
F(4): We’d have an action plan about how we’re doing, to try and respond to this and then a review on whether we’ve achieved it or not.
Malcolm: Who would ‘we’ be? Each Function? The Prison more widely?
F(4): Well it would depend on what that action plan was, but yes, I think there’d have to be a general action plan from...
F(2): Diversity managers
F(4): Prison, yeah, and then how that would be disseminated, lots of people come up with a variety of good ideas about how that could be achieved, whether it’s on an individual or a team or a departmental basis.

6.4.2 Developing an infrastructure to support and maintain change
However, some of the Wing staff indicated that managing the process of change was very important – changes cannot be implemented at short notice without an adequate infrastructure and appropriate training to support them:

W(1): There’s no training.
Malcolm: So there’s something about change that can be disruptive to that environment on the wing?
W(1): Too much change
Malcolm: Too much change, too quickly and not enough training?
W(1): No training and then being held accountable for your rioting is summat happened – that’s typical Prison Service.

The process of ensuring a positive destiny is one that requires active engagement of prison management and prison staff; it requires active engagement with prisoners. It is not easy, it is necessarily both reflective and pro-active. We leave the last words of this chapter to a prisoner who has clearly developed the skill of insight and taking the perspective of others through his engagement on prison programmes during his sentence. We have used this quotation elsewhere but it seems to be both succinctly expressive and symbolic of what is required:

Mike: I find it quite difficult seeing it you know, but it’s hard for them...oh God, you see; that’s the thing, I do understand things, I can see from that perspective taking, which I never had for so many years when I was driven by addiction and it’s kind of having that and it’s hard

Summary
This chapter has shown that staff and prisoners alike have visions of how the prison’s response to diversity could be improved. Positive suggestions have been described, obstacles identified and ways of overcoming these problems suggested. What is most heartening about the contents of this chapter is that there appears to be some common strands of investment in better practice form both prisoners and prison staff.
CHAPTER SEVEN: REFLECTIONS ON METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

7.1 Introduction
At the beginning of this report we noted that the ESRC had funded the research as a pilot project. Our attention has thus been as much focussed on the conduct of the research as it has been on the findings. This chapter is concerned with thinking about issues relating to the design and delivery of the research project. Issues relating to the design of the project are concerned with the overall approach to the study – Appreciative Inquiry (AI) - and how each of the data sources were collected and analysed. Matters relating to the delivery of the project are concerned with practical issues that either helped or hindered the project to keep to schedule and complete all tasks on time. We first consider design issues and then conclude with consideration of matters related to the delivery of the project.

7.2 Design
In this section we first consider the strengths and weakness of AI as a methodology for researching diversity related matters in a high security prison, we then reflect on issues connected to the four sources of data – documentary analysis, prisoner interviews, prisoner survey and staff focus groups.

7.2.1 Appreciative Inquiry as a method for researching diversity related issues in prison
Appreciative Inquiry is both a research methodology and a tool for promoting organisational change. Its strength in the present project is that it required staff and prisoners to focus on positive aspects of prison life. It is doubtful that if we had taken a purely problem focused approach to this research we would have discovered the aspects of good practice that have emerged. By requiring research respondents to consider the good things about their situation a more nuanced picture of life in prison appeared. However, at times in both the focus groups and the prisoner interviews the assertive focus on the positive and ways of developing the regime positively seemed to be at odds with what respondents were wanting to talk about. Asking research participants to ‘dream’, ‘design’ and plan to secure a more positive ‘destiny’ did two things: it prevented them developing their own stories about life in the prison, but it also required them to consider the possibility of change and change for the better. It is in these elements that the organisational change perspective came very much to the fore. There are benefits and problems with this approach. The problems relate to areas that may get overlooked or marginalised – a couple of prisoner respondents and some of the documentation that we encountered pointed to relationships between groups of prisoners as being problematic. The groups identified themselves around aspects of diversity – particularly faith and ethnicity.

