

THE UNIVERSITY OF HULL

The Pains of Custody: how Young Men Cope through the
Criminal Justice System

being a Thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the University of Hull

by

Helen Louise Jones, BSc, MSc

July 2007

Contents

Acknowledgements	3
Abstract.....	4
Introduction	5
Chapter One: Literature Review	14
Overview.....	14
Changing nature of imprisonment	16
Pains of imprisonment	17
Expanding the pains of imprisonment	21
<i>Entry Shock</i>	23
<i>Fear of the unknown</i>	26
<i>Withdrawing from drugs and alcohol</i>	28
<i>Loss of privacy</i>	29
<i>Time</i>	30
<i>Loss of stimulation</i>	31
<i>Waiting game</i>	33
<i>Lack of respect</i>	34
<i>Loss of social support</i>	35
<i>Pains of communication</i>	36
<i>Loss of identity</i>	37
<i>Physical environment</i>	39
<i>Fear or nervousness about release</i>	41
Definitions of, and motivations for, suicide, attempted suicide and self-harm	43
Suicide, attempted suicide and self-harm within the criminal justice system	48
Preventing suicide and self-harm within the criminal justice system.....	67
Adapting to and resisting the pains of custody	76
Coping with the pains of custody	80
Limitations of previous research	88
Chapter Two: Methodology	94
Aim and objectives	94
Research setting	96
Access	100
Ethical considerations	104
Quantitative research	109
Qualitative research	112
Identity	129
The research experience	133
Chapter Three: Pains of Custody - Sykes	141
Deprivation of liberty	141
Deprivation of goods and services.....	147
Deprivation of sexual relationships	154
Deprivation of autonomy and control	157
Deprivation of security	161
Ambivalence, contradiction and the defended subject	163
Expanding Sykes' work	169

Chapter Four: Further Pains of Custody.....	174
Entry shock	174
Fear of the unknown	182
Withdrawing from drugs and alcohol	186
Loss of privacy	188
Time	191
Loss of stimulation	193
Waiting game.....	196
Lack of respect.....	200
Loss of social support	204
Pains of communication	206
Loss of identity	211
Physical environment.....	215
Fear or nervousness about release	220
 Chapter Five: Coping with the pains of custody.....	 223
Adaptation, resistance and coping	223
Coping strategies employed outside the criminal justice system	225
Coping strategies employed within police cells, court cells and escort vehicles	228
Coping strategies employed within prison	236
Suicide and self-harm within the criminal justice system	253
 Chapter Six: Support services within the criminal justice system.....	 276
Support services within police stations.....	277
Support services within court custody suites.....	282
Support services within prison.....	284
Support services accessed by prisoners who have not self-harmed or attempted suicide	290
Support services accessed by prisoners who have self-harmed or attempted suicide	298
Witnessing an incident of suicide or self-harm within prison	303
 Conclusion	 308
 References.....	 322
 Appendix A.....	 361
Appendix B	364
Appendix C	365
Appendix D.....	366
Appendix E	368
Appendix F	369
Appendix G.....	371
Appendix H.....	372

Acknowledgements

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the ESRC, who have provided part-time funding over the last four years. My immense gratitude also goes to the following people, who have made my PhD possible.

To all the young men who I had the pleasure of meeting and talking with, thank you. I feel privileged that you shared your experiences and feelings with me, and I hope that I have done them justice. I am grateful to Glen Parva YOI and the anonymous escort and court custody service and police force for allowing me to visit their establishments and conduct this research. My appreciation goes to the managers and staff who gave up their precious time to show me around, who let me observe them at work and who shared their stories. In particular, thank you to Gill Baker whose support and help have again been invaluable.

Yvonne, thank you for seeing my potential and for suggesting all those years ago that I undertake a PhD. The past five years have not been easy, but despite my reservations, I have succeeded - this is largely due to your faith in me and your support and advice. Although you have moved universities, you have given up your time to help me. I am so grateful to you and hope that our friendship will continue. Thank you.

Mum and Dad, you must have done something right to have both daughters complete their doctorates! Thank you for everything, without you I very much doubt that I would be completing my PhD. In addition, thank you Dad for giving up your time to proof read my thesis and managing to remain positive (and awake) to the end! Your grammatical knowledge was very much welcomed, albeit a few years too late! My gratitude also goes to Pamela and other family members (Alan, Eunice, Pat and Pete) for your encouragement over the years.

Nick, I don't think I can thank you enough. You have been there, supporting me through all my tears and fears. Although I have postponed so many nights and days out in order to do work, you have never stopped encouraging me. I am indebted to you and promise that from now on I will do my share of the washing-up! I love you.

Eleanor, I couldn't ask for a better friend. This journey has been one of my longest, yet you have held my hand at every step. You have always believed in me, supported me and encouraged me. Thank you from the bottom of my heart.

Over the years there have been so many friends who have helped me along the way, who have not let me give up and who have plied me with wine, thank you! In particular, I'd like to thank Sarah Challinor, Danielle, Amanda, Sarah Johnston, Chris and Heather. My gratitude also goes to my friends and colleagues at work.

Lastly, to all those people who over the last five years have followed my progress, shown an interest in my PhD and inspired me, thank you.

Abstract

The aim of this study was to examine the hypothesis that ‘the different support needs of young males are not being adequately addressed as they proceed through the criminal justice system, with serious consequences in terms of personal harm’. In order to explore suicide and self-harm, a holistic approach was taken, reflecting on young males’ experiences of police cells, court cells, escort vehicles and prison. Interviews were completed with 27 young men held at Glen Parva YOI and 10 young men held at three court custody suites. Alongside these, an activity analysis of the custody process was completed at four police custody suites. Interviewees’ narratives demonstrated that the five pains of imprisonment identified by Sykes (1958) are applicable to today’s young male sentenced and remanded prisoners. Moreover, some extend to the wider criminal justice system and a further thirteen pains of custody can now be identified. These pains can have devastating consequences, being associated with suicide and self-harm. Nevertheless, individuals do survive the pains of custody through a number of coping strategies; some of these are imported from outside, whilst some have to be modified or developed because of the particular custodial regime experienced. Paradoxically, self-harm can represent a coping strategy, a way of dealing with the pains of custody. A number of formal support services exist within the criminal justice system to help young men, yet their support needs are not being adequately addressed, particularly in the earlier stages. This may have an impact on suicide and self-harm both within the earlier stages of the criminal justice system and later in prison.

Introduction

Over the past few years, our prisons have reached crisis point; since 2001, the total prison population has grown almost 20%, there are now more prisoners serving indeterminate sentences than short sentences of less than 12 months and there have been considerable resource constraints (HM Chief Inspector of Prisons (HMCIP), 2007). As a result, police cells are being used to house prisoners and plans are underway to find a new 'prison ship' and build two more prisons (BBC, 2006; HM Prison Service, 2007a; Tendler, 2006a; Walker, 2007). It is feared that the situation will deteriorate even further over the next few years as the current prison population of 80,368 (as of 27th April 2007) is projected to increase up to 106,550 by 2013 (de Silva et al, 2006; Howard League, 2007).

Another aspect of this crisis is the number of prisoners suffering with mental health problems in an environment that is ill suited to their needs. In their 1997 survey of psychiatric morbidity, Singleton et al (1998: 23) found "[a] large proportion of all prisoners had several mental disorders". In particular, at least 95% of imprisoned young offenders showed evidence of mental disorder, with approximately 80% having more than one type of mental disorder, including personality disorder, psychotic disorder, neuroses, hazardous drinking and drug dependence (Lader et al, 2000). More recently, HM Inspectorate of Prisons (HMIP) (2007: 5) conclude "[t]hose who end up in our prisons have complex and long-standing mental health needs: often linked to substance misuse, and ranging from acute psychosis, through personality disorder, to high levels of anxiety and depression". Added to this, strong links have been identified between mental health problems and self-harm (HMIP, 2007). However, prisons are not suitable for dealing with the complex needs of prisoners with mental health problems and they

actually receive a worse standard of treatment than that provided outside (Prison Reform Trust (PRT), 2005). Similarly, HMIP (2007) comment on two findings from their report:

The first is that there are still too many gaps in provision and too much unmet and sometimes unrecognised need in prisons. The second, equally important, is that the need will always remain greater than the capacity, unless mental health and community services outside prison are improved and people are appropriately directed to them: before, instead of, and after custody.

Perhaps part of the problem stems from the finding that the Prison Health Policy Unit has no specific policy lead for mental health for young adult prisoners aged 18 – 24 years old, yet has separate leads for those under 18 and those over 18 (HMIP, 2006). This is pertinent as it is within young adults that mental health problems become apparent (ibid.). Consequently, the high rate of psychiatric morbidity among young prisoners and the lack of an appropriate policy lead and specialised services for them raises serious questions as to the legitimacy of placing these young people in prison.

Although centred in our prisons, this crisis has led to greater pressure on the earlier stages of the criminal justice system, as staff working in police stations, court cells and escort vehicles process more and more individuals, many of whom have one or more mental health disorders. The effect that this crisis has had, and is having, on individual detainees and prisoners therefore requires exploration, particularly in relation to the pains of custody, and suicide and self-harm. Using six objectives (see chapter two), this study aimed to examine the hypothesis that ‘the different support needs of young males

are not being adequately addressed as they proceed through the criminal justice system, with serious consequences in terms of personal harm'. This involved asking detainees and prisoners about suicide and self-harm, and the pains that they faced in the current criminal justice system, how they coped with them and the support that they received and required.

Nearly fifty years on, Sykes' (1958) study of a maximum-security prison in New Jersey (USA) remains the most influential prison study of all time (Reisig, 2001). Through interviews with adult male prisoners, Sykes identifies five pains or deprivations of imprisonment, including the deprivation of liberty, deprivation of goods and services, deprivation of heterosexual relationships, deprivation of autonomy and deprivation of security. Whereas Sykes' study has formed the basis of much later research, many are uncritical of his typology, research framework and findings, despite the very different context in which prison research now takes place. Consequently, the present study explored these 'pains', making them more relevant to the modern day custodial process. In doing so, it re-visited the 'effects of prison' debate, which, whilst relatively long-standing, has gone somewhat stale in recent decades (Liebling and Maruna, 2005). This study illustrates that Sykes' (1958) five pains of imprisonment are to some extent relevant to today's young male prisoners and that these may extend to the wider criminal justice system, including police cells, court cells and escort vehicles. Thus, the suggestion is made that they are 'pains of custody', rather than deprivations specific to the prison experience. Evidence is also presented that suggests a further thirteen pains of custody can now be identified and that the distress caused by these pains can lead to suicide and self-harm throughout the criminal justice system.

Research exploring suicide and self-harm in prison has featured more and more prominently over the past decade. In part, this reflects the large numbers of prisoners who are committing suicide and self-harming, albeit in 2006 the suicide rate (67) was the lowest it had been since 1996 (Safer Custody Group (SCG), 2007). Conversely, at the time this study was being developed and undertaken, approximately 90 prisoners per year were committing suicide; the figures for 2002, 2003 and 2004 were 95, 94 and 95 respectively (HM Prison Service, 2007b). With regards to gender, males are substantially over-represented within suicide statistics; 3 of the 67 suicides in 2006, 4 of the 78 suicides in 2005 and 13 of the 95 suicides in 2004 were female (SCG, 2007). Female prisoners are therefore considered to be at less risk of committing suicide than their male counterparts (HMCIP, 1999; Lloyd, 1990; SCG, 2001). In terms of young male prisoner suicides, Liebling (1992) suggests that in comparison with all prison suicides, these have increased slightly more. Whilst there has been a definite decrease in the number of prison suicides overall, figures are more inconsistent for young male prisoners. In 2004 there were 5 young male prisoner suicides; in 2005 this increased to 9, decreasing to 2 in 2006 (SCG, 2007). Furthermore, at Glen Parva Young Offenders Institution (YOI) (where this study was undertaken) there were no suicides between 2002 and 2004, yet there were 2 in 2005 and 1 in 2006 (ibid.). Turning to the general population, suicides amongst young males increased during the 1980s, falling between 1993 and 2004, although young males remain significantly more at-risk of committing suicide than females (Samaritans, 2006). It has been suggested that suicides may have increased amongst young people because of modern youth culture that portrays suicide positively (for example, suicide internet sites and heavy metal music), changes that have taken place in young peoples' environments (i.e. a reduction in family and religious ties) and a greater acceptability of suicide as an option (Cantor, 2002; Cobain, 2005; Hawton, 1986). These values and young peoples' vulnerability to suicide are therefore

being imported into the criminal justice system. In addition to suicide, prisoners are vulnerable to self-harm; in 2004, there were 19,285 incidents of self-harm, in 2005 this figure rose to 23,794 and in 2006 it was at 23,169 (this excludes incidents for December) (SCG, 2007). Considering gender, approximately half of the incidents involved males (ibid.). Therefore, taking into account the actual numbers of prisoners, males are proportionately less likely to self-harm than females. However, young male prisoners appear to be over-represented in these figures; in 2004 they accounted for 16.4% of all male self-harm incidents, in 2005 this proportion rose to 17.3% and in 2006 it was 17.6% (ibid.). Moreover, young males are more likely to self-harm in prison than they are in the general population. Whereas a similar proportion of self-harm incidents in prison involved males and females, in the general population, girls are nearly four times as likely to self-harm as boys (Samaritans, 2006).

Although the above data centres on prison, suicide and self-harm are found in the wider criminal justice system, albeit to a lesser degree. Consequently, studies have been predominantly undertaken in prison, largely overlooking police cells, court cells and escort vehicles, and disregarding research that suggests if young people find these locations distressing, they will import their fears and anxieties into prison (Howard League, 2001). There is evidence to suggest that this may already be happening, as prisoners are more at-risk of suicide and self-harm in the early stages of imprisonment and whilst on remand (Backett, 1987; Bogue and Power, 1995; Crighton and Towl, 1997; 2002; Dear, Thomson, Hall and Howells, 2001; Dooley, 1990a; HMCIP, 1999; HM Prison Service, 1992; Howard League, 1999a; 2005a; Liebling and Krarup, 1993; Lloyd, 1990; Matthews, 1999; SCG, 2001; Shaw et al, 2004; Towl, 1999). The present study therefore supports a holistic approach to studying suicide and self-harm amongst

young men in custody, not only exploring prison, but also police cells, court cells and escort vehicles.

While the pains of custody mean some young men turn to suicide or self-harm, there are many others who successfully adapt to, resist or cope with these pains. In understanding this, researchers have tended to use sociological or psychological approaches. However, like Harvey (2004; 2007), who studied young men surviving and adapting to prison, the current study combines sociological and psychological approaches, providing a greater understanding of how young men deal with the pains of the criminal justice system. In addition, it overcomes a propensity to overlook or downplay the use of support services. Consequently, it explores the support services provided to young men in the criminal justice system, establishing whether they can alleviate distress and anxiety, and prevent incidents of suicide and self-harm.

In order to accomplish the above aims, the present study was based at Glen Parva YOI and a number of police stations and courts that fed into it. A quantitative activity analysis was firstly undertaken of the custody process in four police custody suites, supported by observations and informal discussions with police officers and staff. Secondly, interviews were undertaken with 27 prisoners at Glen Parva YOI, with 10 further interviews being completed with detainees at two Magistrates Courts and one Crown Court. By using semi-structured interviews, young men were asked for their opinions and experiences of the criminal justice system, helping to overcome the shortage of qualitative research that asks prisoners (and detainees in the wider criminal justice system) about their experiences (Medlicott, 2000).

The first chapter of this thesis will cover the literature reviewed, beginning with an examination of how the nature of imprisonment has changed over the centuries. The five pains of imprisonment found by Sykes (1958) will then be outlined, alongside a further thirteen pains of custody which can now be identified. This will lead to a summary of the definitions of, and motivations for, suicide, attempted suicide and self-harm. More specifically, it will discuss these incidents in the context of the criminal justice system. Next, the preventative measures that have been taken by criminal justice institutions will be detailed. Subsequently, it will be shown how young men adapt to, resist and cope with the pains of custody. Lastly, an overview will be provided of how this study overcomes criticisms of previous research.

Following on from the literature review, the methodology chapter (chapter two) will outline the specific aim and objectives of the study. It will describe the research settings as well as examining data on suicide and self-harm, thus meeting the first objective (to examine incidents of suicide and self-harm in police cells, court cells, escort vehicles and prison). An overview will be given of how access was gained to the research settings and the ethical guidelines that were considered throughout the research process. The two parts of this study will then be discussed in detail, including quantitative research that was undertaken in police custody suites and qualitative research that involved conducting interviews with young male prisoners and detainees. The issue of my identity as a researcher and how it influenced the research setting is then discussed, followed by a unique insight into my experiences as a researcher. The subsequent chapters cover the findings from this study, supported by quotes from interviewees.

Chapter three examines Sykes' five pains of imprisonment within the modern day English criminal justice system, alongside an exploration of why some interviewees did

not speak of any such pains. Following on, it explains why Sykes' work can now be extended. Subsequently, chapter four identifies thirteen further pains of custody. Although all pertain to prisoners, it will become apparent that, by their nature, only some relate to young men being held in police cells, court cells and escort vehicles. The thirteen further pains of custody that are identified are; entry shock, fear of the unknown, withdrawing from drugs and alcohol, loss of privacy, time, loss of stimulation, the waiting game, lack of respect, loss of social support, pains of communication, loss of identity, the physical environment and fear or nervousness about release. In examining these pains of custody, the second objective of this study is met; to explore young males' experiences of the criminal justice system.

The fifth chapter explains how young men cope in the criminal justice system, satisfying the third objective of the study; to identify how young males cope with the pains of custody. In doing so, a comparison is made with the coping strategies that young men employ outside the criminal justice system, to establish whether these coping strategies are transferred or modified, or if new ones are developed. In addition, chapter five explores how self-harm may be used by some young men as a coping strategy. However, in contrast to previous research, it does not show significant differences between the coping strategies employed by young men who have and have not attempted suicide or self-harmed.

Chapter six demonstrates how the support services provided to young men in the criminal justice system can help them cope with the pains of custody and prevent incidents of suicide and self-harm. In similar respects to chapter five, it does not show significant differences between the support services accessed by young men who have and have not attempted suicide or self-harmed. The support provided to those who have

witnessed an incident of suicide or self-harm in prison is also explored, as this is a particularly distressing situation to have experienced. Throughout chapter six, interviewees' ideas for improving the support services provided to young men in the criminal justice system are outlined. This chapter meets the remaining three objectives of the study; to explore changes in the support needs of young males as they proceed through the criminal justice system, to compare the support needs of young males who self-harm or who have attempted suicide with the support needs of those who have not and to explore the provision of support services in terms of their availability, accessibility and relevance to young males.

Lastly, the conclusion draws these chapters together, demonstrating how this study has made a unique and significant contribution to current criminological research, particularly at a time when our prisons are in crisis. Not only has the study re-visited Sykes' pains of imprisonment, but it has extended these to the broader custodial context. It has focused on young male prisoners who disproportionately suffer social exclusion and who are amongst the most vulnerable to suicide and self-harm within the general population and the criminal justice system. The conclusion makes recommendations to the agencies involved in the criminal justice system, which will enable them to improve the support provided to young men in general, and to those who are at-risk of suicide and self-harm in particular. Alongside this, it provides ideas for future criminological research, allowing an even greater understanding to be gained about the pains of custody, and suicide and self-harm across police cells, court cells, escort vehicles and prison.

Chapter One: Literature Review

Overview

It is important to view [custody] as a process beginning with arrest, appearance at court, arrival at prison, reception, induction and progression to the ordinary regime (HM Prison Service, 2001: 20).

[A] prisoner's first experience of custody will not be in a prison: it will often be in a court cell, followed by an escort vehicle..... These experiences of custody have not so far been inspected in detail (HMIP, 2004: 3).

Not only has criminological research tended to overlook police cells, court cells and escort vehicles, but research exploring suicide and self-harm within the criminal justice system has predominantly been undertaken in prisons and has not taken into account incidents within the earlier stages. Thus, McCleave and Latham (1998: 13) conclude that "[t]he majority of the research on self-injurious behaviour while a detainee is in custody has focused on the prison environment". The starting point for suicide prevention must be the point of arrest because this is often the most volatile and emotional time for the arrestee (Hayes, 1996). Emotions can continue to run high into police cells, where individuals are placed after being arrested. From here, individuals are either released or transported in an escort vehicle to court, where they are held in a court cell. These escort and court custody services were privatised between 1993 – 1997 (Williams et al, 2000) and have responsibility "for the secure, safe and humane transportation of all prisoners (except Category A prisoners) and for custody duties at Crown and Magistrates Courts" (Caddle, 1995: 3). After appearing in court, the

individual will either be released or sent to prison in an escort vehicle. Therefore, if conditions in court cells and escort vehicles are distressing, individuals will carry these anxieties with them into prison, which can have devastating consequences; “instead of allaying fears, the current escorting arrangements are in fact contributing to the high levels of suicide and self-harm among remand and newly-sentenced prisoners” (Howard League, 2001: 19).

By incorporating the earlier stages of the criminal justice system, Sykes’ (1958) pains of imprisonment can be made more relevant to the modern day custodial process. They can also help inform why suicide and self-harm take place in police cells, court cells and escort vehicles, in addition to prison. Like the focus of the pains of imprisonment, the ‘effects of prison’ research has excluded the earlier stages of the criminal justice system. Furthermore, this literature has been criticised recently by Liebling and Maruna (2005: 3), who argue that “[t]he contemporary effects literature lacks a sufficient affective dimension. Fear, anxiety, loneliness, trauma, depression, injustice, powerlessness, violence and uncertainty are all part of the experience of prison life”. Research should therefore explore this affective dimension for present-day prisoners and extend it to detainees in the wider criminal justice system.

Besides identifying the pains of custody, it is necessary to explore how they relate to incidents of suicide and self-harm across the criminal justice system. The definitions for suicide, attempted suicide and self-harm will be explored in more detail later, but as an outline, suicide results from acute emotional distress, when the individual has an overwhelming need to escape from intolerable pain or despair and can see no alternative except death (HMCIP, 1999). Attempted suicide involves injury to oneself and suicidal intent, but the individual does not die. In contrast, there is no suicidal intent involved

with self-harm, but the individual does deliberately cause pain and / or injury to their body (Babiker and Arnold, 2001). Although, as demonstrated in the introduction, suicide and self-harm are not gender-specific, this study will only explore the male perspective for “it would appear that gender differences are strong enough to make research on prison suicide attempts amongst both males and females too complex for a single enterprise” (Liebling, 1992: 178). Moreover, the sample will only include young males aged 18 to 21years¹ because relatively little attention has been given to their experiences of imprisonment (Harvey, 2007). Subsequently, it is appropriate to explore how detainees and prisoners cope with the pains of custody and what support is made available to them, with a view to preventing incidents of suicide and self-harm. Ultimately, the present study aims to address gaps in the research literature, broaden our knowledge about the pains affecting young men in the current criminal justice system and relate them to suicide and self-harm.

Changing nature of imprisonment

Returning to the effects of prison, it is firstly appropriate to outline how imprisonment has changed. Prior to the nineteenth century, the pains of imprisonment were of a physical nature, with punishment being directed at the body through torture and public ritual (Foucault, 1977). By the end of the nineteenth century punishment was instead targeted at the mind and soul, acting on an offender’s heart, thoughts, will and inclinations (Foucault, 1977; Ignatieff, 1978). Punishment was no longer a public spectacle but was instead hidden behind the walls of the prison. Deprivation of liberty became the dominant form of punishment, involving the suspension of prisoners’ rights and the use of time as a measure of punishment (Foucault, 1977; Matthews, 1999;

¹ Young offender institutions hold individuals aged 18 – 21 years old. However, if the individual is convicted when they are 21 years old, they are sent to an adult prison

Porporino, 1992). The physical pains of nineteenth century prisons were therefore replaced with the psychological pains of modern imprisonment. Nevertheless, these psychological pains can be just as painful as the physical torture they replaced (Sykes, 1958). Thus, Morris and Morris (1963: 183) comment, “it is at the psychological level that imprisonment is a painful, depriving and destructive experience”. Although Liebling (1999a) notes that psychological research concludes there are only minimal effects of imprisonment or that prisoners cope better than anticipated (for example, Zamble and Porporino, 1988), sociological and criminological research does not support this view. Instead, it identifies a number of pains of imprisonment and the negative effect that prisons can have (Cohen and Taylor, 1972; Goffman, 1961; Sykes, 1958). Perhaps the most notable of this work is by Sykes (1958), who identifies five pains or deprivations of imprisonment. Even today, these pains remain largely uncontested, despite the fact that Sykes focused on adult male sentenced prisoners in an American maximum-security prison nearly fifty years ago. Thus, the context of Sykes’ research is very different to the context in which present-day prison research takes place; because of this, the present study is unique and important as it interrogates these pains and makes them more relevant to the modern day custodial process as it affects young men in England.

Pains of imprisonment

The first pain of imprisonment identified by Sykes (1958) is the most obvious of the deprivations, the deprivation of liberty. As Coyle (1994: 27) suggests, it has the potential to cause the greatest distress; “losing one’s liberty is one of the most traumatic experiences any individual is likely ever to undergo”. The deprivation of liberty is a double deprivation in that a prisoner is confined both to and within an institution. There

he is cut off from his family, relatives and friends, and faces a “deliberate, moral rejection... by the free community” (Sykes, 1958: 65). The prisoner is not allowed to forget that because he has committed a crime he has lost his status as a fully-fledged, trusted member of society. Such deprivation is particularly painful for younger prisoners and those in custody for the first time, who are least prepared for this loss of liberty (Harvey, 2007; HMIP, 2000).

The second deprivation is the deprivation of goods and services. Sykes suggests the prisoner not only wants or needs the ‘necessities of life’, but also amenities such as cigarettes, alcohol, individual clothing and individual furnishings. Consequently, “the inmate population defines its present material impoverishment as a painful loss” (Sykes, 1958: 68). An example of this deprivation is that on entering prison, all personal possessions and clothing are removed from the offender and he is given substitutes, which are clearly marked as belonging to the institution (Caird, 1974; Coyle, 1994; Goffman, 1961). By losing these material possessions, the prisoner loses a central method of creating a picture of himself, especially as self-feelings are often invested in personal possessions (Goffman, 1961; Sykes, 1958). However, the deprivation of goods and services was identified by Sykes in 1958 and pertained to a maximum-security prison in the USA. In contrast, this deprivation does not exist to the same extent in today’s English prisons. Nevertheless, Harvey (2007: 30) did find in his study of young male prisoners that “[f]or many of these young men, material possessions and clothing served as a symbol of status; being deprived of these things undermined their presentation of themselves”. Loss of personal possessions can therefore represent an attack at the deepest layers of the personality and may threaten an individual’s self-concept (Goffman, 1961; Mathiesen, 1990).

The deprivation of heterosexual relationships is the third pain of imprisonment. This deprivation arises from one of the main features found in a 'total institution' - the barriers that exist preventing social intercourse between the inmate and the outside world (Goffman, 1961). These barriers are often of a physical nature, for example, high walls and doors, and prevent heterosexual relationships, resulting in a prisoner's involuntary celibacy (Sykes, 1958). According to Sykes, this deprivation is not a pain of imprisonment for homosexual prisoners. In accordance with societal and cultural changes, it is perhaps necessary to adapt Sykes' work and describe this pain as the 'deprivation of sexual relationships', since homosexual prisoners may be losing established sexual relationships. Nevertheless, regardless of sexual orientation, Sykes' suggests that male prisoners are faced by a loss of heterosexual interaction, which can cause psychological problems. Sykes argues that a person searches for their identity within themselves and within the picture they find reflected in the eyes of others. If half of their significant audience is missing, i.e. the female audience, the male prisoner's self-image is in danger of becoming "half complete, fractured, a monochrome without the hues of reality" (Sykes, 1958: 72). Hence, anxieties concerning identity and masculinity may develop within the almost exclusively male prison. Again though, a loss of heterosexual interaction may not necessarily apply to today's young male English prisoners; differences exist not only between English and American prisons, but also between the 1950s and today.

Fourthly, Sykes identifies the deprivation of autonomy, which can be expanded to include the lack of control a prisoner has over their situation. Prisoners are subjected to a vast number of rules and restrictions that are designed to control their behaviour and even to a large degree their bodily functions (Coyle, 1994; Howard League, 1999b; Sapsford, 1983; Sykes, 1958). Thus, "[p]rison life is completely routinised and

restricted, with few opportunities to make decisions or exert choice in their daily routine” (Irwin and Owen, 2005: 98). Consequently, prisoners become “to all intents and purposes a passive player to whom things [are] done” (Coyle, 1994: 27). Likewise, Meisenhelder (1985: 43) suggests that because prisoners feel they are governed by the institutions that hold them, they are “effects rather than causes”. The prison regime also removes any remaining dignity a prisoner has left, making them ask for little things like a drink of water or to use the telephone (Dooley, 1994; Goffman, 1961). Although Goffman (1961) notes that this mortification process may bring about psychological relief for some prisoners who are sick of their world or who are guilt ridden, Sykes argues that the majority of prisoners express hostility towards their dependence on prison staff and their inability to make decisions and choices.

The final pain of imprisonment identified by Sykes is the deprivation of security, which is one of the most fearful expectations confronting those who enter prison for the first time (Medlicott, 2001). Not only are many prisoners forced to share cells or be in close proximity with other male offenders, these other male offenders may have histories of violent and aggressive behaviour (Sykes, 1958). Prisoners’ concerns may therefore centre on avoiding or protecting themselves from injury, rape or death (Jones and Schmid, 2000). Even today, violence is a common occurrence in male prisons, but particularly in YOIs, where prisoners face bullying, threats of violence, physical violence, verbal abuse and robbery (Adler, 1998; Howard League, 1999a; Scraton et al, 1991; Sim, 1994; Tempest, 2007). Thus, Edgar et al (2003: 185) conclude:

We have seen that violence and victimization are commonplace.

Assaults and fights are tightly woven into the fabric of prison life.....

The rates of verbal abuse, threats and assault are high, while prisoners must also guard against the risks of cell theft, exclusion and robbery.

Such occurrences can provoke anxiety within the prisoner who knows that sooner or later he will be 'tested', when he will have to fight for his personal safety or his possessions (Sykes, 1958). Not only does the deprivation of security cause anxiety but it may also cause an individual to doubt their ability to cope (ibid.). However, there is evidence to suggest that these fears are not always long-lived and are often dispelled during the early stages of imprisonment (Harvey, 2007).

Expanding the pains of imprisonment

As noted earlier, Sykes' work has remained relatively unchallenged or unchanged over the last fifty years. Having focused on adult male sentenced prisoners in an American maximum-security prison in the 1950s, it remains to be seen whether in England, today's young male prisoners experience these pains. Suggestion has already been made that such prisoners do not experience the deprivation of goods and services or the loss of heterosexual interaction to the same extent as prisoners in Sykes' study. In addition, it has yet to be established whether Sykes' deprivations extend to the wider criminal justice system or whether further pains can be identified. In the following sections, it will be argued that some of Sykes' pains of imprisonment do extend to the wider criminal justice system and it is therefore more appropriate to describe them as 'pains of custody'. It will be shown that further pains can now be identified; these pains are based on Toch's (1982) analysis of prison demands, which include overload (where they demand more than the individual can deliver) and underload (where they insufficiently

challenge the individual's interests and capacities). In expanding Sykes' work, incidents of suicide and self-harm will be used as a present-day indicator of pain caused.

Considering Sykes' five pains of imprisonment, it is possible to demonstrate how some are relevant to the wider criminal justice system. Firstly, the deprivation of liberty is found in police cells, court cells and escort vehicles, where individuals are detained and their liberty removed. Such deprivation may be particularly acute during the early stages of custody (i.e. police cells) when the shock of losing one's liberty is at its greatest (Blaauw et al, 1998). Harvey (2007) found in his study of 18 – 21 year old prisoners that this deprivation was felt in the court cells once individuals had been remanded into, or sentenced to, prison. Subsequently, this loss was difficult to contend with whilst being transported in the escort vehicles, where young prisoners could see the free world but could not 'reach' it (ibid.). High levels of suicide and self-harm found in the early stages of police custody and prison indicate the level of distress caused by this loss (Arnold and Magill, 2000; Backett, 1987; Bogue and Power, 1995; Howard League, 1999a; Ingram et al, 1997; Liebling and Krarup, 1993; Lloyd, 1990; SCG, 2001). Secondly, not only may the pains associated with the deprivation of goods and services extend across the criminal justice system, but here they may be felt more acutely. In the earlier stages individuals are denied all personal possessions and in some cases, personal clothing. In contrast, prisoners are able to retain some personal items and purchase others. Such deprivation of goods and services may have serious consequences for individuals, threatening their self-concept and identity, which in turn can lead to self-harm (Babiker and Arnold, 2001).

The third pain that Sykes identifies, the deprivation of sexual relationships, probably does not stretch to the wider criminal justice system as individuals are only held in these

locations for relatively short periods. However, the fourth pain, deprivation of autonomy and control, is thought to apply to the wider criminal justice system, where detainees are denied individual responsibility. This loss can exacerbate feelings of helplessness and can lead to anger, frustration, hopelessness and depression (Cooke et al, 1990; Dooley, 1994). For those individuals experiencing a loss of autonomy and control for the first time, it can also be humiliating and frightening (Cooke et al, 1990). Consequently, suicide and self-harm can follow (Arnold and Magill, 2000; Cooke et al, 1990; Dooley, 1994; Howard League, 1999b; 2001; Spandler, 2001; Wool and Dooley, 1987; Young Minds, 1999). Lastly, Sykes' deprivation of security may apply to those individuals being detained in shared court cells, who may fear violence from other detainees. This does not apply to individuals in police custody as they are detained on their own. However, they may fear violence from police officers, especially in light of the number of deaths that have occurred following police restraint (Police Complaints Authority (PCA), 2002). Subsequently, these feelings of anxiety and fear of intimidation can lead to suicide and self-harm (Arnold and Magill, 2000; Dooley, 1994).

In recognising the limitations of Sykes' study, it is necessary to take account of the whole custodial experience, as opposed to simply time spent in prison. Consequently, an additional thirteen pains of custody can be identified. Whilst all pertain to prisoners, only some are applicable to individuals being detained in police cells, court cells or escort vehicles. These thirteen further pains of custody are illustrated below.

Entry Shock

Firstly, although Sykes identifies the deprivation of liberty as the primary pain of imprisonment, he does not recognise 'entry shock', which is the turmoil individuals face during their initial period of incarceration when they enter the criminal justice system

(Blaauw et al, 1998; Gibbs, 1982a; 1982b). At this point, the individual may be overwhelmed by the introduction of a regime that replaces his community life and the reality that he has been cut off from his normal and familiar surroundings, being placed in a completely different and somewhat chaotic situation (Caird, 1974; Irwin, 1970; Towl and Hudson, 1997). Entering the criminal justice system can therefore be a disruptive and disorganising experience (Gibbs, 1982a) and is demonstrated vividly by the increased rates of suicide and self-harm found within the early stages of imprisonment (Backett, 1987; Bogue and Power, 1995; Crighton and Towl, 1997; Dooley, 1990a; HMCIP, 1999; Howard League, 1999a; Liebling and Krarup, 1993; Lloyd, 1990; Matthews, 1999; SCG, 2001). Entry shock is particularly evident within the initial stages of confinement, i.e. police cells, where offenders face a disproportionate amount of stress and where high rates of suicide and self-harm are found during the early hours of custody (Blaauw et al, 1998; Ingram et al, 1997). In part, this is because the offender has made a transition from liberty to incarceration, which is usually more sudden than a transition within incarceration, for example, from a remand centre to a sentenced unit (ibid.).

Entry shock is evident amongst individuals on arrival at prison, when they have to proceed through the reception process. As Caird (1974: 9) notes, the reception process is:

a sophisticated sausage machine into which newly-convicted prisoners are fed at one end and fully-fledged inmates are led out at the other. It is a tunnel which strips off every connection a man has with the outside world and provides him with a number and a set of prison clothes, quite anonymous and undifferentiated.

Goffman (1961: 23) suggests that upon entering prison, individuals begin a series of “abasements, degradations, humiliations and profanations” of the self. Prisoners are systematically, if often unintentionally, mortified (ibid.). Goffman suggests that due to the nature of this process it might be better called ‘trimming’ or ‘programming’. Thus, the reception process involves a ‘leaving off’ and a ‘taking on’; the prisoner is stripped of personal possessions and his usual appearance and given substitute possessions that are clearly marked as belonging to the institution. In all, Goffman argues the mortification process places a barrier between the inmate and the wider world and is likely to involve acute psychological stress for the individual. This stress is highlighted by Caird (1974: 14), who describes how the whole reception process left him “feeling naked, unsure of myself, worried about what was happening to me”. The reception process, in marking the end of a prisoner’s free life and the beginning of their custodial life, can therefore cause considerable distress.

Another aspect of entry shock is that on entering prison, individuals leave one ‘world’ or ‘life’ and enter another (Harvey, 2004; 2007). Consequently, during their first month inside, prisoners occupy a place between these two worlds and in doing so, enter a liminal phase (ibid.). Between these two separate worlds, individuals have “neither relinquished their hopes for the lives from which they had been torn, nor yet accepted their existence within a new enclosed order” (Harvey, 2007: 31). Subsequently, Harvey (2004; 2007) argues that within ten days of entering prison, some individuals begin to show patterns of adaptation, moving to a form of acceptance with their situation. By thirty days, some prisoners reach an equilibrium where they have achieved a balance in their adaptation, not only actively participating in their new world, but also learning to glean from it (ibid.). However, some remain in a liminal phase and consequently experience prison as extremely painful and shocking (Harvey, 2007). The liminal phase

may extend to police cells and court cells, where individuals occupy a position between the free world and incarcerated world. Perhaps even more so than in prison, individuals are acutely aware of this liminal position and the prospect they face of either freedom or incarceration. By extending the notion of a liminal phase it becomes apparent why individuals find their entry into police custody or court custody so distressing and unnerving.

Fear of the unknown

Associated with entry shock is the pain of custody, a 'fear of the unknown', which is particularly evident during the initial stages of the criminal justice system where levels of uncertainty are acute (Blaauw et al, 1998). A fear of the unknown arises from the lack of information that individuals are given regarding their situation. In police cells, individuals may be unaware of what is going to happen and consequently resort to ringing the cell buzzer to ask for information. However, detainees who frequently use their buzzer can be quickly branded a nuisance and find their buzzer turned off, which does little to lessen their fears (Newburn and Hayman, 2002). Caird's (1974) experiences as a prisoner support this pain of custody; whilst waiting in the court cells after being sentenced, Caird (1974: 5) describes how:

My main feeling was one of wondering what was going to happen next.

Where would we be taken? When? How? What was 'it' going to be like?

There seemed to be nothing to be physically afraid of; but I still felt apprehensive. I was being thrown into a situation utterly outside my experience.

Caird also found the court cells stark and without comfort, which did little to alleviate the worries of an apprehensive offender. Even after Caird had been placed on a prison wing, he was unaware of what to expect; he was unsure of whether he would be sharing a cell and if so, with whom and he had no idea how often visits were allowed. More recently, HMIP (2004) has highlighted these fears, suggesting that anxiety levels may be heightened at court because prisoners are not given written information in advance about the escort company, the role of escort staff, conditions whilst being escorted or details of the prison reception. In particular, HMIP found that before arriving at prison, 73% of young adult prisoners had not received any written information about what would happen to them. Consequently, there is a need to improve the provision of information for detainees held in court cells (Howard League, 2001; Williams et al, 2000).

A fear of the unknown continues into prison, being associated with uncertainty about prison itself, families and loved ones, and is especially painful amongst remand prisoners (Harvey, 2004; 2007). Lloyd (1990) argues remand prisoners are placed under increased stress due to the uncertainty surrounding their trial and sentencing. As a result, some remand prisoners remain in a liminal phase and find adaptation to the prison environment difficult until sentenced (Harvey, 2007). A fear of the unknown continues throughout a prisoners' sentence, as inmates are excluded from knowing any decisions that have been made regarding their fate (Goffman, 1961). The effects of this pain of custody are evident; suicide rates are increased within the remand population (Dooley, 1990a; Lloyd, 1990). Likewise, remand and unsentenced prisoners:

continue to represent the majority of those at-risk of suicide and self-harm. They have the greatest degree of uncertainty about what the

future holds, and yet they have limited access to purposeful activity and the programmes which seek to equip prisoners with improved coping strategies (Baker, 2004: 1).

Withdrawing from drugs and alcohol

Related to entry shock is a pain of custody that has been relatively overlooked in the past; the physical and psychological effects of withdrawing from drugs or alcohol. Whilst some individuals may be able to use substitute medication to lessen these effects, others may not be able to do so and the symptoms they experience are the body's reaction to the absence of the addicted drug (Paton and Jenkins, 2002). For example, there are no substitute drugs for cocaine or amphetamines (HM Prison Service, 2005; Paton and Jenkins, 2002). There is probably a lack of research exploring this pain of custody because concerns have tended to centre on the availability and use of drugs in prison (for example, Cope, 2003; Crewe, 2005), despite large numbers of people being held in police custody or prison who have a problem with drugs or alcohol or are experiencing withdrawal from these substances (Howard League, 2001; Paton and Jenkins, 2002). In particular, drug misuse and drug dependence are higher amongst young prisoners aged 21 years or under (Shaw et al, 2003).

In his study of young male prisoners, Harvey (2007: 60) concludes "[t]he prisoners who were withdrawing from drugs suffered both physically and psychologically in acute ways". Paton and Jenkins (2002) describe how prisoners withdrawing from heroin experience physical symptoms comparable to a bout of flu; running nose and eyes, sweating, restlessness, sleeplessness, nausea, vomiting, diarrhoea and pains in muscles, bones and joints, anxiety and irritability. Those withdrawing from stimulants (for example, cocaine and amphetamines) may suffer from depression, agitation and

craving, followed later by fatigue, hunger and insomnia. Subsequently they will reach a stage of exhaustion and excessive sleeping that lasts hours or days. Lastly, the physical symptoms associated with the withdrawal from alcohol include depression, nervousness, insomnia, aggression and poor memory or concentration. Severe symptoms of withdrawal may include fits, hallucinations or delusions. The psychological effects are just as acute; individuals withdrawing from drugs or alcohol are at a heightened risk of suicide and self-harm (Backett, 1987; Bogue and Power, 1995; HM Prison Service, 2001; 2005; Marzillier, 2004; National Centre for Policing Excellence (NCPE), 2006; Paton and Jenkins, 2002; Shaw et al, 2003). HMIP (2000: 80) explains this heightened risk as follows:

For many..... drug use is likely to have become a means of self-medication to protect them from emotional pain and mental trauma. When faced with the prospect of losing this coping mechanism at the same time as experiencing the isolation of imprisonment and the stress of an impending trial, it should be no surprise that some may choose to pre-empt this by ending their lives.

Loss of privacy

Linked to entry shock too is a loss of privacy. On entering the criminal justice system, detainees and prisoners have fewer opportunities for intimacy and freedom from the presence of others. Individuals are not only subject to surveillance from officials outside the cell, by means of door hatches or CCTV, but also from cell mates if sharing. This may be exacerbated by the fact that individuals do not have any control over the amount of personal space assigned to them or the nature of that space (Medlicott, 2001). Thus, all aspects of life are conducted in the same place, with individuals having to eat, sleep,

dream, excrete and pass time within their cell (Goffman, 1961; Medlicott, 2001). In addition, prisoners are under the added stress that at any time a member of staff may walk into their personal cell, search their space and re-arrange or remove items (Goffman, 1961; Medlicott, 2001; Newburn and Hayman, 2002). Moreover, any incoming mail may be read and if necessary censored (Goffman, 1961). The negative effect of losing one's privacy can be seen by reference to Goffman (1959). Goffman describes a 'front stage', where an individual gives their performance to their observers and a 'back stage', where the individual can relax and step out of their front stage character. Within this back stage, individuals expect no member of their audience to intrude; where an individual cannot exert control over their back stage, 'dramaturgical trouble' arises (ibid.). Consequently, Wacquant (2002: 378) argues "[o]ne of the most degrading aspects of penal confinement is this denial of any 'backstage'". Likewise, research by Medlicott (2000) supports this deprivation, with prisoners often speaking of the pain and effort of having to live constantly in a role.

Time

As outlined earlier, within prison, time has become a measure of punishment and can cause prisoners great difficulties. Moreover, it may extend to the earlier stages of police custody, where time appears to pass exceedingly slowly (Newburn and Hayman, 2002). Thus, the distortion of time within non-prison custodial settings may arise because individuals occupy a liminal position. Although on the outside the individual owns their time and is able to control it, within prison and the wider criminal justice system it is owned and controlled by the institution and its regime (Cope, 2003). Consequently, one of the main challenges or pains that prisoners face is the 'doing' or management of time (Medlicott, 2001; Toch, 1992a). This pain is particularly acute for those serving indeterminate and long-term sentences (Cohen and Taylor, 1972; Sapsford, 1983). Time

has to be served rather than used; it is no longer a resource but a controller and a burden (Cohen and Taylor, 1972; Meisenhelder, 1985). Similarly, with respect to time being a burden, Matthews (1999: 39) suggests, “time served in prison is not so much ‘spent’ as ‘wasted’”. As shown later, this is exacerbated by the fact that prison limits the available resources to make time pass (Cope, 2003). Furthermore, the process of imprisonment, instead of channelling time, involves the negation of time, which causes a form of timelessness (Matthews, 1999). Prison time can therefore be experienced as a form of cryogenic suspension, with prison being an interruption of life and not a part of it (Sapsford, 1983). Thus, prison time is futureless and the prisoner has no sense of direction that can be planned in his mind (Meisenhelder, 1985; Sapsford, 1983). Prison terms often reflect this view, with prisoners describing their sentence as ‘doing’ or ‘killing’ time. Consequently, time becomes something that must be ‘done’ or ‘marked’ (Goffman, 1961; Meisenhelder, 1985). Prisoners are able to deal with the overabundance of time and with making its passing more apparent by marking time with institutional routines and events (Meisenhelder, 1985). For example, although the ‘naïve’ prisoner at first finds that prison time moves very slowly and experiences this as ‘hard time’, once immersed in the prison world and marking time, it moves more quickly (ibid.). However, ‘hard time’ can eventually return when the prisoner moves towards release and occupies a liminal position, attempting to ‘live’ in two places and times concurrently (ibid.). Again, Medlicott’s (1999) work highlights how suicidal prisoners experience time as an acute source of suffering and pain.

Loss of stimulation

Connected with time, is the loss of stimulation that individuals face in the criminal justice system, which can limit the resources available to them to help make time pass (Cope, 2003). In comparison with the mid 1990s, prisoners are spending more time

locked in their cells and less time engaged in constructive or purposeful activities (Flynn, 1998; Solomon, 2004). For example, prisoners currently remanded into custody may be locked in their cells for up to 22 hours a day (PRT, 2003). More specifically, HMIP (2004) concludes that at any one time, 30% of prisoners in Glen Parva YOI could be locked in their cells. Furthermore, the Social Exclusion Unit (2002) found that in 2000, young adult prisoners aged 18 – 20 years old, spent only 23.1 hours per week on purposeful activity. Thus, Little (1990: 127) states, “[a] great deal of prison life is spent ‘doing nothing’”. A consequence of this is boredom, which centres heavily in a prisoner’s life. As the Howard League (1999a: 14) concludes, “[t]he reality of prison life is often that of boredom and enforced idleness: prisoners have little to do”. This loss of stimulation can mean life becomes monotonous, mundane and repetitive for many prisoners, who miss day-to-day activities (Cooke et al, 1990; Coyle, 1994; Howard League, 1999a; Meisenhelder, 1985). Concerns therefore centre on surviving an unchanging yet regimented prison routine (Jones and Schmid, 2000). Even when prisoners are able to participate in work, it tends to be low skilled and monotonous (Matthews, 1999; Sykes, 1958). A loss of stimulation may extend to police cells, court cells and escort vehicles, where detainees can spend numerous hours waiting without any means of stimulation (HMIP, 2004; HM Magistrates’ Courts Services Inspectorate and HM Inspectorate of Prisons (HM MCSI and HMIP), 2005). This loss can affect the way offenders think, making it harder for them to solve problems (Cooke et al, 1990). In addition, research has found associations between suicide / self-harm and an inability to cope with boredom (Favazza, 1996; Liebling and Krarup, 1993; Wool and Dooley, 1987). Consequently, the Howard League (1999a: 16, original emphasis) argues “[c]onstructive activity *is* vital to prisoners’ well-being”.

Waiting game

As shown earlier, the deprivation of liberty and the challenge of time have both been widely referred to as pains of custody. However, the waiting endured by detainees and prisoners has been relatively overlooked. This ‘waiting game’ stems from a deprivation of liberty but is also influenced by a loss of stimulation and in turn influences the perception of time. One of the main reasons why detainees and prisoners face a waiting game is because the criminal justice system has regained control of their time and dictates where, when and what individuals will do. When in the police cell and court cell, this waiting game may be exacerbated by a fear of the unknown and the fact individuals are waiting for a result (for example, a bail decision or a sentencing decision). Even when an individual is attending court from prison, lengthy waits can occur. For example, HMIP (2004) found that the average length of time that a prisoner spends on court production from Glen Parva YOI is 8 hours and 59 minutes. Most of this time is spent waiting, as the hearings tend to be relatively short. Consequently, boredom can follow; “[t]he primary emotional effect associated with the universality of waiting seems to be that of boredom” (Meisenhelder, 1985: 44). Once in the escort vehicle, waiting times for getting to prison can be made even longer for young prisoners because of the smaller number of YOIs; Williams et al (2000) found that for 27% of male young prisoners, the travelling time inside escort vehicles was over one hour. Greater distances to court mean young offenders are more likely to arrive at prison after the cut-off time and have to spend the night waiting at a local police station (Howard League, 2001).

Lack of respect

Detainees and prisoners can face a lack of respect from some members of staff working in police stations, court custody suites, escort vehicles and prison, which in turn can negatively affect the relationships individuals build with these staff. Liebling and Price (2001) identify at least three different examples of the term 'respect'; respect as fear or power, respect as individuality and respect as moral strength or legitimacy. Respect as fear or power means respecting the authority, power or status of a person. In comparison, respect as individuality is the most commonly used definition by prisoners and relates to responding to someone as an individual, doing what they ask without complaint and demonstrating care and humanity. Lastly, respect as moral strength or legitimacy means acknowledging the power an individual holds and the careful manner in which they apply it. As an example, prisoners respected the prison officer who "had a firm consistent line, but enforced that consistency in a flexible manner" (Liebling and Price, 2001: 102). Respect is important because it not only arises from relationships, but also affects them (ibid.).

With regards to the most commonly used definition, respect as individuality, it is possible to look at research that has explored how individuals are treated and use this as an indicator of respect. Even within the contemporary criminal justice system, individuals can be left feeling degraded by the treatment of staff; "the most persistent and insidious degradation is the hostility and contempt directed at [individuals] by police officers, deputies and other criminal justice functionaries" (Irwin and Owen, 2005: 108). Previous research shows a disparity in the respect shown by staff at the different stages of the criminal justice system; Williams et al (2000: 3) found prisoners are treated very well by escort staff and conclude "some even commented that the contractor staff [within the escort vehicles and court custody suites] treated them better

than prison or police officers”. Similar positive responses were found by HMIP (2004), although some prisoners’ comments revealed disrespectful behaviour by escort staff. It is possible that prisoners felt they were treated better by escort and court staff because they are now part of a relatively new privatised service, which perhaps sees itself as a service industry. In comparison, the Police Force and Prison Service have become deeply embedded within our society, with police officers and prison officers arguably becoming somewhat institutionalised. Subsequently, long-standing views of how offenders should be treated prevail. However, within the Prison Service this may be changing, as competition from the private sector is playing an important role in ‘humanising’ prisons (Crawley, 2004).

Loss of social support

Extending from Sykes’ deprivation of heterosexual relationships is a loss of social support. As described previously, barriers exist within total institutions to prevent social intercourse with the outside world, which in effect sever the individual’s links with wider society or at least place a severe strain on family and other relationships (Coyle, 1994; Goffman, 1961; Howard League, 1999a; Little, 1990). Consequently, on entering the criminal justice system, an individual faces a loss of support from family and friends, who are often the only people he normally confides in (Cooke et al, 1990; Goffman, 1961). Coyle (1994) suggests that separation from family and friends is one of the greatest pains faced by most prisoners. It is particularly applicable to young detainees and prisoners whose family is a vital form of support (Solomon, 2004). Similarly, Harvey (2005; 2007) found that for young prisoners, separation from loved ones is their biggest concern and that their most important ties are with their mothers and relationship partners. In this respect, young male prisoners occupy a vulnerable position; many have strong ties with their own parents, yet are simultaneously fathers to

their own children. Imprisonment may also change prisoners' established relationships (Gibbs, 1982b; Towl and Hudson, 1997). This loss of support can have a devastating effect on individuals, with a lack of support, poor communication with family and friends, and social isolation being negatively linked to suicidal behaviour and self-harm (Babiker and Arnold, 2001; Favazza, 1996; Liebling, 1999a; Meltzer et al, 1999; Powis, 2002; Wool and Dooley, 1987).

Pains of communication

Associated with a loss of social support are the pains of communication. Within the earlier stages of the criminal justice system, communication with the outside world, in particular family and friends, is extremely difficult, if not impossible (especially in court cells and escort vehicles). Even in police cells, detainees are restricted by who they can call and the number of calls they make. Once in prison, in order to prevent the breakdown of relationships and sustain the support provided by family and friends, it is necessary for prisoners to maintain links with the outside world through communication, i.e. visits, phone calls and letters. However, "one deprivation of prison life is the restricted opportunity to communicate with others" (Harvey, 2007: 86). As a result, there are breakdowns in communication or pains associated with communication. Firstly, some prisoners may not receive visits because they are being held a long distance from home. For example, although 65% of the young offender population are being held in prisons less than 50 miles from home, 23% are being held 50 – 100 miles from home, with 12% being held more than 100 miles from home (Hansard, 2004). Even when visits are made, they are short in length and can leave prisoners feeling vulnerable or upset once their family and friends leave (Caird, 1974; Cooke et al, 1990; Harvey, 2007). As a result, some prisoners may cut off all forms of communication, whilst others may keep phoning family and friends (Harvey, 2007). However, with the

finding that BT is charging prisoners more than five times the standard payphone rate to use a prison phone, these rates could be discouraging prisoners from maintaining family ties (Allison, 2006). Associated problems are also found with letter writing; not only does it involve a delay but it does not come easily to all prisoners (Cooke et al, 1990). More specifically, 80% of prisoners have writing skills at or below the level of an 11 year old child, with 18 – 20 year olds fairing even worse (Social Exclusion Unit, 2002). These pains of communication can have a detrimental effect on young prisoners; Liebling (1992) found a group of young prisoners who had attempted suicide received significantly fewer visits and wrote fewer letters than a comparison group.

Loss of identity

A number of the above pains of custody are associated with a loss of identity, which is probably only applicable to prisoners rather than detainees, because of the length of time they are imprisoned and the processes that they go through. Finch (2007) identifies three categories of identity; personal, social and legal. Personal identity is the self as experienced by the individual, which evolves from the individual's interactions with others and their participation in the social world, whereas social identity refers to how the individual is perceived by others and how this is reflected back to them. Conversely, legal identity relates to social facts and the information that is accumulated about an individual, which distinguishes them from others. Legal identity therefore includes birth certificates and passports, but in a criminal justice setting may incorporate criminal records, prison history, sentencing plans, and medical and educational records. Returning to personal identity, this may be negatively affected by loss of personal possessions. For example, as described earlier, such a loss on entering prison can represent an attack at the deepest layers of the personality and may threaten a prisoner's self-concept (Bonta and Gendreau, 1992; Goffman, 1961; Mathiesen, 1990; Sykes,

1958). Thus, Crawley (2004: 95) concludes that by being stripped of their identity kit, “the prisoner will find it difficult to present his usual image of himself to others”. Personal identity may also be negatively affected by deprivation of autonomy; according to Sykes (1958), a loss of autonomy reduces a prisoner to a weak, helpless and dependent status once found in childhood, which can present a threat to their self-image as an adult. Lastly, Bonta and Gendreau (1992) and Matthews (1999) suggest that a prisoner’s self-esteem and personal identity may be affected by a loss of social support. With respect to social identity, Sykes (1958) suggests that a loss of heterosexual interaction can have a damaging effect on a prisoner’s identity, because, as explained previously, half of their significant audience is missing. The risk associated with a loss of identity is that self-harm may be used in an attempt to assert identity (Babiker and Arnold, 2001). Lastly, to some degree, individuals lose their legal identity whilst in the criminal justice system; staff hold ultimate power over these documents, deciding who can access them and when. The individual detainee or prisoner is not permitted to retain them and thus relinquishes his control of them.

One aspect of a male prisoner’s identity that is worth discussing in more detail is masculinity. Masculinity is a social construction, being constructed through the interactional and institutional struggles of everyday life, for example the labour market, law and State (Hearn and Morgan, 1990; Jefferson, 1997). Masculinity exists in relation to, or in contrast with, femininity and is centred upon the global domination of men over women, with this domination serving to advantage men in general (Brittan, 1989; Carrigan et al, 1985; Connell, 1987; 1995). It is now widely recognised that when discussing masculinity it is more accurate and helpful to refer to multiple masculinities (Brittan, 1989; Connell, 1995; Hearn and Morgan, 1990; Jefferson, 1994; 1997; Newburn and Stanko, 1994a). In doing so, it highlights the varying nature of

masculinity and the range of competing masculinities that exist within institutional settings (Jefferson, 1997). Within this range of masculinities, some are more dominant than others (Jefferson, 1994). Consequently, the term ‘hegemonic masculinity’ has been developed, which recognises the relations between these different types of masculinities (Connell, 1987; 1995). Hegemonic masculinity shows how certain forms and practices of masculinity gain dominance in society through, for example, religion, the mass media and the wage structure (Connell, 1987; Hearn and Morgan, 1990). It is important to note that hegemonic masculinity is not a fixed character type, but is the masculinity that occupies the dominant position in society (Connell, 1995: 76). Another central feature of hegemonic masculinity is that it is heterosexual (Carrigan et al, 1985; Connell, 1987). As a result, homosexual men become a subordinated masculinity (Carrigan et al, 1985; Connell, 1987; 1995). In addition, non-normative men are subordinated by hegemonic masculinity, because of their ethnic identity, class position, religion or marital status (Hearn and Morgan, 1990; Kimmel, 1990). Within prison, certain groups of men are subordinated because of their offence type, for example, child sex murderers (Sim, 1994). Due to some of the pains of custody outlined above, certain characteristics associated with hegemonic masculinity are threatened in prison, including being self-sufficient, independent, heterosexual, in control and invulnerable (Crewe, 2007; Jefferson, 1994; Newburn and Stanko, 1994b). Therefore, Jewkes (2002) argues that the pains of custody attack the central features of hegemonic masculinity, which men from all social classes are culturally encouraged to achieve.

Physical environment

The penultimate pain of custody relates to the negative physical environment that many young people find in police cells, court cells, escort vehicles and, to a lesser extent, prison. Not only does this influence how some of the above pains are experienced (for

example, the deprivation of liberty or the waiting game), but also how young people may feel. The sparsely furnished police cells, with their tiled walls, narrow wooden benches, thin mattresses, toilets with no lid and opaque windows mean, “police cells are not comfortable places” (Newburn and Hayman, 2002: 93). Furthermore, detainees tend to suffer with extremes of temperature, poor ventilation and poor quality of food (ibid.).

Subsequently, on being transported in escort vehicles and being held in court cells, conditions can be just as poor; both have been criticised for lack of cleanliness, vandalism, temperature, poor quality and quantity of food (HMIP, 2000; 2004; HM MCSI and HMIP, 2005; Howard League, 2001; Williams et al, 2000). The cramped, poorly ventilated and claustrophobic conditions of escort vehicles can be distressing and frightening for prisoners (Caddle, 1995; HMIP, 2004; Howard League, 2001). This can be better understood with a description of an escort vehicle. The Howard League (2001) describes how escort vehicles may be either two, six or more typically, 14 seated vans, which are divided into small cells that are laid out on either side of a central corridor. A custody officer will always remain in the vehicle sitting at the back facing a ‘safe cell’, which is a larger compartment designed to hold individuals at-risk of self-harm. The door to the safe cell is clear perspex, allowing continual observation of the detainee. None of the cells have sharp corners or ligature points, padding which could be set on fire or seat belts which could be used as ligatures. The fact that seatbelts are not fitted can exacerbate an individual’s situation; “the absence of seatbelts leaves prisoners feeling very vulnerable” (HMIP, 2004: 13). Prisoners can also be left feeling humiliated by having to use portable toilet bags in the escort vehicles (ibid.). Consequently, these negative experiences of escort vehicles are thought to contribute to suicide and self-harm amongst remand and newly-sentenced prisoners (Howard League, 2001). In addition, negative physical environments are experienced in prison, but to a lesser

extent than in the earlier stages of the criminal justice system. For example, some cells may be cold or damp and some prisoners will have to share cells where toilets are minimally screened.

Fear or nervousness about release

The final pain of custody can only be found in prison and refers to the fear or nervousness that some young prisoners face before being released. Although not an obvious pain, the stressful nature of the latter stages of imprisonment has been highlighted elsewhere. For example, Goffman (1961: 65) argues that:

Although inmates do plan release-binges and may keep an hourly count of the time until their release, those about to be released very often become anxious at the thought..... The inmate's anxiety about release often seems to take the form of a question put to himself and his friends: "Can I make it on the outside?"

Similarly, Paulus and Dzindolet (1992) describe how just before release, prisoners' stress levels become heightened, as they grow increasingly concerned about problems relating to their release. These problems may relate to family concerns, how the prisoner will survive in the outside world after having served a prison sentence or how they will find employment (Jones and Schmid, 2000; Parisi, 1982). Ultimately, these concerns can influence how the prisoner experiences their final stages of imprisonment and exacerbate the feeling of 'hard time', as outlined earlier (Meisenhelder, 1985). The finding that prisoners' stress levels become heightened prior to release mirrors the fact that prisoners' stress levels are increased on entry into prison. consequently, the dip

found during the middle phase of imprisonment means a U-shaped curve, similar to that found by Wheeler (1961) can be identified.

To summarise, although the above discussion suggests that Sykes' work is still applicable to today's young male prisoners, the five pains of imprisonment are somewhat limited when exploring the whole modern day custodial experience. It is therefore now possible to extend Sykes' work to cover the wider criminal justice system, including police cells, court cells and escort vehicles, and to identify a further thirteen pains of custody. Thus, "prison [and the wider criminal justice system] is still a place where people suffer extremes of desperation and despair" (Medlicott, 2001: 9). As an example of this, links were identified between some of the pains of custody and suicide or self-harm. Similarly, Liebling (1995: 183) concludes that research shows a "clear link between the pain of imprisonment and harm (as self-inflicted injury or suicide)". However, it is important to note that these pains are not universal; they are not uniform or constant, nor do detainees and prisoners experience them in the same way (Johnson and Toch, 1982; Matthews, 1999). Thus, "the pains of imprisonment press more heavily on some prisoners than others" (Little, 1990: 44). In particular, Toch (1992b: xiii) argues:

Doing time is hard going, but it gets harder for some people than for others. Prison is harshest for those for whom life outside tends to be harsh, persons whose vulnerabilities are exacerbated by stressors of prison.

Therefore, whilst some individuals may adapt to the pains of custody there are others who do not adjust so easily and who find it an extremely painful experience and suffer

visibly (Backett, 1988; Bartollas, 1982; Toch, 1992a). These are the individuals who may commit / attempt suicide or self-harm. Furthermore, Crewe (2005: 477) argues, “the pains of imprisonment are not interpreted homogenously, but in the context of pre-incarceration biographies that can significantly transform the experience of imprisonment”. An individual’s ability to cope with the pains of custody is based on their own vulnerabilities and differences in coping ability, prior socialisation and past experiences, expectations and prior experience of prison, confinement conditions, individual circumstances (for example, length of sentence, nature of crime committed), emotional state, relationships in the outside world and desired outcome (Davies et al, 1995; Johnson and Toch, 1982, Porporino and Zamble, 1984; Power et al, 1997; Sapsford, 1983). The following section will look in more depth at those individuals who suffer visibly with the pains of custody, by examining incidents of suicide and self-harm in the criminal justice system. Subsequently, it will show how some detainees and prisoners cope and adapt to these pains.

Definitions of, and motivations for, suicide, attempted suicide and self-harm

Before examining motivations, it is necessary to expand on the earlier definitions of suicide, attempted suicide and self-harm. Although efforts have been made to define these terms, problems have arisen because intent and attribution are involved (McHugh and Towl, 1997). In May 1991, the Suicide Awareness Support Unit was established. They adopted the term ‘self-inflicted death’, which refers to deaths arising from non-natural causes, including suicide, death by misadventure, open verdicts and accidental death (McHugh and Towl, 1997). However, this definition has been criticised for being over-inclusive (Tilt, 1998). Therefore, for the purposes of this study, the HMCIP (1999: 19) definition will be adopted:

suicide is the result of a decision which may feel entirely rational to the perpetrator but which is made at a time of acute emotional distress when focus is narrowed and the individual is unable to see alternative options. The overwhelming need is to escape from intolerable pain or despair and from the burden of being conscious.

In contrast, attempted suicide is an act as defined above, which involves both self-harm and suicidal intent, but where the individual does not die. By including suicidal intent, attempted suicide is distinguished from self-harm, which is defined as “an act which involves deliberately inflicting pain and / or injury to one’s own body, but without suicidal intent” (Babiker and Arnold, 2001: 2-3). It must be recognised that although some prisoners, particularly young offenders, will have a low level of suicidal intent, they may still use a highly lethal method of self-harm (Livingston, 1997). In addition to the term ‘self-harm’, ‘self-injury’ is used within the literature. ‘Self-injury’ is generally used because it is a narrower definition and includes acts that characterise behaviours found within the prison context, such as cutting, biting, burning and strangulation (Howard League, 2003). ‘Self-injury’ compensates for the view that ‘self-harm’ is too broad and over inclusive. For example, self-harm incorporates smoking, substance abuse, tattooing, eating disorders and self poisoning, the latter two of which are extremely rare within the male prison context (Crighton, 2002; Howard League, 2003). A third term that is used in the literature is ‘deliberate self-harm’. Again, criticisms have been made because it implies a notion of carefulness and a lack of hurry, which do not accurately characterise the behaviours that fall within this term (Crighton and Towl, 2002). Despite its criticisms though, the term self-harm will be used in this study to reflect the wider range of harmful acts that individuals may employ.

