2011

Political Discourses of Idealised Masculinity: The Risk Management of Male Prisoners through Work, Education and Family Transitions

McFarlane, Helen

http://hdl.handle.net/10026.1/554

POLITICAL DISCOURSES OF IDEALISED MASCULINITY: THE RISK MANAGEMENT OF MALE PRISONERS THROUGH WORK, EDUCATION AND FAMILY TRANSITIONS

MCFARLANE H.L.

Ph.D.   2011

POLITICAL DISCOURSES OF IDEALISED MASCULINITY: THE RISK

MANAGEMENT OF MALE PRISONERS THROUGH WORK, EDUCATION

AND FAMILY TRANSITIONS

By

HELEN LOUISE MCFARLANE

A thesis submitted to the University of Plymouth

in partial fulfilment for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

School of Law and Social Science

April 2011

Helen Louise McFarlane

Political Discourses of Idealised Masculinity: The Risk Management of Male Prisoners through Work, Education and Family Transitions

This thesis focuses upon the new rehabilitation of male prisoners within the context of idealised masculinity. Through the discourse analysis of written policy documents, this work addresses two fundamental questions: How is idealised masculinity constituted within political discourse and how does idealised masculinity influence the formulation of prison rehabilitation programmes? Idealised masculinity is defined as the heterosexual breadwinning role attributed to men as workers and providers for the family. It is this that is articulated within political discourses as a technique of government by which to reduce re-offending amongst the male prisoner population. Within the Foucauldian analysis of governmentality and Neo-Marxist theorising around Post-Fordism, idealised masculinity represent a form of governance that the state employs to inform its programme of managing the risks posed by offenders. This is evident through two particular pathways to reduce re-offending. Namely Pathway Two Education, Training and Employment and Pathway Six Children and Families.

The argument presented is that current forms of punishment and imprisonment are characterised and defined within gender specific practices underpinned by the constitution of masculinity. The purpose of which is to reconstruct male prisoner's attitudes and behaviour from that of deviant to non-deviant behaviour, from anti-social to pro-social values and through their moral and responsible reconstruction towards active, self-governing subjects. Thus the importance of maintaining family ties and the re-skilling and training of male prisoners to be able to compete within the labour market and obtain legitimate employment underpins political discourses surrounding penal concerns of the new rehabilitation. However governing at a distance and the state being unable or unwilling to place the children and family of offender's on a formal footing and to effectively intervene to stimulate job creation activities within the labour market could mean that male prisoners are merely set up to fail.

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CBT	Cognitive Behavioural Treatment/Therapy
CCTV	Closed Circuit Television
DA	Discourse Analysis
DFES	Department of Education and Skills
DIUS	Department for Innovation, Universities and Schools
DWP	Department for Work and Pensions
ETE	Employment, Training and Education
HMIPP	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prison and Probation
HMP	Her Majesty's Prison
ILP	Individual Learning Plans
IMB	Independent Monitoring Board
LSC	Learning and Skills Council
NAO	National Audit Office
NOMS	National Offender Management Service
OLASS	Offender's Learning and Skills Service
OLJ	Offender's Learning Journey
OLSU	Offender's Learning and Skills Unit
ONS	Office for National Statistics
PACT	Prison Advice and Care Trust
R&R	Reasoning and Rehabilitation
SEU	Social Exclusion Unit
TUC	Trade Union Congress

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

AUTHOR'S DECLARATION

At no time during the registration for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy has the author been registered for any other University award without prior agreement of the Graduate Committee.

Relevant criminological seminars and conferences were attended at which work was presented and papers prepared for publication.

Publications (or presentation of other forms of creative and performing work):

Risk Management; Lecture; 2005

Prison Governance; Paper; Crime and Deviance Meeting; 2005

Prison Governance and Male Prisoner Identity: The Penal Constitution of Masculinity; Paper; British Society of Criminology Conference; University of Leeds; 2005

Imprisonment 2007; Lecture; 2007

Hegemonic Masculinity; Article submission to Criminology and Criminal Justice; 2007

The Penal Constitution of Masculinity: A Process of Prisoner Rehabilitation; Poster; Criminology and Criminal Justice Research and Teaching Symposium; University of Plymouth; 2007

Presentation and Conferences attended:

Power to Punish 20 Years On; University of Edinburgh; 2003

British Society of Criminology Conference; University of Portsmouth; 2004

Post Graduate Conference; University of Leeds; 2004

British Society of Criminology Conference; University of Leeds; 2005

x

British Society of Criminology Conference; Strathclyde University; 2006

Kings College Criminology Conference; Kings College London; 2007

Criminology and Criminal Justice Research and Teaching Symposium; University of Plymouth; 2007

Word count of main body of thesis: 75, 475

Signed... *H.L. McFarlane*

Date... 24\8\2011

CHAPTER ONE

1 Introduction: Political Discourses of Idealised Masculinity: The Risk Management of Male Prisoners through Work, Education and Family Transitions

"The most meaningful stake anyone can have in society is the ability to earn a living and support a family."
                    (Blair quoted by Levitas, 2005: 115)

This thesis provides an interpretive and analytical account of written policy documents and aims to examine how and for what purposes idealised masculinity informs prison rehabilitation programmes for male prisoners and how policy intends to shape the identity of prisoners as men. I argue that idealised masculinity is utilised as a governmental tool by which to shape (both to moralise and responsibilise) male identities and thus is conceived of as form of governance in the risk management of male prisoners and offenders. This thesis will interpret and analyse this perspective by undertaking a discourse analysis of written policy documents in order to ascertain how policy makers perceive idealised masculinity as being and how they employ this concept in the formulation of prison rehabilitation programmes to rehabilitate male offenders.

The key themes that emerge from this are the need for men to take on the mantle of the breadwinning role and through legitimate paid employment provide economically for their families. It is a process that is driven by the individual with assistance from the state and provides men with a purpose in life to transform their marginalised and socially excluded status as offenders into idealised and thus socially included members of society. Thus the maintenance of family ties, improving one's education and work opportunities underpin much of the policy debates that surround the reductions in re-offending amongst the

1

male prisoner population. However whilst the intent of policy makers is credible the outcomes of the policies are negligible. Far from helping male prisoners to maintain links with their families and increase their skills base in order to obtain work and thus enjoy the benefits of the socially included. A lack of support, commitment and opportunities from those in authority in facilitating these outcomes merely result in male prisoners becoming more removed and excluded from both their families and the labour market.

The overall themes discussed in this body of work relate to the changing face of governance within contemporary society. It is this that has brought forth the preoccupation with risk management techniques and the promotion of moral and responsible individuals. In terms of penality the state simply facilitates the process of rehabilitation but the onus is upon the individual to manage his own risk of re-offending. The changes in governmental activity in relation not only to governing in general but also towards those of governing penality are related to Neo-Marxist debates around Post-Fordism and Foucault's concept of governmentality.

Neo-Marxian debates of Post-Fordism place risk management at the heart of governance. The regulation of society is no longer the domain of the state but is something that is placed within the market and exercised through the freedom of individuals. It encompasses a marketisation of welfare (Rodger: 2000) and represents the onset of new accumulation regimes and new modes of regulation (Jessop: 1994). However it is not solely a state activity but one that is to be undertaken by individuals, public, private, voluntary, governmental and state bodies in the management of everyday risks (Taylor: 1999) incorporating

the provision of health, wealth, security and wellbeing of individuals, communities and the population in general. The responsibilisation of offenders occurs also at the individual level. It is individual offenders who undertake the mantle of becoming their own risk managers and become responsible for their reintegration back into society. Foucauldian analyses of governmentality share similar sentiments.

Foucault (1991) positions governmentality as a descriptive account of how the state governs and he argues that this occurs through knowledge of the population that can be translated into mechanisms that shape, monitor and control citizens. Governance in this instance occurs at a distance, within the realms of the market and within the management of risk. The state functions as a regulator and exhibits disciplinary mechanism that determine how citizens should behave within society and constructing techniques of power in which this is understood as the norm. Governance therefore aims to govern at a distance by confronting itself with the realities of market, civil society and citizens which are thought to possess their own internalised forms of logic and densities coupled with their own mechanisms for self regulation (Rose: 1993). Penality echoes these thoughts and becomes concerned with managing the risk of individuals through a moral and responsible re-construction of an offender's behaviour towards prescribed norms.

This in itself I relate to the concept of idealised masculinity. It is idealised masculinity that becomes a technique of government to shape and manage the risk posed by offenders. In doing so I argue that policy makers have created a particular type of citizen that befits the aims of government and it is this that

3

influences policy decisions and the formulation of rehabilitation programmes. Male prisoners are governed through their masculine identity and it is through their masculine identity that male prisoners become their own risk managers.

Although this thesis is based upon a particular concept of masculinity, I wish to state that masculinity itself is not a fixed and static entity. Rather masculinity is fluid and, as argued by Hearn (1998), is continually changing and can be determined by age, race, class, ethnicity, disability and sexuality whilst the social practices that men undertake in their everyday lives can construct differing masculinities in relation to their role as fathers, sons, workers, husbands, partners and lovers. Therefore masculinity itself should be thought of in terms of masculinities exemplifying the plurality of the concept. However, I am taking a particular aspect of masculinity as the foundations of my analytical framework and thus will focus more specifically upon idealised masculinity.

Idealised masculinity is a concept that I derived from the debates surrounding hegemonic masculinity. Hegemonic masculinity is considered as the dominant male identity referring to normative expressions of heterosexuality and the socialisation of men into the breadwinning role (Talbot: 1998; Walklate: 2005; Wharton: 2005). It is also considered as being dominant as it derives legitimacy and support from the church and the state as well as being culturally defined and sustained by these institutions (Talbot: 1998; Connell: 2000). However hegemonic masculinity is an idealistic notion of what constitutes male identities. Whilst hegemonic masculinity is perceived as superior and dominates constructions of masculinity, not all men identify with and thus correspond to the cultural ideals that embody hegemonic masculinity (MacKinnon: 2003).

4

Consequently I have utilised the concept of idealised masculinity throughout the thesis to demonstrate that, rather than hegemonic masculinity being the cultural norm for male identities, it is a concept to which men should aspire. It is idealised rather than a reality.

The following narrative will discuss these concepts in more detail and provide an overview of the content of the chapters contained within this thesis.

Chapter Two, The New Penality and the Management of Risk: A Neo-Marxist and Foucauldian Analysis, discusses what is meant by the new penality and risk management and how this relates to forms of governance. The new penality has brought forth new rehabilitative methods and indicates that the state is no longer solely responsible for remedying the risks of offending. Rather the state becomes an enabler and facilitator in encouraging the moral and responsible reconstruction of offenders. In this instance offenders are portrayed as exhibiting poor decision making skills and lack the ability to behave in a moral and responsible manner in which their moral compass and self-steering mechanisms is thought to have failed (Kemshall: 2002). In reiterating the ideals of Feeley and Simon's (1992) New Penology, the overall aim of governing offenders is simply to manage their offending behaviour as categorised by the levels of risk they pose to the public. These risk categories imply that offenders can either be incapacitated or they can be helped to reintegrate back into the community (Rose: 2000). In doing so the new rehabilitation is underpinned by a strategy of responsibilisation and a moralisation of the individual through a variety of programmes that include work to address cognitive skills deficits, substance abuse, living skills, other abuse and trauma and employment and

education programmes (Hannah-Moffat: 2005). These contemporary trends within the new penality are associated with changes in contemporary governance as exemplified through Neo-Marxist and Foucauldian thought.

Neo-Marxist arguments situate contemporary governance structures within the transition from a Fordist to a Post-Fordist economy and the theoretical concept of Gramsci's ideological hegemony. Gramsci (1971) argued that social control was directed by and through civil society and that the state acted to shape the interests and needs of subordinate groups in alignment with those of the more dominant groups. This, to some extent, mirror's the ideals of the Fordist economy. Here both the economy and society became the site of governance for the state as it undertook a primary role in shaping and manipulating markets for the benefit of capital (Tickell and Peck: 1995). However Fordism was found to be unsustainable and it became increasingly evident that the state could not effectively manage and control the economy and society alone (Jessop: 2000; Rodger: 2000). The transition to a Post-Fordist economy sought to reverse the problems engendered by Fordism and placed a greater reliance upon market mechanisms and the private enterprise of individuals to manage their own welfare heralding a decentralisation of state activity (Taylor: 1999; Stenson: 2002). In opening up welfare to market mechanisms an increase in consumer choice heralded the development of risk management techniques. This is a concept much associated with Foucauldian analyses of state government and social control.

The Foucauldian concept of governmentality provides the framework upon which state governance can be understood. In this instance the state aims to

govern through the regulated choices of individuals as society itself becomes the instrument within which to govern. Underpinned by the concept of risk, the economy, society and the family are rendered and articulated into particular forms that allow for state intervention and regulation to shape these into entities that benefit the overall objectives of the state (Miller and Rose: 1993). In relation to penality the aim is to moralise and responsibilise offenders and encourage their active participation in their own government. All of which is made possible on the understanding that there are patterns of behaviour that exist within society and once these become known and objects of knowledge, they can be translated into the techniques of surveillance, management and control (Foucault: 1991). This is related not only to the individual but, in utilising Foucauldian analyses of economic rationality, the same can be applied to government institutions held accountable through managerial techniques. In this instance the development of the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) where risk management is the central focus of activity.

For both Foucault and Neo-Marxism, the aim of government is one that aims to shape and control citizens into a particular mode of action and behaviour and create a particular type of citizen for a particular society and social order. It is these ideals that also echo within the new rehabilitation of the new penality.

Chapter Three, Idealised and Marginalised Masculinity: The Social Construction of Masculine Identity, discusses masculinity as the constitutive force in the social identity of men. It takes a sociological perspective in relation to the concept of social identity and how, for men, this is constructed around notions of masculinity. Thus masculinity is discussed within a broad perspective and

7

argues that masculinity is acted out in a variety of different circumstances and settings. MacKinnon (2003) suggests that the ability of men to achieve masculinity is often through it being distanced from anything that is perceived as being feminine. It follows narrowly prescribed norms of white heterosexual masculinity that promotes the traditional values of white superiority and represses those values that seek to threaten it (Rutherford: 1988). This is demonstrated with comparative examples taken from male sexist and homophobic discourse and the concepts underpinning gay and black masculinities. Overall however, the main tenets of the chapter are centred upon idealised masculinity and how it is utilised as a risk management technique of government to reduce the re-offending of male prisoners. Here, masculinity is considered as a consequence of both social inclusion and exclusion.

Idealised masculinity represents the socially inclusive man within society and one that is both a family man and a provider for the family. Marginalised masculinity represents the socially excluded man whose inability to provide for one's family can result in his marginalised status as benefit dependent and/or as an offender. Idealised man is rich in social capital whilst marginalised man is poor in social capital (Scourfield and Drakeford: 2002). In relating this to criminology, the concept of masculinity is utilised as a tool by which to explain criminal behaviour and that masculinity is achieved through criminality. As noted by Braithwaite and Daly (1994) violence is gendered and is considered as a problem and consequence of masculinity. It typifies a masculine order that legitimates male on male violence and male on female violence (Hall: 2002). It is here that marginalised man informs most criminological thought. However I

argue that masculinity can also be achieved through rehabilitation and, as a consequence, penality is therefore a gendered practice.

Thus the aim of the new rehabilitation is to remedy the problem of marginalised man and turn this failed masculinity into the more successful idealised man. Through the provision of prison rehabilitation programmes that promote the work ethic, the development of pro-social attitudes, education and employability skills, male prisoners are armed with the means by which to obtain legitimate employment upon their release from prison (Blunkett: 2004). It is idealised man that becomes the object of policy makers in formulating policy and the objective to be achieved in policy outcomes.

Chapter Four, Analysing Documents and Texts: Research Design and Discourse Methodology, outlines the methods I employed in order to conduct my research. The chapter details what is meant by Discourse Analysis (DA) and highlights a number of themes associated with the method. Here discourse is defined as the use of language in either speech or writing (Fairclough and Wodak: 1997) and DA is explained as a method by which to explore the connections between language, communication, knowledge and social practices (Muncie: 2006). The narrative on DA focuses upon how language socially constructs and represents reality concerning the social world with discourse as a tool that represents aspects of the social world in which social identities are framed and given meaning (Tonkiss: 1998; Fairclough: 2003). Therefore in analysing discourse it is possible to ascertain how language is utilised as a tool to depict differing pictures of social reality that are produced and reproduced for specific purposes.

Within my research, DA itself is applied to written policy documents and therefore a documentary analysis also forms part of the research methodology. Here documentary analysis treats documents as constitutive accounts of social life in the sense that they are produced, shared and used in socially organised ways and serve to construct particular representations with their own, unique conventions (Atkinson and Coffey: 1997). The documents themselves are considered as valuable written secondary sources of data that have been produced by someone other than the researcher. But they can be classified as primary rather than secondary sources of data if they are written by people involved at a time contemporary with the research (Finnegan: 1996). I am treating the documents as primary sources of data as my timeframe for analysis are the New Labour Years 1997-2007.

The chapter further explains the sampling method (purposive and simple random sampling) that I used to choose my prison population, the importance of interpreting and analysing policy and the importance of analysing idealised masculinity.

Chapter Five, Penal Workfarism and Familial Responsibility: Idealised Families, Fatherhood and Employment, discusses the maintenance and provision of family ties for prisoners. It argues that it is through the family that men are equipped with a role and purpose in life and it is through these family ties that men are encouraged and supported to seek educational opportunities and upskill ready for the labour market upon their release from prison. The chapter discusses the differing family forms that comprise contemporary society but that policy and political actors often promote traditional white middle class family

values. Therefore families undertake what I have termed as idealised and marginalised forms. It is idealised families that represent the traditional notion of a settled, harmonious unit that instils the correct social values into its children (Blagg and Smith: 1989). However many offenders do not originate from this cosy family unit. Their family life is often fragmented and characterised by disruptive families, family breakdown, parental conflict and criminogenic families (Farrington: 2002; Haas et al: 2004). All of which encapsulate marginalised families. Yet, it is the family that is portrayed in written policy documents as providing salvation from crime and reductions in offending (Home Office: 2004b). These two examples demonstrate how political discourses link the family and crime. On the one hand crime is a product of the disruptive and criminogenic family but, on the other hand, the harmonious family is viewed as being the remedy for criminality.

Therefore the new rehabilitation within the prison environment endorses the maintenance of family ties between imprisoned men and their families as it contributes to the construction of idealised man and has a role in reducing re-offending. Men participating within and having a role within the family are perceived as providing the impetus by which they can be reintegrated and resettled back into society and lead a more useful and law abiding life (Jarvis et al: 2004; Boswell et al: 2004; Safe Ground: 2005). The provision of parenting classes, projects managed by Safe Ground and Storybook Dads, visitors centres, letters and telephone calls all contribute to this process. However the benefits written in policy on the prospect of male prisoners successfully maintaining family ties is somewhat negated in policy outcomes.

11

Overall, no one in a position of authority has the responsibility for ensuring that links are maintained between prisoners and their families (SEU: 2002). As one of seven pathways to reduce re-offending, the provision of support and services to families is inadequate (Hudson: 2007; Salmon: 2007). The quality of the provision of visitors centres and the fall in number of visits, the distance from home where prisoners are incapacitated and the costs of maintaining communication between prisoners and their families (Loucks: 2002;IMB: 2004; Action for Prisoner's Families: 2007c; Mills and Codd: 2008) can make maintaining links with the family almost impossible. Taken collectively all of this suggests that whilst official guidance is serious in its quest to maintain family ties to reduce re-offending, the mechanisms by which they seek to do so are woefully inadequate.

Chapter Six, Penal Workfarism and Employability: Idealised Man as Idealised Employee through Education, Training and Skills, follows on from Chapter Five and develops idealised man within education and work. The upskilling of the male prisoner population to make them work ready upon their release is situated within the overall skills deficits of the prison population, the skills deficits of the population in general and the changing place of work for men in the 21st century. This chapter therefore discusses the education and work based learning provision for male prisoners as offered by the Prison Service. The work of the Offenders Learning and Skill's Service (OLASS), the provision of New Deal schemes, prison education (ICT; NVQ; e.t.c), work in prison industries and work through partnership with third party businesses serve to underpin the development of employability skills to enable prisoners to be job ready. It indicates the extent to which idealised masculinity informs penal policy

discourses as the government's overall policy objective is to support offenders into sustainable employment (NOMS: 2006a).

However, again there is a disjunction between intended policy objectives and policy outcomes. In this respect it is negligible the extent to which male prisoners can obtain sustainable legitimate employment. The availability of jobs, the availability and quality of education, the disclosure of a criminal record, exclusion from job opportunities, employer resistance to employing ex-prisoners and the negative attitudes of employers (Turok and Webster: 1998; Peck and Theodore: 2000; Stationary Office: 2005; Nottinghamshire Research Observatory: 2005; Irwin: 2008). Taken collectively this would suggest that whilst official guidance takes the upskilling and education of the male prisoner population seriously, a failure to tackle to barriers that ex-prisoners face in obtaining employment upon their release from prison indicates that prisoners will be set up to fail.

Chapter Seven, And Finally, draws together and summarises the main points as discussed in this thesis and outlined in this chapter. It also comments on the benefits of analysing policy documents arguing that evaluating the outcomes of policy highlights gaps in provision that can be addressed through further amendments of existing policy or the formulation of new policy directives. This chapter also focuses upon how the research can be taken forward in three particular ways. Firstly there could be an analysis of all seven pathways that aim to reduce re-offending focussing upon the interrelationship between them, secondly policy could be analysed using the full remit of the policy cycle and finally policy could be analysed in terms of its impact upon male prisoners.

However the overall final comments of this thesis are that whilst the quest to improve family ties and the skills deficits of prisoners is to be applauded, it will be of little significance or benefit if such programmes are not taken seriously or the multiple barriers that ex-offenders face in terms of obtaining employment are not adequately addressed by policy makers and given statutory recognition through legislation. Yet state intervention within the realms of the family and, in particular, employment opportunities are limited due to the nature of governance in the transition from a Fordist to a Post-Fordist economy. The onus upon market mechanisms and the private enterprise of individuals stresses that individuals are to be their own risk managers against the hazards faced within society and that government can only enable or facilitate participation within the market economy rather than intervene within this process. Ultimately for men who can actively participate in the market economy their identity within the context of idealised masculinity is confirmed and they are able to become part of the socially inclusive society. However for men who cannot their identity within marginalised masculinity continues and they find themselves residing within the socially excluded prison population.

CHAPTER TWO

The New Penality and the Management of Risk: A Neo-Marxist and Foucauldian Analysis

1 Introduction

The concept of the new penality and the contemporary management of imprisonment demonstrate how penal concerns and rehabilitation and/or punishment of offenders have adapted to the changing landscape of state governance and social control mechanisms. Under Advanced Liberal rule and the regulation and accumulation regimes associated with Post Fordism, the new penality argues for a new rehabilitation to occur through the responsibilisation of offenders as individual risk managers and thus responsible for the reintegration of their being back into society. Family relationships, work, education, accommodation and financial concerns are defined as risk factors that contribute to an individual's offending behaviour and subsequently they become risk factors that need to be managed in order to minimise their harm to the wider society. In this instance the state assumes the role of an enabler and facilitator within this process of rehabilitation and prisons, whilst representing institutions of and for punishment, become the institutions within which offenders can become responsibilised risk managers.

This new rehabilitation of offenders through their moral reconstruction ensures offenders change through their own volition with the state taking a secondary role in facilitating this process. It does not assume total responsibility for rehabilitation or indeed for reducing crime. The aim is solely to provide the mechanisms by which individuals are able to help themselves and utilise the tools provided by the state in managing and modifying their behaviour to within

those of morally acceptable and responsible codes of conduct. Thus it is these key factors that underpin the development of the new penality and the new rehabilitation that can be considered as closely resembling the changing contours of state governance and social control. This is demonstrated via the analytical thoughts of Neo-Marxism's Post-Fordism and Foucault's governmentality.

Within Neo-Marxian analyses, the transition from a Fordist to a Post Fordist economy heralds a differing form of state governance that removes the state from sole responsibility for the provision of welfare services. Fordism embodies the era of state collectivist welfare provision and advocates that the state is capable of intervening within the fabric of economic and social life to the benefit of capital and its citizens. The state undertook the task of managing and regulating economic initiatives whilst providing for the welfare necessities required by its citizens (i.e. employment, health care, education, crime control e.t.c.). However the decline in the Fordist ideal coupled with a crisis in the economy brought forth new means of economic and social management. Via the development of Post-Fordism the regulation of society (both in social and economic terms) became removed from the state and placed within the mechanisms of the market and the freedom of individuals to conduct their own provision of welfare needs. The reliance upon collective state interventionism was replaced by a mode of regulation that opened up capital to the world of the market economy. Likewise the new rehabilitation of contemporary penality places an increased reliance upon individuals to recognise and act upon behaviours that have led to their offending rather than relying on the state to remedy the causes of offending behaviour.

16

Similarly, Foucauldian analyses focus upon that of governmentality within Advanced Liberal Democracies and their central concern is solely that of the market economy promoting individual choice and freedom. As with the new penality and Post Fordism, the state takes a more enabling and steering form of governance by aligning the natural contours of civil society towards state objectives and casting them as an instrument rather than the actual foundation upon which to govern. In doing so governmental activity involves the development of a knowledge base in which to render or determine specific ways of thinking and acting about and upon citizens. This allows for the state to govern at a distance by rendering the economy, the family and the social world into specific forms that are then translated into techniques of government to control the conduct of active, self governing, free thinking citizens. All of which is underpinned by the management of risk and the responsibilisation and moralisation of individuals to become their own risk managers and therefore provide for their own, their families and their communities well being and security.

Taken collectively, the views expressed by Neo-Marxism through Post-Fordism and Foucauldian governmentality serve to represent the ideals embraced by and through the new penality. This, in turn, underpins the development of contemporary modes of rehabilitation prescribed and administered towards offenders. The following narrative will discuss these key points in more detail and identify what is meant by the new penality and relate this to both Neo-Marxism and Foucauldian analyses of state governance and social control.

2 The New Penal Concerns, Post-Fordism and Governmentality within the Risk Society

The concept of risk has become the key factor within the new penality and the new rehabilitation. The emergence of the risk society and the preoccupation with the management of societal risks has developed into a process that seeks to govern the conduct of an individual's behaviour through state activity at a distance. Its aim is to align the objectives of the state with the needs, interests and mechanisms that underpin society and individuals through various techniques aiming to classify, group and manage those individuals according to a multitude of assumptions of risk (Foucault: 1991). Thus the state develops "new means to render populations thinkable and measurable, through categorisation, differentiation and sorting into hierarchies for the purposes of government" (Stenson, 2001: 23). It evolves into a new means by which to classify, assess and manage levels of dangerousness and other risks of crime (Ibid: 2001). In doing so social discipline, coupled with a moral re-armament of society, serves to cast individuals with increasing responsibility for their personal and local communal security for life's risks (Ibid: 2001). The current situation that underpins the evolution of the risk society and, by the same token the development of the new penality, can be related to both Neo-Marxian and Foucauldian analyses of state governance and social control.

Post-Fordism and the Risk based Economy

Neo-Marxian thought can relate both the risk society and the development of the new penality to changes within the economic structure of society in its transition from a Fordist to a Post-Fordist economy. Fordism was conceived through a critique of market capitalism and the tendency for markets to fail if left

unregulated (Tickell and Peck: 1995). Therefore, to stem the failure of capitalist markets and thus creating a post war consensus, it was decided that the state should take an interventionist stance and actively intervene to smooth out any demand fluctuations, to regulate individual capitalist activities and to ensure the stability of the capitalist system in its entirety (Ibid: 1995). The economy and society became a site of governance for the state in which its capacity to shape and manipulate markets and society for the benefit of capital came to dominate governmental action and objectives. In creating a post-war consensus, the period between the 1950's and the 1970's can be characterised as the era of Fordism. The consensus for the belief in Fordism gained consent from the public in the wake of a post war reconstruction of the state, the economy and civil society thus endorsing and promoting the responsibility and authority of the state to govern and maintain the accumulation of capital.

It was underpinned by the development of mass production and consumption within large factory based economies that mirrored mass production line systems. This was achieved via direct state taxation, investment and the manipulation of consumer demand in order to increase profits, secure public/private sector employment, streamline periods of boom and bust and to collectively manage risks within the Fordist economy through union recognition and collective bargaining through centrally created public structures (Rustin: 1989; Jessop: 1994; Lea: 1995; Stenson: 2002). All of which implies that the state played a pivotal and central role in managing and regulating investment, productivity, consumption and wage labour within the economy.

This enhanced role of the state also permeated throughout society itself as the state undertook a programme of socialisation. Here the objective was to provide more standardised collective goods and services for the traditional nuclear working class family. This brought forth a 'social vision' in which communal faith was placed upon the state's capacity to promote universal social justice and solidarity (Jessop: 1994; Stenson: 2002).

Within this sphere, social regulation and control became the remit of the state in which it was believed that social homogenisation and communal patterns of consumption and lifestyle due, in part, to rising wages would narrow income inequalities and create an amalgam of both middle and working class family values (Lea: 1995). Social control therefore permeated throughout society and was exercised by citizens through a communal approach in sharing similar values and beliefs in relation to the formulation and governance of society. The threat to such a society, as perceived through criminal behaviour, in this instance was thought to occur through the actions of a few residual individuals.