However, the direction of the AI schedule, being focussed on the research question about the Prison’s response to diversity, did not permit the exploration of these issues in any depth. It may be that these issues underpin problems within the prison that the present research was only vaguely aware of. Similarly, AI requires respondents to dream, design and plan. This moves the activity away from direct inquiry onto the terrain of organisational change; for the purposes of research that may impact on the area being researched, this may be a strength. Certainly, both staff and prisoners showed an engagement in dreaming of a better prison environment and showed a commitment struggling to design this place. Out of this struggle came a number of recognitions – not least that relationships and communication involves all parties involved. Relationship is not something that pre-exists it is something that has to be struggled with by all involved. Areas of struggle involve participating in respectful engagement whilst maintaining appropriate boundaries. Prisoners and staff alike recognised this. It may be that AI research permits the expression of contentment and discontent whilst also actively engaging participants in thinking about how things can be different. This enables prisoners from diversity groupings to talk about both their experiences and their aspirations for social justice in their current environment.

7.2.2 Documentary Analysis
This data source was of considerable utility to us in tracking how practice we observed, or were told about was informed, or at times was not able to be informed, by policy and procedure. However it was also much more problematic than we had anticipated. Identifying the extent of relevant documentation took only a
number of days, but by necessity of working with appropriate prison staff, this was spread across a number of weeks and necessarily and appropriately structured around their availability. Accessing and recording data from the documents occupied a majority of the Research Assistant’s time on the project. Although, we have not completed a full analysis of this material, we now have a complete map of the documents and how they relate to each other. This in itself represents a significant output from the research.

For the future, it will be necessary (in a full study of the establishment to check this representation and identify any documents missed or emerging since; such as new/adapted policies). It may also be worth applying for separate funding to analyse these documents using NVIVO, in preparation for the full study.

7.2.3 Prisoner Interviews

7.2.3a The interview schedules
The development of the interview schedule was achieved in reference to existing sources of information (in particular, the work of Alison Liebling and colleagues 1999; 2001). The first interview was successful, although we recognise that some considerable skill is required on the part of the interviewer to maintain the AI focus. The second interviews were time consuming and we would make alterations to the structure and content. However, the level of engagement of prisoners in the second interviews was improved, indicating that prisoners had perhaps had time to get to see us on the wing and that a more meaningful rapport had begun to develop. A further indication of this was the willingness of prisoners we had interviewed to come and speak to us informally on the wing. Some prisoners attempted to use the second interviews to develop their life history narrative, that was not the focus of this research. Ideally, before the second interview, we would have read the first interview transcript and used the second interview to probe for more detail in areas where detail was lacking. However, the issues discussed later in this section regarding transcription prevented this and resulted in our being able only to ‘listen’ again to first interviews. Whilst this listening enabled the development of a sound schedule for the second interviews, the process was unsatisfactory and illustrates the requirement for developing arrangements which allow swifter transcription.

7.2.3b Adaptations to ensure continued ethical practice
In Chapter three of this report we outlined the considerable preparation that we had made in terms of ensuring our practice was ethical. We have already drawn attention (see 3.5) to some of the emergent issues we dealt with whilst interviewing prisoners. However, a further issue encountered was the need to refine our statement on issues that we would not hold as confidential to include disclosure of material that may pose a risk/threat to the security of the establishment. A further adaptation to ensure ethical practice was the decision in some places in this report not to cite the pseudonym of some prisoners. It was judged that in some cases to do so would make the prisoner highly identifiable and could result in his other comments becoming identifiable.

7.2.3c Effective use of the time of the research team
In our early negotiations with the prison it was agreed that Dr Cowburn and Dr Lavis, would undertake the AI interviews themselves. This agreement was in response to concerns raised about the potential naivety of Research Assistants in relation to security and safety when working unsupervised with prisoners within the High Security Estate. However, having primary researchers undertaking interviews is time consuming and expensive and it would be wise in future research to explore the potential for recruiting research assistants with experience working either in Prisons, Secure Mental Health facilities or with challenging populations. We recognise that in doing so, these research assistants would need to be trained and supervised appropriately by ourselves, perhaps working in as a team headed up by one of us, and obtained the appropriate level of security clearance.
7.2.3d  Analysis of data using NVivo
Our decision to use NVivo to organise and analyse the interview and focus group transcripts was based on a developing preference with Research Funding Councils towards the use of computerised packages which allow the analysis of qualitative data to be audited, thus being consistent with the principle of confirmability (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). Our practice of dividing the transcripts between two researchers meant that the generation of first level descriptive codes was broad and inclusive. Joint working on the second level coding allowed refinement of first level codes, collapsing of similar codes and the emergence of interpretive level of coding, adding to the dependability of the analysis (Lincoln and Guba, 1985).