The relationship between suicide and self-harm in custody is complex, with some holding the view that they form part of the same continuum and others believing they do not. For example, Prison Service policy treats suicide and self-harm as part of the same continuum of behaviour (Howard League, 1999a). In part this is because there is evidence that a minority of people who self-harm go on to commit suicide and that people who self-harm are at a greater risk of committing suicide (Howard League, 2001; National Self Harm Network, 1998). However, evidence also supports the notion that these three acts do not form part of a continuum; not everyone who commits suicide has self-harmed in the past and not everyone who self-harms goes on to attempt / commit suicide (HMCIP, 1999). It is therefore necessary to appreciate both the differences and similarities between these acts and recognise the serious nature of them all.

In terms of motivation, Shneidman (1976, 1985, 1987, cited in Crighton, 1997) suggests that the reason individuals commit suicide is problem-solving; suicide is an attempt to resolve one or more problems which are perceived as intolerable and which are causing the individual intense psychological suffering. When a person is subjected to sufficient stress their coping ability is overwhelmed and they break down; a stage of helplessness eventually passes on to one of hopelessness, where suicide may be seen as the only way of escaping an intolerable situation (Dooley, 1994). In similar respects, Williams (1997) argues that a sense of entrapment is central to suicidal behaviour. Not only does the individual view the situation as impossible to escape from, but they are also helpless and fear punishment. These feelings are “dramatically illustrated in the suicide of those in prison, especially young people on remand, who can escape neither the prison nor the terrible fear that they will be bullied there” (Williams, 1997: 154). Therefore, suicidal behaviour is perceived as reactive, being elicited by a combination of circumstances, rather than communicative, where some view it as a cry for help (Williams and Pollock,

2002). Likewise, by definition, attempted suicide involves self-harm and suicidal intent, but for some reason the individual does not die. This could be for external reasons (i.e. someone finds the individual) or internal reasons (i.e. the individual himself seeks help). The motivations for suicide are thought to apply to those individuals who have attempted suicide, as the individual has most probably set out to commit suicide. These motivations and the characteristics associated with suicide and attempted suicide will be explored in greater depth later.

Identifying the motivations for self-harm can be difficult because for some individuals it is a sudden impulsive act and for this reason they may not think about the consequences of the act or know why they did it (Cooke et al, 1990). There is rarely a single cause or motivation of self-harm; it tends to differ for each individual and is usually a combination or accumulation of a number of factors, often being triggered by a specific event (Babiker and Arnold, 2001; Dace et al, 1998; Howard League, 1999b; McCarthy, 2003). Due to problems in expressing feelings or needs orally, an individual may use self-harm as a means of communication (Howard League, 2003). Consequently, this has influenced people's perception of self-harm, particularly within prison, where self-harm can be considered 'manipulative behaviour'; prisoners may need to talk to a member of staff privately and cannot think of another way of getting noticed (Cooke et al, 1990). It is not useful to view self-harm as manipulative behaviour, because most prisoners self-harm as they cannot see any other solution to the problem they are facing (ibid.). Self-harm therefore serves a more intrapersonal than interpersonal function; it is more to do with what it does for the individual than its effects on others (Spandler, 2001).

Somewhat paradoxically, whilst self-harm can signify that an individual is in distress it can also be an adaptive and essential coping strategy, allowing individuals to cope with

their lives and feelings (Arnold and Magill, 2000; Livingston and Beck, 1997; Thomas, 1998). The notion that self-harm is a coping strategy can be more easily understood with reference to McCarthy (2003: 24), who highlights how we all self-harm to some degree:

Everybody self-harms. Put another way, we all do things to ourselves that we know are, or may be, bad for us; smoke, drink alcohol, go bungee jumping, eat junk food. We may engage in these activities because they help us to relax, take our minds off other things or because we like the way they make us feel. For some people, cutting or using ligatures to inflict pain on themselves, can be understood simply as a more severe expression of such behaviour.

Like the earlier account of drug use by HMIP (2000), self-harm can represent a means of self-medication. Consequently, an individual may self-harm because of a build up of fear, anxiety, tension, emotional pain, self-hatred, guilt, shame, emptiness, desperation or loss of freedom (Arnold and Magill, 2000). Self-harm not only allows individuals to relieve or reduce these feelings of anger, tension and frustration, but to also experience physical pain, to manage negative feelings and emotions, and to provide alternatives to expressing anger towards others or using drugs or alcohol (Haines and Williams, 1997; Morton, 2004; Snow, 2002). Self-harm enables individuals to deal with difficult feelings and problems when they build up inside and when other escape responses are limited (Cullen, 1985, cited in Snow, 1997; Young Minds, 1999). It may perform a protective function for some individuals, diverting them from suicide, helping them to survive and continuing life rather than destroying it (Arnold and Magill, 2000; Babiker and Arnold, 2001; Crowe and Bunclark, 2000; Favazza, 1996; Morton, 2004; NSHN,

1998). Therefore, Favazza (1996: xix) describes it as a “morbid form of self-help”. Similarly, the Howard League (2001: 5) state that “for many prisoners, self-harm is a way of surviving the depression, frustration and powerlessness of being incarcerated. For these people, the motivation is usually a desire to stay alive rather than an urge to die”. Thus, self-harm represents a coping mechanism for some individuals (Haines et al, 1995; HMCIP, 1999). Individuals may also self-harm in an attempt to gain control over their circumstances when they feel powerless and are unable to control what is going on (Arnold and Magill, 2000; Cooke et al, 1990; Favazza, 1996; Royal College of Psychiatrists, 1999; Young Minds, 1999). Again, later sections will explore in more depth the motivations for self-harm and the characteristics associated with it in the criminal justice system.

Suicide, attempted suicide and self-harm within the criminal justice system

Expanding upon the above general motivations for suicide, attempted suicide and self-harm, the following sections will look at such incidents in police cells, court cells, escort vehicles and prison, exploring statistics, methods, motivations and characteristics. A number of motivations and characteristics have already been highlighted within the earlier pains of custody section; these will be expanded here and further ones identified that link back to the pains of custody. Compared with prison, the suicide rate in police cells is relatively low. In part, this is because detainees have fewer resources with which to hurt themselves and because those deemed at-risk are either watched via in-cell CCTV or are placed under constant observation. Thus, out of the 36 deaths in or following police custody in 2004/5, only two individuals were identified as having committed suicide in a police cell (Teers and Bucke, 2005). However, this suicide rate of two has dropped; in 1994/5 it was 15 (Cartwright, 1998).

The overwhelming majority of detainees who commit suicide in police custody do so by hanging, partly because opportunities for other methods are limited (Biles, 1994; Cartwright, 1998; Ingram et al, 1997; Leigh et al, 1998; Norfolk, 1998; PCA, 1999; Teers and Bucke, 2005). The most frequently used ligatures are clothing (for example, shoelaces, shirt, trousers, cord from a jacket / trousers), blankets or bedding (Ingram et al, 1997; Leigh et al, 1998; PCA, 1999; Teers and Bucke, 2005). These findings raise concern because bedding is supposed to be tear-proof (Cartwright, 1998). Even more so, the Police and Criminal Evidence Act (PACE) allows custody officers to withhold a detainee's 'clothing and personal effects' where they consider 'that he may use them to cause harm to himself' (Leigh et al, 1998). In terms of the ligature point, open cell hatches, door hinges, grilles, pipes, light fittings, windows, cell buzzer units and toilet flush buttons have all been used (Cartwright, 1998; Ingram et al, 1997; PCA, 1999; Teers and Bucke, 2005). With respect to timing, the overwhelming majority (61%) of suicides in police custody occur within the first six hours of detention, with only approximately a quarter happening after twenty-four hours (Ingram et al, 1997). Again, this highlights the entry shock faced by detainees during the early hours of detention. Suicides are also more likely to happen during the night, between the hours of 1800 and 0600 (Norfolk, 1998). This is possibly due to less staff working within the police custody suite and a greater number of individuals being brought into police custody. Lastly, very little research has been undertaken exploring why detainees in police custody commit suicide. When Leigh et al (1998) did look at characteristics, they found that in up to 80% of cases involving 'deliberate self harm' there were no apparent signs or signals, for example, no expressions of intent, failure, guilt, hopelessness, signs of past self-harming or the acquisition of implements.

No research has been identified that specifically looks at suicide in escort vehicles, probably because these suicides are relatively rare; individuals are held here for relatively short periods of time and anyone deemed at-risk of suicide or self-harm is observed. However, figures have been collated in relation to court cells; there have been eight suicides during the eight years since the Prison Service began to contract out prisoner escort and custody services (Howard League, 2001). Therefore, in comparison with the above suicide rate in police cells, suicides are less likely to happen in court cells than police cells; this may be because many individuals share a court cell, whilst all individuals will be on their own in police cells. Very little information is available about suicide in court cells, therefore methods used or timing are not known. Nevertheless, attempts have been made to identify why individuals commit suicide in these locations. The Howard League (2001) suggest individuals may be vulnerable to suicide because staff know very little about them and, because these individuals tend to be unsentenced, they are uncertain about their future. A fear of the unknown is consequently acute at this stage of the criminal justice system. Furthermore, withdrawing from drugs may be a factor in the suicide rate. A large number of people are held in police custody overnight who then appear in a court cell the following morning whilst experiencing withdrawal from drugs (ibid.). This is compounded by the fact that there is an increasing awareness that drug withdrawal can lead to suicide (HM Prison Service, 2001).

Whilst suicide within the wider criminal justice system has been relatively overlooked, there has been a plethora of research within prison; the following provides a brief overview of this work. When discussing prison suicides it is important to recognise that there is no single problem with a single profile and a single explanation (Liebling,

1995). Instead, there are many characteristics and explanations. In terms of theories, Liebling et al (2005: 209-210, original emphasis) state:

Theories of prison suicide include *importation* models (that is, prisoners bring their elevated suicide risk into prison with them.....), *deprivation* models (that is, suicide is caused by prison-induced distress.....), and *combined* models (that is, prisons expose already vulnerable populations to additional risk.....).

Of these three models, Liebling et al (2005) argue that substantial evidence exists which supports the combined model. The following discussion also substantiates this.

Within prison, there are three types of inmates; convicted and sentenced, convicted and unsentenced, and unsentenced (Singleton et al, 1998b). Whilst the first is commonly referred to as sentenced, the latter two fall into the remand category. It will become apparent that some characteristics of prison suicide apply to either remand or sentenced prisoners, whilst others relate explicitly to young male prisoners. When exploring these characteristics it is necessary to appreciate that prisons comprise a significant proportion of individuals who already have characteristics associated with an increased risk of suicide in the wider community, for example, a history of drug / alcohol abuse, depression and social deprivation (Tilt, 1998). In addition, many of the risk factors associated with suicide and self-harm are found amongst prisoners in general (Hankoff, 1980; Shaw et al, 2004).

Firstly, in terms of statistics, it must be recognised that coroners decide when to bring a verdict of suicide, which may lead to bias in official records (Lloyd, 1990). For

example, Dooley (1990b) found suicide verdicts were less likely if the prisoner had self-harmed prior to death, had committed suicide during the day or evening, or had used a method other than hanging. The Howard League (2005b) states that whilst the prison population has increased rapidly, the rate of prison suicides has increased even more rapidly. Suicide rates are also substantially higher in prison than in the community (Flynn, 1998; Liebling, 1998; SCG, 2001). During 2004, when this study was undertaken, there were 95 prison suicides, compared with 94 in 2003 and 95 in 2002 (HM Prison Service, 2007b). With regards to gender, males were substantially over-represented, comprising 82 of the 95 suicides in 2004 (ibid.). Thus, female prisoners are thought to be at less risk of committing suicide than male prisoners (HMCIP, 1999; Lloyd, 1990; SCG, 2001). However, it is important to note that the thirteen female suicides in 2004 is a significant increase on earlier years. In relation to age, Liebling (1992) suggests that in comparison with all prison suicides, young male prisoner suicides have increased slightly more. Furthermore, although there were no suicides in Glen Parva YOI between 2002 and 2004, there were 2 in 2005 and 1 in 2006 (SCG, 2007). As highlighted in the introduction, it is thought that young males are importing a change in values and an increased vulnerability to suicide from the outside community into the criminal justice system.

In similar respects to incidents in police cells, the overwhelming majority of prisoners who commit suicide do so by hanging (Bogue and Power, 1995; Crighton and Towl, 1997; Dooley, 1990a; Howard League, 2005a; Lloyd, 1990; SCG, 2001; Shaw et al, 2004). The most common ligature point is a cell window, with prisoners frequently using bedding or clothing as a ligature (Dooley, 1990a; SCG, 2001; Shaw et al, 2004). Other methods of suicide include suffocation, cuts to the throat or wrist, smoke inhalation or burns, and drug overdose / poisoning (Dooley, 1990a; Howard League,

2005a). In terms of timing, prisoners are particularly vulnerable during the early stages of imprisonment, when entry shock can have serious consequences. For example, the majority of research shows that a disproportionate number of suicides occur in the early stages of imprisonment (Backett, 1987; Bogue and Power, 1995; Howard League, 1999a; 2005a; Lloyd, 1990; Matthews, 1999; SCG, 2001; Shaw et al, 2004; Towl, 1999). In particular, approximately 10% of suicides occur within 24 hours of imprisonment and 43 – 45% within one month (Crighton and Towl, 1997; HMCIP, 1999). However, risk of suicide can increase at later stages of upheaval, for example, after remand prisoners return from visits to court (Howard League, 2001). Research also shows young and adult male remand prisoners to be over-represented amongst suicides (Backett, 1987; Bogue and Power, 1995; Dooley, 1990a; HM Prison Service, 1992; Howard League, 1999a; 2005a; Lloyd, 1990; Matthews, 1999). These rates reflect the shock some prisoners face during the early stages of imprisonment, the uncertainty they have regarding their trial and sentence, anxieties they hold about the future, and issues surrounding staff shortages and a continually changing prisoner population (Dooley, 1990a; Gaes, 1985, cited in Liebling, 1992; Lloyd, 1990).

In relation to the time of day when suicides occur, Dooley (1990a) found half occurred between 0000 and 0800, with the remainder spread evenly throughout the day and evening. This increase at night-time is also found in police cells and may be accounted for by the necessary reduction in prison staff during the night-time / early hours. However, Lloyd (1990) did not find any evidence to suggest that suicides occur more frequently at certain times of the day. Nevertheless, research tentatively suggests that suicides may peak at certain times of the year. For example, Dooley (1990a) found an excess of suicides between July – September and the SCG (2001) found peaks in August and October. Peaks during the summer months may be a reflection of staff

shortages or because the deprivation of liberty is hardest to bear during the long hot days (House, 1990).

Research has found that a disproportionate number of suicides occur when prisoners are in specialist locations, for example, the Healthcare Centre, isolation / segregation and vulnerable prisoner units (Liebling, 1992; Lloyd, 1990; SCG, 2001). In part, this is because prisoners are placed in these locations as they have been identified as at-risk (Lloyd, 1990). Consequently, the use of 'strip cells' for vulnerable prisoners has been criticised, suggesting that they are likely to increase levels of social isolation and sensory deprivation (Crighton and Towl, 1997). Furthermore, strip cells punish prisoners for their distress, increase feelings of despair and encourage prisoners to deny their suicidal feelings (Dexter and Towl, 1995). Thus, strip cells are viewed as a damaging response to suicidal prisoners (Howard League, 1999a; Liebling and Hall, 1993). Similar concerns have also been raised in response to the finding that the majority of suicides and suicide attempts occur in single cells (HM Prison Service, 1992; Howard League, 1999a; SCG, 2001). HM Prison Service (1992) suggests that this is because single cells increase feelings of depression and anxiety, particularly for those with low coping skills and especially for young offenders.

Some prisoners are vulnerable to suicide because of certain factors they import into prison, for example, previous self-harm, drug misuse, suicide attempts and psychiatric treatment (Liebling et al, 2005). As outlined earlier, not everyone who commits suicide has self-harmed in the past, however there is some evidence to suggest that people who self-harm are at a greater risk of committing suicide. In particular, young prisoner suicides are slightly more likely to have a history of self-harm than other prisoner suicides (Liebling, 1992). Again, as identified earlier, research has found that those

withdrawing from drugs or alcohol are at a heightened risk of suicide and self-harm. Risk of suicide is also increased by previous suicide attempts; Dooley (1990a) and HMCIP (1999) found statistics indicate that almost half of prisoners who commit suicide have self-harmed. Similarly, Kerkhof (2002) found that among those who commit suicide, up to 40 percent have previously attempted suicide. Regarding previous psychiatric treatment, Dooley (1990a) and the Howard League (1999a) found approximately one third of prison suicides had a history of psychiatric treatment or mental illness. However, Lloyd (1990) argues that none of the research conclusively shows previous psychiatric contact to be more prevalent amongst prisoners that commit suicide.

One way in which the prison environment is thought to contribute to prison suicides is overcrowding (Huey and McNulty, 2005). Overcrowding essentially means “too many prisoners, not enough spaces for them, and not enough staff to care effectively for each prisoner” (Howard League, 2005b: 5). Certified normal accommodation (CNA) is often used as an indicator of overcrowding. CNA “represents the good, decent standard of accommodation that the Service aspires to provide all prisoners” (HM Prison Service, 2007c: 4). Subsequently, ‘in-use CNA’ relates to the number of cells that are available for immediate use, thus excluding damaged cells (ibid.). At the end of February 2007, 83 of the 141 prisons listed on the Prison Service’s monthly bulletin were over their in-use CNA. More specifically, at Glen Parva YOI, the population as a percentage of the in-use CNA equalled 120% (ibid.). Such conditions can have significant consequences for prisoners, as overcrowding is thought to impact on prison suicides (Huey and McNulty, 2005). However, Liebling (1992), Lloyd (1990) and the PRT (1997) argue that there is no direct evidence that overcrowding is a causal factor in prison suicides. Instead, other problems that are concealed by overcrowding may increase suicide rates,

for example, a lack of clothing, food, medical or other specialist care, or unwanted interactions (Liebling, 1992). The facilities available to prisoners are another aspect of the prison environment that contributes to suicide. For example, Huey and McNulty (2005) argue prisoners are more at-risk of committing suicide in prisons that lack, or provide limited access to, rehabilitation, psychological counselling, education programmes, etc. Huey and McNulty suggest that this is because such regimes cause heightened idleness, isolation and a sense of fatalism. The situation for those at-risk of suicide or self-harm is exacerbated further because these prisoners are actually less likely to be engaged in physical education and less likely to have a job (HMCIP, 1999). This relates back to the pains of custody and loss of stimulation and boredom.

Although young prisoner suicides share some characteristics with other prisoner suicides, they do form a unique group in certain respects. Firstly, young prisoners face specific difficulties in prison, including bullying (PRT, 1997). Bullying can be a serious problem for many young prisoners because it threatens their sense of security and adds to the pressures they experience during their custodial stay (Liebling, 1992). Secondly, returning to a loss of social support and the pains of communication, suicides are more likely to occur where prisoners have little contact with the home and family (Matthews, 1999). This is of particular significance to young prisoners who receive fewer visits and letters from family and friends (Liebling, 1992; Liebling and Krarup, 1993). Thirdly, young prisoner suicides are more likely to cluster in particular institutions, suggesting that young people are extremely vulnerable or susceptible to the actions of others (Liebling, 1992; Matthews, 1999). Young prisoners also form one of three types of prison suicides, as identified by Liebling (1992) and Liebling and Krarup (1993) and shown in the following table:

	POOR COPERS / SITUATIONAL	LONG SENTENCE PRISONERS	MENTALLY DISORDERED
Age	16 – 25	30 +	30 +
Proportion of total suicides	30 – 45%	5 – 20%	10 – 22%
Situation	Acute	Chronic	Varied
History of self- injury	High	Low	Medium
Motivation	Fear / helplessness / distress / isolation	Guilt / no future	Alienation / loss of (self) control / fear / helplessness
Features	Often more typical prison population	Often on remand, after midnight, some well into sentence	Psychiatric history present, single

Liebling and Krarup (1993: 9)

Young prisoners comprise the ‘poor copers / situational’ group and account for the highest proportion of prison suicides. With regards to the characteristics of these poor copers, Liebling (1992) and Liebling and Krarup (1993) have conducted in-depth research. In general, these prisoners are, or think they are, in a worse position than others. In particular, they are more likely to be inactive in their cell and less able to occupy themselves constructively; they are more likely to spend time sleeping and less likely to read, write or listen to music (Liebling, 1992; Liebling and Krarup, 1993). This may exacerbate feelings of boredom. Furthermore, fewer poor copers do, or want to do, PE, although this is usually because of bullying (Liebling and Krarup, 1993). Likewise, Liebling (1992) identifies that poor copers are, and feel, worse off in terms of availability and desirability of work, education and other methods of occupation. This is supported by HMCIP (1999) and has serious consequences for suicide, as identified earlier by Huey and McNulty (2005). Slightly more of this group report being bored, which is exacerbated because they find it more difficult to think of positive ways to

overcome the boredom and are less likely to find ways to distract or occupy themselves when feeling down (Liebling and Krarup, 1993). Similarly, HMCIP (1999) found prisoners at-risk are unable to occupy themselves constructively when alone in their cell. In addition to inactivity, significantly more poor copers see themselves as being 'on their own' in prison, not only reporting difficulties with other prisoners but being less likely to describe any fellow prisoners as friends (Liebling, 1992; Liebling and Krarup, 1993). Poor copers receive fewer visits and letters, and write fewer letters, despite being more likely to want this social interaction (Liebling, 1992; Liebling and Krarup, 1993). Again, this relates to a loss of social support and the pains of communication, and highlights the dangers associated with these pains of custody. The relationship between young prisoner suicides and poor coping is also supported by Dexter and Towl (1995). They found that many prisoners who commit suicide do not appear to possess effective coping skills. However, in using the term 'poor copers', Liebling (1992) and Liebling and Krarup (1993) have been criticised. Towl and Forbes (2002) argue that by using the terms 'good' and 'poor' copers, they serve to reinforce institutional stereotypes of suicidal prisoners as inadequate. Medlicott (2001) supports this view, suggesting that in reality prisoners move in and out of relative 'coping' at different stages of their prison experience.

Returning to the previous table, Liebling and Krarup (1993) identify four main motivations that poor copers have for committing suicide; fear, helplessness, distress and isolation. Applying these to the above discussion, it becomes apparent how the pains of custody may result in suicide. For example, 'fear' could relate to the deprivation of security or a fear of the unknown. 'Helplessness' could evolve from the deprivation of autonomy and control. 'Distress' may be caused by a number of pains of custody, including entry shock, having to withdraw from drugs or alcohol, loss of

privacy, loss of identity or the negative physical environment of the criminal justice system. Lastly, 'isolation' may be felt because of a loss of social support or the pains of communication. More generally, Dooley (1990a) identifies four main motivations for individuals committing suicide - the prison situation, outside pressures, guilt for the offence and mental illness. In particular, Dooley (1990a: 44) argues "the single commonest motive for prison suicide is the inmate finding the prison situation intolerable". Factors relating to the prison situation include imprisonment being intolerable (prisoners being unable to cope with the regime, fear of intimidation), pains of communication (no letters or visits, a visitor failing to arrive) and an inability to cope with confinement. This corresponds with the motivations identified by Liebling and Krarup (1993). Included within outside pressures is a threat to a close relationship or the receiving of bad news. Consequently, these factors align with the earlier pains of custody, including the deprivation of security, pains of communication and loss of social support.

In part, because of the lack of research exploring suicide in the wider criminal justice system, no research has been identified that specifically looks at attempted suicide in police cells, court cells or escort vehicles. However, studies have explored attempted suicide in prison. As the following discussion demonstrates, and as can be expected, the motivations for suicide that were discussed earlier relate closely to the motivations or causes of attempted suicide (Liebling, 1999a). Young prisoners appear to be at an increased risk of attempting rather than completing suicide; Liebling (1992) found young people were over-represented in figures on suicide attempts in prison. It is not clear why this happens. Perhaps young prisoners lack the knowledge to complete suicide or perhaps they never fully intend to complete suicide; it is possible that they see attempting suicide as a means of gaining help. Alternatively, in comparison with adult

prisoners, more young prisoners may be prevented from committing suicide by staff or peers. There are a number of characteristics that are common to both completed and attempted suicide. Wool and Dooley (1987) found that in YOIs, a higher proportion of suicide attempts are made by hanging in comparison with other methods. In addition, Wool and Dooley found young men are emotionally vulnerable when incarcerated and when on remand; 65% of suicide attempts were made by men aged 16 – 21 years old and nearly 60% of all attempts were made by men on remand. Similarly, Thornton (1990) found a disproportionate number of suicide attempts occur on remand and in local prisons immediately after sentencing. These findings again relate closely to studies of completed suicide and emphasise the vulnerability of young prisoners and the pains individuals face during the early stages of imprisonment. As with completed suicide, a prisoner's location is of significance; Meltzer et al (1999) found between one quarter and one sixth of those who had attempted suicide were in specialist units such as segregation, although this may again be explained by these locations being used for high-risk prisoners. Furthermore, a loss of social support is associated with attempted suicide. Meltzer et al (1999) found prisoners who attempted suicide were more likely to have very small primary support groups (close friends and family) and a severe lack of social support. In similar respects to completed suicide, tentative links can be made between attempted suicide and self-harm; Liebling (1992) found a larger proportion of prisoners who had attempted suicide had self-harmed before entering custody.

With regards to motivation, Liebling and Krarup (1993) identify six main reasons why prisoners attempt suicide:

MOTIVES FOR ATTEMPTED SUICIDE	EXAMPLE OF MOTIVE
Domestic	Relationship break-up / threat, contact problems, bereavement, illness
Situational	Inability to cope with incarceration
Strategic	Change of location, lack of attention, manipulative
Emotional	Guilt, shame, anger, emotional relief, fear
Medical	Mental illness, drugs / alcohol, medical problems
Other	Wanted to die, personal inadequacies

Liebling and Krarup (1993: 100)

The above motives are very similar to those identified for prison suicides and are supported by Snow (2002) and Wool and Dooley (1987). They found that prisoners who attempt suicide are most likely to report being motivated by domestic problems, the prison situation, grief, feelings of hopelessness, relationship problems, the award / expectation of a lengthy sentence and poor communication with family or friends. Feelings of isolation may also arise in male remand prisoners because of difficulties in communication and the lack of staff continuity in local remand prisons, resulting in prisoners not being able to get to know staff and confide in them (Wool and Dooley, 1987). Likewise, Powis (2002: 37) found that prisoners who attempt suicide are more socially isolated, having little contact with people outside the prison and less communication with other prisoners and staff. These motivations therefore relate back to the earlier pains of custody, for example, a fear of the unknown, pains of communication and loss of social support.

The absence of research into suicide and attempted suicide in police cells, court cells or escort vehicles extends to self-harm as well. One of the few studies to be undertaken within police custody was by Ingram et al (1997), who surveyed Lancashire police custody suites between 1st May and 31st October 1996 and found 47 incidents of ‘deliberate self-harm’. Of these 47 incidents, 42 involved males (89%). Detainees face an increased risk of self-harming during the first hours of custody; of the 47 incidents,

45% occurred within the first hour of custody. Again, this emphasises the entry shock some individuals face on entering the criminal justice system. With respect to method, detainees used items of clothing to strangle themselves and 'slashed' themselves using blades from disposable razors, broken glass, screws and secreted scissors. However, Ingram et al (1997) did not look at why these individuals self-harmed.

No research has been identified that explores self-harm in escort vehicles, although the Howard League (2001) has looked at self-harm in court cells. Between May 2000 and April 2001, there were 376 incidents of self-harm, as recorded by escort contractors. The Howard League found that the main form of self-harm was cutting, with nearly a fifth of incidents involving the use of a ligature made from shoelaces, belts or clothing, although these acts may have been more likely to represent suicide attempts. Again, this is comparable to incidents of self-harm in police cells. In terms of motivation, the Howard League suggests individuals held in court cells may be vulnerable to self-harm because court staff know very little about them and because these individuals are uncertain about their future. Thus, a fear of the unknown can mean some individuals self-harm; a secreted razor blade may be used to cope with the stress of appearing in court or as a means of coping with an adverse decision.

In contrast to self-harm across the earlier stages of the criminal justice system, incidents of self-harm in prison are alarmingly high; in 2004, there were 19,285 incidents of self-harm, in 2005 this figure increased to 23,794 and in 2006 it was at 23,169 (excluding incidents for December) (SCG, 2007). Young male prisoners appear to be over-represented in these figures; in 2004 they accounted for 16.4% of all male self-harm incidents, in 2005 this proportion increased to 17.3% and in 2006 it was 17.6% (ibid.). As with prison suicides, self-harm is higher in prison than in the wider community

(Crighton and Towl, 2002). Again, the most common method of self-harm is cutting, primarily to the arms (Dear, Thomson, Hall and Howells, 2001; Howard League, 1999b; Inch et al, 1995; Livingston, 1997). This differs from the most common method used for suicide, which is hanging. Young prisoners may also bang their heads, punch walls or swallow objects (Harvey, 2007). Once more, research emphasises the stressful nature of the earlier stages of imprisonment; Liebling and Krarup (1993) found that incidents of self-harm tended to occur earlier during the custodial experience of male adult prisoners and young prisoners. Likewise, in their study of Western Australian prisons, Dear, Thomson, Hall and Howells (2001) found prisoners who had been in prison for less than one month were over-represented within self-harm figures. Higher rates of self-harm have also been found among remand prisoners, although this may be attributed to high turnover rates (Crighton and Towl, 2002). In similar respects to suicide in police cells and prison, Livingston (1997) suggests night-time and weekends may be particular risk periods for self-harm in prison. Furthermore, location is a significant factor in self-harm; Livingston (1997) found a strong relationship between the use of isolation and / or segregation and self-harm. Similarly, Dear, Thomson, Hall and Howells (2001) found almost all self-harm incidents occur in the prisoner's cell, when the majority are alone.

As with suicide, the importation of certain factors into prison means some prisoners are vulnerable to self-harm. For example, as identified earlier, withdrawing from drugs or alcohol is related to self-harm. Alongside this, research supports a relationship between mental illness and self-harm (Howard League, 1999b). Likewise, Dear, Thomson, Hall and Howells (2001) and Harvey (2007) identify psychological symptoms or health difficulties as a factor associated with self-harm. More specifically, some young prisoners who self-harm have experienced traumatic memories (Harvey, 2007).

Livingston (1997) too suggests that although depression is not a cause of self-harm it is a contributory factor and when combined with other factors may increase the chance of self-harm.

One factor of the prison environment that is thought to contribute to self-harm is bullying, which mainly affects young male prisoners and is identified as a factor among young prisoner suicides. Inch et al (1995) conclude that the most common reason cited amongst young prisoners for self-harm is bullying. Likewise, HM Prison Service (1992) and Livingston (1997) argue bullying and intimidation are factors in many incidents of self-harm, particularly those involving young prisoners who may be trying to avoid victimisation. Livingston and Beck (1997) also suggest that self-harm is one response to bullying.

In similar respects to prison suicide, poor coping may be associated with self-harm. For example, Liebling and Krarup (1993) found poor coping to be characteristic of most self-harm, particularly amongst younger prisoners. Similarly, Dear, Thomson, Hall and Howells (2001) found that the coping strategies employed by prisoners who self-harm are considered less likely to be of benefit and can even make matters worse. Thus, they suggest, “it is possible that self-harm is born out of a poor match between an individual’s coping competencies and the specific demands of particular prison settings” (Dear, Thomson, Hall and Howells, 2001: 63). Conversely, Haines and Williams (1997: 183) conclude that:

When the evidence is taken as a whole, there is little to suggest that individuals who self-mutilate display massive deficits in coping and problem solving..... self-mutilative behavior is not adopted as a means

of dealing with distress because individuals who self-mutilate have no other means of coping or because they are unable to adequately solve their problems.

Researchers have attempted to identify the individual factors / motivations associated with self-harm. For example, Dear, Thomson, Hall and Howells (2001) found five factors / motivations. Firstly, internal prison events / circumstances (for example, conflict with other prisoners or staff, regime restrictions). Secondly, consequences of imprisonment (for example, missing family or other supports, worrying about the strains on one's family, impact on self-esteem). Thirdly, aspects of the wider justice system (for example, upcoming trial or hearing, problems with parole). Fourthly, outside problems (for example, spouse / partner terminated relationship, problems in relationship with spouse / partner) and lastly, psychological symptoms (for example, traumatic memories, psychotic symptoms, drug withdrawals). Of these five factors, the most commonly cited is internal prison events / circumstances. These factors / motivations therefore align with the motivations identified for prison suicides and attempted suicides. Furthermore, building on Dear, Thomson, Hall and Howells' work, in a recent study of young prisoners, Harvey (2007) identifies four groups of self-harmers. Firstly, young men who repetitively self-harm for relief of tension (for example, to relieve stress or anger and to make themselves feel calmer and more in control). Secondly, young men who have psychological health difficulties (for example, depression, borderline personality disorder, psychosis and traumatic memories). Thirdly, young men who experience extreme entry shock (for example, those who found separation and loss particularly difficult to deal with, those who were withdrawing from drugs) and finally, young men who respond to a particular triggering event (for example, conflict with staff or other prisoners, not receiving help when they

asked for it, not receiving a visit). However, the problems experienced by those prisoners who self-harmed were similar to those reported by other prisoners, although “these problems were more psychologically painful for those who went on to self-harm” (Harvey, 2007: 138). Whilst these general factors may precipitate self-harm, the Howard League (1999b) suggest that episodes of self-harm are often triggered by a specific event, for example a cancelled visit or anniversary.

Lastly, as mentioned earlier and in contradiction to the theory that self-harm is a result of poor coping, prisoners may use self-harm as a coping strategy, when their normal strategies are no longer available to them. Babiker and Arnold (2001: 43 – 44) argue, “men begin to self-injure on entering prison partly because their normal supports and coping strategies are not so available to them”. Within the wider community, numerous sanctioned coping strategies are available to men, including the use of drink or drugs, work, sport, violence or hobbies. However, in prison these coping strategies are not always available and may be banned, perhaps explaining the increase of self-harm amongst male prisoners in relation to men in the wider community. Self-harm within prison can then be a learned response, being adopted as a coping strategy (Morton, 2004). Moreover, it provides individuals with an opportunity to gain control over their circumstances, when they are confronted with a loss of autonomy and control (Arnold and Magill, 2000; Cooke et al, 1990; Favazza, 1996; Royal College of Psychiatrists, 1999; Young Minds, 1999). Self-harm may also be used by young prisoners because of their age; they have had little time, in relation to adults, to develop mature coping skills or resolve the difficulties that may underlie self-injury (Babiker and Arnold, 2001).

To summarise the discussion so far, the definitions for suicide, attempted suicide and self-harm have been outlined, alongside general motivations for these behaviours.

Subsequently, these behaviours have been considered in more detail within the context of police cells, court cells, escort vehicles and prison cells. However, prior to this study, research has been scarce in the earlier stages of the criminal justice system, particularly escort vehicles. Nevertheless, where possible, figures, methods, characteristics and motivations have been reviewed in relation to suicide, attempted suicide and self-harm. It is apparent that there are many overlaps between these three behaviours, particularly in terms of motivation, with many relating to the above pains of custody. Consequently, it has been shown that individuals may turn to suicide or self-harm because of the distress caused by the pains of custody, although self-harm may be paradoxically used as a means of coping with these pains. Despite the apparent pain that some individuals face in the criminal justice system, individuals can and do survive these pains, either through their own actions or those of the agencies involved. Thus, the following section will explore the measures that the criminal justice system has introduced to reduce these pains and avert individuals from suicide and self-harm. Subsequently, it will be shown how individuals can divert themselves from suicide and self-harm through adaptation, resistance and coping.

Preventing suicide and self-harm within the criminal justice system

When discussing present strategies for preventing suicide and self-harm it is necessary to recognise the problems that the criminal justice system faces in identifying individuals at-risk. Thus, not all individuals identified as at-risk will self-harm or commit suicide and not all individuals who self-harm or commit suicide will have been identified as at-risk. For example, in police custody, Leigh et al (1998) found of 12 detainees who had a suicide marker against their name on the Police National Computer, 6 had committed suicide. Likewise, the Howard League (2001) found of 376

incidents of self-harm that occurred in court cells between May 2000 and April 2001, 47% involved individuals who had not been identified as at-risk. Moving onto prison, the SCG (2001) states few prisoners who have committed suicide have been identified as at-risk at the time of suicide. In particular, Shaw et al (2004) found only 24% of prison suicides had an open F2052SH form (which is used to identify prisoners at-risk) at the time of death. Furthermore, Harvey (2007) found of a sample of 25 prisoners who self-harmed, 68% were on an open F2052SH form.

In addition to the problem of identifying individuals at-risk, some preventative measures cannot be applied to all criminal justice settings. More specifically, Ingram et al (1998) argue that preventative measures adopted by the Prison Service are not necessarily relevant to the Police Force, in part because of differences in operating procedures and staffing levels. Detainees also spend considerably less time in police custody than in prison; Ingram et al (1998) found 99% of detainees spend less than 24 hours in police custody. Consequently, the agencies within the criminal justice system have adopted different mechanisms for preventing suicide and self-harm.

In terms of the police, one of the outcomes of the Royal Commission in 1981 was PACE, which specifies conditions for detention, the treatment of suspects and the new 'custody officer' role, who has responsibility for protecting the rights of the suspect (Newburn and Hayman, 2002). As previously mentioned, PACE allows for custody officers to withhold a detainee's 'clothing and personal effects' where they consider 'that he may use them to cause harm to himself' (Leigh et al, 1998). Even before PACE, preventative measures were being introduced because of the number of hangings involving open cell hatches; a Home Office Circular in 1968 advised that cell hatches be closed when cells are occupied (PCA, 1999). More recently, CCTV has been

introduced into a number of custody suites and police cells, enabling staff to keep a closer watch on detainees considered at-risk, i.e. those who are drunk, have addiction problems, are mentally disordered, are juveniles or are distressed by their situation (Newburn and Hayman, 2002). Collaboration with other criminal justice settings has also taken place. The Howard League (2001) describe a pilot that is underway where 'suicide markers' are placed on a released prisoner's name on the Police National Computer after they leave HMP Leicester or Glen Parva YOI. Subsequently, the Police Force is able to access this information if the individual is re-arrested. In addition, the Prisoner Escort Record (PER) has been introduced, the function of which is as follows:

The purpose of the PER form is to ensure that all staff transporting and receiving detainees are provided with all necessary information about them, including any risks or vulnerabilities that the person may present.

The identification of suicide or self-harm is one of the prime purposes of the form (NCPE, 2006: 21).

The PER therefore accompanies detainees from the police station to other locations and accompanies prisoners on each movement (McHugh et al, 2002; NCPE, 2006). The PER not only records various kinds of risk but also records all movements (Howard League, 2001).

In similar respects to police custody, individuals are held in court cells or escort vehicles for relatively short periods of time, although they are never held overnight. Alongside the PER, contract staff are bound by Prison Service suicide awareness protocols, being encouraged by the Prisoner Escort and Custody Services (PECS) to use the F2052SH form, where the individual is considered at-risk of self-harm (Howard

League, 2001). This form is currently being replaced by the ACCT (Assessment, Care in Custody and Teamwork) Plan, as discussed later. Although contract staff are not responsible for opening an ACCT Plan, they will follow the guidance attached to any open plan (Personal Email, 26 April 2005). Rather than opening an ACCT plan they will continue to raise concerns using a Suicide / Self-harm warning form (in addition to the PER), which details the nature of the concern and what action has been undertaken to ensure the detainee's safety whilst in custody. Contract staff can also place individuals on an intermittent watch or in shared accommodation, if they are thought to be an active suicide or self-harm risk (Howard League, 2001). More recently, a pilot has been undertaken at Birmingham Magistrates Court and Crown Court, where 'Insiders' from the nearby HMP Hewell Grange meet with individuals who are going to either HMP Birmingham or HMYOI Brinsford (West Midlands Area Psychology Team, 2006). Their function is to:

reduce anxiety generated during the process of conviction by offering reassurance and providing the new receptions with key information which will be useful to them in their first few days in custody, and generally to give an insight in to what is in store at a very early stage (West Midlands Area Psychology Team, 2006: 2).

Although still in its early stages, the above pilot has been positively evaluated in relation to first time prisoners and those who are vulnerable.

In comparison with the earlier stages of the criminal justice system, a different strategy towards suicide and self-harm has been adopted within prison, partly because prisoners are detained for longer, are able to get to know staff and there is a wider variety of staff

available to aid prevention. However, prison officers and staff do face unique problems. Firstly, to provide an individualised response to self-harm is difficult, because of the large numbers of prisoners who self-harm (Howard League, 2003). Secondly, the Howard League (2003) recognises that in working with prisoners who self-harm (and who attempt suicide) prisons are not able to select individuals according to their suitability for treatment. Thus, prisons have to work with every individual in their care, regardless of offender profile, mental state or desire to engage. Lastly, methods of working with individuals in the community who self-harm or who attempt suicide are not always transferable to the custodial setting. For example, the Howard League (2003) acknowledge that in providing alternative coping strategies for prisoners who self-harm, of the twenty alternative ways of coping with anxiety given in the Hurt Yourself Less Workbook (Dace et al, 1998), nine are very difficult or impossible to implement within prison.

In May 1991, the Prison Service responded to the increasing number of incidents of suicide and self-harm by establishing the Suicide Awareness Support Unit (HM Prison Service, 1992). The unit was established to develop and communicate a national strategy, disseminate research and good practice, and provide advice and support to local suicide prevention management groups. In April 1994, the current Prison Service strategy was implemented, emphasising a multi-disciplinary approach with multi-agency working; the key to which was good communication and support between all those concerned (HM Prison Service, 1992; McHugh and Snow, 2002; McHugh and Towl, 1997; Tilt, 1998). In addition to suicide awareness teams, the aim was for all staff to be responsible for identifying those at an increased risk of suicide and providing support for such prisoners. Subsequently, in 2001 the Safer Custody Group was established to deliver a new Safer Custody Strategy, including safer custody

arrangements, suicide prevention coordinators in all prisons, dedicated units in high-risk prisons for prisoners undergoing detoxification from drugs or alcohol, extended use of peer support for suicidal prisoners and greater inter-agency liaison. (Department of Health, 2002; Home Office, 2005; SCG, 2001). In 2001 a new way of recording incidents of self-harm / attempted suicide was introduced, via the F213SH form (Howard League, 2003). This form is still in use and emphasises the need for all staff to record every incident of self-harm, regardless of the seriousness of the injury.

As part of the 1994 Prison Service strategy, a case conference model was adopted, which provided support to those at an increased risk of suicide and self-harm through the F2052SH form (McHugh and Towl, 1997). These forms can be activated by any member of staff who has concerns about a prisoner and were introduced to aid staff in the effective management of prisoners thought to be at an unacceptably high risk of suicide or self-harm (McHugh and Snow, 2002; Towl and Hudson, 1997). However, by March 2007 these forms are to be replaced by the ACCT (Assessment, Care in Custody and Treatment) Plan, which instead of simply monitoring at-risk prisoners aims to encourage interaction (HMCIP, 2006; Howard League, 2005b). It also enables a fast first response, improved information sharing, individual / flexible care and a requirement for conversation and not just observations (Home Office, 2005). The aims of the ACCT Plan are:

To work together to create a safe and caring environment, where distress is minimised and those who are distressed are able to ask for help. To identify individual need and offer individualised care and support before, during and after a crisis (HM Prison Service, no date:

1).

With the belief that:

Preventing suicide involves listening to the person at risk, engaging them in planning ways of reducing their problems, helping them to build up their own sources of support and thus helping them to choose life. Watching and stopping can be important but it only works in the short-term (HM Prison Service, no date: 1, original emphasis removed).

A multi-agency approach was adopted as part of the 1994 Prison Service strategy, which encouraged peer group support and the involvement of other groups, for example the Samaritans, who later provided training and support for the Listener Scheme. Listeners are carefully selected and trained prisoners who provide a confidential setting where other prisoners who feel distressed or suicidal can discuss their problems (McHugh and Towl, 1997; Snow, 2002). Listeners do not provide a counselling service, as they have not received the necessary training or experience (Carolissen, 1996). Medlicott (2001) argues that the Listener Scheme is a valuable initiative in encouraging communication amongst prisoners, which may help to reduce the anxiety of some prisoners (HM Prison Service, 2001). In addition to Listeners, 'Insiders' have recently been introduced into reception / first night centres and induction units (West Midlands Area Psychology Team, 2006). In comparison with Listeners, Insiders offer reassurance to new prisoners and provide practical key information that will be useful to them during their first few days at prison. Again, they are specially selected and receive training. Thus, the induction process aims to reduce prisoners' uncertainties (Harvey, 2007). Alongside peer support, Personal Officer Schemes have been introduced, where each prisoner is allocated a prison officer who acts as their first point of contact if they have any problems (HM Prison Service, 1992). The Personal Officer is also responsible

for report writing and attendance at the relevant review boards (Liebling and Price, 2001). Furthermore, Healthcare Centres provide prisoners with access to doctors, nurses, psychiatrists and other therapists (Baker, 2004).

The current Prison Service strategy is focused on the underlying problems behind an individual's suicidal behaviour rather than on symptom relief, which featured predominantly in earlier policies and practices. Consequently, Glen Parva YOI has adopted a new strategy, which emphasises solving prisoners' problems without turning to self-harm (Howard League, 2003). The concept of a 'healthy prison' has been introduced, emphasising general psychological and physical well being, rather than just suicide prevention (McHugh and Snow, 2002).

Despite the present strategies employed in dealing with distressed or at-risk individuals, further improvements can still be made throughout the criminal justice system. Although CCTV has been introduced into police custody suites and some designated cells, Cartwright (1998), Long (1998) and the PCA (1999) suggest that it should be installed in more. In terms of court cells, Williams et al (2000) suggest improvements could be made to the provision of information to prisoners, in particular their rights and the complaints procedure. Detainees could also be given information in the escort vehicles as well as in the court cell, outlining what will happen at prison (HM Prison Service, 2001). This information needs to be easily accessible and could include reading materials or videos (Howard League, 2001). Once at prison, the reception process should communicate information to prisoners, thus reducing their uncertainty and anxiety (McHugh et al, 2002). The induction process should therefore be used as an opportunity to introduce prisoners to all potential sources of assistance, for example,

probation, bail staff, chaplains, CARATS (Counselling, Assessment, Referral, Advice and Throughcare), health care, psychology and Listeners (HM Prison Service, 2001).

In general, the focus of present policies and practices has been to identify suicidal individuals. However, a number of researchers are now suggesting that this emphasis needs to be broader, thus identifying individuals with poor coping abilities and those who are showing signs and symptoms of stress (Bogue and Power, 1995; Liebling, 1999a). Prevention is therefore best considered as a more general approach to helping equip young people with essential coping skills and reducing the stress prisoners are under (Backett, 1987; Hawton, 1986). Instead of focusing narrowly on suicide prevention, policies should be developed which embrace all those who are having problems that they cannot cope with (HM Prison Service, 1992). Policy makers could also make better use of prisoners who have the ability to contribute to the development and implementation of these policies (Medlicott, 2000). In particular, when managing self-harm, this behaviour needs to be understood as being symptomatic of some greater distress, therefore the therapeutic aim should be to enable individuals to develop alternative and healthier ways of coping, and of gaining a better understanding of themselves (Crowe and Bunclark, 2000; HMCIP, 1999). Within the criminal justice system, attention should be directed at increasing the coping skills of individuals who self-harm, building self-confidence and improving assertiveness (Arnold and Magill, 2000; Crowe and Bunclark, 2000; Inch et al, 1995; Liebling, 1999a). Self-help groups for individuals who self-harm may be of benefit, enabling feelings to be shared and allowing more adaptive coping strategies to develop (HMCIP, 1999). Furthermore, Crowe and Bunclark (2000) suggest that because many individuals who self-harm find communication difficult, they use their bodies. These individuals should be encouraged to find, and be provided with, alternative means of expression, for example, creative

writing, creative art or drama therapy. Prisoners may be employed to assist staff in suicide prevention, for example, by being utilised as ‘inmate observation aides’ (HMCIP, 1999; HM Prison Service, 2001; McHugh and Snow, 2002).

In summary, this section has shown that advances have been made in preventing incidents of suicide and self-harm across the whole criminal justice system. However, improvements can still be made. In particular, agencies within the criminal justice system need to work closer together. Thus, Jenkins (1982, cited in Lloyd, 1990: 36) argues that the prevention of suicide “cannot be achieved by any single step carried out by one profession”. Consequently, Lloyd (1990) suggests that new ideas for prevention may be uncovered by making comparisons between the treatment and conditions of prisoners in police and prison custody. These improvements need to be made in accordance with how individual detainees and prisoners adapt to, resist and cope with the pains of custody.

Adapting to and resisting the pains of custody

Whilst measures have been introduced by the criminal justice system to reduce the pains of custody and divert individuals from suicide and self-harm, individuals have also employed their own strategies. As expected, much of the literature refers to the prison environment, although some may be applicable to the earlier stages of the criminal justice system. It has been suggested that prisoners survive the pains of custody through a number of mechanisms, including adaptation, resistance and coping. Although there is some overlap between these, they are all distinct. Adaptation refers to an individual modifying, altering or changing their thoughts or behaviour, whereas resistance is more forceful and involves the individual successfully opposing the pains of custody and

refusing to be changed by the regime. Coping on the other hand involves the individual successfully grappling with the pains of custody and “refers to efforts to master conditions of harm, threat, or challenge when a routine or automatic response is not readily available” (Monat and Lazarus, 1977: 8).

Matthews (1999) suggests prisoners use three main types of adaptation: co-operation / colonisation, withdrawal and rebellion. These styles reflect the work of Sykes (1958) and Goffman (1961). Firstly, Goffman suggests prisoners might adopt ‘colonisation’ whereby they attempt to pursue a stable and relatively content life. Similarly, offenders may adopt ‘conversion’ where they try to act out the role of the perfect inmate (ibid.). Secondly, ‘withdrawal’ may be through either physical / situational means or psychological methods (Goffman, 1961; Sykes, 1958). Physical withdrawal refers to the individual making escape attempts, whereas psychological withdrawal involves the individual either relinquishing the goals, drives or needs that are frustrated, or withdrawing into a fantasy based on their past or future (Sykes, 1958). Matthews (1999) also suggests that withdrawal might include depression, self-harm and suicide. Thirdly, in rebellion / innovation, Sykes states deprivations may be eased by overthrowing or changing the custodial regime. Goffman (1961) termed this ‘intransigent line’, which refers to prisoners intentionally challenging the institution by refusing to co-operate with staff. In addition, Goffman suggests prisoners may adapt to their situation by making secondary adjustments, whereby staff are not directly challenged, but prisoners are able to obtain forbidden satisfactions or obtain permitted ones by forbidden means, thus retaining some control over their environment. Alongside these three adaptations, the pains of custody may be eased through social interaction; prisoners can either adopt a collectivistic approach, adopting group cohesion, or an individualistic approach, whereby fellow prisoners are exploited to advance their own interests (Parsons and

Shils, 1951, cited in Sykes, 1958). However, these adaptations may not always be that successful; Sykes (1958: 82) concludes “there are no exits for the inmate in the sense of a device or series of devices which can completely eliminate the pains of imprisonment”. Consequently, Goffman suggests that in most total institutions, inmates adopt a combination of secondary adjustments, conversion, colonisation and loyalty to the inmate group.

In criticism of the above, Irwin (1970) argues that there are three adaptive styles prevalent amongst prisoners who cope. Firstly ‘jailing’, whereby prisoners cut themselves off from the outside world and attempt to construct a new life within prison. Secondly, in ‘doing time’, prisoners maintain their commitment to outside life, merely seeing prison as a suspension of that life, whilst maximising comfort and minimising discomfort. Thirdly, in ‘gleaning’, prisoners take advantage of resources to better themselves for the future. However, not all prisoners can be classified into these three styles, some may change from one to another, whilst others, the non-copers, cannot be characterised by any (ibid.).

More recently, Harvey (2007: 10) has combined sociological and psychological perspectives in exploring adaptation among young male prisoners and states “[a]daptation is a process whereby people move towards reaching a cognitive, emotional and behavioural equilibrium. They do so by mobilising internal and external resources that are available to them.” Harvey (2007: 10, original emphasis) concludes that there are three types of adaptation found among these prisoners:

People must adapt *practically* in that they must learn about the prison rules, regulations and regime. People must adapt *socially* in that they

must become able to communicate and interact with staff and prisoners on a day-to-day basis, and become involved in the regime. Finally, people must adapt *psychologically* in that they must be able to regulate their cognitions and emotions and to manage their level of psychological distress.

However, in focusing on these three overarching styles of adaptation, Harvey fails to explain how prisoners actually cope and overcome the pains of custody, although he does argue that social support may aid the process of adaptation.

Adaptation as a means of survival has been heavily criticised by Cohen and Taylor (1972). In particular, they argue that Goffman's modes of adaptation are essentially tension-reducing in their function and do not reflect the high levels of resistance found amongst male prisoners in their study at Durham prison. Thus, Cohen and Taylor (1972) identify five types of resistance used by long-term prisoners against the pains of custody. Firstly, self-protecting (for example, the active or passive individual refusal to co-operate with staff). Secondly, campaigning (directing attention to individual grievances or to collective complaints). Thirdly, escaping (usually involving some form of collaboration with other inmates). Fourthly, striking (often a non-violent form of resistance) and lastly, confrontation with authority. These types of resistance are not mutually exclusive and different styles may be adopted at different times (*ibid.*). Whilst these theories provide an insight into how prisoners adapt to or resist the pains of custody, they fail to identify the everyday activities and behaviours that individuals use to help them cope with their negative physical environment or situation. Consequently, the following are examples of such coping strategies; some may provide temporary relief, others will provide more long-term benefits.

Coping with the pains of custody

By combining sociological and psychological approaches in this study, a greater understanding of how young men deal with the pains of custody has been developed. In doing so, it has similarities with Harvey's (2007) study of young male prisoners. To reiterate, in comparison with adaptation and resistance, coping refers to the actual behaviours employed by individuals to overcome the pains of custody, without necessarily having to change themselves or resist the regime; "the function of coping is to protect the individual..... from negative physical or psychological consequences" (Patterson and McCubbin, 1987). Many of these coping strategies are learned during the teenage years and form the basis of the coping strategies employed within adulthood (ibid.). The use of certain coping strategies will be dependent upon the conditions being faced, the options available to the individual and their personality (Monat and Lazarus, 1977). This is particularly relevant within a custodial setting, where the pains of custody affect the conditions being faced and the availability of options. Thus, prison limits the range of coping styles available to individuals and restricts normal means of coping, for example, alcohol, drugs or friendship (Crewe, 2007; Ireland et al, 2005).

There are numerous coping strategies that prisoners (and detainees) may employ, some of which have been transferred from the outside. For example, Dexter and Towl (1995) interviewed 22 adult male prisoners, defined as at-risk of suicide, and identify eight coping strategies used inside and outside prison. The following table illustrates these eight strategies and the number of prisoners using them:

CATEGORY	NUMBER OF SAMPLE USING	
	Outside prison	Inside prison
None	3	12
Reactive problem-solving (attempts are made to cope with the situation, but they lack evidence of persistence, planning or consideration of consequences)	17	18
Avoidance or escape (from the situation or from thoughts about it)	14	18
Palliative (including responses made to reduce the emotional distress caused by the problem situation, often by providing some contrasting pleasant experience)	14	5
Social support (use of others for comfort, support, reassurance or sharing of problems)	13	5
Cognitive reinterpetive strategies (use of cognitive techniques to alter their emotional response to their situation or changes in their appraisal or perception of the situation to reduce the perceived threat)	2	7
Anticipatory substitution (deliberate choice of behaviours incompatible with occurrence of problem situation, generally the strategy of filling time)	1	7
Anticipatory problem-oriented (explicit recognition of nature of problem situation – systematic, organised and persistent attempts to resolve the situation and evidence of planning and anticipation of future results)	5	3

Dexter and Towl (1995: 49)

As can be seen from the above table, the most commonly used strategies inside and outside prison are reactive problem-solving and avoidance or escape. The use of avoidance or escape may increase slightly in prison because other coping strategies are not so readily available. For example, the use of palliative coping strategies and social support decline inside prison, probably because of the pains of custody, which reduce the availability of pleasant experiences and access to social support. Likewise, the use of anticipatory problem-oriented coping strategies may decrease in prison because prisoners are limited in the number of strategies they can use to resolve the situation. In comparison with the outside, cognitive reinterpetive strategies and anticipatory substitution increase inside prison. An increase in cognitive reinterpetive strategies may be a consequence of the programmes run in prison, which seek to equip prisoners

with improved coping strategies, for example, Enhanced Thinking Skills (Baker, 2004). Again, an increase in anticipatory substitution may arise because of the limited coping strategies available to prisoners. The increase in the number of prisoners who did not use a strategy to cope with a problem needs to be explored further. What Dexter and Towl's (1995) study highlights is that some coping strategies are employed to the same degree inside and outside prison, whilst the use of others increases or decreases on the inside. The pains of custody also limit the availability of these coping strategies.

Again, although Dexter and Towl's (1995) study is of value, it fails to go into any detail about the behaviours that form these coping strategies. One way in which individuals may avoid or escape their problems is by using drugs or alcohol, both inside and outside prison. For example, cannabis and heroin can aid relaxation, relieve stress and counteract boredom (Cope, 2003; Crewe, 2005). Heroin can help numb emotional pain and produce feelings of contentment, whilst stimulants (cocaine and amphetamines) can elevate mood (Paton and Jenkins, 2002). Alcohol too can help to relieve anxiety and aid relaxation (ibid.). A further form of avoidance is television. As part of the Incentives and Earned Privileges scheme, introduced in 1995, televisions were gradually brought in across the prison estate (Jewkes, 2002). Television allows the prisoner to escape the realities of their environment. Consequently, Jewkes (2002: 103) found an increase in the time spent watching television inside prison.

Being active can act as a release for feelings or distract attention from pain, unpleasant thoughts or memories (Toch, 1992a). Thus, being inactive cuts off one strategy for reducing tension and compounds difficulties in coping (Gibbs, 1982b; Liebling, 1992). Activities may involve sport, hobbies, educational / training programmes or mental activities and are associated with below-average levels of anxiety and / or depression

(Cooper and Berwick, 2001). However, Cooper and Berwick argue that this association does not mean participating in these activities will promote feelings of well being; it is likely that prisoners who are severely anxious or depressed will feel unable to find the energy or enthusiasm to participate in them. By participating in employment, education or training programmes, the prisoner is adopting the adaptive style of 'gleaning', as identified by Irwin (1970). The prisoner is also "using activity, as opposed to inactivity such as sleeping, to help them pass their sentence" (Cope, 2003: 171). Conversely, sleep can be used as a coping strategy in prison (Toch, 1992b). Thus, Cope (2003: 167-168) found in her study of young male prisoners, that "[a] common way to suspend time was by sleeping..... sleeping was more than simply resting, it offered inmates a way to control, repress and suspend time". Likewise, Meisenhelder (1985: 46) argues that "[i]n sleep, time passes normally, effortlessly". Therefore, through sleep, individuals pass into a state of unconsciousness, which offers them a means of escaping the pains of custody.

There are a number of strategies that prisoners can employ when coping with a loss of, or threats to, their identity. Firstly, Baer (2004) notes how a number of young prisoners display massive quantities of shampoo, shower gels, air fresheners, etc. in their cells. Baer provides a number of explanations for this, including the possibility that it is a way for prisoners to express their identity; "the decoration of prison cells could be a reflection of personal identity, within the rules and pragmatics of a prison culture" (Baer, 2004: 213). In support of this, HMIP (2000: 60) argues, "[a] cell is the place where prisoners begin to reconstruct their identities after the trauma of coming into custody. Here they begin to feel safe and to express their individuality, if only in small ways". As an aside, these displays may also be used as a means of resisting the loss of material goods; the few goods that prisoners are permitted to purchase are bought in

abundance and conspicuously displayed for all other prisoners and officers to see. Returning to identity, masculinity is one of the key identities that is threatened in prison. Messerschmidt (1999) argues that the body plays a significant role in the identity of a person and their self-image, thus, “muscles are *the* sign of masculinity” (Glassner, 1989: 311, cited in Jefferson, 1998: 95, original emphasis). Consequently, bodybuilding becomes an ideal mode to test and portray masculinity; not only does it enable individuals to compete with one another (in terms of weights lifted), but it also allows for individual improvements to be made and seen. For example, Cohen and Taylor (1972) found male prisoners use bodybuilding (usually weightlifting) to mark their physical improvements and to mark time. Thus, bodybuilding not only helps prisoners cope with threats to their identity, but as an activity helps them to cope with the boredom of prison time. In addition, tattoos may be used as a means of portraying masculinity; Favazza (1996: 153) suggests many people get tattoos to “display a stereotyped symbol of physical strength and aggressiveness, and to provide a sense of identity and solidarity with other group members”. Favazza goes on to note that although prison rules in Western culture forbid it, the majority of prisoners eventually get tattoos.

In addition to bodybuilding and tattooing, the body may be used as a means of self-harming. Although self-harm can be caused by the distress inflicted on individuals through the pains of custody, it is also, as shown above, employed by individuals as a coping strategy. Thus, “[f]or many young people self-mutilation is seen as a coping mechanism and/or as a way of expressing distress” (HMCIP, 1999: 40). Consequently, while self-harm may appear negative and self-destructive, it can have a positive psychological effect on prisoners and detainees.

A further coping strategy is the use of social support, which, as Dexter and Towl (1995) identify, is used both inside and outside prison. It may also be used within the earlier stages of the criminal justice system, albeit to a lesser degree, though research has focused on the prison environment. In general, the aim of support is “to help, carry the weight of or bear the pressure; to give aid or courage; approval and strength. To ease the strain” (Liebling and Arnold, 2004: 254). Thus, social support serves a similar function, but involves other individuals. Specifically, Cohen and Wills (1985) suggest there are four types of social support. Firstly, esteem support (information that a person is esteemed and accepted, also emotional support and self-esteem support). Secondly, informational support (help in defining, understanding and coping with a problem, advice and appraisal support). Thirdly, social companionship (spending time with others in leisure and recreational activities) and lastly, instrumental support (providing financial aid and material resources). Similarly, Hobbs and Dear (2000) state there are two main functions of social support; emotional and instrumental / practical help. More recently, Harvey (2007) identifies four types of support that prisoners provide to each other and that prison staff provide to prisoners. These are; informational (providing information about the prison), material (sharing belongings with another prisoner), emotional (helping another prisoner with a personal problem) and physical (helping, or being prepared to help, another prisoner in a fight). The first three correspond closely with those identified by Cohen and Wills (1985), however physical support differs. It is possible that because Cohen and Wills’ research was undertaken outside the prison, physical support is prison-specific. This is supported by the fact that prisons are physically and psychologically violent environments (Edgar et al, 2003).

Within prison, individuals have two main groups from whom social support can be obtained; family, professionals and friends from outside prison, and staff and fellow

prisoners within prison (Biggam and Power, 1997). The following discussion will explore these groups separately. However, very little research appears to have explored the social support prisoners can gain from outside prison. Furthermore, as identified in the earlier pains of custody section, an individual's ability to use their usual support network is affected by a deprivation of liberty, pains of communication and the regimes that are in place. Nevertheless, Gibbs (1982a) suggests external significant others may be able to help absorb the shock of imprisonment and provide necessary material benefits, for example, clothing and money. Harvey (2007) also suggests that loved ones on the outside are often fundamental sources of practical and emotional support. More generally, Toch (1982) states that prisoners who have strong ties with the outside are at an advantage when confronting the pains of imprisonment.

On the inside, fellow prisoners are able to provide both formal and informal means of support. Informally, Harvey (2007) found friendships within prison are most likely to provide material support. This may help to reduce the pains associated with the deprivation of goods and services. Secondly, friendships are likely to provide physical support, which may influence a prisoner's perception of the deprivation of security. Thirdly, friendships provide informational support (counteracting a fear of the unknown) and fourthly, emotional support (helping prisoners deal in general with the pains of custody). The prisoner who is most likely to provide this source of emotional support is the cellmate. In addition to informal support, prisoners are provided with a formal means of support through the Listener scheme, as detailed earlier. However, concerns regarding confidentiality and trust mean many prisoners do not utilise this form of social support (Borrill et al, 2005; Snow, 2002).

In terms of staff, on entering prison, the prison officer is probably the prisoner's first source of social support (Hobbs and Dear, 2000). However, Hobbs and Dear found in their study of males in a maximum-security prison in Australia, that prisoners rarely approach prison officers for support, although it does depend on the type of problem encountered. For example, prisoners are more willing to seek practical support from prison officers than emotional support. A similar finding was obtained by Harvey (2007), who found young male prisoners will go to a prison officer first for practical support, whereas they will go to a chaplain first for emotional support. Harvey identifies other sources of practical support, including chaplains, prisoners, Outreach workers, drugs workers, educational workers, Listeners, PE instructors, nurses or doctors, members of the voluntary sector, workshop instructors or Samaritans (in this order). Conversely, other sources of emotional support are Listeners, Outreach workers, drugs workers, prisoners, prison officers, Samaritans, nurses or doctors, educational workers, volunteers, workshop instructors or gym officers (again, in this order). In general, Harvey found reluctance on prisoners' behalf to seek any emotional support. In part, this is because seeking support does not tend to be a young prisoner's normal coping strategy. Furthermore, prisoners perceive the gains of seeking support low, yet the costs high (ibid.). Hobbs and Dear (2000) provide three possible explanations for prisoners not wanting to seek emotional support from prison officers. Firstly, prisoners may have had prior experiences of officers being unsatisfactory sources of support. Secondly, prisoners may have an 'us and them' mentality, whereby officers are seen as authority figures and therefore not as sources of support. Thirdly, prisoners may obtain sufficient support from elsewhere, for example, family, friends or other prisoners. However, further exploration is needed to evaluate these explanations.

