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Abstract

In recent years, prison numbers have grown despite falling levels of crime. Considering the increasing use of custodial sentences, which in many ways can be attributed to the rise of penal populism, research has largely ignored the views of those best placed to offer opinion on the role which imprisonment plays: those who deal with offenders and prison life on a daily basis. Prison officers are responsible for the implementation of penal policy and have the authority to undermine or enhance the goals of the establishment in which they work, yet in answering the philosophical questions underlying imprisonment; their views have rarely been sought.

This study utilised a mixed-method survey to examine the views of 398 prison officers working in Scottish Prison Service establishments. The purpose of this was to identify and explore the attitudes which prison officers hold in relation to imprisonment. Specifically, respondents were questioned on what should be the main purpose of prison, whether it should be a place where offenders are sent ‘as’ punishment or ‘for’ punishment, the effectiveness of prison, and who should influence its policies.

Findings revealed prison officers viewed rehabilitation as the most important purpose of imprisonment, with retribution the least important. The majority of officers believed that offenders should be sent to prison ‘as’ punishment for their crime; though many felt that prison should constitute a place where offenders are sent both ‘as’ punishment and ‘for’ further punishment. Prison officers were largely undecided over the effectiveness of prison; however felt that their role was critical in reducing reoffending. Furthermore, respondents felt their views were often undervalued and believed prison officers should have more authority in the determining of penal policy, whereas political and public influence should be limited.

Analysis reveals the views of prison officers to be largely supportive of the organisation they represent. Findings also provide the basis for a possible divergence of thought between the punitive message politicians promote, and what the Scottish Prison Service aims to achieve.
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Chapter I: Introduction

This chapter presents a brief introduction to this thesis. The purpose of this is to provide a rationale for the topic of study: the attitudes of prison officers to imprisonment. This will be placed into the wider criminal justice context, and the concepts and ideas introduced here will be expanded upon in subsequent chapters. This chapter shall also outline the aim and objectives of this thesis, alongside its structure.

The last few decades has seen the publication of a wealth of research which has aimed to examine public perceptions of crime and its associated problems (Maxfield and Babbie, 2011, p.236). Such investigations however have been conducted at a time where decreasing crime rates have been coupled with rising prison numbers (Scottish Crime and Justice Survey, 2013), and where offenders are not only more likely to face a custodial sentence, but are now more likely to face a longer custodial sentence than before (Scottish Government, 2013). Garland (2001, p.142) characterises this trend as the ‘punitive turn’.

Tombs (2004, p.10) provides further justification for this, highlighting that political, media and public climates have become increasingly punitive in nature. Indeed with reference to the first two, evidence clearly strengthens this view. Political sound bites with regard to justice policy are characterised by ‘tough-on-crime’ rhetoric (Drake, Muncie and Westmarland, 2010, p.50), whilst both the media and politicians increasingly try to justify more punitive penal policy because they believe this is what the public desires (Roberts, Stalans, Indermaur and Hough 2003, p.61). The extent of this ‘public desire’ is however debatable. Whilst research not only casts doubt on the punitive attitudes of the electorate, it also reveals the lack of knowledge the public possess with regard to sentencing policy (Hough and Roberts, 1998; Russell and Morgan, 2001; Roberts and Hough, 2012) and prison (Anderson, Ingram and Hutton, 2002).

Despite the growing body of literature which examines the views of a public which has limited knowledge of such issues, researchers have often neglected those with most
awareness of the criminal justice system. The rising number of offenders serving custodial sentences presents numerous challenges for prisons (Audit Scotland, 2008), however the philosophical questions of such establishments have been largely unanswered. What is the purpose of prison? Should it be a place where offenders are sent as punishment or for punishment? How effective is it? Who should influence its policies?

These are all questions worthy of exploration; however they have still to be answered by those who are best placed to provide opinion: those who engage with prison life on a daily basis. Prison officers “have the power to enhance or undermine the primary goals of the correctional institution where they work” (Kjelsber, Skoglund and Rustad, 2007, p.71); yet their attitudes, particularly in a British context, have been largely unexamined.

The importance of examining such views cannot be underestimated given that the attitudes which prison officers possess are seen as vital in contributing to the role of the "ideal" prison officer (House of Commons Justice Committee, 2009, p.126). Moreover, the recently published Scottish Prison Service (SPS) Organisational Review notes one of its aims as the promotion of a new culture, at the heart of which are the “attitudes, behaviours, assumptions and belief systems of those within the system” (p.43). Consequently, it appears abundantly clear that there exists a requirement for research which examines the attitudes of prison officers.

The implications of doing so exist in both academic and practical terms. Research of this kind would provide an insight into the attitudes of prison officers which are of clear significance in promoting or ignoring the institutional goal of the establishment they work in (Kifer, Hemmens and Stohr, 2003, p.67), yet which have been traditionally neglected in prison research (Arnold, Liebling and Tait, 2007, p.471). Furthermore, the SPS Organisational Review refers to the promotion of a new culture within the organisation. Research which examines the views of prison officers would aid in identifying what this culture presently consists of.
The Present Study

Liebling (2006) asserts that a re-evaluation of the role which prison plays is required and that this must take “into account a realistic and critical evaluation of its interior life” (p.429). In examining the views of prison officers who are integral in influencing the institutional goals of prison, this study will present such an evaluation.

The present study is therefore dedicated to exploring the attitudes which prison officers hold in relation to how they view imprisonment. This thesis will firstly present a comprehensive literature review which identifies the importance of attitudinal research with regard to criminal justice policy, which examines the concepts of punitiveness and penal populism, and which reviews previous research with regard to the attitudes of prison officers. Secondly, using a mixed-method survey which incorporates both quantitative and qualitative data, this thesis will present, analyse and discuss the findings of primary research which examines the views of prison officers on the purpose and effectiveness of imprisonment, as well as who should influence its policies.

Aim, Objectives and Organisation

Aim

The overarching aim of the present research is to identify and explore the attitudes which prison officers hold in relation to imprisonment.

Objectives

In achieving this aim, this thesis has the following objectives:

- To conduct a review of relevant academic literature which firstly examines the possible functions of imprisonment and secondly, which examines the concepts of punitiveness, penal populism and public attitudes toward sentencing and
imprisonment. This will justify the importance of attitudinal research for criminal justice policy.

- To utilise a survey method to collect and analyse data which examines the views of prison officers. This will indicate levels of punitiveness amongst prison officers and indicate support for other factors such as the purpose of imprisonment, its effectiveness and who should influence its policies.

- To evaluate the impact which findings may have for prison policy, with a particular focus on the SPS Organisational Review.

*Organisation*

In meeting these objectives, this thesis is organised into several chapters:

Chapter II will introduce in greater detail the concepts and theories upon which this thesis is based by examining the ‘philosophies’ or ‘goals’ of imprisonment. Retribution/just deserts, deterrence, incapacitation and rehabilitation shall be discussed in turn before an introduction to the prison ‘as’ punishment or prison ‘for’ punishment debate.

The objective of Chapter III is to provide justification for the importance of attitudinal research with regard to criminal justice policy. This chapter will begin by expanding on the philosophies of imprisonment outlined within Chapter II and their relation to the concept of punitiveness. This will be followed by an examination of penal populism and an evaluation of its apparent effects within justice policy, specifically focussing on The Strategy for Justice in Scotland. Chapter III will conclude with a review of academic research which has sought to identify public attitudes toward punishment and imprisonment.
Chapter IV will begin by examining the values of the SPS through the publication of its Organisational Review. This places greater emphasis on the role of the prison officer and the culture in which prisons operate. Consequently, this chapter will justify the need for research which examines the views of prison officers by highlighting the importance of their role in the implementation of penal policy. This chapter will also review previous research with regard to the attitudes of prison officers.

Chapter V will describe the methodology to be utilised in the present research. This will again highlight the research topic of this thesis, which is to identify and explore the attitudes which prison officers hold in relation to imprisonment. The chapter will provide a rationale for the questionnaire method used alongside an overview of participant sampling, survey design, and ethical considerations.

The objective of Chapter VI is to present research findings from a mixed-method questionnaire completed by prison officers. This chapter will begin by examining demographic and descriptive information before extending into both quantitative and qualitative data analysis which conveys the attitudes of respondents toward prison.

The purpose of Chapter VII is firstly to expand upon the findings presented in the previous chapter, examining them in relation to previous research, and also with regard to the SPS Organisational Review. The implications which arise shall be examined throughout, and the chapter will conclude with a discussion of the strengths and limitations of the research conducted.

Chapter VIII provides a conclusion for the thesis and as such, briefly summarises its justification, aim, findings and implications. This chapter will highlight the contribution the present research has made, and also suggest possible avenues for future research.
Chapter II: Imprisonment and Philosophies of Punishment

This chapter will begin by examining the growing number of offenders committed by the courts to prison despite decreasing levels of crime. It will then examine what functions custodial sentences can serve by outlining the goals of imprisonment. This chapter, and those that follow, will act as an expansion to some of the key concepts introduced in Chapter 1.

Introduction

The sentencing of an offender represents what is probably the most public face of the criminal justice system (Ashworth, 2007, pp.90). Matters of crime and penal policy have become “key issues of political concern and media discussion” (Newburn, 2007, p.425) and consequently the subject surrounding how offenders should be punished presents considerable debate. Despite offering what it describes as “one of the most extensive ranges of alternatives to custody in Europe (The Scottish Prisons Commission, 2008, p.71), which includes Community Service Orders, Restriction of Liberty Orders and Drug Treatment Orders, rates of imprisonment within Scotland have steadily risen since the latter half of the 20th century (see Figure 1). These rates are projected to rise further from approximately 8000 in 2012 to approximately 9500 in 2020 (Scottish Government, 2012, p.14).

Figure 1: Average daily Scottish prison population since 1900 (Scottish Government, 2012, p.1)
Offenders are now more likely to face imprisonment for their crimes and are liable to face longer prison sentences than before. Those who are convicted are 5% more likely to receive a custodial sentence now than in 1990, meaning that custodial sentences account for 15% of all penalties (ibid, p.40). This represents a 3% rise since 2003-04. Furthermore, the average sentence length (9 months) is now 10% longer than in 2003-04 (Scottish Government, 2013, p.5). Whilst prison numbers are rising throughout Scotland however, crime rates are in decline. The most recent Scottish Crime and Justice Survey (2012-2013) reveals that the number of crimes has fallen by 22% since 2008-2009.

The reasons behind such an anomalous trend are numerous. These include the increasing use of remand to combat deficiencies in the bail system, changes in legislation which include mandatory minimum sentences, and increased use of ‘supervised’ or ‘tagging’ orders which augments the number of offenders who can be recalled to prison (Audit Scotland, 2008, p.7). Whilst these are of course justifiable explanations, they fail to encompass what Tombs (2004) refers to as a “punitive climate of political, media and public opinion about crime and punishment” (p.10). Given the vital, albeit indirect role which an aspect such as ‘opinion’ plays (Hough and Roberts, 1999, p.17), it is such a concept which will be examined throughout the current research. This will be with specific regard to the attitudes of prison officers regarding the goals of imprisonment, its effectiveness, and influence over prison policy.

**Goals of Prison – Philosophies of Punishment**

The increasing rate at which offenders are given custodial sentences presents an ideal opportunity to renew focus on what the function of prison should be, yet this is no easy task. As early as 1952, Lionel Fox wrote that “whatever prison is for, it is not for one clear and single purpose” (p.15). The House of Commons Justice Committee (2009) further conclude;
“The school, for example, is there to educate young people, the hospital is there to heal people who are sick. There is no similar clarity about the role of the prison” (p.8).

It is therefore clear that in attempting to examine what prison is for, there is no straightforward answer and instead, a prison sentence can serve numerous functions.

Given that there is no Penal Code which exists regarding criminal law in Scotland (Gibb and Duff, 2002 p.28); sentencers abide by the same principles and philosophical foundations of punishment as those in other Western jurisdictions (Hutton, 1999). These are multi-tiered in nature given the different representations which ‘punishment’ can encompass (Tonry, 2011, p.95) and mirror what the institution of prison aims to achieve. The function of prison within the United Kingdom, much like the foundations of punishment, can be grouped into the broad categories of retribution or deserts, deterrence, rehabilitation and incapacitation (Strickland, 2010, p.97; Eley, McIvor, Malloch and Munro, 2005, p.15).