However this consensus suffered a hegemonic crisis in the 1970's due to an overly regulated economy and the state's growing inability to govern and respond to economic, social and political change. In this respect, an increase in the opening for national economies undermined the closed Fordist economy, the growth in trade union power could halt production through national strikes, wages were rising faster than productivity and, as a result, growth began to stagnate and an increased political resistance to taxation and high levels of inflation (Jessop: 2000; Rodger; 2000) culminated in the rejection of the Fordist ideal. Essentially this heralded what became more popularly known as the

'Crisis of Fordism' (Rodger: 2000). This crisis highlighted the problems that are inherent within an overly regulated economy and society from the centre.

The politics of Fordism were too inflexible to respond to global economic change and declining levels of productivity. Consequently this undermined the ability of the state to competently maintain and sustain capital accumulation. The coming to power of Margaret Thatcher and the Conservative government in 1979 (with the birth of Thatcherism) reconstructed the post war economy and society to counteract the problems created within Fordism. A subsequent change in the economic, political and social fabric of the country continues to reverberate in contemporary society. Hence the onset of Neo-Liberalism and the Post-Fordist market altered the responsibilities of the state and its mechanism for regulation and control. The language of Neo-Liberalism functioned therefore as "an ideological fig leaf that disguises and renders respectable and acceptable systems of control whose function is seen as defending an increasingly ruthless and exploitative capitalism" (Stenson, 2002: 114).

The breakdown of the Fordist system created an opening to be exploited by the Right in which they could develop new technologies and remove the perceived collectivist threat to capital accumulation and authority by giving capital access to markets from which it had previously been closed (Rustin: 1989). The transition to Neo-liberalism brought with it a Post-Fordist market in which new technologies, new modes of regulation and a renewed emphasis upon the need for social control could open the scope for greater diversity in the capitalist economy. Thus Post-Fordism and the new prime economic responsibility of the

state is best conceived of as a system of flexibility that entrenches working patterns, labour markets and production processes. This is based upon flexible machines and systems (microelectronics, information and communication technologies), marketable skills, developing new forms of the social wage (differentiating between skilled/unskilled), transition from mass production to niche markets/entrepreneurial enterprise, limiting the power of trade unions, ensuring the quality of available labour and new management techniques (Jessop: 1994; Rodger: 2000; Stenson: 2002). It also suggests that the Post-Fordist market has two particular functions; that of new accumulation regimes and modes of regulation (Jessop: 1994). In doing so this particular process also encompassed the marketisation of welfare services and a contract culture that governs care in terms of its relationship between the voluntary sector and the state (Rodger: 2000).

In this instance the language of consumerism takes precedence as labour, goods, services and welfare all reside under the rubric of consumption. It indicates a 'hollowing out' of state activity in which its role as the main provider and regulator of economic and social welfare has diminished. The state's main function is now to be an enabler or facilitator by which citizens can compete in a more global economy in which the focus is upon economic restructuring and growth rather than those of social solidarity and social justice (Stenson: 2002). In its place is the growth of the market and of market societies. Inevitably the market has now become a fundamental force in social and political discourse and it is hegemonic within such discourses as it moves into a position of dominance through an increased range of privatised activities (Taylor: 1999). .

Taylor (1999) further argues that the contemporary Post-Fordist market is an escapable social fact representing the hegemonic feature of modern day experience. Consequently, contrary to governmental action as applied under Fordism, government and the role of the state (within a Post-Fordist world) is decentralised. Greater emphasis is placed upon consumer choice in welfare due to the availability of privatised industries and a large/informal voluntary sector coupled with more spontaneous networks of political organisation (Rustin: 1989). The aim becomes one of a re-stratification of British society as the minority entrenches itself in power by utilising distributive and disciplinary powers of the state thereby deploying their regulatory and material resources to construct new class alliances that favour capital (Ibid: 1989). This aim coupled with the advent of the market, increased flexibility and differentiation in wage labour, the hollowing out of the state and consumerist activity has a profound effect upon social control mechanisms. This is true not only of those who are in receipt of such control but also in its overall participants and the manifestation of order.

The central tenet of social control in the Post-Fordist market is characterised by the management of risk. Society itself is characterised as exhibiting new opportunities for the development of a variety of hazards and incidences that pose a risk to citizens (Taylor: 1999) Coupled with the belief that such risks have become an everyday phenomena individuals, public, private, voluntary, governmental and state bodies are all involved in the management and minimisation of these harms (Ibid: 1999). In the market society risks are closely associated with those of criminal intent and the reinforcement of vast income inequalities exposed by the Neo-Liberal Post Fordist economy.

This is exemplified by the growth of consumerism and, as consumption is based upon material resources that are provided within the labour market (Rustin: 1989), citizens cannot become consumers and consume unless they earn. The differentiation in wage labour implies that those who are skilled will be highly paid and thus have the means by which to consume whilst those who are only semi or unskilled will be paid lower wages and, if indeed employment is forthcoming, will have a significantly reduced, if not non-existent, means by which to consume. Thus the state develops and seeks to strengthen its powers in order to contain, disband and control forms of criminality that emerge from the poor, ambitious and desperate who wish to achieve the goals of consumerism in their struggle to survive (Stenson: 2000). This is especially profound within the belief that commodities can operate to express not only an individual's identity but also their place within the social hierarchies (Loader: 1999). Consequently the criminal intent of those who wish to consume but lack the material resources with which to do so pose a threat to the capitalist order and the state's ability to sustain the capitalist market economy. Therefore the re-stratification of British society denotes that the central players in new governing alliances, and hence agents of social control, have strong interests in promoting their values of consumerism and excluding those perceived as disruptive groups from the high street, shopping precincts and city centres (Stenson: 2000).

In doing so the governance of social control identifies contemporary society as encompassing characteristics that are underpinned not through playfulness but through control, not through spontaneity but through manipulation and not through interaction but through separation (Christopherson: 1994) in the quest

to contain or exclude the undesirable criminal element. In establishing such an exclusive society surveillance and punishment becomes the primary concern and focuses upon those classified as the dangerous element within society and how best to exclude them from the perceived respectable communities (Young: 1998). Within this scenario it is exclusion that forms the basis of the current trend in the utilisation of private policing and security measures as provided within the market in which the ability to shop and consume has initiated the onset of a 'fortress city' (Christopherson: 1994). In England and Wales it has been noted that the installation of electronic security hardware; i.e. alarms, Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) and integrated security systems is a growing industry (Loader: 1999) and demonstrates the extent to which undesirable elements within society can be identified and excluded. CCTV is the centrepiece of most of these exclusionary strategies as it offers both surveillance and control that enables the prolonged sustenance of consumption, the attraction of greater investment and it serves to challenge the images of dangerousness that are thought to be damaging to the urban ideal (Coleman et al: 2002). The aim of which is to attract tourists and consumers whilst regulating security and cleanliness through the promotion of a desired urban order (Ibid: 2002). Consequently these designs emulate avoidance tactics as 'the street' is consigned to the unhoused, the poor, the undesirable and the unprofitable as fortress like environments provide a predictable and secure place in which to purchase goods (Christopherson: 1994).

A common objective of these scenarios is the surveillance and control of the working class to discipline them into accepted norms of the Neo-Liberal, Post-Fordist market society. Capitalism cannot be sustained if it does not have a

compliant and consuming workforce who is willing to conform to new flexibilities and technologies within the labour market and is willing to purchase goods and services within a legal market economy. The fact that these new technologies and flexibilities of labour are indeed counterproductive and merely exacerbate resistance or perceived threats and curtail citizen's ability to consume and thus sustain capital accumulation is of little or no significance. Here it would appear that the overall aim is to destabilise and denigrate the threat to capital whilst simultaneously deriving acquiescence for its overall method of control.

The realm of social and, by the same token, crime control inevitably becomes actuarial and primarily focused upon the management of these risks through 'fortress cities' and increased levels of imprisonment. Thus the objectives of control are "less to prepare the new working class, through the experience of penal discipline, for the responsibility required by labour for capital and more that of introducing new flexibility, dismantling social rights and keeping the underclass under control..." with the "...criminal justice system picking up those who are unwilling to bend to the new flexibility of the workfare state" (Lea, 1995: 10).

The management of these risks underpin much that is associated with the new penality and also reflect the Marxian concept of Gramsci's ideological hegemony. Here the development of ideas and ideology underpin the crucial factors that determine economic structures and that society itself is not overtly controlled but covertly as its mode of operation is one of consent (Vincent: 1987). This, in turn, implies that the state does not operate directly and with open coercion upon civil society but that its mode of operation is indirect and

26

subtle permeating through that very society itself. Gramsci (1971: 244) suggests that "the state is the entire complex of practical and theoretical activities with which the ruling class not only justifies and maintains its dominance, but manages to win the active consent over those which it rules". Its aim is to eliminate certain actions and attitudes whilst disseminating others (Gramsci: 1971). This is achieved via the rule of law as it is conceived of as an educative instrument that shapes civil society by sanctioning conduct that threatens the establishment of hegemony whilst rewarding conduct that favours it (Hall and Scraton: 1981). Indeed Feeley and Simon's (1992) 'New Penology' (or penality) suggests that crime control or the management of crime does not occur through the diagnosis, intervention and treatment of individual offenders, rather the focus is upon techniques that aim to classify, identify and manage groupings sorted by their dangerousness.

Risk is thus informed by the language of actuarialism and is based upon statistical calculations and distributions applied to the whole of the population (Feeley and Simon: 1992). In this context risk management is forward looking based upon levels of predictability that focus upon minimising the harms and costs to individuals and society (Garland: 1997). The consequences of which denote that interventions on the life and/or career of the offender are not transformative but instead becomes managerial with the rationale for penal action encompassing incapacitation, precautionary and/or supervisory mechanisms (Sparks: 2001). As commented by O'Malley (2000) the importance of incapacitation cannot be underestimated as it paves the way for institutional warehousing, home detention, curfews and electronic monitoring to limit the opportunities available for risky offenders to be able to commit offences.

The relationship that risk management engenders with the new penality is one that seemingly constructs notions of punishment and incapacitation around those of purely managerial concerns in relation to risk rather than seeking to treat and correct offending behaviour. For Brown (2000) such risks can be classified as both fluid and categorical. In terms of fluid risks Brown (2000: 96-98) suggests that they are established upon a scientific basis and

> "have properties that are knowable, that exist in predictable relation to each other, that are measurable and quantifiable and that behave, or produce behaviour, that is explicable and understandable on the basis of an established risk profile".

Here the actuarial nature of the risk management of penal concerns is most evident. Offending behaviour becomes a knowable entity that can be understood and measured against a calculable and established profile of risk. To summarise fluid risks can be thought of as representing a scientific grounding upon which decisions are made based upon the knowledge of the individual and his or her behaviour, classified into risk categories and then aligned to the most appropriate sanction for such categories.

In contrast categorical risks are indicative of a non-scientific approach based upon a common, philosophical, legal or political understanding of human characteristics and the signs that indicate an approaching threat or danger. This involves

> "judgements made in the wider set of social relations within which penality is embedded. Categorical risks often appear in criminal justice as an imputed value or as something determined as much by the methods used to assess it as an independent characteristic of the person in whom it is thought to reside"
> (Brown, 2000: 96-98).

Categorical risks can be considered as representing judgements made upon risk factors and levels of dangerousness according to the nature of the offence

28

with sanctions or punishment determined on this basis. In this instance the nature of categorical risks can be related to the rule of law in Gramscian thought. Here such 'judgements' inform criminal sanctions and they become the legitimate means by which to control those who deviate from the accepted norms, behaviours and attitudes within civil society as they are perceived as threatening or rejecting the hegemonic functions of the state. The rule and enforcement of law and criminal sanctions represent the means by which the powerful coerce and dominate the powerless. However it derives legitimacy from the fact that the law also enjoys popular consent and the 'will of the people' through parliamentary legislation (Hall et al: 1978). The thoughts, actions and sanctions that underpin the new penality likewise reflect these sentiments and echo the concept of the Post-Fordist means of societal regulation and control.

Taken collectively the risk factors that are considered as underpinning the new penality are determined and based upon individual behaviour as a knowable and manipulable entity linked to strategies of rehabilitation to ameliorate them and risks also are both knowable and unknowable but they bear the qualities of essential human categories (Brown: 2000). Yet, fundamentally, it is still risk and the management of risk that underpins the arguments whether they are classified as fluid or categorical and based upon scientific or unscientific principles.

Governmentality and Advanced Liberal Rule

As well as the new penality and the management of risk encapsulating the thoughts of Neo-Marxian theorising, its resonance can also be situated within the Foucauldian analysis of governmentality. Governmentality is predicated

upon a strategy that emanates from the manoeuvres, tactics, techniques and functioning of power relations that are not imposed upon the powerless by the powerful but is something that is invested in them and is transmitted both by and through them (Smart: 2002). In doing so, it questions and seeks to determine the very nature of government and the multitude of techniques it utilises and performs in order to provide a framework for or to derive knowledge of the art of government.

Akin to the theoretical position of Gramsci, Foucault (1979) argues that the practices of government are varied and, as such, there are several forms of government that are not necessarily derivative solely from the state but are internal to either that state or to society. Thus government can emanate from within citizens of a society or society itself as well as those of the state apparatus. Foucault (1991) suggests that governmentality is a process that involves the acquisition of knowledge of the population by the state in which that very state can ensure the well being, prosperity and security of the population by translating that knowledge into technologies of surveillance, management and control. Governmentality is premised upon the 'conduct of conduct' (Gordon: 1991) and denotes that the task of the state is one that addresses the conduct and behaviour of its citizens. To govern therefore implies, with a certain degree of deliberation, an attempt by which to shape aspects of citizens behaviour in accordance with a particular set of norms for a multitude of different ends (Dean: 1999). It signifies a form of governmental activity that aims to shape, guide or effect the conduct of people as human conduct is conceived of as an entity that is conducive to regulation and control that can be utilised for specific purposes (Gordon: 1991; Dean: 1999).

In this instance the state primarily functions as a regulatory and disciplinary mechanism by which it not only denotes how citizens should behave within society but also deploys a multitude of mechanisms by which that can be achieved and conceived of as the norm. Certain patterns and regularities are inherent within the population and it is within these specific forms that the population becomes a fundamental instrument of government for the state (Foucault: 1979). In addition these patterns and regularities draw attention to particular forms of social groups who attempt to regulate the lives of citizens and societal conditions in pursuit of those very goals or governmental ends (Miller and Rose: 1993).

Therefore the economy, the social field and the family can be rendered into particular forms that allow for state intervention and regulation as, once again, the acquisition of knowledge of various social groups are translated into techniques of power designed to observe, monitor, shape and control individual behaviour within a multitude of social and economic institutions (Miller and Rose: 1993; Gordon: 1991). In accordance with Foucault (1991) such technologies of government incorporate the use of statistical distributions within the population that renders them as knowable, thinkable and measurable entities as these regularities govern their everyday life. The knowledge so derived becomes utilised as a target for that population in relation to disciplinary techniques that become the mechanisms for their own and the state's security (Foucault: 1991). It is within this concept that the new penality emulates governmentality analyses through its influence and relevance in the categorisation of offenders according to their levels of dangerousness and

responded to based upon that categorisation through techniques that aim to manage such risky behaviour.

In addition to this, Gramscian thought again resonates within Foucauldian analyses through the belief that the state essentially governs indirectly through and not directly upon civil society by utilising the knowledge it has derived from the population and shaping it thus into specific forms of regulation that befits its overall aims and objectives. It also seeks to govern through the regulated choices available for 'individual citizens' (Rose: 1993), a sentiment also expressed by the ideals of Post-Fordism. However, likewise with any hegemonic project, the ability to govern through the 'freedom' of the population requires an element of consent and coercion implying that authoritarian measures are also of a necessity in any attempt to govern free individuals (Dean: 2002). It is within Advanced Liberal rule that such techniques of government are to be found.

Advanced Liberal rule draws upon its forebear Liberalism as an art of government and thus a measure of governmentality. Liberalism is conceived of as a particular method in which the act of government has become thinkable and practicable as an art (Burchell: 1993). It is dependent upon the discovery of process that are to be found within the population, the economy and society in which the best outcome for the state is provided by the pursuit of self interest within the market economy (Dean: 1999). The conduct of any government has to be aligned with those of free individuals whose natural sense of private interest is what enables the market economy to function to its optimum potential (Burchell: 1993). Government becomes enabling rather than prescriptive;

32

guiding rather than directing; steering rather than rowing (Dean: 2002). Liberal government therefore aims to govern at a distance and confronts itself with the realities of market, civil society and citizens which are thought to possess their own internalised forms of logic and densities coupled with their own mechanisms for self regulation (Rose: 1993). This tends to suggest that Liberal government must, indeed, model any of its interventions on the multitude of regulatory forms, expectations and values that already operate within civil society (Dean: 2002). Government takes a subjectifying rather than objectifying power relation as it seeks to construct individuals capable of choice and action shaping them as active subjects and aligning their choices with the objectives of governing authorities (Garland: 1997).

Advanced Liberal rule echoes these principles and, as with Post-Fordism, issues of welfare are transformed into commodified forms and regulated in alignment with the principles of the market (Rose and Miller: 1992) in which responsible self governing citizens will take it upon themselves to provide for their own and their families sense of security and well being. Consequently governmental power becomes a strategic game and refers to a systematised and regulated operation that reflects modes of power that seek to go beyond the sphere of a spontaneous exercise of power over others that follows a specific form of reasoning or rationale (Lemke: 2001).

It is these specific forms that encapsulate the state governance of Advanced Liberal society. Government embodies a discursive language as political discourse enables the understanding of government not only through systems of thought in which problems have been specified and proposed but also

systems of action which have been sought to give effect to government (Rose and Miller: 1992). In some instances it can function as a "politics of truth producing new forms of knowledge, inventing new notes and concepts that contribute to the government of new domains of regulation and intervention" (Lemke: 2001: 8). Therefore government within Advanced Liberalism not only works through the "various forms of freedom and agency of individuals and collectives but also to deploy indirect means for the surveillance and regulation of that agency" (Dean: 1999: 149). As such governing liberally may not necessarily occur through the freedom that respects an individual's liberty rather, it may imply that the exercise of specific freedoms is overridden in order to enforce obligations upon members of the population (Dean: 2002).

The concept of governmentality and the main tenets of Advanced Liberal rule underpin the contemporary manifestation of governance and social control. As such the articulation of societal control from a Foucauldian perspective is echoed within those of the new penality and the quest to manage the risk of offending behaviour rather than seeking methods of treatment. Neo-Marxian and Foucauldian analyses, when applied to the new penality, suggests that risk management itself can be conceived of as two different processes. Firstly it can be considered as a set of techniques for "aggregating people, representing them as locations in a population distribution and treating people on the basis of that distribution..." and secondly as "...a set of political and economic strategies that have made security a pervasive task for the state and others" (Simon, 1987: 67). In doing so, Leacock and Sparks (2002) suggest that the new penality is concerned for people at risk, is concerned for people at risk of offending and is concerned for people at risk of social exclusion. The structuring

34

of penality within this language of risk takes on a triangular typology whose overriding discursive character is informed by the zones of inclusion and exclusion.

In relation to imprisonment, penality is undoubtedly schizophrenic in nature as it speaks in many discursive tongues that are both complimentary and contradictory. As exemplified by Rose (2000: 322) "the prisoner is to be incapacitated, or the prisoner is to be taught life skills and entrepreneurship, or the prisoner is to be stigmatised and made to accept moral culpability, or the prisoner is to be helped to reintegrate back into the community." Essentially the prisoner or offender is constructed within risk strategies as a 'troublesome' individual who cannot lead a life, who is not attached to the normalising practices of family, work and consumption and as one who is not engaged in the arts of lifestyle maximisation that currently define an ordinary way of life (Rose: 1998). Therefore those who are judged to pose a risk to the community and society are subject to therapeutic (self help), sovereign (prison) and disciplinary (retraining) practices to eliminate them from the community or to lower their levels of dangerousness (Dean: 1999).

The introduction of risk management into the penal system has created a new means of looking at and addressing the punishment and rehabilitation of offenders. It could be argued that the new rehabilitation is a method of extremes. At one end of the spectrum lie incapacitation and the exclusion of offenders from society via the confines of imprisonment and the practice of custodial sentencing. Here the management of offending risks are exercised via the segregation of offenders from the community to reside within the prison

walls. However at the other end of the spectrum, offenders now reclassified as prisoners, are taught or encouraged to develop skills that will enable their successful reintegration back into the community. Here the management of offending risks are to be conducted not by the authority of the state but by the individual prisoners themselves. It involves the responsibilisation and moralisation of prisoners towards securing their personal and familial well being against the risks of everyday life and developing an attachment to the normalising practices of family, work and consumption as stipulated by Rose (1998). It is reflective of the regulatory nature of Post-Fordism, the sanctioning of the rule of law within Gramscian thought and the sorting of individuals into categories for the purposes of government underpinned by their levels of risk as stipulated by Foucault. Thus, taken as whole, new penal concerns can be thought of as adopting both punitive and responsibilisation strategies.

As a policy of punitive segregation the new penality incorporates "harsher sentencing and the increased use of imprisonment, three strikes and mandatory minimum sentencing laws, retribution in the juvenile court and the imprisonment of children, community notification laws and paedophile registers, zero tolerance policies and sex offender registers" (Garland, 2000: 349-350). According to Shearing (2001) imprisonment is a valuable commodity in the sense that it not only is a place for punitive segregation but that it is also a key tool in the management of risk as it is a vehicle for holding people in a situation that minimises the potential harm they pose to others. It is thus "a convenient space in which to keep dangerous people out of harms way" (Shearing, 2001: 209). This is most strongly reflected in current penal trends whereby the total prison population as of the week ending 2 January 2009 stood at 81, 751 (HM

36

Prison Service: 2009). Whereas the responsibilisation agenda encapsulates central government's action upon crime and criminality through indirect means and the devolvement of responsibility for crime prevention on to agencies, organisations and individuals to persuade them to act appropriately (Garland: 1996). Consequently the new penality brings forth a new means of rehabilitating prisoners and is constituted within the concepts of responsibility and morality.

3 The New Rehabilitation, Political Rationality and Responsibilisation: Replacing the Social Engineer with the Moral Engineer

In keeping with the risk management ethos, the new penality denotes that prisoners and/or offenders are their own risk managers rather than becoming reliant upon the sole interventions from professionals within the criminal justice system. In this instance conceptions of need have been rearticulated into conceptions of risk. Therefore risk has evidently become but one of the solutions to the problem of crime and criminality and it is the criminal, as an active subject, who has become invested with personal responsibility for both his status and his actions within society (O'Malley: 2000).

For Rose (2000) this ultimately relates to the distinction between the inclusive and the exclusive nature of societal populations within certain crime control mechanisms. Thus, one the one hand, there is the majority for whom the provision for their own well being and security is achieved through active self promotion and taking responsibility for themselves and their families (Rose: 2000). Whilst on the other hand there exists a minority who reside outside this nexus of activity and either refuse, cannot or do not have the means by which they are tied to the bonds of civility and self responsibility and have not been

37

given the skills, capacity and means by which to do so (Ibid: 2000). It is for these minority subjects that the new rehabilitation exists within the construct of risk, responsibilisation and moral reconstructions of the active subject. Here the aim is to create enterprising prisoners who are able to take control of their lives and can reinvent themselves in more positive and constructive ways (O'Malley: 2000).

New technologies of the self stress the offender's responsibility not only for his criminal actions but also for his subsequent ability to address this behaviour, find solutions that will remedy them and to take responsibility for them (Garland: 1997). In constituting the new rehabilitation within a process of responsibilisation, the criminal is cast as "a misguided subject for whom his or her moral compass and self steering ethical mechanisms have failed" (Kemshall, 2002: 44). Therefore the aim becomes one of regulating conduct through risk management processes and encompasses the task of identifying those who are deserving of segregation and exclusion and those who can be re-moralised through effective programmes that stress straight thinking, rational choice and self management (Kemshall: 2002). Consequently

> "for those who can be included, control is now to operate through the rational reconstruction of the will and self control, of the habits of independence, life planning, self improvement, autonomous life conduct, so that the individual can be reinserted into family, work and consumption and hence into the continuous circuits and flows of control society."
>
> (Rose, 2000: 335)

In addressing criminality within this sphere, the new rehabilitation programme incorporates programmes that aim to target cognitive skills, substance abuse, living skills, abuse and trauma and employment and education programmes (Hannah-Moffat: 2005) Essentially then the responsibilisation strategy of the

38

new penality requires not only positive action on behalf of the active subject but also an attitudinal change in which cognition is both positive and pro-social.

Indeed the responsibilisation and moralising agenda of the new rehabilitation promotes the active participation of prisoners and/or offenders to manage their own well being and that of their families. It involves the recognition of the individual to be aware of and take responsibility for his behaviour and its consequences, to understand the factors that have contributed to his offending lifestyle and to make the changes necessary in order to remedy this problem. Whereas such concerns were considered as relating to questions of need and could be remedied through state intervention, under the new penality they are questions of risk and of how individuals rather than the state can manage and contain them. This shares an affinity with Foucauldian analyses of governmentality within the notion of political rationality.

Political rationality embodies a strategy or technique of government that aims to responsibilise and moralise citizens and to encourage the provision of their own health, wealth and security by consuming goods and services within the market economy. O'Malley (1992) describe this as the 'new prudentialism' in which individuals, families, households and communities are to become responsible for managing their own particular risks in relation to physical and mental ill health, unemployment, poverty in old age, poor educational performance and in becoming victims of crime (Dean: 1999). This implies that citizens, previously conceived of as groupings of people to be governed, now become active participants within their own government (Rose: 1996). It is no longer the sole remit of the state to provide for its citizenry but those very citizens themselves

39

are to adopt moralistic attitudes and become responsible for their own needs and welfare provision. The community is constructed as the main site of such acts of government and technologies of the self.

Within this remit citizens are conceived of as moral individuals who share common bonds, obligations and responsibilities for their conduct that align the citizen to his or her community (Rose: 1996). It incorporates what O'Malley (1996) describes as 'indigenous governance' in which the forms of government that transpire are embedded within the everyday lives of its subjects and the language of community locates Advanced Liberal rule in the voluntary interactions or commonalities of interest within and among private individuals.

Political rationalities are thus morally coloured as they are grounded upon a knowledge base which enables such rationalities to be made thinkable through language (Rose and Miller: 1992) and involve the transition of responsibility for everyday social risks and for life within society into the realm of the individual in which they are responsible serving to transform such risks into problems of 'self care' (Lemke: 2001). As discussed, this too echoes the theoretical perspective of the Post-Fordist hegemony in which provision for goods and services are no longer provided by the state but by the options and choices for the consumer available within the market economy. The responsibilisation and moralising agenda of the new rehabilitation incorporates the key features associated with political rationality of Foucauldian thought in conjunction with the themes of Post-Fordism. The articulation of individuals as morally responsible and culpable for their well being is viewed in a wider sense in which criminal behaviour and the control of such behaviour resides within the individual. Thus

it is individual citizens who are responsible for their criminal activities and, as such, should positively work to counter these activities in line with conduct that is socially acceptable. In addition to this individual citizens also are possessed of a duty to safeguard themselves against becoming the victims of criminal conduct.

In this respect the active citizen capable of providing for their own welfare are also conceived of as being capable of providing their own crime prevention measures and of exercising appropriate measures of control within civil society. The responsibilisation of crime control involves strategies of order and security that no longer reside within or remain the sole domain of the state and dependent upon formal criminal justice agencies but depend upon informal social controls that are exercised within civil society (Loader and Sparks: 2002). There is the inherent belief that the state alone cannot maintain sole responsibility for the prevention and control of crime (Garland: 1996). Consequently a responsibilisation strategy presents the state with techniques for governing at a distance and involves new modes of exercising power and of governing crime that has its own forms of knowledge, objectives, techniques and apparatuses to effect changes in the norms, everyday routines and consciousness of all citizens (Garland: 1997). Such techniques involve "eliciting people's direct participation in anti crime activity (various 'watch schemes: pub; neighbourhood; street); schooling people in preventative habits and routines (locking car doors; avoiding dangerous locations); encouraging people to deploy their judgement and means as consumers in order to secure in the market place the kinds of protection of persons and property they find desirable" (Loader and Sparks: 2002: 89).

Thus the Post-Fordist hegemony of consumerism and individual choice within the market again resonates within the technologies of the self and of Foucauldian responsibilisation strategies. However the emphasis, in contrast to the Neo-Marxist perspective, is not upon producing a compliant and disciplined workforce and inculcating an acceptance of the 'workfare state' in order to curtail the threat to societal order. Rather the consequence of this strategy (although aiming to achieve societal order) merely serves to further segregate and divide citizens in terms of those who can afford to consume and actively manage their own risk and those who lack the economic and social capital that is required to provide for their own security and safety (Loader and Sparks: 2002). Those who can consume effectively become their own risk managers determining their own levels of risk and avoidance that befits their personal situation or preferences (O'Malley: 2000) and purchase safety within the commodified realms of policing and security. Inevitably citizens who cannot mobilise themselves into mechanisms of informal social control or indeed become active responsible participants in providing for their own security find themselves excluded from society as they are perceived as different or dangerous to the morally responsible majority. The issue here is one of inequality and poverty which, although thought to be accepted as a feature of modern day life, brings with it criminal and other sources of risk (Stenson: 2001).