Despite reservations about seeking social support, there are a number of benefits for the individual. It has been argued that social support helps individuals adjust to prison, it alleviates the pains of custody, it lessens prisoners' distress, it reduces fear and uncertainty, and it helps the prisoner manage stress (Biggam and Power, 1997; Hobbs and Dear, 2000; Huey and McNulty, 2005). In particular, Williams (1997: 66) argues, "[t]he most potent preventative factor when such uncontrollable stress threatens to overwhelm the individual is the availability of social support from friends and family". Likewise, Westefeld et al (2000: 452) conclude that the "[a]bsence of social support is especially relevant in terms of predicting suicidality". It is also likely that young prisoners need a higher level of social support than adults, partly because this is probably the first significant period they have been away from their family and friends (Biggam and Power, 1997).

To summarise, although some individuals may adapt to, or resist, the pains of custody, others employ coping strategies. These strategies may be used both inside and outside the criminal justice system, although some are very much dependent on the custodial environment. Thus, a number of coping mechanisms are limited or prohibited by the pains of custody. However, these coping strategies can actually help prisoners and detainees overcome the pains of custody, for example, the deprivation of goods and services, a loss of identity, a loss of stimulation and general feelings of anxiety, fear or distress.

Limitations of previous research

In light of the above literature, the present study overcomes a number of limitations with previous studies. Firstly, there has been an emphasis on identifying factors

associated with suicide and self-harm in order to predict which individuals will be at-risk (Liebling and Krarup, 1993). This has led to large numbers of prisoners being identified as at-risk who do not go on to attempt / commit suicide or self-harm (false positives), and individuals not being identified as at-risk who do attempt / commit suicide or self-harm (false negatives) (ibid.). Lloyd (1990) also argues that attempts to predict suicidal prisoners have not been very successful, in part because many of the variables associated with suicide are associated with a large proportion of the prison population. The present study therefore moves away from prediction.

Secondly, previous research has tended to focus on adult male prisoners serving long-term sentences (sometimes life) in maximum-security prisons. Consequently, few studies have explored the experiences of young males aged 18 – 21 years old who, in terms of suicide, are the most at-risk group. Alongside this, they have tended to ignore shorter prison sentences, which is significant considering that “facing and serving a term of life or twenty years may be a fundamentally different experience from facing and serving a term of two, three, or four years” (Flanagan, 1982: 115). In addition, there is a scarcity of research exploring police custody, court custody or escort vehicles, and even less that specifically looks at suicide and self-harm. In fact, although HM MCSI and HMIP (2005: 3) acknowledge that some aspects of prisoner escort and court custody have been previously examined, until their research in 2005, “the complex array of interfaces between prisons, courts, PECS, the police and other agencies involved with prisoner escort and court custody, had never before been examined”. By overcoming these limitations, it is hoped that a truly connected approach can be taken to reducing suicide and self-harm.

Thirdly, this study focuses on the accounts given by individuals in the criminal justice system, thus overcoming criticisms of some previous research, which prioritises quantitative analysis or relies on ‘official’ sources. Likewise, Medlicott (2000: 2) states “[t]here is a shortage of qualitative research, especially that which focuses on the accounts given by prisoners of their experience of and interaction with prison”. By speaking with these individuals, particularly those who self-harm or have attempted suicide, invaluable information can be gained regarding the prison experience and the causes / motivation of suicide and self-harm (Inch et al, 1995; Liebling, 1992; 1998; 1999a; Lloyd, 1990). In particular, this study overcomes the criticism made by the Howard League (1999b: 10) that “[f]ew academic studies look at the meaning of self-harm for the people who do it”. Likewise, Liebling (1992: 104) criticises the lack of research that has asked prisoners ‘what happened and why’, concluding that “it is a major oversight of previous research that the thoughts and reflections of the subject group themselves have been neglected. Arguably the most valuable source of information is the inmates concerned”.

Fourthly, although this study specifically looks at suicide and self-harm, it also explores individuals’ general experiences of the criminal justice system, including the pains of custody and the coping strategies that they consequently employ. In doing so, it attempts to address such questions as asked by Liebling (2006: 236), that “[w]e still do not know enough about individual psychological survival in prison. (Have markedly improved regimes resulted in a less gruelling and more constructive experience of imprisonment for prisoners?)”. Subsequently, research on coping behaviour may provide a more promising approach to establishing the causes of prison suicide (Liebling, 1995).

Lastly, the use of support services to prevent suicide and self-harm has often been overlooked or downplayed, this is despite Liebling (1999a: 300) arguing that in relation to young prisoners (aged under 21 years old), “their need for support is intense, and their reactions to distress impulsive”. Consequently, Liebling (1999a) suggests that interaction and support should supplement the current identification and assessment systems that are in place to prevent suicide and self-harm. One aspect that the present study explores is social support, which is especially valuable considering “there has been a dearth of systematic research regarding the role that social support has to play in relation to the experience of psychological distress among inmates” (Biggam and Power, 1997: 124). As part of support, the present study examines what information detainees and prisoners are provided with and how it could be improved in terms of content and accessibility. This provision is necessary because a lack of information and guidance can have a negative effect on individuals, contributing to their fear, bewilderment and apprehension about the criminal justice process (Caird, 1974; Grindrod and Black, 1989; HM Prison Service, 2001).

This literature review has demonstrated that nearly fifty years on, Sykes’ (1958) five pains of imprisonment are to some extent relevant to today’s young male prisoners. However, these pains may now be extended across the wider criminal justice system, to include police cells, court cells and escort vehicles, thus becoming ‘pains of custody’. In the early twenty-first century it would appear that a further thirteen pains of custody can be identified. These pains not only cause individuals distress but may contribute to incidents of suicide and self-harm. It has been shown that our present understanding of suicide and self-harm in prison needs to be extended to include police cells, court cells and escort vehicles. In part this is because experiences within the earlier stages of the criminal justice system may affect incidents of suicide and self-harm within the later

stages. However, a dearth of research at these earlier stages means that relatively little is known about the experiences of individuals in police cells, court cells and escort vehicles. Although the criminal justice system has taken steps to prevent suicide and self-harm, in adopting a connected approach, it is possible that 'best practice' can be learnt from the earlier stages and disseminated to the prison setting, and vice-versa. Nevertheless, individuals in the criminal justice system do adapt to, resist and cope with these pains of custody. It has been shown that whilst the pains of custody may lead to self-harm, self-harm can somewhat paradoxically be used as a coping strategy, thus empowering individuals. Any preventative strategy adopted by the criminal justice system should therefore take this into account, for "we have no right to demand that people stop [self-harming], unless we have something better to offer them" (Thomas, 1998: 5).

The need to deal successfully with suicidal thoughts and self-harm within the whole criminal justice system is highlighted by recent research that found ex-prisoners are vulnerable to suicide soon after release (Howard League, 2002). The Howard League suggests that restrictions placed on prisoners (i.e. safer cells) may reduce the number of individuals who have the means to commit suicide in prison. However, this may be postponing the death because it does not deal with the root cause of the problem; some prisoners are leaving prison ill prepared and finding life on the outside 'too much' (ibid.). Thus, the Howard League (1995) argues a significant proportion of the teenage population is being introduced to a pattern of self-destructive behaviour within prison, which they are inevitably taking back to the outside world. Subsequently, it may be argued that a significant number of young males are using self-harm as a means of coping in all stages of the criminal justice system and on release are taking this behaviour back to the outside world with no indication of where support may be found.

The present study therefore aims to explore the experiences, opinions and recommendations of young men in the criminal justice system in an attempt to improve methods of providing support and advice to these individuals before self-harm is used as a coping strategy or before the only viable option is suicide.

Chapter Two: Methodology

Aim and objectives

The aim of this study was to examine the hypothesis that ‘the different support needs of young males are not being adequately addressed as they proceed through the criminal justice system, with serious consequences in terms of personal harm’. To meet this aim, six objectives were set:

- To examine incidents of suicide and self-harm in police cells, court cells, escort vehicles and prison
- To look at young males’ experiences of the criminal justice system, with particular reference to the pains of custody
- To identify how young males cope with the pains of custody
- To explore changes in the support needs of young males as they proceed through the criminal justice system
- To compare the support needs of young males who self-harm or who have attempted suicide with the support needs of those who have not
- To explore the provision of support services in the criminal justice system in terms of their availability, accessibility and relevance to young males, and the extent to which they meet the support needs of young males

To achieve these objectives, a combination of qualitative and quantitative research was undertaken. Whilst quantitative research is closely related to developing and testing theories of the social world, qualitative research captures the social meanings and definitions that underpin action, focusing on gaining an understanding of the actors' viewpoint (Burgess, 1984; Jupp, 2001). Qualitative research is based on data generation and aims to provide rich and detailed findings (Mason, 1996). There are advantages and disadvantages associated with both qualitative and quantitative research, hence a number of researchers have suggested it is desirable and even necessary to adopt an approach that combines the two, where both are viewed as a complement and supplement to the other (Burgess, 1984; Glaser and Strauss, 1967; King, 2000; Layder, 1993; Liebling, 1992; 1999b; Martin, 2000). Denzin (1989: 25) refers to this use of multiple methods as triangulation and argues, "because each method reveals different aspects of empirical reality, multiple methods of observations must be employed".

Within the present study, multiple methods were adopted for a further reason. There were problems associated with gaining access to undertake purely qualitative research in the police custody suites and an opportunity presented itself to conduct a quantitative analysis in this setting (see below). As a result, a quantitative activity analysis was used to examine police custody, supplemented by qualitative observations and informal discussions. Within the courts and prison, a purely qualitative approach was adopted, where in-depth interviews were conducted alongside observations and informal discussions.

Research setting

At an early stage, it was decided to base this study on Glen Parva YOI and a number of police stations and courts that fed into it. This not only ensured that travelling time to these locations was reduced, but that the research would be easy to manage. Likewise, Little (1990) found that by conducting his research in a remand and youth custody centre that used the same geographical region, his research project was manageable.

Glen Parva YOI is situated in the East Midlands and holds approximately 800 sentenced, unsentenced and remanded male prisoners, aged between 18 and 21 years old (HM Prison Service, 2004b) (see appendix A for the full prison population profile as of June 2007). It takes from over 100 courts in the East Midlands region, including Cambridgeshire, Coventry, Derbyshire, Leicestershire, Lincolnshire, Nottinghamshire and Solihull. Within Glen Parva YOI, prisoners have daily contact with prison officers, but may also see nurses, psychologists, the chaplain, art therapists and drugs workers. In all, three court custody suites were visited, which, among other prisons, fed into Glen Parva YOI. To retain anonymity, pseudonyms will be used. The two Magistrates Courts visited were Alpha and Bravo, with the Crown Court at Bravo being visited as well. The private company that was responsible for these courts and employed the court staff directly also had responsibility for the escort service and escort staff, taking prisoners from these courts to Glen Parva YOI. In addition, four police custody suites formed part of this study, all being served by one Police Force. Again, to retain anonymity, a pseudonym will be used (Charlie). Whilst young males from these police custody suites could ultimately end up at Glen Parva YOI, these custody suites did not feed into Alpha Magistrates Court, Bravo Magistrates Court or Bravo Crown Court. In terms of staffing in police custody suites, detainees have contact with a custody officer (a police Sergeant), other police officers and detention officers (police staff).

Figures on suicide and self-harm were collated from the participating establishments. In comparing these figures, it is necessary to acknowledge that the establishments use different recording criteria. For example, Charlie Police Force only records incidents that involve injury or have the potential to cause injury. Consequently, during 2004 just three 'near misses' were recorded in the four police custody suites. These involved two males (aged 46 and 21 years old) and one female (aged 22 years old). Although none of these strictly fit the parameters of this study, the incident involving the 21 year old male will be detailed here as an example of the type of incidents committed by young men in police cells. The 'near miss' report provides information about this male ripping up the tear proof suit that he had been given. According to the report, the suit was subsequently made into a makeshift noose to further harm himself. This method of self-harm corresponds with earlier research in police custody by Ingram et al (1997). Whilst the report recorded that the male had not sustained an injury, it did not detail who had found him or what treatment, help or support he had received afterwards. Furthermore, the report did not establish whether this was a suicide attempt or a method of self-harm, although it had the potential to be fatal if staff had not intercepted. It was apparent from subsequent discussions with staff that far more incidents of self-harm occurred than were recorded on these 'near miss' forms. For example, I noted in my personal field diary that staff at every custody suite I had visited provided details of self-harm incidents that had either happened during the week I was there or had occurred very recently. The figure of three near misses is not felt to accurately reflect the rate of self-harm in the four police custody suites.

When recording incidents of self-harm, the company with responsibility for the three court custody suites only includes cases where individuals have actually harmed themselves, for example, by scratching their own arms with sharp objects. In 2004,

statistics were available for April – December, as before this the data was not electronically recorded (see appendix B). During this period, 32 incidents of self-harm were recorded across the region that the company served. Of these 32, 26 involved adult males and 1 involved a male aged less than 18 (the report does not identify how many were aged 18 – 20 years old). There were no completed suicides and relatively few incidents of self-harm involved serious injury; approximately one third of all the self-harm incidents (involving males and females) required hospital treatment and none required resuscitation. Regarding method, a ligature was used in approximately one third of incidents and a blade or other implement was used in a subsequent third. No incident involved the use of substances. These findings reflect the materials that are available to detainees or that they have been able to hide before entering the criminal justice system and are similar to those obtained by the Howard League (2001). With respect to location, nearly all of the incidents happened in a Magistrates Court with only a few occurring in a Crown Court. None took place in an escort vehicle. Although the Howard League (2001) identifies that self-harm is more likely to occur in court cells than escort vehicles, it fails to distinguish between Magistrates Courts and Crown Courts. It is not known why higher rates of self-harm are found in Magistrates Courts in comparison with Crown Courts. One possibility is that Magistrates Courts receive more at-risk detainees than Crown Courts, or detainees spend longer in these cells, thus having more opportunity to self-harm. Equally, it is not clear why no detainee self-harmed in an escort vehicle. One possible explanation is that detainees do not have access to any objects with which they can harm themselves. It may also be because a member of staff observes any detainee considered at-risk. Lastly, it is apparent from the data that it is incredibly difficult to predict which detainees will go on to self-harm; in just over one third of the self-harm incidents, there was no warning notice received. Consequently, staff must remain vigilant with all detainees.

Within Glen Parva YOI, all incidents of self-harm are recorded and collated by the Suicide Prevention Coordinator. In 2004, they formed part of the Annual Report (Baker, 2004), a summary of which can be found in appendix C. Statistics were gathered from information recorded on the 213SH form (which is completed after every incident of self-harm) and the subsequent 'Post self-harm / attempted suicide review form' (which outlines the prisoner's perspective regarding the intentions and issues surrounding the incident of self-harm). In 2004, there were 216 incidents of self-harm, involving 109 prisoners and no completed suicides. Even taking into account disparities between the recording criteria of the three establishments, it would appear that incidents of self-harm occur more frequently in prison than either a court cell or police cell. As with the court cells, the majority of these incidents resulted in little or no injury; 123 incidents (56.9%) required no nursing or medical treatment and only two prisoners had to be transferred to the local Accident and Emergency Department for assessment, with one being admitted. Cutting / scratching was the preferred method of self-harm, being linked to just over 60% of incidents. In contrast, a similar number of incidents involved hanging, self-strangulation, head banging / wall punching and noose / ligature making (between 5% and 12% of all incidents). This is comparable with earlier research by Dear, Thomson, Hall and Howells (2001), Harvey (2007), Howard League (1999b), Inch et al (1995) and Livingston (1997). Furthermore, the method and severity of self-harm incidents in Glen Parva YOI are similar to those incidents found in the court custody suites. Baker (2004: 3) suggests in her report that the high number of incidents involving cutting may be "explained by the number of prisoners who have access to materials to cut, as well as cutting being used as a form of stress relief without suicidal intent". The data also demonstrate that physical injury should not be used as an indicator of suicidal intent; when prisoners were asked about intent, 34 of the 216 incidents were reported to have been committed with suicidal intent, although this was

not always apparent from the resulting injury. With respect to location, all except one incident of self-harm occurred in a cell, which, according to Baker (2004: 3), “supports the theory that prisoners are less likely to self-harm when occupied with purposeful activity”. As with previous research by Dear, Thomson, Hall and Howells (2001) and Liebling and Krarup (1993), the data show that prisoners are at a high risk of self-harm in the early stages of imprisonment; of the 216 incidents of self-harm, 14 occurred in the first 24 hours and 50 occurred in the first 14 days. Lastly, in similar respects to the court custody suites, not all of the prisoners who had self-harmed were identified as at-risk. Of the 216 incidents of self-harm, 116 occurred whilst the prisoner was not on a F2052SH. Thus, F2052SH documents were not opened for all at-risk prisoners and where open, did not prevent incidents of self-harm.

Access

Gaining access to undertake research in the criminal justice system is a difficult and arduous task. The problems associated with this task have been highlighted by a number of researchers, including Patenaude (2004: 73), who concludes “[t]he greatest challenge facing qualitative researchers doing prison research is gaining entry to the field”. Gaining access can be difficult for a number of reasons. Firstly, many of the establishments in the criminal justice system are closed (Jupp, 2001). Secondly, gaining access is especially difficult when studying policing, because of the highly charged nature of its secrets (Reiner, 2000). Thirdly, gaining access can be time consuming and problematic because of the sensitive nature of the majority of criminological research (Smith and Wincup, 2000). This problem was particularly relevant to my study, which aimed to ask personal questions about a very emotive subject. Lastly, it appears to be more problematical for a PhD student to gain access than more established researchers;

whilst Liebling and Arnold (2004) had no difficulties in gaining formal and informal access once their selection of prisons had been agreed, my experiences were vastly different. Consequently, gaining access is a process of negotiation and re-negotiation, often involving more than one hurdle (Burgess, 1984; Hughes, 2000; Jewkes, 2002; Reiner, 2000).

Problems with gaining access were evident at all stages of the criminal justice system, although the hardest was gaining access to the police custody suites. Initially a letter (see appendix D) was written to the Chief Constable of Charlie Police Force, which outlined the aim and objectives of my study, the methodology, its benefits, the ethical issues and the distribution of the thesis. The request was dealt with by the research department and was declined due to its sensitive nature, the possibility of it compromising active enquiries, the small sample size and that suicide and self-harm are relatively rare in police custody. Despite this initial setback a second proposal, which addressed these comments, was sent directly to the Head of Research (see appendix E). At the same time as access was being negotiated, I was working as a member of police staff for Charlie Police Force, which aided me enormously, as I was eventually able to set up a meeting with the Head of Research. They explained that I was not going to be permitted to interview detainees because of the problems of extending their time in custody and solicitors' concerns. Therefore, a compromise had to be reached. A necessary precursor for the research was that it had to address a problem that the Force had already highlighted and wanted researching. As a result, the proposal was adapted to include an activity analysis, examining the actual time it took for a detainee to go through the custody process. In addition, I was permitted to undertake observations and complete informal discussions with custody staff, which ultimately provided an in-depth knowledge of the custody process (see appendix F for the updated research proposal).

Although the original research proposal was adapted, it was difficult to decline a reciprocal trading. This is not an uncommon dilemma as Lee (1993: 127) illustrates:

Offers of access based on a reciprocal trading of in-house research in return for access are, on the other hand, presumably more difficult to refuse..... researchers are usually in a weak position when seeking access because they can deploy few bargaining resources..... being in a weak bargaining position in itself produces pressures towards reciprocity..... from the researcher's point of view the bargain potentially being struck is apparently a 'good' one since the ability to do the research is produced at a small marginal cost to the researcher.

Although the research proposal was not adapted to gain access to the court custody suites, the process was not without its problems. As before, a letter was firstly sent to the local manager of Global Solutions Limited (GSL), who ran the escort and court custody service for the chosen area (the content of this letter was similar to that sent to the Chief Constable, see appendix D). The manager was not in a position to authorise the research and therefore contact was made with the Prisoner Escort and Custody Services (PECS). Permission was granted to undertake the research and the necessary security checks made. When contact was later made with GSL to arrange the dates of the interviews I was advised that the research, which was due to start in September, would (at the last minute) be postponed until the following January. This was because of staffing issues at the local court. Unfortunately, in January, these issues had still not been resolved and access was subsequently denied. Despite PECS supporting the research, they had no control over the decision made by GSL. As a result, another escort and custody service provider was approached who ran courts that fed into Glen Parva

YOI. Access was granted by this company and they were nothing but helpful in all of the research requests.

Again, gaining access to Glen Parva YOI was a drawn-out process. Initial approval for prison research needs to be gained from the Governor (see King, 2000; Martin, 2000) and a letter was sent to the Governor at Glen Parva YOI (the content of which was similar to that sent to the Chief Constable, see appendix D). This letter was copied to the Suicide Prevention Coordinator who had helped with previous research. After no response, a follow up letter was sent to the Governor, which led to the prison psychologist making contact. The prison psychologist had concerns regarding the benefits of the study and the time needed to supervise it and organise interviews. King (2000) and Patenaude (2004) also describe how the acceptance of a PhD or research proposal is a trade off between the possible benefits and the possible nuisance / interruption of having a student around. After further discussions with the prison psychologist and the Suicide Prevention Coordinator, the proposal was accepted and permission was granted to undertake the research.

Even once initial physical access has been granted, the researcher needs to negotiate other layers of social access, which are controlled by gatekeepers and can be problematic (Lee, 1993). These individuals have the power to grant or withhold access and can ultimately decide which people and situations the researcher has access to (Burgess, 1984; Hughes, 2000; Jewkes, 2002; Jupp, 2001). The final gatekeepers in my research were police officers, police custody staff, court custody staff and prison officers. Gatekeepers may perform a formal or informal role in permitting access, and gaining their confidence and support is crucial, whatever level they are at in the research (Jupp, 2001). Despite problems initially gaining access to undertake the study, all final

gatekeepers were extremely co-operative and helpful. Like Liebling (1999b), I found prison staff (and staff in the police stations and court custody suites) positively welcoming and they were always helpful to research requests.

Ethical considerations

Not only were ethical guidelines taken into consideration when developing the research proposal and applying for access, but they were also considered in the later fieldwork stages. These considerations ensured that the research did not harm participants or put them at-risk in any way (Martin, 2000; Maxfield and Babbie, 2001). The ethical guidelines that were considered were developed by the British Society of Criminology (BSC) and the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC). The BSC states researchers have a responsibility towards the discipline of Criminology, colleagues, sponsors and research participants. All of these responsibilities were taken into consideration, although particular attention was paid to research participants.

Due to the revised research proposal and methodology that was employed in the police phase of the research, the ethical considerations that were relevant here were not necessarily the same as those in the courts and prison. Instead, because the activity analysis involved the use of custody records and the recording of custody numbers, the main consideration was the Data Protection Act 1998. The ESRC explains that if researchers are processing any information that relates to an identifiable living individual it constitutes ‘personal data processing’ and consequently is subject to the provisions of the Data Protection Act. There are a number of guidelines covered by the Data Protection Act, including obtaining data for a specified and lawful purpose, not processing data in any manner that is incompatible with that purpose, only collecting

data that is adequate, relevant and not excessive for that purpose, and keeping data up-to-date. Both the initial collection of the data by the police and my use of the data ensured that these guidelines were not contravened.

Although informed consent was not necessary for the activity analysis, it was a crucial aspect of the research undertaken in the court custody suites and prison. According to the BSC and ESRC, informed consent refers to participants freely agreeing to take part in research once it has been fully explained to them. The BSC suggests that this explanation be given in terms that are meaningful to the participant. Consequently, the ESRC suggests that the primary objective of informed consent is to conduct research openly and without deception. At the start of the interviews, I gave an introduction to participants about the study. Within this introduction I explained about my role, the aims of my research, the research I had already completed, the hope that my study would benefit the establishments taking part and give them information about the support needs of people in their care and the support services on offer, and that a copy of the research would be disseminated to all participating establishments (Borrill et al, 2005; Inch et al, 1995; Liebling, 1992). I did not over-estimate the benefits of the research for the individual detainee or prisoner. Thus, I explained that by being interviewed they would only really gain the opportunity to say how they felt, with the hope that the participating establishments would take heed; I had no power to introduce any changes (King and Elliott, 1977). Detainees and prisoners are however a special population because they are a relatively powerless and vulnerable group whose decisions are normally under the control of others (Martin, 2000). Therefore, it is vital to ensure that these individuals are consenting freely to the research and are not being coerced. Within the introduction I made it clear that a decision to, or not to, participate in the research would hold no rewards or disadvantages (Inch et al, 1995; Liebling,

1992; Martin, 2000). In particular, I explained that participation or non-participation in the research at the court level would not affect either positively or negatively any subsequent court hearings. Likewise, in the prison, earned privileges, work assignments or sentence length would not be affected by the prisoner deciding to, or not to, participate in the research (Liebling, 1992; Maxfield and Babbie, 2001). Furthermore, participants were advised that participation was voluntary, which meant they did not have to answer any question they did not want to and could leave at any point during the interview (Adler, 1998; Borrill et al, 2005; Liebling and Arnold, 2004). Despite all these safeguards, it is important to realise that across the criminal justice system individuals may agree to participate in research for other reasons. For example, individuals may participate out of boredom, because it is a welcome change to the daily routine (particularly if the researcher is a female outsider), they want their opinions taken note of, they want to appear co-operative for hopes of being treated better or they want to ask for information (Davies, 2000; Genders and Player, 1989; Martin, 2000; Moser et al, 2004; Smith and Wincup, 2000; Sparks et al, 1996).

During the fieldwork stages, I had informal discussions with a number of staff and made observations of the people and processes involved. Although informal, it was necessary that these discussions and observations were conducted ethically. As noted previously, the BSC and ESRC recommend that informed consent be gained from all research participants. Therefore, in the police phase, I informed police officers and staff about the aim of the activity analysis and my PhD. Due to the large numbers of officers and staff that came into the custody suite, I could not advise them all, however I ensured that where informal discussions were held, these individuals were advised. Likewise, in the court custody suites and prison, any member of staff that I spoke with was advised

of the aims of my study. In terms of observations, I tried to make sure that all staff observed were aware of my presence and the research being undertaken.

Once the data is collected, the BSC and ESRC recommend that it remain confidential and participants remain anonymous. Similarly, King (2000), Liebling and Arnold (2004) and Singleton et al (1998b) argue that in any interview it is necessary to ensure interviewees remain anonymous. Anonymity means that individuals cannot be identified from their data and that data is not released that would allow an individual's response to be identified. Consequently, I did not record any names of interviewees or members of staff that participated in informal discussions or that were observed. Where interviewees are quoted in the subsequent chapters (chapters three, four, five and six), pseudonyms are used. In accordance with the ESRC guidelines, the Data Protection Act does not apply if 'anonymisation' of the data is undertaken. Therefore, although this Act was of importance within the police phase it did not apply to the court custody suites or prison. It is also vital to guarantee confidentiality, where nothing said in the interview will be passed on to another interviewee or staff member (Liebling, 1999b; Martin, 2000; Medlicott, 2000; Singleton et al, 1998b). Although this is appropriate within the majority of research settings there are occasions when it is necessary to break this confidentiality in the criminal justice system. Therefore, in the introduction to the interviews I explained that where an individual was thought to be at-risk of harming themselves or others, or presented a security risk, I would have to inform a member of staff (Borrill et al, 2005; King, 2000).

Lee (1993: 4) defines sensitive research as that "which potentially poses a substantial threat to those who are or have been involved in it". Subsequently, Lee describes three types of threat; intrusive (dealing with areas that are private, stressful or sacred), the

study of deviance and control, and political. The nature of this study represented an intrusive threat and therefore had the potential to cause distress. To prevent such distress, confidentiality and anonymity were assured. Furthermore, the BSC advises that researchers should seek to minimise any disturbances if they consider that the research experience may be disturbing and to think whether information is offered about support services. When asking any sensitive questions, I reminded interviewees of their right not to answer and to leave at any point. On the rare occasions that an interviewee did become upset or wanted help, I referred them to a member of staff; I did not at any point claim to be trained in either legal or psychological matters.

When undertaking research, the BSC states that researchers should be sympathetic to the constraints on organisations participating in the research and not inhibit their functioning by imposing unnecessary burdens on them. Consideration of this ethical guideline can be seen with reference to the changes made to the research proposal and methodology conducted in the police custody suites. Furthermore, when negotiating access to Glen Parva YOI, the impact of this research on the Suicide Prevention Coordinator had to be reduced to a minimum. Subsequently, when arranging interview times in the courts and prison I fitted in with the schedule or regime that was in place.

Lastly, alongside the ethical guidelines outlined by the BSC and the ESRC, my research was conducted with the central ethical principles of honesty, sympathy and respect (Hollway and Jefferson, 2000). By adhering to these ethical guidelines and principles in the planning and fieldwork stages, I anticipated that no person would come to any harm from this study. For ease, the following section is separated into the fieldwork undertaken in the police custody suites (largely quantitative research) and the court custody suites and prison (qualitative research).

Quantitative research

Sampling is a necessary part of the research process as it is not possible for the researcher to study all people and all events in a social situation (Burgess, 1984). In order to obtain a representative sample for the police custody activity analysis, the research was undertaken at Charlie Police Force's four main custody suites. The nature of a custody suite means certain days and times are busier than others. Consequently, the time I visited each suite varied, from the earliest at 0730 to the latest at 0200, Monday to Saturday. Each suite was visited for a total of five days. It was felt that these times and days would give the necessary variety to ensure a representative sample.

Martin (2000) notes that randomly selecting participants overcomes the possibility of obtaining a skewed sample. However, in a police custody suite this approach is hard to achieve, as any list of individuals in custody is continually changing. Therefore, opportunistic sampling was used, which meant detainees were selected "*if they happen[ed] to be there*" (Martin, 2000: 227, original emphasis). As a result, the first thirty detainees that were booked in at each custody suite during the fieldwork stage were selected. This gave a total sample size of 120, which was considered large enough to be representative of the population under study and to achieve the aims of the research. Of these 120, only 16 detainees fitted the parameters of this study, being male aged 18 – 20 years old (6 were 18 years old, 5 were 19 and 5 were 20). Those aged 21 years old were excluded because they would not have been sent to Glen Parva YOI had they been remanded or finally sentenced.

With regards to data collection, an activity analysis allows the researcher to measure how long an individual takes to perform certain tasks. Within this research, it involved observing how long each detainee took to go through the various stages of the custody

process and recording these times (see appendix G for the completed activity analysis). The activity analysis enabled an overall picture to be developed of the custody process. The data was gathered by visiting each of the four custody suites for five days and collecting information about 30 detained persons. The information was obtained through two methods; I either observed the time as the detainee went through the custody process or I looked at the custody record (paperwork held on each detainee) to obtain the time. It was not possible for me to observe all 120 persons through the custody process as some were detained overnight or in some cases for more than 24 hours. In all cases, either the whole custody process was observed or the detainee was observed at the beginning or end of the custody process and missing information was obtained from the custody record. This method worked well, although the information collected from direct observation was more detailed than that gathered from the custody records.

To supplement the quantitative activity analysis, I used observations and informal discussions with staff. Observations covered how detainees at-risk of suicide and self-harm were managed, the conditions in which individuals were detained and relationships between detainees and police officers / staff. Informal discussions with staff included asking about their experiences of working with detainees at-risk of suicide and self-harm, and any training that had been received. In undertaking these observations and informal discussions it is necessary to recognise that by merely being there the researcher becomes a part of the interaction they are observing and can affect the social situations they are studying (Martin, 2000). Details from my observations and informal discussions were written in a personal field diary, which included my ideas, research experiences and feelings, including any low points and high points. Similarly, during her prison research, Liebling (1992) kept a log and diary of her observations,

conversations and activities. A diary not only acts as a memory aid, but also forms part of the reflective process, allowing the researcher to think about the research process and their effect upon it (Davies, 2000; Martin, 2000).

Before the main body of research was undertaken, it was necessary to become familiar with the research setting and the method of data collection. Liebling (1992) describes how she spent time corresponding, visiting and familiarising herself with the routine of the chosen prisons. In doing this, Liebling was able to establish trust and access, and gather background information. Having worked for the police for the previous two years I had already visited two custody suites so was familiar with the process and some of the staff. However, it was still necessary to undertake a pilot study for the activity analysis, for which the busiest custody suite was chosen, where there was a higher turnover of detainees. Martin (2000) argues that when conducting interviews it is always advisable to conduct pilot studies to allow for any adjustments or changes to be made. Likewise, the pilot study for the activity analysis ensured that the data that was required could be obtained, the categories were accurate and any amendments that were needed were made. As a result, minor alterations were made to the activity analysis.

To reiterate, of a total sample size of 120 detainees, 16 fitted the parameters of my study, being aged between 18 and 20 years old. In analysing the data for these 16 detainees, the average time for each stage of the custody process was calculated. As an example, average times were calculated for waiting to be booked in, having fingerprints taken and waiting in the cell before being interviewed. Since only averages were being calculated, it was not necessary to use a statistical package; the purpose of the activity analysis was to gain an overall picture of the custody process rather than to make comparisons between different groups.

In conducting research, it is necessary to ensure that the method of data collection is reliable and valid. Reliability refers to “the extent to which a test or procedure produces similar results under constant conditions on all occasions” (Bell, 1999: 103). When conducting an activity analysis there is very little personal interpretation that can affect the reliability of the study, it is a matter of recording times that are already written in custody records (which by law should be accurately maintained) or actually observing the time. In terms of validity, an item is valid if it “measures or describes what it is supposed to measure or describe” (Bell, 1999: 104). Activity analyses are used quite frequently in Charlie Police Force to measure various aspects of policing. In addition, by completing a pilot study, the different tasks that were being analysed were checked with custody staff to ensure they were valid parts of the custody process. The activity analysis was therefore deemed a reliable and valid method of examining the custody process.

Qualitative research

In similar respects to the police custody activity analysis, random sampling is hard to achieve in the court custody suites and prison. This is because they have a constantly changing population; while some selected detainees or prisoners leave before they can be interviewed, others not on the sampling list arrive (Martin, 2000; Singleton et al, 1998b). Therefore, a number of researchers have adopted opportunistic sampling with prisoners and prison officers (Adler, 1998; Crawley, 2004; Jewkes, 2002; Liebling and Arnold, 2004). In particular, Crawley (2004) reports that she initially intended to interview a 10% sample of uniformed prison officers, however, this was difficult because of shift patterns, sickness and general demands of the regime. Instead, Crawley (2004: 63) “had to seize any interview opportunity that presented itself..... seize

anyone and everyone that offers help”. Opportunistic sampling therefore represents an easy and economic method of sampling (Maxfield and Babbie, 2001). Arber (1996) also suggests that probability sampling is often unrealistic for small-scale or qualitative research, whilst opportunistic sampling is best if the aim of the research is exploratory. Despite these benefits, de Vaus (1996) argues that when using opportunistic sampling, claims cannot be made about anything but the sample itself.

By using opportunistic sampling, Senior Custody Officers in the court custody suites selected detainees for interview. Likewise, in Glen Parva YOI, the Suicide Prevention Coordinator or prison officers on the individual units selected prisoners to be interviewed. When selecting participants I asked officers to choose detainees and prisoners who they perceived to be articulate, chatty, opinionated and most importantly, available. This was a similar criteria to that applied by officers who selected prisoners for Jewkes’ (2002) research. At times, I also asked that the individual to be selected was on remand, sentenced or had self-harmed. However, Sim (2003: 241) criticises such a method, arguing Jewkes’ sampling procedure “is methodologically suspect and can compromise the independence of the researcher”. In response to this criticism and as later sections will demonstrate, the chosen interviewees were not always articulate, chatty or opinionated, there were times when interviewees did not speak English, had learning difficulties or plainly did not want to be interviewed. While I tended to get some useful information from these interviewees, I particularly struggled with one court interviewee who was Kurdish. After a couple of minutes it was apparent that he could not understand very much English nor could I understand him. Consequently, I had to cut the interview short, only managing to establish his age and that he had never been to prison before. Nevertheless, opportunistic sampling did enable me to gain a wide selection of research participants.

As stated earlier, it is essential to familiarise oneself with the research setting and undertake a pilot study before the main body of research is completed. Like Liebling (1992), Sparks et al (1996) argue that researchers should spend a few months at the chosen prison, going through the induction process, undertaking observations and familiarisation. During the early stages of my prison research, I undertook a familiarisation phase in Glen Parva YOI, where I met with the Suicide Prevention Coordinator, was shown around the prison, undertook pilot interviews and talked informally with staff. Within her research, Liebling (1992) discusses how a liaison officer served as a main coordinator of arrangements and provided a source of information and communication. Similarly, the Suicide Prevention Coordinator proved vital, escorting me to different units, arranging interviews, pre-warning officers of my visit and being a reliable source of information. When I later visited the courts I again spent time familiarising myself with the settings, processes and staff. There the Area Court Manager coordinated the research and dates for the interviews, pre-warning sites of my arrival and research aims. Included in the familiarisation phase at Glen Parva YOI was the pilot study, which allowed me to conduct pilot interviews with six prisoners. This was similar to Medlicott (1999), who undertook six pilot interviews, subsequently interviewing forty male prisoners. Within these pilot interviews, I checked the research topics, made changes to the interview questions and ensured questions were worded appropriately (Bell, 1999; Liebling and Krarup, 1993; Martin, 2000). Due to the small sample size, some of the data from the pilot interviewees has been included in the subsequent findings chapters. This data should not be viewed as any less reliable or worthy than the data obtained from other interviewees. Later, because I asked the same questions in the courts as I had done at Glen Parva YOI, I decided that a further pilot study was not necessary.

Across the court custody suites and Glen Parva YOI, 37 interviews were conducted (excluding the pilot study). Of these 37, 10 were conducted with detainees held in court custody suites and 27 with prisoners at Glen Parva YOI. It must be recognised that such small samples have in the past been criticised. For example, Martel (2004) notes how in her study of women in prison, she was criticised for using a sample size of only twelve. However, Martel (2004: 170) goes on to suggest that such “small samples and open-ended questions generate (in)valuable insights about the particular, or ‘local’, character of our global world”. By using such a small sample, the present study provides an in-depth insight into the experiences of young males in particular police custody suites, court custody suites, escort vehicles and prison. It does not make claims to be representative of all individuals held in the criminal justice system. This view is supported by the SCG (2001: 9), who state, “a qualitative study does not claim to provide data that is representative of all self-inflicted deaths in custody or of all prisoners. What it does allow is a detailed, vivid picture of a smaller number of deaths to emerge”. Consequently, the research wholeheartedly supports Wolcott’s (1990: 63) belief of “do less, more thoroughly” and is in-line with other prison researchers who have used small samples, for example, Borrill et al (2005), Little (1990) and Medlicott (1999).

In terms of the characteristics of the ten court interviewees, five were 19 years old and five were 20 years old. Of these ten interviewees, six had transferred from a police station and four had returned on remand from Glen Parva YOI. The experiences and feelings of these interviewees therefore differed; some knew they would be returning to prison, others did not know if they would be given their first prison sentence. Whilst four of the ten interviews were conducted at Alpha Magistrates Court, four were undertaken at Bravo Magistrates Court and two at Bravo Crown Court. Again,

interviewees were facing different prospects; detainees held at Crown Court tend to have committed offences that are more serious and as a result, face longer prison sentences than those held at Magistrates Courts. With respect to the four interviewees on remand from Glen Parva YOI, they had spent between seven days and three months there. In all, five of the ten interviewees had previously spent time at Glen Parva YOI, with one having been there three times. Three of these five interviewees and another two interviewees had also served time at other prisons / secure units, including Brinsford, Stoke Heath, Onley, Ashfield and Bristol. Only three interviewees had never been to prison before; one had never been in trouble with the police, another was in police custody for his second time and the last one was in police custody for his sixth time. Conversely, some interviewees had thirty-plus arrests and twenty-plus convictions.

The prison interviewees were all aged between 18 and 21 years old (5 were 18 years old, 7 were 19, 11 were 20 and 4 were 21). Out of the twenty-seven prison interviewees, thirteen were on remand (twelve of which were 'convicted unsentenced') and fourteen were sentenced. Thus, whilst some knew how long they had left to serve, others were still awaiting a verdict or sentencing. Regarding location, all thirteen remand and convicted unsentenced prisoners were on a remand unit. The remand unit also housed a sentenced interviewee who served as the unit Listener. Of the remaining thirteen sentenced prisoners, six were on a drugs-free unit, four were on a sentenced allocation unit (for those prisoners serving short sentences or for those who have long sentences and are waiting to be allocated to another prison) and one was on a sentenced unit. Two interviewees were on the induction unit, one was going through the induction process and the other was working as a cleaner. These interviewees had spent between 2 days and more than 1 year at Glen Parva YOI, either on remand and / or sentenced. In similar

respects to the court sample, eighteen interviewees had been in prison or a secure unit before, with the vast majority (sixteen) having been in Glen Parva YOI. Some had been in Glen Parva YOI only once before, others two, three, four or even five times. Other locations where prisoners had been held (in addition to those listed previously) were Feltham, Hollesley Bay, Chelmsford, Swinfen Hall, Lancaster Farms, Moorland, Wetherby, Portland, Gloucester, Medway, Parc and Doncaster. Again, there were interviewees who had forty-plus arrests and twenty-plus convictions, whereas only two of the nine interviewees who had not been in prison previously, had never been in trouble with the police before.

During the interviews, I collected data about which interviewees had attempted or contemplated suicide and / or self-harmed. Of the ten court interviewees, two (one from a police station and one on remand from Glen Parva YOI) stated they had self-harmed or attempted suicide at some point in the past (either inside or outside the criminal justice system). The corresponding figure for prison was nine out of twenty-seven interviewees (four on remand and five sentenced). In addition, two of the six pilot interviewees had attempted suicide or self-harmed in the past. The sample was therefore considered sufficiently varied and representative of the populations under study.

I decided to adopt a purely qualitative approach to data collection in the courts and prison, because such methods “can provide a ‘deeper’ understanding of social phenomena than would be obtained from purely quantitative data” (Silverman, 2001: 32). Having been influenced by grounded theory, the research was essentially discovery-based and exploratory (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). Such an approach enables the researcher to generate theory from the data that is obtained through social research (ibid.). This is of particular importance since very little is known about young males’

experiences of police cells, court cells and escort vehicles. As a result, the crux of the research involved in-depth semi-structured interviews with detainees in court custody suites and with prisoners. Alongside these interviews, I conducted observations and informal discussions. My decision to use these methods was based on Liebling's (1995: 173) argument that an appropriate approach to this type of research is the "use of long semi-structured interviews, supplemented by observational methods, participation, statistical data, and informal discussions with staff and prisoners".

Through the use of semi-structured interviews I aimed to gain an understanding of the real-life world of young males in the criminal justice system, seeking to understand their perspective and ultimately gaining an insight into their thoughts, feelings and beliefs (Jupp, 2001; Lindlof, 1995; Liebling, 1995; Piacentini: 2005; Smith and Wincup, 2000). Consequently, I adopted an ethnographic approach, as described below by Liebling (2001: 474):

Its main features can be summarized as: a strong emphasis on exploring the nature of particular social phenomena, rather than setting out to test hypotheses about them; a tendency to work primarily with unstructured data, that is, data that have not been coded at the point of data collection in terms of a closed set of analytic categories; investigation of a relatively small number of cases, in detail; and analysis of data that involves interpretation of the meanings and functions of human behaviour, with an emphasis on description and illustration.

One of the main themes in ethnography is the ability to empathise. More specifically, Smircich (1983) refers to 'empathic ethnography' whereby the researcher 'stands in the

shoes' of another and sees how the world looks to them. In adopting this approach, it suited the exploratory nature of my study and the sensitive research topic.

Within qualitative research and in particular ethnographic research, the effect of the researcher must be understood. Not only does the researcher shape the social environment of the research, but they are also shaped by it (Genders and Player, 1995). As a result, the researcher becomes an important part of the research process; "the self of the ethnographer is treated as being of equal interest to the action of the observed" (Atkinson and Coffey, 1995: 43). To ensure the research methodology addressed this aspect I noted in my personal field diary details of my experiences as a researcher, outlining how I was influenced and shaped by the research process and how my presence affected the environment I was in.

Alongside ethnography, I was influenced by appreciative inquiry; an approach recently used by Liebling and Arnold (2004), where they explore values, quality and prison life. Appreciative inquiry is "participatory, respectful, and empowering" (Liebling and Arnold, 2004: 141) and was initially used to look at organisations, concentrating on their strengths, accomplishments, best practices and peak moments. Appreciative inquiry concentrates on what is best rather than what is not, focussing attention away from a problem towards possibilities and building a positive desired future (Elliott, 1999; Ludema et al, 2001). In-line with appreciative inquiry, my research looked at improving support cultures for young males in the criminal justice system and improving the culture that existed among staff working with individuals at-risk. In addition, I reflected on good practice, aiming to share this with other criminal justice agencies, as appropriate. However, the aims of my research could not be met solely by this approach, as more negative experiences were also obtained from interviewees.

With regards to the fieldwork, because of problems gaining access and my own personal work commitments, I decided to spend one and a half months of concentrated research at Glen Parva YOI and a three-day slot at Alpha Magistrates Court and a three-day slot at Bravo Magistrates Court / Crown Court. Although this may seem a relatively short period of fieldwork, it allowed me time to undertake the small number of in-depth interviews that I had aimed to complete. Furthermore, King (2000) states that spending three to three and a half days a week in the field, spread out over two months is ample. By only spending three or four days a week at Glen Parva YOI, I had time to check my notes and had the opportunity for emotional release after playing the researcher role (ibid.). This was particularly relevant, as the interview subject was quite 'heavy' and emotionally charged. The hours of fieldwork I could undertake were limited in court by the times of hearings. Likewise, in prison my hours were restricted by the Suicide Prevention Coordinator's routine and prisoners' activities, for example, lunch, education, gym, visits and court appearances (see also King, 2000 and Singleton et al, 1998b).

One of the reasons why interviews were used was because Liebling (1992) argues that few studies have asked prisoners what happened and why, despite prisoners being the most valuable source of information. Although it is fair to say that since this statement there have been numerous studies asking prisoners these questions, there have been relatively few asking individuals about their experiences of police cells, court cells and escort vehicles. Consequently, interviews are the ideal method of obtaining this information. Interviews also overcome the likelihood of detainees and prisoners having literacy problems and the fact that it is harder to elicit detailed qualitative answers from questionnaires (Adler, 1998). In comparison with questionnaires, interviews are more adaptable and allow ideas to be followed-up (Bell, 1999; Newell, 1996). Furthermore,

interviews in general and semi-structured interviews in particular have been used by numerous prison researchers, including Borrill et al (2005), Davies (2000), Jewkes (2002), Liebling (1996; 1999a) and Medlicott (1999; 2000).

I decided to use semi-structured interviews rather than structured interviews because they are more flexible (see appendix H for the interview schedule). Semi-structured interviews allow questions to be outlined but their sequence can be altered to enable a relatively natural conversation to develop between the researcher and interviewee, with probes and other questions being used to elicit more information (Fielding, 1996; May, 1997). Although I set the interview questions prior to the research, they were used more as a memory prompt than a definitive list and were altered accordingly (this was particularly applicable to the court interviews, where some questions became irrelevant). The interview questions were based on themes that had arisen from the literature review and included any that had emerged during the research (Jewkes, 2002). Open questions were used to allow interviewees to respond in any way they wished and were worded in everyday language to ensure they were as simple as possible, easy to understand and not ambiguous (Liebling, 1992; Newell, 1996). The nature of semi-structured interviews and open questions means it is necessary at times to prompt interviewees. When I used prompts I tried to ensure that they encouraged interviewees without leading them and were kept as neutral as possible to avoid affecting the nature of subsequent responses (Davies, 2000; Fielding, 1996; Maxfield and Babbie, 2001).

As already described, before the interviews started, an introduction was given to participants covering ethical issues. Within this introduction, a general statement was provided about the purpose of the research. To ensure participants were not altering their responses to what they assumed I wanted to hear I did not specify the objectives

being explored (Hollway and Jefferson, 2000). The first few questions were largely factual and asked for demographic information and details of prison or offending history (Adler, 1998; Inch et al, 1995; Liebling, 1992). Then, by adopting a ‘funnel approach’, the interview questions narrowed from the more general to the more specific and focused (Agar, 1996; Jewkes, 2002). When interviewing prisoners, Liebling (1992) adopted an autobiographical approach leading them from their recent past circumstances in through the prison gates, along the landing and into their cell. My approach was similar although it was extended to include the police station, court and escort vehicle. Questions were included that asked about interviewees’ methods of coping, related to suicide and self-harm where applicable, and discussing these acts and interviewees’ explanations of them in terms of themselves or other prisoners (Liebling, 1995). These questions were similar to those asked by Liebling and Krarup (1993) and Snow (1997). In all, I wanted to uncover detainees’ and prisoners’ own accounts of their lives, feelings and experiences (Liebling, 1992). To ensure that no participant was left feeling upset by the interview the last few questions were more upbeat, asking about positive experiences and relationships in the criminal justice system (Adler, 1998).

Due to the sensitive nature of some of the questions, it was appropriate to conduct the interviews using a strategy of disciplined empathy (Medlicott, 1999; 2000). According to Medlicott, this approach involves actively trying to present a warm, non-judgmental and interested demeanour, being open about the aims of the research and respecting participants as knowledgeable sources about the research issues. Alongside disciplined empathy, I took values from feminist research. Oakley (1981: 41) argues that “the goal of finding out about people through interviewing is best achieved when the relationship of interviewer and interviewee is non-hierarchical and when the interviewer is prepared to invest his or her own personal identity in the relationship”. Thus, Oakley has decided

that when she is asked questions she will answer them, regardless of whether they are personal questions or questions about the research. Likewise, Denzin (1989) suggests interviews should be approached as conversations. By disclosing her own experiences and feelings, Berger (2001) also found that rapport was increased between her and her research participants. Ultimately I hoped that by adopting these approaches participants would leave feeling that the interview had been a worthwhile experience and that I had given them an opportunity to be heard and understood (Liebling, 1999b).

With reference to location, Douglas (1985) suggests that because environments have a major effect on emotions and expectations of what is relevant, when conducting interviews participants should be able to choose where they want to be interviewed. Although this may be the ideal, when conducting interviews in the criminal justice system it is rarely possible. Consequently, staff chose which room I used for interviews, although I did try and let the interviewee decide where to sit, allowing them some feeling of control. When conducting interviews, I spoke with participants on their own and the door remained closed to ensure privacy and confidentiality (Singleton et al, 1998b). Like Liebling (1992) and Piacentini (2005), interviews were conducted in a variety of rooms. For example, at court I used cells and interview rooms, always out of the direct view of staff and detainees. Alternatively, in prison, the majority of interviews were undertaken in TV rooms or ‘enhanced’ rooms where windows meant the interviewee and I were always under the watchful gaze of both officers and prisoners. Only once in prison when officers had complete trust in a prisoner was I allowed to conduct an interview in a staff room where no one could see in. Despite tending to be in view or earshot of staff, I was still acutely aware of my safety. Thus, I tried to establish where alarm strips and CCTV cameras were located and was mindful not to disclose any personal information relating to where I lived, where I spent my leisure time, etc.

(Davies, 2000; Genders and Player, 1995; King, 2000; Martin, 2000; Singleton et al, 1998b). In addition, staff were careful not to give me any prisoner or detainee who presented a threat to my safety. On the one occasion when prison officers did have concerns regarding a prisoner I was interviewing, they kept an eye on the situation and in the end removed the prisoner as he was starting to get restless. At no point was it necessary or appropriate to have a second interviewer or prison officer present (Piacentini, 2005; Singleton et al, 1998b).

When conducting interviews, the decision of whether or not to use a tape recorder can only really be made by the researcher as both options involve advantages and disadvantages. Using a tape recorder ensures that no data is lost by a researcher who cannot write as quickly as the interviewee talks, it is less intrusive than writing notes and records tones and pauses (Burgess, 1984; Davies, 2000; Douglas, 1985; Liebling, 1992). However, the main disadvantage with taping interviews is that transcribing them is very time-consuming (Genders and Player, 1995; Martin, 2000). Consequently, taking detailed and extensive notes saves time by removing the need to transcribe, allows the identification of salient issues and time for interviewees to think, makes interviewees feel their contributions are worthwhile and significant, and overcomes the possibility of interviewees withholding sensitive or personal information because it is being recorded (Genders and Player, 1995; Jewkes, 2002; Liebling and Arnold, 2004). Despite these advantages, Liebling and Arnold (2004: 136) argue that written notes lose some of the 'rawness' of interviewees' accounts and they "still have mixed feelings" about having left the tape recorder behind. I decided that the advantages of note taking outweighed the disadvantages of using a tape recorder, plus it overcame the obstacle of having to obtain permission for its use. In addition, I found it easier to listen and follow up on ideas if I was taking notes. In practice I found all my interviewees were

considerate of the fact I was taking notes and would, when necessary, wait for me to catch up or repeat any comments.

It is essential that when undertaking interviews in prison and court, good relationships are developed and maintained with both interviewees and staff. By developing rapport and building a climate of trust, acceptance and openness, the researcher will be invited to see the participant's world from their point of view (Smircich, 1983). There are a number of measures that can be used to foster this rapport. Language plays an important role in developing rapport with interviewees. In particular, the researcher needs to learn the language of their research participants (Burgess, 1984). An easy way of accomplishing this is for interviewers to adopt prison or street slang and to repeat some of the words and phrases interviewees use (Davies, 2000; Jewkes, 2002). Bearing this in mind I found myself, when interviewing prisoners and detainees, adopting prison terminology, being less wary of using slang and even swearing. In contrast, when working alongside police officers / staff I paid particular attention to minimise slang and not to swear. On the other hand, I found I monitored my language less when chatting with prison officers and court staff than I did with police officers. Therefore, depending on the situation I was in, I moulded my language to the people I was talking with in an attempt to increase rapport.

Within the interview, small talk and chitchat are vital first steps in developing rapport and enabling subsequent in-depth discussions (Douglas, 1985). In addition, it is necessary for the interviewer to be pleasant, relaxed and friendly, conveying respect and care and a genuine interest in getting to know the interviewee (Maxfield and Babbie, 2001; Smircich, 1983). The way in which interviewees refer to the interviewer can also affect rapport. For example, Jewkes (2002) found that rapport was influenced by

whether interviewees (adult male prisoners) called her by her first name. Although Jewkes asked all prisoners to call her by her first name a minority insisted on calling her Miss (as they did female officers and other female staff). Jewkes found that these interviews were of limited value, in part because the title was associated with obligations and expectations that affected both her and the interviewee's performance. As a result, these interviewees were more restrained in their language and manner and less likely to build rapport with Jewkes. Whilst it is evident that in Jewkes' research rapport was negatively affected by interviewees calling her Miss, rapport was not affected in the same way in my interviews. I too asked all detainees and prisoners to call me by my first name but found that the majority called me Miss. However, I found no evidence that interviewees who called me Miss had less rapport with me or were restrained in their language or manner. I can only presuppose that these differences were as a result of the sample; all my interviewees were 18 – 21 years old and younger than I was, whilst all of Jewkes' interviewees were over 21 years old and tended to be older than her. In addition, Jewkes discusses how in maintaining good relationships with prisoners and sustaining cordial relationships with staff the least troublesome strategy is to discretely concur with whatever is being said about the other. I too shaped myself to whoever I was speaking with, loosely agreeing with what they were saying to ensure good relationships and rapport were maintained. This was an easy task to perform, as there was no likelihood that prisoners or detainees would talk with staff on such a level. Ultimately, by developing a strong rapport between researchers and interviewees the richest and most detailed data can be obtained (ibid.).

The issue of what to wear can also have an impact on rapport, because dress is a changeable factor and can facilitate research if the researcher wears clothes similar to those worn by the research participants (Maxfield and Babbie, 2001; Warren, 1988).

Although I decided against the prison norm of tracksuit and t-shirt, I did ensure that the clothes I wore could not be construed as any kind of uniform, neither ‘dressing up’ nor ‘dressing down’ (Jewkes, 2002). Davies (2000) notes that the issue of what to wear poses concerns for a researcher, particularly those entering prison for the first time. Having had experience of prison research and bearing in mind the aforementioned points, I decided to wear jeans or combat trousers and jersey tops. My choice of clothes meant I was dressed comfortably and casually, in clothes that could not be perceived as provocative (Genders and Player, 1995; Jewkes, 2002; Tracey, 2004). The importance of wearing comfortable clothes is highlighted by Adams (2000), who on dressing up for her interviews felt uncomfortable, unreal and something she was not.

Alongside semi-structured interviews, I used observations and informal discussions with staff, recording my experiences and observations in a personal field diary. Informal discussions covered how staff felt about their work environment, their experiences of detainees and prisoners who had self-harmed or attempted suicide and the training they had received. During my fieldwork, I continually observed what went on around me, for example, the interactions that occurred between staff, between staff and prisoners, and between prisoners. I found that having to wait for interviews not only allowed me time to have informal discussions with court staff, prison staff and prisoners, but also to observe what went on. Silverman (2001) suggests that ethnographers who do not undertake observations as well as interviews are neglecting a crucial source of data. Likewise, Jewkes (2002) and Martin (2000) suggest that it is important to spend time in the research setting, undertaking observations and interacting with prisoners and staff. However, as stated earlier, it is important to appreciate that researchers, by their mere presence, can affect the research setting (Martin, 2000). This is especially true in a prison where a female researcher is immediately obvious.

Before the data could be analysed it was necessary to type up the interviews. Davies (2000) suggests that when using a tape recorder, it is good practice to transcribe interviews within one or two days of the interview, recording other contextual details as well, for example, where, when and what else was going on. Although a tape recorder was not used, I checked all written notes on the same day as writing them, recording details about where and when the interview had been conducted and what else had been going on. At a later stage, I typed up these written notes in-line with the interview schedule, which resulted in a vast amount of data and the task of reducing it. As Wolcott (1990: 18) notes, “the major problem we face in qualitative inquiry is not to get data, but to get rid of it”. Since the study was essentially exploratory, there were no pre-conceived themes with which to code and organise the data. This was similar to Liebling’s (1992) research, where many of the themes were not apparent at the outset and appeared at various stages, becoming incorporated into the research as it developed. During the first stage of coding, I systematically went through each interview, identifying categories and colour-coding the data accordingly. I modified and added to these categories as progression was made through the interviews. It was then possible for me to group these categories into key themes, identifying similarities and differences between interviewees. Borrill et al (2005) adopted a similar approach. Once these themes were identified, I highlighted those quotations that best illustrated them (Bell, 1999; Borrill et al, 2005; Little, 1990; Wolcott, 1990). In all, analysis aimed to explore the similarities, differences and patterns among interviewees and consider any relationships (Bell, 1999; May and Williams, 1997).

As outlined earlier, both before and during data collection it is necessary to assess the reliability and validity of the research (de Vaus, 1996; Maxfield and Babbie, 2001). Interviews are reliable when others using the same questions and the same sampling

criteria obtain similar data (Newell, 1996). A badly worded question could cause a person to have a different understanding of it on separate occasions (de Vaus, 1996). Therefore, questions were worded carefully, checked by the Suicide Prevention Coordinator and tested in a pilot study. The coding stage can also affect reliability; consequently I was the only one to code the responses (ibid.). In terms of validity, the questions asked in this study were based on previous literature and therefore considered to be a valid method of obtaining opinions about suicide and self-harm. Furthermore, by using different complimentary research methods, the validity of the data was improved (Liebling, 1992).

Identity

The issue of identity has been included as a separate section because it played a central role in shaping my research at the police and court custody suites, and prison. Perception of the researcher's identity not only has an influence on the access provided by gatekeepers, but also the data collected. One aspect of this is the perception of me as an 'insider'. As mentioned earlier, staff at all stages of the criminal justice system were helpful with my research requests. Within the police custody suites, this may have been aided by the fact I normally worked for the Force and was consequently viewed as a semi-insider. More specifically, it is possible to describe my identity as an 'inside outsider' (Brown, 1996). Brown explains how individuals conducting research in the police work either inside, or outside of, Police Forces. Thus, researchers are 'insiders' if they are police officers, or 'outsiders' if they are non-police personnel. The fact that I was a police staff member and not a police officer meant that I was deemed an outsider. However, because I was undertaking research *for* the Force, I was perceived as an 'inside outsider'. My identity as an 'inside outsider' was visibly reinforced by my

wearing of a staff identity card and my carrying of keys. Although, as is later discussed, keys can be a disadvantage in prison research, in the police custody suites I found that, like Jewkes (2002), they authorised my presence and access levels. Keys also allowed me to move freely around the police stations without having to inconvenience staff (Martin, 2000; Liebling and Krarup, 1993). Keys reiterated that I was an insider, which helped with the activity analysis and the informal discussions I had with staff. It was inconsequential if detainees perceived me as an insider because I was not allowed to interview them.

Whilst it was beneficial in the police stations to be perceived as an insider, it was not to my advantage to be seen as an insider in the courts or prison. In order to maintain quality of information, numerous researchers have commented on the need to emphasise to both prisoners and staff that they are not employed by or linked to the Prison Service or Home Office (Jewkes, 2002; Little, 1990; Medlicott, 2000; Sparks et al, 1996). I therefore explained in the interviews that I was not employed by the Prison Service, Court Service or Home Office and that I was a university student undertaking research as part of my PhD. I chose not to disclose the fact I normally worked for the police because of fears of being viewed as a police officer and jeopardising my research. Some may view this as dishonest, but at the time of the research I was on unpaid leave from the police and so was in effect a student. Only once did I disclose this to a prisoner who, as a Listener, I felt could keep my confidence and he agreed with my decision. Conversely, I did tell prison staff and court staff of my normal occupation. In doing so, I was perceived as a form of insider who had knowledge of working for the criminal justice system and who had experience of working shifts. I was therefore seen as being sympathetic to the demands placed on individuals working in the criminal justice system.

In comparison with the police custody suites, my identity as an outsider in the court custody suites and prison was reinforced by the fact I was not given keys. The issue of whether to carry keys has been heavily debated. For example, in prison, keys allow researchers to move around freely without having to inconvenience staff (Liebling and Krarup, 1993; Martin, 2000). However, they can be synonymous with power; Gelsthorpe (1990) never lost the discomfort of carrying keys and the power that they gave her. Similarly, King (2000: 305) will not conduct research where he has to carry keys, arguing “possession of keys is so symbolic of the difference between freedom and captivity that it would place the researcher too close to staff”. Moreover, Martin (2000), Morris and Morris (1963) and Sparks et al (1996) did not carry keys to ensure they were not misidentified by prisoners as employees of the prison or as being part of the establishment, which would have compromised their perceived independence. Not having keys also presents an opportunity to chat informally with staff whilst being escorted, and with detainees and prisoners when awaiting an escort (Liebling and Krarup, 1993). Therefore, whilst acknowledging the benefits of carrying keys in a police station, not having them in courts and prison was a positive experience and held many benefits.

Following on from the researcher as an insider / outsider, the researcher can have a number of identities that can influence how participants define them and the subsequent data they gather. For example, Jewkes (2002) found prisoners assigned to her a number of different identities, based on professional status, social power and gender. It is these personal characteristics, as well as age, social class and ethnicity that shape the research process (Burgess, 1984; Warren, 1988). More specifically, a researcher’s gender, in relation to the gender of the people they are studying, may influence how they are defined and the data they obtain (Silverman, 2001). My gender was the primary aspect

of my identity, probably because it was one of the key characteristics that set me apart from all of my research participants (and a large proportion of the staff). Warren (1998) suggests that within interview research it is almost a truism that women will be able to achieve more rapport than will men, in part because they are perceived as less threatening. This may explain why male prisoners find it easier to talk to a female, rather than male researcher, about their feelings and personal problems, although with some prisoners and certain issues this may be reversed (Genders and Player, 1995; Morris and Morris, 1963; Sparks et al, 1996). Liebling (1999b) also found that female researchers are presumed to have a greater capacity for unconditional emotional support. Likewise, the perception of female researchers as powerless and non-threatening may make it easier for them to gain access into an otherwise difficult and inaccessible setting (Easterday et al, 1982). Additionally, being a female researcher in a prison or criminal justice setting may motivate male prisoners and detainees to participate in the research process (Jewkes, 2002). Such benefits of being a female researcher in a male-dominated environment led Piacentini (2005) to adopt a degree of 'gender bending' in her study of Russian prisons. Piacentini wore cosmetics and jewellery, depending on whom she was interviewing and adopted social skills to either blend in or stand out. Although I was always mindful of not dressing provocatively, I will admit to trying to appear feminine in my dress and demeanour, thus emphasising my female identity.

Lastly, in practice, the researcher adopts a variety of roles, with some being better suited to the situation than others (Agar, 1996; Little, 1990). Smircich (1983) suggests that in the field the researcher adopts a role of learner, whilst Liebling (1992) notes that in prison, the role of the researcher, as perceived by staff and prisoners, is that of observer and listener. I found that by adopting a role of observer and listener I simultaneously

adopted a role of learner. Alternatively, Genders and Player (1995) found themselves increasingly drawn into a therapist role, one that they would respond to by listening and asking questions rather than giving advice or personal opinions. Having no training, I tried to steer away from such a role and on the odd occasion I was asked for advice, referred interviewees to members of staff. Likewise, Sparks et al (1996) argue that the researcher must set clear limits to their knowledge, entitlements and roles, not infringing upon the work of psychologists and probation officers.

The research experience

Although a number of authors have written extensively about how to undertake research within a criminological setting and how their identity affected the data obtained, very few have spoken about their experiences of such research. Where experiences have been detailed, the researchers have tended to be young and female (Farrant, 2005). Consequently, Coffey (1999: 1) concludes, “[a]ll too often, research methods texts remain relatively silent on the ways in which fieldwork affect us, and we affect the field”. Similarly, Farrant (2005: 2) argues that “there continues to be little time, space or credibility for the researcher to contextualise their experience within research reports”. The inclusion of experiences and feelings is particularly important considering “fieldwork is about emotions” (Coffey, 1999: 158). To counteract these criticisms, a discussion will be given of my experiences of conducting research within the criminal justice system, with particular reference to prison.