Retribution and Just Deserts

Retributive and desert philosophies have become dominant within Westernised jurisdictions since the 1970’s (Muncie, 2011, p.41), leading Van Hulst (2013, p.5) to argue that society has become “obsessed” with retribution. Pure retributivism is most closely associated with the approach to punishment which advocates “an eye for an eye” in that any sanction must be proportionate to the seriousness of the offence (von Hirsch, 1992, p.56). In the perpetrating of a crime, a ‘wrong’ has been committed and for this reason alone punishment is deserved (Wilcox, Land and Hunt, 2003, p.193). Retributive theory holds no regard for social change or circumstances, and the effectiveness of any punishment is an irrelevant consideration (Banks, 2013, p.109). Most importantly, justice must be ‘seen to be done’ (Drewery, 2004, p.334). As such, the retributive philosophy is a retrospective rather than prospective approach in that it focuses only on
the crime committed, and not on any beneficial consequences of punishment (Fletcher, 1996, p.516).

**Deterrence**

In its simplest form, such a goal presumes that individuals may be discouraged from offending through the knowledge that doing so will likely result in prosecution (Nagin, 1998, p.345). Deterrent effects can be either specific in nature – whereby the individual is presumed to have a lower likelihood of reoffending due to the experience of punishment; or general, where the threat of punishment may discourage potential offenders within the general public from committing crime (Apel and Nagin, 2011, p.411). According to Saunders and Bilante (2003, p.4) it can therefore be assumed that more offenders would be deterred following increased punishment severity. This however seems largely unsubstantiated.

Indeed, there is little evidence to suggest that increases in punishment severity yield any considerable deterrent effects (Tonry, 2011, p.199). With regard to prison sentences versus non-custodial sentences, counterproductive effects have been noted with the former leading to increases in recidivism rates of up to 11% (Gendreau, Goggin, Cullen and Andrews, 2000; Smith Goggin and Gendreau, 2002). Furthermore, those located in maximum security and harsher prison conditions are no less likely to offend upon release than those in minimum security conditions (Chen and Shapiro, 2007; Drago, Galbiati and Vertova, 2008). Given that the central assumptions of deterrence theory therefore appear flawed, it is vital to consider why deterrence is perceived to be a fundamental philosophy of imprisonment and penal policy.

**Incapacitation**

The approach of incapacitation is simple in that it involves the identification of those most likely to cause serious harm to society in the future and as such, assumes that protective measures, most likely in the form of lengthy imprisonment, are justified (Ashworth, 2007, p.995). A crime reduction is then achieved through the redistribution
of offenders, as if offenders are imprisoned; the likelihood of them committing crime against society is minimised (Feeley and Simon, 2003, p.437). Consequently, Wright (1999) estimates that in 1990, over 7 million offences in the United States were prevented due to incapacitative effects, whilst Weatherburn, Hua and Moffatt (2006) estimate rates of imprisonment in New South Wales prevent 45,000 burglaries per year. It is therefore little surprise that judges highlight the importance of incapacitation as a punishment philosophy (Davies, Takala and Tyrer, 2004).

Despite its apparent success however, incapacitation as a goal of imprisonment is problematic. Positive effects are limited for some offences including robbery, assault and murder (Zimring and Hawkins, 1997, p.120) and the implications of keeping offenders in prison for longer presents an obvious financial burden (approximately £32,300 per prisoner: SPS, 2012). Even more important however, is that it is problematic on a moral level (Spellman, 1994, p.10). The theory sets no limits on the time which an offender can be imprisoned for (Harcourt, 2012, p.20) and consequently raises questions over the possibility that if an offender is assessed as a high risk of reoffending, they can be imprisoned indefinitely.

Rehabilitation

The behavioural principle behind rehabilitation is that criminal offences are linked to external factors which include social pressures, situational problems and psychological difficulties. According to Pollock (2006, p.8), rehabilitation is defined as “internal change that results in cessation of the targeted negative behaviour” and consequently the process of rehabilitation involves managing these factors to reduce the likelihood of reoffending (Ashworth, 2007, p.994). This became a dominant ideal in 20th century prisons ahead of the previously outlined goals which had “no moral legitimacy, scientific standing, or pragmatic benefit” (Cullen and Gilbert, 2013, p.4).

There is evidence to support the effects of rehabilitation which can take place within prison. Sadlier (2010) for example notes a 6% reduction in the likelihood of reoffending
within one year when analysing offenders who had undergone cognitive and motivational practices, whilst Wilson, Bouffard and Mckenzie (2005) and McGuire (2008) also highlight the benefits of rehabilitative programmes. Bottoms (2004) however presents a highly critical view of what works in relation to rehabilitation. This sentiment builds upon that of Hudson (1996, p.29) who argues that given the rehabilitative approach assumes crime is a product of social circumstance and not choice, offenders are treated in a patronising manner.

**Prison ‘As’ Punishment or Prison ‘For’ Punishment**

In examining the fundamental goals of imprisonment, it is clear that these differ markedly in both form and philosophy (Miethe and Lu, 2005, p.15). This is subsequently problematic in deciding what the function of prison should be given the long established view that these goals challenge each other. Hart (1968, p.27) for example highlights that rehabilitation contradicts deterrence and retribution, whilst retribution may create more hardened offenders who resist attempts at rehabilitation. Similarly, Dilulio (1987) comment’s that due to such contradictory goals, prison “must be a house divided” (p.40). Hallevey (2013, p.117) however argues that they simply reflect different purposes and are therefore not as contradictory as others suggest.

Whatever the case, overall there seems to be two differing concepts behind imprisonment: punishment or rehabilitation. The philosophies of retribution, deterrence and incapacitation are very much aligned to punishing offenders for their crimes. Accordingly, these philosophies symbolise the notion that offenders should be sent to prison ‘for’ punishment. Conversely, rehabilitation aims to improve the skills and opportunities of offenders within prison to lessen chances of recidivism. In this case, the punishing of an offender is only aligned to the removal of their liberty and therefore, offenders are sent to prison ‘as’ punishment.
Summary

This chapter has outlined numerous philosophies of punishment which mirror the aims of imprisonment. Whereas the most prevailing legal function of imprisonment is punishment, it also has a duty to aid offender’s lead law-abiding lives both in custody and upon release (Burnett, 2013 p.244). This characterises the debate of whether a prison sentence should act ‘as’ punishment, or ‘for’ punishment. This debate is central in analysing attitudes toward imprisonment and the concept of punitiveness which informs public policy. This will be examined further in the next chapter.
Chapter III: Punitiveness and Penal Populism

This chapter will expand on the debate of whether prison should act ‘as’ punishment, or ‘for’ punishment by focussing on the concept of punitiveness. Reference will be made to the previously outlined philosophies behind imprisonment and how these relate to punitiveness, before an examination of a theme which will be scrutinized throughout this thesis: penal populism. The chapter will then review previous research which investigates public attitudes toward levels of punitiveness and imprisonment. The objective of this chapter is to highlight the importance of attitudinal research and its impact upon public policy.

Punitiveness

Within any research which aims to examine attitudes toward criminal justice policy, the concept of punitiveness is fundamental. With reference to whether offenders should be sent to prison ‘as’ punishment or ‘for’ punishment, those more punitive in nature are likely to support the latter given that the word ‘punitive’ represents the infliction of punishment (Ryberg, 2004, p.22). Whilst Mathews (2005, p.178) does concede that as a concept there has been little attempt to define punitiveness in criminological terms, he argues it is most closely associated with vengeance. It can therefore be deduced that punitiveness is an attitude which favours retribution and incapacitation over the rehabilitation of offenders (Courtwright and Mackey, 2004, p.317). It is regularly associated with sanctions such as the death penalty (see Borg, 1997; Unnever, Cullen and Roberts, 2005), and also the favouring of custodial over non-custodial sentences, for example prison terms over community penalties (Maruna and King, 2009).

Focussing on crime policy over the last few decades, Garland (2001) characterises this period with the evolvement of a ‘punitive turn’. This has been responsible for the promotion of “harsher sentencing and increased use of imprisonment” (ibid, p.142), and this is not the only manifestation of increasingly punitive ideology. Hutton (2005, p.243) also highlights the escalating “politicisation of crime and punishment which has seen political parties trying to portray themselves as the party of law and order”. Politicians therefore believe the public demand more severe and punitive punishment to deal with what is perceived to be an escalating crime problem, yet as has previously been outlined,
crime rates are in decline. This led Bottoms (1995) to coin the phrase ‘populist punitiveness’.

**Penal Populism**

The term ‘populist punitiveness’, which has since given way to the expression ‘penal populism’ (Newburn, 1997), was “intended to convey the notions of politicians tapping into and using for their own purposes, what they believe to be the public’s generally punitive stance” (Bottoms, 1995, p.40). Indeed when Tombs (2004, p.10) referred to the punitive climate of political and public opinion surrounding punishment, it seems to have been with this concept in mind.

It is within such a concept that the value of examining attitudes to criminal justice becomes critical. The politicisation of crime which Hutton (2005, p243) refers to has seen ‘the public’ play an increasingly guiding role in determining what punishment offenders should receive. Often implicit in Governmental policy statements is the impression that public opinion should be central in forming what policies are supported (Tonry, 2007, p.31) and in adding further to its definition, “penal populism consists of the pursuit of a set of penal policies to win votes rather than reduce crime or promote justice” (Roberts et al 2003, p.5).

Consequently, adopting a ‘tough on crime’ approach and lying in wait for an opponent to appear soft on such an issue is now a genuine political strategy (Newburn, 2007, p.465). The ‘punitive turn’ has therefore seen more faith placed in retribution and vengeance as legitimate aims of punishment alongside a favouring of custodial sentences (Estrada, 2004, p.420). This is a consequence of the harsh and punitive public attitudes believed to exist toward crime (Almond, 2008, p.448), the effects of which are apparent within penal policy.
Punishment in Practice

What has become evidently clear thus far is that there are multiple purposes of imprisonment. Both in outlining specific goals of imprisonment, or simplifying this to the debate of whether offenders should be sent to prison should be ‘as’ punishment or ‘for’ punishment, it is obvious that prison has numerous functions. The rise of penal populism though presents the need not only to examine these in a theoretical sense, but also a practical one which examines governmental policy and any influence of Garland’s (2001) ‘punitive turn’. That which will be focussed upon within this thesis is the ‘Strategy for Justice in Scotland’ (Scottish Government, 2012).

The Strategy for Justice in Scotland

This document is responsible for outlining an “overarching vision for a safe and just Scotland” (Scottish Government, 2013, p.9). Given it places the reduction of reoffending as one of its core aims, it provides an ideal opportunity to analyse the Scottish Government’s views regarding punishment and imprisonment. In his opening statement, Scottish Justice Minister Kenny MacAskill outlines the goals of imprisonment by arguing:

“I believe in a justice system that provides proportionate punishment for those who offend; that keeps serious and dangerous criminals in custody; that provides appropriate support for those seeking to end their offending” (p.5).

Although not explicitly stated, the goals of retribution, incapacitation and rehabilitation are echoed here. As would be expected considering its prominent role as a goal of imprisonment, there is further reference to the importance of rehabilitation. It is interesting to note however that this also comes with reference to punishment. The document for example states that prison sentences “punish serious offenders appropriately...and offer the opportunity for rehabilitation” (p.5). It also states that “Our justice system must therefore enable rehabilitation as well as punishment” (p.6).
It is expressions such as these which hint at the influence of penal populism. Whereas
the strategy does seem to support the idea of rehabilitation, this seems to go hand-in-
hand with the idea of punishment which is of course characteristic of the ‘tough on
crime’ approach the rise of penal populism has led to (Joyce, 2006, p.32).