Therefore techniques of Advanced Liberal rule have recreated risks related to poverty, unemployment and the formation of an indigent class of vagrants, beggars, the homeless and mentally ill that serves to produce a set of criminal tendencies (Pratt: 1999). Questions of risk and the management of such risks

not only relate to communal factors of welfare provision but also to individual people or groups that undermine the objectives of maintaining a moral social order. Consequently the new technologies of the self and crime control are epitomised by the concept of risk management.

As previously discussed, risk management reflects the sentiments expressed within Foucault's (1979; 1991) concept of governmentality as statistical distributions are said to generate knowledge of the population that can be translated into disciplinary mechanisms for security and control. Risk management can be articulated and conceived of as two different processes in which there is a set of techniques for "aggregating people, representing them as locations in a population distribution and treating people on the basis of that distribution..." and "...a set of political and economic strategies that have made security a pervasive task for the state and others" (Simon, 1987: 67). Consequently the population can be conceived of as a knowable and measurable entity conducive to categorization, differentiation and sorted into hierarchies that suit the purposes of government (Stenson: 2001) whilst those who are judged to pose a risk to the community and society are subject to therapeutic (self help), sovereign (prison) and disciplinary (retraining) practices to eliminate them from the community or to lower their levels of dangerousness (Dean: 1999). In this context risk management is "forward looking, predictive, oriented to aggregate entities and concerned with the minimizing of harms and costs" (Garland, 1997: 182).

Within this particular framework, the rule of law becomes an instrument in the exercise of sovereignty that can be linked to a set of disciplinary and

43

governmental purposes (Dean: 1999). Its function is no longer cast as a coercive technique but as a normalising power in which the establishment of particular procedures will lead to a general agreement in relation to norms and standards (Ibid: 1999). Thus social control can have both an inclusionary and exclusionary dimension. For those capable of meeting the communally agreed norms and standards, risk is managed via the rational reconstruction of "will and self control, of the habits of independence, life planning, self-improvement, autonomous life conduct ..." so that the individual can be "...reinserted into family, work and consumption and the continuous circuit and flows of control society" (Rose, 2000: 335). However those who refuse to become responsible, govern themselves and become members of the moral community, find themselves facing harsher sets of penalties as citizenship is deemed to be conditional upon conduct (Ibid: 2000).

While the rule of law may not be deemed as a coercive instrument it does still continue to share an affinity with Gramsci's ideological hegemony. In this instance law is portrayed as an educative tool serving to shape civil society and sanctioning forms of conduct that threaten hegemony and reward conduct that favours it (Hall and Scraton: 1981). Coupled with the belief that the state seeks to create and maintain a certain type of civilization and citizen through the elimination and dissemination of customs, attitudes and beliefs (Gramsci: 1971), the concept of risk as derived from Foucault's governmentality perspective is compatible with such a viewpoint and clearly echoes the sentiments found within this particular Marxist analysis.

The new penal concerns of the state have inevitable become shaped by the language of risk and the management and control of crime and/or criminal behaviour. However the concept of offending behaviour does not solely rely upon definitions of risk and the techniques to monitor and manage it. Offending behaviour is also viewed within the context of need and, in doing so, contemporary penality has evolved into a hybrid of both risk and need. Ultimately it is this that informs the foundation upon which the new rehabilitative process is built.

According to Hannah-Moffat (2005) the amalgamation of the risk/need paradigm provides the opportunity in which to change or transform the offender into a prudent and responsible subject as offenders are placed on a variety of generic programmes that are designed to enhance their ability to self govern and prudently manage their risk of recidivism. Indeed Robinson (1999) argues that risk management and rehabilitation are partners in crime as the new rehabilitationism runs counter to that of management reinforcing the focus on individual offenders and heralding a return to the model of treatment and corrections. If it is considered that the management of risks ultimately implies the management of need then penality is witnessing an adjustment to new modes of managing offenders whilst simultaneously addressing the problem of criminality through the treatment and assessment of need. The individual as either a misguided subject (Kemshall: 2002) or as an individual who has not been given the skills, capacity and means by which to bond to civility or to demonstrate self responsibility (Rose: 2000) suggests a needs deficit but that those needs are also risk factors that contribute to criminal behaviour and thus have to be assessed, managed and corrected. In this instance

"the new targeted interventions project involves the creation of not only a particular type of disciplined normative subject but also the construction of a prudent risk/needs manager, who is responsible and able to identify risky settings, access resources, and avert situations that may result in criminal behaviour."

(Hannah-Moffat, 2005: 41)

In addressing offending behaviour within this sphere, the New Penality witnesses the transition from a programme of Nothing Works to a programme of What Works. According to the Home Office (1999:3) What Works "is a programme which aims to ensure all probation practice is based on evidence of success..." with funding for the programme being used to develop "...high-quality programmes for the prison and probation services based on what is known to reduce re-offending." For Robinson and Raynor (2006) this relates to a correctional model of rehabilitation and, to some extent, is representative of a return to traditional modes of rehabilitation in which offending is conducive to correctional forms of treatment. In this respect it assumes that it is possible to isolate or identify the causes that contribute to an individual's offending behaviour related to either his/her character, morality, personality, psychological make up or choices and then intervening in such a way as to remove these causes or to effect positive changes within the individual (Ibid: 2006). The majority of this work is conducted using Cognitive Behavioural Treatment or Therapy (CBT) and is bound within the ethos of responsibilising and moralising prisoners and those who offend. The connection between the use of CBT via the What Works initiative demonstrates, again, the ties that bind Foucauldian thought and Neo-Marxism's Post-Fordism dialogues with those of the new penality and rehabilitation.

The New Rehabilitation and What Works: Responsibilisation through Pro-Social Cognition

As has been mentioned the What Works initiative is based upon the evidence of effectiveness in interventions programmes. This is considered as being a key component in reducing re-offending and thus encompasses much of the factors that now comprise the new rehabilitation programme. In doing so the aim of What Works is to ensure that all interventions are based on firstly evidence of effectiveness, secondly that the programmes are delivered to a consistent standard across the whole of the country and thirdly that the programmes are accessible and effective for all different types and groups of offenders (NOMS: 2003). The concept of evidence based practice is to ensure that practitioners and managers overseeing interventions programmes target their energies, time and resources on what is considered as the right people and on those things that work so that their time, energy and resources are not targeted upon doing things that do not work (Chapman and Hough: 1998). Thus all work should be based upon the evidence of success with the purpose of designing, delivering and, again, targeting programmes which work (Crime Reduction: 2003).

A system of accreditation serves to ensure that programmes are "designed in line with the principles of evidence based practice and are consistently delivered to maximise the effect of the treatment..." with the underlying assumption being that "...if an accredited programme is delivered as specified, it will lead to a reduction in reconviction rates" (Clark et al, 2004: 2). Programmes themselves within the What Works and evidence based agenda are also guided by the three clear principles of risk, need and responsivity. According to Chapman and Hough (1998) this is defined as:

- *The risk principle* – the higher the risk of offending the more intensive and extended the supervision programme

- *The need principle* – programmes which target needs related to offending (criminogenic needs) are likely to be more effective

- *The responsivity principle* – programmes which match staff and offenders learning styles and engage the active participation of offenders are likely to be more effective.

At all stages the emphasis is upon effectiveness and the success of delivering interventions programmes based upon what is known that reduces re-offending. The result of developing this evidence base, one which is built upon research and practice, is thus leading to an increased emphasis on an integrated and end to end approach to work with offenders and prisoners that aim to tackle and target as full a range of needs as is practicable and possible (NOMS: 2006a). One of the key elements of this knowledge base that influences and incorporates What Works in reducing re-offending is that of cognitive behavioural programmes or offending behaviour programmes.

As noted by Clark et al (2004: 40) "cognitive skills programmes are designed to introduce offenders to pro-social skills and problem solving strategies that will help them to avoid those patterns of thinking which are associated with offending behaviour." In doing so there is an assumption that offending behaviour results from an individual's failure to internalise moral codes of conduct because they lack either the key thinking skills with which to do so or they have developed distorted ways of thinking (Kendall: 2004). The programmes offered directly target the criminogenic needs of prisoners and offenders related to attitudes and behaviour by addressing the aforementioned deficits in thinking and behaviour (Debidin and Lorbakhe: 2005). However such programmes also indirectly affect a variety of other criminogenic needs through the improvement in cognition and social functioning (Debidin and Lorbakhe:

48

2005). The reliance is heavily placed upon issues of "self blame, self-surveillance and self control and in framing difficulties we encounter as the consequence of our poor thinking it individualises social problems in ways which appear to empower us" (Kendall, 2004: 70).

In this sense, the aim of responsibilising prisoners and offenders takes on some semblance of meaning with the introduction of What Works into the new rehabilitation. Anti-social attitudes and behaviour are to be confronted, challenged and corrected by programmes that aim to promote pro-social attitudes. This is drawn from the belief that the complex web of thoughts, feelings and behaviour that are learnt through the interplay and experience of relationships with significant others involves the process of socialisation that can result in cognitive deficits that serve to reinforce anti-social behaviour (Chapman and Hough: 1998). Therefore if such deficits are learnt they can be corrected through training that serves to reinforce positive rather than negative behaviour in a consistent manner (Chapman and Hough: 1998). The fundamental process of CBT therefore has a somewhat dual function. Not only do these programmes serve to change and alter attitudes and behaviour within the individual and thus contribute to their process of responsibilisation but they are also demonstrative of an act of governing individuals. As commented by Kendall (2004) offending behaviour programmes underpin a type of governmental technique that aims to regulate people's conduct and thus their behaviour.

Consequently self-governance and the management of risk/need factors are the preferred outcomes for CBT through the enhancement of problem solving skills,

49

pro-social decision-making skills and positive improvements in the overall general cognition skills of offenders. Thus cognitive behavioural techniques are employed to

> "change offenders thinking and behaviour through a structured sequence of exercises designed to teach interpersonal problem solving skills (Enhanced Thinking Skills); focus on moral reasoning, self management and self control, social skills and values education (Problem Solving and Offence Behaviour); cognitive self control and self corrective thinking in new situations (Reasoning and Rehabilitation); problem solving, self management and self control, social skills and values education (Priestley and Maguire Combined Programme); thinking and problem solving skills, moral reasoning, attitude change, perspective taking, self management, self control and social skills training (Priestley 1:1)"
> (Kemshall, 2002:51).

This can also incorporate basic skills and education and training programmes as well as those focusing upon sex offender treatment programmes and the development of parenting skills (Merrington and Stanley: 2006: 4). Of all of those here mentioned, the two most widely adopted programmes within prison establishments are the Reasoning and Rehabilitation (R&R) and Enhanced Thinking Skills (ETS) programmes.

Both R&R and ETS share a commonality in that they are multi-modal approaches that focus specifically upon the moral training of prisoners. R&R attempts to develop pro-social cognition amongst prisoners through skills that include "being reflective rather than reactive, to anticipate consequences, better planning skills and to be more flexible and open minded" (Palmer, 2003: 160) and this is built upon and further endorsed by the ETS programme. In both instances the programmes are targeted at medium-high risk prisoners and enlist the use of modelling, reinforcement, role-playing, dilemma games, cognitive exercises, board games, practical tasks and group discussions to facilitate

learning (Ibid: 2003). In order to join and participate on these courses, prisoners must go through a two stage process for selection.

In this respect, the first stage of the process denotes that prisoners should have either a current or previous conviction for a sexual, violent or drug related offence or they must demonstrate a particular lifestyle factor (e.g. drug use; poor family relationships) but this too is dependent upon having less than a particular number of previous convictions (Wilson et al: 2003). The second stage of this process involves prisoners completing a semi-structured interview and, from this, a measurement of their cognitive skills will be undertaken to match those that form the basis of the treatment targets on the skills programmes (Ibid: 2003). A Home Office guideline for matching the right programmes to the right offenders within this two stage process is underpinned by the development of OASys, a risk assessment tool for offenders. In this instance OASys aims to "assess how likely an offender is to re-offend and the seriousness of the type of offence, to identify and classify offending related needs (personality characteristics; cognitive/behavioural problems) and to measure these over time, to provide a systematic framework for assessment of risk of harm (to others and self) and to provide a system for translating the assessment into a practical supervision or sentence plan (to reduce likelihood of re-offending and seriousness of the offence)" (Home Office, 1999a: 6). For those who are accepted and thus participate on the courses, outcomes are generally positive.

Research by Clark et al (2004: 37) found a number of positives from participants including

- "improved interactions with inmates, prison staff, partners and other family members,
- an increased level in self confidence,
- an improved sense of personal achievement on completing a programme, improved literacy skills,
- the acquisition of pro-active enhanced problem solving skills and;
- an increased interest in self development and further learning".

Wilson et al (2003) found similar improvements in their study of those imprisoned for acquisitive crimes and their participation on the courses. They further conclude that prisoners who were punished for acquisitive crimes had greater cognitive skills deficits than those in the non-acquisitive group, they also had a greater number of previous convictions and, consequently, this served to demonstrate the link between offending and poor cognitive skills (Ibid: 2003). Therefore poor cognitive abilities and skills are indeed risk factors that need to be assessed and managed. They can also be construed as needs as they are representative of cognitive deficits within the offender and/or prisoner that need to be corrected through a variety of treatment programmes. Ultimately the What Works principles of the new rehabilitation are thus centred upon the responsibilisation of prisoners through the moral reconstruction of pro-social and positive thought processes as it is this which is considered as being beneficial and, through evidence based practice, as essential in reducing re-offending.

In essence the argument for CBT is somewhat simplistic in that a change in attitude equals a change in behaviour. Indeed the focus of reconviction rates as a measure of success is, by the same token, problematic. Merrington and

Stanley (2000) are concerned about the over-reliance placed upon the use of CBT and comment that the focus upon reconviction rates as a measure of their success through published evidence demonstrates that their impact is not very strong. Meanwhile Blud et al (2003) concur in that reconviction rates as a measure of success have their drawbacks because there is a long time lag between the implementation of programmes and their results. By the same token, the focus upon the development of compensatory strategies to repair cognitive deficits do not allow for sufficient account to be taken of the predispositions, choices, opportunities and motivations of the individual (Ibid: 2003). Inevitably the implication of this is that if individual's motivations and influences are not accounted for and there is a time delay between programme implementation and results, it questions the extent to which CBT is an appropriate rehabilitative programme or if re-offending is reduced to factors beyond the scope and range of an individual's cognition.

Indeed family, economic, social and situational factors may impact upon reductions in re-offending and it is these that encourage a change towards positive behaviours rather than programmes that teach improvements in thinking. However it is believed that by instilling a change in such attitudes that the offender becomes equipped with dealing with his offending lifestyle and changing this lifestyle accordingly through being provided with the cognitive skills in which he is perceived to be lacking. Consequently by concentrating resources on such programmes that are known to be effective individual offenders, their families and communities are perceived as being able to reap the rewards of a reduction in repeat offending (Home Office: 1999a) as the

53

transition from anti-social to pro-social attitudes impact positively upon an individual's propensity to commit crime.

In this scenario crime is perceived to be reduced as acquiring the abilities by which to make positive decisions influences positive behavioural changes. As argued by Hannah-Moffat (2005:42) the poor decision making skills of the offender are constituted as being due to an absence of "the requisite skills, abilities and attitudes necessary for proper informed decision making..." therefore "...techniques like cognitive therapy are vehicles through which offenders can learn to manage their criminogenic needs and reduce their risk of recidivism by acquiring the requisite skills, abilities and attitudes needed to lead a pro-social life". Thus cognitive behavioural techniques become the means by which individuals can re-empower their somewhat disempowered self and they can re-equip themselves with the requisite skills necessary for autonomous coping of a prudent life governed by freedom and choice (Rose: 1996).

4 NOMS: Replicating Foucault's Economic Rationality via the End to End Management of Offenders.

New penal concerns of contemporary modes of rehabilitation have not only found themselves influenced by the era of risk, Foucauldian discourses of political rationality and Neo-Marxism's account of Post-Fordism. They have also been influenced by Foucauldian analyses of economic rationality. In this instance it is not only individuals and their behaviour that is called to account but the behaviour of government and/or public institutions that provide public services are also held accountable for their actions through managerial techniques. The amalgamation by government of the prison and probation

services within the entitled National Offender Management Service (NOMS) stands as a shining example of the growth of managerialism amongst public services and of how risk management has become the central focus of activity.

In 2003 Patrick Carter was commissioned by the government to conduct a review into the correctional framework and services in England and Wales. The review was conducted against a backdrop of high rates of imprisonment and a system seemingly in crisis. As argued by Dobson (2004) England and Wales have been increasingly outstripping the imprisonment rates of some countries with poor human rights records and that tougher sentencing has resulted in more offenders being sent to prison than would have previously and for a much longer period of time. The Resulting Carter Report suggested not only a new approach to dealing with offenders but also a new approach to managing them. In terms of dealing with offenders Carter (2003:25) argued that the objectives of the criminal justice system must be clear in the sense that

- Offenders should be punished for their crimes
- The public needs to be protected
- Persistent offenders should be punished more severely and face increasing restrictions on their liberty
- Offenders should be given the appropriate help in reducing re-offending.

Whereas for the management of offenders Carter (2003), suggests that prison and probation need to focus on the management of offenders throughout the duration of their sentence informed by the What Works agenda. As identified by Hudson et al (2007a: 630)

> "it has been widely recognised that rehabilitative interventions in prison are more likely to be effective if followed up systematically after release and that ex-prisoners are more likely to respond positively to supervision if their transition from custody to community is planned and co-ordinated from an early stage in their sentence."

Thus the management of offenders are to be guided by the principles of what is known to be successful in reducing the re-offending of offenders not only within prisons and within the community but also for those experiencing the transition from imprisonment to their release within the community.

In doing so Carter (2003) argued for the development of a National Offender Management Service to be accountable to ministers for the punishment of offenders, the reduction of re-offending and to restructure the prison and probation service to ensure the end to end management of offenders whether sentenced to a period in custody or in the community. Therefore an individual subject to either a period in custody or punishment in the community would be assigned an offender manager at an early stage in this process to carry out a pre-sentence assessment of the individual, to recommend sentence conditions to the judge or magistrate and to arrange a raft of supervisions and interventions through the whole duration of their sentence (Hudson et al: 2007a) This would be overseen by both an Offender Manager and Regional Offender Managers. The Offender Manager is to be responsible for supervising offenders and commissioning custody places, fine collections and correctional interventions whilst the Regional Offender Manager is to fund the delivery of programmes through specified contracts rather than relying on the services to decide for themselves what should be delivered to offenders and prisoners (Carter: 2003). Taken collectively, the purpose and arrangements as stipulated by Carter for NOMS can be related to Foucauldian analyses that focus upon economic rationalities.

Economic rationality pertains to various technological mechanisms employed by that state that allow for the regulation and control of both public agents and public servants in their provision of societal goods and services. As previously discussed within Neo-Marxism, the concept of economic rationality or, indeed, managerialism has its roots in the transition from Fordism to Post-Fordism. Essentially it denotes the transition within state governance from a Welfare to a Neo-Liberal state. As previously, the mechanisms involved in the Neo-Liberal state governance of public agencies resonate with those of Gramsci and of Post-Fordism in exemplifying the market as a contemporary hegemonic feature of modern life. The market does indeed hold a position of dominance in which its business orientated mode of operation clearly demarcates and defines how public services are to be administered, by whom and for what purpose. Again, the inadequacies of the Fordist regime are echoed within this transitional phase and highlight the extent to which the New Right Conservative critique of Welfare brought forth new technologies by which the state was able to restructure and govern public agencies and their provision of public goods and services.

In this respect Fordism or the Welfare state were deemed to be failing in its delivery of public services. Its predominantly bureaucratic structure was thought to be inherently inefficient and overly populated with professionals who merely served their own interests resulting in such inefficiencies, a loss of democratic control and an inevitable concentration of power residing within monopolistic public suppliers (James and Raine: 1998; Horton and Farnham: 1999). These professionals co-existing with inflexible bureaucrats and interfering politicians were deemed to be preventing and inhibiting the promotion of efficient, effective and economic public services (Newman and Clarke: 1994). The solutions to

these problems were to be found within the rise of Post-Fordism and the belief in the market. Here it was considered that the market was the only means through which economic efficiency could be achieved with its designated objectives of increasing market competition, to reduce the size of the public sector through the contracting out or privatisation of services, to foster an enterprise culture and to create a business minded approach in the provision of public services (Horton and Farnham: 1999). In taking such a stance and promoting the belief of market mechanisms for the provision of public services, the transitional focus of the state reiterates the sentiments of public choice theory in which the broad political agenda is to free citizens from the tyranny of public bureaucracy and to make both politicians and public servants more accountable and responsive to the public they serve (Barberis: 1998). This reliance upon market mechanisms, a business minded approach to public services and support for greater responsibility and accountability amongst public servants and politicians alike heralded the onset of the New Public Management and thus of managerialism in the provision of public services.

Managerialism is considered as a set of techniques, beliefs and practices in which better management will improve and thus solve a wide range of social and economic ills (Pollitt: 1990). Consequently it denotes a rational analysis of organisational inputs and outputs, a commitment to imposing the three E's of economy, efficiency and effectiveness whilst managers are to replace bureaucratic professionals to lead, inspire and provide the impetus to achieve organisational goals and thus have the 'right to manage' (Pollitt: 1990; Newman and Clarke: 1994). Increasingly the emphasis becomes one of controlled delegation, the achievement of value for money within specified cash limits in

the provision of public services, a stronger focus upon consumerism and the needs of the customer, the formulation of various business plans and agency agreements encapsulated within formal contracts and decentralised costs and budgeting devices that are replete with performance targets (Barberis: 1998). A key component of which involves 'joined up' working and a partnership ethos whereby service delivery involves the pooling of budgets and other resources and of agencies working in partnership to align previously separate organisations towards common objectives thus offering a value for money service (Newman: 2000; Ling: 2002). In addition, the notion of joined up working or indeed of partnerships is that activities of various agencies can be co-ordinated across their organisational boundaries without removing their respective boundaries (Ling: 2002).

Consequently economic rationality refers to various methods and techniques employed by the state to control and direct the services provided by public agents. The state exercises and deploys these methods by recognising the patterns and regularities that are apparent within various agencies that provide public services and translating them into disciplinary mechanisms or technologies by which they can be governed. This is similar to the risk management ethos as commented upon within the new penality. In this scenario the knowledge of individuals and their offending behaviour have been translated into governmental techniques that aim to promote a morally responsible citizen whose changing attitudes and perspective upon his conduct becomes more socially acceptable. Thus it is the individual who is held to account. Within the concept of economic rationality, this is applied to large

government organisations or institutions whereby it is the organisation rather than the individual that is held accountable.

The objectives of government therefore become aligned with the everyday operations of public agencies in which the setting of targets and the legislating for 'joined up working' ensures that devolved budgets, whilst promoting a sense of autonomy for managers, must be metered out to areas of performance that fulfil the criteria designated by government. As noted by Dean (1999: 169) 'the devolution of budgets, the setting of performance indicators, the establishment of quasi markets in expertise and service provision, the privatisation of formerly public services and the contracting out of services are all technical means for locking the moral and political requirements of the shaping of conduct into the optimisation of performance'. Consequently agents and agencies of criminal justice increasingly have to justify their existence and restructure themselves in keeping with the disciplines of the market, managerial resource control and certifiable cost effectiveness (McLaughlin and Muncie: 1994).

As an example, the Police Service continually finds itself monitored in terms of 'Best Value'. In this instance HM Chief Inspectorate of Constabulary regularly inspect the work of the police and monitor performance in terms of efficiency savings, the inculcation of a continuous improvement culture and the development of a diagnostic model relating to risk assessment (McLaughlin and Murji: 2001). Meanwhile the Prison Service is also subject to inspections by HM Chief Inspectorate of Prisons and finds its performance increasingly monitored in terms of their reduction in escapes, assaults and overcrowding whilst also co-existing with privatised prisons (McLaughlin and Muncie: 1994). This growth in

the auditing culture amongst public agencies represents the managerialisation of services that seek to regulate the activities of such agencies. In doing so, trust is reignited among the key actors as an interdependence develops between the regulators and the regulated. Here the regulators depend upon the regulated for information, expertise and implementation whilst the regulated depend upon the regulators for funding, approval and political support (Cope and Goodship: 1999).

Managerialism thus adopts a discursive character in which administrators, public servants and practitioners are reconstructed as business managers, purchasers, contractors, strategists and leaders (Clarke and Newman: 1994). Additionally the 'steering and rowing' character of managerialism implies that "central steering agencies (the government) increasingly, both directly and indirectly, regulate rowing agencies by setting policy goals for rowing agencies to achieve, fixing budgets within which rowing agencies must operate, award contracts to competing rowing agencies, appoint the right people to do the right thing and establish regulatory agencies (Audit Commission; HM Inspectorates) to monitor the performance of rowing agencies" (Cope and Goodship: 1999: 7). The state simultaneously attempts to centralise as well as decentralise policy making and delivery in which autonomy afforded to public servants by the state through devolved budgets and the 'right to manage' are coupled with performance targets and a range of monitoring bodies by which to ensure compliance and effectiveness in achieving the overall objectives of government. The state invariably deploys mechanisms by which government evolves into the management of governance and, by the same token, the management of

surveillance (Cope and Goodship: 1999). NOMS is but one such service subject to the conditions of managerialism and governmental action at a distance.

Consequently the government response to the Carter Report, Reducing Crime-Changing Lives (Blunkett: 2004), endorsed his proposals and effectively combined the prison and probation service into one with the establishment of NOMS. In doing so the objective was to bring together custodial and community sentences and place the reduction of re-offending at the forefront of the service (NOMS: 2006a). The focus of this new approach to managing offending behaviour has become centred upon the individual and an assessment of their needs and risks. Therefore the concentration upon the individual is considered as giving offenders a greatly improved chance to change their offending lifestyles and thus reduce their levels of re-offending through early intervention incorporating the assessment and management of their offending risks (NOMS: 2006a). The end to end management of offenders was effectively sealed within the following commentary

> "The prison service can be proud of the extent to which they make offenders employable, get them off drugs and provide them with job interviews. But if those key developments are not built upon in the community through directing offenders into mainstream education, helping them not to return to drug use and helping them to hold down a job, the gains made inside can all be wasted."
> (Blunkett, 2004: 10)

The argument presented here by Blunkett echoes the Foucauldian and Neo-Marxist thoughts of risk management techniques of the self and Hannah Moffat's (2005) risk/need paradigm. Whilst the risk of offending is to be managed by the individual, those risks are also framed by conceptions of need to be administered to offenders by those providing correctional services. NOMS

sits within this framework as the organisation by which to administer and provide for the needs of offenders.

Indeed the NOMS Business Plan (2005a) identifies its key priorities as tackling offenders' drug abuse, to increase the number of offenders to obtain housing and work (thus enhancing their long term employability through the improvement of basic skills) and to improve the capability of offenders to consider and think through the consequences of their behaviour for both themselves and others. This is undertaken in the recognition that ex-offenders are drawn from the most socially excluded groups within society who experience a multitude of problems through education, housing and health inequalities and, by tackling these, it is possible to help ex-offenders to re-establish themselves back into the community (NOMS: 2006a). Grouped within a series of seven pathfinders or pathways, work with offenders is conducted to address accommodation; education, training and employment; health; drugs and alcohol; finance, benefit and debt; children and families and attitudes, thinking and behaviour problems (Ibid: 2006a).

The endorsement of NOMS was given a formal footing on its presentation before parliament within the Management of Offenders and Sentencing Bill (2005). The Bill sought to make formal provisions for the management of offenders and stipulated the aims of the service in relation to both prison and probation. The objectives for the newly formed NOMS were made with regards to

- The protection of the public;
- The reduction of re-offending;
- The proper punishment of offenders;

- Ensuring offenders' awareness of the effects of crime on victims and the public;

- The rehabilitation of offenders.

(Management of Offenders and Sentencing Bill: 2005)

This implies that offender management occurs at the pre-sentence, present-sentence and post-sentence stage of the offenders contact with the criminal justice system. To be able to meet the differing requirements of offenders at these key stages, NOMS provides clear goals that are set at the start of the sentence, ensure that sentences plans are carried out effectively and to bring coherence to the offenders experience of their sentence underpinned by the need to tackle risk factors that contribute to offending behaviour (NOMS: 2006a).