Sparks et al (1996) comment that doing any prison research is a personally challenging and sometimes troubled experience. However such research can be extremely rewarding; being able to build rapport with a detainee or prisoner so they will disclose

personal feelings is an invaluable experience and allows an in-depth insight into their world. Conducting research in the criminal justice system can be an exhilarating experience, as nothing is predictable, although this can equally be unnerving, never being able to predict what awaits (Newburn and Hayman, 2002). My overall research experience is summed up by Pope et al (2001: 15), who state, “the first realization in conducting research is that things rarely go according to plan”. This was particularly true in terms of gaining access to the research settings. Despite having considered and planned for the possible objections to my research proposal I had not expected such a drawn-out and arduous process. The access stage of any research is crucial, yet to have gone through so many negotiations and re-negotiations resulted in a roller coaster of emotions and, at times, the feeling of despair. Nevertheless, once I had gained access to the establishments I was surprised how unquestioning staff were of my role and the research I was undertaking. This is in contrast to Morris and Morris (1963) who found, at the outset, prison staff to regard their research with suspicion. This perhaps reflects how staff have become used to researchers within their places of employment.

In the previous discussion of ethics, the issue of breaking confidentiality was raised. The decision to discuss concerns regarding a detainee or prisoner with a member of staff is one that has to be made by the individual researcher. As an example, when a female prisoner informed Liebling (1992) that she had smuggled a piece of glass into her cell, Liebling did not inform a prison officer. Liebling obviously did not make this decision lightly and at other times did seek assurance that a prisoner would be followed up or helped in some way. Conversely, when I was confronted with a prisoner who was visibly upset I decided to mention it to a prison officer when being escorted back to the gatehouse. Although the prisoner did not convey feelings of suicide or self-harm, I could not leave the prison without at least informing an officer of his emotional state.

In terms of sampling, staff in the court custody suites and prison selected detainees and prisoners for interviewing. Although staff were careful to select males who met some or all of my criteria, there were times when I felt I was being 'tested'. For example, some detainees or prisoners could not speak any or very little English or were obstructive. On one occasion, a prisoner had such severe learning difficulties that he had problems understanding my questions and would only answer "alright". I always persevered with these interviews but often had to finish them early for both our sakes. There were also times when the concept of voluntary participation was jeopardised. On a couple of occasions I heard officers explaining to prisoners that if they helped the staff by being interviewed, the staff would help them. Although this is reasonable in running an efficient prison, it contradicted the ethical guidelines that I was trying to follow. Consequently, I would explain to officers that the prisoner did not have to be interviewed and where the prisoner agreed to participate, ensured they were happy to do so. The idea that some detainees and prisoners felt pressured to participate may also explain why there were times I could not build rapport or could not get some to talk freely and openly. In addition, there was evidence that participation in the interviews was a means of escaping the boredom of a cell or a tedious job, as found by other researchers (Davies, 2000; Martin, 2000; Moser et al, 2004; Smith and Wincup, 2000; Sparks et al, 1996).

While some interviews had to be cut short, there were equally times when interviews lasted one to two hours, with one lasting two and a half hours. These timings are similar to those found by Liebling (1992) and Medlicott (2000). However, keeping some interviewees on track and talking about the issues at hand was difficult. Nevertheless, I felt interviewees had the right to 'use' me in this manner and so I allowed them this opportunity to chat. Likewise, despite some participants seeming to lack the

communication skills or confidence to allow the interview to move into a conversation, a number of interviewees did ask me personal questions, seeming to relish the opportunity to ask about my research, boyfriend and babies. Where appropriate, I would answer these questions in an attempt to re-address the imbalance of power. Despite the building of good relations within these interview settings, like Farrant (2005), I found them to be temporary and somewhat fragile; without a focus, walks back from interviews tended to be in near silence.

One of the main problems I had in conducting interviews in prison was fitting in around the daily regime of meal times, education, gym, etc. Consequently, sometimes interviews were cut short because the prisoner had to go elsewhere and then trying to finish the interview later proved too disjointed. Furthermore, on a couple of occasions prisoners, whose interviews were cut short, were going to be released the following day or had court hearings to attend. In addition to the prison regime, one interview was stopped because a fight broke out; officers needed the room to secure other prisoners and after calm had been restored all prisoners were returned to their respective cells. During a couple of interviews I also found prisoners were affected negatively by their medication and were too tired or too dazed to carry on with the questions.

A central concern during the research phase was the interview data itself. Piacentini (2005) describes how during her research she anxiously questioned the relevance of her data suggesting, “the possibility of a data deficit is an issue facing all social science researchers”. Despite this possibility, very few researchers admit to such anxieties. Where they do, concerns or problems are hidden away. For example, when discussing interviews that had been undertaken with young male prisoners, which yielded “insufficiently comprehensive” information, Little (1990: 20) merely comments how he

conducted further interviews. He fails to explain why the interviews were ‘insufficiently comprehensive’. In comparison, both before and during the research phase I had worries and fears that I was not getting enough data, my data was not relevant, did not match my expectations and that I was not conducting ‘good’ research. I was also concerned that I was not getting ‘deep’ enough and exploring issues fully. This was partially because I did not want to push interviewees too far, for fear of distressing them; whilst I am a researcher, I hate to see or cause others upset. Furthermore, having read numerous criminology texts that contained deep and meaningful quotes from prisoners I felt inadequate that I was not obtaining such literary masterpieces. In the end, I had to reach an acceptance that such insightful accounts by interviewees in Medlicott’s (1999; 2000) research would probably not come from a sample of 18 – 21 year old male offenders, where many had admitted to absconding from school. I also found that whilst some interviewees spoke in depth about their experiences, thoughts and feelings, others were reticent and monosyllabic in their responses. It was not clear whether this was because of literacy problems or because some did not have the appropriate words to express themselves (a common problem for those who self-harm) or that they did not want to discuss personal thoughts or feelings. Reassuringly, when talking with a psychologist at Glen Parva YOI, who had transferred from an adult male prison, she too found it hard working with this age group, in terms of the responses they gave (or rather did not give). Equally, Farrant (2005: 15) notes:

How child-like many of them seemed, so far away from the young adults they were supposed to be. I think of how some were keen to talk whilst others were monosyllabic and inarticulate. It is not just that they don’t necessarily know what would help them most; some do not have the words to express their needs.

By reading such accounts and accepting that I may not find the literary masterpieces I had so hoped for, I began to appreciate the data I had obtained, in part for its sometimes crude take on life. In doing so, I realised its benefits, relevance and significance to the current debates.

Even though I only completed two to four in-depth interviews each day, I found them exhausting, probably because of the emotive subject and because interviewees discussed personal feelings and experiences. When Genders and Player (1995) conducted their interviews and heard about prisoners' past crimes, they had to repress inherent feelings of shock and disgust. In a similar respect, during her interviews with suspects, Adams (2000) experienced hate towards some of her interviewees, feeling that they got what they deserved. However, she also felt love towards some, believing that they had gone astray and needed understanding and protection from harm. Due to the nature of my research it was not necessary to learn of the crimes that interviewees had committed. Nonetheless, many of the interviewees talked about their crimes. Unlike Genders and Player, and Adams, I never felt hatred towards an interviewee, perhaps because I was spared most of the details. I did however develop a fondness for some of the prisoners, particularly those who I met a few times and those that had seized opportunities within prison. For example, I got on well with Philip, who was a unit orderly and who I met on a number of occasions when visiting his unit to conduct interviews. I also established good rapport with Mark, who was a cleaner on the induction unit and Ricky, who was a Listener. It is necessary to explain here that as 'Ricky' is quoted elsewhere and because there are only a small number of Listeners at Glen Parva YOI, another pseudonym is used when discussing his role as a Listener.

Lastly, one aspect of research that I found difficult dealing with was invading detainees' and prisoners' privacy. During one of my first visits to a police custody suite, I was invited to look through a cell hatch so I could see inside a cell. Because the cell was occupied, the accompanying Sergeant checked that the detainee was 'decent' before I looked in. On doing so, I observed the detainee asleep, but was left feeling regretful that I had invaded this man's privacy for no justified reason. Equally, in one of the custody suites, in-cell CCTV had been fitted to a number of cells for detainees at-risk of suicide or self-harm. Unfortunately, the screens on which to view the CCTV were observed within a central room where officers, staff, nurses, official visitors, etc. would walk through, although the camera operator would switch away if the detainee was using the toilet or if they had removed their clothing. I again found myself in a situation where I was keen to observe all that I could, but one in which I felt troubled for participating in this invasion of privacy. Whilst using CCTV to monitor at-risk detainees is undoubtedly a positive response, it should be monitored away from other staff, nurses, visitors and visitors. Similarly, during my familiarisation phase at Glen Parva YOI, I was shown inside a number of cells whilst prisoners were out, including those belonging to a lifer and a Listener. On both of these occasions, I later met the prisoners and, realising that I had already been inside their cells without their knowledge, felt disrespectful and somewhat ashamed. Although I apologised, neither appeared concerned by my intrusion, having become accustomed to their cells being frequented by officers and visitors. Baer (2004: 215) also felt he was "intruding into someone's personal territory in walking into prison cells". Likewise, Wacquant (2002: 378) states:

I can't tame the nauseating feeling of being a voyeur, an intruder into this plagued space. At the same time, it's obvious that it is not the inmates' space either. Nothing is theirs here. It's obvious in the manner

we walk by without addressing them. I would like to say ‘I’m sorry to disturb you’, but it would be incongruous. Their faces tell me that much.

In summary, this methodology chapter has outlined how the aim and objectives of my study were met using quantitative and qualitative research methods. An overview of the research settings has been provided, alongside the difficulties I had in gaining access to these establishments. The ethical guidelines that I considered whilst developing the research and undertaking the fieldwork have also been outlined. Subsequently, I provided an in-depth account of the quantitative and qualitative research, including the sampling procedure, data collection, pilot study, data analysis, and reliability and validity. Following on from this, I demonstrated how a researcher’s identity might influence access given by gatekeepers and the data collected. Lastly, I hope this chapter has given a unique insight into my experiences and feelings as a relatively young female PhD student undertaking research in the criminal justice system. The four chapters that follow are based primarily on this qualitative research and explore the pains of custody that young males continue to face in today’s criminal justice system, how these young males cope and the support services with which they are provided.

Chapter Three: Pains of Custody - Sykes

By exploring the pains that young males face within the modern day custodial process, and the resulting harm that these can cause, an understanding can be gained of why individuals need support and the types of support they require. The most notable author in this area is Sykes (1958), who identifies five pains of imprisonment. Within the literature review, it was argued that these pains remain largely uncontested; there is currently little understanding of whether they apply to today's young male prisoners or if they extend to the wider criminal justice system. The evidence presented here shows that nearly fifty years on, these pains are pertinent to today's young male sentenced prisoners. However, until now they have yet to be challenged. Consequently, whilst Sykes was uniquely concerned with the deprivations experienced by long-term prisoners at a maximum-security prison in the USA, it is apparent that some of these deprivations are more wide-ranging, extending to remand prisoners and detainees in English police cells, court cells and escort vehicles. Moreover, by examining the whole criminal justice system, a further thirteen pains of custody can now be identified. Hence, it is more appropriate to refer to these pains of imprisonment as pains of custody. Although there is some overlap between these 'pains', analysing them separately draws attention to the subtle differences between the feelings and behaviours experienced in each category.

Deprivation of liberty

Sykes (1958) suggests that one of the most obvious pains of imprisonment is the deprivation of liberty, with this deprivation being twofold; individuals are not only confined to prison, but also within it. A number of interviewees commented on how

they missed their freedom whilst in prison. Matthew explained the significance of this deprivation:

[I miss] freedom - that's it – the most important thing to a human being.... you can't handle jail..... no one can handle it without freedom – everyone needs freedom.

Other interviewees stated; “that’s all I’m thinking about – my freedom” (Sam), “you’ve got no freedom” (Simon), “[I miss] freedom” (Alan) and “[I miss] my family, just being in [prison] and wanting to get out – walking around and being free, that’s it” (Jonathan). Part of this pain, which is also associated with the deprivation of autonomy and control, is the fact prisoners are confined *within* prison and not free to make choices. For example, Adam commented “you just miss being out there – do what you want, like go shop” and Danny stated:

[I miss] being free, just doing my own thing, seeing my friends, seeing my family... you take things for granted out there – when you’re in here all you do is think.

Because of the deprivation of liberty, some interviewees found prison hard to endure. In particular, interviewees commented:

[Prison’s] hard... really hard.... I wake up in a morning... it’s like a nightmare not going away (Paul).

It is [hard], just being locked up all the time... you can't see your family
– you just do the same thing everyday – I think I'll get out one day and
all of this will be the past – I won't go back there again (Jonathan).

Equally, interviewees stated; "I hate it.... I just can't wait to get out... at times I think it's very hard" (Mark), "it's too bad for me.... it's too hard..... everything's hard, everything" (Mohammed), "course it's hard... I think I'm going to have hard jail for the last 18 months" (Jack) and "[prison's hard] sometimes – not all the times – just sometimes – when you're in a low mood" (Gareth).

Although no interviewee specifically commented on the deprivation of liberty in respect to police or court custody, it may be possible to expand this pain to the wider criminal justice system. Young people spend considerably long periods confined within police cells and court cells. More specifically, the police custody activity analysis (see appendix G) showed that young male detainees spent, on average, 7 hours and 46 minutes being confined within a police cell. This equates to approximately 85% of their total time at the police station (the average total time was 9 hours and 10 minutes, with times ranging from 48 minutes to 36 hours). From my own observations, the majority of detainees in court custody suites spent far more time being held in a court cell than they did in a courtroom. Consequently, it would appear that young detainees face the deprivation of liberty with respect to being confined *within* police cells and court cells. It is possible that interviewees did not comment on this pain here because it was only a temporary deprivation of liberty; on being transferred to prison, this pain becomes more longstanding, lasting for weeks, months or years, rather than hours or days. Alternatively, because detainees are in a liminal phase, they may perceive police cells

and court cells as transitional stages, with the possibility of freedom at the end (Harvey, 2004; 2007).

Even in prison, despite attempts to improve time-out-of-cell, young prisoners spend the majority of their time locked in their cells. For example, in 2003 – 2004, young prisoners at Glen Parva YOI spent an average of 7.09 hours per weekday out of their cell, which decreased to 3.53 hours for the whole weekend (Solomon, 2004). However, evidence suggests some spend even longer locked in their cells; Alan commented that whilst on remand:

You're locked up all the time... I thought you were only locked up all the time at Belmarsh.... [you spend] 23 hours a day, if not more [locked up].

Adrian and Craig also explained that they had spent most of their first few weeks and months on remand “banged up”. This confinement may be especially difficult for remand prisoners to deal with, as some are awaiting trial and as yet have not been found guilty. Similar criticisms were made of the induction unit; “no soc², just banged up for the whole two weeks” (Danny), “no gym, no soc – bang up for 23 hours” (Jack), “in here it's pure banged up in your cells 23 hours a day – I can't cope with being banged up all the time” (Ryan) and “you're not out your cell much at all” (Richard). Despite statistics suggesting that time-out-of cell has improved, some prisoners (particularly those on remand or induction) face long and sometimes painful periods confined within their cells.

² The term ‘soc’ is slang for association

While Sykes identifies the deprivation of liberty, he fails to establish that it can be felt more acutely at certain times of the year and although refers to holy days and holidays, he does not discuss the different experiences of Christmas or recognise the other religious or traditional holidays. This is of particular relevance to today's prisons, where the population has become more diverse, with a greater number of foreign prisoners and prisoners from different racial groups (Genders and Player, 1989; Lyon, 2006). Despite these cultural and religious differences, interviewees within the present sample only referred to one religious period, Christmas, probably because the interviews were undertaken in the weeks running up to Christmas, including Christmas Eve. Jewkes (2002) suggests that the reality of losing one's liberty and the distinction between prison life and 'normal' life is felt more acutely at this time of year. Interviewees too commented that being inside prison was painful enough, but Christmas and New Year made this pain greater to bear. In particular, interviewees stated:

I only got 5 months – it's not the sentence it's the time of year.... it's just the wrong time of year (Ben).

[The thought of Christmas is] really stressing me out... I've been crying.... I'm just missing Christmas here (Joe).

[Christmas inside's] not nice, I don't like it.... I should be out there with my family (Gary).

I haven't seen my son for a long time.... I look at the [Christmas] card and think fucking hell what am I doing in here..... at the moment I just try and hide it... it is going to be hard but I'm just trying to be positive...

I know at New Year I'm not going to be good... I reckon I won't be too good this year (Mark).

The only known author to make specific reference to such pains is ex-prisoner Boyle (1985: 254), who writes on Boxing Day 1980:

I'm locked up and shutting out all the emotions of the occasion but keeping myself intact and together. I see everyone here struggling through what is obviously a difficult period for them.

Like the above prisoners, Boyle notes how the time of year exacerbates the pains of custody. In addition to the Christmas and New Year period, the summer months can prove hard; "it was [hard] for me at first.... May, June, July, August were hard months – it was summer and I was stressed out" (Shaun). Boyle too writes about 'stolen time' and the joys of being allowed out of prison on day release during the summer months. A possible peak in suicides supports the pain of these summer months (Dooley, 1990a; SCG, 2001). More specifically, House (1990: 587) argues "surely the explanation for an increase in prison suicides in the summer months is that it is during those long hot days that loss of liberty becomes hardest to bear?" Furthermore, particular days of the year can be harder for prisoners to endure; depression and self-harm may be triggered by important anniversaries, especially birthdays and children's birthdays (Howard League, 1999b). A number of prisoners spoke of their pain of having missed their sons' and daughters' birthdays and Christmases. For example, Shaun noted, "I've missed every birthday of [my nephew]..... I've missed too much".

Deprivation of goods and services

Secondly, Sykes (1958) identifies the deprivation of goods and services. Despite improvements to the conditions in which prisoners are held, this deprivation continues to exist within today's prisons and within police cells and court cells. Sykes suggests that prisoners not only want or need the 'necessities of life', but also amenities, for example, cigarettes, alcohol, individual clothing, individual furnishings and interesting foods. Subsequently, by being denied these items, prisoners face a painful loss. Before discussing the deprivation of goods and services, it is appropriate to explain about the necessities of life and how these may have changed over the last fifty years.

The 'necessities of life' were established within the 1999 Poverty and Social Exclusion Survey of Britain, conducted by Gordon et al (2000). Following earlier surveys in 1983 and 1990, it asked a sample of the public to indicate which household goods and activities they considered to be necessities. The necessities were not restricted to the "basic material needs of a subsistence diet, shelter, clothing and fuel. There are *social customs, obligations* and *activities* that substantial majorities of the population also identify as among the top necessities of life" (Gordon et al, 2000: 16, original emphasis). These necessities do not remain constant, but change over time as people's attitudes are affected by changes in taste and technology, and the average wealth of the population increases; goods that are introduced into the market often start as luxuries, but in later years become necessities (ibid.). Although these necessities do not transfer directly into prison, prisoners may expect different goods and services in comparison with fifty years ago.

The pain of having lost goods and services permeates through every stage of the criminal justice system, with interviewees' frustrations centring on the loss of amenities rather

than personal possessions. A recurrent theme was the poor quality and quantity of food provided to individuals. Whilst Sykes acknowledges that prisoners want or need interesting food as well as sufficient quantities of it, this pain can be extended to individuals being detained in police cells. Within police stations there are no cooking facilities, hence meals are either those that can be cooked in a microwave or to which boiling water can be added. Consequently, there were a number of complaints about the quality. For example, Simon stated:

The food's disgusting.... you wouldn't give your dog that... you can't eat it coz it's disgusting.

Other prisoners commented; "it's horrible – manky, horrible, bright orange microwave food" (Shaun), "its horrible... it weren't nice" (Danny), "it was horrible but I had to eat something" (Alex), "I don't eat sometimes – it's horrible" (Kieran) and "I don't really eat them – I don't like them – they're still frozen when they give me them" (Gareth). Within the courts, detainees were either provided with microwave meals or a sandwich pack, neither provoking any significant criticism, partly because detainees spend the least amount of time in court cells in comparison with police stations or prison. However, criticisms were made of the food at Glen Parva YOI; "I wouldn't even bring my dog here. ... I wouldn't even give my dog the food here" (Nick), "it's cooked too much or not cooked at all" (Steven), "it's horrible.... the way they cook it – it's like it's not cooked half the time" (Gareth), "it's nasty, [but] you have to get used to it" (Matthew) and "it's not nice.... you get enough at dinner but at lunch you don't get enough food" (Danny). Similar concerns were raised by HMCIP (2006) during their inspection of young adult establishments, although their criticisms of Glen Parva YOI centred on the timing of prisoners' meals.

A second criticism was the quality of bedding and furnishings within the criminal justice system, especially the bedding provided in police cells. Criticisms largely arose because some individuals were detained overnight in police cells and therefore wanted to sleep, yet they were not provided with proper beds or bedding (partly for health and safety reasons). Within the Poverty and Social Exclusion Survey, having a bed and bedding is deemed to be a necessity by 98% of 16 – 24 year olds. Although it cannot be concluded that these necessities apply equally to the criminal justice system, it can be suggested that they do influence young people's expectations of their environment. For example, detainees might expect to be provided with a bed and bedding that is of a sufficient quality. Instead, interviewees found; "I was sweating like anything – the mattress coz it was plastic stuck to me.... I didn't have a pillow if I wanted to go to sleep" (Mark), "you get a bad back from laying on the thin mattresses" (Ben), "[they could give you] better bedding – thicker blankets – they're too cold" (Kieran), "what they give you to sleep in – those quilts – are horrible – make you itch" (Danny) and "it was cold but they give you them sheets... [though] they make me itch" (Robert). Similar criticisms were made of the benches in court cells, although these were not used for sleeping overnight:

[You feel] pissed off when you get to court coz you're waiting and you don't know what's gonna happen.... the court cells are totally shit.... you ain't even got a mattress – it's just a wooden bench (Alan).

Other criticisms in relation to court cells included; "[the cells have a] wooden bench – I hate them you know.... no mattresses... freezing" (Matthew), "it was dead small, I mean like a box – all it had was a wooden box for a seat" (Danny), "horrible, you're just sitting on wood" (Sam) and "they could be a bit more better... you can't go to sleep in the court cells – it's just wood" (Richard). Even though interviewees spent far longer in

their prison beds, only a couple criticised them; Adam described them as “horrible” and Ricky commented that now he was a Listener the mattress was better than the standard one.

Even though smoking is allowed in prison, it has been prohibited in a number of police stations, courts and escort vehicles. Consequently, a number of interviewees commented on the fact they had been deprived of cigarettes; “it’s nasty, all police stations are nasty.... you’ve not even got a fag to smoke” (Jack) and “I got quite annoyed as you’re not allowed to smoke [at X police station] anymore” (Alex). Adam explained in more depth why he felt detainees should be allowed to smoke in police stations and courts:

If you’re addicted to heroin or crack you can get medication. [At a police station] you get nothing if addicted to cigarettes... it would stop people getting angry... especially after you’ve been interviewed... you start to get wound up... get stressed..... worse now as can’t smoke at magistrates.

Not only does the pain of not being allowed to smoke affect detainees and prisoners, but because of a lack of money, prisoners often smoke roll-ups rather than cigarettes. As a result, Gary stated, “I miss smoking proper fags”. The pain of losing these goods may be linked to the possibility that cigarettes are a perceived necessity of life for some individuals. Although the Poverty and Social Exclusion Survey now excludes having a ‘packet of cigarettes every other day’ (because they are addictive and therefore not a suitable indicator of poverty; Gordon et al, 1999), in 1983 14% of adults deemed them a necessity. By 1990, this had increased to 18%. It is possible that these interviewees

deemed smoking a necessity of life, particularly in stressful situations and found the prohibition of this necessity hard to accept.

Despite evidence to the contrary from Caird (1974), Coyle (1994), Goffman (1961) and Harvey (2004; 2007), only a couple of prisoners mentioned the pain of losing individual clothing when arriving at Glen Parva YOI. For Joe, having his personal clothing removed and having to wear prison clothes meant he hated receiving visits:

Everyone looks nice and you're dressing in prison clothes.... I don't find it good for me.

There are a number of explanations why Joe felt this way; it may have simply been because he did not like the way he looked in prison clothes, because he was embarrassed to be seen without his usual clothing or because the prison clothing reinforced his identity as a prisoner and as an 'outsider' to his visitors. For Alan, the pain of having to wear prison clothing centred on the fact he did not know who had previously worn them:

They took all my property off me and that... I was pissed off..... I had to wear these shit clothes – some rapist could have had them on.

Not only was wearing the "shit" prison clothes a negative experience for Alan, but the possibility that a rapist could have worn them made it worse; a rapist could 'dirty' or 'contaminate' the clothing even more so than another prisoner. Wearing such clothing also threatened Alan's identity. Rapists are arguably a subordinated masculinity, like child sex murderers, and consequently occupy a position at the bottom of the hierarchy (Jewkes, 2005; Sim, 1994). In an environment where such rigid hierarchies are carefully

maintained, Alan felt violated at the prospect of being dirtied or contaminated by clothes that had previously been worn by a prisoner considered to be residing near or at the very lowest stratum of prisoner society.

Despite the above reactions, interviewees were generally indifferent towards having had their personal clothing removed. For example, Paul stated “what’s the point dressing up in prison”, referring to remand prisoners who chose to wear their own clothes and Craig felt there was no point being affected by it, commenting “I knew it’d happen anyway”. Likewise, Philip noted that it was “shit” having his clothes taken off him but he could not do anything about it so had to accept it. Cohen and Taylor (1972: 133) also found indifference amongst long-term male prisoners, concluding “[s]uch ceremonies (exchanging one’s name for a number, adoption of prison clothes, loss of personal possessions) were already familiar to most of the men and had long since ceased to be fundamentally disconcerting”. Although the present interviewees were not long-term prisoners, the majority had been in prison before. Therefore, it is understandable why a number had resigned themselves to such a loss. Alternatively, it is possible that more prisoners were distressed by this loss but did not mention it; other losses may have taken precedence in the interview setting. Another explanation is that evidence from the Poverty and Social Exclusion Survey suggests that young people have become less materialistic and that 16 – 24 year olds consider all clothing items as less important than all adults (Gordon et al, 2000). This includes ‘new, not second-hand clothes’, which only 35% of 16 – 24 year olds identified as a necessity in 1999, in comparison with 59% in 1990 and 50% of adults in 1999. Perhaps young people have become more accepting of wearing second-hand clothes, although it is hard to envisage young people favourably comparing the prison uniform with these.

Lastly, there are a number of issues highlighted within the following chapter that are associated with the deprivation of goods and services; to prevent repetition these will only be mentioned briefly here. The pain of facing a loss of stimulation and having nothing constructive with which to fill their time can be particularly hard for prisoners and detainees to deal with. This pain may be understood by the fact that between 1990 and 1999 the perceived necessity of having a hobby or leisure activity increased from 67% to 80% for 16 – 24 year olds (Gordon et al, 2000). Thus having, and being able to participate in, a hobby or leisure activity is one of the top ten necessities for young people and losing such stimulation in the criminal justice system is difficult to cope with.

Losing access to a telephone can be frustrating for young prisoners, particularly for those trying to sustain relationships with partners. This loss may be exacerbated by the finding that 91% of 16 – 21 year olds not in education have access to a mobile phone (Haste, 2005). In addition, the perceived necessity of having a telephone has increased from 45% to 59% between 1990 and 1999 for 16 – 24 year olds (Gordon et al, 2000). Consequently, Sykes did not identify this deprivation in the 1950s because prisoners did not have the same access to telephones that prisoners have today (Crewe, 2007). However, no interviewee made reference to having lost access to their mobile phone, instead only making reference to the pains associated with having to share a communal phone.

A later chapter (chapter five) highlights the importance of television in prison and the central role it plays in entertaining and stimulating young prisoners. The perceived necessity of television has fallen from 53% in 1990 to 42% in 1999 amongst 16 – 24 year olds, yet it is evident from interviewees' comments that television is perceived as a

necessity in prison (Gordon et al, 2000). Thus, when faced with its loss, prisoners find it difficult to cope. For example, Matthew explained how he had smashed his television because prison officers had not fixed it; “I got 14 extra days for smashing a TV.... coz they were stitching me up... the power had blew and they weren’t sorting it out.... my TV’s my life in here.... I will stay up till 4 o’clock in the morning to watch films”. Again, Sykes did not identify this loss because televisions were not available to the same extent as they are today and prisoners were used to finding alternative stimulation (for example, reading).

Although the Poverty and Social Exclusion Survey is of some use in understanding the necessities of life, it is important to note that it can only be used as a guide within prison; no known study of these necessities has actually been undertaken with prisoners. Furthermore, this Survey is now 7 years old and does not include recent advances within technology. For example, mobile phones, DVD players, the Internet, email, computer games and MP3 players. This is important considering research shows that over 90% of plus-16 year olds not in education have access to mobile phones, the Internet and email (Haste, 2005). With 55% of 11 – 21 year old males feeling unable to be without video games on play stations or personal computers (ibid.). The impact of losing these items in prison needs to be examined in future research.

Deprivation of sexual relationships

The nature of the criminal justice system means that detainees and prisoners are separated from partners and hence lose heterosexual relationships, which Sykes identifies as the third pain of imprisonment. Although this is titled the ‘deprivation of sexual relationships’ and thus includes homosexual relationships, none of the

interviewees referred to a homosexual partner. As suggested within the literature review, no evidence shows that this pain extends to the wider criminal justice system (police cells or court cells), possibly because individuals are only held in these locations for relatively short periods.

With reference to losing a heterosexual relationship, a number of interviewees mentioned missing their girlfriend, in particular; “it’s hard – being away from my girlfriend” (Ben), “[I miss] cuddling my girlfriend... I miss my girlfriend I know if I keep coming here she’s not going to wait for me” (Gareth) and “I miss everything – I miss.... my girlfriend” (Gary). When these relationships were going badly or had ended, some prisoners felt such pain and distress that they either self-harmed or contemplated suicide. Alex, who was relatively sporadic in his self-harm, described how he had started to punch the wall after splitting up with his girlfriend, explaining that he did it because “I was upset – I generally get angry when I get upset”. When asked if it had helped, he replied, “not really... [though] it’s better than going out there and punching someone”. He had also thought about suicide, stating, “when I was in [Glen Parva YO] after I lost my girlfriend I did [think about committing suicide] – but I wouldn’t have done it.... at first I thought about doing it”. However, Alex decided against this, explaining “no point in doing it.... I’ve just blocked my ex out my life.... it’s just moving on time... I feel happier now”. Likewise, Alan had contemplated suicide after things were going badly with his girlfriend. In the end, he wrote to his girlfriend saying he would hang himself. Although Alan stated at the time he was only joking, he also said, “I was feeling like it, but I wouldn’t have done it”. Nevertheless, his pad mate told officers of his intentions and he was moved to the Healthcare Centre.

Some interviewees resorted to ending relationships because they were in prison, possibly to avert the above distress. Danny, who was due to serve a minimum of two years, explained how he had ended a relationship with his girlfriend:

I was thinking about myself and a bit of her... coz when you're in here you're always worrying about her... [worrying that she's] cheating... you don't need it when you're in here.

Likewise, with reference to his girlfriend, Jonathan (on remand at Glen Parva YOI), stated whilst being interviewed at court, "I told her if I had to do over a year I'd split up with her". Other interviewees who were not in long-term relationships, referred to missing girls in general; "girls..... that's the only thing that I miss – hugs, kisses.... I'd kill someone for a hug" (Jack). However, only a couple of interviewees mentioned missing sexual intercourse, with Danny stating "I'm sexually frustrated", explaining how it was made even more difficult by being around so many female nurses. This small number may have been because relatively few prisoners were in long-term sexual relationships or because they were too embarrassed to discuss this loss with a relatively young female researcher.

Further to the deprivation of sexual relationships, Sykes suggests that the deprivation of heterosexual interaction can cause psychological problems with self-image. However, no interviewee referred to this loss of interaction, probably because it now exists within our prisons. When Sykes and other earlier authors (for example, Caird, Cohen and Taylor, Goffman, Mathiesen) were writing, female prison officers were not employed in British male prisons; they were only introduced in 1982 (Crawley, 2004). Consequently, the prison was "a society composed exclusively of men" (Sykes, 1958: 71). For example, as

one Senior Prison Officer commented in Crawley's (2004: 16) study, there were no females at all when he joined in 1967; "I don't mean female officers, there were no females, full stop. It was a very, very male orientated, dominated environment". In comparison, in October 2000, 10.9% of Glen Parva YOI's prison officers were female (Liebling and Price, 2001). When I visited in 2004 it was also apparent that a significant proportion of the Healthcare staff and administrative staff were female. In addition, the majority of prisoners at Glen Parva YOI had open visits with their female partners, friends and relatives, where they were allowed limited physical contact with them. This contrasts with Sykes' research where prisoners could only see visitors from behind a plate glass window and had to communicate via a telephone. Therefore, the male prison has moved from a male orientated and dominated environment to one where prisoners are interacting with females on a daily basis. No longer is the deprivation of heterosexual interaction considered a pain of custody.

Deprivation of autonomy and control

As outlined in the literature review, the deprivation of liberty confines individuals *within* the criminal justice system, subjecting them to a vast number of rules and restrictions (Coyle, 1994; Howard League, 1999b; Irwin and Owen, 2005; Sapsford, 1983; Sykes, 1958). Consequently, according to Sykes (1958), prisoners face the deprivation of autonomy, which should be extended to include the deprivation of control. Within the earlier deprivation of liberty section, interviewees' responses highlighted how some missed the freedom of choice. Other interviewees spoke about a loss of control over everyday decisions:

Some [prison officers] are proper power freaks..... you eat when you're told to.... you've basically got no life no more..... [I miss] being able to do what I want to do (Paul).

[You can't] eat what you want, sleep when you want, drink what you want (Matthew).

[You miss] not being able to do something when you want to do it (Adrian).

Adam also spoke about this lack of control but had become more accepting of it, perhaps because he had spent a large proportion of the last six years in prison; "it's not nice being told what to do, but you sort of expect it".

A contributing factor to this lack of control was that prisoners would be moved around the prison and they had no power to prevent it. Paul described how he had got settled on a unit but was then moved:

Like a chess game... they can pick you up and move you.

Similarly, Gary stated, "it's a bit stupid though – you get settled on one place and get used to the officers then they send you off again". Harvey (2007) too identified the disruptive nature of these moves and having to adapt all over again. Some interviewees were even moved to different prisons; "that's the worst thing – you get settled in a prison... get to know people... know how the prison works, get into a routine" (Dean). Previous research has found that prisoners were given insufficient notice of planned

moves to other prisons (HMIP, 2004). Although for security reasons there are times when prisoners cannot be given forewarning, it is another example of how the Prison Service holds ultimate control over prisoners.

Conversely, there are times when individuals want a move to a different prison but have no ability to influence or control this decision; this can lead to devastating levels of distress. Ryan explained how he self-harmed because he hated being inside Glen Parva YOI and wanted a move. Although he had not self-harmed whilst in the police cell or courts cell, he had whilst on remand. When asked why he self-harmed he stated, “fuck knows – probably coz it’s a crap jail”. After being probed about a recent incident of self-harm, Ryan said, “I can’t remember, I got no fags, I was banged up, I was feeling shit.... inside my head – it does your head in that Glen Parva”. Subsequently, Ryan spoke of an attempt to hang himself because he hated being at Glen Parva YOI and wanted to be moved:

I tried to kill myself probably.... because it’s a shit jail that is.... [but]
the screws come in and stopped me..... I hung myself with a quilt.... the
screws came past and stopped me – they took the bed sheet from around
my neck.

When asked if he was glad that prison officers had found him, Ryan stated, “I don’t know.... probably not coz I’m still here – all I want is to move to [another YOI]”. When probed whether he had tried to hang himself in order to be moved or because he wanted to die, Ryan replied “probably both... they won’t give me a form or nothing [to move]”, explaining that by hurting himself he had hoped to be moved. Ryan therefore appeared to be resorting to more serious methods of hurting himself in a desperate bid to be

moved. Whilst some may argue that these attempts are attention seeking, they may represent the desperation young prisoners face when having no control over their location and being held long distances from home. For example, in 2004, 35% of 18 – 20 year olds held in prison were more than 50 miles away from their home town, 12% of whom were being held over a hundred miles away (Hansard, 2004).

In terms of the rules and restrictions that are used to control prisoners, Paul spoke of how he felt that they were unfairly administered and this led to feelings of disdain. Paul described how prison officers were seen smoking in the association area and exercise yard, yet prisoners were only allowed to smoke in their cells, commenting “one rule for us another rule for them..... it boils down to uniform”. Likewise, Irwin and Owen (2005: 105) conclude, “prisoners are governed by a vast and pervasive set of rules. These rules frustrate and anger prisoners because of the extensive and arbitrary manner in which they are enforced”. Equally, I observed police officers or staff smoking on police property, but detainees would be unequivocally told that they were not allowed to smoke.

Lastly, the prison regime removes any remaining dignity that a prisoner has left, by making them ask for little things (Dooley, 1994; Goffman, 1961). This element of control is evident in the police cells where I observed detainees making requests via an intercom or buzzer for food, drinks, blankets, magazines and toilet paper. Again, in the court cells, detainees would use a buzzer to get the attention of a member of staff so they could get a drink or use the toilet. Likewise, whilst in the association areas at Glen Parva YOI, I observed prisoners asking to use the telephone and requesting clean clothing. I also observed razors being handed out to prisoners during lunchtimes. Whilst it is acknowledged that for reasons of health and safety (particularly to reduce the risk of

suicide or self-harm) or risk of damage, razors cannot be left in cells, these are all examples of how the criminal justice system retains control and power over young males.

Deprivation of security

The final pain of imprisonment that Sykes (1958) identifies is the deprivation of security, which, according to Medlicott (2001), is one of the most fearful expectations confronting those who enter prison. A number of interviewees described how, prior to entering prison, they had been fearful of a loss of security. In particular, Joe had feared violence from prison officers and fellow prisoners:

I didn't expect to find such nice people... I was scared that I might have a pad mate who beat me up..... I thought in prison [the prison officers would] beat you up... in this prison it's all about the psychological things... dealing with you psychologically not physically.... I thought I'd be crying everyday but I find it normal.

Others had feared bullying or violence:

[I was worried about] fighting, getting bullied, getting bothered by other people, getting raped – it ain't that bad in Glen Parva... it's better [than what I expected] – but I still don't like it (Jonathan).

[I expected] to be locked up all day, to get terrorised – you don't (Adrian).

I thought it would be a lot rougher, I didn't think the officers would talk to you with respect... it's up to you how you make your life in prison – you can make it easy or hard (Danny).

[I expected it] to be proper rough – I remember seeing it on TV – fighting and that... you can do more stuff than I thought you could – work, go gym, education, soc (Kieran).

For one prisoner, Dean, this fear was realised during his first prison sentence at Onley:

I sat there and everyone was shouting out the window..... [I thought] I'm gonna get fucked up here, I'm gonna get bullied..... I got terrorised... I thought it was the end of the world.

Unfortunately, research has shown that such fears are justified and that a loss of security in prison is not uncommon (Adler, 1998; Edgar et al, 2003; Howard League, 1999a; Scraton et al, 1991; Sim, 1994; Tempest, 2007). In particular, Hulley and Smith (2005: 17) conclude that “prisoner-on-prisoner victimisation is a serious problem”, with prisoners being victims of verbal abuse, threats, assaults and theft. Nevertheless, as the above quotes highlight, these fears are not always realised. This is similar to Harvey (2005), who found that most in his study of 18 – 21 year old male prisoners at Feltham YOI had concerns over their safety, but these initial fears were often dispelled at an early phase.

In addition, a loss of security may be evident in police cells, where detainees fear violence from police officers. In particular, Mohammed, who was from Iraq, had

transferred his fear of Iraqi police officers (who, according to Mohammed, allegedly kill civilians) to the British police, commenting, “I’m scared of police”. Consequently, for the increasing numbers of foreign nationals that are ending up in prison, the earlier stages of the criminal justice system can be particularly distressing and worrying. A small minority of interviewees also spoke of aggressive encounters with police officers. For example, when asked if he thought police officers respected him, Ryan replied, “some do, some don’t..... they threaten to beat you up sometimes”. Likewise, Dave commented that police officers had dragged him around in the past and that they are “wankers really.... I’ve had no good experiences with them”.

Ambivalence, contradiction and the defended subject

Although a number of prisoners found the criminal justice system a challenging and sometimes distressing place, leading some to self-harm or to contemplate suicide, some were ambivalent in their responses, seeming to contradict the work of Sykes and others. On the surface, these responses seem surprising. However, on scrutiny it becomes apparent that there are inconsistencies and contradictions within several prisoners’ narratives. It is therefore instructive to consider the work of Hollway and Jefferson (2000), who have pioneered a psychosocial approach to research. Hollway and Jefferson provide an account of an interview they undertook with ‘Tommy’, who gave a ‘poor but happy’ story of his childhood; although there was evidence of extreme hardship and deprivation, Tommy gave the impression of thoroughly enjoying his younger years. Hollway and Jefferson argue that for ‘tell it like it is’ ethnographers, Tommy’s account is one of a happy childhood. Yet, such an ‘analysis’ does not give sufficient attention to detail or contradictions. Hollway and Jefferson therefore suggest that researchers should familiarise themselves with the whole interview transcript material in order to obtain an

accurate picture. In doing so, they reveal an inability on Tommy's part to acknowledge emotional reality and the pain of his childhood memories. By applying a psychosocial understanding, Hollway and Jefferson argue that Tommy was displaying evidence of a 'defended subject', whereby individuals defend themselves against feelings of anxiety. As a result, Tommy denies the harsher realities of his past in order to protect his present self. By applying this theory to the present study, it becomes plausible that the following interviewees, like Tommy, were adopting a 'defended subject' and therefore denying the pains of custody in order to protect themselves. In adopting this methodological stance and examining the whole interview material, the following accounts become understandable.

With regards to being arrested and held in police custody, Jack stated, "once it's happened once you get used to it - it's not much of a shock at all... you know what's going to happen". This comment alone would suggest that Jack was not negatively affected by being in police custody. However, later responses suggest otherwise:

Sitting in a police cell is harder than being in a prison cell.... everything goes through your head – it's hard to keep calm... when you've got nothing to do in your cell... it's hard, police stations are hard..... I'd rather do 1 week in a prison cell than 3 days in a police cell.

In similar respects, Tom stated, "it don't bother me [being in a police cell]..... it's a laugh when your mates are in there". Again, this response implies Tom is not at all 'bothered' about being in police custody and actually has a good time if friends are at the station. Nevertheless, Tom later states, "when you get locked behind that door it pisses you off... I'm not an animal – no one wants to be caged... but it's my fault I'm

here”, thus highlighting his anger and disgust at being held in a police cell. Here no reference is made to ‘laughs’. Peter also claimed that within a police cell he was “not scared, not bothered really”. Conversely, Peter later explained how he found it hard to sleep in these cells because of “what’s going through my mind, what I was gonna say, what would happen, if I was gonna get remanded or bail”. This indicates that instead of being ‘not bothered’, Peter was in fact anxious about the subsequent proceedings.

Similar ambivalent findings were obtained in relation to court cells. Shaun explained how on his “first time I were getting sentenced coz of the nature of the burglary I was shitting my pants [however] since that first experience it hasn’t bothered me”. Later this statement is contradicted when Shaun states, “I get times when I sit in court cells I think you stupid dick..... I put myself in this situation again, miss my family, they’re gonna miss me”. Thus implying he is ‘bothered’ by being in a court cell and the consequences he faces. Likewise, Alan initially stated, “it didn’t worry me at all – at the end of the day there’s nothing I can do about it so what’s the point in worrying”. Although later comments imply he was in fact worried about the consequences of being in a court cell:

[You feel] pissed off when you get to court coz you’re waiting and you don’t know what’s gonna happen... the court cells are totally shit..... I asked to go in [a shared cell]... it takes your mind off things if you’ve got someone to talk to..... I was worried... I wanted to sort stuff out before [I was arrested]... but I didn’t get a chance.

Ambivalent feelings were also expressed about prison. Dean stated, “I’ve been jail too many times... I’ve never cracked... I don’t even cry.... some can’t cope in jail – I can’t

see what the problem is”. Despite expressing these feelings, Dean commented, “I don’t want to come back to jail no more... this is going to be my last time ... hopefully” and “I’m missing everything... the good things and the bad things”. When discussing a television programme that was being aired, in which celebrities spend time in a jungle, Dean stated, “go to prison for one bloody day then tell me how hard it is”. Dean’s claims of not being able to see why people cannot cope in prison were particularly surprising considering, as already mentioned, he had been “terrorised” (bullied) at the age of 16 whilst at another YOI, where he “thought it was the end of the world”. It would appear that Dean had found certain aspects of prison painful. Similarly, Jack stated, “once you’ve been to prison it’s prison... once something’s been done it can be done again”, implying that a prison sentence was easily survived. Again, contradictory remarks were found in his interview. For example, Jack stated, “course it’s hard... I think I’m going to have hard jail for the last 18 months... I get agitated”. Likewise, Alan commented that prison was like a “holiday camp except you’re locked up and the food’s shit”. It was apparent from later sections of the interview that Alan had oversimplified and underestimated the pains associated with being ‘locked up’, as he commented, “I’d do anything to just get out of [my cell]” and “I ain’t getting in trouble no more – I’m gonna think before I do it... I ain’t doing nothing wrong – it ain’t worth it – not when you get locked up in here”. Therefore, by adopting a psychosocial approach to the narratives, it becomes apparent that a number of the interviewees who were ambivalent about the criminal justice system may have been employing a defended subject and did face a number of pains of custody.

An alternative reading of these ambivalent responses is that some interviewees found prison easy because of the opportunities it provided them. Returning to Dean, although it appears he was employing a defended subject, he also commented that prison could

be beneficial for the reason that it was an opportunity to participate in educational classes and courses. Cope (2003: 172) too found evidence of prisoners making their sentences purposeful, which allowed them “to justify their sentence by regarding it as a period of self-improvement”. Others spoke of how prison simply provided them with a means of escaping a harder outside world and preventing them from getting into trouble. For example, Tom claimed that:

Prison don’t bother me... been that many times... it’s a way of life.... it’s a little holiday down the [punishment] block.... prison don’t bother me.... some people can’t ride it.

Prison for Tom was therefore an easier alternative to life on the outside; “I feel more secure in prison than out there... it’s harder out there than it is in here”. For Adrian, trying to get a job on the outside and keeping up with probation meant prison felt like an easier option; “when you come out of here you want to come back in again... in here you’ve got no worries”. Likewise, James stated:

I’ve done harder outside than I have in here.... there’s a lot of bad people out there.... the people I’m involved with ain’t the people you’d want to cross... I’ve got more chance of having a bullet in me (when outside)..... I prefer being in jail – it keeps me from doing things.

In similar respects, prison was beneficial to some because it provided a means of overcoming their dependency on drugs or alcohol:

In a way [being in a cell is] the best thing for you if you want to come off drugs.... it does you good every time you come to jail and you come off it (Simon).

Even though my mum's upset she's happy – she knows where I am – she knows I'm safe.... like now I'd rather be in jail – I can't get back on drugs..... my sentences are getting too big... I've grown up a lot on this sentence... what I said to my mum, I needed this sentence... thinking time – get my head sorted – come off drugs (Robert).

It feels weird coz once you come in here and get a chance to come off [cocaine] you have a chance to step back and look at what you had.... I feel better in myself now I'm off the drugs (Alex).

Other interviewees stated; “I'd rather [detox] inside a cell – only time I've been able to get off drugs... I've come to jail to get off drugs and sort out my problems” (Shaun), “being in jail gives me a break..... gets me off the drugs, stops me re-offending, keeps me out of trouble” (James) and “now I can think about the stuff I want to do when I get out – before all I could think about was getting drunk” (Jonathan). Furthermore, Owen described how being in a police cell and court cell meant that he could not drink alcohol; “it does me well – it keeps my head clear for a few days”. Similar findings were obtained by Crewe (2005: 463), who concludes, “those whose offences are addiction-related often use imprisonment as an opportunity to get clean”. Consequently, for these prisoners “the personal and social experience of incarceration has a number of distinctive qualities” (Crewe, 2005: 460). Prison not only provides them with an ‘opportunity’ or ‘relief’, but also improved relationships with partners and family

members. Crewe suggests that for these prisoners, confinement is relatively less painful because it is considered less arduous than life on the streets.

To summarise, the interview data demonstrates that there are individuals who initially do not appear to feel the same pains of custody as others. However, on further exploration it becomes evident that some may be employing a defended subject; a number of prisoners appear to be dismissing any pain of custody despite evidence to the contrary. In doing so, they are preventing feelings of anxiety. Other comments that were made in reference to prison being easy or easier than the outside could be explained by the fact that prison provided these interviewees with a safer life or self-improvement. This is particularly evident in prisoners who were addicted to drugs or alcohol prior to prison. Therefore, the pains of custody do appear endemic amongst young male detainees and prisoners; where reference is made to prison being easy, these comments are usually contradicted or accounted for by the fact that prison can signify both pain and opportunity.

Expanding Sykes' work

Evidence presented within this chapter demonstrates that Sykes' work is still of relevance to today's young male sentenced prisoners, although these pains now extend to remand prisoners, with some being applicable to detainees in the wider criminal justice system. The following chapter will demonstrate that in the early twenty-first century it is possible to move beyond Sykes' work and identify a further thirteen pains of custody. Before doing so, it will be argued that these additional pains have arisen because of differences between the present sample and that used by Sykes, and because of developments within prison.

With respect to differences between samples, whilst Sykes' sample were convicted men, with an average age of 35, serving time in an American maximum-security prison, the sample in the present study were young males aged between 18 and 21, either remanded or sentenced, serving time in a English YOI. The sample also consisted of young males who were being detained in court. Therefore, Sykes' sample differs significantly from the current sample. Firstly, it is thought that whilst the younger sample have had fewer life experiences, the older sample have been out of education and possibly in employment for longer, are more likely to be in established long-term relationships and more likely to have children (or at least older children). Secondly, the two samples are facing different prospects; those in Sykes' sample were all sentenced, whilst some in the present sample were awaiting trial or sentencing. These variations may have resulted in different expectations and experiences of prison, which subsequently affected the pains that interviewees' felt.

Concerning differences between the two prisons, not only do the penal policies and practices of the American maximum-security prison differ from those in the UK fifty years ago, but they differ dramatically from those in the UK nearly fifty years on. For example, in the UK, since the 1950s there have been developments in new prison designs, technologies and penal practices (Liebling and Price, 2001). More specifically, as discussed earlier, female prison officers are now employed in male prisons. The Incentives and Earned Privileges scheme has had a significant impact on the prison regime. The scheme was introduced in 1995, after a report by Woolf in 1991 and is based upon three categories; basic, standard and enhanced. Prisoners are either given privileges for compliance and good conduct or have them withdrawn for bad behaviour and misconduct (Jewkes and Johnston, 2006). Although, as Jewkes and Johnston note, the basic entitlements that Woolf recommended, have become privileges under this

scheme, prisoners are given the opportunity to earn privileges that did not even exist in the 1950s prison. Over the last 30 years, prisoners have also had the opportunity to take their case to the European Commission and Court of Human Rights (ECHR) (Livingstone, 2000). Even though more prisoners have lost their case than have won, significant victories have had an important impact on prison discipline, communication with the outside world and release procedures (ibid.). Furthermore, the opportunity to take cases to the ECHR has allowed prisoners to play an active role in their future and the conditions in which they are confined. This is important, considering that many find the prison environment disempowering (ibid.). During this time, the prison population has become more diverse. Thus, over the last 10 years, the number of foreign prisoners has more than doubled, with a greater number of prisoners coming from different racial groups (Genders and Player, 1989; Lyon, 2006). Again, it is suggested that in comparison with the 1950s, these changes help explain why individuals have different expectations and experiences of prison.

Following on from changes within prison, Pratt et al (2005) suggest that in more recent years we have seen a 'new punitiveness' in penal policy. In support of this argument, Pratt et al point to the trend towards mass incarceration, longer prison sentences, the revoking of prisoners' privileges and more spartan prison regimes. Evidence of this 'new punitiveness' is found within the current prison crisis and overcrowding (HMCIP, 2007). Alongside these trends, there has been the introduction of sex offender registers and, in the USA, 'three-strike' laws, 'chain gangs' and boot camps (Pratt et al, 2005). In particular, Pratt et al discuss the 'Supermax' prisons in the USA, where prisoners are routinely locked away for 23 hours a day and largely denied access to education, programmes, exercise or association. To some degree, such regimes are found in the UK; in 2003 – 2004, young prisoners at Glen Parva YOI spent only an average of 17.3

hours per week on purposeful activity (Solomon, 2004). Baker and Roberts (2005) also argue that there has been a move towards penal austerity, under the belief that by making prison conditions more austere, re-offending will be reduced. Recent speeches by the Home Secretary John Reid support this notion; he is keen to consider community sentences, if the community perceives them as tough (Tendler, 2006b). Consequently, he is interested in exploring how to increase the visibility of such unpaid work, through uniforms. Additionally, John Reid is making plans to ensure that the most dangerous criminals lose their automatic right to be considered for parole halfway through their life sentence and that offenders pleading guilty will no longer have their sentences cut by a third (BBC, 2006). Furthermore, Baker and Roberts (2005) argue that western penal policies have become largely, but not exclusively, punitive over the past decade. They highlight victim reforms that have promoted the interests of the victim at the expense of the offender. This includes local 'naming and shaming' campaigns, run against suspected paedophiles (Pratt et al, 2005). Lastly, Pratt et al refer to the high rate of suicide in the UK as evidence that neglect within the current prison system may cause as much harm as more direct attempts to administer cruel punishment. Therefore, if as Pratt and others suggest, we are seeing a new punitiveness, it could help explain why further pains of custody can now be identified.

Conversely, Matthews (2005: 195) criticises the above evidence, arguing that there is not a "convincing case to support the claim that punitiveness has played a central role in recent developments". Firstly, Matthews suggests that because prison is widely used as a 'dumping ground' for those whom the state is unable to, or unwilling to, provide suitable care and support, there has been an increase in the prison population. This increase is not merely because of an increased punitiveness towards offenders. Secondly, although boot camps have become increasingly popular in the USA, there has

only been one established for young people in Britain, which opened in 1996 and closed in 1998. Thirdly, surveys of public attitudes on sentencing and punishment have shown that they support multiple sentencing goals, rather than just a move towards punitiveness. In addition to Matthews' criticisms, Jewkes and Johnston (2006) suggest that the current long hours of lockdown, segregation, sensory deprivation, and unproductive and psychologically destructive regimes may be a return to conditions of the mid-nineteenth century. Thus, Jewkes and Johnston (2006: 287) ask, "how 'new' is the 'new punitiveness'?" Hallsworth (2002) suggests that whilst some societies have seen a rise in, or the resurrection of, punitive practices (for example, chain gangs and the death penalty), they, and others, have seen a range of rehabilitative treatment-centred intervention. As an example, within Glen Parva YOI, prisoners are given the opportunity to participate in courses to address substance-related offending, enhanced thinking skills training, art therapy and acupuncture. Similarly, returning to Matthews (2005), he notes how over the last two decades, prison conditions in the UK have improved. In particular, improvements have been seen in relation to sanitation, diet and health provision, and the development of more treatment, recreational and educational programmes. Instead of a new punitiveness, Matthews argues that the penal system is actually becoming more progressive and we are seeing a more plural and diverse prison system. Consequently, evidence seems to suggest that we are seeing an increasingly bifurcated prison system with a more diverse and progressive prison regime, that helps and supports prisoners, running in parallel to a generally more punitive system that continues to bear the hallmarks of prison conditions in the mid-nineteenth century. It is possible that this disparity helps to explain why the following further pains of custody exist.

Chapter Four: Further Pains of Custody

To reiterate, whilst Sykes' (1958) contribution to the pains debate is unprecedented, he focuses on the deprivations experienced by long-term male prisoners at a maximum-security prison, failing to recognise young male prisoners and those being held in the wider criminal justice system. The previous chapter suggests that further pains of custody can be identified because of differences between Sykes' sample and the present sample, and because of changes within the criminal justice system and prison in particular. The evidence presented here demonstrates that nearly fifty years on, a further thirteen pains of custody can be identified. These are based on Toch's (1982) analysis of prison demands and include pains that overload the individual (where they demand more than the individual can deliver, for example, withdrawing from drugs or alcohol) and pains that underload the individual (where they insufficiently challenge the individual's interests and capacities, for example, the loss of stimulation). By exploring these further pains of custody, and the resulting harm that they can cause, an understanding is gained as to why individuals need support within the criminal justice system.

Entry shock

Although Sykes identifies the deprivation of liberty, he does not recognise entry shock, which is the first pain of custody an individual may have to withstand (Blaauw et al, 1998; Gibbs, 1982a; 1982b). It encompasses being cut off from the outside world (and from all that is familiar, for example, family, friends, work) and being placed in completely different circumstances, which are characterised by an imposed regime (Caird, 1974; Irwin, 1970; Towl and Hudson, 1997). Entry shock can have a detrimental

effect on detainees and prisoners, being associated with suicide and self-harm (Backett, 1987; Bogue and Power, 1995; Crighton and Towl, 1997; Dooley, 1990a; HMCIP, 1999; Howard League, 1999a; Liebling and Krarup, 1993; Lloyd, 1990; Matthews, 1999; SCG, 2001). Despite identifying an increased risk of suicide and self-harm during the early stages of custody, research has failed to explore how individuals feel when faced by this pain of custody. To address this, the following narratives provide an insight into the experience of entry shock during the first few hours and days of each stage of the criminal justice system. These narratives also articulate the fear and worry that can be felt, particularly by those entering the criminal justice system for the first time.

For two interviewees, entry shock occurred when they were arrested, before they had entered a police station; even at this early stage, interviewees were cut off from their normal surroundings and placed in a different and somewhat chaotic situation (Caird, 1974; Irwin, 1970). Philip described how, on being arrested for a serious offence, he felt like his “guts had been ripped out” and he cried for hours with the realisation that he had lost everything, including his girlfriend and job. The arrest signified to Philip that he was being ‘cut off’ from his everyday world; it was the beginning of him experiencing a completely different set of circumstances. For Mark, he was physically ‘cut off’ from his normal surroundings when, on being arrested at his house, he was held in a police van. Here he described how he had begun crying and panicking when he realised the crime with which he had become involved and the probable consequences.

Even though entry shock may occur during the initial arrest, in many cases it was not evident until the police station or later stages of the criminal justice system. Furthermore, by its nature, entry shock did not always happen on subsequent visits to

the criminal justice system. When discussing their detention in a police cell, a number of interviewees described how they had felt distressed during their first visit. In particular, James explained how he had been nervous the first few times:

I used to [get nervous] – not anymore – you get used to it after a while – I know that every time I get in trouble with the law I come back to jail.... first couple of times.... I think I was probably scared – I was only young – thinking what’s going to happen.

Other interviewees commented; “the first few times I was a bit worried about it but then it got normal” (Simon), “I shit myself the first time I was in there... thinking I wasn’t going to come back out” (Alex), “[I felt] worried then – I remember thinking I don’t want to go back to the cells again.... I was only young” (Kieran) and “I cried the first time but after that I kept my smile on.... there’s nothing bad about going into a police station” (Richard). Others still felt this worry or concern on subsequent visits:

You obviously feel a bit gutted... you wonder what’s going to happen to you... you have to take it all in that you’re going to jail in a couple of days... nothing you can do about it.... I wouldn’t say I feel scared – but you do worry, especially if it’s a serious charge (Adam).

Equally, other prisoners stated; “I was sitting there thinking bollocks... this is it... I’m gonna do a long time in jail” (Dean), “you think about what’s going to happen to you – but not scared” (Gareth) and “a few times I’ve started getting worried about coming to prison” (Luke). For some prisoners, the physical aspect of the police cell distressed

them; “I don’t know, it’s just loneliness – I don’t like it on my own” (Gary) and “I was feeling very claustrophobic being locked in there” (Owen).

Since entry shock can happen at each stage of the criminal justice system, interviewees described feelings of fear and worry on entering the court custody suites. These feelings were predominantly caused by the nature of the courts, where important life-changing decisions are made. With regards to waiting in the court cell, interviewees stated; “you probably feel worse than when you get to prison... loads of things come into your mind... I failed to keep myself out of prison... I felt angry for not sticking to what I was going to do” (Dave), “I was worried... I wanted to sort stuff out before [I went to court]... but I didn’t get a chance” (Alan), “just wondering what they were going to do.... it wouldn’t bother me doing a longer sentence if I didn’t have kids and a girlfriend... it does my head in only seeing them once a week” (Gareth), “first time I were getting sentenced, coz of the nature of the burglary, I was shitting my pants..... I get times when I sit in court cells I think you stupid dick... I put myself in this situation again, I’ll miss my family, they’re gonna miss me” (Shaun) and “I probably [felt] a bit worried – you don’t know what’s gonna happen do you” (Ryan). Fears centred on the court itself as well:

The first time I had to go was nerve wrecking – it’s not that bad – Crown Court’s worse – it’s bigger, people walking around in dodgy wigs... [you’ve got] more chance to go to prison – that’s the scariest thing, you could go to prison.... Magistrates Court’s not that scary – solicitor says it all.... the trial’s a bit nerve wrecking – you have to stand up in front of everyone (Peter).

Interviewees also described; “I went to court that day... I was shitting myself..... I got a panic attack” (Matthew), “I was shaking like a leaf – the thought of getting sent down.... I literally stood in the box crying coz I pleaded guilty to something I didn’t do” (Gary), “it was a shock it was [being given a prison sentence]” (Ben) and “I feel ashamed when I went in court.... being charged for murder.... It’s not easy for me.... I’m not from this country, I don’t have family” (Mohammed).

Subsequently, prisoners spoke of their entry shock on arriving at prison; “I sat on my bed and [it brought] tears to my eyes” (Paul), “[I was scared] sitting in the cell..... [first night] I fucking hated it – it felt like a year” (Gary), “I was too scared... I’ve never seen prison” (Mohammed), “I was still a bit anxious – pacing around... [but] you got to get used to it” (Shaun) and “it wasn’t a shock... I was a bit scared... of being to prison... [the first night] was horrible.... I couldn’t sleep all night... I had backache and feeling cold as well... I was hungry all night” (Joe). Again, prisoners who had served more than one sentence at prison described how these fears were only evident during their first visit:

The first time I came in [the prison reception worried me]... it was all new to me.... it does get easier.... it’s quite hard the first time coz you don’t know what to do or expect but the second or third time it gets easier – you know the routine (Adrian).

No [I don’t feel scared] coz I know the routine... when I first went jail I was a bit scared – you don’t know what to expect.... it scares me that I’m not bothered about coming to jail – that scares me in a way (Robert).

I was only worried the first time I went – now I know what it's like..... as soon as you get there and settle in it's alright.... I know I feel a bit wounded but as soon as I get out the van and walk in I'll be ok – get sorted (Kieran).

Furthermore, Simon remarked, “I was worried yes [on my first time]” and Jack described how he “was scared when I first came in but there were people from X on the bus.... if I'd have come in on my own it would have been a lot harder”. Others explained how prison got easier the more times they went; “it gets easier the more times you come here” (Dave) and “I get through it easy really... once you get used to the regime... it goes easy... especially with a job..... jail's easy once you've been here once or twice... it gets easier and easier and easier every time you come back” (Adam).

As demonstrated in the above quotes, the shock of entering the criminal justice system can be particularly acute, especially for those individuals who have never been in trouble with the police before. Consequently, it is appropriate to highlight the experiences of two such prisoners, Mark and Danny. After being arrested and taken to a police cell, Mark described, “I remember walking in and sitting down thinking oh my god..... loads of different things were going through my head really”. When asked if he had felt nervous, Mark replied “very, honestly, yeah – I thought I ain't gonna get out.... I was getting a bit worried, I was getting more and more upset”. After being held at the police station for four days Mark was let out on bail but had to attend court on a number of occasions. Although being on bail may be perceived as being easier than on remand, it can still be distressing; “I went backwards and forwards to court about 5 – 6 times.... I got very depressed... I couldn't handle it... it was going on for months”. Once convicted, Mark was transported in an escort vehicle:

When I was in [the van] it still didn't do anything... when I got out of Peterborough I thought here we go.... I tried to picture Glen Parva.... I thought oh god – everything was running through my head..... I remember getting here through the big gates... I remember thinking here we go I'm here.

The prison reception itself can be especially distressing for new prisoners, where there is a 'leaving off' and a 'taking on', and where worries centre on what will happen to them (Caird, 1974; Goffman, 1961). Fortunately, for Mark he was helped by a female officer; "that lady kept on talking to me – you could see on my face I was really nervous". Afterwards, when being moved from reception, Mark stated:

I was looking around – I had to wait and stop for people to open the door... I was getting a bit worried then but I was putting a brave face on..... I didn't want to [cry] in front of the officers – I didn't want to do anything like that.

Once Mark was moved to the holding cell he described how he sat there "thinking oh god – looking at the phones – I didn't understand what was going on with the phones at first.... I tried to pick them up and use them and it wouldn't let me – I needed a pin". Even after his induction, Mark had a difficult time settling in; "I'd be fine for a few weeks... then some days I'll have 'I wish I was at home'... I get down... it just hurts you now and again... I've seen people come and go... it hurts you sometimes".

In similar respects, Danny, whose first offence was relatively serious, explained how he was fearful of going to prison, thinking that "if police cells are like this, are the prison

cells going to be the same”. When asked if he had felt scared in the escort vehicle, Danny replied, “yes – it was the first time I’d been in one and I didn’t know what was going on”. Furthermore, Danny was left feeling ashamed by being transported in an escort vehicle:

Because when you’re driving past you can see out... people can see in... people looking up from their cars... I just feel embarrassed being in a Group 4... embarrassed... I was ashamed really that I’d got myself in this situation and in one of them.

Before getting to prison, Danny was anxious:

I was scared – I didn’t know what was going to happen..... what’s [prison] like.... I was nervous... what was going on, what’s going to happen to me.

These feelings continued into prison:

I was nervous – there were loads of other people around me – everyone just stares at me... then my confidence grew – I was getting used to it and I was in a routine.

Even though Danny had adjusted to prison, he stated, “I get down all the time.... I try not to think about it” and still found it stressful.