Strengthening this view further, the Strategy for Justice in Scotland seems to favour the
retributive approach most traditionally associated with punitiveness (Sebba, 2008,
p.198). The term ‘retribution’ is not specifically used, however many expressions
exercise retributive rhetoric. The idea that justice must be “seen to be done” (p.36) is
one allied to retributive thinking (Darley and Pittman, 2003, p.325), whilst the strategy
also advocates “proportionate punishment” (p.5) which again is a key characteristic of
retributive philosophy (Von Hirsch, 1992). Such instances reinforce the increasingly
punitive nature of policy and consequently evidence the influence of penal populism.
Whilst rehabilitation is advocated within the document, it is the ‘tough on crime’
approach which is most obvious since the public are believed to favour a punitive stance
(Bottoms, 1995, p.40).

In highlighting the importance of public opinion the strategy itself states;

“The justice system adapts over time to reflect shifting social norms...
Social attitudes and opinions about justice also change over time”
(p.37).

In this respect, the document is simply reflecting such societal changes where voters
have become increasingly more punitive in their attitudes. Accordingly, to be more
popular amongst the electorate, the government has pursued policy which reflects this
opinion. This in essence is penal populism (Roberts et al, 2003, p.5) and conforms to the
assertion of Freiberg and Gelb (2008) who argue that policy has moved in a “more
punitive direction to reflect the views of an allegedly punitive public” (p.5).
It therefore seems clear that the concept of penal populism is evidenced through the Strategy for Justice in Scotland. The tendency to pander to the desires of what is perceived to be a punitive public is a way of demonstrating that the government is acting decisively regarding crime (Almond 2011, p.68), and ensures that there is support from the electorate (Tonry, 2011, p.109). Should the public be found to be punitive in its attitudes, then actions to ensure that punishment is punitive would certainly be warranted (Payne, Gainey, Triplett and Danner, 2004, p.195). The purpose of imprisonment would be subsequently comprised of punitive rhetoric which favours retribution and incapacitative effects alongside the deterrent value which custodial sentences hold, and this would be well documented by research. Yet whilst governmental policy seems aligned to punitive expression, the extent to which punitive views are actually held by the public is debatable.

**Attitudes to Sentencing and Imprisonment**

Since the early 1990’s the quantity of research which has sought to examine public attitudes to crime has risen dramatically (Roberts and Hough, 2005, p.3). Within that time, it has become increasingly vital to understand what these attitudes are and how they can influence penal policy (Allen, 2002, p.xviii). In examining the influence of penal populism, it is clear to see why this is the case: the public play a key role in the formation of criminal policy. What this research presents though is not a clear indication of the highly punitive public which policy makers believe them to be, but instead a far more complex set of attitudes is apparent. Whilst much of this research does not refer explicitly to functions of imprisonment and instead focuses on sentencing goals, it is still fundamental in influencing the current study.

*Previous Research - Sentencing*

Seminal work in this field includes that of Hough and Roberts (1999) who in utilising a survey method found that 79% of participants felt sentences were to some degree ‘too lenient’. 51% agreed sentences were ‘much too lenient’. This would epitomise a punitive attitude, however those who appeared most dissatisfied with sentencing practices were those who were least accurate in predicting the actual severity of
sentences given to offenders. This lack of knowledge has been replicated across several studies (Hough and Roberts, 1998; Russell and Morgan, 2001; Roberts and Hough, 2012) and exemplifies how public opinion is not based on accurate information, but collective representations (Garland, 2001, p.158), including those promoted by the media (Gelb, 2008, p.73).

It seems then entirely viable that punitive views which exist are due to inaccuracy of knowledge regarding the justice system. Supporting this argument, when the public are presented with additional information, it does seem to alter opinion. Indeed, when participants in Hough and Roberts (1999) were presented with a range of sentencing options with regard to a burglary scenario, respondents favouring a prison term dropped by 13%. This confirms Tonry’s (2007, p.33) observation that those provided with additional information with regard to such issues are likelier to see shades of grey as opposed to black and white. Similar findings have been replicated within both Sprott (1999) and Warner and Davis (2012).

Similarly, Walker, Flatley, Kershaw and Moon (2009) found that 75% of respondents felt that sentences were ‘too lenient’, which is indicative of the public’s initial ‘tough talk’ approach (Roberts and Hough, 2011, p.194). However, when the same sample is presented with specific cases and circumstances which provide additional information, there is favourable support for less punitive options (Lovegrove, 2007; Roberts and Hough, 2011). Such findings therefore support the view that the “British public is not oriented exclusively towards punishment” (Hough and Roberts, 1999, p.22).

**Previous Research – Prison**

The lack of public knowledge which characterises attitudes with regard to sentencing is also prevalent with regard to knowledge of prison. The 2003 MORI poll found that less than a third of respondents knew ‘a great deal’ or a ‘fair amount’ regarding prisons, whilst nearly 90% of a Scottish sample reported knowing ‘not very much’ or ‘nothing at all’ about prisons (Anderson, Ingram and Hutton, 2002). This presents an obvious
problem in that where punitive public sentiment is liable to be based on inaccuracy, and policy is based on an ever-growingly punitive public. Again though, the extent to which research supports the assumption of a punitive public is debatable.

A key question in this area is with regard to the purpose of prison. In the 2003 MORI survey, 73% of participants saw incapacitation as the most important function, whilst 60% favoured rehabilitation. Other studies have however found endorsement of rehabilitation to be higher in importance than punishment (Beare, Hann, Nuffield, Roberts and Tremblay, 1999; Belden, Russonello and Stewart, 2001). Providing an overview of the philosophies underpinning imprisonment, Roberts and Hough (2005, p.96) suggest that in identifying the most important goal, 48% are most supportive rehabilitation, 33% support deterrence and 15% support punishment. In returning to the prison ‘as’ punishment or prison ‘for’ punishment debate, such findings present a complex view. From the perspective of the public then, prison should both punish and reform offenders (Roberts and Hough, 2005b, p.294).

Whilst this would present insufficient evidence to suggest the public are highly punitive, this is not to say that this assertion can be entirely discredited. Anderson et al (2002) for example reported that 50% of respondents agreed ‘life is too soft in Scottish prisons’ and 55% agreed or strongly agreed that tougher sentences would lead to less crime. Given that ‘toughness’ is aligned to longer prison sentences in harsher conditions (Hutton, 2005, p.255), it would certainly appear that in this respect, many favour a punitive approach. Moreover, 43% disagreed that ‘prison is the best way of preventing reoffending’ whilst many agreed (52%) or strongly agreed (16%) that ‘prisons are schools for crime’. This is of course indicative of punitive attitudes, however it is important to note that 90% of this same sample reported knowing ‘not very much’ or ‘nothing at all’ about prisons. Representing more lenient attitudes though, 64% and 21% of participants respectively agreed and strongly agreed that ‘offenders should receive training to help them find jobs’. This is characteristic of rehabilitative practices which are at the lesser end of the punitive scale and furthermore, 67% felt that ‘prison punishes prisoners’ adequately.
This reveals that attitudes with regard to prison are not entirely punitive, and instead attitudes to imprisonment show not only a desire for punishment, but also for other functions such as rehabilitation. The effect this has though is arguable. Again raising the issue of penal populism, Hutton (2005) argues:

“There is evidence of public support for more rationale penal policies. There is sadly little evidence of political leadership prepared to argue the case” (p.254).

Consequently, there is a “symbiosis” which exists between the public and politicians (Freiberg, 2008, p.108), thus reflecting what Pratt (2002) refers to as “a new axis of penal power” (p.181). This subsequently removes authority from experts regarding crime and places it in the hands of the public (Pratt, 2008, p.369). Given that the public are assumed to be punitive in their nature, it is little wonder why policy has adopted such a punitive tone. What this highlights, is the importance of examining attitudes to criminal policy in order to challenge such views.

**Summary**

To summarise, this chapter has focussed on the concept of punitiveness and the favouring of such an approach due to the rise of penal populism. This has undoubtedly had a significant impact on policy; however the extent to which the public hold such punitive attitudes is debatable. Consequently, this chapter has highlighted the importance of attitudinal research with regard to criminal justice issues, and advocates the significance of this as a way of highlighting to policy makers that public opinion is far more complex than what they may perceive. Whilst this chapter has emphasised the punitive message which politicians communicate, the next will highlight divergence of thought between what policy makers convey and what the SPS aims to achieve.
Chapter IV: The Scottish Prison Service and the Prison Officer

This chapter will focus on the concept of imprisonment by examining the values of the Scottish Prison Service through the recent publication of its Organisational Review. The chapter will then examine in more detail the role of the prison officer, subsequently justifying the importance of attitudinal research which focuses on their opinions, before reviewing existing literature which has previously examined their views.

Scottish Prison Service – Organisational Review


Despite the strength of penal populism and its impact upon policy, the SPS Organisational Review places the rehabilitation of offenders at the core of its new mission statement: “Providing services that help to transform the lives of people in our care so they can fulfil their potential and become responsible citizens” (SPS, 2013, p.7). This is in sharp contrast to the ‘tough-on-crime’ approach adopted by politicians. Whilst the role of incapacitation is acknowledged, “public safety is not best delivered by incapacitation alone” (ibid, p.19), and it is also recognised that the failure to adopt a rehabilitative approach would be detrimental;

“Failure to tackle the underlying factors which contribute to people committing offences, or to support those leaving custody to build a better life for themselves and their families, will result in further harm to victims and communities” (ibid, p.9).
Considering what has previously been examined in relation to punitiveness, the SPS is clearly an organisation which does not favour such an approach. This is indicative of disparity between the punitive messages politicians promote and what the SPS aims to achieve. Indeed in returning to the prison ‘as’ or ‘for’ punishment debate, the review states that “In Scotland, people are sent to prison as punishment and not for punishment” (ibid, p.19), however this presents a substantial divergence from the retributive rhetoric conveyed by politicians.

In achieving its mission of reduced recidivism, the review refers to SPS staff as its greatest resource and strength (ibid, p.75). Where the role of the prison officer was one previously of care, support and authority (ibid, p.43), prison officers can now be seen as facilitators for transformation whereby the relationships which exist between officer and prisoner act as a catalyst for change, leading to prisoners to improve their lives (ibid, p.56). This however is no easy task. Not only are prison officers required to promote effective relationships which can lead to desistance in prisoners; they are also required to exercise the rule of law within prison (ibid, p.78). This role conflict is a major source of stress for officers (see Wilson, 2000), and encompasses the difficulties faced in reconciling the aims of custody and care (Liebling, Price and Shefer, 2011, p.64). This of course mirrors the challenge of the prison establishment as a whole, which must balance the demands of punishment, rehabilitation, care and control (Wilson and O’Sullivan, 2004, p.13).

A key aim of the Organisational Review is to promote a new culture which “lies at the heart of the transformation envisaged” (p.43). Culture is formed by the “attitudes, behaviours, assumptions and belief systems of those within the system” (p.43), and has a significant impact upon the quality of life prisoners face (Liebling, 2007a). Indeed according to the SPS, culture shapes the ‘climate’ of the organisation, including the way in which officers treat prisoners, and consequently the importance of factors which inform culture are of vital significance. Given the renewed focus upon the criminal justice system, this presents an ideal opportunity to engage in new research with regard to imprisonment, and in particular, focus on the importance of prison officer attitudes in shaping the way prison functions.
Prison Officer Attitudes

Within the penal system, prison officers are seen as 'key actors' who are directly responsible for the implementation of penal policy (Vuolo and Kruttschnitt, 2008, p309). This includes policy which may favour differing forms or philosophies of imprisonment. The attitudes which prison officers possess are seen as vital in contributing to the role of the "ideal" prison officer (House of Commons Justice Committee, 2009, p.126), yet research which examines what these attitudes are in relation to how they view imprisonment is lacking, particularly within a British context. Prison officers are placed within a unique situation where “they have the power to enhance or undermine the primary goals of the correctional institution where they work” (Kjelsber, Skoglund and Rustad, 2007, p.71; Crewe, 2011). Accordingly, should the SPS wish to promote a positive culture throughout the organisation, it is imperative that these attitudes are examined.

Research on prison life is however characterised by its neglect of prison officers (Arnold et al 2007, p.471). Considering the rise of penal populism and the general consensus that public knowledge regarding the criminal justice and prison system is limited, there is an obvious requirement to study the views of those who engage with prison and offenders most. Given the renewed focus upon criminal justice issues and the SPS Organisational Review, the present time is ideal for such an examination to take place.