In addition to this Carter (2003) also argued for the notion of contestability whereby cost effectiveness within the criminal justice system could be achieved through market testing involving both private and voluntary agencies in the delivery of probation programmes. The opening up of competition within the correctional services is considered as introducing greater partnership working with the private and voluntary sectors. In doing so the 'corrections market' is promoted as allowing more organisations to participate in the management of offenders and, by bringing their expertise and skills into the field of correctional services, it is hoped that they will contribute significantly in helping offenders to desist and turn away from a life of crime (NOMS: 2005b). For Nellis (2006) this refers to the development of a technocorrections market in which the private sector is deemed as being better equipped to marshall the resources and expertise required to deliver new technologies (surveillance, monitoring,

diagnostic and treatment technologies) into the criminal justice system. For Pycroft (2005) contestability heralds the introduction of a regulated social market for service provision and, as a consequence, he argues could be more attractive to faith-based organisations with an interest and commitment to both people and communities to be involved in this process. In doing so such organisations could provide a counterbalance to the seemingly punitiveness of the system due to their welfare based approach (Ibid: 2005). In essence the introduction of contestability into the criminal justice system provides a further example of the link the new penality has with Foucauldian analyses of economic rationality. The contracting out of services and the opening up of a corrections market paves the way for partnership working on a scale that aims to make punishment more cost effective, efficient and thus more accountable.

In doing so it is not one organisation with responsibility for punishment and correctional concerns rather it is a mixed economy of service providers ranging from public, private and voluntary organisations. The monopolistic stance of Fordism's enterprise has given way to a Post-Fordist world where the market takes centre stage. Thus, according to Nellis (2006), as a process of modernisation contestability aims to rip up the obsolete and ossified structures of its forebears and lay the foundations of a flexible and fluid approach to crime control upon its rubble.

Contemporary penal measures have undoubtedly been shaped by the changing modes of state governance. Both Foucauldian analyses of governmentality and Neo-Marxist theorising upon Post-Fordist hegemony argues that the onus is now upon individuals to be accountable for their actions and to conduct

themselves in a responsible and moral manner. The management of risk, be they personal, social, economic or familial, has not only framed the conduct of citizens and societal life but it has also framed the development of the new penality and the new measures by which those who offend are to be rehabilitated.

Thus offenders are encouraged to be their own risk managers, identifying and understanding the causes of their offending behaviour which will then enable them to conduct themselves in a manner which is socially acceptable. Developing pro-social cognition paves the way for offenders to make positive changes in their daily lives and is perceived as upholding conduct that is morally coloured and indicative of a responsible attitude towards the well being of their personal, family and societal life. Likewise individual accountability for conduct amongst citizens is replicated within public and governmental institutions. The providers of public goods and services are also culpable for their actions. In relation to the agencies of criminal justice, the police, the prison service and the probation service must provide evidence that their services are efficient, effective and economic through a variety of performance mechanisms. So whilst the state ultimately steers the ship, it is the individual and institutions that have the responsibility for rowing and sailing through troubled towards still waters.

CHAPTER THREE

Idealised and Marginalised Masculinity: The Social Construction of Masculine Identity

1 Introduction

In the introduction to the thesis I identified that masculinity is not a static and fixed entity but is fluid and flexible underlying the plurality of masculinity as masculinities. In this chapter I wish to develop this further and discuss what is meant by masculinity/masculinities and then identify which of these concepts I will utilise within my analysis in future chapters. Here I wish to stipulate that my concept of masculinity is one that I associate with the perspective of policy makers for the purposes of government. Therefore my notion of an idealised masculinity is one that is drawn not from the recipients of prison policy (i.e. the prisoners) but one that is drawn from those who formulate prison policy. In doing so this chapter will discuss the variations in masculinity, how this is considered within criminological discourse and then how masculinity is articulated within governmental discourse for the purposes of rehabilitating male prisoners.

My concept of idealised masculinity is one that is drawn from the current debates surrounding hegemonic masculinity and its dominance within political discourse. I believe that it is a governmental device by which men are encouraged to aspire to traditional white middle class values of what it is to be a man. Within this context idealised masculinity represents the normative expressions of heterosexuality and, as such, within a process of socialisation men take on the mantle of being the breadwinner and provider for the family (Walklate; 2004). The counter argument to idealised masculinity that I will

discuss is framed by what I shall term marginalised masculinity. This is expressed within the debates surrounding subordinate masculinity that is closely aligned to that of homosexuality. However I will use marginalised masculinity to define men who, whilst wishing to attain the status of idealised masculinity, have little access to the resources and opportunities available by which to do so legitimately. Therefore they resort to criminal means in which to achieve and act out idealised man. In this instance the breadwinning role is not achieved through legitimate paid employment but it is achieved through illegal and criminal means. By situating this argument within criminological discourse I will argue that varieties of masculinity are articulated as both the agents of criminal intent as well as providing the method by which contemporary penality is able to govern and reconstruct male identities through prison rehabilitation programmes and thus manage the risk of re-offending posed by male prisoners.

Contemporary penality is therefore constructed around masculinity and is a gendered process in addressing and responding to criminal behaviour. It challenges the criminological gaze upon crime as being gender blind and aims to provide an account of how the man question can be discussed within criminological concerns. The oft quoted role of criminal men as perpetrators of violent crime directed not only towards other men but, predominantly, towards women and children underpins much of the literature and research surrounding men's involvement with crime (Connell: 2000; Heidensohn: 2002). Therefore the conduct of criminal behaviour is seemingly portrayed as something that men do. However whilst this can be considered as one particular aspect of the masculine characterisation of men, the conduct of men through non-criminal behaviours also underpin their masculine characters. Therefore a counter

argument proposed to this is that whilst crime can be thought of as masculine traits for men so can their processes of rehabilitation. In this instance the new rehabilitation has the objective of reconstructing and reconstituting men towards productive rather than destructive masculine behaviour.

Idealised masculinity thus represents the legitimate means by which men can be rehabilitated and thus reduces their propensity to offend. It underpins policy documentation and political discourses around rehabilitation programmes that equip men with education, training and work based learning, programmes that enable the development of parenting skills and programmes that enable the development of pro-social attitudes all contribute to the production of idealised man. The quest to responsibilise and moralise offenders as previously argued within the new penality casts men within the penal realm as being conducive to change within the confines of developing a masculine identity that positively benefits society through the reduction of re-offending and manages the risk of offending by equipping men with skills relevant for the job market. Men undergo a process of responsibilisation and a moralisation of their character and behaviour and, in doing so, the aim is to transform men from their marginalised masculine status. Therefore I will utilise and define marginalised masculinity as a form of criminal subculture in which men contravene their status as legitimate providers by resorting to illegitimate means such as crime. With this in mind, masculinity forms the backdrop of the governance and rehabilitation of prisoners and is constructed around notions of masculinity. Thus marginalised man is a danger that needs to be managed, controlled and reconstituted towards those of idealised man replacing deviant behaviour with non-deviant behaviour through the moral and responsible reconstruction of men within a

masculine and gendered framework. The origins of this debate and the problematic nature of men being unable to achieve idealised masculinity can be situated within the context of New Labour's social exclusion argument and Conservative debates around the underclass.

2 Social Exclusion and the Underclass: The Social, Economic and Criminal Problem of Men

The problem of men as a socially excluded group belonging to an underclass is often associated with employment and their ability or inability to obtain it. Whitehead (2002) relates the problem of men to their inability to cope with the expectations that are now placed upon women (feminism), the fact that traditional working patterns and male roles have become somewhat diminished and that the two combined have made men become vulnerable in engaging in forms of resistance thus leading to criminal behaviour. For Hearn (1998) such masculinities are 'troubled' and may become so by forces beyond themselves, through internal contradictions and inconsistencies and they can also be seen as troubled by policy makers. Therefore as workfare states increasingly place the reliance upon individuals to manage their social and economic risks through paid employment, those who cannot comply with this new regime face harsh penalties (McDonald and Marston: 2005). The identities of welfare recipients are thus negatively constructed and men who seemingly do not have access to what can be termed as respectable sources of social power (i.e. employment) are considered as constructing a masculine identity that is anti-social (Scourfield and Drakeford: 2002; Hunter: 2003). For some men the lack of paid employment and thus of wage labour is an emasculating process (Haywood

70

and Mac An Ghail: 2003) which can only be compounded by becoming a benefit recipient.

Becoming a benefit recipient is however not only an emasculating process for men. It further acts as a tool to marginalise their status within society and demarcates the division between men who are socially included within society and men who are excluded. The social exclusion of men from the world of paid work can serve to highlight the troublesome aspects of male criminality and indicates where marginalised man exists in relation to idealised man. Social Exclusion was initially defined as

> "what can happen when people or areas suffer from a combination of linked problems such as unemployment, poor skills, low incomes, poor housing, high crime, poor health and family breakdown"
> (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 2004:1)

Levitas et al (2007: 8) expand upon this definition and suggest that social exclusion is a more complex and multi dimensional process as it

> "invokes the lack or denial of rights, goods and services and the inability to participate in the normal relationships and activities available to the majority of people in society, whether in economic, social, or political arenas. It affects both the quality of life of individuals and the equity and cohesion of society as a whole."

Miliband (2006) ventures one step further to argue that social exclusion occurs threefold and can be wide, concentrated and deep. Wide refers to people excluded due to a small number of indicators, concentrated refers to geographical problems and exclusion by area and deep focuses upon multiple dimensions that tend to overlap (Levitas et al: 2007). Offenders undoubtedly fit into this remit.

The Social Exclusion Unit (SEU) (2002) identifies prisoners as a socially excluded group whereby the majority suffer from multiple disadvantage through

71

family problems, low levels of educational attainment and poor prospects in the labour market. They further identify that prisoners seriously lack the 'respectable resources of social power' by which to fully participate in social and economic life. In this instance prisoners have a deficit in the writing skills (eighty per cent), the numeracy skills (sixty five per cent) and the reading skills (fifty per cent) usually attributed to an eleven year old child with over two in three prisoners unemployed at their time of imprisonment (thirteen times the national unemployment rate) (SEU: 2002). With such a pedigree it is no surprise that offenders are amongst the most socially excluded group in society and that marginalised man is demonised and cast as a significant Other in its relationship to idealised man. With this in mind, the troublesome aspect of marginalised man is not necessarily born out of the irresponsible nature of the individual. Rather it is the structural inequalities within which that individual has forged his life that has impacted most strongly upon his ability to participate in the acceptable routines of everyday life.

As consolidated by Hearn (1998) low levels of employment amongst men can be related to low levels in the educational attainment of men that serves to position their human capital as being underdeveloped and with social justice as lacking. Therefore the ability of men to conduct themselves as responsible self serving citizens through the acquisition of paid employment can be undermined as they do not possess the requisite attributes by which to both obtain and maintain steady employment. The overriding result of which is that increasingly men are resorting to criminal means as "known or recorded crimes are concentrated among those who are relatively disadvantaged; men with no jobs or lower paid jobs with less education and poorer health" (Hearn, 1998: 44). It

is here, one could argue, that marginalised masculinity is most prominent. To deviate from and contravene the laws of society in order to accrue a wage, generate social capital and to ascribe to the notion of idealised man when people do not have the resources necessary to do so legitimately results in the marginalised. Therefore the criminality of men can be explained by structural conditions in which they do not possess or have access to legitimate means in which to obtain money and resort to illegal means in which to obtain financial rewards (Morash: 2006). Consequently marginalised man is quite simply idealised man without assenting to the morality, value laden and legal codes of any given society.

Yet, as noted by Lund (1999), 20th century social policy has consistently searched for the scrounger, malingerer and the moral weakening and that benefit agencies have always possessed numerous powers by which to penalise those who are not actively seeking work. Thus from a governmental perspective masculinity can indeed be cast as troublesome and anti-social. Responsible idealised man is one who finds himself in paid employment and irresponsible marginalised man is one who is unemployed and thus a benefit claimant. This too permeates throughout governmental workfare policies in which, far from promoting responsibilised citizens, citizens are simply abandoned (Clarke: 2005).

In this instance

> "protections against the labour market powers and demands of capital have been removed or reduced in order to make potential workers more flexible; social policies and practices have been retooled to position more people as potential workers; benefits have been recast to make them more closely associated with waged work; moves to open up public services have created sites for potential capital accumulation and a

range of once publicly funded and provided services have increasingly moved to commodified forms"
(Clarke, 2005: 453).

The onus at all stages is upon employment and troublesome masculinities are to be corrected through workfare social policies related closely to labour market concerns and the demands of capital accumulation and regulation. For Clarke (2005) the implication is that people (or, for the purposes of this research, men) are considered as making bad choices that result from the wilfulness of irresponsible people rather than structural distributions of resources, capacities and opportunities.

Scourfield and Drakeford (2002: 630) relate the aforementioned themes to the "crisis of masculinity idea namely that working class young men do not know what is expected of them anymore especially in the context of the demise of manufacturing and other heavy industries". This leads to the connection between criminality and poverty whose solution is to be found through employment in which the assumption falls into line with the traditional view that young men need a job in order to tame them (Scourfield and Drakeford: 2002). Thus according to a probation circular people engaged in a probation programme but who are also benefit claimants and then re-offend will have their benefits reduced for a period of four weeks (Home Office: 2001a). Although this provision is applicable to both men and women Scourfield and Drakeford (2002) comment that the preponderance of men within probation programmes will undoubtedly lead to its application in a gendered manner. Therefore to be an offender, unemployed and without paid employment is to be marginalised man whereas to be a non offender, employed and in paid employment is to be idealised man. Attachment, or as the case may very well be, non attachment to

the labour market merely fuels this problem serving to differentiate more fully the differences between marginalised and idealised man. Kemp and Neale (2005) comment that, amongst a survey of drug users seeking treatment from community drug services, during the previous three years one in six were in full time employment and one in ten were in part time employment. However for the majority in the study their employment status had been that of unemployed or economically inactive (Ibid: 2005). All of which contributes to the crisis of masculinity and an ever burgeoning problem of defining men's masculine identity solely around issues relating to work and employment.

From boyhood to manhood the trouble with men has hinged around the following. Various changes to the morals and values of any given society, increases that are apparent within family breakdowns and/or uncertainties regarding men's role in the family and the recognition that many boys and young men lack the required interpersonal and employment skills to fully integrate into a post-industrial service based industry (Collier: 1998). Indeed, a report in the Guardian argued that increases in crime were related to a more general moral decline within society that resulted from the cultural revolution of the 1960's thus serving to fuel contemporary criminality (Francis and Soothill: 2005). This, in itself, can be positioned within the context of the New Right and the general development of what has been labelled as Britain's underclass.

The New Right wave of political thought dominated British politics from 1979 to the early to mid 1990's primarily under the leadership of Margaret Thatcher and the Conservative party. The politics of Thatcherism severely criticised the growth in the welfare state as it was seen as promoting a dependency culture

amongst individuals that created both behavioural and attitudinal incompetences. The permissiveness of the 1960s was perceived as being at the heart of such moral decline. Therefore the Thatcher era of politics rallied against state income maintenance programmes that removed the responsibility away from parents in providing for their children and they argued against the breakdown in the moral authority of the family and the dependence thus upon welfare and the expectation that the welfare state would provide for familial needs (Abbott and Wallace: 1992). As such the New Right Neo-Liberal ideology argued that

> "welfarism creates a deep seated cultural disposition amongst the poor which, via a generational cycle of inculcated values, perpetuates deprivation. The effect is to undermine family ties, erode personal responsibility and initiative and destroy the work ethic"
> (Hayes, 1994: 37)

The aim of the Thatcher administration was therefore to rebuild governance based upon the primacy of the free market and the adoption of the values and traditions of the patriarchal family. The overall aim of this was to reduce public spending and the public sector, adopt monetarist targets, privatise state industries and to weaken trade unions culminating in a greater role for the market economy and a reduced role for the state (King: 1987).

The market therefore became the site of efficiency, innovation, variety and consumer satisfaction through profit, price, competition and interactive supply and demand side economics (Hayes: 1994). Whilst the family provided the behavioural and attitudinal competences by which to promote appropriate codes of conduct that benefit the free market economy. In doing so the traditional family provided the conditions within which economic growth for the benefit of society is needed to thrive (David: 1986). Thus

76

"the traditional nuclear family was central to economic well-being, with the man as the breadwinner and economic provider with the women as economic dependent but consumer of goods and services in the market on behalf of her family."

(David, 1986: 139).

However individuals overly reliant on the welfare state and its system of benefits and support are considered as having negated this through the growth of single parent families and unemployment leading onto criminal endeavours. Such individuals are now typically and collectively known as the underclass.

For Murray (1996: 33) "the habitual criminal is the classic member of an underclass. He lives off mainstream society without participating in it". The key to which is found not within the individual but within a large proportion of communities where families lack fathers (Murray: 1996). In this instance it is welfare dependency that have left families without fathers due to the break up of the traditional nuclear family and it is this that then leads to a process of socialisation that favours dependency and/or criminality and devalues legitimate employment (Morris: 1994). It is these sentiments that have enabled the New Right and Thatcherite politics to demonise single parents, illegitimacy and welfare dependency as the fundamental causes of criminality. Again Murray (1996: 41) illustrates this point by commenting that

"when large numbers of men don't work, the communities around them break down, just as they break down when large numbers of unmarried women have babies. Supporting families is a central means for a man to prove himself that he is a 'mensche'. Men who do not support families find other ways to prove that they are men, which tend to take various destructive forms."

However whilst New Right political agendas blamed the dependency culture and the underclass for criminality, the Thatcherite solution to reduce welfare dependency (and by association criminality) and build an economy based upon market principles through the inculcation of traditional family values merely

77

exacerbated the problem. Far from families and the economy prospering, families and the economy festered.

As argued by Hayes (1994) Thatcher's period in office was characterised by persistent economic problems, the reduction of industrial capacity, the balance of payments deficit and a welfare system that eroded social security benefits, greatly reduced housing benefit and maintained child benefit at the same basic rate. Convery (1997) notes that the 1980s and 1990s were characterised by two recessions resulting in mass unemployment. He comments that there were 1, 705, 000 jobs lost in the manufacturing industries, 247, 000 job losses in the service sector, 276, 000 losses in retail, 84, 000 in hotel and catering and 203, 000 in the construction industry in the 1980s (Convery: 1997). This furthered rather than reduced the number of people labelled as the underclass and increased the numbers of individuals having to depend on welfare. But far from thinking of them as inferior and troublesome members of society, they were essentially individuals and communities suffering from social exclusion and living daily with the costs of growing inequality and rising poverty brought on by the Thatcher administration.

However, whilst the employment sector did recover from each recession and new jobs were created, they were levelled mainly at part time workers. Oppenheim (1997) comments that there was a continual decline in full time male work during the 1980s and 1990s, a rise in female part time work, a rise in jobless households and a widening pay gap between the rich and the poor. This ultimately left many young men facing a future of uncertainty around stable employment and left them experiencing even more so economic marginality in

78

the long term and severe deprivation in the short term (Connell: 1991). Therefore with a growth in the feminisation of the labour force, a steady growth in atypical employment practices and the domination of women in part-time employment (Wigfield: 2001), it is hardly surprising that men are experiencing difficulties in maintaining the legitimacy of idealised man and resort to the illegitimacy of marginalised man.

This argument provides the framework upon which men, employment and criminality are discussed within policy and political discourses. It also underpins the following discussion and provides the basis upon which much of the theorising surrounding masculinity can be understood. Therefore the remainder of this chapter will detail firstly how masculinity is defined and constituted, how this relates to the criminological literature and finally how written policy discourses surrounding masculinity inform penal practice.

3 Masculine Identity: The Social and Discursive Constitution of Men

One of the guiding factors that underpin the concept of masculinity is that of social identity and how or in what forms it is constituted. A primary aspect of this is that identity and masculinity are informed by discursive practices and involves the language of gender. According to Whitehead and Barret (2001) language not only serves to inform concepts of masculinity but it also serves as a tool through which gender identities can be performed, labelled and interpreted. Doing specific forms of masculinity undoubtedly are informed by gender and it becomes a reciprocal process. As noted by Hunter (2003) it is identity that informs behaviour and it is behaviour that informs identity. By incorporating masculinity into this equation identity, masculinity and behaviour are mutually

reinforcing concepts that exist within a cyclical relationship but it is a relationship that is founded upon discursive practices. Language gives meaning to the development of the self and of living thus providing the mechanism by which it is possible for individuals to locate themselves within the social world (Whitehead and Barret: 2001). For Wharton (2005) the social constitution of masculinity can occur through gender socialisation whereby the target of socialisation (i.e. a newborn) encounters the social world through the interaction with parents and caretakers and through this experience with other people and the outside world, people become aware of themselves as individuals. In addition to this there are the agents of socialisation who have a part to play within this process such as individuals, groups or organisations who pass on cultural information (ibid: 2005) and it is through these that masculine identities can also be formed.

Thus masculine identities are formed within specific discourses in which masculinity is not constituted as an individual property and/or attribute but is formed within both institutions and can be historically constituted (Talbot: 1998). Consequently masculinity can be either reproduced or changed according to specific practices within the social structure (Messerschmidt: 2005). Masculinity is but a social construct that is informed by language, which gives form and shape to us and the world around us in which representation does not picture our world but constitutes it (Barker and Galanski: 2001). Thus masculine behaviour or what is considered as masculine behaviour serves to cast men within specific gendered roles whose construction is given some semblance of reality and meaning through the discourse between and amongst human subjects

According to Connell (2000) masculinities are defined within collective terms culturally and sustained in institutions whereby they are actively produced using both resources and strategies that are available within any given social setting. This allows for the institutionalisation of masculinity in which gender is perceived to be a structured action as various masculinities can be constructed through specific practices that can simultaneously reproduce and change social structures (Messerschmidt: 2005). Thus masculinity is an ever evolving way of being for men and is predicated upon where they are, with whom they are with and what position or social status they uphold within the social structure. Masculinities can change over time and can be determined by the social positioning of age, race, class, disability, ethnicity, sexuality and various other social divisions through social practices that men undertake as fathers, sons, workers, husbands, partners and lovers (Hearn: 1998).

MacKinnon (2003) argues that for men to achieve masculinity they have to distance themselves from femininity and other forms of being that seek to undermine the very essence of masculinity. For masculinity or men to be accepted as masculine implies that they have to adopt the traditional values that encompass male superiority and reject or repress those that seek to threaten it (Rutherford: 1988). Or they create what can be termed as a demonised other by which to consolidate and re-affirm their masculinity and thus embark upon a process that involves the politics of identity. As suggested by Petersen (1998: 22) this is

> "premised upon either/or distinctions and leads to the repression or denial of difference and the marginalisation of those who do not conform to narrowly prescribed norms"

Those who fall within the remit of narrowly prescribed norms relate to heterosexual white men whilst those who do not conform to the remit are those whose masculinity is classed as black or gay.

Heterosexual men or heterosexual masculinity is often defined in terms of what it is not and from what it is excluded from. Primarily this involves an exclusion from all that is feminine but it also applies to homosexual men who are often attributed as being feminine (MacKinnon: 2003). Therefore the way in which this is operationalised and made real is often reduced to actions that affirm or confirm male sexuality and the performance of men during sexual intercourse. Thus a 'dominant heterosexual masculinity' is characterised through difference from and a desire for women, one that is sexually driven and one that is uncontrollable through the unrelenting pursuit of women (Segal: 1997a). In research conducted by Gough and Edwards (1998) this was reinforced with continual reference to the penis and how this symbolised the 'privileged' sign of masculinity. Their work examined the reproduction of masculinity from within the interaction of a group of men via the use of discourse analysis and, in one account, the men discussed the names used for the penis within the context of the film Naked Gun. As an example

> "E: 'n he gives 'im this book 'n it says 'he thrust his huge purple dominating head, no huge dominating purple headed warrior in to [G laughs] her quivering mound of love pudding' [laughter]
>
> G: one eyed trouser snake; one eyed forest-livin fuckin; cave-seekin' blue veined fucker [laughter] fucking trouser snake, ah go on pal"
> (Gough and Edwards, 1998: 416)

Here Gough and Edwards (1998) suggest that the discussion not only hinted at the desire to posses something that was diminished or absent (phallic/social

power) but also that its comical connotations underlies male anxieties surrounding their stature and performance within heterosexual relationships. For Reynaud (2004) this means that men do not allow their sexuality to fully develop and that he confines it purely to his penis as becoming too enveloped in sexual pleasure is viewed as a threat to his power. Thus the pleasure that man gets is from the power he asserts over a woman's pleasure and is represented in the language he deploys; he fucks and she gets fucked (Ibid: 2004). In doing so the penis is a signifier of masculinity when it is applied to its legitimate use through heterosexual intercourse (Gough and Edwards: 1998). Consequently "publicly defining oneself as heterosexual seems to be a means to male legitimacy" (MacKinnon, 2003: 7).

As heterosexual masculinity is defined through sexual intercourse and the pursuit and domination of women, the focus upon what heterosexual masculinity is not relates back to Petersen's (1998) comments upon the repression of difference and the marginalisation of non-conformists to the norm. As noted by Bucholtz (1999) whilst it is true that most men do project some vagaries of masculinity within certain contexts (as identity), only a certain percentage of possible and/or actual masculinities are culturally acceptable (as ideology). Therefore the ideologically privileged masculinity of white male heterosexuality is one that is considered as culturally acceptable and their dominant position as such derives from constructing subordinated or marginalised others. Thus Rutherford (1988: 26) comments that the legitimacy of heterosexual masculinity involves constructing the Other; "the huge penis of the black man and the plague like seduction of the homosexual". In doing so heterosexual masculinity becomes somewhat competitive in the sense that

heterosexual man must compete against the forces that serve to undermine his manhood.

The sexual virility of the black man and thus of black masculinity pose a threat to heterosexual man. However whilst black masculinity is not wholly different to that of heterosexual masculinity, the difference in gender identity between the white and the black man is reduced to what Bucholtz (1999: 444) terms as "monolithic masculinities that stand counter to the hegemonic white norm". Therefore black masculinity is cast as being ideologically associated with physical strength, hyper heterosexuality and physical violence (Bucholtz: 1999). Hoch (2004: 98)) identifies this within a historical period of the witch hunts associated with a medieval Christian theology that espoused the epic struggles of a chaste God and super sensual devil in which the devil was cast as a lascivious black male with "cloven hoofs, a tail and a huge penis capable of super masculine exertion". The devil or the black beast as it was also known became the object of taboo desires. As a consequence the villain is perceived as being threatening or immoral and shrouded in the 'dark bestial forces' of lust and perdition set against the higher spiritual plane of the hero's conscience (Hoch: 2004). The colonial image is one that takes this forward and constructs the black man as a "dark villain out to steal our women or the black beast running amok amongst white virgins" (Rutherford, 1988: 64). In doing so it represents the conflict between hero and villain or white and black and serves to depict a black sexual imagery that threatens to undermine white heterosexual supremacy.

In this instance black becomes the "colour of the dirty secrets of sex represented in the image of black boy as stud" (Segal, 1997a: 176). As argued by Rutherford (1988) the white man identifies the black man as Other through stereotypical colonial discourses in which the white man perceives the black man as a primitive being who contains a primordial sexuality that is Other to the civilised white man. At one and the same time this encompasses heterosexual man's fear of and idealisation of black masculinity; the power and potency of the black man's penis (Segal: 1997a). This is particularly prudent as Alexander's research (quoted by Charles, 2002: 121) identifies that

> "being male and black is about asserting control; publicly in relation to women and other groups of young men, particularly white men, and in private over women"

As such black masculinity is perceived as being threatening to heterosexual masculinity and is thus subject to its rejection and demonisation via racist and stereotypical discourse and acts of violence.

Gough and Edwards (1998: 429-430) provide an example of how black masculinity is undermined and thus gives supremacy to heterosexual masculinity:

> "D: 's like when ya go in an Asian shop innit 'n ya walk up wi' yer beers 'n that 'n they go like 'at nibleonderbewhit [Indian accent] [C, D and G laugh] nibleondewhit
>
> E: round 'ere y' go in like, pack o' cigs or whatever
>
> D: they could be callin' y' fuckin owt couldn't they? Just like 'at look at this piss 'ead 'ere getting' a few bears, dunt understand a word we're saying' what a wanker! [laughter], just like that, yeah d' y' wanna speak English I'll twat yer face in like [G and D laugh]"

This can be understood on the understanding that the dialogue involves a "rejection of others not included within conventional definitions of masculinity"

85

(Gough and Edwards, 1998: 430) and this in itself marginalises those who are not perceived as belonging to or conforming to the norm. As Charles (2002) comments young Asian men are perceived as being effeminate as they are generally associated with work that is feminine such as shop keeping or office work. Again, the comments from Gough and Edwards research participants are merely rejecting that which is seen to be threatening to heterosexual masculinity; that which is feminine in nature.