Associated with entry shock is the notion of liminality, where individuals occupy a place between two separate worlds; the free world and incarcerated world (Harvey, 2004; 2007). Although Harvey recognises the pains associated with being in a liminal phase during the first month of prison, he does not extend this theory to the earlier stages of the criminal justice system. From the above narratives, it becomes apparent that individuals may occupy a liminal position whilst on bail and whilst being detained in police cells or court cells. Here, individuals are painfully trapped between the free world and the prospect of incarceration. The stress and anxiety caused by living in such a liminal phase is highlighted by Gary, who, whilst on bail, self-harmed because of the anxiety caused by his impending court case. Gary described how he had started to cut his arms with a piece of plastic because he felt:

Just worried – the fact I’m coming to prison.... it’s just one of those things you do – you just do it and don’t think why you do it.... something that I did – spur of the moment.

Gary also took an overdose of painkillers in an attempt to kill himself. He explained how he had wanted to commit suicide because of the stress associated with his court case, although he remembered very little of the whole incident; “I just started going mad..... everyone was telling me I was tripping out – [but] I can’t remember anything”.

Fear of the unknown

Related to entry shock is a ‘fear of the unknown’, which concerns the lack of information individuals are given regarding their situation and is evident during the early stages of the criminal justice system, when uncertainty is high (Blaauw et al,

1998). As shown in the previous section, a number of interviewees described how they did not know what was going to happen to them. This was reflected at each stage of the criminal justice system and was similar to Caird's (1974) experiences of being in a court cell and on a prison wing. For example, whilst in the court cell, Caird was concerned about where he was going to be taken, when and how. Subsequently, in prison, Caird was unaware of what to expect and whether he would be sharing a cell. Further to the quotes in the above section, interviewees spoke about their fears in the police cell; Gareth stated, "I didn't know what was going to happen – where they were going to take me" and Sam described how "I was crying for my first time – most people do for their first time.... coz I never knew what [the police station] was like". These fears were transferred into prison; "I was just worried about prison..... what is going to happen to me, who am I going to be put with" (Gary), "when I first went jail I was a bit scared – you don't know what to expect" (Robert) and "I was feeling a bit scared, worried, nervous... I felt like that in the police cell and in prison and in the Group 4 van... I was wondering what goes on, how it works" (Danny). Similarly, Sam stated:

I was just like paranoid – I never knew what jail was like.... just what I've heard about jail..... I did cry for my first time – I never knew what it was like.... the second time I went I was alright.

Part of this fear appeared to stem from the fact that throughout the criminal justice system, interviewees were often 'kept in the dark'. When held at the police station, interviewees explained how they were not informed about their case:

When your solicitor comes you find out what's happening ... police don't tell you nothing.... it does your head in... you sit there thinking about it

and when you're thinking about it time drags – if they told you, you could just go sleep (Gareth).

[The police] don't just come and tell you anything ... they don't really tell you much... it'd be better to know what's happening (Adam).

Accounts from other interviewees included; “it's not knowing what's going to happen to you.... they don't tell you, you just wait” (Tom), “I didn't know what was going on” (Mark), “you never know what's going to happen” (Paul), “you don't even know what's going on” (Dean) and “I was always on my bell asking what was going on – they didn't know” (Danny). Likewise, with regards to court, interviewees stated; “I kept ringing on my bell ‘when will it be?’.... I didn't know what to expect” (Craig) and “they don't even come and tell you [what's happening] - they've turned the buzzers off” (Nathan). Newburn and Hayman (2002) also found that detainees who frequently use their buzzers may find them turned off. As shown here, this provides the detainee with little or no means of communication, which can exacerbate their fears and anxieties. Even in prison, Simon explained how he was not told he had been dismissed from his job; “they never came to us and tell us we've been sacked”. Similarly, Goffman (1961) suggests that this pain of custody continues throughout a prisoner's sentence because inmates are excluded from knowing decisions about their fate. Within the earlier stages of the criminal justice system it was apparent from my own observations that there were times when staff genuinely did not know what was happening, however there was also a reluctance to pass any information on to detainees until they asked. In part, this is because police and court cells are busy locations and staff sometimes have to manage a large number of detainees. However, this reluctance does increase anxieties and acts as another means of controlling detainees and prisoners.

Within the literature review (chapter one), it was suggested that remand prisoners are particularly susceptible to a fear of the unknown, being placed under considerable stress due to the uncertainty surrounding their trial and sentencing (Lloyd, 1990). This uncertainty places remand prisoners within a liminal phase and makes adaptation to the prison environment difficult until sentenced (Harvey, 2007). The following responses from interviewees demonstrate that this pain of custody is prevalent among remand prisoners and those who are convicted unsentenced. Many were concerned because they did not yet know the length of their sentence and when they would be released; “you think 6 days left, then 5 days, then the day comes and they remand you again” (Craig), “you’re just waiting to see what’s happening.... that’s probably the worst thing – if getting out or not – knowing” (Ryan), “[on remand] you’re thinking what’s gonna happen – once you’ve been sentenced you can get your time over with” (Sam), “you’re just thinking I wonder how long I’m gonna get” (Kieran), “it’s a lot harder [being on remand]... when you get sentenced you get something to look forward to” (Paul), “it’s better to be sentenced than to be on remand... you definitely know by 2007 you’re going home” (Joe), “I’d sooner know when I’m getting out” (Alan) and “I was well happy when I was going court... I just wanted it over with... I was so happy when I signed the papers [with a release date]... you’d love to know what day you’re getting out” (Mark). Consequently, some were eager to get sentenced; “you want to hurry up and get sentenced” (Simon), “I just want to get sentenced so I know what day I’ll get out – that’ll make it easier” (Jonathan) and “it’s worse being in remand coz you just want to get sentenced – you don’t know what you’re looking at.... time does go quicker once you’re sentenced – you’re in a routine” (Luke).

Withdrawing from drugs and alcohol

The physical and psychological effects of withdrawing from drugs and alcohol have been relatively overlooked in the past, with research tending to centre on the availability and use of drugs in prison (for example, Cope, 2003; Crewe, 2005). This is despite large numbers of people being held in police custody or prison who have a problem with drugs or alcohol or are experiencing withdrawal from these substances (Howard League, 2001; Paton and Jenkins, 2002). Furthermore, the pain associated with such withdrawal is evident; individuals withdrawing from drugs or alcohol are at an increased risk of suicide and self-harm (Backett, 1987; Bogue and Power, 1995; HM Prison Service, 2001; 2005; Marzillier, 2004; NCPE, 2006; Paton and Jenkins, 2002; Shaw et al, 2003). Due to this lack of research, the physical and psychological effects of withdrawing from drugs or alcohol within the initial periods of incarceration, i.e. the police cell and first few days or weeks of prison, are relatively unknown.

As outlined within the literature review (chapter one), individuals withdrawing from drugs or alcohol may experience both physical and psychological side effects (Paton and Jenkins, 2002). In support of Paton and Jenkins, a number of interviewees mentioned physical effects when withdrawing from drugs in the police cells and prison. For example, whilst being detained in police cells, interviewees explained:

[You feel] down, you can't sleep, your belly aches, you just want to go home... you want to take some drugs to make you feel better.... heroin, it's a bad drug.... it's a nice drug, but once you start taking it, after a couple of weeks you have to take it.... it just takes over your body (Simon).

You just feel ill... you ache like fuck..... it's just the no sleep – worst thing about it... you start hallucinating.... you're anxious more than anything..... I just sit there and keep moving – I just can't stop doing it... I jam my legs under the table to stop them moving (Robert).

I was feeling ill all the time... feeling sick and dizzy, I kept falling asleep coz I hadn't been to sleep for ages..... you ain't got a window you can open... when I was on my come down it was horrible – just sweating..... it makes you feel horrible (Alex).

Shaun also described that it made him feel, “like shit... aching, tired, can't sleep, being sick” and James commented, “I was probably addicted to base (speed)..... it makes you feel shitty”. On entering prison, these physical effects continued. Robert described how on his first time in prison it took three and a half weeks to withdraw from drugs; “that was just for the pain to stop – my body didn't go normal for about 6 months”. Similarly, Shaun stated that to get back to ‘normal’ took one week, but “to get my sleeping back, couple weeks.... to get my thinking straight took quite a bit”. For Alex, his first week in prison was the worst; “the first week was the roughest – I was feeling like shit.... really it took me about a month to feel proper like this”.

Alongside these physical effects, and as outlined by Paton and Jenkins (2002), there were psychological effects of withdrawing from drugs. In police custody Alex described how:

I just wanted to get out and get some more [coke] – plus it didn't help me being locked up in a small room..... after a bit if I don't get [coke] I get

quite violent... things going round my head.... only at Glen Parva that I started to get angry.... about a week after I came in (Alex).

In the same way, Robert stated, “you get angry... that’s like more frustration than anything else..... frustration coz you want it but you can’t get it” and James described how he “went mad.... I beat the crap out of the police cell”. Lastly, one interviewee spoke about the pains of withdrawing from alcohol; “it don’t really bother me now but the first couple of weeks it bothered me” (Jonathan). These narratives expand on the work by Paton and Jenkins (2002) and Harvey (2007), providing evidence of how young men feel when experiencing the physical and psychological symptoms of withdrawal within the confines of the criminal justice system.

Loss of privacy

Previous authors have identified how individuals face a complete loss of privacy in prison and the problems that this can lead to in terms of living in a role (Goffman, 1961; Medlicott, 2001; Sykes, 1958; Wacquant, 2002). This pain may now be extended to individuals being detained in police cells. Although police cells are not shared, police officers and staff are able to observe detainees through the cell hatch or via CCTV, which means they can lose all sense of privacy. Thus, as with prisoners, detainees are nearly always within sight or earshot of someone (Goffman, 1961). Perhaps surprisingly, only two interviewees mentioned this pain of custody in relation to police cells, stating; “you get no privacy” (Peter) and “[CCTV cameras are an] invasion of my privacy” (Andrew). In part, these small numbers may have been because interviewees were unaware CCTV was in operation in some cells or, because they were only in the cell for a relatively short period of time, it did not concern them to the same extent it did

in prison. In fact, as detailed in the methodology chapter (chapter two), I felt more aware of invading detainees' privacy than they appeared affected by it.

In the literature review, it was suggested that detainees being held in court cells, which tend to be shared, would face a loss of privacy. However, no interviewee mentioned such a loss, possibly because detainees are not expected to undertake private functions within their cells, i.e. cells do not contain toilets. Instead, detainees are often held with others and are always escorted from their cell to use the toilet facilities. The fact that detainees are held with others may also mean they are having to portray a 'front stage' persona (Goffman, 1961). Consequently, detainees may be amenable to being viewed by court staff. Conversely, whilst being held on their own in police cells, detainees are caught between their back stage character, because no-one is in their cell, and their front stage character, because officers and staff can observe them via CCTV or cell hatches. This discrepancy may result in distress.

Once in prison and as part of the reception process, prisoners have to go through a strip search, which can result in a loss of privacy and was evidently painful within some interviewees' accounts. For example, interviewees stated; "it's not that nice really... they take your clothes off you ... you do get used to it after a while..... but it's a bit embarrassing the first time" (Adam), "I was embarrassed" (Danny), "I didn't like that at all" (Gary) and "I got strip searched..... it didn't feel very good" (Mark). Mark so disliked being strip-searched that he later avoided all contact with visitors:

I don't even touch the other person – I'm afraid to get strip searched again.

In contrast, Luke was more annoyed by this process than embarrassed, explaining that he had been to court three times from prison and on all occasions had been strip-searched at each stage; “that’s the most annoying thing... you get strip searched before you get out, onto the van, get searched... when you come back through you get strip searched again”.

Furthermore, although sharing a prison cell can be beneficial, for some prisoners it was detrimental. For example, Danny explained, “it’s good and bad [sharing a cell]... [it’s bad because] you lose your privacy”. Likewise, Mark described how he felt on realising he had to use a toilet in front of his pad mate:

I got told about [the cells] – they closed the door on me – I looked around – the only thing that got me was the toilet – I’m sharing with someone and they can watch me..... at first [I got lonely in a single cell] but after a while I started enjoying it... going to the toilet without anyone watching... I relaxed.

The need for prisoners to undertake these functions within their cell has also been highlighted by Goffman (1961) and Medlicott (2001), who comment that prisoners have to eat, sleep, dream, excrete and pass time in their cell. Paul too described how when he first arrived at Glen Parva YOI he cried, as you “have to do everything in your cell”, including eat, sleep, brush your teeth and use the toilet. In addition, Paul did not like the fact that prison officers were able to enter his cell whenever they wanted; “your cell’s your home.... that’s the only privacy we’ve got”. Again, Medlicott (2001) identifies the added stress that prisoners are under when officers are able to enter their cell at any time.

Time

Dealing with time is one of the main challenges or pains faced by prisoners (Medlicott, 2001; Toch, 1992a). Consequently, the prison literature discusses how prisoners experience time differently, particularly those serving indeterminate or long sentences (Cohen and Taylor, 1972; Sapsford, 1983). Although this pain is more evident in prison, it may at times extend to the police cells, where detainees are held for long periods and where time may appear to pass exceedingly slowly (Newburn and Hayman, 2002). From the interview responses, it was apparent that individuals' experiences of time differed quite dramatically. There were a few interviewees who thought that time was going quickly inside prison. For example, "inside it goes a lot quicker than outside... I don't know how that is" (Alan) and "[time is] flying I think" (Adrian). Jack found that time could pass quickly if he placed himself in a different state of consciousness:

Yeah, you get bored and you go past it... you can just sit there and say nothing and do nothing and time passes quickly.... it's almost like you're in an awake sleep and time just goes past..... you try and think, then you think about what happened..... you get past bored... you're dreaming with your eyes open.... like a daydream – I can sit there and do that for hours – especially in a police cell.

However, for other prisoners, time passed slowly. Thus, Matthew commented, "some weeks go fast, some go slow" and Craig stated, "it just drags on a bit". Danny actually found that by buying a clock it made time go slower:

I bought a clock – I had to chuck it in the bin – you keep watching it and it goes slower and slower.

While some prisoners chose to ignore the passing of time, others chose to mark it. For example, when asked how long he had been on a sentenced allocation unit, Matthew replied, “I don’t know... I never keep count”. Conversely, Gareth marked his weeks by Fridays (canteen days); “it’s something to remember – a marker”. By marking his time with such institutional events, Gareth was able to deal with the overabundance of time (Meisenhelder, 1985). Meisenhelder suggests that whilst at first the naïve prisoner finds prison time to move very slowly, once they mark time, it moves more quickly. Subsequently, ‘hard time’ may return when the prisoner moves towards release and attempts to ‘live’ in two places and times concurrently. This is supported by Gareth’s account; “first week and last week [are the hardest] - coz time goes slow – you know you’re close to it but time goes slower.... that’s why I don’t count days”.

In earlier discussions about a fear of the unknown, it was shown that those prisoners on remand or who were convicted unsentenced, found it difficult not knowing how much time they had left to serve. For example, Sam stated “[on remand] you’re thinking what’s gonna happen – once you’ve been sentenced you can get your time over with”. Likewise, Joe described how “time goes very slowly.... I’ve been here 2 months but it feels like 2 years”. It was the knowledge of a release date and being able to work towards it that meant time went quicker for sentenced prisoners; “time does go quicker once you’re sentenced – you’re in a routine” (Luke). As a result, it seems appropriate to extend the work of Sapsford (1983), who suggests that time is one of the great deprivations of prison, particularly for those serving indeterminate sentences. This should also include those who are remanded or convicted unsentenced, who are unsure about the length of time they face in prison.

Loss of stimulation

Following on from the above, the feeling that time is passing slowly can be exacerbated by a loss of stimulation. In turn, a loss of stimulation can lead to boredom (Cope, 2003). Previous authors, for example Cooke et al (1990), Coyle (1994), Howard League (1999a), Little (1990) and Meisenhelder (1985), acknowledge that prisoners have little to occupy their time and consequently boredom can play a significant role in many of their lives. However, this pain of custody extends to the wider criminal justice system; loss of stimulation is one of the most significant pains of custody faced by today's young male detainees and prisoners.

A number of interviewees reported feeling bored whilst being held in a police cell. For example, "I was very bored" (Mark), "[I felt] proper [bored] it's a killer in there..... it's shit" (Tom) and "it's alright but it's not alright – it's a bit boring you know" (Sam). These same sentiments were found in court cells and prison cells; "it don't bother me what [the Judge is] going to say.... I just want to get out of there..... it's real boring" (Luke), "[court's] just really boring" (Peter), "prison's not hard, it's boring, just shit....that's the only thing I can't cope with, the boredom" (Alan), "you just feel fed up, bored" (Danny), "I hate being locked up all the time – it gets boring" (Gareth), "I do get bored quite a bit sometimes" (Mark), "it is like boring – if you ain't got a job you're banged up 24, 7" (Sam) and "it just stresses you out sometimes coz it gets boring" (Adrian). Lastly, returning to an earlier quote from Shaun about the hard summer months, boredom was something that had to be broken to make life in prison easier and less stressful:

It was [hard] for me at first.... May, June, July, August were hard months
– it was summer and I was stressed out.... I sat down and started thinking

about the future.... I did that drugs course – it made me think what I need to do... since the end of August it's been easy... it was about breaking boredom.

For some young men, boredom can be especially difficult to cope with. When Dave was at another YOI, he used plastic, glass and razor blades to cut his arms and chest. In response to being asked why he cut himself, Dave explained:

I don't really know actually... I just find something to do – coz I get bored and that..... it helps the boredom watching blood come out your arms... I feel claustrophobic in here sometimes..... getting bored, that's a bit hard.

In similar respects, other researchers have found associations between self-harm and an inability to cope with boredom (Favazza, 1996; Liebling and Krarup, 1993; Wool and Dooley, 1987).

With regards to prison, one of the main reasons why interviewees felt bored was the 'sameness' of it; "prison's long – same thing every day" (Paul), "just wake up and everything's the same" (John), "you do the same thing day in, day out" (Dean), "just the same thing everyday" (Jonathan) and "same things just another day" (Russell). Individuals also felt they had nothing to do in prison or the wider criminal justice system; "I had nothing to do [in the police cell] so it was a bit boring" (Joe), "I was very bored [in the police cell].... I didn't have anything to do" (Mark) and "if you're banged up all day it's hard work.... [you've got] nothing to do" (Adam). This 'sameness' and loss of stimulation were found by Cope (2003: 161), who quotes a young male prisoner

explaining prison is “[t]he same thing every day”. Cope explains that one of the central problems in prison is that routine is only given to certain times of the day. Thus, prisoners are faced with both highly structured periods of time (for example, when to wake, when some will go to work or education and what they will be undertaking there) and unstructured periods of time (for example, when those that have not gone to work or education, time in-cell after dinner and before bed). Consequently, it is not surprising to find that interviewees are bored when they are ‘banged up’ and have little structure to their time. Furthermore, Cope (2003: 160) argues that “passing time in prison was more challenging [than the outside world], because confinement and control influence the experience of time and limit the resources available to make time pass”. Again, interviewees suffer with boredom when they have few resources available to them, which subsequently impacts on their experience of time.

It is appropriate here to return to the earlier section on the deprivation of goods and services. In comparison with the 1950s, technological advancements make this pain of custody more apparent to today’s prisoners and detainees, as young people are now used to almost constant stimulation. For example, young people have access to mobile phones, MP3 players, computer games, personal computers, televisions and DVD players. They can spend their day stimulated by one gadget after another, sometimes using more than one at a time. Consequently, on entering the criminal justice system, young people can feel particularly bored and pained at the loss of these daily forms of stimulation.

Prisoners on remand are particularly susceptible to this pain of custody, as they find it difficult to get on a course or get a job; “all the courses you have to be in for a certain amount of time” (Gareth), “you don’t get nothing on remand.... remand’s the worse for

work” (Adam), “no point [putting down for education] till I come back from court.... if I get a year I’d definitely think about education” (Craig) and “coz I’ve put down for tag... if I get tag it’s the 20th January I’m out – there’s no point [putting down for a course]” (Ben). Consequently, because Dean could not attend courses whilst on remand, he felt he was wasting time; “for me personally I think I’m wasting my time”. Cope (2003) found a similar sentiment among her young male interviewees, when faced with the sameness of prison life. However, within the present sample there was evidence that prisoners were not happy with their present circumstances, and their wishes centred on overcoming this boredom, with some craving educational and occupational opportunities. As an example, Mark mentioned the possibility of a forklift course starting at Glen Parva YOI and how he hoped to get onto it, although he would be happy to do more education; “I’d like to get on the forklift course... I’d love to do more English and maths if they could – I can’t ask for that.... 8 out of 10 people in here have problems reading and writing [and there is only one teacher]”. Likewise, Craig stated he wanted to “go education to get me out of my pad” and Mohammed commented, “I like going to education.... I don’t need money – just send me to education”. With respect to getting employment in Glen Parva YOI, Paul stated that he wanted a decent job, which he could really enjoy; “most of the time people don’t get the opportunity to do anything”. Other prisoners merely showed a desire to be kept busy rather than being employed in constructive activities; “if they said I could have a play station – I’d have something to do – [that would] make me happier” (Gary)

Waiting game

The ‘waiting game’ stems from the deprivation of liberty and refers to the waiting that detainees and prisoners endure throughout the criminal justice system. Not only is it

influenced by a loss of stimulation, but it also influences the perception of time and is associated with boredom; “[t]he primary emotional effect associated with the universality of waiting seems to be that of boredom” (Meisenhelder, 1985: 44). Evidence of the waiting game was found in interviewees’ accounts of police cells, court cells, escort vehicles and prison. The police custody activity analysis was referred to in the deprivation of liberty section and showed that young male detainees spend an average of 9 hours and 10 minutes being held at a police station (see appendix G). Of this total time, an average of 29 minutes (5%) is spent merely waiting in the chute; the chute is an empty holding room where detainees sit with the arresting officer/s before being booked in by the custody officer. It is often busy and those waiting can sometimes become aggressive or even violent. I was even told of occasions when detainees had tried to self-harm there. After the chute, the waiting continues into the cells, where detainees spend an average of 4 hours and 14 minutes (46% of the total time), waiting for their first interview. This can be an anxious and worrying period that is exacerbated by the fact that detainees can only communicate with custody officers and staff by means of the cell buzzer or the intercom. Not only may these be turned off, as indicated earlier, but interviewees’ responses suggest that buzzers are not always answered as quickly as liked. For example, interviewees stated:

[In X police station] they do take long to answer their buzzer – in [Y police station] they come straight away..... last night I was ringing the buzzer and I waited 10 – 15 minutes to come to the door, I was sick and everything (Sam).

[They could improve] the time it takes to answer the buzzer – in [X police station] you press it and it takes 20 minutes, even ½ hour for them to answer (Kieran).

More generally, when requests were made, interviewees felt police officers and staff made them wait; “you have to wait for ages” (Gareth), “you ask them to do something, it don’t get done straight away” (Shaun), “they don’t do what you ask them to do..... you ask for a coffee and they say fuck off and wait 2 hours... you ask for a light and they say fuck off” (Andrew) and “they say they’re gonna do something and they don’t..... you ask them if I can have a phone call and they say ½ hour and you lie there waiting for a couple of hours” (Richard). This ties in with the deprivation of autonomy and control, whereby detainees have to make requests via an intercom or buzzer for food, drinks, toilet paper, etc. From my own observations it was apparent that on a couple of occasions when requests were made to custody officers and staff, detainees were kept waiting. Delays supposedly arose because of other commitments, for example hand-over, although it seemed a member of staff could have assisted earlier. Nevertheless, there were times when custody officers and staff were genuinely busy and could not answer every request as quickly as desired by detainees. Furthermore, many detainees who were being held at particular police stations faced long waits due to problems with GSL (the escort service provider for the area), which led to increased feelings of frustration. For example, Ben explained how at the police station staff kept explaining that GSL would arrive in the next half an hour, but they did not. Unaware of the problems GSL were having, Ben thought staff were lying to him and became more and more agitated; “I was just kicking the cell – I was alright – they were lying to us – in the end I went mental – ringing the bell”.

Subsequently, individuals were left waiting in the court cells; “it was a bit hard to wait..... I didn’t know what was going to happen” (Joe), “you’re pissed off when you get to court coz you’re waiting and you don’t know what’s gonna happen... the court cells are totally shit” (Alan), “[you’re] sitting there..... you just sit and wait” (Robert), “[the court hearing is] supposed to be 10am, but they normally leave you hanging around” (Peter), “[the court process is] long.... you wish they could deal with it quicker” (Adam) and “it does take too long to get to court – just waiting to get in there.... wasting your day” (Peter). Again, my observations supported these comments. For example, on one day at Alpha Magistrates Court, only one out of eleven detainees had been in court by 2pm, all having arrived at approximately 8.30am. Research by HMIP (2004) also found long waiting times at court, despite relatively short hearings. In addition, some detainees were kept waiting after having pressed their cell buzzer, although this tended to be when staff were on lunch or pre-occupied with other tasks. Later, Robert spoke of how he had a long wait for an escort vehicle to take him from Mansfield to Glen Parva YOI; “you have to wait for a bus passing to get onto it..... that’s why I had to wait so long”. This waiting in part arises from the fact there are relatively few YOIs, consequently individuals have greater distances to travel from court (Howard League, 2001; Williams et al, 2000).

On arrival in prison the waiting game continued. For example, Mark “had to wait for ages” after arriving at Glen Parva YOI until he and other prisoners were taken from the bus into reception. Shaun also described how he could talk to any member of staff, but sometimes had to wait for a problem to be resolved:

If ever I have any problems I talk to them and they sort it out... you may have to wait, but it’s a waiting game in here... you’ve got to be patient.

Once more, I observed young men having to wait repeatedly throughout the day. Firstly, prisoners would be woken up and then would wait until they were let down to breakfast in small numbers. There they would wait in a queue to hand over their flasks from the previous night, put in any applications, hand in letters and collect their breakfast. After returning to their cells to eat, those going to work, gym, education, etc. would wait in the association room before being registered and sent to the relevant location. At lunchtime they would be returned to their cell and would wait to be released to collect their lunch. Again, they waited for their food and returned to their cell, only to wait after lunch in the association room before the afternoon session. These routines, which continued day after day, not only exist because time is highly controlled within the prison and the wider criminal justice system, but also because they help to maintain control (Cope, 2003). However, the waiting game is the side effect of such highly controlled time.

Lack of respect

Within the criminal justice system, some interviewees felt staff had not respected them. More specifically, the overwhelming number of interviewees who did not feel respected, referred to a lack of respect from police officers and staff, partly because they had been kept waiting. For example, when asked if they had felt respected in the police station, interviewees replied:

No.... the only person who treats you with respect is your solicitor.....
it's just the way they act – their attitude... you get some of them who are
alright..... [but] if you use your buzzer you have to wait for ages
(Gareth).

You'll ask them something... and they're so quick to say fuck off or in a minute..... every hour is like three... if they were straight with you, then you'd know where you stand (Jack).

Likewise, Shaun replied, "not really.... they're always taking the piss out of what you've done..... you ask them to do something, it don't get done straight away" and Sam said, "no.... they just take ages for things and they try to treat me like a piece of shit". Equally, Craig felt that he was not shown respect because when he rang his bell to ask for something, the police officers or staff would not return for an hour, despite saying they would return in a couple of minutes. The importance of this delay is shown by Harvey (2007: 82), who concludes that "[t]he prerequisites to prisoners forming a trusting relationship with prison staff were that the staff should respond in a timely manner and that they should not break promises or make promises they could not keep". Although Harvey specifically refers to prison, interviewees' responses show that responding in a timely manner also affects respect in police cells.

The attitude of police officers and staff also influenced interviewees' perception of respect; "the way they arrest you, the way they speak to you" (Dave), "I'd say the woman [respected me] but the other blokes didn't – they look down on you.... it's how they talk to you" (Danny), "the way they treat you" (Gary) and "some do, some don't... they threaten to beat you up sometimes" (Ryan). In addition, not being helpful was cited as disrespectful; "they don't want to help you" (Simon) and "some of them [respect me].... some of them are total arseholes and ignorant.... you ask them for something and they say 'fuck off'" (Alan). Similarly, Dean stated he did not feel respected at the police station because he was kept in a cell for hours on end, staff would give him a

cigarette but no lighter and they would only give him meals at set times even though he was hungry.

In terms of court and escort staff, no interviewee mentioned feeling a lack of respect; instead, they were deemed more respectful than police officers and staff. In particular, Robert stated escort staff were “better than the police.... they’re more polite – they show you more respect”. Likewise, Simon and Ryan felt court staff respected them more than staff at the police station. This is a similar finding to research conducted by Williams et al (2000) and HMIP (2004), who found that detainees and prisoners do, in general, feel well treated by court and escort staff. Likewise, the Howard League (2001) found that some prisoners thought contract staff working in court cells were more respectful than prison staff. Part of this may be because escort and court services are now all privatised, unlike the Police Force and Prison Service. Consequently, staff may have a different perspective towards the people in their care and the role that they are employed to undertake. Lastly, with respect to prison, only one interviewee stated they had not felt respected. Danny described how when working in the Healthcare Centre, some of the staff kept leaving dirty plates and cups around after prisoners had just cleaned up, thus commenting “they don’t respect you some of them”.

It seems paradoxical that respect increases as individuals proceed through the criminal justice system, despite many being ‘innocent until proven guilty’ at the police station. However, on further exploration it becomes apparent why individuals may feel more respected by prison officers in comparison with police officers and staff. As outlined within the literature review (chapter one), Liebling and Price (2001) identify at least three different examples of the term ‘respect.’ These are respect as fear or power, respect as individuality and respect as moral strength or legitimacy. The majority of

interviewees spoke of respect in relation to individuality, which means responding to someone as an individual, doing what they ask without complaint, and demonstrating care and humanity (ibid.). Firstly, with reference to ‘responding to someone as an individual’, prison officers have to get to know prisoners as individuals for “the smooth running of the regime, for security purposes and for the safety of staff and other prisoners” (Crawley, 2004: 95). Relationships are aided because prison officers spend more time with prisoners (Liebling and Price, 2001). Conversely, in police stations, escort vehicles and court custody suites, individuals are often processed as ‘units’, with the emphasis on providing a quick and efficient system. Secondly, with respect to ‘doing what they ask without complaint’, previous interview responses show that detainees felt they had to wait far longer in a police cell for specific requests to be answered, in comparison with court cells or prison cells. This is partly because prisoners do not need to make as many requests; they already have access to cigarettes, toilet paper, reading material, bedding, food, etc. Thirdly, regarding ‘demonstrating a little care and humanity’, chapter five will show that interviewees are far more positive about the relationships they develop with prison officers and the support they provide, in contrast with police officers and staff. This is particularly important as respect not only arises from relationships but also affects relationships (Liebling and Price, 2001). Furthermore, respect, staff-prisoner relationships and humanity are three of the eleven most important aspects of prison life for prisoners, as shown by the MQPL (measuring the quality of prison life) survey (Liebling, 2007). One reason why prison officers may demonstrate greater care and humanity is because they share similar socio-economic backgrounds, interests and experiences with prisoners (Crawley, 2004). Thus, Sykes (1958: 33) concludes, “[g]uards and prisoners are drawn from the same culture and they hold many of the same values and beliefs. They share a common language and a common historical experience”. This explanation is supported by an informal discussion

I had with a prison officer at Glen Parva YOI, who explained how he could relate to a number of prisoners as he too had come from a council estate, where his father had beaten him and where he had ended up in care. Conversely, police officers tend to hold a victim-centred perspective and view offenders with cynicism and suspicion (Reiner, 1985).

Loss of social support

A number of interviewees commented on how their relationships with family and friends were severed or at least placed under considerable strain whilst in the criminal justice system (Coyle, 1994; Goffman, 1961; Howard League, 1999a; Little, 1990). Perhaps because of the age group interviewed, far more individuals mentioned the pain of being separated from family and friends in comparison with the deprivation of heterosexual relationships. The loss of social support seems particularly relevant to young detainees and prisoners, who “are often not as mature as their age may suggest” and to whom their family are a vital form of support (Solomon, 2004: 14). Likewise, Crawley (2004: 100, original emphasis) refers to the immaturity of many young prisoners, stating in response to quotes from prison officers, “[c]omments such as this highlight the fact that these prisoners are *children*”.

When speaking of being separated from family and friends, interviewees commented; “we’ve all been took away from our families, people we love – that’s the worst punishment” (Paul), “[I miss] all my family” (Richard), “[I miss my] friends, girlfriend, mum” (Kieran), “[I miss] my daughter – it is quite hard” (John), “[I miss] just daft little things – [like] waking up with my daughter smacking me” (Gareth), “I do miss my mates and my family” (Sam) and “I miss my mates” (Gary). These narratives highlight

the vulnerable position of many young male prisoners, who are not only sons but also fathers. Harvey (2007) too found that young prisoners were concerned about being separated from their loved ones, particularly their mothers and relationship partners. Consequently, this separation may have a significant impact on interviewees, who use family and friends as a form of social support. For example, the last time Gary was held in a court cell he started head-banging, explaining, “I started going mad... I started head banging the walls.... they wouldn’t let me see my sister or dad”. When asked why he had not continued this within prison, Gary explained, “I would do it in here but I’ve got my girlfriend to look forward to – no point doing anything stupid”. Therefore, by having access to his girlfriend and the support she provided him, Gary was diverted from further self-harm. Similarly, in prison, Justin described how he cut himself because he was stressed about court and the fact he could not see his family; because this avenue of social support was largely cut off, Justin found he lost his temper and would subsequently cut himself as a form of release. Previous research has also found a link between suicide or self-harm and a lack of social support, poor communication with family and friends, and social isolation (Babiker and Arnold, 2001; Favazza, 1996; Liebling, 1999a; Meltzer et al, 1999; Powis, 2002; Wool and Dooley, 1987).

Not only can imprisonment result in a lack of support, but in some cases it can change a prisoner’s established relationships (Gibbs, 1982a; Towl and Hudson, 1997). The previous chapter demonstrated how some prisoners ended relationships because of long prison sentences. Interviewees also described how prison had affected their family, which in turn impacted negatively on their relationships with them. Paul described how “[prison is] affecting my mum... not just affecting me... I don’t want her to get upset” and Robert stated:

My mum and dad keep asking me for visits but I keep saying no..... when I see my mum it upsets me.... I don't want her to be in the visiting room and get upset coz it upsets me... I think it hurts my mum and dad more on visits.

A lack of contact with, and lack of control over, the outside world meant some prisoners were left feeling worried and concerned about their family and friends. For example, Mark stated that police custody could be improved by allowing family visits, explaining "I had to keep asking if my mum had rung.... even if they'd put me behind a glass window... just to visit them... to see if they were alright". Likewise, when in prison, interviewees found; "you just think and worry about your girlfriend and family each day" (Danny), "that worries me in here – I know if anything happens to them I can't do nothing about it" (Gareth) and "I don't care about myself... it's like being in here I can do it, it's knowing my missus and my baby are alright" (Ben).

Pains of communication

The pains of communication apply specifically to prisoners. In order to prevent the breakdown of relationships and sustain the support provided by family and friends, it is necessary for prisoners to maintain links with the outside world through communication, i.e. visits, phone calls and letters. However, because prison life restricts the opportunity to communicate with others, there are breakdowns in communication or pains associated with communication (Harvey, 2007).

A number of prisoners mentioned that Glen Parva YOI was too far for their family to travel to visit them and consequently they had not received a visit. This ties in with

earlier research, which shows that 23% of the young offender population are being held 50 – 100 miles from home, with 12% being held more than 100 miles from home (Hansard, 2004). Not having a visit can have a detrimental effect on young prisoners. Paul spoke of how he felt when seeing other prisoners on visits; “it gets you upset some times... I get a gutted feeling in my belly”. Even when prisoners did receive visits, they found pains associated with this form of communication, as did Caird (1974) and Harvey (2007):

I’m happy at the time and I’m happy for a couple of hours afterwards but I hate seeing them going.... it gets you when you’re in your cell... you get time to think (Gareth).

When I go on my visit and [my mum] looks ill I come back and think about things – I don’t want to talk to no-one.... [I feel upset] all the time - every time I have a visit... I still don’t like it when they go – you wish you could go with them (Shaun).

I know when I get on visits I’ll break up – I can’t handle it.... seeing my family and girlfriend – just seeing them.... when I usually see my family and girlfriend I go with them – I don’t have to sit there and watch them walk away from me (Gary).

Likewise, interviewees stated; “I don’t like it... there’s other people around you... it makes me emotional – they’ve been having a good time” (Danny), “when they go that’s the hardest bit – going back to your cell and you know they’ve gone” (Jonathan) and “[I feel] pissed off – coz I see [my girlfriend] and you’re chatting, then suddenly they’ve

got to go and you won't see them for one or two weeks" (Kieran). For Joe, the distress of seeing his family and friends was too great so he stopped family and friends from visiting, explaining, "I don't like anyone coming to visit me..... I want to go home as well when they're leaving".

With respect to communication by telephone, a number of prisoners spoke of the problems associated with the limited number of phones and the difficulty of maintaining contact. In particular, Alan explained:

I need to use the phone but every time I come down on soc she's at work.... I'm alright really – I'm just pissed off I can't ring up when I want... I can't explain everything on the phone in five minutes and I can't explain everything in a letter either..... three phones here and one hundred lads.

Paul also commented on the lack of phones inside Glen Parva YOI, stating how there were always prisoners "arguing to get on the phone". Furthermore, Shaun highlighted the problem of expensive phone calls; "I don't use the phone.... I won't be able to afford buying phone credit". This corresponds with evidence that prisoners are being charged more than five times the standard payphone rate to use a prison phone, rates that are discouraging prisoners from maintaining family ties (Allison, 2006). In addition, John explained how he avoided using the phone to speak with friends because calls were recorded, whilst Danny was prevented from calling anyone for the first six months because all his numbers were in his mobile phone, which had been seized by police. Lastly, using the phone can be too distressing for family members; "I didn't

[call] when I first come in – mum was too emotional... now I call her once a week – she’s got used to my calls” (Robert).

Similarly, there were problems associated with writing letters. Paul commented on the difficulties of having dyslexia, although other people would help him when he wrote to his mum and girlfriend. Many other prisoners also suffer problems like Paul; the Social Exclusion Unit (2002) reports that 80% of prisoners have writing skills at or below the level of an 11 year old. In addition, as identified by Cooke et al (1990), letter writing does not come easily to all prisoners. For example, Danny spoke about how he found it difficult knowing what to write in his letters:

I like getting letters – I just don’t like writing them back – you don’t have much to say – it’s the same routine everyday.... [I write about] what I’ve been up to, what I had for dinner – just stupid things.

As previously found by Cooke et al (1990), the time delay in receiving letters makes it a problematic form of communication. Alan described how when he argued with his girlfriend she would send him a nasty letter, so he would reply with a nasty letter, but then she would follow it up with a nice letter, only to receive the nasty letter from him. Consequently, letters sometimes made arguments worse. As well, letters could be upsetting for prisoners; “when I get letters I sit there and think, you do sort of get depressed” (Dean). More significantly, the pains of communication can have a significant impact on those who self-harm. Dave described how the stress caused by family problems and them not writing letters led to him cutting himself. In similar respects, Liebling (1992) found a group of young prisoners who had attempted suicide received significantly fewer visits and wrote fewer letters than a comparison group.

Again, in comparison with the 1950s, developments in technology make this pain of custody harder to bear. Young people have come to expect almost constant stimulation and means of communication. As stated previously, 91% of 16 – 21 year olds not in education have access to a mobile phone, providing them with a means of calling family and friends, and allowing them to send text messages at any time of the day or night (Haste, 2005). Furthermore, 97% have access to a computer that links to the Internet (ibid.). Thus, the Internet provides immediate communication with family and friends all over the world. However, within prison, young people are only able to write letters or have access to a limited number of shared payphones; neither compensate for losing access to mobile phones and email. To lessen this loss, the Prison Service perhaps needs to consider providing prisoners with access to email, although there could be security risks associated with such a move.

Lastly, even when in prison, with access to numerous prison officers and staff, prisoners can feel communication is restricted or of limited value, which can have a detrimental effect on those who self-harm. Matthew described how he had begun self-harming in prison as a means of coping with depression, and as a means of getting attention and speaking to someone:

I've never slashed up on the road outside before.... I was depressed that's why I was slashing up..... I need to see a friendly face and I can't see one in here..... I was depressed miss – [it was for] attention – anything.... when people don't listen to you, you resort to last resorts..... other people I know had done it – I was on [the vulnerable prisoner] unit at the time..... I was in jail – I couldn't cope.... I didn't think about it – it was bam I saw the razor blade and I just did it.

Equally, inside prison, Mohammed self-harmed because he wanted to talk to somebody; “they won’t talk to you...when you do talk to them they won’t listen to you”. Consequently, for Matthew and Mohammed, self-harm provided them with a means of communication when they felt prison officers or staff were not listening to them. This was particularly relevant to Mohammed, who had difficulties communicating in English.

Loss of identity

Since individuals are detained in the earlier stages of the criminal justice system for relatively short periods, only prisoners face a loss of identity, which is influenced by a number of other pains of custody. Although interviewees never spoke specifically about this pain, there is evidence to suggest that the prison environment did threaten some interviewees’ identities. Within the literature review (chapter one), three types of identity were described; personal, social and legal (Finch, 2007). According to Finch, personal identity refers to the self as experienced by the individual, evolving from the individual’s interaction with others and their participation in the social world. One way in which personal identity may be affected is through the loss of personal possessions (Bonta and Gendreau, 1992; Crawley, 2004; Goffman, 1961; Mathiesen, 1990; Sykes, 1958). In support of this, and as outlined in the previous chapter, Alan commented on the fact his personal clothes were replaced with “shit” prison clothes, which posed the possibility that “some rapist” could have worn them. Alan seemed worried that his own identity could be dirtied or contaminated by the possibility that a rapist had worn his clothes. Equally, Cohen and Taylor (1972: 64) have identified the threat posed to prisoners by sex offenders; “[t]he prisoners we met were worried about contamination but only by one other type of inmate – the sex offender”.

The deprivation of goods and services may lead to the loss of personal clothing, but it can also lead to the loss of personal possessions such as mobile phones. In addition to providing young people with an almost constant source of stimulation and communication, mobile phones enable them to present their image and identity to others. For example, Haste (2005: 18) argues that for young people, the mobile phone “is an extension of their person and expresses their identity and selfhood in a variety of ways, including both how it is used and how it is worn”. Not only are young people able to chose different ring tones for their phone, but they can alter the background screen image or snap-on cover and choose where / how to wear it (ibid.). The loss of such an item may therefore alter how the prisoner portrays his usual image and may consequently threaten his identity.

A third way in which personal identity may be negatively affected is through the deprivation of autonomy and control. Sykes (1958) suggests that when prisoners lose their autonomy, it reduces them to the weak, helpless and dependant status once found in childhood, which can present a threat to their self-image as an adult. In support of this child-like status, Crawley (2004: 100) found that prison officers thought of young prisoners as “needy” and as “craving contact with staff”. In similar respects, interviewees’ responses demonstrate how they were reduced to a helpless and dependent status. For example, Paul explained how some prison officers are “proper power freaks” and how “you’ve basically got no life no more”. Likewise, Adrian and Matthew commented on how they could not do what they wanted or when they wanted. Therefore, by reducing them to a helpless and dependent status, the deprivation of autonomy and control could pose a threat to these young prisoners’ identities.

In contrast to personal identity, social identity refers to how individuals are perceived by others and how this is reflected back to them (Finch, 2007). Within the literature review (chapter one), a lengthy discussion was given to masculinity and hegemonic masculinity. It was noted how some of the pains of custody mean certain characteristics associated with hegemonic masculinity are threatened within prison, including being self-sufficient, independent, heterosexual, in control and invulnerable (Crewe, 2007; Jefferson, 1994; Newburn and Stanko, 1994b). Regarding vulnerability, a number of interviewees commented that, despite the pressures of being inside prison, you should not be seen by others as showing a weakness. For example, Matthew stated:

I don't like listeners....they don't do nothing..... they don't give a fuck about what's going on with you..... you show a weakness [by seeing a Listener] - that's one thing people don't like showing in jail.

Gareth too described a fear of showing weakness; when he was at another YOI, a prisoner that he knew tied a sheet against the bars in a hospital cell and hung himself. However, prisoners were not told that the lad had died, finding out about his death via the news on television. When asked if this had upset him, Gareth replied:

There's nothing you can do about it..... no one wants to say they're bothered about someone dying – you're showing you're weak – no one wants to show you're weak in prison..... that's just the way it is.

Although there is evidence to suggest that prisoners' identities were threatened, in comparison with Goffman (1961) and Sykes (1958), these findings were more tentative. It is possible that sample differences led to this disparity; neither Goffman nor Sykes

specifically look at young prisoners, instead focusing on middle-aged men. Consequently, in comparison with older men, the identities of young prisoners may not be fully formed yet, they may have greater difficulties comprehending their identity or expressing such threats in words. In support of this, Finch (2007: 29) claims that “[i]dentity is a complex and multi-faceted concept”. Furthermore, it is possible that the identity of adult men is far more established and embedded than that of 18 – 21 year olds. Therefore, adult men may feel a threat more so than 18 – 21 year olds. Changes within the prison may also help to explain these differences. Sykes (1958) argues that a prisoner’s identity may be negatively affected by a lack of heterosexual interaction. Here, Sykes is referring to an individual’s social identity; how others perceive them and how this is reflected back to them (Finch, 2007). However, as shown previously, although today’s prisoner lacks heterosexual relationships, they no longer lack heterosexual interaction and consequently their social identity should not be affected. Prisoners’ identities are also influenced by their relationships with prison officers; “[t]hrough relationships, prisoners..... became individuals” (Liebling and Price, 2001: 95). Again, prisoners’ identities may be sustained because of improved relationships with prison officers; present staff-prisoner interactions are qualitatively different from those in the 1970s and 1980s (and arguably the 1950s), when relationships were abrupt and overweening (Crawley, 2004). Additionally, not all researchers have found that prisoners lose their identities. In their study of a maximum-security wing, Cohen and Taylor (1972: 148) conclude:

We have asserted that the men in E-Wing hardly lost their identities as a result of being processed through the prison system. Being processed did not seem to have significantly changed them.

Lastly, legal identity refers to the social facts and information that is accumulated about an individual and that distinguishes them from others. Within the criminal justice system, this includes criminal records, prison history and sentencing plans. Previously, it was suggested that detainees and prisoners might lose their legal identity to some degree because staff hold ultimate power and control over these documents. Although interviewees did not comment on this issue, I did observe examples of this manifestation of power. Thus, in Glen Parva YOI, a Senior Prison Officer invited me to look at any of the prisoners' files that were kept on the unit. Similarly, in Bravo Crown Court I was handed two open F2052SH forms to look at. It is probable that under these circumstances staff were only trying to be helpful and show they had nothing to hide, but it highlights the power staff hold over detainees' and prisoners' legal documents.

Physical environment

The penultimate pain of custody refers to the negative physical environment that many young people find themselves in when confined in the criminal justice system. In particular, this relates to police cells, court cells and escort vehicles, and to a lesser extent, prison. The physical environment influences how some of the above pains are experienced, for example, the deprivation of liberty or the waiting game, and how young people feel. Although the following narratives demonstrate that a significant number of interviewees found examples of a poor physical environment, it must be noted that numerous interviewees commented on positive conditions. When asked about their experiences of police cells, a number of interviewees noted how they were dirty; "grotty really, it weren't clean really" (Danny), "dirty... just everything – the walls and everything – there's all spit everywhere... peoples' dinner down the walls and door" (Robert), "trampy.... not clean, muck up the wall, stains on them" (Nathan), "some of

them are clean sometimes, if someone's been in there before you they can be a bit dirty" (Jonathan) and "it's a shit hole.... sometimes it's dirty" (Richard). Like Newburn and Hayman (2002), interviewees commented on the poor ventilation of police cells and how they found them cramped. This had a negative impact on their psychological well-being; "it made me angry though being in that cell – it was dead claustrophobic" (Danny), "it's fucking horrible... just the cells themselves... I can't stand them... they're claustrophobic.... it's just too claustrophobic... thick windows and you can't even open them" (Gary) and "I just wanna get out, it's all small and stinks" (Jonathan). Similarly, Tom stated:

[I felt] pissed off... coz I'm mad at myself for letting myself get caught..... when you get locked behind that door it pisses you off... I'm not an animal – no one wants to be caged... but it's my fault I'm here.

Other interviewees described how being placed in a police cell led to negative feelings; "I was just annoyed I was there" (John) and "[I felt] pissed off coz like I didn't want to come here" (Alan). For some individuals, being detained in a police cell can have a detrimental effect on self-harm. When held in a police cell, Gary explained:

I start head-butting the walls.... coz I don't like it in there... [head-butting] don't hurt [me] now, I got used to it... [I head-butt] quite a lot – every time I get arrested I start head-butting the cell.... it just helps me calm down – I get so wound up.

For Gary, the physical aspect of the cell distressed him. Conversely, Gary explained that when he was in prison he did not self-harm because the physical environment was less

stressful; “coz I’ve got fucking windows in here and someone to talk to”, whereas in the police cells there were no transparent windows and he was held on his own.

Similar negative conditions were found in the escort vehicles that interviewees travelled in from the police station or prison to court and / or from court to prison. These are comparable to the findings by Caddle (1995), HMIP (2000; 2004), HM MCSI and HMIP (2005), Howard League (2001) and Williams et al (2000). While only a minority of interviewees cited negative conditions in police cells, the majority of interviewees spoke about negative conditions in escort vehicles. The familiar nickname for escort vehicles is ‘sweat box’ and a number of interviewees referred to this. In particular, Mark stated it was “really hot in there”, Sam commented that it was “too hot and sweaty.... it’s horrible” and Alan said “it’s just hot... either hot or freezing cold – no in between”. Other interviewees mentioned that the vehicles could be too cold; “it was a bit cold” (Joe) and “they’re small and cold” (Shaun). A number of criticisms were made of how dirty and damaged the vehicles were; “they’re horrible, dirty, people spit on the floor, graffiti everywhere, fag burns everywhere” (Paul), “the windows were scratched... it smells of piss... dirty” (Dean), “pretty filthy really” (Dave), “it stinks of piss and that” (Tom), “it was a right mess... [I could] barely see out the window, people had been scratching, the floor was all sticky – you could see where people had been spitting” (Luke), “it was dirty – [there was] spit on the floor” (Andrew), “it’s clean but there’s a load of shit (graffiti) over the walls” (Alan), “it had all on the sides peoples’ names scratched in” (Danny) and “you couldn’t really see out the window – it was all scratched” (Mark).

One of the contributing factors for poor conditions in escort vehicles is that, for security reasons, they are only allowed to stop for rest breaks at designated locations (for

example, police stations). Consequently, if detainees need to go to the toilet they are provided with specially designed bags containing a substance to soak up liquid; “you tell them you want to go to the toilet... they just throw in a piss bag” (Jack) and “they give you a bag to piss [in]” (Tom). Tom also related an incident when he had been suffering from food poisoning and was feeling sick. On advising a member of staff that he was going to be sick, they replied, “what do you want me to do about it?” Tom subsequently “had to be sick in my little cubicle”. When asked how this had made him feel, Tom replied, quite surprisingly, “I’m used to it... I laugh at it”. It is possible that this is a further example of an interviewee displaying evidence of a ‘defended subject’.

In addition to the above poor conditions, a large number of criticisms centred on the cramped and uncomfortable conditions of escort vehicles. In particular, “the seats [are] plastic and hard... it’s like a box” (Paul), “it’s not very comfy.... just hard seats, especially if you’re sitting on there for hours.... you can’t really move about” (Adam), “[the seats are] hard.... you can’t really get comfortable... it’s cramped” (Dean), “they’re horrible they are.... not comfortable – small area – plastic seats... you get bum ache.... just dead uncomfortable – when you go round corners you go all over the place” (Danny), “if it’s a long distance the seats are a bit hard” (Jonathan), “it’s like you’re sitting on a toilet seat all the way here” (Richard), “you’re just crammed in – when I get to prison I’ve got cramps” (Robert), “it’s shit... small, uncomfortable, just shit isn’t it” (Ben) and “everything’s plastic you can’t get comfy in there” (Shaun). A couple of prisoners also commented on the safety aspects of the escort vehicles:

There’s hardly any space at all – you’ve got no space to stretch at all....

the only thing that scares me is when you’re going down motorways it

wobbles from side to side.... it gets uncomfortable after a while – plastic seats (Gareth).

They could change the seats – make it a bit safer – put a seat belt in them ... they could have buggy seats (Danny).

Similar concerns are raised by HMIP (2004), who identify that the absence of seatbelts can result in prisoners feeling vulnerable.

The above conditions were found in court cells, albeit to a lesser degree. These again compare with research by Caddle (1995), HMIP (2000), HM MCSI and HMIP (2005), Howard League (2001) and Williams et al (2000). For example, interviewees commented; “it was grimy, graffitied all over” (John), “it had all spit and food all on the floor” (Adrian), “disgusting.... the walls are all tatty, graffiti everywhere – no fresh air coming in” (Peter), “the [court] cells are worse though... more trampy [than the police cells]” (Nathan), “they’re dirty – spit all up the walls, toilet rolls stuck to the ceiling – they’re disgusting... police ones are better” (Andrew) and “[the court cells] should be cleaned – there’s load of stuff up the walls – they should be cleaned everyday” (Jonathan).

Criticisms of the conditions inside Glen Parva YOI were made far less frequently than in relation to police cells, escort vehicles or court cells. In part, this is because prisoners are directly involved with cleaning and lose privileges if their cells and communal areas are not kept clean. Nevertheless, a few interviewees did comment on the negative conditions of Glen Parva YOI; “[I thought] oh my god.... I wouldn’t even let my dog sleep in there” (Paul), [the induction unit is] horrible – it’s dirty” (Gareth) and “[the

induction unit] would be a good unit if the cells were kept fucking clean” (Shaun). Perhaps criticisms tended to centre on cells within the induction unit because there was a higher turnover of prisoners; cells on other units may have been kept cleaner because prisoners stay in them for significantly longer periods.

Fear or nervousness about release

The final pain of custody that emerged from this study was fear or nervousness about being released from prison. Although it is not an obvious pain, it did affect a number of interviewees. Previously, this pain has been identified by Goffman, (1961), Jones and Schmid (2000), Parisi (1982) and Paulus and Dzindolet (1992), who describe how prisoners often become anxious or stressed at the thought of being released, with concerns about their families, employment and how they will survive. Paul spoke of feeling scared about getting a long prison sentence and then being released from prison; “I wouldn’t know what to do.... I’m scared of being released... I don’t really want to experience it”. This was partly because on release from his last sentence, Paul found it hard to re-adjust; “everything’s moving faster.... your whole brain switches to prison..... it is a different world, totally different”. When referring to how his ‘whole brain’ had switched to prison, it is possible that Paul had experienced prisonization, where he had begun to take on the morals, customs and general culture of the prison (Clemmer, 1940). Other interviewees had concerns about re-adjusting after their present sentence; “I’ve forgot what it’s like to be outside.... I don’t even want to be thinking about [release]” (Dean), “I’m used to prison life.... it’ll take another month to readjust” (Joe) and “it is a bit weird – it will be this time..... new shops, people always changed” (17). Similarly, Gareth spoke in some depth about his past experiences of being released:

It was [hard] when I did the 15 ½ months – a lot of things had changed..... when you're in prison it's like everything pauses – you expect everything to be the same... everything's all changed... the only thing's not changed is the people you see in prison.... you're waking up in the morning and expecting to be knocked up... I never used to make my bed... now I make my bed, tidy up my bedroom, lounge.... it's a habit.

In addition, a few prisoners recognised that this fear was rooted in a feeling of institutionalisation, or as Clemmer (1940) refers to it, prisonization. Unlike other prisoners, those that are profoundly institutionalised experience prison as a “safe place of comfortable routine” (Medlicott, 2001: 103). Consequently, Dave described the pain he felt when being released from prison:

I feel as though I'm being dragged away from my home... I feel institutionalised... I feel like prison's my home.... when I'm in prison I wish I was on the out and when I'm on the out I wish I was inside prison.

Dave thought that this feeling of institutionalisation had arisen after spending a childhood in foster care, secure units and mental health institutions. Likewise, Tom stated, “I prefer it in Glen Parva, I don't think I'm institutionalised... well, I might be” and James noted how “lads in Glen Parva call me institutionalised.... I probably am... I get used to it – it's like home”. In similar respects to Dave, Andrew did not like the feeling of being released because he missed the daily routine of prison; “you get used to [prison] after a while – the first time I went to prison it was hard for the first couple of weeks – then I got released and after a day I wanted to come back – I missed it..... I

was just used to it – I was used to the daily routine”. Therefore, it must be recognised that some prisoners may feel particularly anxious or worried about the prospect of release.

In summary, the previous chapter showed that nearly fifty years on, the pains of imprisonment identified by Sykes (1958) are pertinent to today’s young male sentenced prisoners. Thus, even today, prisoners face obvious and at times, acute desperation and despair when confronted with the deprivation of liberty, deprivation of goods and services, deprivation of sexual relationships, deprivation of autonomy and control, and deprivation of security. Furthermore, evidence shows that these pains extend to young male prisoners on remand and a number extend to detainees being held in police cells, court cells and escort vehicles. Consequently, it is felt more appropriate to refer to these as pains of custody. However, because of cultural and temporal differences between Sykes’ sample and the present sample, and because of changes within the philosophies that drive the prison system and the wider criminal justice system, it is now possible to identify a further thirteen pains of custody. These affect young males being detained in police cells, court cells, escort vehicles and prison. By exploring these pains it becomes apparent why some individuals resort to suicide or self-harm. In contrast though, as the next chapter demonstrates, the majority of detainees and prisoners are able to cope with these pains of custody. Some of these coping strategies are transferred into the criminal justice system from the outside, while other coping strategies are modified to fit the demands of the environment. In some cases, young men have to develop new coping strategies to survive the pains of custody. Paradoxically, for a few detainees and prisoners, self-harm is a way of coping with these pains and becomes a frequently used coping strategy employed within the criminal justice.

Chapter Five: Coping with the pains of custody

The previous two chapters remind us that Sykes' (1958) five pains of imprisonment are still relevant to today's young male prisoners. However, by applying them to the modern day criminal justice system, it is possible to extend some of these to young men being detained in police cells, court cells and escort vehicles, and to identify a further thirteen pains of custody. The distress caused by these pains of custody can be far-reaching; evidence demonstrates that they may lead young men to attempt suicide or self-harm. Nevertheless, this chapter will establish that many young men are able to survive these pains. In addition, it will be shown that some individuals self-harm, somewhat paradoxically, as a coping strategy in order to deal with these pains.

Adaptation, resistance and coping

The pains of custody, as outlined in the literature review, may be survived through a number of mechanisms, including adaptation, resistance and coping. Firstly, within adaptation, the individual modifies, alters or changes. In contrast, resistance is more forceful, where the individual successfully opposes the pains of custody and refuses to be changed by the regime. Thirdly, coping refers to the behaviours or activities employed by individuals to overcome harmful, challenging or threatening conditions, without necessarily changing themselves or resisting the regime (Monat and Lazarus, 1977). Although some evidence was found in support of Matthews' (1999) suggestion (following Sykes, 1958 and Goffman, 1961) that prisoners co-operate / colonise, withdraw or revel in order to adapt to confinement, it was somewhat limited in this study. It is possible that this may have been because individuals were asked what they did when they felt down, upset, fed up, angry or annoyed and how they coped with

feeling bored, not being able to see family and friends, and not being able to do what they wanted. Differences may also have arisen because Sykes and Goffman focused on adult prisoners rather than young prisoners. Likewise, limited support was found for Irwin (1970), who identifies three adaptive styles prevalent amongst prisoners; jailing, doing time and gleaning. Greater support was however found in relation to Harvey (2007), who, in his study of young male prisoners, identifies three types of adaptation; practical, social and psychological. Conversely, in terms of resistance, no evidence was found to support Cohen and Taylor (1972). As with Sykes and Goffman, it is possible that this was because of differences between the interview questions or samples. In particular, the prisoners in Cohen and Taylor's (1972) study were adult long-sentence prisoners and lifers, some of whom were notorious, for example, Ronald Kray and the Great Train Robbers. Resistance may have come more naturally to these 'celebrity prisoners' and there was evidence of such; Cohen and Taylor identify how prisoners on the wing undertook hunger strikes, escape bids, disturbances and protests.

While there is some evidence to support the above studies, the main criticism is that they fail to identify the mundane minutiae of everyday activities or behaviour that individuals employ to help them cope with their negative environment or situation. Moreover, the majority of these studies focus on adult male prisoners, rather than young prisoners, many of whom are made vulnerable by their life circumstances and experiences of exclusion, including a childhood often within social care and frequent stays in prison. Consequently, the following highlights how young men cope on a day-to-day basis with the pains of custody. Whilst some of these coping strategies may provide temporary relief, others can benefit individuals in the long-term.

In general, the use of a specific coping strategy will depend on the conditions being faced, the options available to the individual and their personality (Monat and Lazarus, 1977). These factors are even more applicable within the criminal justice system, as the pains of custody affect the conditions being faced, limit the range of coping styles available and restrict an individual's normal means of coping (Crewe, 2007; Ireland et al, 2005). The literature review in chapter one demonstrated that some coping strategies employed by adult male prisoners at-risk of suicide might remain the same outside and inside prison, whilst some might increase or decrease in prison (Dexter and Towl, 1995). To assess if this applied to young male detainees and prisoners, interviewees were asked about the coping strategies they employed outside the criminal justice system, as well as inside. As will be seen, because of the sparse environment in police cells, court cells and escort vehicles, individuals are severely limited in using coping strategies that require external stimuli. Consequently, in these locations individuals have to rely more on internal coping strategies. Alternatively, in prison, a greater number of coping strategies involving external stimuli are available.

Coping strategies employed outside the criminal justice system

One of the main coping strategies that interviewees employed whilst outside the criminal justice system was the use of drugs and alcohol. This in part explains why, on entering a police cell or prison, so many suffered the physical and psychological pains of drug or alcohol withdrawal. The majority of interviewees who used drugs in this way smoked cannabis, although some combined drugs with alcohol. For example, when faced with a problem on the outside, Simon stated he would “have a spliff, have a drink, have drugs” and Shaun would “get smashed” by taking large quantities of drugs and alcohol. Others just chose to drink alcohol. While not all interviewees were able to

describe how the drugs or alcohol helped them, some were able to articulate their feelings. Firstly, drugs and alcohol allowed interviewees to forget about their problems, it provided a means of avoidance or escape (see also Dexter and Towl, 1995):

The drugs come first... I was having problems at home so I went onto the drugs... I was doing crime to feed my habit – then it was a one way trip to prison... it always seems to be arguments – with the family or girlfriend.... it just blanks everything out – you just forget your problems (Robert).

Darren as well commented, “I don’t have any problems [when using heroin]” and Craig explained, “in a way [alcohol] kind of blocks everything out... I wake up in a weird mood but feel ok after a drink”. Secondly, drugs and alcohol helped to calm interviewees down and reduce stress. This, according to Dexter and Towl (1995), represents a palliative coping strategy, whereby emotional distress is reduced, often by providing some contrasting pleasant experience:

[Alcohol] just takes all your stress away – makes you forget everything... I started drinking heavier and heavier until the point I’m drinking every day..... I got addicted to it... I thought I needed it to get on with people – I thought I needed it (Jonathan).

The reasons which interviewees gave for using drugs and / or alcohol to cope with their problems is further supported by work examining the psychological effects of these substances. For example, cannabis can aid relaxation and relieve stress (Cope, 2003; Crewe, 2005). Heroin too can help numb emotional pain and produce feelings of

contentment, whilst stimulants (cocaine and amphetamines) can elevate mood (Paton and Jenkins, 2002). Alcohol also helps to relieve anxiety and aid relaxation (ibid.).

A number of interviewees spoke about how social support helped them to overcome problems when on the outside. In particular, interviewees would talk with their parents, partners and friends; “I go talk to my mum” (Paul), “I always talk to my mum” (Simon), “I’d have spoke to my mum or my girlfriend” (Gareth) and “I talk to cousins, friends, family” (Shaun). Others would see friends; “I’d probably go out and have a laugh, relax... with mates and my girlfriend” (Peter) and “seeing my mates” (Luke). Again, a large proportion of the adult prisoners within Dexter and Towl’s (1995) study identified the use of social support outside prison.

The remaining forms of coping used on the outside were quite varied. For example, Richard would listen to music when he had a problem; “I put my music on” (Richard). Whilst Jack stated he would “deal” with the person causing him the problem. Equally, Andrew described, “I’d find someone I didn’t like and whack them up – just coz they’d pissed me off.... they get what they deserve – if it’s something that’s pissed me off I smash it up and it won’t piss me off again”. In contrast to seeking social support, a few interviewees spoke about spending time on their own; “I just lie there – I just stay on my own and think things through” (Sam) and “if I feel pissed off, angry, I probably sit in my house” (Kieran). Therefore, in terms of the coping strategies that males employ outside the criminal justice system, similarities have been found with Dexter and Towl’s (1995) research. The following sections will show that within the criminal justice system, some of these coping strategies are not permitted or possible. Consequently, young males must adopt new ways of dealing with the pains of custody.

Coping strategies employed within police cells, court cells and escort vehicles

Within police cells, court cells and escort vehicles, the main pains of custody that detainees face are entry shock, the deprivation of liberty, fear of the unknown, loss of stimulation, deprivation of goods and services, and the waiting game. These are all exacerbated by the negative physical environment that detainees find themselves in. The main coping strategy employed by individuals in these locations was sleep. Although sleep has previously been identified by Cope (2003), Meisenhelder (1985) and Toch (1992b), it has only been recognised in the prison setting. However, it is widely used by individuals when detained in police cells, court cells and to a lesser extent escort vehicles, helping them cope with a loss of stimulation, boredom and the passing of time. When speaking about being held in a police cell, interviewees commented; “I was very bored - I just tried to sleep all the time... I didn’t have anything to do” (Mark), “I just try and sleep” (Ben) and “sleep, pass the time – all you really can do” (Peter). Likewise, in court cells interviewees explained “the best thing you can do is sleep... sleep the day away” (Dean) and “I just slept most of the time” (Gareth). Mark described how he had coped with his fears and worries in the escort vehicle by falling asleep:

I thought oh god – everything was running through my head..... but
then I fell asleep and woke up when I got here.... I had to [sleep], I had
to do something.