Previous Research

Despite a distinct lack of research within a British context, Crewe, Liebling and Hulley (2011) did examine the punitive orientations of prison officers. This focussed on a wider ‘punitiveness dimension’ rather than accounting for specific goals of imprisonment, and revealed officers to be “relatively punitive in their attitudes” (p.100). In examining orientations more specifically, research conducted in North America reveals distinct support for the concept of rehabilitation. Farkas (1999) for example found that 71% of respondents disagreed with the statement ‘rehabilitative programs are a waste of money’. Furthermore, 59% disagreed with the statement ‘rehabilitation programs
should be best left to mental health professionals’. Conversely, there was equal support in relation to making prisons more uncomfortable as a way to reduce crime.

Support for rehabilitation is also evident within Moon and Maxwell (2004), who in examining the views of South Korean prison officers found a favouring of rehabilitation over punishment. There were however doubts over the effectiveness of this ideal, with 60% of officers agreeing that rehabilitation programs do not work. Officers in Bermuda have also been found to be supportive of rehabilitation. Burton, Dunaway and Wolfe (1991) found that 78% of officers believed the rehabilitation of offenders to be just as important as punishing them, and 83% disagreed that the best way to lower crime rates was to punish offenders.

Tewksbury and Mustain (2004) also found that officers in the United States identified rehabilitation as the most important purpose of prison. This was followed by retribution, incapacitation, specific deterrence and general deterrence. Justifying the importance of such findings, Tewksbury and Moon (2004) state that it is “critically important” to know what the attitudes and beliefs of prison officers are given they are likely to influence interactions with prisoners (p.229) and in a wider sense, the goals of the prison institution (Kjelsber et al, 2007, p.1).

The research of Kifer, Hemmens and Stohr (2003) however contradict previous findings that exemplify the importance of rehabilitation. Using a survey method to ask prison officers in the United States what they believed to be the main goal of prison, respondents identified incapacitation as most important, followed by deterrence, rehabilitation and retribution. Again, the importance of such findings in relation to policy cannot be underestimated considering prison officers “hold the power to either carry out or destroy the institutional mission (Kifer et al, 2003, p.67).

Research also reveals the fluctuation of results both within and between locations. In examining views of prison officers in Texas, Teske and Williamson (1979) found strong
support for rehabilitation; however this had significantly diminished in Paboojian and Teske (1997). Furthermore, Lerman and Page (2012) investigated attitudes with respondents from Minnesota and California. Whilst 67% of Minnesota prison officers agreed that rehabilitation should be a central goal of imprisonment, this dropped to 47% for those in California. Similarly, 46% of officers in Minnesota saw punishment as the dominant goal of prison compared to 61% from California.

The extent of these variances emphasise the growing requirement for a British based study which investigates prison officer attitudes. Prisoners often view officers as possessing a confrontational attitude alongside an eagerness to discipline wrongdoings (Dirkzwager and Kruttschnitt, 2012, p.410), therefore it is imperative to examine if such behaviours are coupled with punitive views. If this is the case, officers are more likely to favour punishment over the rehabilitation of prisoners which would represent a sharp divergence from the message the SPS conveys. Indeed, when examining the wider picture in relation to previous discussions regarding penal populism, comments from the House of Commons Justice Committee (2009) suggest that punitive public attitudes impact on the views prison officers have of their role. As this is a role which involves many purposes, serious consideration must be given to research which not only examines public attitudes, but also the attitudes of “those individuals who are directly responsible for implementing new penal policies” (Vuolo and Kruttschnitt, 2008, p309). Consequently, this research is dedicated to examining the attitudes which prison officers hold with regard to philosophies of prison, the effectiveness of prison, and who should influence prison policy.

**Summary**

In summary, this chapter has outlined the SPS Organisational Review and its emphasis on transforming the lives of prisoners alongside a commitment to rehabilitation. In doing so, it aims to promote a new culture, which at its centre, are the attitudes of those working within prisons. Whilst the importance of prison officers and their attitudes cannot be underestimated in shaping such culture, research which examines these opinions in a British context is severely limited. The remaining chapters are
consequently dedicated to the conducting of research to identify the attitudes of prison officers in relation to imprisonment within the SPS. The next chapter focuses on the method adopted to do so.
Chapter V: Methodology

The primary aim of this research was to collect and analyse data which examined the attitudes of prison officers with regard to their views on various aspects of prison. This chapter will outline the methodology used to conduct this research. It will discuss and justify the chosen research method and outline details relevant to the selection of participants, design, procedure and data analysis. It will also highlight the necessary ethical considerations adopted.

Participants

Participants were drawn from operational staff (Operations Officers, Residential Officers, Regimes/Programmes Officers and First Line Managers) from all thirteen SPS establishments. An email was sent to the approximate 4000 prison officers working in these prisons which outlined the nature and purpose of the study. Also included was an ‘Information Sheet’ (see Appendix A) which provided details of the researcher and further information regarding the research.

Design

The survey administered was of mixed methods design, incorporating both quantitative and qualitative elements. Quantitative analysis provides a favourable approach when assessing attitudes regarding criminal justice (Roberts, Feilzer and Hough, 2011); however qualitative data can be used to provide a deeper understanding of survey responses (Driscoll, Appiah-Yeboah, Salib and Rupert, 2007, p.27). It was therefore decided to “draw the best from the two approaches and combine them” (Taylor and Trumbell, 2005, p.245). The survey took place in the form of a self-completed electronic questionnaire and its design mirrored seminal works within this particular field of criminal justice including Hough and Roberts (1999), Anderson et al (2002) and Roberts and Hough (2005).

The survey consisted of 23 questions (Appendix B) split into two subsections. The first gathered information related to participant demographics such as gender, age, length of
service and educational attainment. The second subsection examined the participant’s views on imprisonment. Questions fell into four specific themes: philosophies of imprisonment, prison ‘as’ or ‘for’ punishment, prison effectiveness and prison policy influence.

The majority of questions asked participants to indicate their level of agreement with a given statement. These could be answered using a 5-point Likert scale where respondents stated they ‘strongly disagree’, ‘disagree’, ‘neither disagree nor agree’, ‘agree’ or ‘strongly agree’ with the statement. There were also several questions where respondents were provided with a set of options and asked to place these in order of importance. Given possible order effects (see Krosnick and Presser, 2010), the order of these options was randomised for each respondent. In providing for qualitative data, beneath each question participants were given the opportunity to add further comment if they chose to do so.

**Procedure**

All prison officers in SPS establishments were contacted via an email which included a brief introduction to the survey and an ‘Information for Participants’ attachment. This highlighted details such as participant confidentiality and included information with regard to the nature and purpose of the research. This also contained an electronic link to the survey which was hosted via surveymonkey.com. Participants who chose to continue were asked to follow this link and electronically provide their informed consent before proceeding to the survey itself. This involved clicking an ‘agree’ or ‘disagree’ option. Participants were informed that there were no correct or incorrect answers to any of the questions and there was no time limit to complete the questionnaire. Upon completion, respondents were thanked for their participation.
Analysis

Quantitative results were collated and inputted into Microsoft Excel. This provided for calculation of the relevant descriptive statistical analysis which would be conducted. The purpose of this research was aligned to subject exploration rather than the testing of hypothesis. As the topic of study is characterised by a lack of previous research, qualitative data analysis was inductive in its approach given that this analysis can lead to a far deeper understanding of a particular issue (Hays and Singh, 2012, p.5). Content was analysed and grouped into relevant themes, and any similarities/differences in the views of respondents were identified. This followed a similar pattern to the approach used in Anderson et al (2002). Here, researchers reported data first in terms of percentage responses to various questions, and then interpreted data further by highlighting examples of why participants chose particular responses by examining themes which arose through qualitative data analysis.

Ethical Considerations

Given that this research involved the collection of data from serving prison officers, it was essential to negate any reluctance from respondents to take part due to issues regarding confidentiality. It was therefore vital to ensure the anonymity of participants by using an anonymous questionnaire method. Through the use of an information sheet, respondents were fully informed as to the voluntary nature of the research and also provided their informed consent. Respondents were reminded before beginning the survey that no data would identify them, and they would not be asked to give their name at any point.

Permission to conduct research was obtained from the University of Portsmouth Ethics Committee, The SPS Research and Ethics Committee, The SPS Operations Directorate and The SPS Corporate Services Directorate. Consequently, the researcher was fully aware of all necessary ethical considerations, and considering that this is an area characterised by a lack of research, was also aware of their responsibility “to advance
knowledge about criminological issues” (Code of Ethics, The British Society of Criminology),
**Chapter VI: Results**

This chapter will present findings from a mixed-method survey completed by prison officers. The chapter will first present statistics of a descriptive nature relating to demographic characteristics of respondents. Following this, research findings will be presented in four specific themes: philosophies of imprisonment, prison ‘as’ or ‘for’ punishment, prison effectiveness and influence over prison policy.

**Descriptive Statistics**

The analysis within this chapter is based on a survey which was completed by 398 prison officers working in SPS establishments: the purpose of which was to identify and explore the attitudes which prison officers hold in relation to imprisonment. This sample provides a 4.66% margin of error at the 95% confidence interval. Of those respondents, 74% were male and 26% were female. The most common age group represented were those in the 45-54 age group which comprised 41% of the sample. This was followed by those in the 25-34 and 35-44 age group which each comprised 22% of the sample. Officers were generally found to be highly experienced, with over 18 years being the most common length of service (44%), or relatively inexperienced with the next most common length of service per respondent being under 3 years (20%). Participants were most likely to be Residential Officers (35%) or Operations Officers (29%), however all job roles were represented (First Line Managers: 16%, Regimes Officers: 13% and Programmes Officers: 7%). Educational attainment across the sample ranged from 3.5% who stated they had ‘none’, to 32% achieving O Grade/Standard Grades and 10% achieving an undergraduate degree. A full breakdown of data can be found in Appendix C.

**Mean Analysis**

Respondants were asked to specify their opinion on a number of statements by indicating their level of agreement with them. This was achieved using a Likert scale whereby participants allocated a figure of 1 to 5 to best describe their support. 1 indicated that the participant ‘strongly disagrees’, 2 equaled ‘disagree’, 3 indicated ‘neither disagree nor agree’, 4 represented ‘agree’, and 5 indicated respondents ‘strongly agree’ with the statement. All questions were allocated a ‘mean response’ which
reflected the level of agreement across the sample. Mean responses closer to 1 revealed strong disagreement with the statement; responses closer to 5 were indicative of strong agreement.

**Question Analysis: Philosophies of Imprisonment**

Respondents were presented with brief descriptions of the main philosophies of imprisonment (specific deterrence, general deterrence, incapacitation, retribution and rehabilitation) and asked to order these from most important to least important. For this question, higher mean scores were indicative of higher importance. Data is presented in Figure 2.

![Figure 2: Purpose of Prison - Summary of Mean Responses](image)

Whilst retribution received the lowest support with a mean response of 2.69, it was virtually no different from specific and general deterrence which each had a mean response of 2.70. Incapacitation was supported with a mean response of 3.32; though the majority of officers believed rehabilitation to be the main purpose of imprisonment with a mean response of 3.59. Qualitative data was mainly related to rehabilitation and signalled support for its philosophy; however a significant finding was that officers believed those prisoners who chose not to engage with rehabilitative efforts should endure a more punitive prison regime;
“Every effort should be made to increase prisoners skills, education, addictions, health etc but if they don’t want the help then a strict regime should be implemented for that prisoner i.e. loss of privileges, no tv, recreation and access to activities such as PT”.

Indeed within any question which examined the concept of rehabilitation, this became a common theme. Furthermore, despite the obvious significance officers placed in rehabilitative ideals, there were doubts raised over its effectiveness;

“Although I have stated rehabilitation first this should be on an individual basis and merit based. Why are we offering help every single time to repeat offenders who are really only interested in milking the system. But I do agree that we shouldn't be making prison and easy option, it should be a deterrent which it is not at the moment”

“Support for rehabilitation, but scepticism over its effectiveness”.

Whilst this question determined the importance prison officers attached to each philosophy in what they felt was the most important goal of imprisonment, further statements determined support for individual principles of each philosophy. Findings are summarised in Table 1.