7.2.4  Survey

7.2.4a  Design
The survey questions/items were inductively derived from the prisoner interviews. The quality of the survey was enhanced by the involving of stakeholders, including external researchers, prisoners themselves, and the steering group, in its design. Particular areas of involvement were in

- confirming that the content of the survey was relevant,
- identifying ambiguous or superfluous questions/items,
- recommendations regarding the sensitive placement of questions which might be viewed as contentious or controversial, and
- other refinements enabling greater precision in the measure, for example the suggestion that when rating relationships prisoners might prefer to be able to rate ‘staff’ from different functional areas, rather than ‘staff in general’.

Refinement of the survey and the validity of its contents was achieved though pre-testing by Prisoner Advisory Group after which it was further refined by the research team.

7.2.4b  Generalisability and issues of representation
The research team were aware at the planning stage that due to the pilot nature of the research it was unlikely that sufficient numbers of surveys would be returned to enable the research to claim a representative sample. It is recognised that 1 in 5.5 is a low return rate, but it is consistent with and is some cases exceeds the return rates of other surveys within the prison. If this return rate were to be repeated in a full prison study, across four wings, healthcare and segregation unit this would be likely to generate a return of in excess of 124 surveys; sufficient to enable a more detailed analysis of the data.

7.2.4c  Implications for future research
The contextual nature of the survey (being developed in relation to issues raised on only one wing of the prison) means that we could not use this actual survey again in the full study. It would be necessary to generate, reduce and pre-test an inclusive version following prisoner interviews in the full study.

7.2.5  Focus Groups
The design of the schedules for the focus groups were informed by and corresponded closely to the schedules developed to guide the first prisoner interviews. The utility of the schedules is demonstrated by the quality and richness of the data they generated. Moreover, the decision to use focus groups rather than individual interviews with staff was supported by the quality of discussion which took place during the groups, and which added context and illustrate the range of views held by staff. However, one adaptation that we made was to split staff into two separate groups and not to include Governor grade staff. We would advocate this method as an appropriate one for enabling staff to feel comfortable to share experiences without fear of reprisal or reproach. This is reflected in our decisions regarding anonymisation of the transcripts. We have not allocated individual pseudonyms to staff, but rather have opted to distinguish
between speakers using numbers. This ensures that staff are not identifiable to others who attended their focus group. The focus group transcripts were analysed using the same process as the prisoner interviews [see 7.2.3d]

### 7.3 Delivery of the project

In this section we reflect on issues, anticipated and unanticipated, that facilitated or hindered the work of the project. Primarily the section is concerned with practical issues; these can be identified under two broad headings – working in a high security environment and the underestimated workload. What we present here are some issues and our learning in relation to them. The final part of this section reflects on the role and functioning of the project advisory/steering groups.

#### 7.3.1 Working in a high-security environment

Although the Principal and Co investigators are familiar with working and researching in high security environments, the constraints that these settings impose on a research project were underestimated in two key areas: the appointment of the Research Assistant (RA) and the recording and transcribing of data.

Although the security clearance for both of the main investigators began before the funding award was announced, we could not begin the process of obtaining security clearance in relation to the RA until well after the award had commenced. Thus advertising, interviewing and appointing the RA took time and had to be completed before we could begin the security clearance process. The impact of this delay on the project meant that the RA was not able to move freely about the prison and thus was limited in the tasks that he was able to accomplish. A consequence of this was that much of the work that was planned for the RA had to be done by the two main researchers (particularly in relation to some of the documentary analysis and the survey).

The other area where the specific conditions of the high security environment impacted significantly on this research is the recording and transcribing of interviews and focus groups. All interviews and focus groups were digitally recorded. After each interview or group, the recording was transferred from the digital recorder onto a laptop computer that was securely stored in the prison. The recorder was then wiped. Initially the prison required us to identify and appoint transcribers, who would then be subjected to security clearance, after which they would be allowed access to the Admin building of the prison to transcribe the audio recordings. Although we tried to identify transcribers both at Sheffield Hallam University and at Bradford University, we were unable to find any willing to travel to the prison to work on our material. For several months we were in a state of impasse. Eventually, a security protocol was drawn up which allowed us to move the laptop to a secure location at Bradford University where work could begin on transcribing. However, restrictions included an agreement that no copies be made of the sound files, thus only one transcription could be undertaken at any one point in time. This has a severe impact on the time transcription took and the consequent availability of data to the researchers for analysis. Upon completion of the report and final preparation of the data sets the laptop will be returned to the prison in order that the audio files can be deleted in the presence of a Security Governor. Whilst we recognise the sensitivity of the data and the importance of security, these requirements drastically extended the length of time it took to transcribe and analyse the audio data.

