

The Psycho-Social Environment (PSE) of Prisons and Its Relationship to Recidivism

Professor Kevin Howells
School of Psychology
University of South Australia

November 2000

The Psycho-Social Environment (PSE) of Prisons and Its Relationship to Recidivism

1) INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The interaction between rehabilitation program effectiveness and the PSE of prisons is quite remarkably under-investigated, given a) the long history of anecdotal and ethnographic observation as to the nature of prison culture and its possible deleterious effects b) the massive increase in the number of outcome studies relating to the effectiveness of rehabilitation programs. It has been estimated, for example, that more than 1500 outcome studies have been conducted internationally (Lipton et al, 1997; Howells, Day and Byrne, 2000). The effect of this latter research effort has been to refute the notion that “nothing works” in offender rehabilitation. The focus of contemporary rehabilitation research is increasingly on “What works best” and on the identification of principles underlying good rehabilitation practice (McGuire, 1995, 2000).

It is not uncommon for prison-based programs to be compared with community-based programs in terms of outcomes, with the general conclusion being that community-based programs are more effective. The reasons for this differential effectiveness, however, have rarely been discussed, let alone addressed empirically. The most common suggestion is that programs delivered in prison have low “ecological validity”, that is, the conditions of life in the community cannot be replicated in a prison setting. Learning of new skills in prison, therefore, may not generalize to the “real-world” setting. One response to this problem has been the suggestion that community follow up and community-based relapse prevention programs need to be added to prison programs. Virtually all Good Practice and Accreditation guidelines for offender rehabilitation internationally suggest the necessity to extend prison programs into the community in this way.

Professor Harding’s Review demonstrates lucidly how the prison environment is often unquestioningly taken as a given in such work. Some programs appear to have attempted to modify the prison environment to make it more “therapeutic” but there are no comparisons of the same program conducted in a standard versus a therapeutic regimen (Wexler et al, 1999). It is my belief, and experience, that those who deliver rehabilitation programs in prison settings readily confirm the many and serious ways in which program effectiveness can be impaired by some features of some prison cultures. Howells, Watt, Hall and Baldwin (1997) for example, in discussion of violence programs, point to the gap that commonly exists between the lessons learned by prisoners in anger-management groups (one of the most common programs in corrections) and the contradictory learning that may occur in day-to-day living in a prison setting. Unfortunately, such observations are largely anecdotal, with no attempts reported in the literature to formally document such problems by systematically surveying program deliverers. Some researchers have reported very positive results from within-prison programs, particularly for substance abuse programs, when therapeutic community elements are present (Peat and Winfree, 1992). The latter authors point to evidence to suggest:

“Prisonization and the traditional inmate subculture are antithetical to the goals of rehabilitation.....prisonization is the taking on....the folkways, mores, customs and general culture of the penitentiary..... the key is the normative component of the penitentiary culture, or the inmate code. Its message denigrates the very system of legitimate norms....that is at the heart of prison rehabilitation. Instead of participation in prison treatment...programs, it mandates avoidance.....staff are, in the main, seen as part of a social world in which convicts neither seek nor desire membership”” (pages 208-209)

2) HOW TO ASSESS THE PRISON PSYCHO-SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

Some of the major problems in the conceptualization and measurement of PSE (“prisonization”) and related variables were described in an early paper by Porporino and Zamble (1990):

- Use of different and unrelated indices of PSE
- Failure to establish the reliability and internal consistency of the measures used
- Exclusive use of self-report methodologies
- Paucity of longitudinal analysis

Porporino and Zamble’s own research has suggested that the coping behaviour of inmates and particularly their cognitive appraisals of the prison environment are crucial factors in trying to predict the effects of the prison environment. There has been little work examining the interplay between prison environment (as assessed by such scales) and rehabilitation outcomes. Moos (1975) showed that the social climate of prisons can vary greatly from one institution to another and Cooke (1992) reported that institutional climate has an impact on the behaviour of violent offenders.