Table 1: Goals of Imprisonment – Response Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Disagree or Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In prison, offenders should receive training to increase their employability</td>
<td>3.27% (n=13)</td>
<td>2.26% (n=9)</td>
<td>5.53% (n=22)</td>
<td>52.76% (n=210)</td>
<td>36.18% (n=144)</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A harsher sentence will reduce the likelihood of an offender committing the same offence once released</td>
<td>5.03% (n=20)</td>
<td>23.12% (n=92)</td>
<td>18.59% (n=74)</td>
<td>33.42% (n=133)</td>
<td>19.85% (n=79)</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoners should serve their full sentence</td>
<td>1.32% (n=5)</td>
<td>13.68% (n=52)</td>
<td>14.21% (n=54)</td>
<td>36.05% (n=137)</td>
<td>34.74% (n=132)</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminals deserve to be punished because they have harmed society by their crime</td>
<td>1.31% (n=5)</td>
<td>3.94% (n=15)</td>
<td>11.55% (n=44)</td>
<td>46.98% (n=179)</td>
<td>36.22% (n=138)</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rehabilitation

Support for rehabilitative ideals was acquired by asking respondents to indicate their agreement with the statement: “In prison, offenders should receive training to increase their employability”. Of all questions asked, this produced the strongest agreement across the sample with a mean response of 4.16.

Given that 88.94% of respondents at least agreed with this statement, it would appear that prison officers strongly favour rehabilitative philosophy. The positivity related to the importance of such ideals was well documented in qualitative analysis; however such analysis also revealed an important caveat of this. Whilst the vast majority of officers were strongly supportive of the opportunities afforded to prisoners, there were again doubts over their effectiveness.

“Training, in most cases, is a pointless task as the vast majority of prisoners have no intention of ever utilising the training they receive to gain employment.”

“Receiving training gives the opportunity to gain better employment but it is only beneficial if they want to learn and better themselves.”

A distinct theme emerged indicating that for rehabilitation to be most effective, prisoners must want to use these opportunities, rather than have such opportunities forced upon them. According to many officers, such efforts were often wasted. Findings would therefore suggest that in this regard, officers place the onus on the individual prisoner to exploit training opportunities and take responsibility for their own progression.

Deterrence

Respondents were asked to indicate their agreement with the statement: “A harsher sentence will reduce the likelihood of an offender committing the same offence when
released”. This measured their support for deterrence as a goal of imprisonment. With a mean response of 3.40, this particular philosophy produced the lowest level of support in comparison to others. Whilst 33.42% and 19.85% of officers agreed and strongly agreed respectively, 23.12% and 5.03% of officers respectively disagreed and strongly disagreed that deterrence would produce its desired effect. Qualitative analysis revealed the polarity of opinion with regard to this:

“In my experience of dealing/speaking with prisoners for over 10 years, if they knew they would get a long sentence (i.e 3 strikes rule like America) they would not commit the crime. They know that their sentence gets automatically halved if less than 4 years plus backdated to when they got remanded so there is no real deterrent for them as very rarely do we see a "long" sentence”.

“In my opinion a "lenient or harsh" sentence plays little bearing on whether the individual will reoffend or not. It is the experiences they receive while in custodial care and lifestyle they go back into upon release that determines whether an individual is likely to commit the same offence again”.

In examining comments made; it was clear that some officers felt that prison held no deterrent element. This was elucidated with regard to lenient sentencing procedures and also the ‘comforts’ of prison conditions including television and gym access. Whilst some officers pointed to the fact that longer sentences would allow for more time to engage the prisoner in relevant rehabilitative efforts, there were also those who felt that harsher sentences would have limited impact in producing deterrent effects. Much like that of rehabilitation, a theme emerged whereby officers felt the onus was on the prisoner alone to desist from offending. Subsequently, officers believed it was the decision of the offender to cease any criminal activity and this was not as a result of any deterrent factors related to imprisonment.
Incapacitation

Attitudes toward incapacitation were tested by asking officers to indicate their agreement with the statement: “Prisoners should serve their full sentence”. This produced a mean response of 3.89, with 36.05% of respondents agreeing and 34.74% strongly agreeing. 13.68% and 1.32% disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively. In reviewing comments from officers, there was strong support for change in relation to the amount of time prisoners serve. Quantitative analysis revealed support for forcing offenders to serve their full sentence, and qualitative analysis again revealed this to be the case. Importantly however, there was a strong consensus that engagement with rehabilitative programmes coupled with good behaviour should allow for prison terms to be shortened;

“Prisoners who display exemplary behaviour and can demonstrate their time in custody has been purposeful and desistance from future crime should be released early for action such as good behaviour, I also feel this would work more effectively with a victims (Victims family) input”.

“Prisoners should earn the right to early release. There should be no automatic right for short term prisoners to receive a 50% reduction in their sentence and no automatic right to participation in a parole scheme which results in most cases of a reduction of up to a third of their sentence. The starting point should be serving the full term with reductions based on engagement/behaviour within the penal setting”.

It was clear from analysis that the attitudes of officers were strongly related to the above views. There seemed to an annoyance that prisoners were automatically released at specific stages of their sentences irrespective of their conduct within prison or any rehabilitative programmes which they had/had not engaged in. Accordingly, many respondents were of the opinion that prisoners who had conformed to behavioural expectations and utilised the rehabilitative opportunities afforded to them should be rewarded with sentence remission.
Retribution

Attitudes toward retribution were examined by asking respondents to indicate their agreement with one of its main principles: “Criminals deserve to be punished because they have harmed society by their crime”. Much like ideals surrounding rehabilitation, this produced a highly supportive mean response of 4.13, indicating offers were strongly in favour of this principle. 46.98% and 36.22% of officers agreed and strongly agreed with this statement. 3.94% disagreed and 1.31% strongly disagreed. Comments which exemplified support for this statement, and indeed the concept of retribution included;

“Failure to comply with the norms of society deserves punishment, without values and restrictions, as defined by society, there would anarchy and chaos”.

Such a view highlights the attitudes of respondents in that many who supported the idea of retribution felt that due to the harm caused in the committing of a crime, offenders deserve to be punished. Feelings such as this were highly prevalent, however added to this was a theme amongst some officers that punishment should only involve the removal of liberty which a prison sentence creates, and not further punishment within prison. This subsequently provided a glimpse of opinion with regard to the prison ‘as’ or ‘for’ punishment debate;

“Prisoners do deserve to be punished, being in prison is punishment enough though, I do not believe prisoners should be mistreated but I do think they should be expected to work while in prison or engage with education or programmes”.

“They deserve to be punished with their liberty taken, but I disagree that they should be further punished inside prison”.
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Question Analysis: Prison ‘As’ or ‘For’ Punishment

Within the survey, respondents were asked four questions which examined the debate as to whether offenders should be imprisoned ‘as’ punishment or ‘for’ punishment. Summaries of responses can be found in Figures 3 and 4.

The statement “Being put in prison should punish offenders” was one supported with a mean response of 3.79. Analysis revealed that 26.10% of respondents strongly agreed with this, and 46.77% agreed. In contrast, 11.37% and 4.13% disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively. In comparison, the statement “Being put in prison actually punishes offenders” received less support with a mean response of 2.56. Here, only 2.33% of officers strongly agreed and 22.74% agreed. The largest response (37.98%) was comprised of those who disagreed, whilst 16.54% of the sample strongly disagreed.

With regard to the statement that being put in prison should punish offenders, many officers noted that the punishment given was the removal of the offender’s liberty, and as a result, the offender should not be subjected to further punishment whilst within prison. Others however felt that prison should be more punitive;

“There is always a punishment element to prison, although it is important for the prisoner and the general public to understand that being put in prison and losing their liberty is the punishment and that it is not the job of the prison to punish people”.

Figure 3: Response by % to questions ‘Being put in prison should punish offenders’ and ‘Being put in prison actually punishes offenders’ – Comparison
“Although a restriction of liberty is seen as punishment, once behind the prison walls there is a less than favourable punitive approach, more seen as molly coddling”.

“I think now to a certain extent there is relatively no punishment in Prison. Everything is catered for a human being's needs. - 3 square meals - newspaper - television - sweets/chocolate - x-box, playstation - pool, snooker tables - gym, football pitches - education - social work - family visits often twice a day and this is just the start. In no way is this punishment”.

Much of what was raised in the latter of these comments was perpetuated when examining the thoughts of officers in relation to whether prisoners are ‘actually’ punished whilst imprisoned. Many officers felt that prisoners believed prison to simply be an ‘occupational hazard’, and in many cases a ‘second home’ for offenders. Whilst many again noted the loss of liberty which prisoners face, there was consensus that the ‘comforts’ provided within prison limited any punishment factor. In relation to this statement, a strong theme developed that in terms of actual punishment, it was not the prisoner who suffered most, but the families they left behind;

“This depends on the type of prisoner, repeat offenders are often not bothered about being in prison as they are surrounded by their associates/friends from outside. Often the families/children are more affected than the prisoner”.

Two questions focussed more specifically on the prison ‘as’ or ‘for’ punishment debate. The first of these asked “Offenders should be sent to prison for what purpose?” with the options of ‘as punishment’, ‘for punishment’ or ‘both’. The second question asked respondents “Prison should be concerned with what purpose?” with the options of ‘punishing offenders for their crime’, or ‘ensuring they do not offend when released’. Response rates can be found in Figure 4.
Findings revealed that the majority of respondents (56.65%) saw prison as a place where offenders should be sent ‘as’ punishment for their crimes and not ‘for’ further punishment. Many felt that prison should encompass elements of both (39.89%), however very few were of the opinion that offenders should be sent purely ‘for’ further punishment (3.46%). Furthermore, over three quarters of the sample (77.54%) believed that prison should be more concerned with rehabilitation rather than punishment (22.46%). Qualitative analysis tended to mirror these statistics revealing three distinct preferences: those advocating prison ‘as’ punishment, those ‘for’ punishment and those supporting elements of both by advocating a more punitive regime;

“Prisoners should not be punished within a prison as the punishment is being sent to prison. Further punishments I believe would be counterproductive and would teach them less about fitting back into society”.

“Let offenders fear coming to prison, not a holiday camp. Our current prison is more like a hotel and the programmes and education is like a new college .It’s shocking , people living in poverty and they are living in excellent clean conditions with doctor physiotherapy etc on call”
“The punishment is being sent to prison, however there should be restrictions on what prisoners are allowed to enjoy, for example why should they gain access to games consoles or multiple television channels at public expense, when there are law abiding members of society who cannot afford to enjoy such luxuries.”

Much like analysis of previous statements, respondents in favour of prison acting ‘for’ punishment questioned the ‘comforts’ which prisoners had access to. The question ‘Life is too easy for prisoners in Scotland’ provided a mean response of 3.90, with 35.40% of the sample agreeing and 35.14% strongly agreeing with the statement. 11.37% and 2.07% disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively.

**Question Analysis: Effectiveness of Prison**

Respondents were asked to indicate their agreement with statements which examined the effectiveness of prison. Results can be seen in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Disagree nor Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prison has a positive impact on offenders</td>
<td>11.29% (n=43)</td>
<td>31.50% (n=120)</td>
<td>42.78% (n=163)</td>
<td>13.65% (n=52)</td>
<td>0.79% (n=3)</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison is the best way of preventing reoffending</td>
<td>6.53% (n=26)</td>
<td>30.90% (n=123)</td>
<td>35.18% (n=140)</td>
<td>16.08% (n=64)</td>
<td>11.31% (n=45)</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of the prison officer is key to reducing reoffending</td>
<td>2.93% (n=11)</td>
<td>10.11% (n=38)</td>
<td>14.36% (n=54)</td>
<td>39.36% (n=148)</td>
<td>33.24% (n=125)</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Officers remained largely undecided on the statements “Prison has a positive impact on offenders” and “Prison is the best way of preventing reoffending”. These produced mean responses which indicated disagreement (2.61 and 2.95 respectively), however a
A common finding was that respondents neither disagreed nor agreed with either of these statements. Conversely, the majority of officers were in agreement that their role was vital in reducing reoffending;

“A prison officer's role has become unrecognisable from the one I took on as an officer over twenty four years ago. A prison officer now has the very real opportunity to contribute to the reducing reoffending strategy which is key now to addressing the high numbers of our prisoners who re-offend and come into our establishments. Prison officers are highly skilled individuals who can support prisoners in their efforts to desist from committing crime”.