Another form of masculinity rejected by heterosexual man due to its association with femininity is that of gay masculinity. Homosexuality is portrayed as something to be feared by the heterosexual man. On the one hand homosexuality is a threat to man's power as he is excluded when this occurs between women and, on the other hand, there is a possible risk that he will be sexual appropriated by another man (Reynaud: 2004). Therefore his fears originate from the belief that he is excluded from the role of providing sexual pleasure for the women and also that he himself will become the object of sexual desire amongst other men. For Kimmel (2004) the marginalisation of homosexuality lies in the belief that masculinity involves a flight from the feminine. In developing the work of Freud, Kimmel (2004) suggests that boys emulate the sexuality of their fathers to be menacing, predatory and possessive and fear their unmasking as frauds, not completely separate from their mothers and thus emasculated as not a real man but a sissy, mama's boy and a wimp. Therefore men are fearful of being seen as not fulfilling their identity as 'real men' that of the all-powerful all-encompassing heterosexual man. As noted by Kinsman (2004: 166)

> "in our society heterosexuality as an institutionalised norm has become an important means of social regulation, enforced by laws, police

practice, family and social polices, schools and the mass media. In its historical development heterosexuality is tied up with the institution of masculinity, which gives social and cultural meaning to biological male anatomy, associating it with masculinity, aggressiveness and an active sexuality"

Consequently 'real' men are inherently heterosexual whilst gay men, therefore, are not 'real' men (Kinsman: 2004). In this respect the heterosexual distances himself from the homosexual as he does not wish to be perceived as anything other than a real man and this in itself often takes on a discursive character, usually this is in the form of homophobic discourse.

Homophobic talk is a form of defence in which the heterosexual man seeks to distance himself from the homosexual man. Coates (2003) suggests that male conversation actively constructs gay men as the despised Other as a means of avoiding talk that is associated with femininity. She provides an example of this through a story told between two friends about an evening out:

> "night before I come here right, I told you this, I was driving down the road and I've just seen this long hair little fucking mini skirt. I've beeped the horn, this fucking bloke turned around, I've gone aaaggghhh!. Bill's gone 'what what what?'It was a bloke. I've gone turn round turn round and he's just turned around and you could just see these shoes hiding under this car and you could see he must have thought we were gonna literally beat the crap out of him. I've driven past opened the window, come out come out wherever you are, here queerie, queerie, queerie"
> (Coates, 2003): 69-70)

Coates (2003) comments that the man in conversation positions himself as a heterosexual through his initial interest in the 'long hair mini skirt' and affirms this through his horror at realising that this person is in actuality a man. In being interested initially in the 'woman' and then using derogatory language when this person is identified as a man, the conversant strengthens heterosexual

87

masculinity and undermines homosexuality. Gough and Edwards (1998) research produced similar findings.

Here their research participants discussed alternative names for homosexuals and homosexuality. Thus

" C: what about poofs? What words 'ave y' got for that?
D: fuckin' loads in't there? One day we came up with like...
G: fudge nudge
C: chutney ferret
D: mattress muncher
G: carpet fitter
C: pillow biter, turd burglar
E: any requests for type of tunes?
G: arse bandit, sausage jockey fuckin'"
(Gough and Edwards, 1998: 427)

They further note that such terminology renders homosexuality as something that is subject to ridicule and abuse with the implication that it is feminine and weak (Gough and Edwards: 1998). For Anderson (2002) this underlines the heterosexism that exists within homophobic discourse that supposes that expressions of heterosexuality is right and proper whilst all other forms of sexuality are immoral, unhealthy or inferior. The US military provides an example of this heterosexism in its policy (both current and historical) on the prevalence of homosexual service men and women within the US armed forces.

In this instance homosexuals have been deemed to be mentally unfit for military service, they have been perceived as threatening to national security, objectionable on moral grounds amongst heterosexuals, a disruptive presence within unit cohesion and as violators of heterosexual privacy (Dean Sinclair: 2009). As Anderson (2002) comments the use of sanctions and other forms of conscious control exemplify the attempts of the US military to reproduce its soldiers as essentially hegemonically masculine as fully integrating homosexual

88

men and women into the service would render them just as good at soldiering as heterosexuals (Dean Sinclair: 2009). The implication here would be that homosexuals are the equal of heterosexuals and thus to be embraced within the US military would threaten the power and privilege currently enjoyed by heterosexual superiority. The world of sport also illustrates this point.

Research by Anderson (2002) found that homophobic discourse served as a means to resist the intrusion of gay subcultures within the sporting environment in order to preserve and maintain orthodox masculinity and patriarchy. The use of the word 'fag' stood as a testament to how gay masculinity was undermined and marginalised within the sporting fraternity as it represented homosexual sportsmen as lesser men than those who were heterosexual. Indeed one of Anderson's research participants discussed his fear of coming out due to the degree of homophobic discourse rife amongst his teammates:

> "I was totally afraid to come out to my team mates; I mean they are always calling other people fags and stuff."
> (Anderson, 2002: 872)

Such discourse underpins the limits to the acceptable face of masculinity. Desultory comments against homosexual men merely serve to bolster the more dominant masculinity (Gough and Edwards: 1998). In this case it is heterosexual masculinity that dominates and gay masculinity that is subordinate and inferior. Therefore whilst masculinity itself can claim to have plural meanings and identities, essentially this plurality of identity is framed from a position of dominance and power that privileges the acceptable face of heterosexual masculinity and marginalises those deemed as the Other.

Hegemonic and Subordinate Masculinity: Theorising the Expectations and Aspirations of Idealised Man

The dominant masculinity as discussed within heterosexual masculinity is found within much of the theorising upon masculinity as relating to one that is hegemonic in nature. Talbot (1998) concurs with Kinsman's (2004) argument in that hegemonic masculinity serves to be the dominant form as it is considered as normal, through tradition has the blessing of the church and is supported by the state (Talbot: 1998). It echoes sex role theory in which the instrumental role for men is concerned with achievement, goal attainment and breadwinning because it is what 'men do' and, the fact that this is reinforced through a process of rewards and punishments, it becomes the means by which individuals take on gender appropriate behaviour (Walklate: 2004; Wharton: 2005). Men learn to be men within a process of socialisation that occurs within the traditional family setting. Thus men, within hegemonic masculinity, are perceived to represent and are somewhat socialised into normative expressions of heterosexuality within an idealised socially dominant man as the breadwinner (Walklate: 2004). Groombridge (2005) suggests that being the breadwinner for men involves more than just a job in that it actually serves to legitimate their maleness. This is exemplified by Haywood and Mac An Ghail (2003) who comment that men who occupy a hegemonic masculinity are asserting a position of superiority and that they do so by winning the consent of other males and females to secure their (hegemonic) legitimacy.

Thus the idea of being a provider for the family becomes a major element in the social construction of masculine identity but it is not solely based upon economic categories, it is also a moral category in the construction of male

identities (Morgan: 2005). As noted by Talbot (1998) bringing in the family wage is considerably entrenched in masculine identities and that work itself is part of what is perceived as being a real man. However what is considered as being a real man is informed and sanctioned by gender relations and that these are embedded in cultural, political, social and economic discourses. With this in mind the moral categorisation of hegemonic masculinity is espoused through key structural agencies relating to the state, education, the media, religion, political institutions and business and, because they are historically dominated by men, they serve to project the dominance of man through the promotion and validation of the ideologies that underpin hegemonic masculinity (Whitehead: 2002). To do so requires the consent of both men and women to maintain patriarchal relations of power (Hearn: 2004). Likewise with heterosexual masculinity, hegemonic masculinity has a counter argument that subordinates men who do not conform to what is socially acceptable as being masculine.

Subordinated masculinities are not considered as a dominant form because they are discredited or oppressed and most often are associated with homosexuality (Connell: 1991; 2002) as previously discussed. Therefore hegemonic and subordinate masculinities are diametrically opposites. Whereas hegemonic masculinity espouses a particular male form as that of heterosexuality, dominance, power, authority and legitimacy subordinate masculinity espouses homosexuality, illegitimacy, femininity, marginalisation and oppression. As noted by Collier (1998) hierarchies that exist between men are structured around the avoidance of being seen as not masculine and of being womanly in terms of being a girl, a puff and a fag. Consequently to be seen as anything other than a normal heterosexual family man is somewhat

91

abnormal and a negative debasement of the male form. To be anything other than heterosexual is to be deviant (Segal: 1997b).

However I wish to argue that subordinate masculinity cannot solely be related to sexuality in that to differ from perceived norms of sexual behaviour is to be deviant. The deviancy of men, in terms of offending, can also be construed as an act of subordinate masculinity in that men contravene their legitimate masculinity by resorting to illegitimate means in order to be breadwinners. Therefore subordinate masculinity is a subcultural form of offending behaviour and a way of being for men. As noted by Connell (2000) whilst the most important example of subordinate masculinity is that of gay masculinity there are numerous marginalised masculinities and gender forms that are exploited or oppressed. Whilst these continue to share many features of hegemonic masculinity they are also socially de-authorised (Ibid: 2000). For Morgan (2005) they can be classed as failed masculinities of the downwardly mobile individual whose failures are considered as not only an indication in the weakness of character but also as something that is gendered (lack of ambition; alcoholism). In this instance subordinate masculinities are deviant because they represent a non conformist attitude and behaviour towards hegemonic masculinity. They can also be thought of as marginalised and as a failed masculinity in relation to men whose identity is categorised within this sphere do not uphold their responsibility and obligations towards their family in a legitimate manner. Therefore men who offend and thus exhibit the characteristics of subordinate masculinity can also be considered as upholding the characteristics of a failed and marginalised masculinity as, again, their behaviour contravenes legitimate hegemonic masculine forms.

This implies that hegemonic masculinity's primacy over subordinate masculinity is determined by those who have power and dominance over others to determine what is and what is not acceptable modes of behaviour and acceptable ways of being. Consequently there is the need to understand "how particular groups of men inhabit positions of power and wealth and how they legitimate and reproduce the social relationships that generate their dominance" (Carrigan quoted by Newburn and Stanko, 1994: 3). Connell's (1987) framework provides the basis upon which this can be ascertained as it is specifically related to the persistent and general use of force by men against men, the institutionalisation and control of hegemonic masculinity and the development of relationships between different masculinities. In doing so there is the recognition that some men have greater power than other men and that that power forms the backdrop of a relationship in which social interaction is structured between and among men and that behaviour serves to inform individual identities (Hunter: 2003; Messerschmidt: 2005). Messerschmidt (1994:82) argues that "boys will be boys' depending upon their position in social structures and upon their access to power and resources". The same is also true for men. Men will be men, in a legitimate and hegemonic sense, according to their access to power, resources and social capital within the social structure. Deviancy is a manifestation of the inability to attain and acquire social capital and thus have access to resources and become hegemonic man. Instead they become subordinate man.

Yet the preponderance of hegemonic masculinity as representing the dominant male form is somewhat idealistic. It is portrayed as the ideal to which men should aspire and is embedded within a variety of social and structural

foundations as the norm. It is a "structural device that understands the production and re-production of masculine attributes, attitudes and behaviours..." and centres this around the "...outcomes of social processes and inequalities which are upheld at every level of society" (Jewkes, 2002: 51). Therefore this idealised form of masculinity is something that may not necessarily speak for the actions and behaviours of all men within society. It is an aspiration rather than an actuality. Thus

> "the actual personalities of the majority of men may show little correspondence with the cultural ideals of masculinity. It may be, in fact, that hegemony needs fantasy figures to embody its particular variety of masculinity".
> (MacKinnon, 2003: 9)

Henceforth, hegemonic masculinity will be replaced throughout the remainder of this thesis and be referred to as idealised masculinity and as a counter argument to this, subordinate masculinity will be referred to as marginalised masculinity. It is these two concepts that will inform the forthcoming discussions within criminology and the importance of masculinity within this discipline in relation to understanding the nature of criminality.

Criminological Man: Violence and Crime as an Expression of Masculinity

The governance of crime and criminality has long been a topic of debate and, until very recently, little thought has been given to the concept of masculinity within this framework. Indeed discussions of gender within criminology tend to focus primarily, though not exclusively, upon domestic violence, rape and what Heidensohn (2002) terms as 'private harms' with women as victims and men as perpetrators of crime. This perhaps is unsurprising as, in the informal culture of neighbourhoods, workplaces and pubs, there is the expectation that husbands

are to keep their wives or women in their place and this controlled or threat of force has widely been constituted as men's repertoire of dealing with women and children (Connell: 2000). Those who cannot do this are often regarded by other men with contempt and subject to being labelled as 'henpecked' or their relationship is governed by the common phrase 'she wears the trousers' scenario (Ibid: 2000). Within this realm the criminology of men has been shaped by their propensity to commit and act out violent behaviours. It is this which has often become the focus of criminological investigation.

Websdale and Chesney Lind (1998) argue that men are much more likely to behave violently towards women than women are towards men. According to Messerschmidt (1993: 144) this is derived from the belief that the violence of men towards women is intimately linked to the more traditional patriarchal expectations of men as firstly "credible figures within monogamous relationships and secondly that men possess the inherent right to control those relationships". For Websdale and Chesney Lind (1998) it is representative of the extent to which it exemplifies their [men's] socio-political domination over women and, simultaneously, provides the means by which this can be controlled and maintained. However Talbot (1998) argues that such a social ascendancy implies that there is a requirement imposed upon men that they will embody both male dominance and control and that they will perform it.

Thus the violent behaviour of men is often cast as serving their role and expectations in life as men. These expectations become culturally embedded and, as such, underpin the overriding fact that men are violent and behave more violently than women. In this respect men's violence towards women is

95

endemic across many societies but it is codified through everyday cultural practices and legal systems that serve to render such practices as invisible (Whitehead: 2002). Therefore it is somewhat a given that male behaviour will often be underpinned by violence or by the threat of violence. In this respect violence is therefore gendered and, as such, it is considered as a problem and consequence of masculinity (Braithwaite and Daly: 1994). However such acts of violence conducted by men are not only directed at women. Men also behave violently towards other men and, for some, this again serves to solidify and affirm their masculinity.

Research conducted by Canaan (1996) identifies the extent to which acts of violence between men act as key signifiers of masculinity and a way for men to express their strength and dominance. This expression of masculinity through violence was typified in the relationship between fighting and drinking. Canaan (1996: 119) commented that both fighting and drinking provided the mechanisms by which young men could exercise their power and control of hardness and, in doing so,

> "they performed outrageous acts with friends, in which they demonstrated bodily might or acted violently towards a subordinate. Thus individual acts of hardness took place amongst peers who drank and laughed together at individual and collective acts of strength, power and daring."

Research by Messerschmidt (1999) however found that masculinity through violence was accomplished not as a sign of physical strength and dominance amongst peers but as a method of solving interpersonal problems.

Through constructing the life histories of two young men, Messerschmidt (1999) located violent masculinities within the context and as a result of family

dynamics and practices that emphasised and endorsed physical violence as not only the correct and effective response to a threat but that it was also demonstrative of being a real man. In this sense a real man was obliged to respond to any threats through the use of violence. To use any other means would, by definition, be perceived as being unmanly. Primarily what both of these studies identify is the extent to which masculinity, when discussed within criminological discourse, is framed by acts of violence. Most often such acts are perpetrated against women but they are also committed by men against men with the similarity of outcome that is demonstrative of physical strength and control. As a consequence, it can be perceived as an exemplary of the cultural orientation of what it is to be a real man.

As noted by Hall (2002: 37) "male cultural production exalts these practices by giving men the impression that they have a legitimate right to call upon violence when it is deemed essential to the maintenance of the traditional order". Consequently a cultural hegemony reproduces the belief in the legitimacy of men to use violence to oppress women and less belligerent males as part of a traditional masculine order (Hall: 2002). In doing so Braithwaite and Daly (1994) note that men's violence against men involves a masculinity of status, competition and bravado amongst peers whilst men's rape and assault of women represents a masculinity of domination, control, humiliation and the degradation of women. Thus multiple masculinities are seemingly at play in terms of the gendered pattern of violence as displayed by men. It is these key facets of masculinity (status competition, physical force, domination and humiliation of the less powerful) that have an overriding cultural support (Ibid: 1994).

Thus the violent behaviour of men is something that is frequently acted out and performed in a wider cultural theatre and it is something that is anchored in social and cultural values of what it is to be a man through the perceived ability and opportunity of men to react violently towards other men and women (Whitehead: 2002). As a consequence "criminality and masculinity are linked because the sort of acts associated with each have much in common. The demonstration of physical strength, a certain kind of aggressiveness, visible and external proof of achievement, whether legal or illegal – these are the facets of the ideal male personality and also much of criminal behaviour" (Oakley quoted by Box, 1983: 175).

Idealised VS Marginalised Masculinity: Putting the Man back into Cri(man)ology

From the previous discussion and perspective upon the criminality of men, it would appear that the issue espoused by criminology is predominantly one that is male specific and of consequence is gender blind. As noted by Walklate (2004) many feminist writers conclude that the world is often presented as a masculine world and yet, conversely, many men have not found themselves the objects of the criminological gaze.

Naffine (10: 2003) argues that the "man question remains the most troubling and pressing question of criminology and criminal justice..." as it is "...men [who] are vastly more criminal than women". Whilst Messerschmidt (1999: 1) concurs with this and argues that "while men and boys have been viewed as 'normal subjects', the gendered content of their legitimate and illegitimate behaviour has been virtually ignored". Jefferson (1992) further comments that

the knowledge that most crime is committed by men is rarely, if ever, acknowledged and that there is a need to put masculinity back into criminology. Taken in conjunction with a perceived contemporary crisis of masculinity (Jefferson: 2002) there is a need to consider the criminality of men within the concept of masculinity. This is especially relevant when given the fact that "what it is to be a man has become a real personal problem for large numbers of men and a pressing social problem for the societies in question" (Jefferson, 2002: 65). With this as a given it is surprising that little consideration has been given to the 'man' question or indeed, when it has, has merely rested upon the violence of men as an expression of masculinity as significant for the committal of offences by men.

What seemingly is not given consideration is how masculinity can be significant for the rehabilitative process of male offenders. In this instance it is the concept of idealised and marginalised masculinity that can allow for the man question to be debated within criminology and, in doing so, it becomes highly significant and relevant for the rehabilitation of male prisoners. As noted by Braithwaite and Daly (1994:190) "while male identities [within the family] are a problem, the caring sides to those identities may be part of the solution." Essentially idealised man is the ideal type to which all men should aspire to but those who deviate are failing their masculine identity and thus are defined as marginalised man.

Herein lies the key facet of how idealised and marginalised masculinity are relevant for contemporary criminological concerns but, more importantly, of how marginalised masculinity and can be conceived of as a masculine deviant subculture in terms of behaviour that needs to be transformed into idealised

man. On the one hand idealised masculinity and the breadwinning role is sanctioned by the family, society, the church and the state because it is legitimate. Work and paid employment provides the means by which men actively and legitimately achieve masculinity. On the other hand marginalised masculinity remains deviant because the behaviour of men contravenes the rule of law and men's achievement of masculinity is arrived at through illegitimate means. In other words, it is achieved via offending behaviour and it is the committal of offences that determine marginalised man's role as the breadwinner.

However, as noted in the introduction, marginalised man is one who suffers from multiple disadvantage and lacks the social capital by which legitimate paid employment can be obtained. Being in receipt of benefits further marginalises men within society to the point that the whole process of social exclusion erodes their male identity from one that is positive and productive to one that is negative and destructive. Marginalised masculinity can therefore become the solution to the emasculation of men in their quest to achieve the dominant and privileged status that is afforded to idealised masculinity (albeit through offending behaviour). I suggest that it is these points of interest that are missing from much of the criminological literature and of much that is discussed within penality.

Here I wish to argue that penal governance and policy is formulated around the notions of idealised and marginalised masculinity as it is these that underpin certain features of contemporary punishment and imprisonment through the new rehabilitation of the new penality. They serve to provide the mechanism by

which the behavioural expectations of men are both constituted and institutionalised serving to sanction male behaviour within a gendered masculine role. The aim of which is to transform marginalised man into idealised man. To transform the failed marginalised socially excluded man into a successful more socially inclusive idealised man. Essentially the risks emanating from marginalised masculinity are to be managed through the responsible and moral reconstruction of idealised masculinity. The following section discusses this further and aims to put the man back into cri(man)ology through the penal governance of male prisoners.

4 The New Penality and Idealised Masculinity: A New Man for A New Rehabilitation?

The New Penality with its emphasis upon the responsibilisation and moralisation agenda of the new rehabilitation (as discussed in Chapter Two), not only serves to underpin the features of contemporary penality but is also demonstrative of the extent to which idealised and marginalised masculinity are relevant for the emergence of contemporary modes of rehabilitation. The production and definition of masculinity within not only the social structure but also institutions serves to act as a benchmark through which idealised forms are both normalised, made real and are constituted as sanctioning lawful or expected modes of behaviour. As exemplified by Walklate (2004: 65) the concept of a man's role within society provides a mechanism for "understanding the ways in which social expectations, actions and behaviour reflect stereotypical assumptions about behavioural expectations: that is, what it is that should be done, by whom and under what circumstances." Idealised man represents what it is that should be done, by whom and under what

circumstances whilst marginalised man represents what should not be done, who it shouldn't be done by and under what circumstances.

Sparks (2003) wisely points to the fact that many reactionaries, revolutionists and reformers have at one time or another acknowledged or sensed a connection between the various forms of punishment that have existed within their respective societies and the moral or political inclination and constitution of the times. 21st Century penality is no exception but in reflecting contemporary moral and political constitutions that currently exist, punishment and imprisonment are characterised and defined within gender specific practices. It is this which serves to cast male offenders and male prisoners within the aforementioned masculine sex role and construes masculinity as troublesome (Hearn: 1998) and therefore needs remedying or correcting. But it is marginalised man who is troublesome and it is marginalised masculinity that is shrouded within the discourse of risk as a hazard to be managed and controlled through the moral and responsible reconstruction of men towards idealised masculinity. The management and minimisation of harm perceived to be conducted by marginalised man could be construed as providing the solutions to Jefferson's (2002) and Hearn's (1999) social problem of men. Thus in diagnosing the existence of a social problem of men, its treatment can be found within the prescription of a idealised form. It reinforces O'Malley's (2000) argument that the criminal is an active subject and, as such, is to become invested with personal responsibility for his actions and status within society. Consequently, and in adopting similar sentiments to Connell (2000), the relationship between personal life and structure is perceived as a key issue in respect of masculinity and within penality reflects men's engagement in crime

102

and its relationship to the hierarchical organisation of criminal justice institutions.

The punishment of offenders exemplifies the link between identity and behaviour and is significant as sentencing practice is based upon perceived or known levels of dangerousness. As recommended in the Halliday Report (Home Office, 2001b: 13) the severity of sentencing should be guided by the principles of risk and the management of such risks whereby:

- "the severity of the punishment should reflect the seriousness of the offence and the offender's criminal history;

- the seriousness of the offence should reflect its degree of harmfulness and the offenders culpability in committing the offence and;

- in consideration of the offender's criminal history, the severity of the sentence should increase to reflect previous convictions taking account of how recent and relevant they were."

This in itself is demonstrative not only of the extent to which men, in positions of power, not only serve to reproduce social relationships that maintain their dominance but it can also raise the question of how masculinity is both institutionalised and controlled. This is most relevant for risk (as discussed in Chapter Two) and public protection issues whereby those who do not conform to perceived norms of behaviour are seen as a risk or threat to the established social order of the law abiding inclusive majority. Thus, individuals can undergo a classification process in which their identities are constituted by the extent to which the public is in need of protection from them (in relation to their offending behaviour) and sentenced accordingly.

This can be related specifically to notions of masculinity as the Home Office (2004a) indicate that the majority of crime is committed by males with eighty three percent of persistent offenders being male committing offences ranging

from, amongst others, burglary and theft and with criminogenic needs ranging from lifestyle, attitudes and thinking skills, drug misuse, unemployment, accommodation and training and education needs. In addition Jefferson (1992) states that apart from shoplifting, where offending rates are evenly balanced between the sexes, all other crimes including property crimes, violent crimes, crimes of the powerless/powerful and crimes committed against or by the state are dominated by men. Thus offending can represent a specific form of masculinity, one in which sentencing practice both punishes and endeavours to correct. Indeed the seeds of marginalised man are evident in the crime and criminality of men. This is indicative of a deviation from idealised man towards the failure of marginalised man. Marginalised man should be punished whilst idealised man is its salvation.

With this in mind the Halliday Report (Home Office: 2001b) argues that the case for a change in sentencing practice and punishment should include risk based measures of assessment in which targeted programmes include the development of offender's thinking and understanding in order to effect a change in attitudes and offending; the removal of drug and/or alcohol dependency; improvements in literacy, numeracy levels and other aspects of educational training; improvements in job related skills. The former Home Secretary David Blunkett (2004) also outlined similar plans with education and work given priority to increase offenders basic skills qualifications, for prisoners to have access to the Open University, for learning in custody to be achieved through vocational training and the development of Custody to Work and Freshstart for prisoners to increase their prospects of finding a job upon their release. All of which points to the remedy of marginalised man into idealised

man but within the confines of the new penality and its mode of rehabilitation. As previously mentioned the responsibilisation and moralisation agenda of the new rehabilitation promotes the active participation of prisoners to manage their own well being and that of their families through a recognition of the consequences of their behaviour, to understand the various factors that have contributed to it and to make the necessary changes to prevent an occurrence of offending behaviour. In doing so the overall aim is to govern and shape the behaviour and action of individuals towards more constructive and productive contours. To manage the risk of marginalised man is to promote the development of idealised man and it is this that underpins the rehabilitative function of prisons within the new penality.

Imprisonment itself however, as a prescriptive remedy for the problem of men, represents the ultimate in male dominance and the ability of men to shape, control and govern the idealised reality of other men. It is demonstrative of the extent to which men, in positions of power, not only reproduce social relationships that maintain their dominance but also raise the question of how masculinity is both institutionalised and controlled. Idealised man is the object of policy makers and the objective by which they identify male offenders are to be rehabilitated and reformed. This in itself denotes the hierarchical relationship that exists between men, crime and criminal justice agencies in its most emblematic form. However this does not mean that what is decided upon at the policy level is necessarily accepted at the point of its delivery. Whilst this argument is not the focus of this thesis it is worth noting that the recipients of penal policy (i.e. prisoners) do resist the attempts of policy makers to guide, instruct and construct their lived experiences within prison regimes.

Resistance by prisoners against the prison regime can be categorised under three headings which I shall term as (1) riots and rebellion, (2) politics of identity (incorporating gender, religion, diet e.t.c) and (3) manipulation or backstage resistance. Within all three categories the aim is to resist the power of the institution via power at the individual and/or personal and collective level in order for the prisoner(s) to maintain some semblance of autonomy and freedom in an environment where that has been curtailed. Research conducted by Scraton et al (1991), Bosworth (1998) and Crewe (2007a) provides examples of this.

Firstly in terms of riots and rebellion, Scraton et al (1991) conducted research into the riots at Peterhead prison in Scotland and found that the prison was managed on the basis of the 'less eligibility' criteria of the nineteenth century Poor Law reforms and it was this regime that formed the basis of the male prisoners rebellion. The themes of the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws 1832-1834 suggested that the "situation of the able bodied pauper be inferior to that of the poorest independent worker..." and as such indoor relief (the workhouse) was to be made as disagreeable as possible by "...vexatious regulations, want of social amenities, hard labour, poor dietary requirements and the imposition of strict discipline" (Englander, 1998: 11-12). The assumption here was that the pauper was the perpetrator of his own misfortune and that such disagreeable conditions would force the pauper out of the workhouse to find employment of any kind within the market (Englander: 1998). For Scraton et al (1991) this formed the basis of the prison regime as experienced by the prisoners in Peterhead.

Scraton et al (1991) comment that the daily lives of the prisoners were filled with and lived in an environment with poor sanitation and hygiene, a strict timetable of activities, poorly organised and boring work and recreational activities, violence from both fellow prisoners and prison staff and lock up for some prisoners for twenty three hours a day. All of which culminated in a regime that was punitive, harsh and humiliating. The rebellion of the prisoners against this regime was noted as a demonstration of a desperate form of resistance against such brutality and inhumane treatment. Therefore the riots occurred not out of a sense of mindless violence directed at the fabric of the prison but as a 'vehicle for change' (Scraton et al: 1991).

To some extent the riot as a vehicle for change echoes the work of Bosworth (1999) and her research into the resistance of female prisoners as she found that the prison environment instilled ideals of femininity that have long since been abandoned (cleaning, gardening, sewing, cooking and hairdressing amongst others) and that it was this that became the object of resistance. With reference to the second theme of resistance, the politics of identity, she identified that femininity and gender (as well as race, religion and diet) were challenges to the stereotypical values of the institution and used by the women to promote their own identity and agency in contrast to that dictated by the prison. To give one example many women formed lesbian relationships that not only soothed the pains of imprisonment but also flouted "prison rules – since sexual relations are disallowed – at the same time as it contradicts many fundamental assumptions about femininity" (Bosworth and Carrabine, 2001: 512). Therefore

> "the women did not seem to aspire to or seem to support the homogeneous femininity advocated by the institution. Rather they

107

> pursued diverse gender roles through lesbian relationships and religious and ethnic practices, particularly those concerned with diet, education and dress"
>
> (Bosworth, 1999: 135)

Thus power is negotiated by women through a process of developing an identity that contradicts the traditional norms of femininity and it is this that is the motor for change addressing, as it does, outdated stereotypes.

The third and final category of resistance, manipulation or backstage resistance, comes from the work of Crewe (2007a). In this scenario prisoners understood that they could neither ignore or overcome the prison system and instead acted out a scene of active obedience, in effect, telling the authorities what they wanted to hear in order to progress through the system. Here Crewe (2007a: 271) provides a narrative from a male prisoner demonstrating his active obedience

> "the way that's useful for me is manipulation. [...]Being summat you're not. Letting them think that you're this good person. [...] When I went to sentencing planning, I knew what he wanted to hear. [...] I says 'I do feel sorry for my victims and I'd like to have a chance to apologise to them'. But deep down I didn't give a fuck. [..] You've got to make sure you are seen how you want to be seen. [..] Its an act."