Multidimensional approaches to assessing PSEs of prisons

Toch in 1977 identified eight environmental concerns of prison inmates: privacy, safety, structure, support, emotional feedback, social stimulation, activity and freedom. Wright (1985, 1993) devised a measure of prison climate –the Wright Prison Environment Inventory- based on Toch’s formulation and identified six of Toch’s factors in a factor analysis. Professor Harding has described a similar multidimensional approach by Logan (1992) in his review. One of the best known and best-validated approaches to the multidimensional assessment of social climates in institutions has been devised by Moos (1975). Moos’s techniques and measures have been applied in a range of medical, psychiatric and correctional settings (Moos, 1987) and have psychometric scales to assess facets of the PSE.

The prisoners’view of the prison environment

Attempts have been made to measure prisoner perceptions of the social (and physical) features of the prison environment. Such perceptions are addressed in social climate

methodologies (Moos, 1987), which comprise measures of perceptions of the environment by both staff and prisoners. Other studies have explicitly addressed prisoner perceptions. In a recent paper Ortmann (2000) has reported measuring aspects of perceptions of the social environment in prisoners and attempts to relate such perceptions to the outcomes (recidivism rates) of rehabilitation programs. One of Ortmann's research questions was very close to the current brief:

“Is the influence of incarceration as an unfavourable socialization process on future legal conduct lower, equally large or higher than the favourable influence of social-therapeutic programs administered in the course of imprisonment” (page 216)

It could be argued that the more important question, framed in terms of Analysis of Variance, is the **interaction** between prison factors and rehabilitation, rather than the main effects. In any event, Ortmann devised measures of “Prisonization”, including scales to assess variables such as “criminal orientation of friends within the institution”, “fear of fellow inmates” and “hostile reserve towards staff and institution”. However the derivation and construction of these scales is not described in sufficient detail to ascertain their utility in Australia. Measures of these constructs would need to be devised and validated

Prisoners' coping and reactions to the prison environment

There have been attempts to measure the emotional and behavioural impact of prison environments on prisoners. Paulus and Dzindolet (1993), for example, devised scales to measure the extent to which prisoners are concerned about a variety of social and environmental problems in the prison setting (including staff, inmates, loss of freedom, privacy, food etc). The same authors devised a Tolerance Scale to assess the extent to which inmates were able to tolerate common features of prison life. These scales had good alpha coefficient reliabilities. This study demonstrated that inmate negative reactions to the environment became worse over time. It has been suggested that failure to cope with prison is related to poor outcome in institutional treatment programs (Wooldredge, 1999).

Inmate subcultures and responsivity to programs (“prisonization”)

The importance of inmate subculture as a factor diminishing engagement in prison programs has been discussed above. There have been some attempts to formally measure this variable. Peat and Winfree (1992) devised Likert Scales and Semantic Differentials to assess adoption of inmate code, staff rejection (caseworkers, mental health and custodial). Principal component factor analyses were used and confirmed the intuitive description of the underlying factors.

Prison Officer roles and attitudes

An early study of prison officer roles by Williams (1983) attempted to define some dimensions of these roles. This study was conducted in the Western Australian correctional system and focused on 3 important attitudinal dimensions:

- Reliance on disciplinary authority
- Negative stereotyping of inmates
- Antagonism to non-custodial staff

Williams pointed to the neglect of such variables in research. This state of affairs does not seem to have changed substantially since 1983. Williams' analysis is from an organizational perspective and he hypothesises that such attitudes are strongly related to the primary task and role of prison officers: that of maintaining inmate custody. This attribution to role rather than "personality" is an important one in that it directs attention to the need to measure role definitions, as well as the attitudes that follow from them, in any study of prison culture. Williams makes a number of telling observations about prison officer roles

"The state confers on uniformed staff authority over prisoners and other measures are taken to protect them from inmate pressure by maintaining social distance between the two groups. The organizational structure of the typical prison is para-military, and the significance of this for prison officers is that it supports their attempts to control inmates' behaviour. The structure provides the legal authority that is necessary to carry out their duties and defines them as having superior status over the prisoners. However the authority of uniformed staff is subject to several limitations. Whilst they have legal authority, this is not absolute and its exercise is limited by legal constraints, outside pressures and the capability of inmates to resist. Moreover staff lack moral authority over prisoners, since the latter are unlikely to be committed to the organizational task of confining them in custody.....while the hierarchical organization of the prison provides prison officers with an important means of control over the prisoners, formal authority alone is not enough. In order to avoid serious friction and disturbance within the prison, uniformed staff also find it necessary to penetrate the inmate community by establishing informal relations with prisoners....this creates for them the problem of attempting to maintain control in an unstable situation and under continuous strain between reliance on legal authority and tendencies towards informal relations with the inmates. Prison officers must look to the official hierarchy for authority, support and protection in performing their tasks, but, to some extent, they must also work independently of that hierarchy".