Much like analysis linked to rehabilitative ideals however, a theme emerged that the work of prison officers and any opportunities given to prisoners can only go so far. Again, comments emphasised the responsibility of the offender in any attempt to desist from crime;

“I agree that this role is changing for the positives however this is largely down to if the offender wanting to change themselves. I believe officers can act as positive role models but we also have to be careful not to "pander" to them but instead make them take responsibility for their own actions”.

“I think it is a two way thing. We need to set an example and be good role models but offenders need to accept responsibility and the help being offered”.

**Question Analysis: Influence Over Prison Policy**

Respondents were asked to identify, in order of importance, their preference as to who should have the most influence over what happens in prisons. Mean response rates can be found in Figure 5.
Support for ‘politicians’ and ‘the public’ was limited, with mean response rates of 1.92 and 2.43 respectively. Qualitative analysis identified a theme in which respondents saw the public as being misled by media conceptions of prisons;

“Definitely not the public as they are misled by the media and have little understanding of what happens in jail. I find politicians idealistic, and even some governors in suits are out of touch with what actually happens on the front line”.

“The Public are graded at 5 as the general opinion of crime is all too often influenced by sensationalism via the media”.

Political influence saw even less support. Officers felt that the concept of prison was too politicised, and there was an impression of distrust toward politicians leading one respondent to note: “sometimes we are just a political toy”. It appeared the main source of agitation was linked to the lack of experience which politicians and the public had in dealing with offenders;
“Politicians and the general public should have no influence in what happens in prisons, both have their own agenda and as such will never look for the best option in dealing with re offending”.

“Let the public be made aware, and ignore the politicians who presume to interpret what the public wants”.

“Most of the general public haven’t got a clue, politicians can easily be influenced by public opinion, particularly as elections approach and are prone to knee jerk reactions”.

Focussing on the remaining groups, ‘professional experts’ such as psychologists and criminologists provided a mean response of 3.07, whilst the two most popular choices were prison officers and prison management. Mean responses for these groups were 3.71 and 3.87 respectively. The most dominant theme arising throughout analysis for this question was how prison officers felt their opinions were largely unappreciated;

“Prison officers are not listened to enough. Our opinions are not asked for or wanted. Staff have to embrace all new changes and rarely understand or agree with them. Officers are the biggest asset for the prison system and their input should be taken seriously and used to aide change. Politicians should not be allowed to decide that after every election they want to change a bit more of prison”.

“Prison officers are first line in communicating with prisoners their knowledge is hugely undervalued at times both in the running of prisons and the rehabilitation of offenders”.

These comments exemplify the widespread theme that whilst respondents believed prison officers to have an integral part to play in the prison environment, their views were not sought often enough. Whilst statistical analysis revealed that the sample believed prison management should be most influential in determining policy, there was a large consensus revealing prison officers should have more authority in the development of prison policy.
Summary

This chapter has presented the findings of a mixed method survey which gathered both quantitative and qualitative data. This was completed by 398 prison officers and aimed to determine their attitudes toward the goals of prison and its effectiveness. Further analysis and interpretation of these findings, including their implications, will be outlined in the following chapter.
Chapter VII: Discussion

This chapter will begin by outlining the aim of this thesis. It will then focus on the primary research discussed in the preceding chapter, further analysing the findings which arose and examining them with regard to the SPS Organisational Review. The chapter will then critique the study by examining its strengths and limitations, whilst the implications which the research findings have will be examined throughout.

Introduction

The aim of this thesis was one of subject exploration: to examine the attitudes of prison officers toward prison. Consequently, a mixed-method survey was utilised to examine the views of prison officers on various themes with regard to imprisonment. Where previous chapters reviewed relevant literature to provide a rationale for the topic, this chapter extends this by examining this literature with reference to the findings of the current research.

Review of Findings and Literature

Philosophies of Imprisonment

Whilst the views of prison officers have traditionally been neglected by researchers (Arnold et al, 2007, p.471), it is within the area which examines the goals of imprisonment where most literature exists. This was consequently the result of particular focus within the present study, which revealed rehabilitation to be the philosophy of imprisonment most supported by prison officers. This conformed to the findings of other research in which officer’s highlighted the importance of rehabilitation as a purpose of imprisonment (Farkas, 1999; Tewksbury and Mustain, 2004). When presented with the question what should be the goal of prisons, Kifer et al (2003) however found incapacitation to be of most importance. This was ranked second in the present study. Similarities were though found in both pieces of research, with retribution identified as the philosophy of least importance.
In examining whether prison officers are punitive in nature, these findings present limited support. If as Mathews (2005, p.178) suggests, punitiveness is most closely aligned with the vengeance associated with retributive rhetoric, favouring of rehabilitation over retribution would suggest prison officers could be placed at the lesser end of the punitive scale. Punitiveness is of course also associated with incapacitation (Courtwright and Mackey, 2004, p.317) and whilst this was strongly supported in the present findings, given the nature of the sample this is hardly surprising. One of the key aims of the SPS is to “keep in custody those committed by the courts” (SPS, 2012, p3), and considering that the nature of their job is to hold prisoners within a secure environment which is “by its very nature incapacitating” (SPS, 2013 p.20), it would therefore be expected that this would be a goal favoured by prison officers.

Whilst in the present study there was strong support for rehabilitation, qualitative analysis revealed doubts over its effectiveness. Furthermore, a continuous theme emerged whereby officers were of the opinion that prisoners had little desire to utilise any skills they may have learned through rehabilitative opportunities. This is an issue which is currently under address, as the Operating Task of the SPS now includes the will to “empower offenders to take responsibility and fulfil their potential” (SPS, 2013 p.50). Whether this will be successfully implemented or not remains debatable, however this is clearly an attempt to encourage offenders to shoulder greater accountability in their rehabilitation. Considering much of the dissatisfaction felt by officers was that rehabilitative resources were often wasted, there exists clear acknowledgement in the SPS Organisational Review that this issue needs to be improved.

The implications of asking prison officers to identify their views on the purpose of prison are undoubtedly of importance. As has been previously noted, prison officers play an integral role in promoting or rejecting the primary goals of the institution where they work (Kifer et al, 2003; Kjelsber et al 2007; Crewe, 2011). There is of course scepticism over the effectiveness of rehabilitation, however the significance which the SPS places upon rehabilitation as its primary purpose is mirrored by the officers who represent the organisation and implement its policy. This is certainly a positive finding, and one which supports the assertion of Liebling (House of Commons Justice
Committee, 2009) who argues that there now exists “better alignment between the aims of the prison and the inclinations of prison officers” (p.5).

Conversely, whilst officers clearly favoured rehabilitation, many supported the introduction of more punitive elements for those who did not engage with this approach. This included the removal of certain comforts in order to increase the deterrent element of prison. Whether this would be as an attempt to encourage prisoners into more rehabilitative engagement, or simply as a way to punish those who do not do so is unclear. Whilst this may sound valid theoretically, there is little evidence to suggest that increasing the deterrent element of prison would have the desired effect on either purpose. Increasing deterrent effects of punishment have been found to be counterproductive (Gendreau, Goggin, Cullen and Andrews, 2000; Smith Goggin and Gendreau, 2002), and consequently, the result that some prison officers believe those who refuse to engage with efforts to reduce recidivism should be treated in a more punitive manner has some important implications.

Given the significance placed upon the culture in prisons, much of which is based upon the attitudes of staff and relationships with prisoners, it is not impossible to assume that for some officers when dealing with prisoners who do not engage in rehabilitative efforts, the purpose of prison for them may be more aligned to deterrence and punishment rather than rehabilitation. It is therefore vital that prison officers are educated in such matters. The adoption of a ‘tough’ approach is unlikely to be successful, especially when considering flaws in deterrence theory. In surmising if tougher sentences would produce their desired effect of reduced crime rates, Tonry (1996) argues “maybe, a little, at most, but probably not” (p.137). This subsequently casts into doubt any benefit of a deterrent approach to imprisonment.

In a much wider sense, these findings add to the debate surrounding attitudes to criminal justice. An earlier discussion of ‘penal populism’ referred to the notion of politicians (inaccurately) perceiving that the public demands harsher policy for offenders, and as a consequence, a ‘tough-on-crime’ approach is adopted (Drake et al, 2010, p.50). Not only
now has a review of the relevant literature conducted in Chapter III found this to be debatable, the present research has found that prison officers, who deal with offenders and the effects of prison most, largely do not hold a punitive standpoint. There are of course some results which suggest that prisons should hold more of a punitive effect, however the finding that retribution is the least important purpose of prison for officers and rehabilitation is of most importance further challenges the concept of the electorate holding highly punitive attitudes toward crime (Almond, 2008, p.448).

**Prison ‘As’ or ‘For’ Punishment**

Findings from the present study indicated that a minority of officers felt that offenders should be imprisoned ‘for’ punishment, whereas the majority were of the view that offenders should be sent to prison ‘as’ punishment. Almost 40% of respondents were supportive of both functions. When asked whether prison should be more concerned with either ensuring prisoners do not offend upon release or punishing them for the crimes, over three quarters of officers supported the former.

It would therefore appear that the views of most prison officers are aligned to that of the SPS (2013, p.19), which states that “people are sent to prison as punishment and not for punishment”. This would indicate that prison officers are not largely punitive in their attitudes to imprisonment. The finding that many officers advocated prison as a place where offenders are sent both as and for punishment was an unsurprising one. The prison establishment must balance the demands of punishment, rehabilitation, care and control (Wilson and O’Sullivan, 2004, p.13) and with regard to this finding; it appears as though prison officers in their favouring of ‘both’ as an option, are much the same.

There were though inconsistencies when examining the views of prison officers. As was previously highlighted, retribution was the philosophy of imprisonment viewed as least important. However, almost 73% of officers felt that ‘being put in prison should punish offenders’. The nature of this question is though somewhat ambiguous. There may have been respondents who viewed the ‘punishment’ the question referred to as the removal
of an offenders liberty in which case, findings would further support the concept of imprisonment ‘as’ punishment. Alternatively, others may have viewed the ‘punish’ element in terms of further punishment, thus promoting the prison ‘for’ punishment argument.

When questioned over whether prison actually punishes offenders, there were some considerable differences in the views of the general public and prison officers. Anderson et al (2002) found that 59% of a public sample agreed that prison punishes offenders, however in comparison, the present study found only 22.74% agreed with this. Furthermore, 15% of the public sample disagreed, compared with almost 38% of prison officers who disagreed that prison punishes prisoners.

These differences in opinion may be largely attributed to differences in knowledge. Whilst the public has a limited knowledge of issues pertaining to criminal justice and prison (Hough and Roberts, 1998; Russell and Morgan, 2001; Roberts and Hough, 2012), those who engage with prison and prisoners on a daily basis, such as prison officers, are perhaps best-placed to offer the most accurate views. Indeed, such findings should be looked upon positively by the SPS which notes offenders are sentenced to prison ‘as’ punishment, and not ‘for’ punishment. It appears that this is supported when examining the realities of prison life given over half of prison officers disagree or strongly disagree that prison punishes offenders.

*Effectiveness of Prison*

The increasing use of custodial sentences for offenders presents an obvious need to examine the views of prison officers with regard to the role of the prison officer and the effectiveness of prison. When asked if they felt their ‘role was key to reducing reoffending’, findings revealed respondents to be highly supportive of this statement. Almost 73% of officers at least agreed that their role was significant in reducing recidivism.
This finding identifies the need for further research which examines the attitudes of prison officers considering the importance attached to their role. A significant proportion of officers see their work as vital in providing a positive contribution for prisoners, and this is fundamental should the SPS wish to promote a positive culture within its prisons. Given that the attitudes and beliefs of officers are likely to influence interactions with prisoners (Tewksbury and Moon, 2004, p.229), it is therefore crucial that officers have a positive attitude toward their job, and that the relationships they form with prisoners through their role can act as a catalyst for change (SPS, 2013, p.56).