Crewe (2007a) puts forth the argument that prisoners see themselves as active and resistant rather than resigned and compliant as they are willing to play the game on paper but without 'normative engagement'. In doing so resistance is achieved through manipulation and such deception heralds a victory against the system.

Yet such resistance against the prison establishment on numerous levels does not seem to detract policymakers away from their fundamental ideals on policy. The idealised masculinity of men continues to underpin much penal policy and

motors for reform and rehabilitation. As Young and Matthews (2003) argue work is deemed to be the key theme in New Labour discourse representing not only a means of escaping social exclusion but also a means of preventing re-offending through the implementation of education and training programmes. A National Action Plan to Reduce Re-offending (Home Office: 2004b) states that three quarters of prisoners do not have employment upon their release and almost half of prisoners have few or no qualifications. Webster et al (2001) further suggest that recipients of income support and those in unskilled employment prior to imprisonment were more likely to be reconvicted upon their release thus indicating that levels of education and unemployment can be considered as predictors of recidivism. Indeed research compiled by Harper and Chitty (2005) indicate that employment, training and education were common offending factors for sixty five percent of those sentenced to custody. Again echoes of the new penality and the new rehabilitation resonate here indicating that the problematic nature of offending is related to the failed moral construction of offenders and thus to failed masculinities. The moral engineer must come to the fore and replace such failures with the success of idealised man.

Consequently it is of little surprise that employability skills have formed part of the 'What Works' package (as discussed in Chapter Two) under the umbrella of community reintegration as it is widely acknowledge that work conducted to address problems of reintegration, such as literacy, numeracy and employability skills, should be a vital component of effective intervention programmes (Crime Reduction: 2003). Coupled with HM Prison Service (Home Office: 2004b) creating Heads of Learning and Skills in all prison establishments, the overall conclusion that can be reached is that work gives meaning to a particular form

of male identity constituting that of the legitimate worker and provider. And exemplifies the extent to which imprisonment entails measures for improving offender's employability status in order to prevent re-offending thus serving to remedy the social problem and troublesome aspects of actively and actually being a man. As argued by Rose (2000) and discussed in Chapter Two, the networks of inclusion seek to promote the habits of independence, life planning and autonomous life conduct so that man can be reintegrated back into family, work and consumption. In doing so the replacement of marginalised with idealised man is complete. It could be argued that the work of the new rehabilitation within prisons is seemingly replacing what is often lost in the youth of men who find themselves imprisoned. Namely that of work as it is this that is the key reference point through which the subjectivity of male identity is understood (Collier: 1998). Scourfield and Drakeford (2002) identify the importance of work as a mode of taming troublesome men because essentially "without work and in particular without an appropriate *initiation* into work, the transition from childhood/youth to male adulthood is rendered problematic (Collier, 1998: 74).

Therefore employment and the ability or capability to work underpins certain features of contemporary punishment and imprisonment serving to construct male prisoners within a gendered masculine role. Here prisoners as men and the function of the prison seek to shape male behaviour through the inculcation of the work ethic and development of employability skills that can be conceived of as representing the validated ideologies of masculinity. As previously mentioned it defines how maleness is legitimated through behavioural expectations by giving men an instrumental role and purpose within civil society

detailing how men who offend should behave (what it is that should be done), via criminal just agencies within prison programmes (by whom) and with the intention of transforming an offender into a non-offender under the auspice of sentencing practice within a custodial setting (under what circumstances) (Walklate: 2004; Groombridge: 2005). The aim of which is to reverse Collier's (1998) observation that lovely boys are turning into unlovely men and to make the unlovely lovely once more. Thus instead of idealised masculinity being accomplished through crime (Messerschmidt: 1997) idealised masculinity is to be accomplished through rehabilitation.

Masculinity and Imprisonment: A Gendered Framework for Male Prisoners

Essentially then the concept of masculinity not only serves to cast men as offenders and thus of exhibiting criminal intent but it also provides the mechanism by which men can be rehabilitated and thus re-constituted as non-offenders. As noted by Morash (2006) this process encompasses five specific factors:

- Constructions of masculinity are embedded and encouraged in correctional institutions;

- Masculinities are related to life choices and life chances and the desistance from crime involves an offender revisioning what it is to be male;

- Programmes encourage offenders to change their gender ideologies and identities;

- Correctional programmes may attempt to alter existing gender arrangements through actions such as job creation and;

- Gender ideologies of programme developers influence the design of correctional and punitive experiences.

It is after all human agents that are the active producers of penal policy and practice and, as such, prison populations are constructed by the ideological beliefs of powerful members of capitalist states (Milovanovic: 1991). In doing so

111

they serve to placate fears that are born out of that system (Ibid: 1991) and construct rehabilitation programmes accordingly. Therefore penal discourses that favour morality, risk and strategies for intervention become entwined, organised and rendered as socially meaningful through the organising force of state institutions that have produced them (Coleman and Sim: 2005).

Coleman and Sim's (2005: 108) discussion of CCTV within the city suggests that it is a tool that "legitimates a series of punitive interventions and sanctions for those who fail to 'perform' in these spaces." This is an argument that could be levelled at masculinity within the new rehabilitation. The concept of idealised man and the ideal of men's role, function and behaviour within families and the wider society legitimate a series of interventions within the prison environment for men who fail to perform as they should. It is marginalised man who fails in this task and it is idealised man who legitimates state intervention within the penal realm to address and correct these failures. As noted by Witz and Savage (quoted by Carrabine and Longhurst: 1998) organisations themselves are routinely gendered and these gendered organisations therefore are both central and key figures in the reproduction and reconstitution of wider gender relations. In doing so it serves to demonstrate the extent to which men seemingly have power over other men and that this power allows for the control and articulation of idealised masculinity.

As exemplified within the new penality the risks from criminal behaviour are to be counteracted by the development of a more morally responsible individual through social discipline and moral re-armament of civil society that cast individuals as having prime responsibility for their personal, familial and

communal security against life's risks (Stenson: 2001). The masculinisation of the new rehabilitation is part of the process by which this is made possible. Kemshall's (2002) misguided subject is marginalised man whereas Hannah-Moffat's (2005) prudent risk/needs manager is idealised man. As a consequence rather than viewing men as prisoners the aim is one which views prisoners as men (Sim: 1994). Although this could be construed as being constitutive of the gender blindness of criminology, in fact the recognition of men and the modes and means by which it is possible to rehabilitate their offending behaviour exemplifies the development of the man question within criminological discourse and, by the same token, the gendered framework that has developed within penality underpinned by masculinity. The aforementioned categories as given by Morash (2006) detailing the masculine character of penal concerns stands as a testament to this.

Indeed, current penal policy and rehabilitative programmes overwhelmingly advance the rehabilitation of men. Or they serve to flag up the masculine nature and maleness of offending behaviour. In reiterating the Home Office (2004a) report on persistent and prolific offenders, eighty three percent are male with an average conviction rate of two to three occasions per year ranging from eight to nine offences. In conjunction with this work to address such prolific and persistent offending consisting of programmes centring upon drug misuse, offending behaviour and education and incorporating both male and female offenders, was predominantly male orientated with seventy nine out of eighty five prison participants being male (Ibid: 2004a). Indeed of the ten offending behaviour programmes identified within the Correctional Policy Framework (Home Office: 1999b) nine of those are male orientated within only one

113

specifically aimed at female prisoners. Thus the current penal climate seemingly embraces the maleness of crime and criminality whilst giving scant attention to the femaleness of offending. This is exemplified by the most recent report from the Ministry of Justice detailed in a background paper regarding penal policy. In this instance female offenders were perceived as having many complex personal needs coupled with difficult family circumstances with a high proportion of those in custody at risk of self harm and experiencing or suffering mental, physical, sexual or emotional abuse (Ministry of Justice: 2007). Whilst at the same time, a general commentary (one can only assume directed at the male prisoner population) indicates that there needs to be a high security prison system for violent and dangerous prisoners and that the reduction of re-offending shall be achieved through the provision of health, education, drugs and alcohol, housing and employment support (Ibid: 2007). Therefore it could be argued that contemporary penal trends encompass both a feminisation and masculinisation framework in dealing with and responding to offending behaviour. This gendered framework for penality is significant for male prisoners as it ultimately serves to construct, as previously mentioned, their process of rehabilitation within the constitution of masculinity. In doing so offending is not only demonstrative of masculine conduct but its remedy and risks can also be managed and achieved through masculinity.

Crime is therefore overtly a male behavioural trait representative of a particular type of masculinity albeit one that is marginalised and, according to Messerschmidt (1993) can be classified as destructive. One, undoubtedly, that is in need of correction through reformation or rehabilitation that is both idealised and productive. Indeed while male prisons continue to be populated

114

by those who have experienced truancy and exclusion from school and whose poor schooling is reflected in their literacy and numeracy levels, prison programmes will be implemented to provide education and real work skills (Owers: 2007). The aim of which is to fundamentally ensure that male prisoners are better equipped with the requisite skills to gain work after their release as employment is considered as the single most important factor likely to aid resettlement and reduce re-offending (Ibid: 2007). This in turn is relevant for the maintenance of family ties.

In this respect "employment may provide an income and occupy ex-prisoners time constructively so they have fewer opportunities for deviant activities, but it may also improve their sense of self-worth by facilitating the development of new skills and allowing them the opportunity to provide for their families (Mills and Codd, 2007: 673-674). In treating employment as a means for prisoners to provide for their families, this gendered approach towards penality merely epitomises and consolidates the importance of idealised masculinity as providing the mechanisms by which male prisoners can be rehabilitated and reduce levels of re-offending. Again marginalised man is to be reconstructed and reproduced into idealised man resulting in the new rehabilitation for a new penality being articulated around the concept of masculinity.

The emphasis upon education, work and family commitments as key components of the masculinisation of the new rehabilitation suggests that penality is focused upon the ideals of workfarism. In this case it is Penal Workfarism through the constitution of masculinity that is informing the rehabilitation of male prisoners. As discussed in Chapter Two, workfarism

underpins the social control function of contemporary Post-Fordist and Advanced Liberal rule through the risk management of individuals and through the encouragement and/or coercion of those to bend to the demands and flexibilities of the workfare state. As Argued by Jessop (2003) the workfarist approach aims to encourage and enforce work through active forms of social and employment policy that aid the development of transitional labour markets to smooth the path from welfare into work. Penality undoubtedly conforms to this agenda as the constitution of idealised masculinity within the new rehabilitative function of the prison seeks to aid the transition not from welfare but certainly from imprisonment into work. In addition governmental objectives that are committed to "transforming citizens from passive recipients of state assistance into active self sustaining individuals" (Clarke: 2005) also finds a voice within penality. Here it is the transformative process from criminal endeavours as a means of support to active self sustaining individuals in support of themselves that informs contemporary penal trends.

Therefore it is without doubt that the underlying principle of masculinity within penality serves to constitute men as familial breadwinners via the work ethic and thus men become subjected to a particular notion of masculinity and the perceived idea of what it is to be a man in order to produce productive and responsible human beings. The construction of offenders and/or prisoners within the concept of idealised masculinity is serving to not only recast the role of the ideal type of man for society but it is also serving to recast the role of rehabilitation. The risks and harms exhibited by marginalised man are to be managed, controlled and disarmed by idealised man. In this instance the new rehabilitation ultimately strives to reproduce idealised man through the onus that

is placed upon work and education as a means of preventing re-offending. It aims to reverse and to some extent terminate the existence of marginalised man. Therefore the new rehabilitation can be thought of as a masculinised concept as it represents the transformation of marginalised man into idealised man. Thus maleness for men within the prison environment and through rehabilitation is both a way of being and a way of becoming.

CHAPTER FOUR

Analysing Documents and Texts: Research Design and Discourse Methodology

1 Introduction

"One predominant way of characterising the task of the social scientist is to see it as attempting to provide a theoretical account of social life."
(Hughes and Sharrock, 1990: 104)

The aim of this chapter is to discuss the methods I utilised in order to conduct my analysis, in this case discourse and documentary analysis. This chapter will therefore discuss these methods, how I used them and why and the rationale for specifying masculinity as the context upon which to base the research. The research takes language as a means of interpreting and understanding the social world. This is understood through the analysis of discourse and it is through the discursive character of official documentation that I will interpret the social reality of prison rehabilitation programmes for male prisoners within the context of masculinity. By encompassing prisoner rehabilitation within the concept of idealised masculinity, I endeavour to ascertain how and for what purposes idealised masculinity informs prison rehabilitation programmes and how they intend to shape the identity of prisoners as men. For the purposes of my research idealised masculinity is defined as representing an idealised version of hegemonic masculinity with men positioned within society as the breadwinner and the provider for the family (Walklate: 2004). Therefore my overall argument is that idealised masculinity is a form of governance in the risk management of male prisoners and offenders.

In order to achieve this, a number of relevant documents will be identified and utilised as primary sources of data. These documents will be classified as

official documentation and will be accessed from governmental sources and charitable organisations that have a significant and relevant bearing upon imprisonment. They include HM Inspectorate of Prisons reports, reports from the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB), research reports and documentation produced by HM Prison Service, the Ministry of Justice, the Home Office and the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) as well as research reports and documentation from Prison Advice and Care Trust (PACT), Safe Ground, Storybook Dads, Prison Reform Trust, Inside Out Trust, Action for Prisoners Families and Nacro. I will utilise this documentation to inform the understanding of official representations of idealised masculinity and how this concept itself informs prison rehabilitation programmes. The result will demonstrate how idealised masculinity, as a form of identity achieved through rehabilitative measures, not only serves to create idealised types of men for a civil and productive society but that such notions underpin the risk management of male offenders.

The following narrative will discuss these ideas and concepts further. Firstly I will begin by providing a definition of what is meant by discourse analysis and documentary analysis. I will then consider how I utilised this within my analysis and finally I will discuss why I opted to analyse the rehabilitation of male prisoners through the lens of idealised masculinity and official documents.

2 Discourse and Documentary Analysis: The Language and Meaning of Documentary Texts

Discourse Analysis: The Analytics of Language and Texts

Some researchers believe that the definition of what is generally meant by Discourse Analysis (DA) is difficult to ascertain. Indeed because of its diverse

119

and differing variations, DA as a methodological tool for social scientific analysis is often found wanting (Tonkiss: 1998); Maingeneau: 1999; Wood and Kroger: 2000; Bryman: 2004). As such one could argue that the analysis of discourse is therefore a contested issue. However I wish to provide a discussion of what I interpret as DA and primarily my focus will be that discourse is framed by language and thus, as a social research method, the aim of DA is to be a communicative tool to enhance our understanding of the social world via the analysis of language as a representation of social reality.

Tonkiss (1998) argues that language and texts are generally considered as the locus of study but they are viewed as particular forms of discourse that both create and reproduce systems of social meaning. In this respect DA involves the analysis of language in order to understand or to make sense of how language contributes to or constructs varieties of social meaning. Quite simply, discourse refers to the use of language in either speech or writing (Fairclough and Wodak: 1997) and it is the analysis of language as discourse that becomes the focus of interest or concern (Bryman: 2004). Therefore discourse is framed by language and language thus has a discursive character. To argue that discourse constitutes the social world simultaneously implies that the social world is characterised and made real through language. With this in mind, one can conclude that DA is a research technique that involves a particular way of thinking about discourse (or language) and a particular way of treating discourse (or language) as data (Wood and Kroger: 2000).

Muncie (2006) suggests that DA is a generic term that covers a wide variety of theoretical and analytical constructs that seek to explore the connections

between language, communication, knowledge and social practices. In summary it places the focus upon the meaning and structure of communicative actions in a given context (Ibid: 2006). In this instance language within DA becomes the source of data and the topic of research. Language and texts are *the* sites in which social meanings are both created and reproduced and they are the sites in which social identities are framed (Tonkiss: 1998). For Fairclough (2003) discourses are ways of representing aspects of the world through the processes, relations and structures of the material world, through the mental world of thoughts, feelings and beliefs and through the social world. Therefore discourse is not only representative of but also actively serves to create and produce a variety of aspects that exist within the world and a variety of social identities that comprise the world in which we live. It is a constitutive force with language at the forefront.

Language is thus both active and functional shaping and reproducing social realities, identities and ideas and, through analysing language within a discursive basis, the aim becomes one of examining how it is utilised to present these differing pictures of reality (Tonkiss: 1998). Wetherell (2001a) provides a list of six particular research traditions within DA that exemplify the importance of language as a constituting force within society. A brief description of these research tools for DA is presented in the following table (Table One; Page 122).

Table One: Six Methods of Discourse Analysis

Discourse Traditions	Description of Method
1. Conversation analysis and ethnomethodology	Focuses upon how culture and its shared meanings and social norms are developed, maintained and changed underpinned by the study of language (Punch: 2005)
2. Interactional sociolinguistics and the ethnography of communication	Focuses upon social behaviour/practice of language within a social context and the relationship between social contexts and the function of language (Yates: 2001)
3. Discursive psychology	The exploration of DA within a psychological context analysing the ways in which people both represent/make sense of social reality (Wetherell: 2001b)
4. Critical discourse analysis and critical linguistics	Aims to link language and its mode of use to the significance of power and social difference in society (Bryman: 2008)
5. Bakhtinian research	The study of language as a concrete and lived reality in which meaning occurs through the dynamic social use of language in different contexts for different purposes (Maybin: 2001)
6. Foucauldian research	Focus upon discourse as a way in which a particular set of linguistic categories relate to an object and ways of depicting it from the way that object is comprehended (Bryman: 2008)

Source: Wetherell M, Yates S and Maybin J, Sage, 2001
Punch K, Sage, 2005
Bryman A, Oxford University Press, 2008

The importance of language within these differing research tools indicates that discourse is both "socially constitutive and socially shaped; it constitutes situations, objects of knowledge and the social identities of and relationships between people and groups of people" (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997: 258). In this instance discourse is not only a constituting force but it is also

122

representative of power relationships between individuals and/or social groups within society. Thus, on the one hand discourse shapes social identity and belonging to social groups whilst on the other, it indicates and demarcates the differences between dominant and subordinate groups.

Bryman (2008) relates these concepts to Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), as briefly outlined in Table One, in which language becomes the source of power in relation to ideological and socio-cultural change. Discourse is the vehicle by which this power is exercised through various disciplinary practices such as the operation of rules and procedures to normalise these practices and make them acceptable (Ibid: 2008). Therefore CDA primarily focuses upon power in relation to the social problems associated with race, gender and class and an important aspect of this concerns the use of discourse to construct objects and subjects (Wood and Kroger: 2000). In this instance the analysis of discourse reveals how "institutions and individual subjects are formed, produced, given meaning, constructed and represented through particular configurations of knowledge" (Muncie, 2006: 74). Consequently, both DA and CDA are associated with the work of Foucault and the Archaeology of Knowledge.

Foucault (2002: 51) argues that discourse practices "determine the group of relations that discourse must establish in order to speak of this or that object in order to deal with them, name them, classify them, explain them and analyse them". Kendall and Wickham (1999) suggest that Foucauldian Analysis of the Archaeology of Knowledge involves looking at a set of social arrangements to find out something about the visible in opening up statements and something about the statement through opening up visibilities. This implies that interacting

with discourse positions individuals within a given set of structures and that this positioning gives those structures a sense of normality and solidity. They are made real by what they produce and mutually condition each other (Ibid: 1999). As noted by Muncie (2006) individuals are frequently addressed by discourses that position and place them as reminders of who they are and what might be expected of them in different situations. It is within this scenario that discourses are exemplaries of power that are both objectifying and subjectifying.

In relation to this, Van Dijk (2009) suggests that the analysis of language occurs on two levels. Firstly the use of language, its tool as a form of verbal interaction and language as a tool for communication belongs to one level of social order whilst, by contrast, the second level of analysis considers power, dominance and the inequalities that exist between differing social groups (Ibid: 2009). The implication here is that those who are in positions of power and dominance can shape the existence and actions of others through influential discourses. As my research is focused upon political discourses through the medium of written policy, one can argue that politics itself is undoubtedly embedded in discursive practices and thus, as a consequence, so too are governmental organisations. Therefore influential discourses can be considered as political imaginaries whereby official language or documentation inculcates new ways of being and new identities to correspond with new economic and social formations (Fairclough: 2005). In this instance, political discourse plays an active part in shaping individual, group and organisational identities to correspond with newly emerging economic and social conditions.

In consideration of the theoretical standpoint of discourse, the research is more concerned with processes within which texts depict reality rather than whether these texts are thought to contain true or false statements (Silverman: 2003). It is through discourse that ideologies can be formulated, reproduced and reinforced and it is through discourse that social reality, social situations and social identity can be constituted and constructed (Barker and Galanski: 2001). The discursive analysis of language is thus not merely a fundamental account of actualities or realities. Rather it constitutes constructions or articulations of how the world is given meaning and of how identity is made real through discursive representations. Thus discourse contributes to the "construction of social identities, it helps to construct social relationships between people and it contributes to the construction of systems of knowledge and belief" (Fairclough, 1992: 64). In doing so DA expresses a commitment to the study of discourse as texts and talk in a variety of social practices with the focus being on language as it is *the* medium for interaction (Potter quoted by Silverman: 2006).

Essentially then it is the focus of DA upon the use of language that identity is both treated as a given representation of reality and thus is made real. Gill (2000: 174) argues that Discourse Analysis consists of the following four main themes:

- A concern with discourse itself – discourse as a form of enquiry in itself and not merely a means of gaining aspects of social reality that lie behind it
- A view of language as constructive and constructed – discourse as a way of constituting a particular view of social reality
- An emphasis upon discourse as a form of action – language as a way of accomplishing acts
- A conviction in the rhetorical organisation of discourse – discourse as a tool of persuasion when individuals want to present a particular version of events

Consequently the aim of DA is to fundamentally analyse language to interpret, understand and identify how, in what forms and for what purpose the discursive context of language actively shapes and gives meaning to the social world, to social actors and to social identities. The underlying message of DA is that it is a method for understanding how social phenomena is constructed and that how this is constructed not only has consequences but that it can also fulfil certain social functions (Hammersley: 2003). In this instance social phenomena is treated as a discursive product and the focus of enquiry rests upon "how and why they are constructed in the way they are..." with a view of social life as comprising of "...individuals and groups employing discursive strategies in pursuit of various interests" (Hammersley, 2003: 757).

Documentary Analysis: Official and Documentary Sources of Data

Documentary Analysis refers to the analysis of written sources of data that have already been produced by someone other than the researcher. Documents are, although not often, considered as a rich source of data in their own right and offer an alternative to the more traditional methods of questionnaires, interviews and observations (Denscombe: 2003; Punch: 2005). However they are often classed as secondary sources of data (May: 2001) as the researcher has not generated that data themselves in line with more traditional social scientific methods. Rather the researcher utilises materials that are already in existence and it is for this reason that documents are considered as secondary materials because they have not been primarily developed for either the study or the research in which they are to be used (Becker quoted by Sarantakos: 1998). Nevertheless Finnegan (1996: 141) argues that some documents can be considered as primary sources if "they are written by people who are directly

126

involved at a time contemporary or near contemporary time with the period being investigated".

Therefore whether or not documents are classified as primary or secondary sources, they are indeed written texts that have been produced with some purpose in mind and can be treated as valuable sources of data to be analysed as such from a social scientific perspective. As noted by Bryman (2004) documents are materials that can be read, have not been produced for the purpose of social research, are preserved to become available for analysis and are relevant to the concerns of the researcher. Indeed the use of documentary evidence as research data has been well established amongst History scholars and researchers.

Corti and Thompson (2007) argue that archived qualitative data are rich and unique sources of research material for the social scientist providing a significant account of our cultural heritage to be explored from a historical perspective. Historiography thus draws upon an analysis of diaries, letters or other forms of documentation to systematically analyse complex nuances, the people, meanings, events and the ideas of the past that influence and shape the present by fashioning descriptive narrative accounts of the past (Berg: 2001). Therefore, for Berg (2001), the use of historical documents means that you can learn about the present from the past. In this sense documents can be considered as artefacts of a bygone age that have long lasting relevance and significance for contemporary society. Documents thus speak for the past, present and future.

For Prior (2003) every document that is produced must be related to the fields of action that have produced them. In this respect documents enter into the field as receptacles incorporating instructions, commands or reports and they enter the field as an agent in their own right leaving them subject to manipulation by others, as an ally, as a resource encouraging further action and as an enemy to be destroyed or suppressed (Prior: 2003). Documents, in this sense, are a communicative tool and give expression to actions to be undertaken or allows for their translation into action in much the same way that occurs through verbal communication.

In summary then documents are written rather than verbal forms of communication and can be classed as one of the following:

- Official documents - government publications; court archives; cabinet papers; prison records; mass media; literature
- Personal documents - letters; diaries; memoirs; autobiographies; life histories
- Virtual documents - internet sources; web pages; CD ROMS
- Visual documents - film; photographs; sound; video; DVD; objects
  (Finnegan: 1996; Sarantakos: 1998; Denscombe 2003; Bryman: 2004).

However the key factor that binds all of these differing facets of documentary sources and the nature by which they have been produced is the influence of human or social actors. It is human or social actors that produce these documents and as such they are the results and products of human activity. They are produced by human beings acting in particular circumstances and within constraints of particular social, historic or administrative conditions (Finnegan: 1996). The ultimate decision on how these documents should be filmed, written or photographed thus rests with the decisions of human actors but how those documents are utilised rests with the person employing that document. Documents therefore have effects in which they are not only

manufactured but also consumed (Prior: 2003) meaning that they are open to manipulation and function at different levels depending upon whom is accessing that material.

Yet, as the product of human or social actors, documents do make pronouncements upon the world and provide the materials by which the social world is made real. As argued by Silverman (2006: 157) textual data provides

> "*richness* – close analysis of written texts reveals presentational subtleties and skills; *relevance and effect* – texts influence how we see the world and the people in it and how we act; *naturally occurring* – texts document what participants are actually doing in the world and; *availability* – texts are usually readily accessible and not always dependent on access or ethical constraints."

In this instance the "writing down of words often allows language and meanings to be controlled more effectively and to be linked to strategies of centralisation and codification" (Hodder, 2003: 157). As such texts can be considered as artefacts that have been produced under material conditions that are embedded within both social and ideological systems (Hodder: 2003).

Therefore documents are not only produced by human actors themselves working under particular constraints and within ideological boundaries but the actual document itself can direct people who are the recipients of these documents to frame their behaviour within a particular set of given constraints and ideals.

Documents can be considered as constitutive accounts of social life in the sense that they are produced, shared and used in socially organised ways and

serve to construct particular representations with their own, unique conventions (Atkinson and Coffey: 1997). The analysis of the content of documents thus gives rise to a particular idea of how things ought to be and of how things should be done. In consideration of this, Hammersley and Atkinson (1995) offer a series of questions that researchers should consider in their analysis of documents incorporated within the following:

- How documents are written
- How they are read and who reads them
- For what purposes they are read, on what occasions and with what outcomes
- What is recorded and what is omitted
- What do readers need to know in order to make sense of them

This echoes Prior's (2003) comments that such questions involve the engagement of actors, creators and users and encompasses fields of action from which documents emerge. Translated into a social setting documents become studied based upon how they are manufactured and how they function (Ibid: 2003) as well as referring to what they contain. This is of vital importance to my research as I am analysing the discursive content of written policy documents based upon how they have been formulated and their outcomes within the prison establishment. Therefore policy documents as reconstructions or representations of social reality they are intimately bound with and depend upon a particular use of language (Atkinson and Coffey: 1997). They are produced and manufactured with a specific purpose in mind and an analysis of their textual and discursive character can elicit how they are produced, for whom and for what purpose.

Why use Discourse and Documentary Analysis?

According to Silverman (2001) social scientists have never been confident about analysing texts as there is uncertainty surrounding language and texts

are only viewed as important when providing 'background' material for 'real' research. So although documentary evidence is vast and routinely compiled and retained, social researchers have neglected much of this as other forms of gathering social data have become more fashionable (Punch: 2005). In this respect interviews, social surveys, observations and experiments are somehow perceived as being more fashionable and indicative of 'real' research. Consequently the methods for collecting social data are grounded in a more social scientific format that is deemed to be more appropriate or applicable for data collection and analysis. The implication here is that the *only* method for conducting 'real' research is to 'go out' into the 'field'. Whilst undoubtedly interviewing, observing or surveying active research participants is of fundamental importance within social research, it is worth remembering that these methods do not comprise *all* forms of information gathering (Finnegan: 1996).

Data is not solely gathered from or representative of spoken words, number analyses and observing the interaction between human and social actors. Data is collected from language and language is representative of the written word. In doing so the discursive content of documents can be utilised to create certain kinds of predictability and uniformity surrounding events and social arrangements (Atkinson and Coffey: 2004). Language that is embodied in a document is considered as a medium of both thought and expression (Prior: 2004). Documents serve to make things visible and this visibility is tied into a variety of social practices (Ibid: 2004). As a consequence "when organisations generate documentary records, they transform diverse circumstances and

131

people into documentary forms that can be processed in relatively predictable and standardised ways" (Atkinson and Coffey, 2004: 61).