Considering the cramped and uncomfortable conditions found in escort vehicles, it is not surprising that Mark was the only interviewee to mention falling asleep whilst being escorted. For the above interviewees, sleep helped to suspend time or allow it to pass effortlessly (see also Cope, 2003 and Meisenhelder, 1985). This ties in with Dexter and Towl (1995), who found that ‘avoidance or escape’ (from the situation or from thoughts

about it), is one of the most frequently used coping strategies within prison. In comparison, only one interviewee cited using sleep as a coping strategy when outside the criminal justice system; “I don’t normally talk to people – I normally go to bed early.... I don’t show that character to people” (Joe). This is probably because on the outside, interviewees do not have to cope with such high levels of boredom or they have more resources to overcome it.

In addition to sleep, reading was used to help pass the time in police cells; “I just go to sleep all the time – nothing else to do – or I read a magazine” (Craig) and “I read magazines.... it helps a bit – it passes the time” (Gareth). Reading magazines therefore represents a means of escaping the situation (Dexter and Towl, 1995). In contrast, only one interviewee (Owen), whose account will be described later, mentioned reading as a coping strategy when outside the criminal justice system. As before, this was probably because interviewees had other means of stimulation.

Specific to escort vehicles, when interviewees were asked how they coped with being transferred, a number referred to how staff had allowed them to listen to the radio. In addition, at Bravo Magistrates Court, the radio could be played into cells for detainees to listen to. The radio offered individuals a means of overcoming boredom and provided them with a chance to escape any fears or worries running through their minds; it provided a temporary period of relief. This again links to Dexter and Towl (1995). However, it is important to note that staff retain ultimate control over this coping strategy; they decide whether to turn the radio on and which station it is tuned into. Thus, the music was not always to interviewees’ liking. For example, Owen stated that the music played in the cells at Bravo Magistrates Court helped “slightly – it’s not my kind of music though”.

The remaining coping strategy employed within the earlier stages of the criminal justice system is the use of social support. Within prison, Biggam and Power (1997) suggest that individuals can obtain social support from two groups; family, professionals and friends from outside prison, and staff and fellow prisoners within prison. In extending this to police cells, court cells and escort vehicles, detainees have to rely on fellow detainees and staff for social support, as individuals are largely prohibited from making contact with family and friends on the outside. More specifically, fellow detainees help alleviate boredom (which results from a loss of stimulation), provide companionship and are a means of overcoming a fear of the unknown. Nevertheless, this avenue of social support is only available to individuals in court cells or escort vehicles; in police cells, individuals are held on their own. When speaking about being held in a court cell, interviewees stated; “you don’t get bored, you can talk to [your cell mate]” (Adrian), “they used to put you in with other people but they’ve stopped..... [it used to give you] someone to talk to” (Gareth), “you can have a laugh, talk – you just get bored sitting on your own” (Luke), “if you have someone, you can talk to them” (Peter) and “I prefer to have someone there who I can chat to” (Richard). Equally, Ben explained how he had chatted with others when he was being transferred in an escort vehicle. For Simon, it depended on whether he knew the other passengers; “if you know them, talk to them, if you don’t, keep yourself to yourself”. Therefore, as identified by Dexter and Towl (1995), social support allows individuals to use others for comfort, support, reassurance or sharing of problems. This ties in with the four types of social support identified by Cohen and Wills (1985), namely esteem, informational, instrumental and social companionship. Furthermore, it supports Hobbs and Dear (2000), who suggest social support provides emotional and instrumental / practical help. However, whereas Harvey (2007) found friendships in prison most likely to provide material support, followed in turn by physical, informational and emotional support, in the court cells and escort

vehicles a different order was found. Thus, support tended to be emotional, informational or at times material (when cigarettes or tobacco were shared), rather than physical; a disparity probably arose because companionships rather than friendships are formed during the short periods individuals are held in court cells and escort vehicles.

The social support that staff can provide to individuals detained in police cells, court cells and escort vehicles may be informal or formal. Whilst this section will concentrate on informal social support, including the provision of information, the next chapter will explore more formal means of support, for example, drugs workers and psychiatric community nurses. Research on social support has tended to focus on the prison environment. Consequently, little is known about the support detainees can obtain from police officers or staff, court staff and escort staff. There appear to be two crucial factors determining whether detainees will use staff as a form of social support; these are their opinion of them and the relationships they build with them. Evidence presented here will show that the further young males progress into the criminal justice system, the better their opinions are of the staff and the more supportive the relationships are that they build with them. This also ties in with the earlier section on respect and how respect increases through the criminal justice system.

Individuals spend relatively little time in police cells in comparison with prison; as a result, supportive relationships are rarely developed with police officers or staff. In part, this appears to be influenced by detainees' somewhat negative opinions of them. It will become apparent that interviewees were less positive about police officers and staff than they were about prison officers, court and escort staff, although a large number of interviewees did consider them to be "alright". Whilst interviewees were asked for their opinions of police officers and staff working in the police station, comments did seem to

centre on police officers, particularly those who arrested them. Firstly, some interviewees were mixed in their opinions of police officers and staff. For example, Shaun stated:

Some of them are sound, some of them are wankers.... some coppers can be alright – some of them are just knobheads.

Other mixed responses included; “alright, some of them” (Craig), “some of them are alright... some treat you like you’re a scum bag” (Gareth) and “some of them are alright... some of them are dickheads as well” (Robert). Secondly, there were those that held more negative opinions; “they’re just knobs” (Andrew), “like everywhere you get dickheads” (Kieran) and “some of them are just arseholes – some are alright – 90% of them are twats” (Richard). Thirdly, a few interviewees were influenced by previous negative encounters with them; “I don’t think much of them... some are alright.... some take the piss out of me.... I hate the old bill... they put you in [prison]” (Tom) and “you don’t get no fair treatment... once you get arrested... you get treated less than a person” (Jack). Interviewees’ opinions of police officers and staff therefore appear to be linked to the fact that interviewees did not feel respected by them.

Although detainees did not tend to seek emotional or esteem support from police officers or staff, they did seek informational or instrumental / practical support (Cohen and Wills, 1985; Harvey, 2007; Hobbs and Dear, 2000). Similarities therefore exist between this study and those conducted by Harvey (2007) and Hobbs and Dear (2000), who found that prisoners were more willing to seek practical or informational support, rather than emotional support, from prison officers. Through this provision of informational / practical support, police officers and staff lessened the distress caused to

detainees by a fear of the unknown. For example, Sam stated, “I never knew what was happening but the police officers told me” and Mark, who had never been to a police station before, said “I really didn’t know what was going on at first.... [but after being booked in] they explained to me about solicitors”. However, there does appear to be a need for this information to be improved, particularly for those who have not been through the criminal justice system before; Sam explained how having advice about the court process would have helped him feel better about his first court appearance, as the first time he was “panicking... coz I didn’t know what was happening”. Danny too commented on the need for written material about Glen Parva YOI, as he had never been to prison; “something to read – tell you more about the process and what was going on – it would have calmed my nerves”. Therefore, whilst the staff in police stations are a crucial source of informational support, improvements can be made.

Returning to interviewees’ opinions of staff, a large number of interviewees described court and escort staff as “alright”, whilst others were more mixed in their opinion. Information relating to court and escort staff has been combined here since some staff worked in both the cells and the vehicles. Sam explained how “some of them are alright, some of them have got attitude – the ones this morning are alright”. However, in contrast to police officers and staff, some interviewees were particularly positive about court staff; “[they’re] alright... they have a laugh with you” (Gareth), “Group 4’s alright – they’re not too bad – if you want a drink and you ring your bell they bring it to you straight away” (Simon) and “they were kind, they were nice... they weren’t nasty people” (Mark). In addition, some interviewees thought that they received better treatment from court and escort staff in comparison with police officers and prison officers. This also links to respect and the waiting game. For example, Richard explained:

In the court cells and vans they're alright – in the police station and prisons they're twats.... they're just more polite they know how to have a joke.... if you ask them 'can I go to the toilet' they do it straight away.

Similarly, interviewees commented; “[court staff] don't treat you like a prisoner – they treat you like a normal person” (Gareth), “[court staff are] nice, alright..... coz they speak to you and have more of a joke with you” (Jonathan), “[escort staff are] better than the police – they'll talk to you like you're somebody.... the police hate all of us” (Luke) and “[escort staff are] better than the police.... [they're] more polite – show you more respect” (Robert). Positive opinions of escort staff were also found by HMIP (2004: 10), thus they conclude, “one of the most striking and consistent findings from surveys, interviews and inspections was prisoners' positive perception of escort staff”. In all, there were no major criticisms of either the court or escort staff; this was probably because in comparison with police officers / staff and prison officers, detainees spend less time in their company. Perhaps to a greater degree than in police stations, the informational support detainees gain from court staff is crucial, because they have to enter a courtroom full of grandeur and technicalities, whilst facing the possibility of being sent to prison. Attending court can be daunting for anyone, but particularly for those who have never been before and have problems understanding the technical words. For example:

[I understand] some of it, some it's all technical words.... your solicitor explains it all.... but they normally just expect you to know [the process]... I normally just ask the usher (Peter).

I didn't know [what to do] - I just listened to what [the court staff] said....

Group 4 tell you where to sit (Jonathan).

When asked if it would have helped having information at the courts about Glen Parva YOI, a number of interviewees thought not. In particular, Kieran responded, "no – all jails are the same" and Sam replied, "it wouldn't have mattered, I was going jail anyway so would have found out for myself". Even a couple of those who had not been to prison before did not think information would help. Thus, Joe stated, "no – I don't think it would help.... that's the only way... just to come in here and find out for yourself". However, there were those that had not been to court or prison before who thought otherwise:

I had to ask what was gonna happen.... I suppose it would be a bit better to know where to stand, what's gonna happen (Peter).

A leaflet, even pictures... what goes on and what don't [would have helped]..... I'd rather have someone – I know it sounds stupid – but someone who's been through it – not a prison officer... but someone who's gone through it and rehabilitated (Mark).

[Someone to speak to or something to read or watch] would have helped – calm my nerves down... if I'd seen somebody.... an officer or, I don't know, someone who deals with [prison] (Danny).

Therefore, as with police officers and staff, court and escort staff provide a valuable source of informational support. Improvements can however be made, particularly for those individuals who have not been through the criminal justice system before.

In brief, this section has demonstrated that the pains of custody not only influence how individuals feel, but also which coping strategies are available to them. Consequently, within police cells, court cells and escort vehicles, individuals may have to modify their usual coping strategies or adopt new ones because their normal strategies have been prohibited. The following section moves on to look at the coping strategies that young males employ within prison, comparing these with those used in police cells, court cells and escort vehicles, and with those used outside the criminal justice system.

Coping strategies employed within prison

In contrast to police cells, court cells and escort vehicles, all eighteen pains of custody can be found in the prison setting. Those that appear to cause the most distress and suffering to young males are entry shock, the deprivation of liberty, fear of the unknown, loss of stimulation, deprivation of goods and services, loss of social support and pains of communication. This section will begin by exploring whether the coping strategies found in the earlier stages of the criminal justice system transfer into the prison setting. Subsequently, it will be established whether the coping strategies employed outside the criminal justice system are transferred into prison. Lastly, any remaining coping strategies that are developed specifically in prison will be examined.

As with police cells and court cells, sleep is one of the most frequently cited coping strategies employed in prison, allowing individuals to escape the realities of their

environment, overcome boredom, suspend time or to make time pass effortlessly (Cope, 2003; Dexter and Towl, 1995; Meisenhelder, 1985; Toch, 1992b). For example, interviewees stated; “I just try and sleep – to get my sentence over quicker, to make the day go quicker” (Jonathan), “I sleep quite a lot.... nothing else to do” (Craig), “if I’m just feeling bored – I don’t know – I don’t really know... I just go to sleep” (Danny) and “I tend to go sleep I think.... I sleep most of the days on Sundays as there’s nothing on telly” (Adrian). Therefore, sleep is primarily used as a means of overcoming the pains associated with time and the loss of stimulation; many prisoners are confronted by a lengthy period in prison, which is characterised by acute boredom and exacerbated by the deprivation of goods and services.

When speaking about being detained in a police cell, a number of interviewees spoke about reading magazines, which provided them with a means of escape or avoidance. Whereas in police cells, individuals are restricted to magazines, in prison they are allowed books. Consequently, in prison a couple of interviewees read books as a means of passing time and coping with boredom. For example, Luke explained that he had a routine within prison to help cope with boredom and as part of this, would read; “reading books... I read a lot”. Likewise, Gareth would read when he had no other means of stimulation and was bored; “I only like reading when I’m bored”. Reading as a coping strategy may therefore transfer into prison from the outside and from police cells. However, it would appear that reading is not relied upon in prison to the same extent as within police cells, as other external stimuli are available.

Outside the criminal justice system, only one interviewee explained how he would listen to music when he had a problem or was feeling down. However, as in escort vehicles, the use of this coping strategy increased within prison. Not only did music make

prisoners feel happier but it also gave them something to do. In particular, Shaun described how when he listened to music it made him “think about good memories in the past”. By listening to music and thinking about past memories, Shaun was employing the adaptation style of withdrawal (Matthews, 1999). This, according to Sykes (1958), includes psychological withdrawal, which incorporates withdrawing into a fantasy based on the past. Music also represented a means of avoidance or escape from the problem and signified a palliative coping response, allowing prisoners access to a pleasant experience (Dexter and Towl, 1995). In comparison with the outside, music probably had greater importance because it was one of the few ‘luxuries’ that prisoners could purchase; this was particularly significant considering that on entering prison many normal goods and services are lost. Furthermore, by purchasing stereos, prisoners were able to regain a sense of control, being able to choose what they listened to and when. This differs greatly with escort vehicles and Bravo Magistrates Court custody suite, where staff retain control over the radio.

In terms of social support, prisoners are able to access this via family and friends from outside prison, or from staff and fellow prisoners within prison (Biggam and Power, 1997). Whilst detainees in the earlier stages of the criminal justice system could only access staff and fellow detainees, prisoners were able to access family and friends from outside prison. One way in which prisoners were able to access this support was through visits. Thus, interviewees described how visits helped them; “it makes you feel happy for a bit” (Adrian), “brilliant – I love them yeah... it makes me happy... I know everyone’s alright” (Mark) and “it makes me feel better – I forget about everything” (Jonathan). Likewise, Adam stated:

You should get more visits... it keeps the family together... it makes you feel better yourself – you know everyone's alright out there.

However, due to the nature of imprisonment, prisoners could not see family and friends when they desired. Consequently, many modified this form of social support and instead used the telephone or wrote letters. When talking about the telephone, Kieran stated, “if I was pissed off I'd phone my mum or girlfriend up” and Danny commented, “I like ringing my family but not my friends – they say they went out last night”. With regards to letters, interviewees stated:

It puts a smile on my face when I get a letter..... when I feel a bit down in here I like to be on my own – I stay in my cell – write a letter – I still use my girlfriend for that (Gareth).

I used to write twenty letters a week... it's great when your mum writes to you and your mates – it keeps you in touch with the real world (Shaun).

I just write a letter or something.... I seem to be worse when I sit there and dwell on it –it winds me up more..... I do get my feelings out in a letter (Robert).

Therefore, the use of family and friends as social support appears to transfer into prison. However, because of the pains of custody, the means through which this support is accessed has to be modified, i.e. instead of face-to-face visits, prisoners use the telephone or write letters. Social support provides prisoners with a means of overcoming the pain or distress caused by, for example, the deprivation of liberty.

Whilst Dexter and Towl (1995) found social support to decrease within prison, the present study suggests that the use of family and friends in this manner remains an important and reliable source of support for young male prisoners.

With reference to social support in prison, individuals are able to access this from either fellow prisoners or staff. In similar respects to court cells and escort vehicles, prisoners were able to seek support from cellmates or pad mates. Despite compromising their privacy, interviewees explained how sharing a cell provided them with company, someone to talk to and a method of relieving boredom. Interviewees' responses were therefore comparable to those obtained in relation to court cells and escort vehicles. In particular, interviewees commented; "it's better [to have a pad mate] - at least I can talk to him – have a laugh – talk about my problems" (Ben), "it's better [to share a prison cell] as long as it's not smackheads" (Nathan) and "I prefer to have someone there who I can chat to" (Richard). Similarly, Mark found that he was able to talk to his pad mate about prison; "he knew what I was going through..... it was easy for me and him to talk to each other". Quite ingeniously, Mark found that he was able to talk to the prisoner in the next cell, by utilising a gap in the wall where the plumbing went through. As in court cells and escort vehicles, the support pad mates provided one another in prison tended to be informational, practical, emotional, esteem or material support, or social companionship (Cohen and Wills, 1985; Harvey, 2007; Hobbs and Dear, 2000). No interviewee referred to pad mates providing physical support, as found by Harvey (2007). Again, it is possible that this was a result of different questions; within the present study, interviewees were asked how they coped and who they turned to when they had a problem, rather than what help they had received from their pad mates.

The relationships that young prisoners develop with prison officers and staff play a crucial role in making prison less painful and improving prisoners' quality of life (Crawley, 2004; Liebling, 1999a; 2007). Consequently, in comparison with staff who work in police stations, court custody suites and escort vehicles, prison officers provide greater emotional support. Nevertheless, as in the earlier stages of the criminal justice system, interviewees will not always access this support because they hold negative opinions of prison officers or have poor relationships with them. Generally though, interviewees were very positive about prison officers. Furthermore, these opinions tended to be more positive than those held about police officers, although in comparison with court staff and escort staff, while some interviewees were more positive about prison officers, others were far more critical. Thus, interviewees appeared to hold extreme opinions of prison officers; there was a greater disparity between the best and the worst than there was for court or escort staff. Prisoners may also have held opinions that were more positive about prison officers because they felt more respected by them and because they share similar socio-economic backgrounds, interests and experiences (Crawley, 2004).

In similar respects to police officers, court staff and escort staff, a number of interviewees were mixed in their opinions of prison staff:

The officers... once they get to know you and you keep your head down and you do what you're supposed to do, they remember your name and a bit about you.... some can be arseholes some can be ok (Dean).

Other mixed responses included; "there is certain officers I get on with.... some are dickheads... some officers have helped me in here – I wouldn't say they've gone out

their way [though]” (Robert), “some of them are alright, some aren’t” (Sam) and “most of them are safe – some of them are knobs” (Kieran). For some, as found by Crawley (2004), it depended on the unit in which they were held. Thus, a couple of prisoners felt that officers on unit 12 (a convicted unsentenced unit) were better than others; “[unit 12 is better] because the staff seem more polite... I can get on with them” (Paul) and “officers on [unit 12] are quite alright... on some wings they’re not” (Adam). As identified by Crawley (2004), a number of prisoners developed good relationships with prison officers because of shared similarities. For example, Andrew described how officers were “alright – they sit there and play pool with you – they’re just like people your own age – you can sit and have a laugh with them”. Equally, Shaun stated, “[unit 9 is] a laid back unit... you can have a laugh with [officers]... they talk to you like a young adult not kids... they’re sound on this unit”. Gareth also stated that “most of the screws are alright in here.... it’s wicked on [unit 9]”. Officers on unit 9 may have been particularly laid-back and friendly because it was a drugs-free unit and prisoners therefore received greater privileges. Nevertheless, this evidence contradicts HMIP (2004), who conclude that at Glen Parva YOI, there is little positive interaction between staff and prisoners. Perhaps this is due to the timing of their research, since HMCIP (2006) subsequently notes that relationships between staff and prisoners are improving.

A number of interviewees spoke about the help they had received from prison officers. As an example, Adrian explained that “staff have really [helped], they’ve helped me get a job” (Adrian). Thus, prison officers provided Adrian with practical support. Similarly, Lee singled out one prison officer who had helped him to get a job and a television. Lee explained that this prison officer not only made time for him, but went out of his way to help. Danny too commented that “a lot of officers have [helped] me” and thirdly, Mark stated:

The time I felt a bit relaxed was, there was a lady... she called me out and talked to me – [asked me] if I had any questions... that lady kept on talking to me – you could see on my face I was really nervous..... the best lady was that first lady..... Mr X - he helped me out so much.... he sorted me out a job and he got me down to the gym.... they started me going down the gym – there was a brilliant lady down there – she really helped me.

Therefore, prison officers not only provided Mark with practical support, but they also provided him with much needed emotional support. More specifically, interviewees were asked whether they felt able to talk to prison officers if they had a problem. This related to more emotional problems than practical problems. Again, a mixed response was found. In general, those that held positive views about prison officers (and a couple who held mixed opinions) felt able to talk to them if they had a problem; “some I really do trust” (Paul), “if you’ve got a problem they’ll listen to you” (Dean), “yes of course [I could talk to a prison officer]... they’re really good people” (Joe), “I like them... if I’ve got a problem I can talk to them” (Chris), “I could talk to an officer or a Listener or X – he’s the [hospital] manager up here” (Danny) and “if ever I have any problems I talk to them and they sort it out..... I have a laugh with officers” (Shaun).

Conversely, a number of interviewees felt unable to talk to prison officers if they had a problem, some of whom held mixed views about prison officers. Several reasons were provided why interviewees did not like talking to prison officers. Firstly, interviewees mentioned a lack of trust in prison officers. For example, Adam stated:

There's no one to talk to.... there is, but I don't want to talk to them.... I wouldn't talk to an officer.... I'd rather keep it to myself... that's what I've got used to doing..... might think they'll tell someone else and they're an officer.

Equally, Jack commented, "coz officers talk between them.... they'd take the piss". The above quote from Adam supports Hobbs and Dear (2000), who suggest prisoners may not want to seek emotional support from prison officers as they have an 'us and them' mentality. Likewise, Luke did not talk to prison officers because "they're the ones keeping us here". Alternatively, Kieran would not talk to prison officers because they do not know him well enough; "they don't know me – I'm not gonna chat to someone who doesn't know me".

In contrast to the accounts from some interviewees who had spoken of being mistreated and disrespected by staff within the criminal justice system, the detainees and prisoners that I observed were generally treated with respect and dignity. However, it was notable that better relationships had been formed within prison. This was partly because of the length of time in which individuals were held there in comparison with the earlier stages of the criminal justice system and because prisoners felt more respected by prison staff than police officers, court staff or escort staff. In addition, differences in the language and humour used by staff across the criminal justice system probably influenced detainees' and prisoners' opinions of them. Whilst police officers and staff tended to be acutely aware of being politically correct, court staff and prison officers were less so. Thus, in comparison with the police stations, officers and staff would swear more frequently within the courts and prison, and tell 'dirtier' jokes. This humour was not only shared between staff but also with detainees and prisoners. It was particularly

apparent within prison, where it probably helped staff to build a rapport with the young prisoners in their care and consequently influenced the opinions prisoners had of them, enabling prisoners to feel they could approach them for emotional as well as practical support.

The evidence presented in this section has demonstrated that the coping strategies employed in the earlier stages of the criminal justice system do transfer into the prison setting. These include sleeping, reading, listening to music and accessing social support from fellow detainees / prisoners and staff. Within the earlier stages of the criminal justice system, detainees were not able to access social support from family and friends. Consequently, the use of family and friends as a means of social support transferred directly from the outside into prison. The following section will look at the remaining coping strategies employed by young males outside the criminal justice system to establish whether they too transfer into prison.

One of the most widely used coping strategies employed on the outside was the use of drugs or alcohol. In contrast, no interviewee mentioned having used this coping strategy whilst inside prison (or whilst in police cells, court cells or escort vehicles). However, it is probable that individuals did continue to use drugs when in prison, for example, see Cope (2003) and Crewe (2005). Consequently, interviewees may have been reluctant to mention such practices because it could have lead to disciplinary action. Another possibility is that none of the prisoners used these banned substances, particularly as six were on a drugs free unit. It was also apparent that some had since realised that drugs added to their problems. Thus, when asked if drugs had helped, interviewees replied; “you think it takes away your problems but it doesn’t... taking away all the worries and the stress – but in the long run it doesn’t” (Simon), “I’ve realised in here they make

your problems bigger” (Robert) and “no, you just get more depressed” (Richard). Despite no admittance of drug taking, a number of interviewees did explain how cigarettes had helped them in prison. In particular, Danny had taken up smoking again, stating, “[prison’s] just too stressful – you need something to calm your nerves... just doing the same routine everyday – that’s stressful – just being here, that’s stressful”. Interviewees probably only referred to this coping strategy in prison because in the police cells, court cells and escort vehicles they were largely prevented from smoking. The loss of this coping strategy therefore helps explain why detainees were angry about not being allowed to smoke within the earlier stages of the criminal justice system.

Whereas a couple of interviewees spoke about the use of violence as a means of coping with a problem when outside the criminal justice system, neither mentioned its use in prison. Instead, only one interviewee, Shaun, referred to any form of violence, describing how he and his pad mate would play fight; “it’s a stress release for us both”. Although violence does exist in prison, as identified by Adler (1998), Edgar et al (2003), Howard League (1999a), Scraton et al (1991), Sim (1994) and Tempest (2007), it is likely that this is spontaneous rather than employed specifically as a coping strategy, although it may have a similar cathartic effect. Another coping strategy that young men sometimes used on the outside was spending time on their own. Only one prisoner (Gareth) referred to spending time on his own when he felt down, explaining that he would use that time to write a letter. This coping strategy is somewhat difficult to employ within prison because the pains of custody largely deny prisoners the privacy or opportunity to spend quiet time alone. Consequently, some of the coping strategies employed on the outside are not transferable to the criminal justice system, or are not widely used there, because they are either prohibited or because the pains of custody

prevent them. Prisoners therefore have to employ new coping strategies, as shown by the following.

Television was one of the most widely used coping strategies found in prison, representing a means of avoidance or escape and signifying a palliative coping response (Dexter and Towl, 1995). Primarily, television was used in response to the pains associated with time, the loss of stimulation and the deprivation of goods and services. Consequently, some interviewees preferred being held in a prison cell to a police cell or court cell:

Sitting in a police cell is harder than being in a prison cell.... everything goes through your head – it's hard to keep calm... when you've got nothing to do in your cell... it's hard, police stations are hard.... I'd rather do one week in a prison cell than three days in a police cell.... got no one to talk to, no TV... no bed in a police station (Jack).

Equally, interviewees commented; “you just lie there and that's it [in the police cell] - I prefer it in jail coz you've got a TV” (Sam), “I couldn't wait to go to prison..... to get a TV..... [police cells are] alright – it's just the walls are white and it gets to you” (Andrew), “in Glen Parva it's alright - you've got a TV – in [the court cell] you've got nothing – you get bored” (Gareth) and “I'd rather be in prison than one of [the court] cells..... [you've got a] TV, you can sleep, it's a bigger cell and I'm more used to it” (Jonathan).

Interviewees explained how television provided them with a means of escape or avoidance; “TV does help.... it keeps you laughing” (Paul) and “while you're watching

it, it takes your mind off being here, a little bit anyway” (Adrian). Television also provided prisoners with ‘something to do’ and made time go quicker:

You get to watch all the soaps.... I watch more [television] when I’m in here coz there’s nothing else to do... I don’t watch half of the stuff [on the outside that] I do when I’m in here (Gareth).

I’ve got my nice little routine now..... I watch certain programmes in the morning.... I’ve turned into a soap addict.... when I’m out I’d have other things to do..... [television] helps the time go by (Robert).

Similarly, Dean stated, “while you’re in jail [television is] something to do”, Joe explained, “TV is the most important thing..... if you have no TV time will drag..... this is the most I’ve ever watched TV” and Craig commented, “I don’t know what I’d do without a TV in my cell”. Equally, Jewkes (2002: 103) found an increase in the time that adult male prisoners spent watching television, concluding that it fills time that might otherwise be spent in “painful self-contemplation”.

Being employed helped young men cope with the pains of custody. Firstly, as highlighted by Cope (2003) and Toch (1992a), being active can help prisoners to pass their sentence. It can also help prisoners cope with boredom and make the time pass quicker:

[Working on laundry] makes the time go quicker and you’re associating with people – you ain’t just sitting on your bed (Kieran).

[Being an Insider] I try and help you out as much as I can.... I like helping out people.... it's gone so fast these past 8 months... I feel so lucky for it..... if you're sitting in your pad it drags (Mark).

Secondly, for Mark, being employed as an Insider and helping others offered him the opportunity to better himself. In doing so, this signifies the 'gleaning' style of adaptation, as described by Irwin (1970). Even when employment does not provide prisoners with an opportunity to better themselves and is even perceived as boring, it can help pass the time; "it's fucking boring – it does pass the time though" (Richard). Thirdly, as with other coping strategies found within prison, employment may act as a means of escape (Dexter and Towl, 1995). For example, Simon enjoyed cleaning and working on the server because they kept his mind off the outside:

It helps a lot – you don't think about the outside, you don't think about anything..... [officers] treat you nice.... you've got more time out of your cell.... it's a good thing to be working.... it's not that stressful..... it really helps a lot.

In similar respects to employment, participation in education or courses allows prisoners to remain active, overcoming feelings of boredom, helping them pass their sentence and distracting attention from painful thoughts (Cope, 2003; Dexter and Towl, 1995; Toch, 1992a). Like employment, prisoners may use education or courses as a means of bettering themselves (Irwin, 1970). Thus, Dean described how he could not study when he was outside prison since he got distracted, but because of boredom, he found he could study inside. He therefore wanted to use his time constructively:

[I want to] use my time constructively.... do NVQs.... I know where I want to go in 5 years... this is basically my starting block..... the only way is to go to jail and learn.... [prison] can be a punishment or a blessing.... for me it's a blessing..... no point sitting here thinking another day gone... should be thinking another day gone, fuck I should be doing something..... I need to do as much as I can in jail before I leave.

Doing a new course not only gave Dean “something to look forward to” but also made the time go quicker; “doing something constructive always does”. In fact, Dean was hoping to get an 18-month sentence, in which he could complete his NVQs in sport, engineering, carpentry and brick laying. Likewise, Danny was studying for his A-level in English; “I keep my time busy – might as well make the most of [being in prison]”. Similarly, Robert described how he had completed a cooking course; “once I got into it I thought I was Jamie Oliver.... it was an achievement to me – I didn’t want to do it in the first place – but I stuck at it”. Therefore, in contrast to those who resort to sleep, some prisoners prefer to make their time in prison purposeful, by becoming involved in the regime and “using activity, as opposed to inactivity such as sleeping, to help them pass their sentence” (Cope, 2003: 171).

Another form of activity is sport, which again helps prisoners fill their sentence and overcome boredom. Thus, a number of prisoners explained how they went to the gym to occupy their time. However, not all prisoners liked using the gym and consequently some exercised in their own cell. Whilst Adrian would occasionally lift buckets of water or do press-ups to fill time, Luke had made these exercises part of his routine, undertaking them first thing in the morning when he got up. Using exercise in this

manner to remodel their bodies may also have represented an attempt by these prisoners to assert their own individual personality, whilst allowing them to test and portray masculinity (Cohen and Taylor, 1972; Jewkes, 2002). Other interviewees commented that sport had helped them psychologically; “[football] clears your mind” (Joe) and “I asked to go to the gym quite a lot – I think that’s helped me” (Mark).

Some prisoners found the act of writing down their thoughts helped them to cope with a problem. For example, Luke stated, “I write it down ... I write stuff down – that helps me a lot”. Ricky, who was a Listener, used a diary to help him cope with any problems that arose from this role; “I’ve got a diary... if anything happens I write it in there.... if I have a caller who’s deep I write about it – I ask them first.... it does help me – it helps me look at it in a different way”. However, this coping strategy is largely limited to those prisoners that do not have literacy problems, those that are able to express themselves through words and those that are able to secure such letters / diaries away to prevent others from reading them.

If prisoners are on ‘enhanced’ under the Incentives and Earned Privileges Scheme, they may have access to computer games. These can provide individuals with a means of avoidance or escape (Dexter and Towl, 1995). For example, Mark described how playing computer games would help when he was feeling down; “I play on the computer... then all of a sudden all these things that make you feel down have gone..... you try and keep your mind busy – if you just sit around you get more depressed”. However, not all prisoners have access to computer games, consequently this coping strategy was not widely used.

Lastly, as cited within the literature review, Baer (2004) suggests that prisoners display large quantities of shampoo, shower gels, air fresheners, etc. for a number of reasons. In particular, it may offer a way for them to express their identity. From my own observations, it was apparent that some prisoners did display large quantities of toiletries on a table within their cells. One prisoner had gone to great lengths displaying these; there were straight rows of toiletries in the middle of the table running parallel with the front of the table, whilst at either side there were straight diagonal rows of toiletries. A couple of prison officers referred to these displays as status symbols; the more goods you had, the greater your status within prison, which would subsequently influence identity. In part, this was because prisoners were only supposed to have a maximum of three items of each product, therefore in allowing larger quantities, prison officers had to overlook this misdemeanour. However, prisoners tended to deny that these displays were for status, arguing that they just wanted their cells to look good. These displays therefore also help prisoners deal with the deprivation of goods and services; the limited range of goods that they are permitted to purchase are bought in abundance and displayed for all other prisoners and officers to see.

To summarise, this section has shown that young males' normal coping strategies are not always permitted in prison. Consequently, to overcome the pains of custody, prisoners have to adapt new ways of coping or realise that normal everyday actions outside of prison (for example, watching television or participating in sport) have a greater significance within prison and can actually help them cope with the pains of custody. The following section will explore the use of self-harm as a coping strategy, both inside and outside the criminal justice system.

Suicide and self-harm within the criminal justice system

Despite the fact that many individuals detained within the criminal justice system are able to employ strategies to cope with the pains of custody, the above discussion specifically excludes those who have attempted or contemplated suicide and those that have self-harmed. These interviewees have previously been identified as ‘poor copers’, who find it difficult to cope when under stress (Liebling, 1992; Liebling and Krarup, 1993). Consequently, they turn to suicide or self-harm because they cannot cope with the pains of custody. It is therefore of interest to explore this group in more detail. Of the total sample (43 including the pilot interviews), nine interviewees had self-harmed or attempted / contemplated suicide outside the criminal justice system. This represented a fifth of the total sample, which rose to a quarter (11 interviewees) when looking inside the criminal justice system. In terms of interviewees who had attempted or contemplated suicide without self-harming, there were two – James and Alan, both of whom had done so inside and outside the criminal justice system. James described how whilst inside prison he had made two suicide attempts, explaining how he suffered with depression as a result of flashbacks:

Flashbacks - of my little brother dying, granddad, gran dying.... the worst ones I get is of my crime I did in 2001 – they come back pretty bad... it does my head in... they just come – mostly when I sleep.

In particular, when James was having problems coping with his grandmother’s death he tried to hang himself - he was 15 months into an 18 month sentence at another YOI:

It was just my nan passing away really – that’s when I hit rock bottom....
it brought memories back..... I just couldn’t cope that night..... I don’t
know what I was thinking.

Suicide therefore represented a way out for James, because he could not cope with the emotions of his grandmother passing away. Like the majority of prisoners who attempt suicide, James chose hanging (Wool and Dooley, 1987). Similarly, the majority of completed suicides within prison result from hanging (Bogue and Power, 1995; Crighton and Towl, 1997; Dooley, 1990a; Howard League, 2005a; Lloyd, 1990; SCG, 2001; Shaw et al, 2004). However, like other prisoners, James was unsure whether he had intended to kill himself or hurt himself; “that’s a tricky question that is.... probably to kill myself, probably in between”. Despite having depression, James had not thought about committing suicide again; “I got used to my nan dying after a while..... I don’t really think about [suicide] no more”. From this account it appears that James’s suicide attempts are triggered by specific external events rather than the pains of custody. This ties in with previous research that has shown bereavement, outside pressures, domestic problems and grief to be associated with completed or attempted suicide (Dooley, 1990a; Liebling and Krarup, 1993; Snow, 2002; Wool and Dooley, 1987). By attempting to commit suicide, James was trying to escape from an intolerable situation which was causing him intense suffering (Dooley, 1994; Schneidman, 1976, 1985, 1987, cited in Crighton, 1997). It is possible that James had learned such a response from the outside, as he had previously attempted to commit suicide when his son was killed; “I had driven a car into a wall at 50mph trying to kill myself..... I went really bad.... depression – all of the anger came”.

In contrast to James, Alan had contemplated suicide after things were going badly with his girlfriend. As described within an earlier chapter (chapter three), Alan had written to his girlfriend saying he would hang himself, although he later admitted that even though he felt like killing himself, he would not have done it. This echoes the findings of Liebling and Krarup (1993), Snow (2002) and Wool and Dooley (1987), who identify relationship problems or break-ups as one of the main motivations of attempted suicide. Like James, Alan may have contemplated suicide in prison because of previous attempts to kill himself on the outside by cutting his wrists:

I had no family at that time..... basically I had an argument with [my girlfriend].... I thought I'd lost her... I didn't think there was any point in living..... I just did it.... I sat there thinking on my own, I was pissed off and did it... I saw a bit of glass and did it.

Although Alan explained he had wanted to kill himself, he was relieved that he had not died, as he later sorted out the problems with his girlfriend. These accounts highlight the impulsive nature of young people and the transient nature of their despair. Consequently, staff within prison need to be vigilant when young prisoners receive bad news. They also suggest that learned responses to bad news may be transferred into the criminal justice system. Nevertheless, evidence does not appear to support Liebling (1992) and Liebling and Krarup's (1993) view that such prisoners are 'poor copers' - instead it would appear that these prisoners employ similar coping strategies to other prisoners. For example, both James and Alan preferred to share a cell so they could access social support; "I asked to go in [a shared cell]... it takes your mind off things if you've got someone to talk to" (Alan) and "it's better [to share] - you're not on your own and you get to talk" (James). James also found exercise helpful, explaining how he

would spend three and a half hours a day exercising in his cell, doing sit-ups, press-ups, weights and boxing. Likewise, Alan would try to get his name down for the gym, education or courses; “I do whatever I can – I always put my name down for everything every morning..... I enjoy all of them – [it] takes your mind off things”. Therefore, it would appear that young men who attempt or contemplate suicide do not have poorer coping strategies than other young men.

Whilst there were some similarities between Alan, James and the above interviewees in terms of their opinions of staff working within the criminal justice system and the support they provided, there were some important differences. For example, like other interviewees, James explained how escort staff are “alright they are.... everyone gets on with Group 4”. Similarly, when asked about prison officers, Alan commented, “I get on with some of them but then you get on the wrong side of some... I just keep my distance unless they talk to me”. However, because Alan had not been to prison before, he had a need for greater informational support within police cells, suggesting it would have been better to have “something to read so you know what you’re coming to”. Alongside this, Alan did not feel able to access emotional support from prison officers. Alan explained that he felt unable to talk to prison officers because of a lack of care; “I couldn’t.... I don’t think they care..... you never know which one’s going to talk to you like what”. This supports Powis (2002), who found that prisoners who had attempted suicide had less communication with prison staff. In comparison though, James was able to talk to a couple of the prison officers, though he preferred to talk to the female staff; “I’d probably talk to a couple of [officers]... I prefer to talk to the women – I can express what I feel to a woman more than a man”. Therefore, it is particularly important that greater informational support is provided to those individuals who have not been

through the criminal justice system before. Furthermore, it is crucial that these individuals feel able to trust and talk with members of staff, especially within prison.

In comparison with Alan and James, five interviewees had either attempted or contemplated suicide within the criminal justice system, whilst also having self-harmed. Firstly, Russell described how he had made two suicide attempts in the criminal justice system; approximately five years ago he had tried to hang himself in a police cell and on another occasion he had tried to hang himself at a YOI using a ripped up bed sheet. On both occasions he was found by a member of staff. Russell's experiences therefore reflect previous findings; not only is hanging predominantly found amongst attempted and completed prison suicides, as outlined earlier, but the majority of detainees in police cells who commit suicide do so by hanging (Biles, 1994; Cartwright, 1998; Ingram et al, 1997; Leigh et al, 1998; Norfolk, 1998; PCA, 1999; Teers and Bucke, 2005). Like other individuals who self-harm, Russell found it difficult to identify the reasons for these suicide attempts, stating that he was just fed up with his life and had wanted to kill himself. During his early teenage years, Russell explained how he had tried to hang himself in his mother's garden with a rope. Again, Russell could not explain why he wanted to kill himself or why that day was particularly bad. Conversely, Russell was able to articulate why he self-harmed. Russell began self-harming at the age of 9 when his brother died from a drug overdose, a traumatic experience that left him feeling frustrated and unable to talk to anyone. Consequently, he found that by using razors to cut his skin, he could take this build-up of frustration and anger out on himself and it prevented him from thinking about his problems. Similarly, Arnold and Magill (2000) suggest individuals may self-harm to relieve feelings that have built-up, including anxiety, emotional pain and tension. For Russell, the same feelings that led to his self-harm on the outside, led to his self-harm on the inside and he found that by using razor

blades to cut himself he could stop thinking about his problems. When asked how often he self-harmed, Russell explained how it varied – sometimes he would not do it for six months, but then the anger would build up and he would ‘explode’, subsequently cutting himself. The motivation for Russell’s self-harm in prison also corresponds with Harvey (2007), who identifies four groups of self-harmers, one of which includes individuals who repetitively self-harm for relief of tension.

While Russell found it difficult to explain why he had attempted suicide, Dave had made two suicide attempts in prison, in response to the voices he heard in his head telling him to kill himself. Dave therefore represents the significant number of individuals who are being held within the criminal justice system who either attempt or complete suicide because of mental illness (Dooley, 1990a; Howard League, 1999a; Liebling and Krarup, 1993). Like other interviewees, Dave spoke of how he had tried to commit suicide when outside prison, explaining how he had attempted to hang himself with a rope, but “the rope snapped... I thought I was gonna die”. When asked if he had wanted to die he replied, “not really.... it was like waking up out of a bad dream”. Adding to this, Dave explained that he did not realise what he was doing at the time, but when he ‘came to’ he found out what he had done. As well as suicide attempts, Dave self-harmed partly because of the voices he heard telling him to kill himself; when he became stressed by these voices and his family problems, he would cut himself. Hence, this supports Dear, Thomson, Hall and Howells (2001) and Harvey (2007), who both identify psychological symptoms or mental health difficulties as related to self-harm. In addition, as described within chapter four, self-harm allowed Dave to cope with a loss of stimulation and the resulting boredom, explaining, “it helps the boredom watching blood come out your arms”. Again, similarities can be found with Dear, Thomson, Hall and Howells (2001), who identify internal prison events / circumstances (including

regime restrictions) as a factor within self-harm. Like Russell, Dave began self-harming outside the criminal justice system at a relatively young age (13), which served a similar purpose to his self-harm inside prison:

Coz I wanted to go through the pain... it was a way of releasing the stress that was building up inside me... its better to hurt myself than other people.... it took the stress away a little bit.... it just come to me to cut myself.

Once more, this confirms findings by Arnold and Magill (2000) and Harvey (2007), who suggest an individual may self-harm to relieve a build-up of tension or anxiety.

Another motive for attempting suicide is a lack of control, which has previously been associated with self-harm, being used in an attempt to regain control (Arnold and Magill, 2000; Cooke et al, 1990; Favazza, 1996; Harvey, 2007; Royal College of Psychiatrists, 1999; Young Minds, 1999). As explained within a previous chapter (chapter three), Ryan had tried to hang himself in prison because he hated it and wanted a move to another prison, but he had no ability to influence or control this decision. Ryan explained that he had attempted to hang himself because he wanted to die but also because he wanted a move. In addition, Ryan had self-harmed whilst on remand, explaining, “I got no fags, I was banged up, I was feeling shit.... inside my head – it does your head in that Glen Parva”. Thus, Ryan self-harmed partly in response to the triggering event of not being allowed to move. Furthermore, the entry shock and internal prison events / circumstances of being in Glen Parva YOI seemed to lead to Ryan’s self-harm (see also Dear, Thomson, Hall and Howells, 2001 and Harvey, 2007). In contrast to the above interviewees, Ryan had not attempted suicide whilst outside the

criminal justice system nor had he self-harmed. Consequently, because some individuals begin to self-harm or attempt suicide within prison, they can be perceived as being manipulative. For example, Liebling and Krarup (1993) identify a 'strategic' motivation for attempted suicide, which includes wanting a change of location. Similarly, Harvey (2007) found that young male prisoners admitted to self-harming for 'strategic' purposes, for instance, they did not want to be transferred to another prison. While it is useful to understand that these acts may be strategic, it is not useful to view them as manipulative, instead they reflect how young prisoners may resort to self-harm or suicide because they cannot see any other solution to the problem they are facing (see also Cooke et al, 1990).

Until now, accounts of the suicide attempts made by interviewees have all occurred in a police cell or prison. However, Gary attempted to kill himself by taking an overdose of painkillers while on bail. As outlined in chapter four, Gary wanted to commit suicide because of the stress associated with his court case. For the same reason, Gary began self-harming whilst on bail. Gary described how he had cut his arms with plastic because he was worried about coming to prison. He also found self-harm to have a cathartic effect; "it calmed myself down... I don't know, it felt weird... it felt different" (in a good way). Again, this corresponds with Arnold and Magill (2000) and Harvey (2007) who argue that self-harm may arise from a build-up of tension or anxiety. It also supports the notion that self-harm may act as a coping strategy. Subsequently, within the police cells and court cells, Gary continued to self-harm. However, because he had limited resources he chose to head-butt rather than cut himself, although it continued to serve the same purpose; "I start head-butting the walls..... it just helps me calm down – I get so wound up". In terms of motivation, Gary appeared to self-harm partly because of the environment he was held in, but also because of a loss of social support and

because he was worried about his family. Hence, when talking about why he self-harmed in the police cells, Gary stated, “[the police cells are] fucking horrible..... just the cells themselves.... I can’t stand them.. they’re claustrophobic..... I don’t know, it’s just loneliness – I don’t like it on my own”. Likewise, in the court cells, Gary explained, “I started going mad... started head-banging the walls.... they wouldn’t let me see my sister or dad..... the fact I couldn’t see my family and my girlfriend and that I was going to miss Christmas and new year’s eve..... I was pissed off – I just wanted to see my Dad..... he didn’t even see me”. Once more, this corresponds with Dear, Thomson, Hall and Howells (2001), who found internal prison events / circumstances and consequences of imprisonment (missing family, worrying about the strain on one’s family) to be associated with self-harm.

The previous accounts demonstrate how some young men make suicide attempts in the criminal justice system. However, as detailed in chapter three, rather than attempting suicide, Alex contemplated suicide after he lost his girlfriend, explaining “when I was in [Glen Parva] after I lost my girlfriend I did [think about committing suicide]”. Alex was able to ‘block his ex out of his life’ though and ‘move on’, having no further suicidal thoughts. Again, this demonstrates how some young men are in temporary stages of despair or crisis, being able to move through these after relatively short periods. At the same time, Alex stated he self-harmed by punching a wall, explaining how he did it because he was upset. Thus, as found by Dear, Thomson, Hall and Howells (2001), outside problems can lead to self-harm. Unlike the above interviewees though, Alex did not find this useful; when asked if the self-harm had helped him, he replied, “not really... [though] it’s better than going out there and punching someone”. Alex therefore seemed to differ from the above interviewees, who used self-harm as a form of

coping. Furthermore, when Alex had previously self-harmed on the outside, by cutting his wrists, he explained that he was “just messing about really”.

The above narratives emphasise the vulnerability of young people when detained in the criminal justice system and the impulsive nature of their actions and decisions. Evidence tentatively shows a link between suicide attempts outside and inside the criminal justice system, with these acts sometimes arising for the same reasons or feelings. Likewise, motives for self-harm are often the same inside and outside the criminal justice system. Even though methods of self-harm and attempted suicide tend to differ substantially, motives for these acts do occasionally overlap. A later section will demonstrate that, despite evidence to the contrary, the coping strategies employed by these individuals are similar to those employed by individuals who have not attempted suicide or have not self-harmed.

Before exploring the coping strategies used by individuals who have attempted suicide or self-harmed, it is appropriate to look at the remaining interviewees who self-harmed within the criminal justice system. Firstly, it was apparent from discussions with Nick, and observations of his scarred arms, that he self-harmed. However, it was not possible to establish why he self-harmed because his interview was cut short. Therefore, Nick could not be included within this section. Unlike the above interviewees, Justin explained how he had begun self-harming by copying someone else. He explained that he had started self-harming at the age of 8 when his granddad died, beginning with little cuts and getting bigger and deeper, until later he was using cigarettes to burn himself. Although Justin was able to acknowledge that self-harm was a way of coping and helped to some degree, he did not know how. In part this may have been because his self-harm was impulsive (see also Cooke et al, 1990). Alternatively, Justin appeared to

find it difficult explaining how it helped him. For example, he was able to describe how on one occasion he had been in a fight with his brother and had wanted to kill him, but because he could not, he had cut his arm very badly. It would appear that like other interviewees, and findings by Arnold and Magill (2000) and Harvey (2007), self-harm acted as a form of release for Justin. Although Justin had not attempted suicide within the criminal justice system, he had tried to hang himself in the toilets of his boarding school. Like his self-harm, this act arose because he was stressed.

Compared with the above interviewees, Mohammed was unique in a number of respects. Firstly, he was from Iraq and had experienced a very troubled childhood; Mohammed explained how when he was younger he had seen both his father and brother killed. Even now, he was unsure whether his mother was still alive. As a result, he cut the tops of his arms with a razor, finding that it made him forget the thoughts in his head:

When that's hurting (pointing to his arm) I forget about everything.....

if cutting myself I forget this one (pointing to his head).

Therefore, as identified by Dear, Thomson, Hall and Howells (2001) and Harvey (2007), self-harm can provide a means of forgetting traumatic memories. However, by cutting the tops of his arms, Mohammed's self-harm differed from other interviewees, who tended to cut their lower arms. Similarly, Baker (2004) found an increasing number of foreign national prisoners are coming to Glen Parva YOI and who display unusual patterns of self-harm, including superficial cuts to their chest and abdomen. Whilst Mohammed self-harmed outside of prison as a way of forgetting the thoughts in his head, within prison it was because he wanted to talk to somebody. As noted in chapter

four, Mohammed stated, “they won’t talk to you...when you do talk to them they won’t listen to you”. It is possible that Mohammed felt that prison staff would not talk or listen to him because he had difficulties communicating in English. Consequently, Mohammed may have used self-harm as a means of communication (see also Howard League, 2003).

Whereas the above interviewees had self-harmed or attempted suicide outside the criminal justice system, Matthew only began to self-harm inside prison. Like other interviewees, Matthew began self-harming as a means of coping with depression and as a means of getting attention and speaking to someone:

I’ve never slashed up on the road outside before.... I was depressed that’s why I was slashing up [inside Glen Parva YOI]..... I was depressed miss – it was for attention – anything.... when people don’t listen to you, you resort to last resorts.

In similar respects to Mohammed, it would appear that Matthew self-harmed within prison as a means of communicating with staff (see also Howard League, 2003). This example also signifies how self-harm can be a new and learned behaviour that is adopted in prison as a coping strategy (Morton, 2004). When probed further to explain why he had decided to start self-harming inside Glen Parva YOI, Matthew replied:

I don’t know.... other people I know had done it – I was on [the vulnerable prisoner] unit at the time..... I was in jail – I couldn’t cope.... I didn’t think about it – it was bam I saw the razor blade and I just did it.

Matthew is therefore similar to Justin, who was influenced by others who self-harmed. In addition, this narrative emphasises the impulsive nature of self-harm and how it may be used when individuals cannot cope. With only a few months of his sentence left, Matthew stated he did not think he would harm himself again; “I’m out in a few months.... I don’t want to die in jail – fuck that”.

Returning to the question of whether individuals who attempt suicide or self-harm are ‘poor copers’, it was shown earlier that the two prisoners who had contemplated or attempted suicide inside and outside the criminal justice system, adopted similar coping strategies to other interviewees, suggesting that they are not poor copers. Likewise, the evidence presented here demonstrates that young men who self-harm employ similar coping strategies to those who do not. In doing so, it contradicts Liebling and Krarup (1993), who found poor coping to be characteristic of most self-harm. Similarly, Dear, Slattery and Hillan (2001) found that the coping strategies employed by prisoners who self-harm are considered less likely to be of benefit than those used by prisoners who do not. Within the present study though, no significant differences were found. For example, like other interviewees, when speaking about how he felt being detained in a police cell and how he coped, Alex stated; “[I get] very bored..... sleep – that was it, sleep”. Conversely, Matthew would read when detained in a police cell; “I read – every time I get arrested I read”. Like other interviewees, when being transferred in an escort vehicle, Gary talked with a friend, thus preventing him from self-harming:

I spoke to my mate X..... yeah [it was better that he was there with me]... but I do really hate him a bit... his fault I’m fucking here..... in the van it was weird – I had someone to talk to – in the [police] cell I didn’t have anyone to talk to.... I was a lot happier [in the van].

With regards to coping in prison, interviewees who self-harmed employed similar strategies to those that did not. Thus, Gary explained how “smoking calms me down” and how having cigarettes helped him on his first night in prison; “I was going mad but I had some fags so I was alright”. Social support also played a central role in these interviewees’ lives; Russell and Justin would talk to their girlfriends, whilst Dave found it beneficial to share a cell; “sitting on your own and you get bored and that... it goes a little bit quicker with others [sharing your cell]”. Like other prisoners, Gary found music improved his mood and he was looking forward to getting a stereo in prison; “when I get my stereo I’ll be happier I’ll have my music to listen to..... [the music is] just happy and bouncy.... it makes me proper happy”. In similar respects to being detained in a police cell and like other prisoners, Alex confronted the loss of stimulation in prison by sleeping; “generally I just sleep during the day if I haven’t got anything to do”. As before, other prisoners watched television to occupy their time; “the TV ain’t been turned off since I got here.... I watch more TV in here... nothing [else] to do” (Gary) and “[TV] passes the time..... nothing else to do coz banged up all day..... [I watch it] all night sometimes, as I don’t sleep” (Ryan). Equally, employment helped Alex to occupy his time:

For the first month it was dragging... the other day I looked at my calendar and realised I hadn’t ticked it for 3 – 4 months.... it’s just coz I’m out doing my cleaning... getting on with it... not thinking about the outside – I don’t bother ticking it off..... coz you’re out of your cell in the morning – you can talk to people... it’s doing something – it’s not just sitting in your cell all day.

Lastly, Russell would write letters to overcome boredom, whilst Matthew found it beneficial writing his thoughts down; “sometimes I’ll write letters and then not send them out”. The above narratives therefore suggest that the coping strategies employed by young males who self-harm are very similar to those who do not self-harm and supports Haines and Williams (1997: 183), who conclude that:

there is little to suggest that individuals who self-mutilate display massive deficits in coping and problem solving..... self-mutilative behavior is not adopted as a means of dealing with distress because individuals who self-mutilate have no other means of coping or because they are unable to adequately solve their problems.

Again, whilst there were some similarities with the above interviewees in terms of their opinions of staff working within the criminal justice system and the support they provided, there were some significant differences. Like a number of the above interviewees, Gary had a mixed opinion of police officers; “some of them are alright, some are nasty – they’re all alright – none of them are arseholes – some just treat you better”. Dave was more negative in his opinion of police officers, explaining, “they’re wankers really.... I’ve had no good experiences with them”, although his opinion of court staff was slightly more positive; “court staff can be alright sometimes”. Matthew was also positive about court staff, explaining, “[they’re] wicked.... you can have a right laugh with them”. However, as highlighted before, the informational support provided to young men within these earlier stages could be improved. For example, Gary suggested that having someone to talk to in the police cells would have helped calm him down; “someone to talk to... someone I knew would have helped”. This was

of particular importance to Gary, who had not been to prison before and who had self-harmed on the outside because he was worried about prison.

Regarding prison, only Ryan was really negative about prison officers / staff, stating, “I just don’t like it at Glen Parva, I don’t get on with the staff... it’s crap... it just is – staff are horrible and that”. It is important to bear in mind that Ryan desperately wanted a move to another prison and found it difficult to identify anything positive about Glen Parva YOI. In contrast, a number of interviewees were positive about prison officers; “[unit 12 are] quite good... I get on with them alright” (John) and “they’re all sound” (Matthew). However, whilst Matthew would talk to a prison officer if he had a problem, John would not, explaining, “I wouldn’t speak to a prison officer.... they’re the good side and we’re meant to be the bad side.... it’s probably trust really”. John’s sentiments again tie in with the suggestion of Hobbs and Dear (2000), that prisoners may not want to seek emotional support from prison officers because of an ‘us and them’ mentality. Instead, prisoners may speak with other members of staff. For example, Alex mentioned that he could talk to a nurse in the Healthcare Centre, “I speak to that nurse – I wouldn’t go and speak to the screws – I wouldn’t trust their confidentiality.... [nurses are] alright to speak to.... I don’t like speaking to [prison officers]... I don’t trust them”. Likewise, Matthew stated how he found it easy talking to his drugs worker, in part because she was female; “[it’s] nice to see a friendly face – friendlyish.... she proper talks to you – not like some people – the blokes – they’re insensitive – I like speaking to ladies”. To sum up, further informational support could be provided within the earlier stages of the criminal justice system, which would be particularly beneficial to those who have not been through the system before. Furthermore, it could reduce distress and anxiety, which can lead to self-harm. If prisoners find it difficult to seek emotional support from prison officers, they should be encouraged to find alternative avenues of emotional

support, for example, healthcare staff. Being able to do this is particularly important for those individuals who are at-risk of suicide or self-harm.

As demonstrated in the discussion above, self-harm appears to act as an alternative coping strategy, being used alongside, or as a supplement to, more traditional methods. Whether self-harm is learned inside or outside the criminal justice system, it provides individuals with a means of coping. Thus, interviewees spoke of how self-harm allowed them to release a build-up of frustration and anger, to help them calm down, to prevent them from thinking about their problems, to help them cope with depression and to help them cope with boredom. It was also a means of communicating their needs or feelings to staff when they could see no other way of getting their attention or speaking to them. Similarities therefore exist between the motivations for self-harm found here and by Dear, Thomson, Hall and Howells (2001) and Harvey (2007). In particular, support was found for Harvey's (2007) four groups of young male prisoners who self-harm; young men who repetitively self-harm for relief of tension, who have psychological health difficulties, who experience extreme entry shock and who respond to a particular triggering event. However, it maybe more appropriate to re-name 'young men who experience extreme entry shock' to 'young men who find the pains of custody particularly distressing'. Furthermore, parallels can be drawn between self-harm and the benefits of other coping strategies. For example, there are a number of similarities between self-harm and the use of drugs or alcohol (arguably another form of self-harm). Thus, interviewees spoke about how these substances allowed them to forget about their problems, helped them to calm down, allowed them to block everything out and reduced stress. Nevertheless, before accepting self-harm as a coping strategy it is appropriate to explore two remaining accounts from interviewees who self-harmed outside the criminal justice system, but not inside.

Whilst at Bravo Magistrates Court, an interview was conducted with Owen, who was 20 years old, in court for breach of bail. He had never been to prison before and was subsequently released after his court hearing. It was apparent from observations of Owen that he had mental health problems, which were confirmed by conversations with him:

More recently I've been having problems – I've been waking up in sweats..... I can't be in a room with a door locked – it makes me feel unsafe – I'm trapped in my head.....I feel paranoid that people are watching me..... it's stress and depression probably..... I've been feeling quite suicidal...I can't leave the house for 2 hours when I first get up as I don't feel safe.....I feel it's when I go out[side] that all the problems start.....it's the stress that's building up about everything... [last night] I was actually suicidal coz my TV wouldn't turn on..... I felt quite suicidal coz I wasn't able to watch TV – that's what calms me down.

Compounding Owen's problems was a "history of short term memory loss and problems rationalising things", along with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder and the fact he was homeless. Consequently, by self-harming, Owen found that he could concentrate on the pain he was inflicting rather than the thoughts that were causing him problems. Snow (2002) similarly highlights how self-harm allows individuals to experience physical rather than psychological pain. Owen described how in the past he had hurt himself using knives, forks and a lighter, resulting in faint scars on his thumbs, legs, arms and stomach. When asked if it made him feel better he stated:

No because it leaves big ass scars on me, but yes coz it calms me down.... it takes the thought away – I’m concentrating on the pain – not the cause of the pain... I’m focusing on the feelings there, not what causes them.

Therefore, like a number of the above interviewees, self-harm had a cathartic effect. In addition, Owen found tattoos provided him with a similar effect to that gained from self-harming:

This is the more legal way of doing it – the pain but not such a damaging effect..... it’s the pain that makes me feel back in control – it’s me having the pain – not me giving pain to others.... I make myself feel like the pain’s coming to me not someone else.

Hence, tattooing can represent a more acceptable form of self-harm. Furthermore, within the above quote, Owen refers to how the pain makes him feel like he has regained control and that it is he receiving the pain rather than someone else; these comments echo the work of Arnold and Magill (2000), Cooke et al (1990), Favazza (1996), Snow (2002) and Young Minds (1999). Despite the perceived benefits of self-harm and the fact he tended to feel claustrophobic in police cells, escort vehicles and court cells, Owen had not self-harmed within these locations. Instead, Owen was able to employ alternative coping strategies. For example, in the police cell he stated, “as long as I’ve got a cigarette and a cup of tea I’m alright – my mind concentrates on them”. Owen was also helped by staff; when it came to being transported in an escort vehicle, police officers would often take him in a police van, as “they know it’s bad for me in

the back [of an escort vehicle]”. Subsequently, in court cells, Owen managed not to self-harm by taking his mind off his problems:

I try and focus on something else..... fairies, dragons.... inside a cell I cannot wear shoes and I have to stay on the benches – I can’t get off them.. I have to sit there and concentrate on something I’m doing or have done or someone special to me.

Owen also liked to read fairy tales; “they’re the only things that calm me down... I sometimes think [fairies] exist... nothing [else] will calm me down”. For Owen, his enjoyment from reading fairy tales stemmed from a belief that they mirrored his life and they talked about getting from one realm to another. However, whilst other interviewees found it beneficial to be in shared court cells, Owen preferred to be on his own:

I don’t trust [other detainees] – I wouldn’t feel safe – I’d end up probably smashing my head against the wall..... I wouldn’t be able to control the situation – not knowing what they’ve done.... not being able to know the situation that could arise from that point.

Consequently, by managing to avoid stressful situations and focussing his mind on other things, Owen averted himself from self-harm. Furthermore, by respecting Owen’s needs, staff in the police station and court helped to reduce his distress and the possibility of him self-harming. Therefore, although self-harm did represent a coping strategy for Owen, positive action by himself and staff prevented him from using it within the criminal justice system.

John, in contrast to the majority of the above interviewees, had only self-harmed once. Earlier in the year John described how he had impulsively cut himself with a knife after feeling “depressed that my girlfriend left me”. Despite not wanting to hurt himself, John wanted, somewhat paradoxically, to know how it felt to cut himself. John also described how he had wanted time on his own to think about the break-up with his girlfriend and “just started thinking about it with a knife”. Through self-harm John felt better, commenting that “you put yourself in a different pain than what you’re feeling..... [it helps by] taking your mind off what you were thinking”. This is similar to comments made by other interviewees, for example, Owen. Although John found self-harm could take his mind off his problems, he had not self-harmed again, explaining how his friends had called him a “twat” and he had realised it was not worth hurting himself.

The discussion in this chapter has shown that for some individuals, self-harm can represent a means of coping with their problems, particularly when confined within the criminal justice system. However, this view is not widely supported; many of the detainees and prisoners who were interviewed could not understand why their peers self-harmed and would sometimes hold negative opinions about them. For example, when interviewees who had not self-harmed were asked why they had not done so or had not contemplated suicide, responses included; “I never harmed myself – that would be the last thing to do.... it doesn’t help you in anyway” (Joe), “if I were that down and depressed I’d rather get pissed and have a fight and get rid of it that way..... now I’ve grown up I’d talk to someone – get it off my chest straight away” (Shaun), “I think that’s a cowardly thing” (Paul), “I don’t see the point in it... it’s just a weak way out of life” (Craig), “I’ve never self-harmed... I’ve got more self respect for my family than that” (Adam) and “no, I wouldn’t do that.... I know if I did anything like that it’d hurt my family more than me.... I don’t like to see things like that it’s horrible” (Gareth).

Others failed to see why these individuals did not access the support they were offered; “they can’t handle it... I just think they’re idiots... there’s just no need for it – the help’s there, they just don’t ask for it, so it’s their fault” (Andrew) and “they’re twats – there’s no need for it – speak to someone if you feel depressed” (Richard). Consequently, there is a distinct difference in how self-harm is perceived by young males who do and do not self-harm. The perception that young men who do not self-harm have of others who do is that they are weak, uncaring, manipulative and to blame for their circumstances. This perception reinforces negative stereotypes of people who self-harm.

In summary, this chapter demonstrates that the problems some young men face (or their perception of these problems), overwhelm their coping strategies. Consequently, they continue to feel that they cannot cope and either attempt or contemplate suicide. In contrast, there are individuals who do cope with the pains of custody. Some coping strategies may be transferred from the outside, whilst others cannot, because they are either prevented or prohibited. Therefore, individuals may have to embrace new or modified forms of coping in order to minimise the pains of custody. In general, coping strategies tend to centre on avoidance or escape, sometimes offering individuals a pleasant experience or an opportunity to better themselves. They tend to enable young people to keep their mind off their problems, reduce stress, help them calm down, help them overcome boredom and make time go quicker. Alongside these more traditional coping strategies, young males may self-harm. Evidence appears to suggest that these individuals do not have poorer coping strategies than other prisoners. In fact, they share many of the same strategies. However, evidence does suggest that they might need greater informational and emotional support, particularly those that have not been through the criminal justice system before. Instead of signifying that individuals cannot

cope, it is thought that self-harm is used alongside other coping strategies to enable the individual to cope. By employing self-harm, they manage to divert themselves from suicide. Leading on from this, the next chapter explores the more formal support services offered to young males within the criminal justice system, helping them cope with the pains of custody.