Much like that linked to the philosophy of rehabilitation, analysis found that whilst officers were certainly optimistic with regard to aiding prisoners change, they were of a view that this could only go so far, and consequently much emphasis was placed on the need for offenders to take responsibility for their own actions and rehabilitation. Again though, steps have been taken to address this issue, with the will to “empower offenders to take responsibility and fulfil their potential” now acting as the operating task of the SPS (SPS, 2013, p.50).

On a more critical note though, findings revealed respondents disagreed that prison was an effective measure, with analysis revealing the statements ‘prison has a positive impact on offenders’ and ‘prison is the best way of preventing reoffending’, had limited support. The most common response however, was that officers neither disagreed nor agreed with these statements.

In accounting for this indecisiveness, difficulties in measuring success related to these statements may have contributed. The notion of what constitutes a ‘positive impact’ may be different for each officer and more importantly, prison officers do not see the effects prison has had upon offenders when they are liberated back into society. Following the implementation of the proposed SPS Throughcare program (SPS, 2013, p.26) which provides support for offenders for up to six weeks after release, the effects, whether negative or positive, may be easier to identify. Accordingly, it may be useful to return to such questions in the future in order to note any changes in opinion this has led to.
Nevertheless, the finding that many officers are undecided as to the effects of prison should not dwarf the finding that many officers are of the opinion that prison is neither the best way to prevent reoffending, nor has a positive impact on offenders. In returning to the beginning of this thesis, the issue of why prison numbers rise despite falling levels of crime was raised. In reference to the findings derived from the view of prison officers, it is certainly not because prison is effective. Instead, the findings of the present study seem to add support for the influence of penal populism. This “consists of the pursuit of a set of penal policies to win votes rather than reduce crime or promote justice”, whereby penal effectiveness is of secondary importance to electoral advantage (Roberts et al, 2003, p.5). As officers are of the view that prison is not effective, this theory presents a plausible explanation in accounting for the growing use of imprisonment. With regard to influence over prison policy, a similar account emerged.

Influence Over Prison Policy

In further examining the views of prison officers, respondents were asked to identify, in order of importance, those who should have the most influence in the determining of prison policy. Findings indicated that prison management, closely followed by prison officers themselves, should have the most say. This was followed by professional experts, the public and lastly politicians.

In accounting for why the public and politicians saw such limited support, the theoretical framework linked to penal populism appears a large contributory factor. As has been the case throughout this thesis, continual reference has been made to the lack of knowledge which the public possess in relation to justice issues. Qualitative analysis of the present research continued this theme, with many officers highlighting public knowledge stems mainly from inaccurate media representations and consequently, public influence should be limited.

Such views are certainly justified. Gelb (2008, p.73) argues that the media plays a crucial role in the development of creating a misinformed public due to stories which
depict sensationalism over objectivity. Where Garland (2001, p.158) argues that public opinion is based upon collective representations rather than accurate information, it would appear that the media play a large part in forming these representations. The real danger of penal populism, and a reason as to why justice policy appears dominated by ‘tough-on-crime’ rhetoric, is when politicians assume that the public stance is one which approves a punitive approach to crime. This is of course in essence populist punitiveness, which Bottoms, (1995, p.40) defines as “the notions of politicians tapping into, and using for their own purposes, what they believe to be the public’s generally punitive stance”. Although not specifically referred to as such, analysis revealed prison officers to be aware of the effects of penal populism, with one highlighting that politicians have “their own agenda and as such will never look for the best option in dealing with re offending”. As a consequence, prison officers felt that politicians should have the least influence in dealing with prison policy.

Focussing on those who should have the most influence over prison policy, officers believed prison management should hold most authority. This was closely followed by prison officers themselves. Analysis revealed the most dominant theme in this respect was that prison officers felt they were undervalued and unappreciated, and when this finding is coupled with the strong support for the importance of their role in reducing reoffending, it is clear why officers feel they should have a greater role to play in the formation of prison policy. Given the emphasis which the SPS Organisational Review places upon prison officers who act as “facilitators in the process of change and personal development of prisoners” (p.55), the belief that officers should have a greater input into decision making appears justified considering they are the ‘street level bureaucrats’ who “hold the power to carry out or destroy the institutional mission” (Kifer et al, 2003, p.67). It is therefore surprising when taking this power into account that the views of prison officers have traditionally been neglected by researchers. Consequently, it is hoped that this thesis will encourage more research with regard to such issues.
Research Strengths and Limitations

Strengths

The present study was conducted with the aim of examining prison officer attitudes to imprisonment. Considering this area has been characterised by a lack of research, this thesis has contributed to what previously existed a very limited amount of literature related to this topic. Moreover, from an extensive literature search, no studies of a similar kind have been conducted with a Scottish sample. The survey was completed by almost 10% of the 4000 operational officers working in SPS establishments, and accordingly the sample used should be largely representative of the organisation.

The main strength of this research is in its method, which utilised both quantitative and qualitative elements. This mixed-method design employed quantitative analysis which provides a favourable approach when assessing attitudes to criminal justice issues (Roberts et al, 2011), however also employed qualitative data to provide a deeper understanding of survey responses (Driscoll et al, 2007, p.27). Data analysis found this to be the case as some of the themes which arose from qualitative data analysis would not have been evident in examining quantitative data alone. Using the philosophy of rehabilitation as an example, statistical analysis revealed that for prison officers, this was the most important purpose of prison. Qualitative analysis however revealed that despite this importance, there was scepticism over its effectiveness and doubts over whether the skills prisoners had learned within prison would be used upon release. It is therefore advisable for future research to garner both quantitative and qualitative data.

Limitations

Whilst the method employed in this research is an obvious strength, it also presents limitations, particularly with reference to the qualitative method. Weaknesses include the subjective and personalistic nature associated with its analysis (Stake, 2010, p.29). Not only can this lead to researcher bias, but qualitative research is so “personal to the researcher that there is no guarantee that a different researcher would not come to radically different conclusions” (Mays and Pope, 1995, p.109). Some researchers, for
example Greineder (2013), combat this through the employment of an independent coder to ensure perceptions are encoded accurately and subjectiveness is limited. The present study however did not utilise such a method. It may therefore be advisable for future research to do so.

Summary

In summary, this chapter has expanded on the findings of the present research which examined the attitudes of prison officers in relation to imprisonment. Where literature in previous chapters presented a rationale for the topic, this chapter has discussed findings with reference to theory, research, and policy which had been previously outlined. Particular focus was placed upon the SPS Organisational Review, the implementation of which may in the future have a significant bearing on the attitudes of prison officers. The strengths and limitations of this research were discussed, and a concluding evaluation can be found in the next chapter.
Chapter VIII: Conclusions

This chapter summarises the key elements of this thesis including its rationale and findings. It will begin by outlining the aim of this research and briefly examine its justification. It will present the major implications arising from findings and highlight the contribution this research has made. The chapter will bring the thesis to its conclusion by suggesting avenues for future research.

Introduction

Criminal justice policy within the last few decades has been characterised by what Garland (2001) refers to as a ‘punitive turn’. Even though crime rates have fallen, prison populations continue to rise amidst a ‘tough-on-crime’ approach adopted by politicians who subsequently place the perceived opinions of the electorate first, and penal effectiveness second (Roberts et al, 2003, p.5). Whilst politicians justify this approach by arguing it is simply what the public desires, this is not entirely the case. The finding that the public possess a limited knowledge regarding justice issues perpetuates research and moreover, it appears that when they are given more information regarding the topic, their attitudes are less punitive.

In terms of prison population growth, this presents a number of challenges for the SPS. In answering some of the vital philosophical questions regarding prison however, research has instead focussed on the opinions of the ill-informed public and ignored those who know it best. Liebling (2006, p.429) highlighted the need to conduct a critical evaluation with regard to the “interior life” of prison, and in conjunction with the publication of the SPS Organisational Review and its emphasis upon creating a new culture within prisons, this presented an ideal opportunity to renew focus on the concept of imprisonment. As a consequence, attitudes of prison officers with regard to their views on the purpose of prison, its effectiveness, and who should determine its policy were examined.

Using a mixed method survey, analysis revealed that whilst rehabilitation was the most important purpose of prison in the eyes of prison officers, there was scepticism over its
effectiveness and consequently, officers felt that offenders must take more responsibility for their actions. Retribution was identified as having the least importance. Officers were more likely to support a prison sentence ‘as’ a punishment and not ‘for’ punishment, however many believed that imprisonment should encompass both. Whilst there were doubts over the effectiveness of prison in terms of having a positive impact on offenders and preventing reoffending, prison officers were strongly supportive of their role in reducing recidivism. Finally, respondents saw prison management as those who should have most influence in determining prison policy, closely followed by prison officers themselves. Officers did however feel that their views were regularly undervalued. There was little support for the influence of the public and politicians having influence over policy, which was largely due to awareness of penal populism amongst respondents. Although they did not specifically use such a term, prison officers were attentive to its key principles.

**Implications**

This research has revealed what appears to be a significant divergence of thought between what politicians promote, and what prisons aim to achieve. Whilst the rhetoric used by politicians to appear ‘tough-on-crime’ is often of a punitive nature, the language which is utilised by the SPS through its Organisational Review, and indeed largely that of prison officers, is far removed from this. The rise of penal populism and its associated ‘punitive turn’ has seen the philosophy of retribution emerge as a legitimate, and indeed when examining political and media representations, a predominant aim of punishment (Estrada, 2004, p.420). What is vital to note however, is that imprisonment for this purpose focuses only on punishment for the offence and not on any beneficial consequences punishment may have in reducing the likelihood of future offending (Fletcher, 1996, p.516). Conversely, the SPS and indeed many prison officers who represent the organisation adopt a more prospective approach, focussing upon the rehabilitation of offenders. Consequently, it would appear that in terms of promoting what offers the best opportunity to reduce recidivism, the thoughts of politicians need to be more aligned with those who have most experience in working with offenders, rather than what they perceive the public to desire.
This is of course symptomatic of penal populism which removes authority from experts regarding crime (Pratt, 2008, p.369), and whereby politicians determine policy based not on penal effectiveness, but what will prove most popular amongst the electorate. Whilst prison officers are of course distinct from ‘academic experts’, their knowledge with regard to prison and offenders means they should be considered as experts no less. The SPS wishes to develop professional prison officers who’s voice is “considered expert by others” (SPS, 2013, p.177), and in light of the finding that prison officers often feel their views are undervalued, it is clear that both the SPS, and those in charge of forming justice policy, should take the experiences and knowledge of prison officers into greater account. In producing policies which promote penal effectiveness over electoral support, and which are likely to be advocated by those who play a large role in influencing the institutional goals of prison, it is essential that prison officers are included in decision making processes.

**Contribution**

Arnold et al (2007, p.471) assert that prison officers tend to be ignored within prison research and accordingly, this research has presented the first study to examine the attitudes of prison officers regarding questions of purpose, effectiveness and influence with a Scottish sample. The assertions of Arnold et al (2007) seem to be justified by prison officers themselves, with a key theme arising from the present research being that their views were largely undervalued. It is therefore hoped that research of this kind has not only justified the reasons why this particular group should be accounted for more within justice literature, but also that it will lead to further research which examines the attitudes and opinions of prison officers.

**Future Research**

The present research has been conducted at a time of “unprecedented focus” on the on the practice of imprisonment across Scotland (SPS, 2013, p.29). This includes a vigorous appraisal of the future of the SPS through its Organisational Review. Indeed, attitudes with regard to criminal justice change over time (Scottish Government, 2013,
p.37), and those of prison officers are likely to be no different. In examining future research, it would be beneficial to return to the questions asked within the present study once the changes proposed in the SPS Organisational Review have been fully implemented. This will allow for comparison with present data, and will allow testing to reveal the impact the Organisational Review has had upon the attitudes of prison officers and subsequently the culture within prison. Given the limited literature which exists in this field however, research of any nature which examines the attitudes and role of prison officers should be welcomed.
Appendix A: Participant Information Sheet

**Study Title:** Critically Exploring Attitudes Toward Philosophies of Punishment and Prison

You have been invited to take part in a small survey which will examine attitudes regarding imprisonment. In order to inform your decision whether to take part or not, please read this information sheet. Should you require further information, please contact either the researcher or project supervisor.