This is true of the nature and construction of masculinity within the penal realm and of how idealised masculinity is constituted as the means by which to rehabilitate offenders and thus manage the risk of offending through the standardisation of gender identity. Therefore the DA of documentary texts is equally as valid, scientific and as equally useful and valuable as the more traditional methods for data collection and analysis. Not only does interview and statistical data communicate realities of the social world, so too does discourse and documents.

It is for this reason that I have chosen to analyse the discursive content of documentary sources. I am interested in how aspects of the social world and the people that comprise that world are constructed and articulated within political discourse. The key method in which this occurs is through the formulation of policy. It is policy that provides the structure (both hierarchically and systematically) of an organisation and determines how things should and ought to be and provides instruction upon how this can become a reality. In relation to penal policy, policy makers construct a prescriptive account of rehabilitation that includes its functions, purposes and its consequences. Written penal policy thus communicates to practitioners the purposes and functions of imprisonment and of its rehabilitation programmes and how these are to be delivered.

From my perspective language is a form of social action (Chiltern and Schaffner: 1997) and the aim of my research is to discursively analyse language and the way in which language is used, what it is used for and the social context in which it is used (Punch: 2005). In this sense, the DA of documentary texts allows for the interpretation and understanding of social problems and hierarchical structures of power and how such problems are addressed within that specific structure. Not only does discourse serve to construct and constitute this but it also constitutes or constructs its solutions. As noted by Punch (2005) DA emphasises a number of interrelated relationships between accounts and hierarchies; power and ideology. Discourse can enable the researcher to analyse documentary evidence in such a way that he or she can seek to ascertain "who (agent) is doing what (processes of moving; effecting; causing) to whom (patient; prisoner) where (location) why (cause; purpose) and by what means (instruments)" (Chiltern and Schaffner, 1997: 223).

Consequently the application of DA upon documentary evidence is both relevant and significant for my research and implies that the two are somewhat inextricably linked. A documentary analysis coupled with discourse has the aim of understanding the categories of (policy) participants and to see how these are used in concrete activities that may involve telling stories, assembling files or describing social life (Silverman: 2003). The textual content of documents, in terms of language, can be examined and analysed in order to understand and interpret how a particular image, vision of reality or identity is constructed and constituted. The focus of DA upon how different versions of the world are produced through the interpretive repertoires, claims to stakes in accounts and

the constructs of knowing subjects (Ibid: 2003) enables such an evaluation and examination to be undertaken. It also enables the researcher to interpret and understand how social actors interact, where this interaction is to take place, the purpose and overall function of this interaction and the methods employed by which such interaction is made possible. All of this sits well with the aims of my research in which I seek to understand and interpret how idealised masculinity is constituted within written policy documents by policy makers for the purposes of managing the risk of offending and re-offending.

Increasingly language has become an important factor within social life and this has led to an even greater level of conscious intervention to actively control and somewhat shape language practices that concur with economic, political and institutional objectives (Fairclough and Wodak: 1997). Undoubtedly penality is enshrined with these objectives and it is this that I aim to uncover and analyse within the discursive content of documentary sources. By adding a critical element to this process, discourse is perceived as having a role in the (re)production of dominance (Van Dijk: 1993). Hence the penal constitution of idealised masculinity implies that political actors are constructing an ideal type for the new rehabilitative function of the prison by which officials, those within authority and those who have produced the relevant documents can be considered as maintaining some semblance of dominance. It is a top down approach by which political actors are actively attempting to shape the social identities of a specific section of the population in order to manage, contain and control their future risk of offending. In doing so it is tied to the creation or construction of a particular ideal of a civil society and a civil citizen who inhabits

that society. These ideals are then produced and reproduced through the discursive qualities of official documentation such as written policy documents.

As noted by Colebatch (2002: 7) "the concept of policy is central in our understanding of the way we are governed." The importance of this statement should not be underestimated as policies can be considered as prescriptive accounts that embody the goals of elected representatives to be implemented in a subordinate manner by public officials (Hill: 1997). In this sense policy decisions are made by an elected government that both define goals and set out the means to achieve them (Howlett and Ramesh: 2003). Policy actors within this realm undoubtedly formulate policy in order to express their views on the way the world is and how the world ought to be and it is this belief that underpins the extent to which policy declarations shape and constitute society and its citizens. Policy therefore is an expression of power. The power of policy rests on three assumptions relating to social order – instrumentality; hierarchy; coherence – and it is the worth of these three concepts that gives policy its power (Colebatch: 2002). Colebatch (2002: 8) describes these concepts thus

- *Instrumentality* – organisation in general as a device for the pursuit of particular purposes with policy understood in terms of its objectives and ways to achieve them
- *Hierarchy* – governing flows from people at the top giving instruction with policy as an authoritative determination of what will be done in an area so that participants do not go their own way
- *Coherence* – an assumption that all the bits of the action fit together and forms part of an organised whole

Policy in this sense resembles the authority of those in government and it is the goals and objectives of those in government that become embedded in policy. It is this that forms the basis of my research through my analysis of written policy documents in which my aim is to ascertain how idealised masculinity informs

135

rehabilitation within penal policy discourses and thus influences the risk management of offenders. I argue that the objective of written penal policy is to create idealised man for the purposes of reducing offending and re-offending amongst the male prisoner population. Therefore a DA of documentary texts provides the basis upon which this can be achieved as it is a method that makes it possible to identify the structures, strategies or properties of text that play a fundamental role in these modes of production (Van Dijk: 1993).

The Application and Use of Discourse and Documentary Evidence

For the purposes of my research I shall be treating documents as primary sources of data as they encompass contemporary visions of how it is possible to reduce re-offending amongst the male prisoner population within the context of idealised masculinity. In reiterating the sentiments of Finnegan (1996) if the documents utilised within research are written by those involved at a contemporary moment with the period under investigation then they can indeed be classified as primary sources of data. In addition to this I am not using documents to supplement other research methods and findings in which they could be classed as secondary sources not only because they have been produced by someone other than the researcher but because they are supplementary pieces of evidence. Rather I am using the documents as sources of data in their own right and it is through their discursive properties and textual configurations that I aim to address and analyse my research questions. Thus I will be extracting texts and passages of discourse from relevant documents in order to ascertain both how and in what forms idealised masculinity is constituted within penal discourses and how idealised masculinity informs prison rehabilitation programmes. Consequently, I will be interrogating

or interviewing policy makers through the documents that they have produced. In this sense, my analysis of the discursive content of policy documents involves asking questions of and interviewing the document as opposed to interviewing human participants. Documents themselves become the research participants and they become the means by which rehabilitation within the context of idealised masculinity is communicated to me by the policy makers.

The form of DA that I shall utilise for this research resembles the four themes associated with DA as argued by Gill (2000) in this chapter, CDA as argued by Wood and Kroger (2000) following in the tradition of Foucault and represent the function of documents as argued by Prior (2003; 2004). The emphasis therefore will be upon the importance of discourse as a means of research in itself and interpreting discourse as a form of action in which the language content is both constructive and constructed. Discourse itself is perceived as a form of action and as the exercise of power that seeks to discipline and normalise behaviour. By the same token, I will treat documents as receptacles of instruction and reports and as agents in their own right in which they make things visible. In doing so I shall be treating and interpreting discourse as the means by which social reality is given some semblance of meaning and made real as it provides the basis upon which social identities are framed and constructed and documents provide the receptacle in which this is made visible. Documents therefore are a visible voice of government and provide the framework for institutional, organisational and individual conduct.

Thus I shall be using discourse contained within official documents to determine how identity is made real through these textual representations. By

incorporating a critical element I shall argue that such representations are indicative of a hierarchical approach towards reductions in re-offending in which constructions and pronouncements upon idealised masculinity act as a governmental technology of power by which it is possible to shape, constitute and control the proper and legitimate conduct of citizens (including prisoners when released) within society. It is representative of how problems relating to criminality are articulated within official documents through discursive mediums and also of how those problems can be remedied and resolved.

The themes explored in Chapters Five and Six (where I analyse the discursive content of official documents) have been derived from the theories discussed in Chapters Two and Three of this thesis. It is these chapters that have underpinned what I consider are the facets of state governance and social control and the constitution of idealised masculinity which I have then applied to official documents.

In Chapter Two I argued that state governance and social control involves the creation of an idealised type of man for civil society and of how this idealised man informs the risk management of offenders. Citizens are conceived of as responsible and moral individuals and are the active participants in their own risk management of the everyday risks and harms that are faced within contemporary society. The state and acts of government aim to shape, control and manage the conduct of its citizens. As argued by Gramsci (1971) the state attempts to create and maintain a particular type of civilisation and civilian that eliminates certain behavioural traits and attitudes whilst disseminating others. In the Post-Fordist realm and Foucauldian analyses of Governmentality, this

translates itself into the management of risk and the formulation of self governing active subjects responsible for minimising those very harms they face in their everyday life (Taylor: 1999). Government therefore aims to govern at a distance but it is a form of governance that occurs through the regulated choices of individuals and its ability to subjectify those individuals by constructing them as capable of choice and action and aligning that choice and action with their own governing objectives (Rose: 1993; Garland: 1997).

Meanwhile the New Penality's focus upon risk management encapsulates both inclusionary and exclusionary modes of punishment. Thus, on the one hand, punishment aims to exclude offenders from society and advocates the use of punitive sentencing and imprisonment thus serving to eliminate particular behavioural traits from the wider society through incapacitation. On the other hand, however, the period of imprisonment entails rehabilitation programmes that aim to produce citizens capable of becoming part of the inclusive set within society through the dissemination of conduct that is considered as the constitution of productive and constructive individuals. In this instance the new rehabilitation programme incorporates measures that aim to responsibilise and moralise offenders and/or prisoners by targeting problems that are considered as contributing to offending behaviour and eliminating them. Thus the responsibilising agenda of both the New Penality and the new rehabilitation advocates that prisoners are to become the moral entrepreneurs of their own destiny by taking control of their lives and reinventing themselves in positive and constructive ways that enable their active self promotion and the undertaking of the responsibility for themselves and their families (Rose: 2000; O'Malley: 2000). The ideals apparent within the concept of the New Penality

suggest that there are certain ways of behaving that people within society should aspire to. Within the new rehabilitation this is constituted around the notion of masculinity and, in particular, the ideals relating to the development of idealised masculinity.

As discussed in Chapter Three, idealised masculinity is a socially constructed way of being for men underpinned by language and discourse. Specific discourses construct masculinity as a social reality and it is the interaction and interplay between social actors within discursive as well as structural practices that define masculinity as a social identity for men. The aspirational and most dominant form is idealised masculinity in which men are cast as the familial provider and breadwinner for the family. The less dominant and oppressed form is marginalised masculinity although, whilst often referred to as homosexuality, can also be articulated as a form of deviancy in which men contravene their idealised masculine role. Thus instead of providing for the family through legitimate means, as with idealised man, marginalised man resorts to criminal behaviour and illegitimate means of provision for the family.

Such masculinities are represented and created as both economic and moral categories through structural agencies incorporating the state, education, religion, the media, political institutions and business (Whitehead: 2002). As historically these are dominated by men, they project the dominance of man through the promotion and validated ideologies that not only underpin idealised masculinity (Ibid: 2002) but also demonstrate its dominance as a masculine identity. Idealised masculinity has dominance over marginalised masculinity as it is determined by those who have power over others to stipulate what is or is

not acceptable behaviour. Within the New Penality, idealised masculinity informs the new rehabilitation as it is demonstrative of how men should behave within society as ideal citizens and presents the opportunity by which deviant behaviour can be corrected through the moral responsibilisation of men to gain lawful paid employment and provide for their own and their families well being. As argued by Morash (2006) masculinity is embedded in correctional institutions and programmes that seek to rehabilitate and encourage offenders to change their gender ideologies and identities. Therefore marginalised masculinity is subject to a transformation into idealised masculinity.

These political and social constructions of male identity are the themes that have emerged from my analysis and which I have then applied to the discursive content of official documents. Increasingly the role of men within the family and the importance of fatherhood and that of responsible fathers have been consistently highlighted within official documents as the means by which to prevent re-offending both of the man himself and, potentially, of his children. In doing so man is cast as the risk manager of any societal ill which may befall him or his family and he must guard against these be acting in a moral and responsible manner. Therefore the portrayal of men undertaking the role of a responsible and moral father permeates throughout government documentation and represents governmental action in constituting a particular identity and role for men within the context of idealised masculinity.

Supporting Families: A Consultation Document (Home Office, 1998: 39) provides an example of the importance of fatherhood for society and family life stressing that

"increasingly boys and young men seem to have difficulty maturing into responsible citizens and fathers. Declining educational performance, loss of traditional 'male' jobs, the growth of a 'laddish' anti-social culture, greater use of drugs, irresponsible teenage fatherhood and the rising suicide rate may all show rising insecurity and uncertainty among young men. This has worrying implications for the stability of family life and wider society. Fathers have a crucial role to play in their children's upbringing and their involvement can be particularly important to their sons."

Every Parent Matters (DFES: 2007) further supports the important role that fathers have in family life and comments that children benefit from the different qualities that fathers bring to family life and that fathers who are fully involved with their children have not only stronger relationships but also that their children perform better in school and are less likely to offend than those whose fathers are absent. Every Child Matters[1] (Stationary Office: 2003) advocates support programmes for fathers, with an emphasis on those who are living apart from their children, to assist in the development of positive father child relationships. In addition the Reducing Re-Offending National Action Plan (Home Office: 2004b) states that it is the maintenance of family relationships that helps ex-prisoners to desist from offending and helps them to resettle more successfully back into the community.

Indeed HM Government's (2005a: 30) Five Year Strategy for Protecting the Public and Reduce Re-Offending acknowledges that "we know that staying in touch with family and friends while they are in prison helps offenders to 'go straight' more successfully once they get out". Likewise NOMS (2006a: 40) outlines in its delivery plan that

"children and families play a significant role in supporting an offender to make and sustain changes which reduce re-offending. Many offenders' relationships are broken or fragmented as a result of their offending and their families are left bewildered and unsupported, increasing the

---

[1] The provisions of which were later made into an act of parliament: The Children Act 2004

likelihood of intergenerational offending, mental health and financial problems."

However the role of the father within the family is not only perceived and political or socially constructed as one of a moral guardian and role model for his children. The father also has a financial duty to his family and the breadwinning role is also informs the constitution of idealised man.

HM Government's (2005b) Reducing Re-Offending through Skills and Employment exemplifies the extent to which governmental action aims to create a particular type of citizen for a given society. In this instance, idealised man as idealised employee requires that

> "any specific intervention needs to be viewed in the broader context of the need of the offender to normalise their lifestyle and equip themselves with the necessary skills to function successfully in society and as an employee."
>
> (HM Government, 2005b: 13)

The aim of which is to make re-offending less likely to occur by encouraging those who offend to confront and find resolutions to those contributory factors by helping or 'pressing' them to get jobs (HM Government: 2005a). Therefore "if we can turn offenders away from crime and give them the tools to exercise better judgement and become more constructive and productive members of society, then the rewards will be great" as sustained employment is *the* key to leading a life free from crime (HM Government, 2005b: 5). In examples given within Reducing Re-offending through skills and Employment 'John', after serving his third prison sentence was selected for training as a gas network operative with the National Grid and now works in the gas industry whilst young men serving their sentence in HMYOI Aylesbury are taking advantage of the partnership between HM Prison Service and the Toyota Motor Company and

receive training in motor vehicle engineering with ten of the eighteen learners now in employment (Ibid: 2005b).

The focus here undoubtedly is upon men and the ability of men to take responsibility to re-train and re-skill for the labour market and so become constructive and productive members of society. The National Reducing Re-Offending Delivery Plan (2006a: 21) stresses that the overriding "focus of the government's policy is to support offender's progression into sustainable employment" as employment and employability lies at the heart of the strategy. Indeed the strategic partnership implemented to improve prisoner's learning and skills comments that "the primary aim must be to ensure that more prisoners are equipped with the relevant skills and qualifications for work" (DFES, 2000: 7). As quoted in the TUC (2001: 4) document Employment and Ex-Offenders, Jack Straw a former Home Secretary argues that "crime breeds when individuals are left without a stake in society....getting a job is the best thing that any ex-offender can do". Similarly, the former Labour Prime Minister Tony Blair (quoted by Levitas, 2005:115) stated that "the most meaningful stake anyone can have in society is the ability to earn a living and support a family". At all junctures the emphasis is placed upon individuals taking responsibility for themselves and their families well being. For men the onus is clearly upon fulfilling the requirements of idealised man.

Consequently the risk management of societal harms are to be achieved through the construction of idealised man as the idealised father and idealised employee. The aim of penality is to eliminate the traits of irresponsible parenting and fatherhood that leads to yet more offending, family breakdown

and financial hardship and to disseminate the traits of responsible parenting and fatherhood to reduce re-offending and promote financially and emotionally strong, stable and secure families and society.

3. Timeframe for Analysis: The New Labour Years 1997-2007

My analysis covers the period of New Labour governance from 1997-2007. This represents the era of what is widely termed as Advanced Liberalism and reflects the Post-Fordist mode of regulation in which issues of risk, responsibilisation, residual welfare and market mechanisms have come to the fore of social and political life (please refer to Chapter's Two and Three for a full discussion). To briefly reiterate, the governance of the population has been structured within the boundaries of a market economy that promotes the freedom of self activating individuals to provide for their own, their family and their community's well being (Rose and Miller: 1992; Stenson: 2002). This is underpinned by a process of responsibilisation and the re-moralisation of contemporary society that advocates the primacy of paid employment as a means of self-sufficiency, responsibility and morality with support from the state to facilitate this for those who cannot do so for themselves (Rose: 1998; Dean 1999; 2002). The penal realm mirrors the ideals that are apparent within civil society and this, in itself, is central to the concept of idealised masculinity. Idealised man both obtains and maintains legitimate employment and it is through this that man has a clearly defined role and purpose within the family (and within social and economic life) as the provider and breadwinner. Therefore the underlying of features of idealised masculinity encapsulates the concepts of family, work and education. Three key factors that exemplify the morally laden ideals of New Labour

governance under the banner of the 'new social morality' (Driver and Martell: 2003).

The sample of prisons that were analysed in my research were classified as male Category C Training Prisons. Category C prisons house men who are not trusted in open conditions but who lack the will and resources with which to make a determined escape attempt (House of Commons Home Affairs Committee: 2005). Whilst Training Prisons are considered as providing both better quality and quantity of education, work and training (HM Inspectorate of Prisons: 2005) than other types of prison establishments and therefore more closely reflect the concept of idealised masculinity that informs my framework for analysis. Of the fifteen Category C Training Prisons as stipulated by HM Prison Service, I randomly chose a sample of four, HMP Channings Wood, HMP Coldingley, HMP Dartmoor and HMP Featherstone to represent this category. Both purposive sampling and probability sampling were the methods I employed in order to choose my sample of HM Prison Establishments.

Purposive sampling is defined as a method researchers employ when they have specialist knowledge or expertise about some group enabling them to select subjects who represent this population (Berg: 2001). Oliver (2006: 245) claims that one of the advantages of purposive sampling is the ability to "identify participants who are likely to provide data that are detailed and relevant to the research question." For the purposes of my research, prisons in their totality are the known population. However I wanted to refine this further by focusing on a particular sample of the prison population and thus settled upon Category C Training Prisons as they centred specifically upon training and the provision of

good quality education and work. From these prisons I then wanted to choose a smaller sample to represent the population of Category C Training Prisons. Here I conducted a probability sample using a simple random sampling method whereby "all units within the sampling frame have an equal chance of being selected" (Davidson, 2006: 238). The random sample of the four prisons were chosen by listing the prisons in no particular order, choosing the first name on the list and missing three in between before choosing the next name. In this way I had my sample of four Category C Training Prisons and used inspectorate reports of these establishments as an example of how idealised masculinity is constituted within official documents.

The documents that I have utilised in this research are derived from official sources and charitable organisations whose work is closely linked with that of prisons and imprisonment. The following table (Table Two; Page 148) provides a list of these documents and the organisations that have produced them.

Table Two: Research Documents by Organisation

Name of Organisation	Name of documents produced by the organisation
Action for Prisoner's Families (AFP)	2003 Submission in response to the Green Paper Every Child Matters 2007-2008 Action News – journal 2007 Staying Close: A guide for male prisoners on maintaining family ties 2009 Annual Review 2008-09
Department for Education and Skills (DFES)	2000 Improving Prisoner's Learning and Skills: A new partnership 2001 Barriers to Employment for Offenders and Ex-offenders 2002 Skills for life: The National Strategy for Improving Adult Literacy and Numeracy Skills 2003 21st Century skills: Realising our potential 2005 Cutting Crime through Skills and Employment 2006 Implementation of the New Prison Library Specification 2006 The Offenders Learning Journey: Learning and skills provision for adult offenders in England 2007 Every Parent Matters
Department for Work and Pensions (DWP)	2004 Building on New Deal: Local solutions meeting individual needs preliminary paper 2004 Building on New Deal 2006 Homepage (website)
Department for Innovation, Universities and Schools (DIUS)	2007 The Offenders Learning and Skills Service (OLASS) in England
Her Majesty's Chief Inspectorate of Prisons	2004 Report on an unannounced inspection of HMP Channings Wood 2005 Report on a full announced inspection of HMP Coldingley 14-18 November 2005 2006 Report on an unannounced short inspection of HMP Dartmoor 13-14 February 2006 2006 Report on an unannounced inspection of HMP Featherstone
Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (HMIP)	2001 Through the Prison Gate: A Joint Thematic review by HM Inspectorate of Prison and Probation
Her Majesty's Prison Service	1999 PSO 4405 Assisted Prison Visits 2005 Prisoner's family life 2006-2009 Prison Service Journal 2007 Prison's Information Book: Visiting and keeping in touch 2009 Prison Industries
Her Majesty's Government	2005 A Five Year Strategy for Protecting the Public and Reducing Re-offending

	2005 Reducing Re-offending Through Skills and Employment 2006 Reducing Re-offending Through Skills and Employment: Next steps
Home Office	**1997 No More Excuses: A New Approach to Tackling Youth Crime in England and Wales** **1998 Supporting Families: A consultation document** **2001 Building Bridges to Employment for Prisoners** **2004 Reducing Re-offending National Action Plan** **2005 The impact of corrections of re-offending: A review of What Works** **2005 The feasibility of using electronic job search** **2005 Evaluation of basic skills training for prisoners** **2006 Resettlement outcomes on release from prison in 2003**
Howard League	**2000 Rehabilitating work: What are prison workshops for?** **2008 Prison Work and Social Enterprise: The story of Barbed** **2009 Barbed: What happened next? Follow up story of employees of a prison social enterprise**
Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)	**2004 HMP Dartmoor annual report 1 August 2003-30 September 2004** **2006 HMP Channings Wood: Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Office by the Independent Monitoring Board 1 September 2005-31 August 2006**
Inside Out Trust	**2004 Turning Prisoners into Tax Payers: Employment Inside and Out**
Jobcentre Plus	**2003 Jobcentre Plus vision 2003-2010**
Learning and Skills Council (LSC)	**2006 What we do**
Ministry of Justice	**2008 Titan Prisons** **2009 Jack Straw sets out prison and probation plans** **2009 Reducing Re-offending Supporting families, Creating Better Futures** **2009 New Prison Consultation response**
National Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders (NACRO)	**2003 Recruiting Ex-offenders through Skills and Employment: The Employers Perspective** **2006 Reducing re-offending through skills and employment: NACROs response to the Department for Education and Skills** **2006 Employment for Ex-offenders: A Missed Opportunity**
National Audit Office (NAO)	**2002 HM Prison Service Reducing Prisoner's Re-offending** **2004 Department for Education and Skills: Skills for Life Improving Adult Literacy and Numeracy**

	2005 NOMS: Dealing with Increased Numbers in Custody
National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER)	2002 Made for Prisoners by Prisoners: A Summary of NFERs evaluation of Safe Ground's Family Relationships and Parenting Programme
National Offender Management Service (NOMS)	2004 Reducing Re-offending National Action Plan 2006 National reducing re-offending delivery plan 2006 Assisted Prison Visits Scheme: Customer Service Guide
New Philanthropy Capital	2005 Inside and Out: People in Prisons and Life After Release
Offender's Learning and Skills Service (OLSU)	2004 Offenders Learning and Skills Service for Adults and Juveniles: Delivery Framework for England
Office for National Statistics (ONS)	2009 Social Trends
Prison Advice and Care Trust (PACT)	2005 Annual Review
Prison Reform Trust	2002 Just Visiting: A Review of the Role of Prison Visitors Centres 2005 Bromley Briefings
Safe Ground	2003 Father's Inside course overview 2003 Family Man course overview 2005 Annual Review 2004-05 2006 The Safe Ground Story 2006 Father's Inside project
Social Exclusion Unit (SEU)	2002 Reducing Re-offending by Ex-prisoners
Stationary Office	1999 The national prison survey 2003 Every Child Matters 2004 Rehabilitation of Prisons: First report of sessions 2004-05 volume one (House of Commons Home Affairs Committee) 2005 Government response to the House of Commons Education and Skills Committee report: Prisoner's Education
Storybook Dads	2007 Storybook Dads 2009 The Storybook Das/Mums scheme: Your questions answered 2009 Participating Prisons

The organisations and institutions mentioned here are of importance to the research because they represent government action in respect of penal policy and because they detail and/or critique provision of rehabilitation programmes for male offenders. In addition, the context in which I shall conduct the analysis

is based upon idealised masculinity and the documentation that I have sourced reflects this, primarily the ability to obtain a job and to provide for one's family.

The seven pathways to reduce re-offending also consider the importance of work, education and family life in reducing offending behaviour. The pathways in their entirety are as follows (NOMS: 2006)

- Pathway One: Accommodation
- Pathway Two: Education, Training and Employment
- Pathway Three: Health
- Pathway Four: Drugs and Alcohol
- Pathway Five: Finance, Benefit and Debt
- Pathway Six: Children and Families
- Pathway Seven: Attitudes, Thinking and Behaviour

For the purposes of my research I focused my analysis on Pathways Two and Six as, again, they reflect the ideals of work and family as exemplified by idealised masculinity. However I do realise that there are many men held within prison who are not fathers and do not have families of their own to support or to draw on for support. In this instance this research will not be wholly applicable to them and, for these men, alternate forms of achieving idealised masculinity will take precedence. In this case any one or combination of the seven pathways to offender reintegration will be appropriate for them.

Yet much of the documentation, as gleaned from governmental sources, do not differentiate between the differing identities of men as either single, married or gay. Rather official documentation portrays men as a homogenised group and one that is ensconced within the family and emulating traditional notions of the work ethic. Therefore the concept of idealised masculinity that I am applying to my research is, as previously mentioned, centred upon the family as a means by which men find a role and purpose in life through which to pursue

educational and employment endeavours. Therefore as I am putting forth the argument that idealised masculinity is a key feature of the new rehabilitation and, as a consequence, is influential upon prison rehabilitation programmes the data for this research has been collected from a sample that bears the hallmarks of the characteristics that I attribute to idealised masculinity, that of the family, work and education. Therefore only two of the possible seven pathways to offender reintegration are incorporated within my research.

With regards to policy, my thesis is not centred upon researching the development and application of idealised masculinity through all stages of the policy process. The policy process itself focuses upon the key stages that inform the policy cycle framework of analysis. The following list provides a description of the five stages of the policy cycle as given by Howlett and Ramesh (2003:13):

1. Agenda Setting: the process by which problems come to the attention of government
2. Policy Formulation: how policy options are formulated within government
3. Decision Making: process by which government adopts a particular course of action or non-action
4. Policy Implementation: how government put policies into effect
5. Policy Evaluation: process by which the results of policies are monitored by both the state and societal actors.

Colebatch (2002) adds a sixth dimension to this suggesting that policy after evaluation may be amended or terminated.

For the purposes of my research, I focused upon written policy formulation and decision-making by analysing how policy options are formulated with regards to the course of action that has been chosen and upon policy evaluation by analysing the overall outcomes of the policy. The implementation of policy at the

practitioner level and how practitioners receive such policies or documentary sources is not applicable to this research. Rather the aim is to consider and identify how idealised masculinity is articulated and formulated within policy documents and to evaluate policy outcomes. It is the discursive nature and character of these documents that inform the research and therefore, it is how the concept of idealised masculinity is formulated within these discursive contexts that underpin my research. It is for this reason that the discursive character of policy and documentary sources forms the basis of this thesis in which the quest is to interpret, understand and ascertain how and in what forms idealised masculinity is constituted within penal discourse and thus how idealised masculinity underpins prison rehabilitation programmes.

4: Why Analyse Idealised Masculinity?