In the past decade, the "tendency towards informal relations" has become more pronounced as a feature of the prison officer's role, though in a changed form. The role of the prison officer as a rehabilitative agent, as well as a custodian, is increasingly emphasized in many jurisdictions (Hall and Underwood, 1992). Prison officers now often have a formal role in facilitating rehabilitation programs and a responsibility to counsel and assist prisoners as part of "case management". Thus the relationship with the prisoner is increasingly emphasized as a formal responsibility. This does not contradict the important point that a strain may exist in maintaining custodial and these additional "human service" roles.

In terms of methodology, Williams used the following to measure prison officer attitudes and role definitions: structured interviews, a 150 item questionnaire, which was subjected to hierarchical linkage and path analysis. Interview and questionnaire scores were related through analysis of variance to differences between institutions and to the social backgrounds of officers. Although the content of Williams' questionnaires may now be dated and require revision, the broad approach to the definition and measurement of the variables, combining qualitative and quantitative methods, would still be valid as a methodology.

Lariviere and Robinson (1996) investigated the attitudes of correctional officers towards offenders in a Canadian setting. This work was based on the stated assumption that "when CO attitudes are positive and supportive of offender rehabilitation, the CO will be better equipped to promote favourable correctional outcomes among offenders" (page 1). The authors investigated three aspects of attitudes:

- Empathy towards inmates
- Punitiveness
- Support for rehabilitation

Questionnaire items were derived from the All Staff Survey. Amongst the many interesting findings in this survey was the finding that high empathy staff were more willing to engage in offender rehabilitation programs. Positive attitudes were also more common in more senior staff. Questionnaires of the sort used are simple and straightforward. With some additional psychometric validation they could be adapted for use in the study which is the focus for the present briefing.

The implication of the above for the present brief is that staff-prisoner relationships would need to be an essential feature of any evaluation of PSE. It also needs to be borne in mind that some of the methodologies for evaluating prison culture (for example, Logan, 1992, Moos, 1995, Wright, 1985) have been devised and validated in other cultures and/or in different eras. During the past decade important changes have occurred in prison cultures and staff roles, in part as a result of the renaissance of interest in rehabilitation programs. Thus there is a need to psychometrically re-validate any such measures in a contemporary Australian environment. This may need to be a precursor to any experimental study.

Staff-prisoner Relationships

Many commentators have highlighted the role of staff-prisoner relationships as an important factor in the effective management of correctional systems. Morgan (1994, page 224), for example, argues, in the context of discussing self-harm in prisons, that "the quality of life in prison depends largely on the nature of the relationships between prisoners and basic grade prison officers". Some have argued that the negative effects of imprisonment are so strong as to make effective rehabilitation impossible. Social environmental factors undoubtedly play an important role in shaping behaviour, and the

prison social environment is a central factor in ensuring that treatment gains are sustained and generalized. Inmates move from therapeutic groups in which self-disclosure and openness is encouraged to prison wings characterized by guardedness and suspicion. Patmore (1990) stresses the importance of prison officer commitment and involvement in the success of offender programs. Losel (1996) reports that evaluations of offender treatment have paid insufficient attention to staff relationship variables. For example, staff who explain crime in terms of socio-economic or situational factors are more likely to support rehabilitative approaches than individuals who blame the person for the crime (Hall and Underwood, 1992).

In their review of criminal conduct, Andrews and Bonta (1994) note that effective correctional supervision and counseling includes the following:

- Authority: “firm but fair”. Distinguishing between rules and requests, reinforcing compliance, not interpersonal abuse
- Anticriminal modeling and reinforcement: demonstrating and reinforcing vivid alternatives to procriminal patterns
- Concrete problem-solving
- Advocacy and brokerage
- Relationship factors: relating in open, enthusiastic, caring ways

There have been attempts to train correctional staff to increase their level of empathy and prosocial modeling, albeit with community corrections officers rather than with prison staff. Trotter (1996) for example used logistical regression methods to predict breaches and recidivism in community offenders from ratings of their supervisor’s style. Supervisor pro-social modelling and the use of problem-solving methods were all related to reductions in recidivism though a relationship for empathy was not found. Styles were rated from corrections case-notes. Such variations in officer style in a prison context are likely to be a product of both intra-individual factors (the personality and skills of the prison officer) and the culture and values and training provided by the institution itself. Studies such as this begin to define potential “non-specific” features of supervisory style which might need to be measured in a study of prison PSE and addressed in any attempt to experimentally change or manipulate prison PSE (see proposal below).