In future research, to reduce the impact of this necessary process, we suggest consideration of the following strategies:

- **a)** Build ‘lead in’ time to project timetable to enable recruitment and security clearance of staff.
- **b)** Consider possibly using staff already security cleared in some areas of the research (for example costing for an AREO to be involved in collecting and collating some of the documentary analysis).
c) Prison to cost for administrative tasks, such as accessing documents, taking minutes and organising meetings) and that this cost is included in any funding bid.
d) Consider appointing and security clearing more than one professional transcriber who can hold audio data securely in advance of project.

7.3.2 The underestimated workload

As the project has progressed it has become increasingly clear that the original bid substantially underestimated the amount of work that was required to complete this project. To summarise the situation, there was too much data collection and analysis to be undertaken by three investigators. However, there is a slightly problematic issue to consider. The two main investigators have experience of working in a high security environment and it was partly this experience that encouraged the prison management to support our bid. We undertook all of the interviews. Our previous experience of interviewing was very important in the successfully completion of this work. However, our workload has been very heavy. Similarly the delay in the RA being available for work in the prison also impacted on us – many of the tasks assigned to this role had to be undertaken by one or other of us.

A key area that was originally assigned to the RA was the documentary analysis. It was in this area that we made the greatest underestimation of the hours available for the task. Firstly, when we spent time (approximately two days) with two Governors to identify documentation related to policies, procedures and practices that related to the treatment of diversity minority group prisoners, we began to realise that the amount of material was substantially more than we had estimated. Secondly accessing this documentation was problematic for four reasons: (i) The RA did not have free access to the prison; (ii) Accessing the documentation consumed a lot of diversity staff time; (iii) Some documents could only be accessed in situ at various locations in the prison; (iv) At the funding application stage we did not include time to train the RA in the AI method of data collection and data analysis.

In the future bids we suggest that there is a need to:
   a) build into project a greater number of basic level research staff,
   b) purposively recruit for researchers with experience of working in prisons/diverse range of methodological skills to collect the data,
   c) identify time to orientate and train research staff to how AI works. This could be done whilst waiting for security clearance,
   d) have No1 Governor level instruction at the outset to gain access to functional areas to collect data.

7.3.3 Project advisory groups.

As has been previously noted, this project had two advisory groups throughout its duration. Both groups met at least three times, but the Prisoner Advisory Group (PAG) met at five times.

The Steering group was a vital part of our research. It had both internal (to the prison) and external (to the prison) members. The group had two Black and Minority Ethnic members (an external academic and an IMB member) plus the prisoner diversity representatives. There were no Black and Minority Ethnic staff members of the group. The GALIPS representative for the prison was part of this group. Officially, a person from Age Concern in Wakefield was also a member of this group but they were not able to attend any of the meetings. Similarly the prison Imam was a member of the group but was only able to attend one meeting. Whilst one member of B wing staff was always present at meetings, this was not always the same member of staff. The Steering group was generally either convened by the Diversity Governor, or a previous Diversity Governor and we welcomed this commitment and consistency. Whilst, we recognise the difficulties that can arise from the unpredictable nature of Prison life, it is also important to highlight the impact that irregular attendance has on the ability of the group to effectively ‘steer’ the research. For the future we suggest:
a) Membership from external members such as Age UK [formerly Age Concern], Disability Alliance, Gender Trust is essential,
b) It is key to have at least one other independent prisons researcher on the steering committee to consider academic issues related to the research,
c) Developing strategies to maintain attendance of internal & external members, and
d) Ensure the attendance of PAG members, as a means of establishing and maintaining transparency.

In relation to the Prisoner Advisory Group, we were very fortunate to be able to invite original attendees of the Diversity week event to be part of this group. They had both an established relationship with us, and energy and commitment to the research. Attendance was generally very good, but the diversity representative from healthcare was never able to attend and there was only one Gay Prisoner Representative in the group.

For the future it would be useful to:
   a. have at least two reps from each diversity strand so that there is a critical mass of representation,
   b. try to ensure representation from all wings,
   c. develop some work with potential members of the PAG in advance of the first official meeting of the group. This would help to develop relationships/establish trust, and
   d. ideally, involve the PAG in re-visiting the original WonderWall design of the research is there anything missing/needs adding since the original research.