Researcher: Gary McArthur  
E-Mail: gary.mcarthur@sps.pnn.gov.uk

Supervisor: Professor Mike Nash  
E-Mail: mike.nash@port.ac.uk

**What is the purpose of the study?**
The purpose of this study is to allow me to complete an MSc degree in Criminology and Criminal Justice at the University of Portsmouth. Attitudes toward punishment and imprisonment are extremely important in influencing the decisions of policy makers in this area, and the results of this study will present an account of the group who perhaps work offenders most: Prison Officers.

**Do I have to take part?**
Participation is entirely voluntary, and it is up to you to decide whether to take part.

**What will happen to me if I take part?**
You will not be asked to give your name or any contact information. Responses will only be examined by myself and the project supervisor, and we will not be able to identify any individual responses. Once you submit your responses, you will not be required to do anything more.

**What will I have to do?**
You will be asked to complete a short questionnaire which should take no more than around 10-15 minutes to complete.
Will my taking part in the study be kept confidential?
The survey itself will not ask for any information which may identify you. The survey will be anonymous. All those involved have a duty of confidentiality to you as a research participant. Any information collected will be stored securely, and will be destroyed once the final project has been marked and verified around October/November 2014.

What will happen if I don’t want to carry on with the study?
Your participation is voluntary and you do not have to take part in this study. You are also free to change your mind and withdraw from the study. However, if you have already submitted your survey, the responses you have given cannot be withdrawn given the anonymous nature of the survey.

What if there is a problem?
Should you have any concerns about the study, or would like to ask any questions or request more information please contact the researcher or project supervisor. Their details can be found at the top of this document. If you remain unsatisfied and wish to complain, you can do so by contacting Dr Phil Clements, Head of Department, Institute of Criminal Justice Studies, University of Portsmouth, Ravelin Park, Ravelin House, Portsmouth, PO1 2QQ.

What will happen to the results of the research study?
The results of this study will be presented in the format of a 15,000 word dissertation submitted to the University of Portsmouth in partial fulfilment for the award of an MSc Criminology and Criminal Justice degree. Participants will not be identified as this as an anonymous survey. Participants may contact the researcher if they would like access to the full document once it has been completed, and an amended version which briefly summarises the results of the study will also be made available. These will be available from October 2014.

Who is organising the research?
This research is supported by the Institute of Criminal Justice Studies, University of Portsmouth.

Who has reviewed the study?
Research supported by the University of Portsmouth is examined by an independent group called an Ethics Committee. These individuals ensure the interests of participants are protected, and upon examining the methods this study has used, have awarded it a favourable ethical opinion. The research has also been reviewed by the Scottish Prison Service Research and Ethics Committee.

Thank you for taking the time to read this information. If you wish to take part in this research, please follow the link below, where all you will be asked to provide your consent and then complete the questionnaire.

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/8TNLNC6
Appendix B: Survey Instructions and Questions

Thank you for choosing to complete this survey. It consists of 23 questions and you are free to take as much or as little time as you wish to complete it. The first page will ask you questions relating to yourself and your job role. You will then be asked your opinion regarding statements which relate to imprisonment. Please note there are no right or wrong answers.

1) What is your gender?
   Male   Female

2) What is your age?
   18-25   26-35   36-45   46-55   56-65

3) How long have you worked for SPS?
   ______________________________________

4) What is your job title?
   ______________________________________

5) What was your job before joining the Scottish Prison Service?
   ______________________________________

6) Highest level of education (please circle);
   None
   O Grade/Standard Grade
   Highers
   HNC/HND
   Undergraduate Degree
   Postgraduate Degree
7) Which establishment do you work in?

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? (Circle relevant number) If you wish to make any comments, please do so in the space provided. If you require more space, please use the last page and write the question number alongside your comment;

8) In prison, offenders should receive training to increase employability
   1) Strongly disagree
   2) Agree
   3) Neither disagree nor agree
   4) Agree
   5) Strongly Agree

9) Prison is the best way of preventing re-offending
   1) Strongly disagree
   2) Disagree
   3) Neither disagree nor agree
   4) Agree
   5) Strongly Agree

10) A harsher sentence will reduce the likelihood of an offender committing the same offence when released
    1) Strongly disagree
    2) Disagree
    3) Neither disagree nor agree
    4) Agree
    5) Strongly Agree

11) Being put in prison should punish offenders
    1) Strongly disagree
    2) Disagree
    3) Neither disagree nor agree
    4) Agree
    5) Strongly agree
12) Being put in prison actually punishes offenders
   1) Strongly disagree
   2) Disagree
   3) Neither disagree nor agree
   4) Agree
   5) Strongly agree

13) Life is too easy for prisoners in Scotland
   1) Strongly disagree
   2) Disagree
   3) Neither disagree nor agree
   4) Agree
   5) Strongly agree

14) Prisoners should serve their full sentence
   1) Strongly disagree
   2) Disagree
   3) Neither disagree nor agree
   4) Agree
   5) Strongly agree

15) Prison has a positive impact on offenders
   1) Strongly disagree
   2) Disagree
   3) Neither disagree nor agree
   4) Agree
   5) Strongly agree

16) Criminals deserve to be punished because they have harmed society by their crime
   1) Strongly disagree
   2) Disagree
   3) Neither disagree nor agree
   4) Agree
   5) Strongly agree
17) Offenders should be sent to prison...
   a) For Punishment
   b) As punishment
   c) Both

18) The role of the prison officer is critical to reducing re-offending
   1) Strongly disagree
   2) Disagree
   3) Neither disagree nor agree
   4) Agree
   5) Strongly agree

19) Imprisonment should be more concerned with
   a) Punishing offenders
   b) Ensuring they do not re-offend upon release

20) Who should have the most influence over what happens in prisons? Rank in order of importance where 1 is most important and 5 is least important.
   a) Politicians
   b) Professional Experts
   c) Prison Management
   d) Prison Officers
   e) The public
21) What should the main purpose of prison be? Rank in order of importance where 1 is most important and 5 is least important.

a) **Retribution**  
   Offenders deserve to be punished, and this punishment (imprisonment), should be proportionate to the crime committed.

b) **General Deterrence**  
   Punish offenders in order to deter others from committing that offence.

c) **Specific Deterrence**  
   Punish an offender so that they will not commit that offence again.

d) **Rehabilitation**  
   Helping offenders change (enhance job skills, provide drug/alcohol treatment etc.) to prevent future re-offending.

e) **Incapacitation**  
   Keeping those at higher risk of offending in the future in custody for longer.

[End of Survey]
### Appendix C: Quantitative Data From Survey Questions

#### What is your gender?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number of Respondents (n)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### What is your age?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Number of Respondents (n)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### How long have you worked for the SPS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How long have you worked for the SPS?</th>
<th>Number of Respondents (n)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3 years</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-18 years</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19+ years</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### What is your current role?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your current role?</th>
<th>Number of Respondents (n)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operations Officer</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Officer</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regimes Officer</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmes/ICM Officer</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Line Manager</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your highest level of education?</td>
<td>Number of Respondents (n)</td>
<td>Percentage (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Grade/ Standard Grade</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highers</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNC/HND</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Degree</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Qualification</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which prison do you work in?

![Bar chart showing the number of responses per prison](chart.png)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Disagree Nor Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In prison, offenders should receive training to increase their employability</td>
<td>3.27% (n=13)</td>
<td>2.26% (n=9)</td>
<td>5.53% (n=22)</td>
<td>52.76% (n=210)</td>
<td>36.18% (n=144)</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison is the best way of preventing reoffending</td>
<td>6.53% (n=26)</td>
<td>30.90% (n=123)</td>
<td>35.18% (n=140)</td>
<td>16.08% (n=64)</td>
<td>11.31% (n=45)</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A harsher sentence will reduce the likelihood of an offender committing the same offence when released</td>
<td>5.03% (n=20)</td>
<td>23.12% (n=92)</td>
<td>18.59% (n=74)</td>
<td>33.42% (n=133)</td>
<td>19.85% (n=79)</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being put in prison should punish offenders</td>
<td>4.13% (n=16)</td>
<td>11.37% (n=44)</td>
<td>11.63% (n=45)</td>
<td>47.77% (n=181)</td>
<td>26.10% (n=101)</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree Nor Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Mean Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being put in prison actually punishes offenders</td>
<td>16.54% (n=64)</td>
<td>37.98% (n=147)</td>
<td>20.41% (n=79)</td>
<td>22.74% (n=88)</td>
<td>2.33% (n=9)</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoners should serve their full sentence</td>
<td>1.32% (n=5)</td>
<td>13.68% (n=52)</td>
<td>14.21% (n=54)</td>
<td>36.05% (n=137)</td>
<td>37.54% (n=132)</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison has a positive impact on offenders</td>
<td>11.29% (n=43)</td>
<td>31.50% (n=120)</td>
<td>42.78% (n=163)</td>
<td>13.65% (n=52)</td>
<td>0.79% (n=3)</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminals deserve to be punished because they have harmed society by their crime</td>
<td>1.31% (n=5)</td>
<td>3.94% (n=15)</td>
<td>11.55% (n=44)</td>
<td>46.98% (n=179)</td>
<td>36.22% (n=138)</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree Nor Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Mean Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of the prison officer is key to reducing reoffending</td>
<td>2.93% (n=11)</td>
<td>10.11% (n=38)</td>
<td>14.36% (n=54)</td>
<td>39.36% (n=148)</td>
<td>33.24% (n=125)</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Disagree Nor Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life is too easy for prisoners in Scotland</td>
<td>2.07% (n=8)</td>
<td>11.37% (n=44)</td>
<td>16.02% (n=62)</td>
<td>35.40% (n=137)</td>
<td>35.14% (n=136)</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offenders should be sent to prison...</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Punishment</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As Punishment</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>55.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>39.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prison should be more concerned with...</th>
<th>Number of Respondents (n)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Punishing offenders for their crime</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>22.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring they do not reoffend when released</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>77.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question: Who should have most influence over prison policy? Rank in order of importance where 1 is most important and 5 is least important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prison Management</strong></td>
<td>37.62% (n=17)</td>
<td>29.58% (n=92)</td>
<td>18.65% (n=58)</td>
<td>10.29% (n=32)</td>
<td>3.86% (n=12)</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prison Officers</strong></td>
<td>27.97% (n=87)</td>
<td>36.98% (n=115)</td>
<td>20.26% (n=63)</td>
<td>8.04% (n=25)</td>
<td>6.75% (n=21)</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Experts</strong></td>
<td>13.18% (n=41)</td>
<td>19.94% (n=62)</td>
<td>35.69% (n=111)</td>
<td>22.83% (n=71)</td>
<td>8.36% (n=26)</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public</strong></td>
<td>15.42% (n=48)</td>
<td>7.07% (n=22)</td>
<td>16.72% (n=52)</td>
<td>26.69% (n=83)</td>
<td>34.08% (n=106)</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Politicians</strong></td>
<td>5.79% (n=18)</td>
<td>6.43% (n=20)</td>
<td>8.68% (n=27)</td>
<td>32.15% (n=100)</td>
<td>46.95% (n=146)</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question: What should be the main purpose of prison be? Rank in order of importance where 1 is most important and 5 is least important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retribution</strong></td>
<td>14.98% (n=46)</td>
<td>16.61% (n=51)</td>
<td>20.85% (n=64)</td>
<td>17.59% (n=54)</td>
<td>29.97% (n=92)</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Deterrence</strong></td>
<td>11.07% (n=34)</td>
<td>18.24% (n=56)</td>
<td>23.45% (n=72)</td>
<td>24.43% (n=75)</td>
<td>22.80% (n=70)</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific Deterrence</strong></td>
<td>9.45% (n=29)</td>
<td>18.24% (n=56)</td>
<td>24.10% (n=74)</td>
<td>28.99% (n=89)</td>
<td>19.22% (n=59)</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rehabilitation</strong></td>
<td>41.69% (n=128)</td>
<td>19.54% (n=60)</td>
<td>10.10% (n=31)</td>
<td>13.68% (n=42)</td>
<td>14.98% (n=46)</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incapacitation</strong></td>
<td>22.80% (n=70)</td>
<td>27.36% (n=84)</td>
<td>21.50% (n=66)</td>
<td>15.31% (n=47)</td>
<td>13.03% (n=40)</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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