Methods for investigating staff-prisoner relationships and attitudes have already been described above. Multidimensional assessment systems include relationship variables (Logan, 1992; Moos, 1975; Toch, 1977; Wright, 1985). In addition the following are potential measurement approaches:

- Behavioural observation. Techniques developed in psychiatric and mental health settings could be applied to the prison context. Prison interactions between staff and prisoners could be sampled and then coded according to established behavioural categories. Methods of this sort would require that the reliability and validity of the particular observational and coding techniques be established.
- Verbal behaviour analysis. One obvious and well established methodology for assessing the quality of relationships is to investigate the way in which people interact verbally. Methods of discourse analysis have been developed in the social sciences, which allow conversations to be broken down into distinct verbal categories and reliably coded. Coding categories can include, for example, degree of dominance/submission, control attempts, expressions of support etc.

A range of other methodologies has been used to study staff-inmate relationships, with different foci of interest. Ben-David (1992), for example, distinguishes the dimensions of

Staff perceptions of inmates
Orientation of the relationship
Relation model and
Social distance

In her own study Ben David used a combination of participant observation over 18 months and constructed inmate and staff questionnaires. From this data, Ben-David attempted to define five prototypes of staff-inmate relationships (Punitive, Custodial, Patronage, Therapeutic, and Integrative).

Professor Harding has already described Liebling's work in detail in the Review. I concur with his assessment of the value of this approach and with his suggestion that such methods might be included with quantitative assessments.

Conclusions re measurement of prison PSE

- PSE is a poorly defined and multi-dimensional construct
- It includes, but is not exhausted by concepts of prisonization, inmate subculture, staff perceptions of and attitudes towards inmates, staff-prisoner relationships, inmate perceptions of and attitudes towards staff, broader inmate perceptions of the prison environment, organizational definitions of values and roles etc, as discussed above
- The assessment of such variables may be either multi-dimensional (Logan, Moos, Toch, Wright) or unidimensional
- Quantitative methods do exist for multi-dimensional assessment, but they would need to be revised and re-validated for the current Australian context

- A series of uni-dimensional measures exists for specific variables (staff empathy etc). Many are measures made up by authors for specific studies but could be adapted and developed for a future Australian study.
- The social climate of prisons is a crucial factor, a major contributor to which is the quality of staff-prisoner relationships.
- The proposed project should focus on the measurement of staff-prisoner relationships and their contribution to the social climate of prisons
- The research project should include a first phase in which the focus is the development of comprehensive measures of social climate and relationships. This work should not “re-invent the wheel” and should build on the previous social climate methodologies described above.

3) RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The critical research questions that need to be answered include:

- How can existing measures of social environment and staff-prisoner relationships in prison be adapted and refined for use in an Australian setting?
- Is rehabilitation more effective when conducted in positive social environments in prison settings?
- Can prison social environments be improved through an intervention?

4) WHAT RESEARCH METHODOLOGY?

If the objective of CRC is to establish whether the PSE of prisons has an impact on the effectiveness of rehabilitation programs offered in prisons, two potential research designs would need to be considered:

1. A quasi-experimental design

In this design a standard rehabilitation program (for a discussion of which program – see below).would be delivered in two separate prison environments. The two environments would differ in terms of their measured PSE. Thus the implementation of the program would need to be preceded by the development of a PSE measure(s) and by a decision as to what might constitute a rehabilitation-congruent versus rehabilitation-non-congruent environment. Pre- and post-measures would be administered in relation to measures of the effectiveness of the selected program. Ideally, in the longer term, recidivism measures would be compared for individual offenders for the two PSE conditions.

This design has a number of weaknesses, one being the possible confounding of prison environment with the previous characteristics of the prisoners. It might be, for example, that offenders with particular characteristics are differentially allocated to particular prison environments (for example, difficult prisoners are

sent to “tougher” environments). A second problem is that it might prove difficult to find two sufficiently different PSE conditions within the same prison.