Summary
In this, the final chapter of the report, we have reviewed the progress of the project from beginning to end. We have considered issues related to the design of the project, in particular – the suitability of AI as a research method and issues related to teach of the data sources. We consider that AI is a useful method particularly if it is including the possibility of organisational change. The latter stages of AI tend to encourage the commitment of research participants to improving matters. Additionally, practical matters in relation to delivering the project have been highlighted – key issues relate to the under-resourcing of the project and the impact of a high security environment on undertaking a practical project in prison.
APPENDIX ONE

Racial Codings used in HMP Wakefield

A1 (Asian Indian)
A2 (Asian Pakistani)
A3 (Asian Bangladeshi)
A9 (Asian other)
B1 (Black Caribbean)
B2 (Black African)
B9 (Black other)
M1 (Mixed Caribbean)
M2 (Mixed African)
M3 (Mixed Asian)
M9 (Mixed other)
O1 (Chinese)
O9 (Any other ethnic group)
W1 (White British)
W2 (White Irish)
W8 (White Irish /traveller/gypsy)
W9 (White other)
APPENDIX TWO

Religions and Faiths

Alphabetical list of Individual religions showing numbers and percentage of population on 25th January 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Number of prisoners following the faith</th>
<th>Percentage of prison population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church in Wales</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of England (Anglican)</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of Scotland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopian Orthodox</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehovah’s witness</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mormon</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-conformist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox (Greek/Russian)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pagan</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecostal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quaker</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rastafarian</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Orthodox</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikh</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritualist</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taoist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Reformed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alphabetical list of categories not identifying with a faith

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-faith category</th>
<th>Number of prisoners</th>
<th>Percentage of prison population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agnostic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religion</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Broad Religious groupings in HMP Wakefield

**Named Faiths**
- Buddhist
- Christian
  - Baptist
  - Christian
  - Church in Wales
  - Church of England
  - Church of Scotland
  - Ethiopian Orthodox
  - Jehovah’s Witness
  - Methodist
  - Mormon
  - Non-conformist
  - Orthodox (Greek/Russian)
  - Pentecostal
  - Quaker
  - Roman Catholic
  - Russian Orthodox
  - Spiritualist
  - United Reformed
- Hindu
- Jewish
- Muslim
- Pagan
- Rastafarian
- Sikh
- Taoist

**Other classifications**
- Agnostic
- Atheist
- No religion
- Not specified
APPENDIX THREE

Details of offences of prisoner population

**Violence (22 offences)**
- Aggravate burglary
- Arrange/facilitate arrival into the UK of a person for sexual exploitation
- Arson
- Attempting to choke/suffocate or strangle in order to commit indictable offence
- Attempted murder (potential victim one year old or over)
- Causing grievous bodily harm with intent to do grievous bodily harm
- Commit an act for purposes of terrorism
- Commit an action for purposes of terrorism
- Commit genocide
- Conspire to cause an explosion likely to endanger life or property
- Conspiracy to murder (victim one year old or over)
- Do an act with intent to cause explosion likely to endanger life or property
- False imprisonment
- Kidnapping
- Manslaughter
- Murder (victim one year old or over)
- Murder (where the victim is a child)
- Other violence offences
- Possessing firearm with intent to endanger life
- Possessing firearm when committing schedule 1 offence
- Wounding /inflicting grievous bodily harm
- Wounding with intent to do grievous bodily harm

**Sexual (26 offences)**
- Assault by penetration SOA 2003 S3
- Assault on a child U13 by penetration
- Attempt rape of a female aged 16 years or over
- Attempted buggery
- Attempted robbery
- Attempt to commit rape
- Buggery
- Buggery with a child U16 (SOA 1956 s12)
- Indecent assault on a child
- Indecent assault on woman (16 or over)
- Indecent photographs of children
- Possessing indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of child
- Rape
  - Rape on a child (SOA 1956 s69)
  - Rape of a female 13/14/15
  - Rape of a female aged 16 years or over
  - Rape of a female child under 13 by a male
  - Rape of a child U13 (SOA 2003 s5)
  - Rape on child (SOA 1956 s69)
  - Raping female under 16
  - Sex act with child family member
  - Sexual activity with a child (SOA 2003 s9)
  - Sexual Assault (SOA 2003 s3)
Sexual Assault child U13 (SOA 2003 s7)
Sexual intercourse with a girl under 13
Trespass with intent to commit a relevant sexual