Chapter Six: Support services within the criminal justice system

Following on from coping strategies, this chapter explores how the formal support services provided within the criminal justice system can alleviate and help young detainees and prisoners cope with the pains of custody. By exploring each stage of the criminal justice system, the support provided to young men and in particular, those who self-harm, will be identified, together with their ideas for improvement. The analysis excludes escort vehicles, as individuals are held there in isolation for relatively short periods and are unable to access support services. Throughout this chapter, it is important to remember that although some young people may use self-harm as a coping strategy, a 'duty to care' means that none of the establishments within the criminal justice system condone it. Consequently, at all three stages, attempts are made to prevent suicide and self-harm. Staff working within the criminal justice system also face unique problems when addressing suicidal and self-harm behaviour. Hence, methods of supporting individuals in the community are not always transferable to the custodial setting.

Firstly, it is appropriate to explore the support offered to young men on the outside, who have attempted suicide or have self-harmed. In doing so, it will become apparent that the criminal justice system plays a crucial role in providing young people at-risk with support. Dave explained how on the outside he had seen psychiatrists, been involved with social services and had spent time in a mental health hospital, all in response to his self-harm and suicide attempt, which resulted from the voices he heard in his head. Despite having been provided with this support, Dave stated that none of it had helped him. Similarly, after Justin began self-harming at the age of 8 he was referred to a psychologist, who he refused to talk to. Consequently, he had not received any further

support. More recently, because John was suffering with depression and had begun to self-harm, he was referred to a counselling service in his city. Unfortunately, when he was advised that it would take two months before they could see him, he did not return, arguing that if they could not help him then, they would not be able to help him in two months time. Lastly, Owen, who had mental health problems and who self-harmed, had arranged an appointment with a counsellor, via the Young Housing Project. His appointment was for the same day that he was arrested and taken to court, so he missed it. Furthermore, he was not able to contact the counsellor to advise them that he was unable to attend. These narratives suggest that a significant proportion of young people who have self-harmed or attempted suicide on the outside have not been given support. When support is offered, it is not always effective, may not be available soon enough or may not be accessed because individuals have become caught up in the criminal justice system. Consequently, it is imperative that young people are made aware of outside support services whilst being dealt with by the police, courts or prison.

Support services within police stations

Police officers and police staff only have the capacity to prevent suicide and self-harm through physical means and are therefore not able to provide a direct support function. This becomes apparent from the paperwork that custody officers have to complete when booking a detainee in, which assesses whether they need any special treatment. When a detainee arrives at a police station, the custody officer will complete a 'Detainee Integrated Risk Assessment and Care Plan'. Relatively few questions on this form relate to self-harm, with only one asking 'what special treatment do you feel that you need whilst you are detained here?' Thus, it emphasises treatment rather than support. In addition, detainees have to know what special treatment could be made available; they

are not advised of the options. Where a detainee is assessed as high risk, they will see a Police Surgeon who completes a 'Detainee Risk Assessment Form Medical Report'. By completing this report, the Police Surgeon is able to specify 'treatment advice' and what measures need to be put into place by the custody staff when caring for the detainee. It does not provide any advice for the detainee in seeking support for their self-harm or suicidal feelings. Therefore, the forms used in police custody suites centre on the physical measures or actions that must be taken to prevent, or at least reduce the risk of, suicide and self-harm. They do not include providing the detainee with information about, or access to, support services.

Subsequently, several precautionary measures are put in place to reduce the risk of suicide and self-harm. Firstly, detainees are asked to hand-over all personal possessions and are physically checked to ensure they are not carrying or hiding any objects that could be used to harm themselves or others. Detainees then have to remove any cords in their clothing and leave their shoes outside their cell; the cells have been designed to limit the ligature points. Any blankets provided to detainees in their cells are tear-proof. Those who are deemed at-risk of suicide or self-harm are then placed in tear-proof suits and may be under the constant observation of a police officer sitting outside the open cell door or regularly watched via in-cell CCTV. As an example, during my study, a 19 year old male was placed on constant observation, because he had previously attempted to hang himself in police custody and had also cut his wrists. For the vast majority of the time he spent in police custody an officer was stationed outside his cell door. In total, he was on constant observation for nearly 26 hours and observed via in-cell CCTV for the remaining 10 hours. Some detainees are considered at such a high risk of harming themselves that more drastic measures are taken. Thus, whilst I was at a police station, a 24 year old male was placed in handcuffs inside a cell and watched by two

police officers; not only was he at-risk of self-harm but he had previously managed to throw a blanket over officers and therefore posed a security risk.

Although doctors will see detainees who are considered at-risk of suicide or self-harm, unless they are sectioned under the Mental Health Act or provided with medication, no further support is provided. However, detainees can require further support. During his interview, Russell described how he had tried to hang himself in a police station five years ago. When officers found him, they stripped him of his clothes and locked the door. Despite Russell feeling that “no-one can give me help except myself”, such a response from the police officers seems inhumane; it is hoped that five years on, this would not happen. It was also apparent from speaking with Gary that although police officers had been sympathetic to, and helpful with, his situation, he had never been provided with any support. Thus, Gary described how after head-butting in police cells, “[officers] take me out the cell and put me in a different room or hurry up and get the interview done so I can go home”. No further action is taken or support is offered.

Somewhat different measures are put in place when an individual is arrested on suspicion of paedophilia. During an informal conversation with a Detective Constable, it was explained to me how, following arrest, there is a higher incidence of suicide and self-harm amongst these individuals, due to the pressures and fears they face. Hence, at the end of interviews, police officers speak with detainees and provide them with a leaflet about the support services available to them. The leaflet contains information about a group set up specifically to help and advise paedophiles, the Samaritans and the contact numbers for the officers in the case. It is therefore suggested that these provisions be extended to detainees who regularly self-harm, are at-risk of self-harming or have suicidal thoughts or tendencies. A leaflet could be devised outlining what self-

harm is, what suicidal thoughts may involve and where individuals can access support and advice. By doing so, the Police Force may help reduce incidents of suicide and self-harm in the community and within police cells, if these individuals are re-arrested.

In addition to support for suicide or self-harm, detainees may need help or advice in relation to drug or alcohol problems, particularly as so many are experiencing the physical and psychological effects of withdrawal. Within police stations, detainees are now able to access independent drugs / alcohol workers, who provide a confidential service. If the detainee would like further support or advice, they are able to refer them on. Although a number of interviewees stated they had been offered this service, very few took the opportunity to speak with a worker, explaining “you don’t feel in the right mind to speak to drugs workers at that precise minute” (Simon), “I thought I’d have more time to do that in Glen Parva” (Luke), “because by this time I’d been arrested I’d been through the cycle.... I knew where I was going wrong” (Shaun) and “I’ve been there before – at [X police station] they’re crap” (Ryan). Even when Alex had seen the drugs / alcohol worker, he did not find it useful; “waste of time really – the only thing the drug worker did was get the tablets off the doctor.... because she was chatting to me about a load of shit..... I was on a come down [from coke] at the time”. For Jonathan, the drugs / alcohol worker had been helpful, but it had failed to keep him from drinking alcohol:

One time I was in a different station I seen one..... she was alright – she just spoke – told me where to go if I needed help..... no [it didn’t help] - I kept on drinking..... I did want to [stop drinking] when I was in there, but I got alcohol when I got out.

For these reasons, drugs / alcohol workers need to ensure that when they initially speak with detainees they are mindful that some may not feel in the right mood to talk or that some have seen one before and not succeeded in staying off drugs or alcohol. These issues need to be addressed with the detainee and overcome, so that they are more inclined to participate. Some individuals may also need additional support on leaving the police station or prison to help them succeed.

In contrast, there were interviewees who had not been offered a drugs / alcohol worker. For example, Robert stated, “that’s what pisses me off – you get arrested and chucked in a cell and taken to court – you don’t get fuck all”. Nevertheless, when asked if he had wanted to see a drugs / alcohol worker, Robert replied, “not really – I wouldn’t have listened to them – I wanted to get in prison”. On the other hand, there were those detainees that would have seen a drugs / alcohol worker had they been offered one; “not the drugs one but probably the alcohol one.... it depends how it would have been” (Gary) and “yes I would have seen someone.... the ones in prison don’t even help you – they come round and tell you the effects of drugs and fuck off again (Andrew). During my visits to police custody suites it was apparent that all detainees were asked if they would like to see a drugs / alcohol worker. However, some custody officers skimmed over this question, whereas others explained the service in more detail. A better working relationship between custody officers and drugs / alcohol workers could therefore be developed; there was a tendency for staff within the custody suite to view the latter as ‘do-gooders’.

Police stations are the first, and sometimes the only, point of contact individuals have with the criminal justice system. Although significant developments have been made in offering support to individuals with drug or alcohol problems, greater support could be

offered to those at-risk of suicide or self-harm, particularly when more and more people are entering the criminal justice system with mental health problems, which are compounded by the pains of custody. However, as highlighted during my conversations with police officers and staff, they are not social workers nor do they join the job to perform such a function. This is exacerbated by the fact that detainees spend relatively short periods within police custody and are rarely able to develop strong relationships with staff. Therefore, instead of providing a direct support function, police officers and staff could act as gatekeepers to external support groups. For example, they could provide detainees with leaflets that explain about suicide and self-harm, give ideas for coping with detention and detail local and national self-help groups. This could be especially useful, as individuals may not know where to find support about suicide and self-harm, or may be too embarrassed to ask for help. In turn, this may not only help to reduce the self-harm rate within police custody, but also the wider community.

Support services within court custody suites

In similar respects to police stations, staff in court custody suites are limited in the support they are able to provide detainees at-risk of suicide or self-harm. As outlined within the literature review, the F2052SH forms that court custody suites used in the past are being replaced by the ACCT Plan. Whilst court staff must follow the guidance attached to an open ACCT Plan, they are not responsible for opening one. Instead, they raise concerns via a 'Suicide / Self-harm Warning Form'. This form is completed when a member of staff has concerns regarding a detainee and may include statements of intent to self-harm / commit suicide or acts of self-harm. In comparison with the Detainee Integrated Risk Assessment and Care Plan used in police stations, this form asks for more detailed information about the nature of the concern and the detainee's

history of self-harm. Furthermore, the Suicide / Self-harm Warning Form asks whether the detainee has been given 'other support, e.g. telephone call to family or Samaritans'. Therefore, although court staff are limited in the support they can provide to detainees and because preventative measures are physical, they are encouraged within the Suicide / Self-harm Warning Form to provide detainees with access to further support.

Some of the physical preventative measures which are put into place within court custody suites to avert detainees from suicide or self-harm are comparable to the measures found in police stations. Firstly, detainees' personal possessions are withheld from them and metal detectors are used to check that individuals are not hiding metal objects. Although metal detectors were not used in the police stations that were visited, police officers do have the authority to undertake strip searches, and where necessary, authorise the Police Surgeon to complete an internal examination. Secondly, detainees considered at-risk of suicide or self-harm have their shoes and any cords in their clothing removed (although they are not issued with a tear-proof suit). Thirdly, any detainee who persistently self-harms is given a specially made fork / spoon which is sturdy enough to eat with, but still flexible to ensure it is not used to self-harm. From my observations, it seemed that this utensil was only being used in court custody suites, rather than police stations or prison. Fourthly, five-minute watches or constant observations are used for those detainees at-risk. A Psychiatric Community Nurse (PCN) is also called in to undertake a risk assessment. PCNs act independently and are able to offer advice, help and support to detainees. Once the risk assessment is completed, the PCN will pass any necessary information onto the court custody service. However, unless the detainee is sectioned under the Mental Health Act there is no further support offered in relation to self-harm. During my study, this deficit was highlighted in an informal discussion with a PCN. They explained that there was no one

agency that dealt with individuals who self-harmed. Instead such individuals fell under the remit of a number of agencies, including drugs / alcohol workers (who also visit detainees in court) or the individual's own doctor.

The support that court custody staff are able to provide detainees at-risk of suicide or self-harm is therefore limited, partly because detainees are held in court cells for relatively short periods. In comparison with police stations though, they are encouraged to provide the detainee with access to further support, for example, their family or the Samaritans. This is particularly important as the pains of custody mean that many detainees are nervous, scared or volatile, as they face the prospect of imprisonment. Although not used in the courts visited, there is evidence to suggest that 'Insiders' may help reduce this anxiety, especially in relation to a fear of the unknown (West Midlands Area Psychology Team, 2006). Furthermore, some courts provide detainees with booklets or videos that describe the prison to which they are going to be sent (HM MCSI and HMI Prisons, 2005). Having access to these may be of particular benefit to individuals at-risk of suicide or self-harm and could be extended to the courts that were visited. Moreover, it would take the pressure off court staff having to provide advice and support. However, not all individuals go to prison, consequently, some individuals at-risk of suicide or self-harm are released into the community without having received any formal support. These detainees may benefit from being provided with leaflets about local and national self-help groups for suicide and self-harm.

Support services within prison

In comparison with police stations and court custody suites, a different approach to preventing suicide and self-harm is adopted by the Prison Service. Instead of focusing

on physical preventative measures, prisoners are encouraged to access a wide range of support services. Again, this is evident in the forms that are used by the Prison Service to manage prisoners at-risk of suicide or self-harm. In particular, the ACCT Plan, which is being introduced to replace the F2052SH form, aims to help prisoners “build up their own sources of support” (HM Prison Service, no date: 1). As part of the immediate action plan, staff have to consider the frequency of staff support, phone access for the prisoner (whether to the Samaritans, family or other) and Listener access. Subsequently, the ACCT Plan asks staff to consider what action needs to be taken to link the prisoner to people who can provide support. Prisoners are also encouraged to develop their own support networks and coping strategies. Furthermore, the ACCT Plan recognises that prisoners are at-risk of suicide after release from prison and encourages staff to put into place measures that will try to reduce this risk. The Prison Service therefore adopts a supportive approach in tackling suicide and self-harm. It does not merely record details of these incidents, but actively encourages prisoners and staff to utilise the support services on offer. The Prison Service also adopts a holistic approach, extending its support services to individuals with, for example, drug or alcohol problems, learning difficulties and anger management problems. The following flowchart provides an overview of the support services available to prisoners within reception, the induction unit, remand unit and sentenced unit at Glen Parva:

Reception (one night)

- First night – Healthcare staff complete a health screening with prisoners
- Referrals are made to the Healthcare Centre & in-reach mental health teams
- Prisoners are also interviewed by the first night induction officer
- If necessary, an ACCT plan is opened
- Prisoners are allowed to make a phone call to a family member
- The next day Healthcare staff verify the first night screening with prisoners



Induction Unit (up to six days)

- Prisoners are assessed again on their first night in the induction unit
- Depending on whether prisoners have previously been to Glen Parva, they will spend up to 6 days in the induction unit being provided with information about the prison
- Support services accessible whilst on the induction unit include:
 - Listeners
 - Insiders
 - Samaritans (dedicated phone accessible 24-7)
 - Chaplain
 - Probation
 - CARATS workers
 - Healthcare Centre staff
 - In-reach mental health teams
 - Prison officers
 - Education staff
 - Access to phone credit to call family / friends
 - Visits from family / friends
- Where necessary, support is also provided through the ACCT plan



Remand Unit

- Remand prisoners have the same support services available to them on the induction unit except for Insiders
- Remand prisoners are also able to access:
 - Education courses
 - Workshops
 - Art therapists
- Again, where necessary, support is provided through the ACCT plan



Sentenced Unit

- Sentenced prisoners have the same support services available to them on the induction unit except for Insiders
- Sentenced prisoners are also able to access:
 - Education courses
 - Workshops
 - Anger management courses
 - Courses including Enhanced Thinking Skills & Prison – Addressing Substance Related Offending
 - Art therapists
 - Personal Officers
- Again, where necessary, support is provided through the ACCT plan

Note that the role of the Suicide Prevention Co-ordinator is to co-ordinate the prison's response to the prevention of suicide and self-harm, in part through the above support services. In addition, within Glen Parva, prisoners may request to see the Suicide Prevention Co-ordinator who will do so on a one-to-one basis.

One way that prisoners learn about support services on offer at Glen Parva YOI is through the induction unit. Here, prisoners spend their first six days, unless they have already been to Glen Parva YOI, when they are fast-tracked. While some interviewees found this process and information helpful, others were more critical. In particular, a couple of interviewees who had not been to prison before found it beneficial, commenting; “it gives you the first appearance of what jail is like... it was really useful for me” (Joe) and “bits of it was [useful]... [for example, the] video – coping in prison” (Craig). Other prisoners stated, “suppose induction’s good coz it teaches you certain things about the prison” (Dean), “when I first did it, it was useful... they do help you with stuff like [bail]” (Adam), “it’s useful... before you didn’t know anything” (Adrian), “they cover pretty much everything” (Shaun) and “they tell you all about Glen Parva, you go to different classes, see doctor, nurse, they tell you about food hygiene..... probably [helpful], yeah” (Jonathan). The induction unit therefore tries to alleviate prisoners’ fears of the unknown and help them cope with the distress caused by entry shock. However, because some prisoners had returned to Glen Parva YOI, they did not find the induction useful; “not [useful] to me coz I know it all... to lads that haven’t been here before yes it would be useful.... they tell you more or less everything you need to know” (Simon), “it’s alright – it’s helpful if it’s your first time in Parva – if you keep coming Parva it’s bullshit.... the first time I came to Parva it was helpful” (Robert), “not really [useful] - it might be to some people who haven’t been before.... I’d have rather got moved straight to a remand unit” (Alex) and “if you’ve been here before – they should put you straight on a unit – I suppose it’s part of the punishment – everyone hates it” (Luke). For these prisoners, a fear of the unknown was less applicable. Therefore, prisoners who had already been to Glen Parva YOI wanted to either by-pass the induction or have one tailored to their circumstances and needs.

With regards to interviewees who had not been in prison before, although Joe and Craig had found the induction useful, Alan felt that the unit was not a true representation of the other units and consequently not worthwhile completing:

I can't understand them having an induction unit and then moving you onto [unit X] – it's totally different.... everything's totally different... it's a waste of time having [an induction] here.... you have to do another week [on unit X] to know what to do.

Gareth did not like the induction unit because of what it involved and because he found it boring:

I wish I could have skipped it all out – I hated it on there – proper horrible.... how the whole unit is – it's all dark and dull..... no mail, no phone calls, not knowing if your girlfriend was alright.

Other interviewees stated, “I hate it now – it's the same routine now.... it's the worst unit... it's going to be like that on any unit [though]... you've got nothing – you're back to square one” (Robert), “when I were doing it, it was crap – doing tests and crap like that” (Shaun), “boring – same as any other unit... all the units are bare.... I knew how it all worked” (Matthew) and “worse wing - boring – locked up in your cell all the time, questions and answers, what to do” (Luke). The pains of custody therefore seemed worse on the induction unit, although the unit may have been no worse than any other.

Consequently, a number of prisoners made recommendations about how the induction could be improved. With respect to the video that is shown, John did not think it was set

at Glen Parva YOI and thought that it was harder to go through prison than portrayed in the video. Likewise, Paul stated prison was not like the video and wanted the video to show, honestly, what prison was going to be like. Furthermore, Paul stated the video was played in prisoners' own cells and could therefore be turned over onto another channel. In terms of the content, Adrian, who had already been inside Glen Parva YOI, suggested the induction could be longer and last two weeks:

I think they rush it I do..... one day you get told about something then the next day you get shoved onto something else and you forget what you were told the first day... it's alright for the people who understand it but not for the slower people.

It may therefore be necessary to keep certain prisoners on the induction unit for longer if they are struggling to understand the prison system. Similarly, Alan, who had not been to prison before, suggested that the information concerning courses, Listeners, education, etc. should be later in the week when prisoners are more settled:

When you're trying to get used to being here you're not listening to what people are saying to you..... once you've got used to what you're doing... it might go in a bit.

Danny, who had not been in prison before, did not find the induction helpful because "all they were trying to find out was if I was clever or not". Danny wanted information about "what's actually going to happen to you... what's the best thing to do in here – you have to work that out for yourself". However, whilst these prisoners wanted more information about education, Gareth wanted information about finding a job; "I don't do

education, that's no good to me.... the only day that's good is the first day you see the job man... and resettlement – sort things for you when you get out”. Lastly, Mohammed found that not having English as his first language meant he had problems understanding the induction and did not find it useful; “no [it was not useful] - I can't understand too much”. Likewise, Lyon (2006) concludes that many foreign prisoners do not understand the workings of the criminal justice system, which is exacerbated by the lack of translation facilities and English classes for such prisoners. Consequently, with the increasing number of foreign nationals entering prison, it may be necessary to tailor an induction pack specifically for prisoners with different languages and cultures.

On leaving the induction unit, prisoners are allocated to different units. Here, depending on their needs, they will be provided with access to different support services. The previous chapter demonstrated that prisoners who have self-harmed or attempted suicide employ similar coping strategies to those that have not. Similarly, the following sections will show that the support services accessed by prisoners who have self-harmed or attempted suicide are similar to those accessed by prisoners who have not, albeit there are some differences.

Support services accessed by prisoners who have not self-harmed or attempted suicide

As shown previously, prison officers are an important source of informal social support. More formally though, there is the Personal Officer Scheme, where sentenced prisoners are allocated a prison officer who acts as their first point of contact (HM Prison Service, 1992). Perhaps surprisingly, very few prisoners mentioned this relationship and of those that did, all were generally positive. For example, Mark explained how his personal

officer “comes up to me – talks to me – asks me if I’m alright.... he’s a good man”. Likewise, Robert described how his personal officer was “one I can talk to – I’m glad I got him”. Other interviewees commented that the Personal Officer Scheme was somewhat redundant as they could go to any officer for help; “I don’t know who he is though.... it’s a waste of time in here coz all the officers will do anything for you” (Gareth), “[personal officers] don’t really mean much to me – you can speak to any officer” (Luke) and “they’re all the same to me” (Simon). Thus, where prisoners did differentiate between prison officers and personal officers, they were complimentary of the relationships they had developed with them.

Another avenue for accessing support services within prison is the Healthcare Centre. In particular, it provides prisoners with access to nurses and psychiatrists, but also alternative forms of support. As an example, Luke had attended art therapy, explaining how he had gone for three weeks on a one-to-one basis and found it useful. This was partly because he found it easier speaking with the art therapist than a prison officer:

It was alright, yeah, I enjoyed it – she was quite good to talk to – she’s not an officer... I don’t mind speaking to them.... they’re paid to speak to us not lock us up.

To help with relaxation, Luke had also received acupuncture, because he used to drink a lot of alcohol; “I do [acupuncture] coz I drank a lot..... I just feel a bit mellow after”. In similar respects, Mark had used the prison library to get ‘relaxing tapes’, which had helped him cope with the pains of custody. These were particularly useful to Mark who had never been in prison before.

When requiring emotional support, Harvey (2007) found that young male prisoners are most likely to approach a chaplain. Within this study, only a small number had accessed the chaplain or Sister, although all had approached them for emotional support. Firstly, Joe explained that whilst at Glen Parva YOI he had been to church twice, both times finding it beneficial; “it has been useful.... when I’m singing I forget about prison.... it gives you hope... encourages you”. By allowing Joe to escape from his thoughts about prison, church acted as an avoidance or escape mechanism. This is similar to the coping strategies identified by Dexter and Towl (1995). Secondly, after a close relative died, Mark spoke with the Sister, who he found particularly caring and supportive:

She’s come down – I’ve spoke to her... she told me that *‘I’ll take you to the chapel on the day of the funeral... do whatever you like... you’ll be calm’*.... [it helps] knowing that there’s help... she’s a brilliant lady.

Hence, the church provides prisoners with an invaluable source of support, although this is a newly accessed support service; no interviewee mentioned going to church outside prison when they had a problem. In part, this may be because on entering prison their normal avenues for support are restricted or because they have different spiritual or religious needs on the inside.

As outlined within the literature review (chapter one), Listeners are trained prisoners who offer a formal support service to their peers who are feeling distressed, anxious or suicidal (McHugh and Towl, 1997; Snow, 2002). According to Harvey (2007), when needing emotional support, prisoners are most likely to approach a chaplain, followed by a Listener. Out of all the interviewees, only one had spoken with a Listener, primarily for emotional support. Similarly, Snow (2002) found that the majority of

prisoners do not access Listener Schemes. Paul explained that he tended to see a Listener when he got stressed and had recently spent the night in a Listener's cell; "if stressed out I go and speak to a listener.... [I see them] mostly when I get stressed out.... they do a good job". One of the main reasons why Paul spoke with a Listener was the confidential service they provided; "you know [Listeners] can't say nothing.... you don't know what a member of staff is going to say". Paul also preferred to speak with a Listener because they are prisoners and of a similar age. Conversely, some interviewees were reluctant to talk to Listeners due to concerns regarding confidentiality and because they are prisoners who are of a similar age:

If I had a serious problem like that I'd rather talk to an officer.... It's confidential.... I'd probably talk to a drug worker..... things are done discretely (Shaun).

I wouldn't talk to a listener – I don't think they could understand you.... [I would want to talk to someone] a bit older, someone who's been through the same sort of problems (Simon).

Equally, Joe explained, "that would be my last option....it's like another prisoner", Luke commented, "they're all idiots – they're cons as well" and Robert felt, "they don't do nothing, they take the piss". Borrill et al (2005) and Snow (2002) also found prisoners expressed concerns over Listeners and the preservation of confidentiality and trust. In addition, Andrew felt that seeing a Listener may result in bullying; "it causes you problems". Some prisoners merely preferred to talk to someone else or keep the problem to themselves; "if I was pissed off I'd phone my mum or girlfriend up.... [Listeners] don't know me" (Kieran), "[Listeners] don't need to hear my problems

either – the only person who needs to know is me – I’d tell my mum as well” (Richard), “no I don’t need to – I sort my own problems out in my own head.... I prefer not to share my business” (Gareth) and “I wouldn’t chat to a Listener.... I don’t talk to no one about my problems really” (Jack). It appears that further work could be done with the Listener Scheme to encourage as many prisoners as possible to access it.

To contrast with the account provided by Paul, a Listener was interviewed. To reiterate, because of the small number of Listeners at Glen Parva YOI, another pseudonym is used when reference is made to this role. During his interview, Ricky described how he had been a Listener for 4-5 months and spoke in-depth about his role, the support he provided others and the support he was given. Initially Ricky completed the Listeners course “to get a better pad” but then his perception changed; “to help other people coz everyone’s got problems – some people don’t show them.... you make yourself feel better as well – it gives you a boost”. Being a Listener therefore provided Ricky with benefits; “you get a better pad – better mattress, curtains, more responsibilities, more respect.... I’m respected [by other prisoners] – they respect what I’m doing - they don’t take the piss”. However, there were difficulties associated with this role:

One downer – if someone wants to kill themselves you can’t tell no one, you have to give them advice – options – if they go back and hang themselves you have to live with it..... it’s hard sometimes – emotions can get in the way..... a paedophile spoke to me.... that was hard for me.

At times, prisoners may stay overnight in a Listener’s cell and this can prove difficult; “the most I’ve had in a week is 5 overnights..... that’s what gets on my nerves when people come in and don’t respect my pad”. In terms of supporting prisoners, Ricky

explained how Listeners have been taught to “aim at the pain” and not give opinions; “we’re not allowed opinions in this place – that’s what they always say to me”. Although some prisoners questioned the confidentiality of the Listener Scheme, it is central to the Listener’s role. Thus, when asked if he found it hard not being able to tell others, Ricky replied, “no not really – I’m glad they can trust someone in this place”. To help them deal with the difficulties of their role, Listeners are also provided with support:

We have meetings every Wednesday... we talk about things so emotions don’t build up.... we see each other every day.... if we need to, we can go to another unit and talk to a Listener... we have Samaritans come in and talk to us every Wednesday.... the officers support us a lot as well.

From discussions with Ricky, it is apparent that both prisoners who use the Scheme and prisoners who are trained as Listeners, benefit. Being a Listener not only brings with it a sense of responsibility and pride, but also greater respect from other prisoners and staff. These sentiments are essential in an environment where the pains of custody can strip prisoners of respect and autonomy.

In response to the large numbers of young males entering prison with drug or alcohol problems, a number of courses have been developed, including Short Duration Programmes (SDP) and the Prison – Addressing Substance Related Offending course (PASRO). Robert, who had spoken about the pains of withdrawing from drugs in police cells and prison, described how he had completed a SDP and PASRO course, finding them both useful:

It's my first time in prison that I've done a course.... they're alright – I've learnt more about drugs and strategies to avoid drugs than I have done on the out.... on the road you get people [running the courses] who've never done drugs.... chatting shit.... that's what I want to do, go college and do a course and be a drugs worker..... now I've done those courses it'll give me loads of confidence to succeed when I get out.... I've learnt from the course – to avoid things happening.

Shaun too spoke about the pains of withdrawing from drugs in the criminal justice system and explained how the PASRO course had helped him:

I'd done a PASRO course – that did help..... I make stupid decisions.... the only thing I enjoyed was the PASRO course - I learned about my problems... they talked to you like humans... I chilled out for a bit coz I started doing PASRO.... my PASRO worker [has helped me] - going through things one-to-one made me see things in a different perspective.

These courses are therefore crucial sources of advice and support to prisoners with substance-related problems. However, this is dependent upon prisoners being able to access these courses and having the time to undertake them, which can be a particular problem for remand prisoners. Furthermore, there is a need for this support to continue after a prisoner's release, as Paul commented, "I want some support when released".

Another type of course that prisoners in Glen Parva YOI can access is Enhanced Thinking Skills (ETS). It is one of the most frequently delivered programmes for prisoners, being relatively short and aiming to address thinking and behaviour

associated with offending (HM Prison Service, 2004a). As stated within the literature review, these courses are an example of cognitive reinterpetive coping strategies (Dexter and Towl, 1995). For prisoners like Danny, who do not have any problems associated with drugs, alcohol or anger, this is one of the few programmes that they can complete; “that’s the only thing I can do... there’s not much stuff you can actually do in here”. Danny found ETS useful because it began to help him understand why he had committed the crime he had, although he felt it could have been longer; “it should be longer really..... they told me to write my life story down – to see why the way I did.... I want more to help me and understand why I went that way... just for myself... why did I [do it] really”. These criticisms of ETS may be unique to Danny, who had been imprisoned after committing his first offence and who was relatively introspective compared with other prisoners.

Not only does attending education provide prisoners with a coping strategy to keep themselves busy, but the staff there provide a source of formal support, particularly for those prisoners with learning difficulties. Mark, who was in prison for his first time, described his amazement at how helpful an English teacher had been:

The best thing was... the English teacher helped me... I was so shocked it was unbelievable... I thought it was like, you’re in here, do it yourself sort of thing.

However, Mark felt more could be done to support prisoners with learning difficulties:

They haven’t got any learning support people in here.... who actually knows, who’s actually trained – it would be a lot easier for the prison....

prison's supposed to help you out, I think it's bad [that there's only one English teacher].... [though] I think it's brilliant what she's doing.

Similarly, although Sam acknowledged that support was available for prisoners with learning difficulties, he wanted more one-to-one help:

I am a bit shy to say I can't write and read – I feel gutted and feel like [the officers would] take the piss.... I do feel ashamed I can't read and spell... I wish I could get help for reading and spelling but I won't sit in a classroom with loads of people.

Therefore, some prisoners were especially positive about the help they had received, but some felt more could be done to support prisoners with learning difficulties. This is particularly important considering Clark (2001, cited in Social Exclusion Unit, 2002: 44) found that “among a group of ex-prisoners with poor educational attainment, those who had not taken part in education or training while in prison were three times more likely to be reconvicted than those who had”.

Support services accessed by prisoners who have self-harmed or attempted suicide

Evidence presented in this section will demonstrate that in comparison with the above interviewees, prisoners who have self-harmed or attempted suicide access similar support services in prison, although there are some differences. Within her report, Baker (2004: 1) states that Glen Parva YOI provides “appropriate, individualised support for those prisoners currently at risk of suicide and / or self-harm, in order to reduce the risk of injury and death”. In support of this, HMCIP (2006: 15) concludes that “Glen Parva

had an excellent system for reviewing and supporting all those who self-harmed”. Glen Parva YOI achieves this through prison officers, Listeners, Samaritans, the Insider Scheme (for those on induction) and the development of an in-reach service in the Healthcare Centre, which provides an improved service for prisoners with mental health problems. More specifically, Baker (2004) found that in 27% of all incidents of self-harm, the prisoner was provided with increased unit support. In 24% of cases, prisoners were admitted to the Healthcare Centre, in 9% they were reviewed by a psychiatrist and in 8% they were referred to art therapy. In addition, the location of prisoners was changed and they were referred to the chaplaincy, psychology or anger management. Therefore, it would seem that prisoners in Glen Parva YOI who are at-risk of suicide or self-harm are provided with a variety of support services.

Previously, it was shown how the Healthcare Centre can provide prisoners with access to art therapy and acupuncture. As well as this, the Healthcare Centre provides a respite for prisoners at-risk of suicide or self-harm from the prison regime and its associated pains, whilst providing them with greater support. Matthew described how after he had cut himself he was “took down to the hospital... the first time I spent a night in the observation cell and the second time I spent a night in the observation cell and a night in the dormitory”. When asked if it had helped, he replied, “bits and bobs yeah”. A number of prisoners described how they had been referred to a psychiatrist or counsellor in the Healthcare Centre. For example, James commented that the psychiatrist was helping him along with his flashbacks. Prisoners also talked favourably about staff from the Healthcare Centre, explaining how it was easier to talk to them than other prison staff; “[the nurse is] the only person I like talking to.... I speak to that nurse – I wouldn’t go and speak to the screws – I wouldn’t trust their confidentiality” (Alex), “I can trust [the nurses] and the psychiatrists more than anyone else.... you get a good feeling off them”

(James) and “if they take me to hospital – the nurses will listen” (Mohammed). The Healthcare Centre had also provided Alex with the opportunity to access counselling, heart therapy and acupuncture; although Alex had not harmed himself whilst in Glen Parva YOI, he had tried to commit suicide in a previous prison. Like other interviewees, Alex viewed this support favourably:

I’ve had it bad all my life... I know I need psychiatric treatment – mental health treatment..... [when I first came in] my head was all over the place.... I had dreams that were like real... voices in my head.... [psychiatrists are] helping me along.... I can trust [the healthcare staff] and the psychiatrists more than anyone else.... you get a good feeling....
X (a nurse) is the only person I like talking to.

As before, the chaplain provided prisoners at-risk with support. Thus, James had visited the chapel a few times when he was having problems. Likewise, when Alex’s son was in hospital he visited the chaplain, who helped him by contacting the hospital on his behalf. In describing the chaplain, Alex commented, “he was alright – he helped me”. Whilst neither of these prisoners continued to see the chaplain, their accounts demonstrate the importance of being able to access the chaplain during particularly distressing or difficult times, which are often exacerbated by the pains of custody.

Alongside the above, the Listener Scheme provides prisoners at-risk with a support service, also enabling them to spend a night in the company of a Listener, where appropriate. However, the only prisoner to access the Listener Scheme was Paul, as described earlier. Thus, prisoners at-risk of suicide or self-harm are not always utilising this avenue of support. As before, there were a number of reasons why interviewees had

not spoken with Listeners. Firstly, Gary felt Listeners did not provide a confidential service; “I don’t know – it’s another inmate... how do I know he’s not going to spread my bullshit about”. Similarly, when asked if he would speak with a Listener, James stated, “no... they’re an inmate – they’re like me”. Other reasons for not seeking support from a Listener included “they take the piss sometimes” (Dave) and “I don’t like listeners.... they don’t do nothing..... they don’t give a fuck about what’s going on with you..... you show a weakness [by seeing a Listener] - that’s one thing people don’t like showing in jail” (Matthew). Therefore, Glen Parva YOI may benefit from undertaking promotional work with the Listener Scheme, emphasising that it is confidential and highlighting the benefits of speaking with a Listener.

Although prisoners who were not at-risk had completed courses for drug or alcohol addiction, none of the interviewees who had self-harmed or attempted suicide had completed a course. Nevertheless, some prisoners had a drugs worker with whom they had developed a good relationship; “she was alright, yes.... she knows what she’s on about” (Alex) and “it’s nice to see a friendly face – friendlyish..... she proper talks to you – not like some people – the blokes – they’re insensitive – I like speaking to ladies miss” (Matthew). Matthew was also hoping to start a drugs course within a couple of months. Similarly, prisoners at-risk had developed good relationships with education staff. For example, John commented that the education teacher had helped him and that he got on well with her, partly because she was “down to earth”. Mohammed, who was from Iraq, also spoke of the teacher who ran classes for prisoners who could not write English, commenting that she was “very, very good”.

Lastly, a number of prisoners who had self-harmed or attempted suicide spoke about the anger management course on offer at Glen Parva YOI. As identified within the literature

review, prisoners may attempt suicide because of a build-up of anger or may self-harm as an alternative to expressing anger towards others (Liebling and Krarup, 1993; Snow, 2002). Consequently, some prisoners who have self-harmed or attempted suicide find anger management useful. For example, Justin, who had self-harmed, explained how he had completed one of these courses and had found some of the new strategies helpful. However, Alex and James were still hoping to complete an anger management course. More specifically, James explained:

I don't even know what's wrong with me... when I'm angry I'm not a very nice person – especially when I loose my temper.... I'm trying to put myself on [an anger management course] – that would be the first step to sorting me out.

Briefly, this section has demonstrated that prisoners who have self-harmed or attempted suicide access similar support services to those prisoners who have not. However, prisoners at-risk do not always utilise the Listener Scheme, a Scheme that was established to support distressed prisoners. Further work could therefore be done to encourage at-risk prisoners to access this valuable avenue of support. In addition, prisoners at-risk of suicide or self-harm may benefit from the establishment of a self-help group, which allows them to share their feelings (HMCIP, 1999). These improvements would complement the work already being undertaken by Glen Parva YOI to support prisoners in general and particularly those thought to be at-risk of suicide or self-harm.

Witnessing an incident of suicide or self-harm within prison

Until now, this chapter has focused on the help prisoners are provided with in overcoming personal problems or helping them deal with the pains of custody. However, one particularly distressing experience within prison that has yet to be explored is witnessing another prisoner self-harming or attempting / committing suicide, or knowing a prisoner who has self-harmed or attempted / committed suicide. The support that is offered to these prisoners can be crucial in alleviating the distress caused by witnessing such an event. Evidence from Liebling (1995) suggests that approximately two thirds of young prisoners know others who have attempted or committed suicide in prison. Furthermore, Hales et al (2003: 667) found in their study of 15 – 21 year old male prisoners, that “contact with a non-fatal suicide attempted by others [either inside or outside the prison] was associated with own self-harm”, although there was no such association with completed suicide. Similarly, HMCIP (1999) acknowledges that prisoners may be affected by the suicide of another prisoner, whether they had witnessed it or were a friend. Thus, “[c]ontingency plans should be prepared to provide support for prisoners directly affected by a suicide. As much information as possible should be passed quickly to prisoners” (HMCIP, 1999: 31). Subsequent quotes will show that these recommendations have not always been put into place.

A number of interviewees spoke about having seen or heard of another prisoner who had self-harmed or attempted / committed suicide inside prison, yet none had been offered any formal support. In part, this was because these prisoners had not been affected or because prison staff were not aware they had witnessed the incident. With respect to those prisoners that had been affected, one feeling to emerge was that of fear or nervousness. Sam described how his pad mate had self-harmed and had said to him “watch you don’t wake up in the morning to find me dead”. Subsequently, Sam had

asked to be moved; “I would have been scared – I’ve never seen a dead body before – I didn’t want to see it”. Likewise, during his last sentence at Glen Parva YOI, Wayne requested a move after he returned to his cell one evening and found his pad mate sitting at the table cutting himself. Whilst he took the razor blade off his pad mate and pressed the buzzer for an officer, Wayne felt nervous finding his pad mate in this situation, partly because he did not think he would harm himself. As a result, Wayne asked to be moved cells, explaining that he did not like to see that sort of thing. Although neither of these interviewees had been offered any formal support, both stated they had not been in need of any and had not been affected in the long-term by these incidents.

In similar respects to the above two prisoners, Jonathan explained how he had felt shocked witnessing an attempted suicide. Jonathan described an incident in Glen Parva YOI a few years ago:

In 2003 there was a boy next door to me – I heard his pad mate screaming for the officers – I could see through the pipes and he’d hung himself. They cut him down and took him to the hospital..... I could see his pad mate holding him up – the screws came and cut him down..... I saw him at breakfast the next day – he had all marks round his neck.

When asked if he had found the experience difficult to deal with, Jonathan stated, “if he’d have died it would have been different – it would have been much worse..... it’s just shocking innit”. Again, this prisoner was not offered any formal support, although Jonathan explained that officers had spoken with the pad mate concerned. In addition,

Jonathan had not told officers he had seen anything and felt there was little they could do; “you get over it – they can’t really do much about it”.

Although, as the above has shown, prisoners witnessing incidents of suicide or self-harm do not necessarily want formal support, an account by Gareth suggests some prisoners may not feel able to acknowledge that they have been affected by such incidents. In-line with the recommendations made by HMCIP (1999) there is a need for prison officers to be more open about these incidents. Gareth described how when he was at another YOI, a prisoner that he knew tied a sheet against the bars in a hospital cell and hung himself. Gareth could see the hospital from his cell and heard the alarms ringing:

I could see loads and loads of screws running in..... [after he died] I had to go to chapel and pray for him.... he was a good lad – first time in, got 2 years – he couldn’t handle it.

When asked if it had been hard to cope with this prisoner’s death, Gareth stated, “it weren’t hard it just made me think why people do things like that”. However, prisoners were not told that the prisoner had died; “no one said that he’d died.... I knew when it came on the news..... it was like nothing happened”. As detailed in chapter four, Gareth’s response to being asked if this had upset him was:

There’s nothing you can do about it..... no one wants to say they’re bothered about someone dying – you’re showing you’re weak – no one wants to show you’re weak in prison..... that’s just the way it is.

Whilst the above prisoners had been affected to some degree by witnessing incidents of suicide or self-harm, others appeared less affected. During his previous sentence at Glen Parva YOI, Jack described how another prisoner had made a suicide attempt and he had heard the paramedics running in. Jack did not know this prisoner and when asked if the experience had affected him, stated, “couldn’t give a fuck”. Likewise, Simon explained how during his last sentence at Glen Parva YOI a prisoner on a different unit had tried to hang himself, however he had never known him and was not affected by it. Whilst at another prison, Robert described how the prisoner next door to him had tried to hang himself. Again, Robert stated he was not affected by it, explaining, “it’s more attention seeking than anything else”. Similarly, Richard had not been affected by witnessing others self-harming despite having seen two graphic incidents; “I saw someone cut their wrists on the cell window” and “my next door in Glen Parva – some Kosovan – cut his belly – blood all on the floor – I seen the screws take him off”. It is possible that these prisoners have got used to such incidents and therefore do not feel affected by them or that they simply do not care. Alternatively, they may be adopting the stance of ‘defended subject’ and denying the harsh realities of prisoners harming or killing themselves in order to defend or protect their own selves (Hollway and Jefferson, 2000). Nevertheless, seeing or knowing other prisoners who have committed suicide or have self-harmed could lead others to similar actions, particularly when not supported or when simultaneously confronted by the pains of custody.

In summary, evidence presented within this chapter illustrates that the formal support services provided within the criminal justice system can help young males cope with the pains of custody. However, whilst a great deal of support is offered to individuals within prison, relatively little is provided to those in police cells or court cells, partly because individuals are detained here for very short periods. Consequently, greater

informational support could be provided, especially in relation to suicide and self-harm. For example, detainees could be given leaflets explaining suicide and self-harm, and providing suggestions for coping with the pains of custody. Furthermore, details of local and national self-help groups could be provided to those individuals being released. Nevertheless, good practice was identified in the court cells, where the Suicide / Self-harm Warning Form encouraged staff to provide detainees with access to other support, including calling their family or the Samaritans. It may therefore be possible to extend this service to police cells. In general, prisoners were positive of the support on offer at Glen Parva YOI and the relationships they had developed with staff. Perhaps surprisingly, no significant differences were found between the support services accessed by those that had self-harmed or attempted suicide and those that had not. One difference that was identified was that no prisoner who had self-harmed or attempted suicide spoke of having accessed the Listener Scheme, whilst one prisoner who had not self-harmed or attempted suicide had accessed this service. Further work could therefore be undertaken to improve the use of the Listener Scheme, particularly for those at-risk. Thus, whilst the support needs of young males within prison are largely being met, the findings of this study suggest that significant improvements could be made within the earlier stages of the criminal justice system.

Conclusion

Over the past few years, our prisons have reached crisis point. In response to this, the present study examined the hypothesis that ‘the different support needs of young males are not being adequately addressed as they proceed through the criminal justice system, with serious consequences in terms of personal harm’. In doing so, Sykes’ (1958) five pains of imprisonment were re-visited and extended to the broader custodial context. Young males were asked about their experiences of police cells, court cells, escort vehicles and prison. Thus, the study not only addressed Medlicott’s (2000) argument that there is a shortage of research exploring prisoners’ accounts, but it went further, examining young men’s experiences of the earlier stages of the criminal justice system as well. In addition, interviewees were asked how they coped with the pains of custody, which support services they accessed and how support could be improved. Consequently, criticisms of earlier research that had overlooked or downplayed the use of support services to prevent suicide and self-harm were overcome. Furthermore, where applicable, interviewees were asked about incidents of suicide and self-harm, exploring the function of both, inside and outside of the criminal justice system.

To examine the hypothesis, six objectives were set, the first of which was ‘to examine incidents of suicide and self-harm in police cells, court cells, escort vehicles and prison’. In terms of suicide, none of the participating establishments reported such a fatality during 2004, although at Glen Parva YOI there were two suicides in 2005 and one in 2006. With regards to self-harm, it was apparent from the data collected that the participating establishments used different recording criteria. For example, Charlie Police Force only recorded three ‘near misses’ in 2004, although based on conversations with police officers and staff, three is thought to be a significant under-representation of

the actual level of self-harm. In comparison, statistics showed a higher level of self-harm within court cells (particularly Magistrates) than in police cells, yet there were no incidents of self-harm within escort vehicles. Consequently, significantly more incidents of self-harm were recorded at Glen Parva YOI than in the earlier stages of the criminal justice system. Even taking into consideration disparities between the recording criteria, it would appear that self-harm does occur more frequently within prison than police cells, court cells or escort vehicles. In terms of method and severity of injury, data from the participating establishments supported previous research. For example, self-harm in police cells was likely to involve a ligature (see also Ingram et al, 1997). Likewise, in the court cells, detainees were most likely to use a ligature or a blade / other implement, with relatively few incidents involving serious injury, which corresponds with earlier research by the Howard League (2001). Similarly, in prison, incidents of self-harm tended to involve cutting / scratching, hanging, self-strangulation, head banging / wall punching and noose / ligature making, with the majority resulting in little or no injury, which is comparable with previous research by Dear, Thomson, Hall and Howells (2001), Harvey (2007), Howard League (1999b), Inch et al (1995) and Livingston (1997). Lastly, it was apparent that predicting which individuals go on to self-harm was incredibly difficult; in one third of incidents in court cells and in half of incidents in prison, the individual had not been identified as at-risk. Previous research by the Howard League (2001) and Harvey (2007) has also demonstrated that not all incidents of self-harm involve individuals who have been identified as at-risk. Consequently, data supports the decision to move away from predicting which individuals are at-risk.

The second objective was to explore young males' experiences of the criminal justice system. In doing so, it was recognised and acknowledged that previous research had tended to focus on prison, overlooking the earlier stages of the criminal justice system

(HMIP, 2004; HM MCSI and HM Inspectorate of Prison, 2005; McCleave and Latham, 1998; Quin, 1999). Therefore, a holistic approach was taken, beginning with arrest and leading onto police cells, court cells, escort vehicles and prison, as recommended by HM Prison Service (2001). A holistic approach was important because experiences within the earlier stages of the criminal justice system are thought to affect incidents of suicide and self-harm among remand and newly-sentenced prisoners (Howard League, 2001). Interviewees' narratives therefore provided a unique insight into the thoughts and fears of young men transferring through the whole criminal justice system.

In exploring individuals' experiences of the criminal justice system, the present study took as its starting point one of the most notable authors in this field - Sykes (1958), who identifies five pains of imprisonment; deprivation of liberty, deprivation of goods and services, deprivation of heterosexual relationships, deprivation of autonomy and control, and deprivation of security. Sykes' study has formed the basis of much later research, yet has remained largely uncontested; until now, there was little understanding of whether Sykes' pains applied to English prisons, to today's young male sentenced and remanded prisoners or if they extended to the wider criminal justice system. Using interviews, it was demonstrated that Sykes' five pains of imprisonment are applicable to the English penal system and to today's young male sentenced and remanded prisoners. Furthermore, the deprivation of liberty, deprivation of goods and services, deprivation of autonomy and control and deprivation of security extend to the wider criminal justice system, mainly being found in police cells and court cells. Until now, it was not recognised that Sykes' pains began prior to prison. Thus, by identifying that four of the five pains may begin in the earlier stages, an appreciation can be gained of why these pains may be so distressing; because certain pains are experienced at each stage this can intensify the feeling of distress.

By applying Sykes' (1958) theory to the twenty-first century custodial process, it has been possible to identify a further thirteen pains. Thus, it is more appropriate to refer to Sykes' pains and the thirteen additional pains as 'pains of custody'. There are a number of reasons why these further pains can now be identified. Firstly, the present sample differs significantly from the sample used by Sykes; whereas Sykes focused on middle-aged sentenced male prisoners held in an American maximum-security prison, the present study looked at young male remand and sentenced prisoners in an English YOI and young males being detained at court. It also encompassed experiences of police cells. Secondly, since the 1950s there have been substantial changes within the criminal justice system, for example, the employment of female prison officers, the Incentives and Earned Privileges Scheme and the introduction of televisions (Crawley, 2004; Jewkes, 2002; Jewkes and Johnston, 2006). Thirdly, there have been changes in the wider society that have influenced life in prison, for example, the European Commission and Court of Human Rights and developments in technology (Livingstone, 2000).

The thirteen pains of custody that can now be identified are; entry shock, fear of the unknown, withdrawing from drugs and alcohol, loss of privacy, time, loss of stimulation, the waiting game, lack of respect, loss of social support, pains of communication, loss of identity, the physical environment and fear or nervousness about release. It must be acknowledged that whilst all of these pains pertain to prison, not all are found in the earlier stages of the criminal justice system. However, by incorporating interviewees' experiences of the earlier stages some of these pains were made more apparent. The pains that were particularly painful or apparent within the earlier stages of the criminal justice system included, entry shock, fear of the unknown (especially being kept in the dark), withdrawing from drugs and alcohol, loss of

stimulation (mainly external stimuli), lack of respect and a negative physical environment. The despair and desperation that some young men feel when confronted by these pains are evident in interviewees' accounts of attempted suicide and self-harm. Consequently, the present study helps inform why incidents of suicide and self-harm are found among young men throughout the criminal justice system and shows an association between the pains of custody and suicide and self-harm. These pains though were not uniform or constant, nor did detainees and prisoners experience them in the same way (see also Johnson and Toch, 1982; Matthews, 1999). Thus, narratives were presented that appeared to suggest some interviewees did not feel the same pains of custody as others. However, by employing a psychosocial approach from Hollway and Jefferson (2000), it became evident that some were adopting the position of defended subject; dismissing any pain of custody despite evidence to the contrary. In doing so, they alleviated feelings of anxiety. Nevertheless, there were interviewees who referred to prison being easy or easier than the outside; for these, prison provided an opportunity for a safer way of life. In particular, prisoners who were addicted to drugs or alcohol spoke about seizing opportunities in prison to get clean (see also Crewe, 2005). Therefore, the pains of custody do appear endemic amongst young men being held in the criminal justice system; where reference is made to custody being easy, these narratives were usually contradicted or accounted for by the fact that prison can signify both pain and opportunity.

Following on, the third objective was to examine how young men cope with the pains of custody. Evidence was presented that showed there are some young men whose problems (or the perception of these problems) overwhelm their coping strategies and they attempt or contemplate suicide. However, many individuals do cope with the pains of custody, by employing a variety of coping strategies. Evidence found here

demonstrated that, as found by Dexter and Towl (1995), some coping strategies transfer from the outside into the criminal justice system, for example, the use of social support. Yet, young males' normal coping strategies are not always permitted within, or are constrained by, the criminal justice system. Consequently, within the earlier stages of the criminal justice system, individuals tended to rely more on inner resources than external stimuli, with many young men resorting to sleep. Within prison, sleep was widely used as a form of coping with boredom, although because more external stimuli were available, prisoners found themselves filling time by watching television, listening to music or participating in sport, education or courses. Whilst these strategies enabled prisoners to cope, they were often newly embraced or modified forms of coping; the pains of custody prevented many 'normal' coping strategies being transferred from outside. Similarly, other coping strategies had to be modified within prison, thus instead of talking with family and friends face-to-face, prisoners resorted to using the telephone or writing letters. Generally, these coping strategies allowed young men to avoid or escape their problems, they enabled them to keep their minds off their problems, reduce stress, help them to calm down, help them to overcome boredom and make time go quicker. By identifying that some of the coping strategies employed in police cells, court cells and escort vehicles differ in comparison with prison, the agencies involved could look to learn from one another, developing the support made available to detainees and prisoners. In addition, evidence demonstrated that some young men self-harm as a coping strategy. In this respect, self-harm had similar effects to taking drugs or drinking alcohol on the outside, and helped individuals to calm down, to avoid thinking about their problems, to overcome boredom and was also a means of getting staff to listen. For these individuals, self-harm did not signify a poorer coping ability; self-harm was used alongside the same coping strategies that other young men used. Instead, self-harm represented a way of coping, of dealing with the pains of custody.

The fourth objective satisfied was concerned with how the support needs of young males change as they proceed through the criminal justice system. Evidence illustrated that individuals had a need for more informational support within the earlier stages of the criminal justice system, particularly those individuals who had not been through the criminal justice system before and those at-risk of suicide or self-harm. By including the earlier stages of the criminal justice system within an analysis of young prisoner's support needs, it is possible to identify where support in the earlier stages could be increased or improved, thus reducing distress, suicide and self-harm here and later on within prison. Simultaneously, the finding that individuals at-risk of suicide or self-harm require more informational support within the earlier stages meets the fifth objective, to explore how the support needs of young males who self-harm or who have attempted suicide differ from the support needs of those who have not. Thus, such individuals spoke of a desire for details about what would happen to them at each stage of the criminal justice system. At times, interviewees also commented on a need for more social or emotional support during the earlier stages of the criminal justice system, particularly from family. Subsequently, within prison, such individuals have a need for informational support during their first few weeks, but this then changes to a need for more social and emotional support. It must also be recognised that individuals withdrawing from drugs or alcohol also have an intense need for support from drugs workers during the first few weeks of prison, but this then tends to diminish.

With regards to the sixth objective, the provision, availability, accessibility and relevance of support services to young males, the majority of interviewees were aware of how to access support services at all stages of the criminal justice system, although its provision, accessibility and relevance was not always perceived positively. For example, some interviewees were not aware of being able to access drugs / alcohol

workers when at police stations, whilst others felt the police station was not the right time or environment to access this service. Although it was evident that Glen Parva YOI had an effective means of making prisoners aware of the support services on offer, achieving this through the induction unit, prisoners could not always access the services on offer, particularly the anger management and drugs courses. Furthermore, interviewees were reluctant to access the Listener Scheme. Thus, out of all the interviewees, only one had spoken with a Listener and he had not self-harmed or attempted suicide, nor was at-risk of doing so. Nevertheless, good practice was identified within all stages of the criminal justice system, as highlighted in the following section. In addition, interviewees were particularly positive about some of the services at Glen Parva YOI, for example, the Healthcare Centre, the chaplain, drugs workers and prison officers. Across the criminal justice system, staff represented a central means of obtaining support, although interviewees were more likely to approach officers or staff working within prison than staff working within court cells or police cells. In part, this was linked to the greater respect that interviewees felt from prison officers or staff, but was also influenced by the fact individuals had more time in prison to develop relationships with staff.

Although largely beyond the scope or requirements of a PhD thesis, some clear avenues for further thought emerge from this study. These avenues mainly relate to how young men cope in the criminal justice system and the support services that are available to them; they have been identified largely because a holistic approach has been adopted, which emphasises the whole criminal justice system working together to reduce suicide and self-harm. Firstly, Police Forces such as Charlie should consider improving how incidents of self-harm are recorded to ensure that they are a true reflection. Although some officers or staff may find this bureaucratic, future incidents of self-harm or even

suicide could be prevented. Secondly, whilst the use of CCTV in Charlie Police Force to monitor detainees is undoubtedly a positive response in terms of preventing suicide or self-harm, it should be monitored away from the watchful gaze of other staff, nurses and visitors. Thirdly, good practice exists within Charlie Police Force in relation to individuals arrested on suspicion of paedophilia, who are provided with a leaflet outlining the support services available to them. It is suggested that this be extended to detainees at-risk of suicide or self-harm. The leaflet could explain about suicide and self-harm, suggest ways in which to cope with detention and provide details of external local and national support groups (for those individuals who are subsequently released). In particular, this could prove useful for those individuals who repeatedly go into police custody, but who never go to prison where support for suicide or self-harm can be found. Fourthly, good practice exists within the court custody suites, where detainees are permitted to call the Samaritans. A similar system could be provided within police cells, as long as a dedicated telephone line was used. Fifthly, within police cells and court cells, greater informational support could be provided to detainees, particularly those who are in for the first time and those at-risk of suicide or self-harm. For example, leaflets or videos could be used to detail the different stages of the criminal justice system, also including ways in which to avoid self-harm. Sixthly, a scheme similar to the 'Insiders' in Birmingham Magistrates Court and Crown Court could be extended to Alpha Magistrates Court, Bravo Magistrates Court and Bravo Crown Court (West Midlands Area Psychology Team, 2006). Lastly, a better working relationship could be developed between drugs / alcohol workers and staff working within police cells and court cells. Thus, all detainees should be made aware of this support service and the benefits it can have.

With regards to Glen Parva YOI, the main recommendations made by interviewees related to the induction unit. Here, some interviewees felt that the process was not relevant to them, particularly those who were returning. Some felt that it was not relevant because the video that was shown was not thought to be set at Glen Parva YOI or that it was not a true reflection of prison life. One interviewee mentioned that this video had been shown in prisoners' cells and could therefore be turned off. If this is still the case, it may be more beneficial to show the video to small numbers of prisoners, although this would have staffing implications. In terms of the video, specific advice relating to suicide and self-harm could be included, reiterating and extending the information contained within leaflets given to individuals in police and court custody, as suggested above. A couple of interviewees also felt that the induction should be lengthened, particularly for those with learning difficulties. Consideration could therefore be given to increasing the length of induction for such prisoners or ensuring that they have sufficient support when moved to another unit. Following on, some interviewees with learning difficulties commented on the need for more educational support, particularly one-on-one. Although this would have financial implications, educational support can make a significant contribution to reconviction rates (Clark, 2001, cited in Social Exclusion Unit, 2002). Lastly, with the increasing numbers of foreign prisoners, thought should be given to writing induction booklets in different languages; perhaps prisoners could be utilised in this work.

As identified by Allison (2006) and a number of interviewees, the cost of making a phone call in prison is especially high. Measures therefore need to be taken by the Prison Service to reduce these costs. Consideration could also be given to introducing the facility to send and receive emails; in a society where almost constant communication exists, prisoners find themselves having to resort to letter writing and

the associated problems that these entail. With technological advancements, it is thought that a secure means of communicating via email could be found or developed. Family and friends are a crucial source of support for prisoners, particularly young prisoners; consequently, communication with them should be encouraged and not made too arduous.

In terms of prisoners who were at-risk of suicide or self-harm, it was evident from interviewees' responses that further work could be done in relation to the Listener Scheme. Thus, despite Listeners providing an invaluable support role, no interviewee who self-harmed or who had attempted suicide accessed them. The main reason that Listeners were not accessed was because they were thought to break trust and confidence. Where this occurs, appropriate action needs to be taken with the Listener. However, if this is due to perception or rumours, further promotional work could be undertaken, advertising the confidential nature of the Scheme. In addition, a self-help group could be established at Glen Parva YOI for prisoners at-risk of suicide or self-harm, which could be managed by a member of staff and would allow individuals the opportunity to share their feelings (see also HMCIP, 1999).

When speaking about having seen or known fellow prisoners who had self-harmed or attempted / completed suicide, a couple of interviewees commented on the need for more informational support. In particular, when such fatalities arise, prisoners should be informed by a member of staff and not left to find out through the news on television. Although this criticism was not made in relation to Glen Parva YOI, like all prisons and YOIs, they should ensure that this practice is adhered to. Support should also be extended to all prisoners and not limited to those who shared a cell with the prisoner.

It is now appropriate to look at the limitations of this study. The main limitation was that, due to access problems, young men were not interviewed within police cells, albeit interviewees' experiences of police cells were recalled and explored. More generally, a number of decisions that made this doctoral research so specific and unique might conceivably lend themselves to criticism. For example, only one YOI was chosen with only one escort and court custody service and one Police Force. Moreover, only a small sample of young males was interviewed. Consequently, it may be difficult to generalise from this study. However, findings from this research did share some similarities with those obtained By Harvey (2004; 2007) in his study of Feltham YOI. Furthermore, within the methodology chapter (chapter two), this criticism was accepted; the intention of this study was only ever to provide an in-depth exploration of young males' experiences within one YOI and a sample of the police cells, court cells and escort vehicles that fed into it. The aim was to undertake an in-depth qualitative piece of research that, for the first time, took a holistic approach to suicide and self-harm.

In addition to overcoming these limitations, a number of suggestions can be made for future research. Firstly, this study could be replicated in other YOIs across the country. Secondly, it could be extended to adult males, and young and adult females. The inclusion of females is particularly important as 2004 saw the suicide level reach 13, significantly higher than in previous years (although the rate has since dropped). Thirdly, future research could examine why a greater number of self-harm incidents are found in Magistrates Courts in comparison with Crown Courts. This may lead to improvements within Magistrates Courts. Fourthly, research could explore prisoners' 'necessities of life', particularly following recent advancements in technology, which would help further our understanding of the pains of custody. Lastly, very few researchers have openly written about their experiences. My research was unusual in

that it provided an account of my experiences and feelings conducting research within the criminal justice system; other researchers should also be encouraged to ‘open up’.

To conclude, this study has made a unique contribution to criminological debates; it is one of the first to explore suicide and self-harm across the criminal justice system and to challenge Sykes’ (1958) work. By adopting a holistic approach to the problem of suicide and self-harm, it has furthered our understanding of the pains facing young men in police cells, court cells, escort vehicles and prison. In response to Liebling’s (2006: 236) question, “[h]ave markedly improved regimes resulted in a less gruelling and more constructive experience of imprisonment for prisoners?”, the answer is essentially no. Consequently, the pains of imprisonment that Sykes identified almost fifty years ago are applicable to today’s young male sentenced and remanded prisoners. Moreover, they extend to the wider criminal justice system and a further thirteen pains of custody can now be identified. One of the prevailing pains of custody is loss of stimulation, thus boredom and a lack of constructive activities are a central theme running throughout the whole criminal justice system. The impact that these pains can have is evident within interviewees’ accounts, particularly in relation to suicide and self-harm. Nevertheless, these pains can be survived through a number of different coping strategies. Paradoxically, for some young men, self-harm can represent a coping strategy, a way of dealing with the pains of custody and does not always signify a poorer coping ability. Alongside these coping strategies, a number of formal support services exist within the criminal justice system to help young men. However, evidence suggests that the support needs of young men are not being adequately addressed within the criminal justice system, particularly the earlier stages. Thus, within the earlier stages, young men have a need for greater informational support, particularly those at-risk of suicide or self-harm. This is particularly disconcerting as, due to the current prison crisis, more and more

prisoners are being held in police cells, where they cannot be provided with their normal prison regime and where those with mental health or drug addiction problems are not receiving the services they require (Howard League, 2006). Part of this prison crisis appears to be the uneven policy and practice across the prison estate and the wider criminal justice system as a whole. Thus, whilst policy provides for prisoners to be able to access drug and anger management programmes, practice is very different, with prisoners being unable to obtain a place on such programmes. Furthermore, despite the high rate of psychiatric morbidity among young prisoners and its links with suicide and self-harm, there is no specific policy lead for mental health for young adult prisoners aged 18 – 24 years old (HMIP, 2006). Compounding this, there is still no policy that attempts to prevent suicide and self-harm across the criminal justice system. Thus, whilst certain practices have been extended from prison to the courts, for example *Insiders*, they have not been extended to police cells or escort vehicles. Without policy and practice that encompasses all stages of the criminal justice system, only limited improvements can be made in preventing suicide and self-harm. Consequently, only time will tell whether the crisis that our prisons (and the wider criminal justice system) are facing, will cause the recent drop in suicides to start increasing again.

References

- Adams, C. (2000), 'Suspect data: arresting research' in R. King and E. Wincup (eds.), *Doing research on crime and justice*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 385-94
- Adler, J. (1998), Incidence of fear in prisons: prisoner and officer assessment. *Web Journal of Current Legal Issues* [Online], vol. 5. Available:
<http://webjcli.ncl.ac.uk/1998/issue5/adler5.html> [Accessed 06 August 2004]
- Agar, M. (1996), *The professional stranger*, London: Academic Press Ltd
- Allison, E. (2006), Phone call costs cut off prisoners. *Guardian* [Online]. Available:
<http://society.guardian.co.uk/offdiary/story/0,,1683160,00.html> [Accessed 20 August 2006]
- Arber, S. (1996), 'Designing samples' in N. Gilbert (ed), *Researching social life*, London: SAGE, pp. 68-92
- Arnold, L. and Magill, A. (2000), *Making sense of self-harm*, Abergavenny: The Basement Project
- Atkinson, P. and Coffey, A. (1995), 'Realism and its discontents: on the crisis of cultural representation in ethnographic texts' in B. Adam and S. Allan (eds.), *Theorizing culture. An interdisciplinary critique after postmodernism*, London: UCL Press, pp. 41-57

Babiker, G. and Arnold, L. (2001), *The language of injury. Comprehending self-mutilation*, Leicester: British Psychological Society

Backett, S. (1987), 'Suicide in Scottish prisons', *British Journal of Psychiatry*, vol. 151, pp. 218-21

Backett, S. (1988), 'Suicide and stress in prison: implications for a preventive strategy' in: S. Backett, J. McNeill and A. Yellowless (eds.), *Imprisonment today*, Hampshire: Macmillan Press Ltd, pp. 70-84

Baer, L. (2004), 'Visual imprints on the prison landscape: a study on the decorations in prison cells', *Royal Dutch Geographical Society KNAG*, vol. 96(2), pp. 209-17

Baker, E. and Roberts, J. (2005), 'Globalization and the new punitiveness' in J. Pratt, D. Brown, M. Brown, S. Hallsworth and W. Morrison (eds.), *The new punitiveness. Trends, theories, perspectives*, Cullompton: Willan Publishing, pp. 121-38

Baker, G. (2004), *HMYOI and RC Glen Parva suicide prevention team annual report 2004*, Unpublished.