2. An experimental design

In this design a standard rehabilitation program would be delivered in two separate prison environments. The two environments would be selected on the basis of both achieving a low score on the PSE measure. A “culture-intervention” program would then be implemented in one environment to make it more rehabilitation congruent. A manipulation check (repeat testing on the PSE measure) would be required to ascertain that culture change had actually occurred. As in design 1, pre- and post-measures relating to the rehabilitation program would be administered. Thus this second design would answer the question of whether the PSE can be changed and whether this change made the rehabilitation intervention more effective.

The Independent Variable in the above study would be the implementation of a culture change program within an institution or a discrete part of it. The content of the manipulation of the independent variable (the culture change mechanism) would be determined by the initial analysis of the PSE in the unit involved. For example, the culture change might involve:

- Increasing informal interaction between prisoners and custodians
- Addressing perceived obstacles to help-seeking etc
- Addressing perceptions of role and priorities in staff group through structured training.
- Provision of increased social support

The Dependent Variables would be the extent of changes produced by the rehabilitation intervention:

- Take up of treatment opportunities
- Completion of treatment
- Clinical changes
- Consumer evaluation of extent of change, of program etc.
- Disciplinary reports, incidents etc., breaches of protocol.
- Positive engagement between the agency and client
- Reduced antagonistic interactions with staff and other prisoners.

Other experimental designs are clearly possible and it would be appropriate to request those tendering for the project to suggest and justify a design they thought appropriate.

5) WHAT REHABILITATION INTERVENTION AND IN WHAT PRISON SETTING?

To be useful this project would need to investigate a rehabilitation program that is widely used in the correctional environment, plausible and with a research and theoretical base, readily implemented in a standard way, relatively brief and easily delivered and for which reliable and valid measures of change are available. The following programs are amongst the most commonly delivered in correctional services internationally and in Australia:

- Anger management/violence prevention
- Sex offender treatment
- Substance abuse programs
- Cognitive Skills programs

For pilot work, sex offender programs probably ought to be excluded because they are intensive (often requiring 6 months to one year of intervention). In addition, the specific content of sex offender programs varies somewhat across the states and the behavioural impact of the programs is difficult to assess in a prison setting, where there is no access to the relevant victim group. Cognitive Skills is delivered in only one or two states. Substance abuse programs also vary in content across states and have the same problem of behavioural measurement being impossible in a prison setting. Of the four programs, Anger management would seem to be the most appropriate for a pilot study. It is delivered to large numbers of prisoners in most states, often from a Manual, which is standard in content. The programs are relatively brief (20 to 30 hours) and a wide range of reliable pre-post measures have already been developed, including the STAXI, the Novaco Anger Scales and other measures. In addition, behavioural outcomes are measurable in the prison setting (aggressive incidents and disciplinary reports). Whatever the program chosen for the proposed study, the successful tenderer would need to include standardised measures before and after the program, in multiple modalities, and with a check on program integrity. Impact on recidivism will only be possible to ascertain if a longer-term study is anticipated.

Anger management, substance abuse and cognitive skills programs are offered to general offenders rather than to specific offender types. I would recommend that a pilot study investigate a program such as anger management with generalist, adult offender inmates in one state. Subsequent work could then seek to determine the generalisability of results to other program types, to other offender groups and to other states. Our own research group's review of programs for female offenders and for Indigenous offenders has indicated that standard and widely available programs for these groups are rare. Thus these groups might be addressed in later work rather than at the pilot stage.

A number of previous studies have already investigated prison versus community comparisons, therefore it would not be appropriate to make this comparison the independent variable in the proposed study. A study focussing on variations within the prison setting would be more useful.

6) HOW SHOULD PROGRAM OUTCOMES BE EVALUATED?

Quantitative program outcome measures have already been suggested above. These would constitute “clinical” outcomes and would need to be supplemented by recidivism measures in the long term. The addition of qualitative measures would also be useful. These might take the form, for example, of structured interviews with the experimental and control participants in which they were asked to identify features of the psycho-social environment they believe facilitated or impeded their deriving benefit from the rehabilitation program. For this aspect, participants might be regarded as “consumers” whose views are required.