**Theft or other offences the main focus of which is obtaining goods illegally (4 offences)**
Burglary (stealing or attempting to steal - in dwelling)
Burglary (with intent to steal - in dwelling)
Robbery
Possession Drug

No main offence
Holding warrant

*(Mental) health*
APPENDIX FOUR

Prisoner WonderWall and Research Design

Exploring the impact of HMP Wakefield’s Diversity Strategy
WonderWall and the research design

Stage one
Analysing the documents

- Major Faiths
- Travellers
- Ethnic minority
- Regional cultures
- Disability groups (e.g., physical, HIV, mental)
- Inmates from different faith backgrounds
- Inmates from diverse backgrounds
- Gay, Lesbian, and Bi sexual
- Elderly
- All prisoners

Stage two
One to one interviews with diversity prisoners

- Major Faiths
- Travellers
- Ethnic minority
- Regional cultures
- Disability groups (e.g., physical, HIV, mental)
- Inmates from different faith backgrounds
- Inmates from diverse backgrounds
- Gay, Lesbian, and Bi sexual
- Elderly
- All prisoners

Stage three
Survey to all prisoners

- Anonymous survey
- Give 24hrs to complete questionnaire
- Time to return questionnaire
- Advance warning of survey
- Surveys to all prisoners
- Collaboration between partners/group to get trust
- Information from survey etc. can be discarded
- All prisoners

Stage four
Talking to other people

- Group interview
- Inmates from diverse backgrounds
- Gay, Lesbian, and Bi sexual
- Elderly
- All prisoners

WAYS OF FINDING OUT

- Poster/pictures on research on each wing
- ‘Seating’ regular feedback
- Information on diversity based in each wing
- Attend all wing social inclusion forums
- Require feedback doing the survey will deliver an honest outcome

PEOPLE YOU SHOULD ASK

- IMB
- All prison visitors
- Administration
- Solicitors

Minutes of meetings/forums
- Social inclusion forum meetings
- Documented statistics
- Community group (inside and outside)

IMB report
- RDG
- IMB (HOD) reports
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Breakdown of prisoner responses to survey statements about relationships in an ideal world

The table below illustrates the percentages and frequencies of prisoner ratings of specific staff groups in relation to statements about relationships in an ideal world.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements about relationships with [each of the identified staff groups] in the ideal world</th>
<th>Staff groups with the highest importance rating</th>
<th>Staff group with the lowest importance rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would feel able to ask Staff for help</td>
<td>Healthcare 86.7 26</td>
<td>Segregation 42.3 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would feel confident to talk to staff about problems</td>
<td>Healthcare 82.1 23</td>
<td>Segregation 40 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff would not treat me differently because of my faith</td>
<td>Wing 80.6 25</td>
<td>AIC 57.1 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff understanding with prisoners’ frustration about unresolved problems</td>
<td>Wing 74.1 20</td>
<td>Segregation 52 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff would not judge me by my offence</td>
<td>Chaplaincy 70.4 19</td>
<td>Probation/AIC 55.6 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoners and staff would help one another</td>
<td>Probation 85.7 24</td>
<td>Segregation 64 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff and prisoners would stick to the rules</td>
<td>Wing 85.2 23</td>
<td>Gym 74.1 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would feel confident that staff would give me good advice</td>
<td>Wing 89.3 25</td>
<td>AIC 81.5 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would feel confident that staff would give me good advice</td>
<td>Education 89.3 26</td>
<td>AIC 84 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff/prisoners would treat each other as they’d expect to be treated</td>
<td>Education 89.3 26</td>
<td>Segregation 51.9 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff would have greater understanding of the needs of prisoners with disabilities/disabled prisoners</td>
<td>Healthcare 89.3 26</td>
<td>AIC 69 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff willing to work with all prisoners even challenging ones</td>
<td>Wing/Healthcare 89.7 26</td>
<td>AIC 82.1 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wing 89.3 25</td>
<td>Segregation 88 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work 89.3 25</td>
<td>Segregation 88 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education 96.3 26</td>
<td>Segregation 87.5 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wing/Probation/Healthcare 92.6 25</td>
<td>Chaplaincy 88.9 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wing/Probation/Education 92.6 25</td>
<td>Gym 76.9 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AIC 92.3 24</td>
<td>Segregation 87 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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