Bartollas, C. (1982), 'Survival problems of adolescent prisoners' in R. Johnson and H. Toch (eds.), *The pains of imprisonment*, California: SAGE, pp. 165-79

BBC (2006), Life prisoners lose parole rights. *BBC* [Online]. Available: http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/5197426.stm [Accessed 23 July 2006]

Bell, J. (1999), *Doing your research project*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

Berger, L. (2001), 'Inside out: narrative autoethnography as a path toward rapport', *Qualitative Inquiry* [Online], vol. 7(4), pp. 504-18. Available:
<http://qix.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/7/4/504> [Accessed 14 May 2005]

Biggam, F. and Power, K. (1997), 'Social support and psychological distress in a group of incarcerated young offenders', *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, vol. 41(3), pp. 213-30

Biles, D. (1994), 'Deaths in custody: The nature and scope of the problem' in A. Liebling and T. Ward (eds.), *Deaths in custody: international perspectives*, London: Whiting and Birch Ltd, pp. 14-27

Blaauw, E., Schilder, F. and van de Lande, S. (1998), 'Prevention of suicides in the Dutch CJS' in A. Liebling (ed.), *Deaths of offenders: the hidden side of justice*, Winchester: Waterside Press, pp. 201-23

Bogue, J. and Power, K. (1995), 'Suicide in Scottish prisons, 1976 – 1993', *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry*, vol. 6(3), pp. 527-40

Bonta, J. and Gendreau, P. (1992), 'Coping with prison' in P. Suedfeld and P. Tetlock (eds.), *Psychology and social policy*, London: Hemisphere Publishing, pp. 343-54

Borrill, J., Snow, L., Medlicott, D., Teers, R. and Paton, J. (2005), 'Learning from 'near misses': interviews with women who survived an incident of severe self-harm in prison', *Howard Journal*, vol. 44(1), pp. 57-69

Boyle, J. (1985), *The pain of confinement*, London: Pan Books Ltd

British Society of Criminology (no date), *Code of ethics for researchers in the field of criminology* [Online], Available: www.britsoccrim.org/ethics.htm [Accessed 14 April 2003]

Brittan, A. (1989), *Masculinity and power*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd

Brown, J. (1996), 'Police research: some critical issues' in F. Leishman, B. Loveday and S. Savage (eds.), *Core issues in policing*, London: Longman, pp.177-90

Burgess, R. (1984), *In the field: an introduction to field research*, London: George Allen and Unwin

Caddle, D. (1995), *A survey of the prisoner escort and custody service provided by Group 4 and by SCS*, London: Home Office

Caird, R. (1974), *A good and useful life. Imprisonment in Britain today*, London: Hart-Davis, MacGibbon

Cantor, C. (2002), 'Suicide in the Western world' in K. Hawton and K. van Heeringen (eds.), *The international handbook of suicide and attempted suicide*, Chichester: John Wiley and Sons Ltd, pp. 9-28

Carolissen, M. (1996), 'The Wandsworth Listeners: Befriending in prison from a listener point of view' in A. Liebling (ed.), *Deaths in custody: Caring for people at risk*, London: Whiting and Birch Ltd, pp. 149-54

Carrigan, T., Connell, B. and Lee, J. (1985), 'Toward a new sociology of masculinity', *Theory and Society*, vol. 14, pp. 551-604

Cartwright, J. (1998), 'Investigating deaths in police custody' in A. Liebling (ed.), *Deaths of offenders: the hidden side of justice*, Winchester: Waterside Press, pp. 95-104

Clemmer, D. (1940), *The prison community*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston

Cobain, I. (2005), Clampdown on chatrooms after two strangers die in first internet death. *Guardian* [Online]. Available:

http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk_news/story/0,,1589260,00.html [Accessed 14 April 2007]

Coffey, A. (1999), *The ethnographic self. Fieldwork and the representation of identity*, London: SAGE

Cohen, S. and Taylor, L. (1972), *Psychological survival. The experience of long term imprisonment*, Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd

Cohen, S. and Wills, T. (1985), 'Stress, social support and the buffering hypothesis', *Psychological Bulletin*, vol. 98(2), pp. 310-57

Connell, R. (1987), *Gender and power. Society, the person and sexual politics*, Cambridge: Polity Press

Connell, R. (1995), *Masculinities*, Cambridge: Polity Press

Cooke, D., Baldwin, P. and Howison, J. (1990), *Psychology in prisons*, London: Routledge

Cooper, C. and Berwick, S. (2001), 'Factors affecting psychological well-being of three groups of suicide-prone prisoners', *Current Psychology*, vol. 20(2), pp.169-82

Cope, N. (2003), 'It's no time or high time': young offenders' experiences of time and drug use in prison', *The Howard Journal* [Online], vol. 42(2), pp. 158-75. Available: <http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/1468-2311.t01-1-00273> [Accessed 28 May 2006]

Coyle, A. (1994), *The prisons we deserve*, London: Harper Collins Publisher

Crawley, E. (2004), *Doing prison work. The public and private lives of prison officers*, Cullompton: Willan Publishing

Crewe, B. (2005), 'Prisoner society in the era of hard drugs', *Punishment and Society* [Online], vol. 7(4), pp. 457-81. Available:
<http://pun.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/7/4/457> [Accessed 28 May 2006]

Crewe, B. (2007, in press), 'The sociology of imprisonment' in Y. Jewkes (ed.), *Handbook on prisons*, Cullompton: Willan Publishing

Crichton, D. (1997), 'The psychology of suicide' in G. Towl (ed.), *Suicide and self-injury in prisons*, Leicester: British Psychological Society, pp. 36-44

Crichton, D. (2002), 'Suicide in prisons: a critique of UK research' in G. Towl, L. Snow and M. McHugh (eds.), *Suicide in prisons*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, pp. 26-47

Crichton, D. and Towl, G. (1997), 'Self-inflicted deaths in prison in England and Wales: an analysis of the data for 1988-90 and 1994-95' in G. Towl (ed.), *Suicide and self-injury in prisons*, Leicester: British Psychological Society, pp. 12-20

Crichton, D. and Towl, G. (2002), 'Intentional self-injury' in G. Towl, L. Snow and M. McHugh (eds.), *Suicide in prisons*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, pp. 48-65

Crowe, M. and Bunclark, J. (2000), 'Repeated self-injury and its management', *International Review of Psychiatry* [Online], vol. 12(1), pp. 48-53. Available:
<http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdf?vid=3&hid=12&sid=8afa8a1d-bc47-4aa2-a1ba-7431444c7753%40sessionmgr8> [Accessed 27 May 2006]

Dace, E., Faulkner, A., Frost, M., Parker, K., Pembroke, L. and Smith, A. (1998), *The hurt yourself less workbook*, London: National Self-harm Network

Davies, M., Croall, H. and Tyrer, J. (1995), *Criminal justice. An introduction to the CJS in England and Wales*, Harlow: Longman Group Ltd

Davies, P. (2000), 'Doing interviews with female offenders' in V. Jupp, P. Davies and P. Francis (eds.), *Doing criminological research*, London: SAGE, pp. 82-96

de Silva, N., Cowell, P., Chow, T. and Worthington, P. (2006), Prison population projections 2006 – 2013, England and Wales. *Home Office Statistical Bulletin* [Online]. Available: <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs06/hosb1106.pdf> [Accessed 17 February 2007]

de Vaus, D. A. (1996), *Surveys in social research*, London: UCL Press Limited.

Dear, G., Slattery, J. and Hillan, R. (2001), 'Evaluations of the quality of coping reported by prisoners who have self-harmed and those who have not', *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior* [Online], vol. 31(4), pp. 442-50. Available: <http://proquest.umi.com> [Accessed 27 May 2006]

Dear, G., Thomson, D., Hall, G. and Howells, K. (2001), 'Non-fatal self-harm in Western Australian prisons: who, where, when and why', *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, vol. 34(1), pp. 47-66

Denzin, N. (1989), *The research act*, New Jersey: Prentice Hall

Department of Health (2002), *National suicide prevention*, London: Department of Health

Dexter, P. and Towl, G. (1995), 'An investigation into suicidal behaviours in prison' in N. Clark and G. Stephenson (eds.), *Criminal Behaviour: perceptions, attributions and rationality*, London: British Psychological Society for the Division of Criminological and Legal Psychology, pp. 45-53

Dooley, E. (1990a), 'Prison suicide in England and Wales, 1972 – 87', *British Journal of Psychiatry*, vol. 156, pp. 40-45

Dooley, E. (1990b), 'Unnatural deaths in prison', *British Journal of Criminology*, vol. 30(2), pp. 229-34

Dooley, E. (1994), 'Prisons' in R. Jenkins, S. Griffiths, I. Wylie, K. Hawton, G. Morgan and A. Tylee (eds.), *The Prevention of suicide*, London: HMSO, pp. 104-8

Douglas, J. (1985), *Creative interviewing*, London: SAGE

Easterday, L., Papademas, D., Schorr, L. and Valentine, C. (1982), 'The making of a female researcher: role problems in fieldwork' in R. Burgess (ed.), *Field research: a sourcebook and field manual*, London: George Allen and Unwin, pp. 62-67

Economic and Social Research Council (no date), *Research ethics framework* [Online], Available: www.esrc.ac.uk/ESRCInfoCentre/Images/ESRC_Re_Ethics_Frame_tcm6-11291.pdf [Accessed 14 April 2003]

Edgar, K., O'Donnell, I. and Martin, C. (2003), *Prison violence. The dynamics of conflict, fear and power*, Cullompton: Willan Publishing

Elliott, C. (1999), *Locating the energy for change: An introduction to appreciative inquiry*, Winnipeg, Manitoba: International Institute for Sustainable Development

Farrant, F. (2005), 'Unlocking the researcher: research performance in a prison setting'. Paper presented to the British Criminology Conference, University of Leeds, 12-14 July 2005

Favazza, A. (1996), *Bodies under siege. Self-mutilation and body modification in culture and psychiatry*, Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press

Fielding, N. (1996), 'Qualitative interviewing' in N. Gilbert (ed), *Researching social life*, London: SAGE, pp. 135-53

Finch, E. (2007), 'The problem of stolen identity and the internet' in Y. Jewkes (ed.), *Crime online*, Cullompton: Willan Publishing, pp. 29-43

Flanagan, T. (1982), 'Lifers and long-termers. Doing big time' in R. Johnson and H. Toch (eds.), *The pains of imprisonment*, California: SAGE, pp. 115-28

Flynn, N. (1998), *Introduction to prisons and imprisonment*, Winchester: Waterside Press

Foucault, M. (1977), *Discipline and punish. The birth of the prison*, London: Penguin Books

Gelsthorpe, L. (1990), 'Feminist methodologies in criminology: a new approach or old wine in new bottles?' in L. Gelsthorpe and A. Morris (eds.), *Feminist perspectives in criminology*, Buckingham: Open University Press, pp. 89-106

Genders, E. and Player, E. (1989), *Race relations in prison*, Oxford: Clarendon Press

Genders, E. and Player, E. (1995), *Grendon. A study of a therapeutic prison*, Oxford: Clarendon Press

Gibbs, J. (1982a), 'The first cut is the deepest. Psychological breakdown and survival in the detention setting' in R. Johnson and H. Toch (eds.), *The pains of imprisonment*, California: SAGE, pp. 97-114

Gibbs, J. (1982b), 'Disruption and distress: going from the street to jail' in N. Parisi (ed.), *Coping with imprisonment*, California: SAGE, pp. 29-44

Glaser, B. and Strauss, A. (1967), *The discovery of grounded theory. Strategies for qualitative research*, Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company

Goffman, E. (1959), *The presentation of self in everyday life*, London: Penguin Books

Goffman, E. (1961), 'On the characteristics of total institutions. The inmate world' in D. Cressey (ed.), *The prison: studies in institutional organization and change*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, pp. 15-67

Gordon, D., Levitas, R., Pantazis, C., Patsios, D., Payne, S., Townsend, P., Adelman, L., Ashworth, K., Middleton, S., Bradshaw, J. and Williams, J. (2000), *Poverty and social exclusion in Britain* [Online]. Available <http://www.jrf.org.uk/bookshop/eBooks/185935128X.pdf> [Accessed 24 June 2006]

Gordon, D., Pantazis, C. and Townsend, P. (1999), *Changing necessities of life, 1993 – 1999* [Online]. Available: www.bristol.ac.uk/poverty/pse/99PSE-WP3.pdf [Accessed 10 August 2006]

Grindrod, H. and Black, G. (1989), *Suicides at Leeds prison: an enquiry into the deaths of five teenagers during 1988/89*, London: Howard League for Penal Reform

Haines, J. and Williams, C. (1997), 'Coping and problem solving of self-mutilators', *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, vol. 53(2), pp. 177-86

Haines, J., Williams, C., Brain, K. and Wilson, G. (1995), 'The psychophysiology of self-mutilation', *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, vol. 104(3), pp. 471-89

Hales, H., Davison, S., Misch, P. and Taylor, P. (2003), 'Young males prisoners in a Young Offenders' Institution: their contact with suicidal behaviour by others', *Journal of Adolescence* [Online], vol. 26, pp. 667-85. Available: www.sciencedirect.com [Accessed 27 May 2006]

Hallsworth, S. (2002), 'The case for a postmodern penalty', *Theoretical Criminology* [Online], vol. 6(2), pp. 145-63. Available: <http://tcr.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/6/2/145> [Accessed 25 May 2006]

Hankoff, L. (1980), 'Prisoner suicide', *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, vol. 24, pp. 162-66

Hansard (2004), Written answers to questions (7 Sept 2004). *Prison* [Online]. Available: <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200304/cmhansrd/vo040907/text/40907w08.htm#40907w08.html> [Accessed 06 September 2006]

Harvey, J. (2004), *Transition and adaptation to prison life: a study of young adults aged 18 to 21*, Ph.D. University of Cambridge

Harvey, J. (2005), 'Crossing the boundary: the transition of young adults into prison' in A. Liebling and S. Maruna (eds.), *The effects of imprisonment*, Cullompton: Willan Publishing, pp. 232-54

Harvey, J. (2007), *Young men in prison. Surviving and adapting to life inside*, Cullompton: Willan Publishing

Haste, H. (2005), *Joined-up texting* [Online]. Available: www.mori.com/polls/2004/pdf/nestlesrp3.pdf [Accessed 13 August 2006]

Hawton, K. (1986), *Suicide and attempted suicide among children and adolescents*, California: SAGE

Hayes, L. (1996), 'Custodial suicide: overcoming obstacles to prevention' in A. Liebling (ed.), *Deaths in custody: Caring for people at risk*, London: Whiting and Birch Ltd, pp. 169-82

Hearn, J. and Morgan, D. (1990), 'Men, masculinities and social theory' in J. Hearn and D. Morgan (eds.), *Men, masculinities and social theory*, London: Unwin Hyman Ltd, pp. 1-18

HM Chief Inspector of Prisons (1999), *Suicide is everyone's concern. A thematic review by HM Chief Inspector of prisons for England and Wales* [Online]. Available: <http://inspectorates.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmiprisons/thematic-reports1/suicide-concern/> [Accessed 17 March 2003]

HM Chief Inspector of Prisons (2006), *Annual report of HM Chief Inspector of Prisons for England and Wales, 2004 – 2005* [Online]. Available: <http://www.official-documents.gov.uk/document/hc0506/hc08/0883/0883.pdf> [Accessed 24 June 2006]

HM Chief Inspector of Prisons (2007), *Annual report 2005/2006* [Online], Available: www.official-documents.gov.uk/document/hc0607/hc02/0210/0210.pdf [Accessed 19 February 2007]

HM Chief Inspector of Prisons (2007b), *Report of an unannounced short follow-up inspection of HMYOI Glen Parva. 25 – 27 June 2007* [Online]. Available:

[http://inspectors.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmiprisons/inspect_reports/hmp-yoi-inspections.html/Glen_Parva_\(25-27_June_2007\).pdf](http://inspectors.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmiprisons/inspect_reports/hmp-yoi-inspections.html/Glen_Parva_(25-27_June_2007).pdf) [Accessed 07 December 2007]

HM Inspectorate of Prisons (2000), *Unjust deserts. A thematic review by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons of the treatment and conditions for unsentenced prisoners in England and Wales* [Online]. Available:

<http://inspectors.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmiprisons/thematic-reports1/unjust.pdf?view=Binary> [Accessed 29 October 2006]

HM Inspectorate of Prisons (2004), *Prisoners under escort* [Online]. Available:

www.inspectors.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmiprisons/thematic-reports1/under-escort-04.pdf?view=Binary [Accessed 05 June 2006]

HM Inspector of Prisons (2006), *Young adult male prisoners: A short thematic report* [Online]. Available: http://inspectors.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmiprisons/thematic-reports1/Young_adult_male_prisoners.pdf?view=Binary [Accessed 09 December 2007]

HM Inspector of Prisons (2007), *The mental health of prisoners. A thematic review of the care and support of prisoners with mental health needs* [Online]. Available:

http://inspectors.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmiprisons/thematic-reports1/Mental_Health.pdf?view=Binary [Accessed 09 December 2007]

HM Magistrates' Courts Service Inspectorate and HM Inspectorate of Prisons (2005), *The joint inspection of prisoner escort and court custody in England and Wales*

[Online]. Available: www.hmica.gov.uk/files/Custody_and_enforcement_draft_5.pdf [Accessed 24 June 2006]

HM Prison Service (no date), *The ACCT Approach. Caring for people at risk in prison. Pocket guide for staff*, London: HM Prison Service

HM Prison Service (1992), *Caring for prisoners at risk of suicide and self-injury. The way forward*, London: HM Prison Service

HM Prison Service (2001), *Prevention of suicide and self-harm in the prison service*, London: HM Prison Service

HM Prison Service (2004a), *Offender behaviour programmes* [Online]. Available: www.hmprisonservice.gov.uk/adviceandsupport/beforeafterrelease/offenderbehaviourprogrammes/ [Accessed 10 September 2006]

HM Prison Service (2004b), *Glen Parva* [Online]. Available: <http://www.hmprisonservice.gov.uk/prisoninformation/locateaprison/prison.asp?id=391,15,2,15,391,0> [Accessed 23 December 2006]

HM Prison Service (2005), *Prison drug treatment and self harm* [Online]. Available: http://psi.hmprisonservice.gov.uk/PSI_2005_46_drug_treatment_and_self_harm.doc [Accessed 05 November 2006]

HM Prison Service (2007a), *Home Secretary announces plans for new prisons* [Online]. Available: <http://www.hmprisonservice.gov.uk/resourcecentre/pressreleases/index.asp?id=6342,230,608,242,0,0> [Accessed 17 February 2007]

HM Prison Service (2007b), *Record fall for 2006 prison deaths* [Online]. Available: <http://www.hmprisonservice.gov.uk/resourcecentre/pressreleases/index.asp?id=6149,230,608,242,0,0> [Accessed 17 February 2007]

HM Prison Service (2007c), *Monthly bulletin – February 2007* [Online]. Available: http://www.hmprisonservice.gov.uk/assets/documents/100027E6pop_bull_feb_07.doc [Accessed 14 April 2007]

Hobbs, G. and Dear, G. (2000), 'Prisoners' perceptions of prison officers as sources of support', *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, vol. 31, pp. 127-42

Hollway, W. and Jefferson, T. (2000), *Doing qualitative research differently*, London: SAGE

Home Office (2005), *Memorandum* [Online]. Available: www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200506/cmselect/cmhaff/656/5110809.htm [Accessed 05 June 2006]

House, A. (1990), 'Prison suicides', *British Journal of Psychiatry*, vol. 156, pp. 586-87

Howard League (1995), *Banged up, beaten up, cutting up*, London: Howard League for Penal Reform

Howard League (1999a), *Desperate measures: Prison suicides and their prevention*, London: Howard League for Penal Reform

Howard League (1999b), *Scratching the surface: The hidden problem of self-harm in prisons*, London: Howard League for Penal Reform

Howard League (2001), *Suicide and self-harm prevention: Court cells and prison vans*, London: Howard League for Penal Reform

Howard League (2002), *Suicide and self-harm prevention: following release from prison*, London: Howard League for Penal Reform

Howard League (2003), *Suicide and self-harm prevention: the management of self-injury in prisons*, London: Howard League for Penal Reform

Howard League (2005a), *9 February 2005. 52 prisons experienced the suicide of a prisoner* [Online]. Available: <http://www.howardleague.org/index.php?id=226>
[Accessed 24 November 2006]

Howard League (2005b), *Briefing paper on prison overcrowding and suicide* [Online]. Available:
http://www.howardleague.org/fileadmin/howard_league/user/pdf/PrisonOvercrowdingAndSuicide.pdf [Accessed 22 October 2006]

Howard League (2006), *The Howard League for Penal Reform today condemned the use of police cells to warehouse prisoners as likely to endanger the public* [Online]. Available: <http://www.howardleague.org/index.php?id=230> [Accessed 17 February 2007]

Howard League (2007), *Prison population Friday 27 April 2007* [Online]. Available: <http://www.howardleague.org/index.php?id=464> [Accessed 5 May 2007]

Huey, M. and McNulty, T. (2005), 'Institutional conditions and prison suicide: conditional effects of deprivation and overcrowding', *The Prison Journal*, vol. 85(4), pp. 490-514

Hughes, G. (2000), 'Understanding the politics of criminological research' in V. Jupp, P. Davies and P. Francis (eds.), *Doing criminological research*, London: SAGE, pp. 234-48

Hulley, S. and Smith, M. (2005), 'Reducing prisoner-on-prisoner victimisation in a young offender institution', *Prison Service Journal*, vol. 157, pp. 17-22

Ignatieff, M. (1978), *A just measure of pain*, London: Penguin Books

Inch, H., Rowlands, P. and Soliman, A. (1995), 'Deliberate self-harm in a YOI', *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry*, vol. 6(1), pp. 161-71

Ingram, A., Johnson, G. and Heyes, I. (1997), *Self harm and suicide by detained persons: a study (PRAS 106)*, London: Home Office

Ingram, A., Johnson, G. and Heyes, I. (1998), 'Self-harm and suicide by detained persons: a study' in A. Liebling (ed.), *Deaths of offenders: the hidden side of justice*, Winchester: Waterside Press, pp. 145-47

Ireland, J., Boustead, R. and Ireland, C. (2005), 'Coping style and psychological health among adolescent prisoners: a study of young and juvenile offenders', *Journal of Adolescence* [Online], vol. 28, pp. 411-23. Available: www.science.direct.com [Accessed 27 May 2006]

Irwin, J. (1970), *The felon*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall

Irwin, J. and Owen, B. (2005), 'Harm and the contemporary prison' in A. Liebling and S. Maruna (eds.), *The effects of imprisonment*, Cullompton: Willan Publishing, pp. 94-117

Jefferson, T. (1994), 'Theorising masculine subjectivity' in T. Newburn and E. Stanko (eds.), *Just boys doing business?*, London: Routledge, pp. 10-31

Jefferson, T. (1997), 'Masculinities and crime' in M. Maguire, R. Morgan and E. Reiner (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of crime*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 535-57

Jefferson, T. (1998), 'Muscle, 'hard men' and 'Iron' Mike Tyson: reflections on desire, anxiety and the embodiment of masculinity', *Body and Society*, vol. 4(1), pp. 77-98

Jewkes, Y. (2002), *A captive audience*, Cullompton: Willan Publishing

Jewkes, Y. (2005), 'Men behind bars: 'doing' masculinity as an adaptation to imprisonment', *Men and Masculinities*, vol. 8, pp. 44-63

Jewkes, Y. and Johnston, H. (2006), 'Introduction' in Y. Jewkes and H. Johnston (eds.), *Prison readings. A critical introduction of prisons and imprisonment*, Cullompton: Willan Publishing, pp. 1-12

Johnson, R. and Toch, H. (1982), 'Introduction' in R. Johnson and H. Toch (eds.), *The pains of imprisonment*, California: SAGE, pp. 13-21

Jones, R. and Schmid, T. (2000), *Doing time. Prison experience and identity among first-time inmates*, Stamford, Connecticut: JAI Press Inc

Jupp, V. (2001), *Methods of criminological research*, London: Routledge

Kerkhof, A. (2002), 'Attempted suicide: patterns and trends' in K. Hawton and K. van Heeringen (eds.), *The international handbook of suicide and attempted suicide*, Chichester: John Wiley and Sons Ltd, pp. 49-64

Kimmel, M. (1990), 'After fifteen years: the impact of the sociology of masculinity on the masculinity of sociology' in J. Hearn and D. Morgan (eds.), *Men, masculinities and social theory*, London: Unwin Hyman Ltd, pp. 93-109

King, R. (2000), 'Doing research in prisons' in R. King and E. Wincup (eds.), *Doing research on crime and justice*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 285-312

King, R. and Elliott, K. (1977), *Albany: birth of a prison - end of an era*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Lader, D., Singleton, N. and Meltzer, H. (2000), *Psychiatric morbidity among young offenders in England and Wales* [Online]. Available:
http://www.statistics.gov.uk/downloads/theme_health/PyscMorbYoungOffenders97.pdf
[Accessed 09 December 2007]

Layder, D. (1993), *New strategies in social research*, Cambridge: Polity Press

Lee, R. (1993), *Doing research on sensitive topics*, London: SAGE

Leigh, A., Johnson, G. and Ingram, A. (1998), *Deaths in police custody: Learning the lessons*, London: Home Office

Liebling, A. (1992), *Suicides in prison*, London: Routledge

Liebling, A. (1995), 'Vulnerability and prison suicide', *British Journal of Criminology*, vol. 35(2), pp. 173-87

Liebling, A. (1996), 'Prison suicide: what progress research?' in A. Liebling (ed.), *Deaths in custody: Caring for people at risk*, London: Whiting and Birch Ltd, pp. 41-53

Liebling, A. (1998), 'Prison suicide and the nature of imprisonment' in A. Liebling (ed.), *Deaths of offenders: the hidden side of justice*, Winchester: Waterside Press, pp. 64-74

Liebling, A. (1999a), 'Prison suicide and prisoner coping' in M. Tonry and J. Petersilia (eds.), *Prisons. Crime and justice*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 283-360

Liebling, A. (1999b), 'Doing research in prison: breaking the silence?', *Theoretical Criminology*, vol. 3(2), pp. 147-73

Liebling, A. (2001), 'Whose side are we on? Theory, practice and allegiances in prisons research', *British Journal of Criminology* [Online], vol. 41, pp. 472-84. Available: <http://bjc.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/reprint/41/3/472> [Accessed 27 May 2006]

Liebling, A. (2006), 'Suicides in prison: ten years on' in Y. Jewkes and H. Johnston (eds.), *Prison readings. A critical introduction of prisons and imprisonment*, Cullompton: Willan Publishing, pp. 230-36

Liebling, A. (2007, in press), 'Measuring the quality of prison life (MQPL)' in Y. Jewkes and J. Bennett (eds.), *Dictionary of prisons and punishment*, Cullompton: Willan Publishing

Liebling, A. and Arnold, H. (2004), *Prisons and their moral performance. A study of values, quality, and prison life*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Liebling, A. and Hall, P. (1993), 'Seclusion in prison strip cells', *British Medical Journal*, vol. 307, pp. 399-400

Liebling, A. and Krarup, H. (1993), *Suicide attempts and self-injury in male prisons*, London: Home Office

Liebling, A. and Maruna, S. (2005), 'Introduction: the effects of imprisonment revisited' in A. Liebling and S. Maruna (eds.), *The effects of imprisonment*, Cullompton: Willan Publishing, pp. 1-29

Liebling, A. and Price, D. (2001), *The prison officer*, Leyhill: HM Prison Service

Liebling, A., Durier, L., Stiles, A. and Tait, S. (2005), 'Revisiting prison suicide: the role of fairness and distress' in A. Liebling and S. Maruna (eds.), *The effects of imprisonment*, Cullompton: Willan Publishing, pp. 209-31

Lindlof, T. (1995), *Qualitative communication research methods*, London: SAGE

Little, M. (1990), *Young men in prison*, Aldershot: Dartmouth Publishing Co. Ltd

Livingston, M. (1997), 'A review of the literature on self-injurious behaviour amongst prisoners' in G. Towl (ed.), *Suicide and self-injury in prisons*, Leicester: British Psychological Society, pp. 21-35

Livingston, M. and Beck, G. (1997), 'A cognitive-behavioural model of self-injury and bullying among imprisoned young offenders' in G. Towl (ed.), *Suicide and self-injury in prisons*, Leicester: British Psychological Society, pp. 45-49

Livingstone, S. (2000), 'Prisoners' rights in the context of the European Convention on Human Rights', *Punishment and Society* [Online], vol. 2(3), pp. 309-24. Available: <http://pun.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/2/3/309.pdf> [Accessed 16 September 2006]

Lloyd, C. (1990), *Suicide and self-injury in prison: A literature review*, London: Home Office

Long, N. (1998), 'What are the lessons from tragedies?' in A. Liebling (ed.), *Deaths of offenders: the hidden side of justice*, Winchester: Waterside Press, pp. 120-44

Ludema, J., Cooperrider, D. and Barrett, F. (2001), 'Appreciative inquiry: the power of the unconditional positive question' in P. Reason and H. Bradbury (eds.), *Handbook of action research. Participative inquiry and practice*, London: SAGE, pp. 189-99

Lyon, J. (2006), The foreigners still locked in our jails are the other scandal. *Guardian* [Online]. Available:

<http://politics.guardian.co.uk/homeaffairs/comment/0,,1762120,00.html> [Accessed 20 August 2006]

Martel, J. (2004), 'Policing criminological knowledge: the hazards of qualitative research on women in prison', *Theoretical Criminology*, vol 8(2), pp. 157-89

Martin, C. (2000), 'Doing research in a prison setting' in V. Jupp, P. Davies and P. Francis (eds.), *Doing criminological research*, London: SAGE, pp. 215-33

Marzillier, J. (2004), *Psychological report on the relationship between substance abuse and suicide in relation to the death of Mr Christopher Waite*, Unpublished

Mason, J. (1996), *Qualitative researching*, London: SAGE

Mathiesen, T. (1990), *Prison on trial*, London: SAGE

Matthews, R. (1999), *Doing time. An introduction to the sociology of imprisonment*, Hampshire: Macmillan Press Ltd

Matthews, R. (2005), 'The myth of punitiveness', *Theoretical Criminology* [Online], vol. 9(2), pp. 175-201. Available: <http://tcr.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/9/2/175> [Accessed 25 June 2006]

Maxfield, M. and Babbie, E. (2001), *Research methods for criminal justice and criminology*, London: Thomson Learning

May, T. (1997), *Social research: issues, methods and process*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

May, T. and Williams, M. (1997), 'Social surveys: Design to analysis' in T. May (ed), *Social research: issues, methods and process*, Buckingham: Open University Press, pp. 81-108.

McCarthy, C. (2003), 'Hurting inside', *Prison Service Journal*, vol. 148, pp. 23-25

McCleave, N. and Latham, D. (1998), 'Self-injurious behaviour in police custody', *Journal of Clinical Forensic Medicine* [Online], vol. 5, pp. 13-26. Available: www.sciencedirect.com [Accessed 06 August 2004]

McHugh, M. and Snow, L. (2002), 'Suicide prevention: policy and practice' in G. Towl, L. Snow and M. McHugh (eds.), *Suicide in prisons*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, pp. 1-25

McHugh, M. and Towl, G. (1997), 'Organizational reactions and reflections on suicide and self-injury' in G. Towl (ed.), *Suicide and self-injury in prisons*, Leicester: British Psychological Society, pp. 5-11

McHugh, M., Towl, G. and Snow, L. (2002), in G. Towl, L. Snow and M. McHugh (eds.), *Suicide in prisons*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, pp. 156-64

Medlicott, D. (1999), 'Surviving in the time machine. Suicidal prisoners and the pains of prison time', *Time and Society*, vol. 8(2), pp. 211-30

Medlicott, D. (2000), "'Don't think this stuff". An analysis of prisoners' accounts of being suicidal in prison' in G. Mair and R. Tarling (eds.), *Selected papers from the 1999 British Criminology Conference*, July 1999, Liverpool [Online]. Available: <http://www.britisoccrim.org/volume3/007.pdf> [Accessed 19 September 2003]

Medlicott, D. (2001), *Surviving the prison place: Narratives of suicidal prisoners*, Aldershot: Ashgate

Meisenhelder, T. (1985), 'An essay on time and the phenomenology of imprisonment', *Deviant Behaviour*, vol. 6, pp. 39-65

Meltzer, H., Jenkins, R., Singleton, N., Charlton, J. and Yar, M. (1999), *Non-fatal suicidal behaviour among prisoners*, London: ONS

Messerschmidt, J. (1999), 'Making bodies matter: adolescent masculinities, the body, and varieties of violence', *Theoretical Criminology*, vol. 3(2), pp. 197-220

Monat, A. and Lazarus, R. (1977), 'Introduction' in A. Monat and R. Lazarus (eds.), *Stress and coping: an anthology*, New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 1-11

Morris, T. and Morris, P. (1963), *Pentonville. A sociological study of an English prison*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Morton, P. (2004), 'Self-harm in prison. An appraisal of a user-led support group in HMP Manchester', *Prison Service Journal*, vol. 151, pp. 7-10

Moser, D., Arndt, S., Kanz, J., Benjamin, M., Bayless, J., Reese, R. Paulsen, J. and Flaum, M. (2004), 'Coercion and informed consent in research involving prisoners', *Comprehensive Psychiatry* [Online], vol. 45(1), pp. 1-9. Available: www.sciencedirect.com [Accessed 29 October 2006]

National Centre for Policing Excellence (2006), *Guidance on the safer detention and handling of persons in police custody* [Online]. Available: http://police.homeoffice.gov.uk/news-and-publications/publication/operational-policing/Safer_Detention_and_Handlin1.pdf?view=Binary [Accessed 05 June 2006]

National Self-harm Network (1998), *Self-injury: myths and common sense* [Online].

Available: www.nshn.co.uk [Accessed 25 February 2003]

Newburn, T. and Hayman, S. (2002), *Policing, surveillance and social control*,

Cullompton: Willan Publishing

Newburn, T. and Stanko, E. (1994a), 'Introduction. Men, masculinity and crime' in T.

Newburn and E. Stanko (eds.), *Just boys doing business?*, London: Routledge, pp. 109

Newburn, T. and Stanko, E. (1994b), 'When men are victims. The failure of

victimology' in T. Newburn and E. Stanko (eds.), *Just boys doing business?*, London:

Routledge, pp. 153-65

Newell, R. (1996), 'Questionnaires' in N. Gilbert (ed), *Researching social life*, London:

SAGE, pp. 94-115.

Norfolk, G. (1998), 'Deaths in police custody during 1994: a retrospective analysis',

Journal of Clinical Forensic Medicine [Online], vol. 5, pp. 49-54. Available:

www.sciencedirect.com [Accessed 06 August 2004]

Oakley, A. (1981), 'Interviewing women: a contradiction in terms' in H. Roberts (ed.),

Doing feminist research, London: Routledge, pp. 30-61

Parisi, N. (1982), 'The prisoner's pressures and responses' in N. Parisi (ed.), *Coping*

with imprisonment, California: SAGE, pp. 9-26

Patenaude, A. (2004), 'No promises, but I'm willing to listen and tell what I heard: conducting qualitative research among prison inmates and staff', *The Prison Journal*, vol. 84(4), pp. 69-91

Paton, J. and Jenkins, R. (2002), *Withdrawal from drugs, mental health problems and self harm* [Online]. Available:
www.prisonmentalhealth.org/downloads/main_text/01prelims.pdf [Accessed 24 August 2006]

Patterson, J. and McCubbin, H. (1987), 'Adolescent coping style and behaviours: conceptualization and measurement', *Journal of Adolescence*, vol. 10, pp. 163-86

Paulus, P. and Dzindolet, M. (1992), 'The effects of prison confinement' in P. Suedfeld and P. Tetlock (eds.), *Psychology and social policy*, London: Hemisphere Publishing, pp. 327-41

Personal Email (xxxxx.xxxxx@xxxxx.co.uk) (26 April 2005), *ACCT Plan*, Personal email to H. Jones (H.Jones@hull.ac.uk)

Piacentini, L. (2005), 'Cultural talk and other inmate acquaintances with Russian prisons', *Crime, Media, Culture*, vol. 1, pp. 189-208

Police Complaints Authority (1999), *Deaths in police custody. Reducing the risks*, London: Police Complaints Authority

Police Complaints Authority (2002), *Safer restraint* [Online]. Available:
http://www.ipcc.gov.uk/safer_restraint_june2003.pdf [Accessed 12 November 2006]

Pope, C., Lovell, R. and Brandl, S. (2001), 'Introduction' in C. Pope, R. Lovell and S. Brandl (eds.), *Voices from the field. Readings in criminal justice research*, London: Wadsworth / Thomson Learning, pp. 1-16

Porporino, F. (1992), 'Foreword' in H. Toch (ed.), *Living in prison. The ecology of survival*, Washington: American Psychological Association, pp. ix-xiii

Porporino, F. and Zamble, E. (1984), 'Coping with imprisonment', *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, vol. 26, pp. 403-21

Power, K., McElroy, J. and Swanson, V. (1997), 'Coping abilities and prisoners' perception of suicidal risk management', *Howard Journal*, vol. 36(4), pp. 378-92

Powis, B. (2002), *Offenders' risk of serious harm: A literature review*, London: Home Office

Pratt, J., Brown, D., Brown, M., Hallsworth, S. and Morrison, W. (2005), 'Introduction' in J. Pratt, D. Brown, M. Brown, S. Hallsworth and W. Morrison (eds.), *The new punitiveness. Trends, theories, perspectives*, Cullompton: Willan Publishing, pp. xi-xxvi

Prison Reform Trust (1997), *The rising toll of prison suicide*, London: Prison Reform Trust

Prison Reform Trust (2003), *Innocent lives lost - remand needs reform* [Online].

Available: <http://www.prisonreformtrust.org.uk/subsection.asp?id=330> [Accessed 19 September 2003]

Prison Reform Trust (2005), *November 2005 – Troubled inside: meeting the mental health needs of men in prison* [Online]. Available:

<http://www.prisonreformtrust.org.uk/subsection.asp?id=318> [Accessed 09 December 2007]

Quin, J. (1999), 'Suicide in prisons: the need for an integrated approach' in G. Towl, M. McHugh and D. Jones (eds.), *Suicide in prisons. Research, policy and practice*, Brighton: Pavilion Publishing, pp. 3-6

Reiner, R. (1985), *The politics of the police*, Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf

Reiner, R. (2000), 'Police research' in R. King and E. Wincup (eds.), *Doing research on crime and justice*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 205-35

Reisig, M. (2001), 'The champion, contender, and challenger: top-ranked books in prison studies', *The Prison Journal*, vol. 81, pp. 389-407

Royal College of Psychiatrists (1999), *Mental health and growing up. deliberate self-harm in young people (Second Edition). Factsheet 30* [Online]. Available: www.rcpsych.ac.uk [Accessed 17 March 2003]

Safer Custody Group (2001), *Self-inflicted deaths in prison service custody*, London: HM Prison Service

Safer Custody Group (xxxxx.xxxx@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk) (19 February 2007),
Suicide and self-harm figures, Personal email to H. Jones (H.Jones@hull.ac.uk)

Samaritans (2006), *Young people and suicide* [Online], Available: www.samaritans.org
[Accessed 17 February 2007]

Sapsford, R. (1983), *Life sentence prisoners. Reaction, response and change*, Milton
Keynes: Open University Press

Scruton, P., Sim, J. and Skidmore, P. (1991), *Prisons under protest*, Buckingham: Open
University Press

Shaw, J., Appleby, L. and Baker, D. (2003), *Safer prisons*, London: The Stationary
Office

Shaw, J., Baker, D., Hunt, I., Moloney, A. and Appleby, L. (2004), 'Suicide by
prisoners. National clinical survey', *British Journal of Psychiatry* [Online], vol. 184, pp.
263-67. Available: <http://bjp.rcpsych.org/cgi/reprint/184/3/263> [Accessed 27 May 2006]

Silverman, D. (2001), *Interpreting qualitative data. Methods for analysing talk, text and
interaction*, London: SAGE

Sim, J. (1994), 'Tougher than the rest? Men in prison' in T. Newburn and E. Stanko
(eds.), *Just boys doing business?*, London: Routledge, pp. 100-17

Sim, J. (2003), 'Book review: Y. Jewkes - Captive audience: media, masculinity and power in prisons', *Theoretical Criminology* [Online], vol. 7(2), pp. 239 – 42. Available: <http://tcr.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/7/2/239> [Accessed 24 June 2006]

Singleton, N., Meltzer, H., Gatward, R., Coid, J. and Deasy, D. (1998), *Psychiatric morbidity among prisoners: summary report* [Online]. Available: http://www.statistics.gov.uk/downloads/theme_health/Prisoners_PsycMorb.pdf [Accessed 09 December 2007]

Singleton, N., Meltzer, H., Gatward, R., Coid, J. and Deasy, D. (1998b), *Psychiatric morbidity among prisoners in England and Wales*, London: ONS

Smircich, L. (1983), 'Studying organizations as cultures' in G. Morgan (ed.), *Beyond method. Strategies for social research*, London: SAGE, pp. 160-72

Smith, C. and Wincup, E. (2000), 'Breaking in: researching criminal justice institutions for women' in R. King and E. Wincup (eds.), *Doing research on crime and justice*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 331-49

Snow, L. (1997), 'A pilot study of self-injury amongst women prisoners' in G. Towl (ed.), *Suicide and self-injury in prisons*, Leicester: British Psychological Society, pp. 50-9

Snow, L. (2002), 'The role of formalised peer-group support in prisons' in G. Towl, L. Snow and M. McHugh (eds.), *Suicide in prisons*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, pp. 102-20

Social Exclusion Unit (2002), *Reducing re-offending by ex-prisoners*, London: Social Exclusion Unit

Solomon E. (2004), *A lost generation: the experiences of young people in prison*, London: Prison Reform Trust

Spandler, H. (2001), *Who's hurting who? Young people, self-harm and suicide*, Gloucester: Handsell Publishing

Sparks, R., Bottoms, A. and Hay, W. (1996), *Prisons and the problem of order*, Oxford: Clarendon Press

Sykes, G. (1958), *The society of captives*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press

Teers, R. and Bucke, T. (2005), *Deaths during or following police contact: statistics for England and Wales 2004/05* [Online}. Available:
www.ipcc.gov.uk/deathreport0405_printerversion.pdf [Accessed 05 June 2006]

Tempest, M. (2007), Prison violence soars by 600%. *Guardian* [Online]. Available:
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/print/0,,329706281-108101,00.html> [Accessed 17 February 2007]

Tendler, S. (2006a), Prison ship sought as crowding crisis grows. *Times Online* [Online]. Available: <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/uk/article608134.ece> [Accessed 17 February 2007]

Tendler, S. (2006b), Get Army to knock young criminals into shape, says Reid. *Times Online* [Online]. Available: <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2-2280493.html> [Accessed 23 July 2006]

Thomas, P. (1998), 'Foreword' in E. Dace, A. Faulkner, M. Frost, K. Parker, L. Pembroke and A. Smith (eds.), *The hurt yourself less workbook*, London: National Self-harm Network, pp. 3-5

Thornton, D. (1990), 'Depression, self-injury and attempted suicide amongst the YOI population' in N. Fludger and I. Simmons (eds.), *Proceedings from Psychologists' Conference*, 1989. London: Directorate of Psychological Services, pp. 47-55

Tilt, R. (1998), 'Changing perspectives on deaths of prisoners' in A. Liebling (ed.), *Deaths of offenders: the hidden side of justice*, Winchester: Waterside Press, pp. 33-43

Toch, H. (1982), 'Studying and reducing stress' in R. Johnson and H. Toch (eds.), *The pains of imprisonment*, California: SAGE, pp. 25-44

Toch, H. (1992a), *Living in prison. The ecology of survival*, Washington: American Psychological Association

Toch, H. (1992b), *Mosaic of despair: Human breakdowns in prison*, Washington, DC: American Psychological Association

Towl, G. (1999), 'Self-inflicted deaths in prisons in England and Wales from 1988 to 1996' in G. Towl, M. McHugh and D. Jones (eds.), *Suicide in prisons: research, policy and practice*, Brighton: Pavilion Publishing Ltd, pp. 13-20

Towl, G. and Forbes, D. (2002), 'Working with suicidal prisoners' in G. Towl, L. Snow and M. McHugh (eds.), *Suicides in prisons*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, pp. 93-101

Towl, G. and Hudson, D. (1997), 'Risk assessment and management of the suicidal' in G. Towl (ed.), *Suicide and self-injury in prisons*, Leicester: British Psychological Society, pp. 60-64

Tracey, S. (2004), 'The construction of correctional officers: layers of emotionality behind bars', *Qualitative Inquiry* [Online], vol. 10(4), pp. 509-33. Available: <http://qix.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/10/4/509> [Accessed 27 May 2006]

Wacquant, L. (2002), 'The curious eclipse of prison ethnography in the age of mass incarceration', *Ethnography* [Online], vol. 3(4), pp. 371-97. Available: <http://eth.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/3/4/371> [Accessed 14 May 2005]

Walker, P. (2007), Reid announces plans for new prisons. *Guardian* [Online], Available: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/print/0,,329718075-108101,00.html> [Accessed 17 February 2007]

Warren, C. (1988), *Gender issues in field research*, London: SAGE

West Midlands Area Psychology Team (2006), *Peer support – evaluation of ‘Insiders at Court’ scheme*, Unpublished

Westefeld, J., Range, L., Rogers, J., Maples, M., Bromley, J. and Alcorn, J. (2000), ‘Transition and adaptation to prison life: A study of young adults aged 18 to 21’, *The Counseling Psychologist*, vol. 28(4), pp. 445-510

Wheeler, S. (1961), ‘Socialization in correctional communities’, *American Sociological Review* [Online], vol. 26(5), pp. 697-712. Available: www.jstor.org [Accessed 5 May 2007]

Williams, B., Cuthbert, C. and Sattar, G. (2000), *Prison escort and custody services: prisoners' experiences*, *Research Findings Number 123* [Online]. Available: <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs/r123.pdf> [Accessed 17 March 2003]

Williams, J. and Pollock, L. (2002), ‘The psychology of suicidal behaviour’ in K. Hawton and K. van Heeringen (eds.), *The international handbook of suicide and attempted suicide*, Chichester: John Wiley and Sons Ltd, pp. 79-93

Williams, M. (1997), *Cry of pain. Understanding suicide and self-harm*, London: Penguin Books

Wolcott, H. (1990), *Writing up qualitative research*, London: SAGE

Wool, R. and Dooley, E. (1987), ‘A study of attempted suicides in prison’, *Medicine, Science and the Law*, vol. 27(4), pp. 297-301

Young Minds (1999), *Worried about self-injury?* [Online]. Available:

<http://www.youngminds.org.uk/leaflet.pdf/self-injury.pdf> [Accessed 17 March 2003]

Zamble, E. and Porporino, F. J. (1988), *Coping, Behaviour and Adaptation in Prison Inmates*, New York: Springer-Verlag

Population Profile of Glen Parva YOI

As of June 2007, the population profile of Glen Parva YOI was as follows:

Age	Number of Prisoners	Percentage
18 years	176	22.34%
19 years	287	36.42%
20 years	277	35.15%
21 years	48	6.09%
Total	788	100.00%

Status	Number of prisoners	Percentage
Sentenced	594	75.38%
Convicted but unsentenced	81	10.28%
Remand	110	13.96%
Detainees (single power status)	3	0.38%
Total	788	100.00%

Sentence	Number of sentenced prisoners	Percentage
Less than 6 months	65	10.94%
6 months – less than 12 months	48	8.08%
12 months – less than 2 years	167	28.11%
2 years – less than 4 years	283	47.64%
4 years – less than 10 years	18	3.03%
10 years and over (not life)	1	0.17%
Life	12	2.02%
Total	594	100.00%

Length of stay	Sentenced prisoners		Unsentenced prisoners	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Less than 1 month	95	15.99%	85	43.81%
1 month to 3 months	154	25.93%	60	30.93%
3 months to 6 months	136	22.90%	36	18.56%
6 months to 1 year	154	25.93%	13	6.70%
1 year to 2 years	50	8.42%	0	0.00%
2 years to 4 years	5	0.84%	0	0.00%
Total	594	100.00%	194	100.00%

Main offence	Number of prisoners	Percentage
Violence against the person	137	17.39%
Sexual offences	17	2.16%
Burglary	119	15.10%
Robbery	143	18.15%
Theft and handling	46	5.84%
Fraud and forgery	2	0.25%
Drugs offences	67	8.50%
Other offences	189	23.98%
Offences not recorded/ holding warrant	68	8.63%
Total	788	100.00%

Distance of home address from Glen Parva YOI	Number of prisoners	Percentage
Within 50 miles of the prison	484	61.42%
Between 50 and 100 miles of the prison	245	31.09%
Over 100 miles from the prison	35	4.44%
Overseas	15	1.90%
No fixed address	9	1.14%
Total	788	100.00%

Nationality	Number of prisoners	Percentage
British	718	91.12%
Foreign nationals	70	8.88%
Total	788	100.00%

Ethnicity	Number of prisoners	Percentage
White:		
British	580	73.60%
Irish	2	0.25%
Other White	13	1.65%
Mixed:		
White and Black Caribbean	34	4.31%
White and Black African	2	0.25%
Other Mixed	6	0.76%
Asian or Asian British:		
Indian	10	1.27%
Pakistani	15	1.90%
Bangladeshi	7	0.89%
Other Asian	10	1.27%
Black or Black British:		
Caribbean	57	7.23%
African	28	3.55%
Other Black	13	1.65%
Chinese or other ethnic group:		
Chinese	6	0.76%
Other ethnic group	5	0.63%
Total	788	100.00%

Religion	Number of prisoners	Percentage
Church of England	105	13.32%
Roman Catholic	65	8.25%
Other Christian denominations	1	0.13%
Muslim	55	6.98%
Sikh	3	0.38%
Hindu	2	0.25%
Buddhist	3	0.38%
Other	7	0.89%
No religion	547	69.42%
Total	788	100.00%

Taken from HMCIP (2007b)

Incidents of self-harm amongst detainees under the care of X escort and court custody service (April 2004 - December 2004)

	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Totals	As a % of the total
Prisoners handled	5552	5907	6327	5450	5273	5188	5067	4933	4349	48046	-
Self-harm warning notice received	215	264	228	202	147	834	827	820	726	4263	8.9
Suicide / self-harm form commenced	9	17	15	15	4	0	4	3	1	68	-
Self-harm (totals)	8	16	3	1	1	0	2	1	0	32	-
Gender Male adult	6	14	3	0	0	0	2	1	0	26	81.3
Male < 18 yrs	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3.1
Female adult	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	15.6
Female < 18 yrs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Method Blade	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	12.5
Other implement	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	18.8
Ligature	5	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	10	31.3
Substance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Other	0	8	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	37.5
Location Crown Court	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	9.4
Magistrates' Court	8	13	3	1	1	0	2	1	0	29	90.6
County / Civil Court	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Hospital	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Escort Vehicle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Without warning notification	1	8	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	12	37.5
Hospital treatment required	2	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	10	31.3
Medical treatment (resuscitation) required	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Medical treatment declined	3	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	8	25.0

Incidents of self-harm amongst prisoners within Glen Parva YOI
(January 2004 - December 2004)

		Totals	As a % of the total
Total number of self-harm incidents		216	-
Who administered treatment	Non health care staff	1	0.5
	Nurse or HCO	72	33.3
	Medical officer	18	8.3
	Paramedic	2	0.9
	No treatment	123	56.9
Method <i>(only known for 212 of the 216 incidents)</i>	Hanging	27	12.7
	Self strangulation	11	5.2
	Cutting - scratching	131	61.8
	Overdose	6	2.8
	Burning self	4	1.9
	Swallowing objects	0	0.0
	Head banging / wall punching	15	7.1
	Suffocation	1	0.5
	Noose / ligature making	16	7.5
	Other	1	0.5
	Mental health issues	47	17.5
	Family issues	16	6.0
Cause of intent (as reported by prisoner) <i>(prisoners were able to choose more than one intent)</i>	Bereavements	2	0.7
	Coping with custody	163	60.8
	Stress relief	4	1.5
	Substance misuse	5	1.9
	Bullying issues	13	4.9
	Other	18	6.7

Appendix D

Miss Helen Jones
XXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXX

21st June 2004

Dear XXX XXXXX,

I am writing to you in relation to research that I wish to undertake as part of my PhD. I am currently in my second year of a PhD in Criminology, which I am studying part-time with the University of Hull. In addition I work full-time as a XXXXXXXX within the XXXXXXXX at force Headquarters. The aim of my PhD is to examine how the support needs and provision of support services, in relation to suicide and self-injury, change for male young offenders as they proceed through the Criminal Justice System. This is an extension of research that I undertook as part of my MSc where I explored the support services offered to young offenders at Glen Parva YOI in 2001.

In particular, my research will involve semi-structured interviews with approximately 50 young people aged 18 – 21 years. I hope to be able to carry these interviews out at all stages of the CJS, including police cells, court cells, escort vehicles and remand / sentenced units within prison. In terms of the police cells, if permission is granted I hope to be able to complete all my interviews at the Custody Suite, XXXXXXX. I will be exploring a number of objectives including:

- the number of incidents of suicide and self-injury within police cells, court cells, escort vehicles, remand and sentenced units
- changes in the support needs of young offenders as they proceed through the CJS
- the provision of support services within the CJS in terms of their availability, accessibility and relevance to young offenders
- the extent to which young offenders' needs for support are being met within the CJS and their ideas for improvement
- young offenders' experiences of suicide and self-injury

Whilst I do not intend to complete interviews with staff I hope to listen to their views and experiences and incorporate them into my discussion. It is anticipated that by exploring the whole CJS a more 'joined up approach' will be adopted which will provide the participating establishments with a greater awareness about suicide and self-injury, support services and young offenders' needs. Furthermore, establishments will directly benefit from ways in which to develop and improve these services, making them more effective. The research may also include any specific issues that establishments would like addressed, which fall within the aims of the study.

I am aware of the sensitive nature of this research therefore any young people who decide to participate will do so on a voluntary basis and will be able to withdraw at any stage. All data will be completely confidential and will contain no names of staff or young people. The research will be submitted in 2006 as part of my PhD and your approval will be sought before any other distribution. A report of my findings will also be available to yourself, which will hopefully provide useful information in relation to suicide, self-injury and support services for young offenders.

I am still at the preliminary stages of designing my research but aim to undertake it September – December 2004 when I will hopefully have three months

leave from my post as XXXXXXXX. I hope you will be able to help me in researching this sensitive issue and if you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,

28th July 2004

In view of XXXX XXXXX's comments I propose to make the following alterations to my proposal.

Although the overall aim of my PhD will be to examine how the support needs and provision of support services, in relation to suicide and self-injury, change for male young offenders as they proceed through the Criminal Justice System, I will not include any aspect of suicide or self-injury when talking to young male detainees (aged 18 – 21 years) in police cells. I therefore propose to only speak to detainees about their support needs and the provision of support services available to them within a police cell.

If through my interviews I find a detainee is upset, discusses suicidal feelings or talks about self-harming I will inform the Custody Sergeant as soon as possible. It is not my intention to make anyone undergo trauma or distress.

The central aim of my PhD is to explore the Criminal Justice System as a whole, including police cells, court cells, escort vehicles and a Young Offenders Institution. I therefore need the support of all establishments within the Criminal Justice System. PECS (Prisoner Escort and Custody Services) have already granted me permission to undertake interviews with detainees in court cells and escort vehicles (run by Global Solutions Limited). I also anticipate that Glen Parva YOI will help me. XXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX XXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXX XXXXXXX XXXXXXX XXX XXXXXXXX XXXXXXX
XXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXX XXX XXXXXXX.

I acknowledge that suicides in police custody are rare, which means there is a small sample base, however I do not intend to interview just those detainees at-risk of suicide or self-injury, but will interview all young detainees where possible. I am happy to fit in around officers' interviews as necessary and if it is felt more appropriate for me to visit more than one custody suite I am more than happy to do so. In addition, I will not be discussing any aspect of the detainee's offence and am only interested in their thoughts about support needs and services.

Very little research, in comparison with prisons, has been undertaken exploring suicide, self-injury and support services within police cells. Furthermore, I am unaware of research that has attempted to examine this within the Criminal Justice System as a whole. I therefore think this PhD is unique and could offer invaluable information to the participating establishments.

Miss Helen Jones

XXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXX

Appendix F

Miss Helen Jones
XXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXX

23rd September 2004

Dear XXXX XXXXXX,

Further to our meeting I am providing you with a revised copy of my research proposal which forms part of my PhD in Criminology (for which I am registered part-time with the University of Hull). The aim of my PhD is to examine how the support needs and provision of support services, in relation to suicide and self-injury, change for male young offenders (aged 18 – 20 years) as they proceed through the Criminal Justice System. Therefore, in addition to research with the police force it will include research in court cells, escort vehicles and a Young Offenders Institution. However, as previously agreed, my research will not involve talking directly to detainees about their support needs or experiences of self-harm.

The proposed research will involve the following three sections:

- **Time and motions study**
 - To examine the actual time it takes for custody staff and officers to complete the different sections of the detention process. It is anticipated that this will involve examining both adult and young detainees, and male and female detainees.
 - This will involve liaison with XXXXXX XXXXXX to decide upon methodology, which custody suites will be included and the numbers involved.
 - Findings that relate to young male detainees will be included as part of my PhD, but I also expect to compile a report of my findings for XXXXXX Constabulary, as deemed necessary.
- **Informal discussions**
 - Whilst conducting the time and motions study I will be undertaking informal discussions with custody staff and officers about the support they offer detainees in general and young male detainees in particular, who are visibly distressed and who may be self-harming.
 - These discussions will not interrupt any work that is being undertaken.
 - It is anticipated that these discussions will be used in my PhD to supplement the findings of later research, which will explore the opinions of male young prisoners.
- **Informal observations**
 - In addition to informal discussions I will make informal observations about the custody process and the support that is offered to detainees in general and young male detainees in particular.
 - Again, it is anticipated that these observations will be used in my PhD to supplement the findings of later research.

All custody staff and officers involved in the research will be informed of its purpose, in relation to both XXXXXXX Constabulary and my PhD. In terms of research undertaken as part of my PhD all data will remain completely confidential and anonymous. The research will be submitted in 2006 as part of my PhD and your approval will be sought before any other distribution or publication. Furthermore I understand that I will need to sign a Data Processing Agreement to undertake this research.

As per our previous meeting this research will start from 1st October 2004 and will be co-ordinated by XXXXXX XXXXXX. If you need any further information regarding this proposal please contact me at the above.

Yours sincerely,

Activity Analysis: Police Custody Process

- **Date:** 13th October 2004 – 3rd November 2004
- **Total number of cases:** 16
- **Age of detainees:** 18 – 20 year old males (21 year olds were excluded)
- **Average age of detainees:** 18 years & 11 months

	No. of cases	Ave. Time Taken (mins in decimal units)	Ave. Time Taken (in hours, mins, secs)
--	---------------------	---	---

Getting to Station	Travel after arrest	14	28.1	28 mins 6 secs
Shute	Waiting time	16	29.4	29 mins 24 secs
Booking in	Excluding F, P, DNA	14	12.5	12 mins 30 secs

Close Personal Supervision		1	1543	25 hours 43 mins
-----------------------------------	--	---	------	------------------

Fingerprints	Time to obtain	11	8.1	8 mins 6 secs
Photo	Time to obtain	10	1.1	1 min 6 secs
DNA	Time to obtain	5	5.2	5 mins 12 secs

Appropriate Adult	Called to arrival or consultation time	1	702	11 hours 42 mins
--------------------------	--	---	-----	------------------

Solicitor	Called to arrival or consultation time	7	177.4	2 hours 57 mins 24 secs
	Consultation time	10	35.4	35 mins 24 secs

Interview	Start to finish	17	28.1	28 mins 6 secs
------------------	-----------------	----	------	----------------

Waiting in Cell	From booking in to interview	9	254	4 hours 14 mins
------------------------	------------------------------	---	-----	-----------------

Total time at station	From arrival to leaving	16	550.5	9 hours 10 mins 30 secs
------------------------------	-------------------------	----	-------	-------------------------

Total time in cell	Excluding shute, booking in, fingerprints, photo, DNA & interview	16	466.1	7 hours 46 mins 6 secs
---------------------------	---	----	-------	------------------------

Interview Schedule

1. General background of detainees / offenders

- Age?
- Have you been through any part of the CJS before?
 - If so, when? Where? How long were you previously in prison for?
- How long have you been in Glen Parva for?
- Remand or sentenced?

2. To explore the experiences of young offenders as they proceed through the CJS

- Describe your experience of entering police custody, travelling in an escort vehicle, entering a court custody suite, entering Glen Parva
 - Feelings, fears, anxieties
 - What did you expect? Did your expectations match up with your experiences?
 - Did you feel safe?
 - Did you feel respected by the staff?
 - How well were you treated?
 - What did you think about the staff?
 - Were you given information about what was going to happen to you? – What information were you given? When? By whom?
 - What could have been improved?
- On entering Glen Parva, describe the reception process. How did it make you feel?

3. To explore changes in the support needs of young offenders as they proceed through the CJS

4. To explore the provision of support services within the CJS in terms of their availability, accessibility and relevance to young offenders

5. To examine the extent to which young offenders' needs for support are being met within the CJS and explore their ideas for improvement

- Have you found anything hard being in a police cell, escort vehicle or court custody suite? What has added to your problems? What has made you feel worse? Are there any times that were particularly bad?
- When you were outside is there anything that you did or anyone you would speak to if you had a problem or were feeling upset or down?
- Would this have helped you when being in a police cell, escort vehicle or court custody suite? If so, would it have been possible to do? If not, why not? What would have helped?
- Within the police cell, escort vehicle or court custody suite did you have any problems? Or did you want to speak to someone?
- What help / support did you receive or been told about?
 - If you received help, what help? Who from? Was it good? Could it have been improved?
- What help / support would you have liked? Who from?
- What helped you get through these stages?
- Within Glen Parva

- Have you found anything hard being at Glen Parva? What has added to your problems? What has made you feel worse? Are there any times that are particularly bad?
- What has helped you get through your sentence?
- Referring back to how you used to cope outside can you do this within Glen Parva? If not, why not?
- Are you aware of any support services offered to inmates?
- How were you told about them?
- Do you know how to access them? Or where they are based?
- Have you used any?
 - If so, when? Why did you decide to use them? Have they helped you? What could have been improved?
 - If not, why not? Could anything be improved so you would access them?
- Is there anyone inside Glen Parva that you can talk to? Who? Do they help? Did you approach them or did they approach you?
- Have you used the Listener Scheme? If so did you find it useful? What was good? What could have been improved?
- Do you think you could approach an officer if you had a problem? Do you think you could approach your personal officer? If not, why not?
- Would you talk to another inmate or your cell mate if you had a problem?
- Are you attending any specific classes or groups to help you with a problem?
- Do you still manage to keep in contact with your family, relatives and friends? If not, why not?
- What would help you get through your sentence?

6. To examine past experiences of self-harm or attempted suicide and explore whether this has continued into the CJS?

- What do you understand by the term self-harm? Do you think this is different to an attempted suicide? If so, how?
- Before entering the CJS have you self-harmed or attempted suicide?
 - If yes
 - When?
 - Where were you?
 - How old were you?
 - What was happening to make you feel so bad?
 - What did you do?
 - Why do you think you harmed yourself at that time?
 - How often did you harm yourself?
 - When did you last harm yourself?
 - When you harm yourself is it usually planned or impulsive?
 - How do you feel before and after you have harmed yourself?
 - Does self-harm help you? How?
 - Do you know what triggers an incident of self-harm?
 - Does anyone know about your self-harm?
 - Do you get any help or support? If so, who from? When?
 - What is helpful or unhelpful when you want to self-harm?
 - If no
 - Have you seriously considered it? If yes
 - When?

- Where were you?
- How old were you?
- What was happening to make you feel so bad?
- Who or what stopped you from going through with it?

7. To compare the support needs of young offenders who self-injure or who have attempted suicide with the support needs of young offenders who have not

- Whilst here have you self-harmed or attempted suicide?
 - If yes
 - And they have self-harmed in the past / attempted suicide in the past – was it the same as before or different? – Same feelings? Same trigger? Same method?
 - And they have not self-harmed in the past / attempted suicide in the past – what led to it this time?
 - In both of the above also ask –
 - When?
 - Where?
 - Why? What triggered it? What led to these feelings?
 - How?
 - What were you feeling before, during and after?
 - Was it planned or impulsive?
 - Have you told anyone? Who? What did they do? What happened after you did it?
 - Were you offered any help or support? If so, what? Has it helped? How has it helped?
 - How did officers and fellow inmates react to you?
 - If you haven't told anyone, why not?
 - What helps to prevent you from self-harming?
 - Do you feel that self-harming is a problem? If so, why? Would you like help to reduce it? What would help?
 - After you get released do you think you will stop self-harming? Will you try and get help? Who / what support will you get?
 - If you have previously been in prison and self-harmed, what happened when you were released? Did you continue to self-harm or did you stop? Why?
- If no
 - Have you seriously considered it?
 - If yes
 - When?
 - What was happening to make you feel so bad?
 - Who or what stopped you from going through with it?
 - If no
 - What do you think about other inmates who self-harm or who attempt / commit suicide?
 - Have you been affected by other inmates who have self-harmed or who have attempted / committed suicide? How? Were you offered any support?

8. Ending questions

- Were there any parts of the experience that were good? How were they good?
- Was there anyone in particular who has helped you a lot? Who? How?
- Is there anything else you would like to ask or say?