Bibliography

- Andrews, D. and Bonta, J. (1994) *The psychology of criminal conduct*. Cincinnati: Anderson.
- Ben-David, S. (1992) Staff to inmate relations in a total institution: A model of five modes of association. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 36, 209-219.
- Cooke, D.J. (1992) Violence in prisons: A Scottish perspective. *Forum on Correctional Research*, 4, 23-30.
- Hall, G. and Underwood, R. (1992) Prison officer training and education. In D. Bull (ed) *Proceedings of the 1991 Conference of the Australasian Association of Criminal Justice Educators*. Mitchell: Centre for Social Justice Studies, Charles Sturt University.
- Howells, K., Watt, B., Hall, G. and Baldwin, S. (1997) Developing programs for violent offenders. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 2, 117-128.
- Howells, K., Day, D. and Byrne, M. (2000) Best practice in the rehabilitation of offenders. *Report to ACT Department of Correctional Services*. Adelaide: University of South Australia.
- Kolstad, A. (1996) Imprisonment as rehabilitation: Offenders’ assessment of why it does not work. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 24, 323-325.
- Lariviere, M. and Robinson, D. (1996) Attitudes of federal correctional officers towards offenders. *Canadian Correctional Service Research Report*.
- Liebling, A. and Price, D. (1999) An exploration of staff-prisoner relationships at HMP Whitemoor. *Prison Service Research Report 6*. London: Home Office.
- Liebling, A., Price, D. and Elliott, C. (1999) Appreciative enquiry and relationships in prison. *Punishment and Society*, 1, 71-98.
- Lipton, D.S., Pearson, F.S., Cleland, C. and Yee, D. (1997) Synthesizing correctional treatment outcomes: Preliminary CDAT findings. *Presentation to the 5th Annual National Institute of Justice Conference on Research and Evaluation in Criminal Justice*. Washington DC.
- Logan, C. (1992) Well kept: comparing quality of confinement in private and public prisons. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 83, 577-613.
- Losel, F. (1996) The efficacy of correctional treatment: a review and synthesis of meta-evaluations. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 22, 91-105.

- McGuire, J. (1995). *What works: Reducing reoffending: Guidelines from research and practice*. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons.
- McGuire, J. (2000) Reducing re-offending: Putting research into practice. Presentation to a meeting of the Forensic College of the Australian Psychological Society, Adelaide, August.
- Moos, R. (1975) *Evaluating correctional and community settings*. New York: Wiley.
- Moos, R. (1987) *The social climate scales: A user's guide*. Palo Alto Cal.: Psychologists' Press.
- Morgan, R. (1994) Minimising the risk of suicide in custody. In A.Liebling and T.Ward (eds) *Deaths in custody: International perspectives*. London: Institute for the Study and Treatment of Delinquency.
- Ortmann, R. (2000) The effectiveness of social therapy in prison – A randomized experiment. *Crime and Delinquency*, 46, 214-232.
- Patmore, P.R. (1990) Unit programming: a positive approach: The Tasmanian Experience. In *Conference of Commonwealth Correctional Administrators*. London: Legal Division, Commonwealth Secretariat.
- Paulus, P.B. and Dzindolet, M.T. (1993) Reactions of male and female inmates to prison confinement: Further evidence for a two-component model. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 20, 149-166.
- Peat, B.J. and Winfree, L.T. (1992) Reducing the intra-institutional effects of "prisonisation": a study of a therapeutic community for drug-using inmates. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 19, 206-225.
- Porporino, F.J. and Zamble, E. (1990) Coping with imprisonment. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 26, 403-421.
- Toch, H. (1977) *Living in prisons: The ecology of survival*. New York: MacMillan.
- Trotter, C. (1996) The impact of different supervision practices in community corrections: Cause for optimism. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 29, 29-47.
- Wexler, H.K., De Leon, G., Thomas, G., Kessel, D. and Peters, J. (1999) The Amity Prison TC evaluation. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 26, 147-167.
- Williams, T.A. (1983) Custody and conflict: An organisational study of prison officers' roles and attitudes. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 16, 44-55.
- Wooldredge, J.D. (1999) Inmate experiences and psychological wellbeing. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 26, 235-250.
- Wright, K.N. (1985) Developing the prison environment inventory. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 22, 257-277.

Kevin Howells

Forensic and Applied Psychology Research Group
University of South Australia