Many commentators allude to the fact that men and masculinity have not been the focus of attention within criminology (Jefferson: 1992; Naffine: 2003) and whilst the gender blindness of criminology towards women has been rectified by feminist criminology, this has not been the case for men and crime (Jefferson: 1996). Indeed although it is widely acknowledged that crime and the control of crime are regarded as men's work, discussions pertaining to this are negligible (Ibid: 1996). This is something of a surprise as most criminologists and indeed research points to the fact that women are much less criminal than men and that criminal behaviour is a male activity. Heidensohn (1996) argues that women consistently have a much lower rate of officially recorded crimes than men and that whilst women are less criminal than men, criminal convictions that are normal for men are very unusual for women. As a result Heidensohn (1987) also remarks that women are less likely to be recidivists and what can be

termed as the professional criminal and contribute little to the occurrence of serious violent crime when compared with men. Morris (1987) concurs with this and states that in 1985 in England and Wales only seventeen per cent of women were cautioned or found guilty of a notifiable offence. Contemporary research focusing upon the prevalence of crime amongst men and women confirms that men are indeed more likely to participate in crime than women.

Farrington and Painter (2004) studied the risk factors of offending for both boys and girls (in relation to brothers and sisters) and found that males were more likely to offend than females and that male offending overall was more likely to be serious, persistent and violent. The following table (Table Three; Page 155) provides a summary of the types of offences committed by the participants in their study. Overwhelming the majority of offences were committed by the boys (brothers) in comparison to the girls (sisters).

Table Three: Type of Offences Committed by Gender

Offence Type	Boys	Girls
Burglary (%)	187 (20)	11 (6)
Theft of vehicle (%)	122 (13)	7 (4)
Shoplifting (%)	52 (6)	49 (28)
Other theft (%)	231 (25)	35 (20)
Deception (%)	114 (12)	47 (27)
Violence (%)	108 (11)	15 (9)
Weapons (%)	26 (3)	0 (0)
Drugs (%)	18 (2)	1 (1)
Vandalism (%)	46 (5)	6 (3)
Other (%)	37 (4)	4 (2)
Total	941	175

SOURCE: Farrington D and Painter A, Home Office, 2004

In their report analysing the findings of the 2003 Crime and Justice Survey, Budd et al (2005) also found that males were more likely to offend than females with thirteen per cent of men committing a core offence in comparison with seven per cent of women. In addition they found that men were frequently involved in a wider range of offences and more likely to be serious and prolific offenders than women and over the course of a lifetime, thirty seven per cent of women compared with fifty three per cent of men were to commit offences in more than one category (Budd et al: 2005). Through analysing the re-offending rates of the adult 2002 cohort, Cuppleditch and Evans (2005) found that the majority of those sentenced for the offence of theft were male (seventy seven per cent). Indeed the Sentencing Statistics for England and Wales 2008 (Ministry of Justice: 2010) identify 1, 045, 223 (seventy seven per cent) of men

and 288, 338 (twenty one per cent) of women were sentenced for a criminal offence. All of which tends to suggest, quite strongly, that men commit more crime than women and therefore are more likely to participate in criminal activity.

The narrative of the previous paragraphs discussing a lack of attention given to men as criminals within criminology and the high prevalence of male offending rates form the basis as to why men rather than women are the focus of my research. Undoubtedly men are more criminal than women but the focus upon men as criminals and more importantly, the measures undertaken to prevent their offending is something that is found wanting in much of the criminological literature. There is a wealth of literature focusing upon women and crime from within feminist criminology but there is not, as yet, the development of a discipline of gender studies of criminality from within a masculine criminology. As noted by Walklate (2004) although since the 1990s many commentators have endeavoured to examine the relationship between maleness and crime, very little work has applied these developments to criminology. Messerschmidt (1999) and Naffine (2003) seemingly agree with this statement and argue that the gendered content of both legitimate and illegitimate male behaviour has been ignored by criminology and thus the man question is a troubling and pressing concern.

My thesis aims to redress this balance and place men and masculinity at the heart of the analysis. In this instance not only are men and the nature of masculinity discussed in relation to criminal behaviour but also that masculinity itself can be a tool by which to rehabilitate male offenders. Therefore this thesis

stresses the importance of analysing men and masculinity within criminological discourses and that masculinity itself can be analysed as a form of governance in the risk management of male offenders.

CHAPTER FIVE

Penal Workfarism and Familial Responsibility: Idealised families, Fatherhood and Employability

1 Introduction

We have seen so far in this thesis how the management of risk permeates throughout society. The governance of society is encapsulated by the need to manage the risks of everyday harms posed to society and citizens by citizens themselves. The state enables and facilitates such a role. In the realms of penality it is the individual offender who is to be encouraged to be his own risk manager through a moral reconstruction of his attitudes and behaviour. This, I have argued, is shrouded in the concept of masculinity and an idealised masculinity that is promoted by policy makers as the norm to which all men (particularly male prisoners) should aspire. One of the key factors of this idealised man is to be a family man. However, likewise with masculinity, the concept is one that is aspirational in nature and thus idealised, as many prisoners do not originate from traditional middle class families and lack the social capital by which to uphold such values. Yet it is *the* idealised family that is promoted within policy discourses. It is this argument that I will discuss within this chapter and examine the extent to which policy makers promote the family as playing a pivotal role in the new rehabilitation of male prisoners and how traditional white middle class family values provide the mechanisms by which idealised man is to be rehabilitated.

The analysis will be framed within the following typology as given by Fraser (1997). Her typology of affirmative and transformative reform provides a useful framework in which to discuss the new rehabilitation of male prisoners through the development of familial roles within the context of masculinity and the

barriers that are faced in their successful implementation. In this instance affirmative reform aims to correct "inequitable outcomes without for social arrangements without disturbing the underlying framework that generates them..." whilst transformative reform aims to correct "...inequitable outcomes precisely by restructuring the underlying generative framework" (Fraser, 1997: 23). Gray (2007) interprets these concepts as firstly (affirmative reform) a piecemeal transfer of resources to tackle inequitable outcomes without also making the necessary changes to the structural inequalities that have caused them and secondly (transformative reform) as outcomes that have become more equitable due to making the necessary changes in the distribution of wealth and resources. The overriding implication in reference to this framework and the rehabilitation of male prisoners is that if government does not tackle structural inequalities or indeed redistributes resources effectively the ability of men to transform themselves from marginalised into idealised man will be doomed to fail.

In this chapter the analysis of political discourse relating to the maintenance of family ties between male prisoners and their families utilises one aspect of Fraser's (1997) typology. In this instance governmental action occurs at the affirmative level of reform and thus seeks to derive equitable outcomes through changes in the existing social arrangements. The remainder of this chapter will explore this by providing an overview of contemporary family life and how the family form has changed through the generations. This will be followed by a discussion on fatherhood and how fatherhood is constructed. It will then discuss how fatherhood, the family and the maintenance of family ties have been

integrated within penal policy for male prisoners and has formed part of the new rehabilitation for male offenders.

2 Marginalised and Idealised Families: The Cause and Solution of Male Criminality

My concept of an idealised family is one that is drawn from policy discourses with the family conceived of as the vehicle through which men are ingrained with a positive role and purpose in life. Fatherhood and familial responsibility as the head of the household are roles that are promoted within policy formulations. Thus Tony Blair (the former Labour Prime Minister quoted by Levitas, 2005: 115) advocated, "the most meaningful stake anyone can have in society is the ability to earn a living and support a family." He further strengthened this by commenting

> "my politics are rooted in a belief that we can only realise ourselves as individuals in a thriving civil society, comprising strong families and civic institutions buttressed by intelligent government. For most individuals to succeed society must be strong"
> (Blair, 1998: 3)

A strong society is one that is undoubtedly comprised of strong families and within this context individuals can thrive and succeed. In addition there is also the recognition that family forms have altered over the course of generations. The Labour MP Harriet Harman (quoted by Muncie and Wetherell, 2000: 59) echoes these thoughts by suggesting that

> "family policy needs to recognise that families come in all shapes and sizes...to claim that one kind of family is right and others wrong can do considerable harm by stigmatising those who live in non-traditional family settings. Public policy cannot alter private choices, but it can mitigate the painful effects of change."

However Muncie and Wetherell (2000) comment that such rhetoric surrounding family forms is not echoed within policy, as assumptions about normal family life remain implicit within social policy. Gittins (1985) argues that the family is an ideological tool presented as a tangible reality to which all can, should and ought to aspire and experience. For Segal (1983) the traditional family as represented by the heterosexual couple with children based on the father as economic provider and the mother as the nurturer is the central focus of all family ideology. As stipulated in the green paper Every Child Matters (Stationary Office: 2003) the government needs to focus and support more fully the critical relationship that children have with their parents and, for government, this means recognising the importance of the role played by fathers as well as mothers. Comments such as this merely add weight to Muncie and Wetherell's argument.

However, these assumptions of normal family forms originate from the idealised view of family life in the early 1950s in terms of the nuclear family. Sherratt and Hughes (2004) describe the nuclear family as a social unit comprising of a wife, husband and their dependent children whom policy makers held in great esteem as providing the bedrock upon which a healthy society could be ordered and maintained. This concept was highly significant as the development of the Fordist mode of production relied upon male labour and the stay at home housewife. Within this scenario men were paid wages commensurate with the ability to purchase goods for the home and this allowed women to be able to stay at home and provide the caring activities required of both men and children (Silva and Smart: 1999). The family image presented here is thus one

synonymous with British life and the British understanding of what is meant by the family. It is an image encapsulated by

> "a settled, harmonious, wholesome and orderly unit, instilling the correct social values into its children, and capable of prudent housekeeping without needing the interference of the state and its armies of functionaries to prop it up"
>
> (Blagg and Smith, 1989: 23)

This is undoubtedly the ideal family type and it is one that is endorsed in much of the policy debates surrounding the family. As argued by Jack Straw in the government green paper Supporting Families, "family life is the foundation on which our communities, our society and our country are built" (Home Office, 1998: 2). It is the image of the strong family that underpins this philosophy. It is strong families that are articulated as safe families providing a haven from the perils and evils that exist within society (Francis and Padel: 2002). However the changing face of the workforce and the dawn of Post Fordist economy have changed the family form.

Silva and Smart (1999) argue that the Post Fordist economy has changed the family form from one that is predicated upon the conjugal heterosexual couple and the male breadwinner to one that is fluid and changeable satisfying emotional and material needs. Common factors responsible for this change are that more women have entered into the labour market than had previously occurred and that the divorce rate has steadily risen since its legalisation in the Divorce Reform Act of 1969. Thus it is not necessarily the nuclear family that can provide for such needs but one that can be fulfilled by a variety of family forms. The contemporary family is therefore characterised by diversity in terms of both family types and family relationships. This can included lone parent families, step families, families with unmarried parents, families created by

single sex couples, families where women stay at home to care for the children and families where women participate in paid employment (Sherratt and Hughes: 2002). The Family Report of 2002 identifies the extent to which family life has changed.

The report comments that divorces reached their peak in 1993 standing at 180, 000 whilst lone parenting has risen by fifteen per cent in the year 2000 where an estimated 1.7 million families are of one parent (Wicks and Asato: 2002). Social Trends 39 produced by the Office for National Statistics (ONS: 2009) also concurs with the findings of the Family Report in that family forms have altered and changed to the extent that contemporary society is witnessing a reduction in marriage and a growth in lone parenting and cohabiting families. They comment that "in 2006 there were around 237, 000 marriages in England and Wales, the lowest recorded since 1895" (ONS, 2009: 19) whilst the proportion of lone parent households have increased in the years 1971 to 2008 threefold to eleven per cent. In relation to co-habitation, in 2006 twenty four per cent of both men and women were co-habiting in comparison to eleven per cent and thirteen per cent respectively in 1986 whilst civil partnerships have stabilised from their initial high (in 2006) when same sex couples could marry for the first time to 8700 a fall of forty six per cent (ONS: 2009). The increase in lone person households has been equally significant more than doubling from six per cent to fifteen per cent between the years 1971 to 2008 (Ibid: 2009).

Social Trends also records the number of children placed into care with friends, relatives and local authorities. Whilst this number has fallen, it still demonstrates a remarkably high number of children placed into the care of people other than

163

their parents. Thus in the year up to March 2008 59, 500 children were placed into care compared with 60, 000 in 2007 and 61, 200 in 2004 (ONS: 2009). Figures such as these are, of course, important in understanding not only the changes in family trends but also for policy makers both in the formulation and implementation of a variety of social policies. Therefore the importance of the family is equally important when addressing the needs of offenders and permeates throughout political discourse in relation to prisoners and those who offend.

Charles Clarke (quoted by Safe Ground, 2005:2) the former Home Secretary argued that an "offender is much less likely to re-offend if he feels part of a family or community from which he receives support as well as owes obligations". Research continually comments that men who manage to maintain strong family ties in prison and who, upon their release, assume a role within the family are less likely to re-offend (Halsey: 2004). Just over half (fifty one per cent) of prisoners interviewed by Niven and Stewart (2006) had employment, training or education arranged on their release from prison either through their families, friends or personal contacts beyond the prison. Hairston (1988) proposes that if the prisoner maintains a link and a role within his family then he is more likely to function in such desirable roles upon his release from prison. However, if these roles are not maintained, then the prisoner may function in the role ascribed to him as a prisoner. Families thus are *the* site in which crime can be reduced, prevented and controlled (Francis and Padel: 2002).

The comments and research presented here rely on strong families. They place the onus upon stable, secure and loving two parent families or for a male

prisoner having a wife and children to go back home to when released from prison. The reliance in this instance is upon the idealised family in order to successfully aid the reintegration of the prisoner back into society through the supportive network of a family. However such a family form is one based upon a nostalgic and ideal conception of families that has significantly changed during the previous 5 or 6 years. As noted in both the Family Report and Social Trends, families have altered and this alteration in the composition of households and family forms are not necessarily reflected within policy and, in particular, do not wholly reflect the family life of many prisoners. Many prisoners do not inhabit a world of strong families or indeed what is termed as normal families. Their family life is often fragmented and dysfunctional and thus marginalised to the whole and complete norm. Therefore political debates surrounding family life become aspirational and focused upon traditional family forms that do not correspond with the lived realities of prisoners within contemporary society. Far from families providing the safety net in which prisoners can return to society, for the majority their family life have been the motors for criminal activity rather than instilling resistance and desistance from crime.

The SEU (2002) comment that prisoners are thirteen times as likely as the general population to have been placed in care as a child, ten times as likely to have regularly truanted from school and two and a half times as likely to have had a family member convicted of a criminal offence. Research from the National Prison Survey of 1991 also concurs with these findings. In this instance Walmsley et al (1992) found that eight per cent of prisoners surveyed spent most of their time within an institution and twenty six per cent had been in local

authority care (the breakdown for young and adult prisoners was thirty eight per cent and twenty three per cent respectively) the comparable figure for the general population was two per cent. The researchers further asked why prisoners had been taken into care. They reported thus

> "forty per cent said that it was because of family problems, thirty two per cent said it was because they had committed a criminal offence, thirty two per cent said they had been beyond parental control and twenty two per cent said it was because of truancy."
> (Walmsley et al, 1992: 15)

Therefore, for some offenders, family life has been the basis of their offending behaviour. Indeed the family has not been the site of stability, security and non-criminal behaviours but has been the central figure in much criminal behaviour.

Farrington (2002: 669-670) argues that families are one of the important factors in predicting offending behaviour and categorises them within five key groups:

- "criminal and anti-social parents;
- large family size;
- child rearing methods (poor supervision, poor discipline, coldness and rejection, low parental involvement with the child);
- abuse (physical or sexual) or neglect; and
- parental conflict and disrupted families"

Collectively these groups indicate that being born and reared in a household where the parents commit criminal offences or where there are large numbers of siblings or where there is conflict between parents and neglect and poor supervision of children results in criminal behaviour from the child. The Home Office white paper No More Excuses – A New Approach to Tackling Youth Crime in England and Wales[2] echoes these thoughts. The paper suggests that whilst parents are not directly to blame for the crimes of their children, they are responsible for providing their children with proper care and control (Home

---

[2] The provisions of which were later made into an act of parliament: The Crime and Disorder Act 1998

Office: 1997) and an absence of this results in criminal behaviour. Inadequate parental supervision is cited as a common cause with forty two per cent of juveniles receiving low to medium level supervision offending compared with twenty per cent of young people receiving high levels of supervision (Ibid: 1997). Research by Haas et al (2004) tends to support this.

Haas et al (2004) found that there was a link between disrupted families and delinquency and broken homes and delinquency. However they also suggest that boys from broken homes may not necessarily resort to criminal behaviour as the "detrimental effect of a family break up can be lessened if the remaining parent, normally the mother, is warm and loving" (Haas et al, 2004: 530). This, in turn, supports Farrington's assertion that criminogenic families, child rearing methods and disrupted families have a significant and detrimental impact upon the behaviour of boys. He goes further to suggest that the arrest and conviction of the father had a greater prediction level upon boy's delinquent behaviour than any other relative. In his study of youth and delinquency he found that sixty three per cent of boy's who had a father convicted of a criminal offence were themselves convicted of a crime compared with thirty percent of the remainder (Farrington: 2002).

Research conducted by Murray and colleagues also concurs with the work of Haas et al and Farrington in relating the delinquent behaviour of boys to their father's criminality. Murray (2002) comments that children often feel sadness, loss, anger, rejection, bewilderment and fear when their father goes to prison and that this is often accompanied by depression, low self esteem, poor academic performance and juvenile delinquency. Therefore the imprisonment

of a parent suggests that children are exposed to an increased risk of offending than those whose parents had not been convicted and imprisoned of an offence. Thus the separation of the parent-child relationship due to parental imprisonment is deemed as being a strong predictor of anti-social and delinquent behaviour amongst children whose parent was imprisoned and may contribute to the intergenerational transmission of offending (Murray and Farrington: 2005). Crime, in this sense, can be viewed as being the product of deviant, dysfunctional and marginalised families.

In doing so, such views are indicative of the way that the family and crime are linked within popular political discourses. This serves to construct the family as fragile and brittle resulting in it being at risk of breaking down and as a consequence contributes to an increase in crime (Saraga: 2002). As far as Drakeford and McCarthy (2000) are concerned such constructs belie a fundamental lie that poor parenting is at the root of youth crime. Rather they suggest that poor parenting is a symptom of more pressing problems relating to poverty, social exclusion and structural inequalities (Drakeford and McCarthy: 2000). These concerns also echoed those surrounding the themes of troublesome masculinities (as argued in Chapter Three) and, far from it being an individual problem, such problems are the result of a lack in social capital and social exclusion. However it isn't the structural and social inequalities that are tackled to remedy the problem rather it is the individual and in this case families that are the site of the cure for criminality.

The importance of the family in reducing and preventing offending has found a formal footing in The Reducing Re-Offending National Action Plan (Home

Office: 2004b). As one of seven pathways to reduce re-offending the Children and Families of Offenders pathway highlights the benefits to prisoners maintaining links with their families in not only preventing their future offending behaviour but also as a method of assisting their reintegration back into the community. Indeed the Action Plan discusses the development of partnerships to establish family services with Action for Prisoner's Families (the Prisoner Families Helpline) and with the Prison Service, the Ormiston Trust and the Lankelly Foundation establishing the Eastern Area Families Project to provide a broad based service to prisoners and their families (Home Office: 2004b). The Helpline offers a freephone service providing information and support for those with a friend or loved one in prison with details of how to keep in touch, how the prison system works and help with any other issues that are of importance (NOMS: 2004). The Eastern Area Families Project provides services to prisoners and their families both inside prison and within the community offering links to education, health and social services and links to both voluntary and community services (Ibid: 2004).

Yet the Action Plan also echoes the thoughts expressed within the Every Child Matters green paper in that there needs to be a more co-ordinated and strategic approach in providing services for prisoners and their families. This is in view of the fact that "there is nobody currently within prisons or among community services with responsibility for supporting families in maintaining links and overcoming their problems..." thereby resulting in the green paper to request "...views on what more could be done to improve services for this group" (Stationary Office, 2003: 43). Whilst on the one hand there is a call and an apparent need for greater input and resources devoted to prisoners and their

families, it still seems as if little importance is given on a formal and statutory basis to addressing the needs and to improve services to this vulnerable group apart from much discussion and little action.

However, despite the request for an improvement on current services available to prisoners, Saraga (2002) argues that political discourses and policy directions continually call for the restoration of traditional family values as it is assumed that this will serve to restore moral and social order and thereby a decrease in crime. It is the idealised family that fulfils this remit and it has become the cornerstone of government policy. Therefore the family is an ideological construct associated with the modern state and emerges through the complexity of state governed social formations (Collier et al: 1992). As echoed in Tony Blair's first key speech as Prime Minister.

> "We cannot say we want a strong and secure society when we ignore its very foundations: family life. This is not about preaching to individuals about their private lives. It is addressing a huge social problem......Nearly 100, 000 teenage pregnancies every year; elderly parents with whom families cannot cope; children growing up without role models they can respect and learn from; more and deeper poverty; more crime; more truancy; more neglect of educational opportunities, and above all more unhappiness. Every area of this government's policy will be scrutinised to see how it affects family life. Every policy examined, every initiative tested, every avenue explored to see how we can strengthen our families"
>
> (The Guardian quoted by Silva and Smart, 1999:3)

This again echoes the sentiments expressed within the debates surrounding masculinity.

In Chapter Three I argued that masculinity was both the cause of and cure of criminality and likewise the family upholds a similar position. Not only is the family the site of criminality through its moral breakdown, through its dysfunctional marginalised status and through its disruptive nature but the

family can also be the site of the cure of criminality through its moral and social restoration within idealised traditional family values. These values and the idealisation of the family form place the father at the heart of family life. It is through the adoption of these values that families can be strengthened and crime decreased. Political discourses argue that the criminal family and/or the dysfunctional marginalised disruptive family can be altered and transformed via penal policy into the moral and socially ordered and strong ideal family.

3 The Social Construction of Fatherhood

The new rehabilitation of prisoners within the context of idealised masculinity and the depiction of men as breadwinners has not only been enshrined within the context of work and education (as discussed in Chapter Three) but has also become incorporated within the family and it is ultimately the family who are perceived as making a significant contribution to this process. Fathers are seen as offering emotional, social and financial support to their family and, once removed from the familial setting, the loved ones he leaves behind suffer a multitude of hardships. By the same token, imprisoned fathers also suffer emotional and social losses that serve to affect their self-esteem and motivation to undertake the possibility of becoming rehabilitated into responsible and moral citizens. Attachment and contact with the family is thus beneficial not only to families for the continuity of life in the outside world but also to prisoners providing for them the reason to change and to be law abiding upon their release from prison. Families have, as a consequence, been labelled as the key actors in influencing the re-offending rates of ex-prisoners and the ability of ex-prisoners to reintegrate into society and attain a job. In doing so, families can be constituted as the means by which men can behave in a moral and responsible

171

manner and the rights to partake in family life are accompanied by the responsibility of maintaining the families' welfare. Primarily then it is the constitution of fatherhood that underpins the new rehabilitation within prison via the imprisoned father through the responsible father.

Notions of fatherhood can be determined by changes within society and referred to what is often termed pre-industrial, industrial and post-industrial society. In pre-industrial society both men and women worked within close proximity of their homes and this meant that men could become more actively involved in the nurturing and rearing of their children (Lupton and Barclay: 1997). Underemployment was the most common feature of worker's lives with work often governed by the hours of natural light and the changing weather conditions (Burgess: 1997). In this scenario the whole family accompanied both the men and women who worked the land and, when work slackened, men became involved in the domestic sphere and participated in preserving food, cooking, cleaning and looking after children (Burgess: 1997).

Pre-industrial fathers essentially were viewed as an important resource within family life and, at times, were often considered as being more important to families and children than the mother. Men, in assuming the role of the father, were depicted as "moral teachers responsible for ensuring that their children grew up with an appropriate sense of values acquired from the study of the bible and other scriptural texts" (Lamb, 1997: 2). Thus, for men, being a father required taking on moral leadership over their children and offering such guidance and leadership to the family in general. The pre-industrial fathers were articulated into men who were rational, controlled, cultural and capable of

bestowing order whilst women, as mothers, were deemed to be passive and emotional (Lupton and Barclay: 1997). The characteristics of both men and women in pre-industrial times and the nature of the work and need to secure an abundant harvest may well lie at the root of men taking a superior stance within the family.

Order, control and a rational approach to the working day ensured that tasks could be completed and that children could be nurtured and cared for within the confines of the work undertaken on the land. Having faith and promoting that faith through a communal belief system as headed by the father as head of the household ensured conformity towards traditional values reaping the rewards of hard work. However the birth of industrialisation and the development of specialist forms of labour brought change within the familial home, working life and the aforementioned ideal of the pre-industrial father.

Williams (1998) comments that fatherhood has been constructed within social, economic and cultural conditions and such conditions have constituted fatherhood in terms of the man's breadwinning capacity. Through

> "going out to work, providing for a family, having power, authority and control over a wife and children, establishing undisputed paternity have been seen as essential defining characteristics of manhood and as central to the construction of 20th century masculinities"
> (Williams, 1998: 64-65).

Such 20th century masculinities can be thought of as reflecting the requirements of a modern industrial era. They exemplify the divisions between the home and work and of the public and private sphere. In this respect the family serves to shape and reproduce gender identities through a process of socialisation and social reproduction within internal divisions of labour that benefit the economy

and public life (Morgan: 2001). Economic industrialisation is considered as having increased the gender separation in family roles and it is this that has served to erode the interdependent contribution of men and women in the daily provision of providing and caring for children (Bloom-Feshbach quoted by Dienhart: 1998). Whereas the pre-industrial father brought men into the family unit, the industrial father removes men from the inner sanctum of family life. In doing so, men are seen as having an instrumental and functional role in societal life and it is this that has served to clearly delineate the social and familial roles undertaken by both men and women.

> "Home was becoming more matricentral, women retreated into their homes, older siblings remained at home longer, communities stabilised around certain industries and the readily available back up of female kin strengthened the division of labour between men and women."
> (Burgess, 1997: 57)

Increasingly women became synonymous with the home whilst men became more identified with paid work and thus retreated from home life.

Men, as instrumental leaders, were expected to earn the family living through work in a sustained and productive manner ensuring continued economic support whilst women, as expressive leaders, were conceived of as being the homemaker providing unconditional love for her children and fostering the conditions in which men could retire to an affectionate haven at the end of the working day (Beail and McGuire: 1982). Within this scenario as men ventured further from the family home in order to find work. The dominant story of what men do ultimately became one of casting man as the provider whilst what women do remained one of nurturing and caring for children; men thus worked outside the family environment whilst women remained within the family environment (Dienhart: 1998). Inevitably this resulted in the articulation of family life as providing the supportive and caring environment in which men can go out

174

to work and fulfil their familial as well as their social and economic responsibilities. In reiterating the ideal of the functional-structuralist approach the changing family context, due to the process of industrialisation, socialised both men and women into specific gender defined roles. Father's engaged in paid work to support the family whilst mother's cared for the children and the traditional nuclear family unit cumulatively enhanced and supported the needs of the capitalist economic system (Lupton and Barclay: 1997). In turn this also implied that men were fulfilling their perceived gender identities and actively engaged in activity and behaviour that befitted the requirements of a functioning industrial society.

As experienced in the post-war boom, the 1950's saw the expansion of several technological advances in British industry incorporating electrical engineering, electrical consumer goods, telecommunications, electrifications of the railways, new weapon systems, chemicals, coal, petroleum products, rubber and plastics (Wheelock: 1990). Although married women did find employment within these growing sectors, this was not at the expense of male employment (Ibid: 1990). Thus men held their dominant position in the labour market securing their role as the familial provider. In doing so male identity was thus constituted as that of the breadwinner assuming mature adult responsibilities of his wife and children and settling down into a life of respectability, duty and security (Morgan: 2001). Within this context, policy considerations have reflected men's roles as workers, citizens and soldiers or ex-soldiers rather than directly as fathers and yet men's role as fathers has followed on largely from these specific constructs and thus it is discipline within paid work in public life that has defined men as fathers (Williams: 1998).

The industrial era, which consolidated fatherhood as portraying the breadwinning role model of family, life continues to dominate constructions of men, family and masculinity and typifies idealised family life. However the post-industrial era has somewhat taken a step back and re-introduced the notion of fathers as care givers within the family context. Whereas previously the pre-industrial era gave primacy to the father as emotional and educational carers and the industrial era gave primacy to the father as financial providers, the post-industrial era seeks to combine both elements of fatherhood into one whole. The post-industrial era can be traced to emerging from what can be termed as a crisis of masculinity originating from the growth of women entering the world of paid employment.

Burgess and Ruxton (1996) comment that fatherhood has become de-skilled and whilst the breadwinning role has often been seen by men as a burden, it has provided men within society the exclusive status upon which their masculine identity has always relied and become defined. Yet, as noted by Williams (1998), the decline in the industrial base has brought with it an increase in male unemployment and this has served to undermine the capacity of many men to act as breadwinners. Wheelock (1990) relates this to Neo or Post-Fordism (as discussed in Chapter Two) as the growth of more flexible working patterns and production processes ended a system of monopolistic regulation through intensive accumulation programmes and the introduction of specified work roles coupled with the flexibility demanded from the labour force brought more women into the labour market at the expense of men. Indeed, flexible labour market policies have brought about a more demanding and turbulent working life for both men and women however, for women, marriage is

no longer considered as a barrier to their employment whilst men's status as lifelong breadwinners is no longer enshrined in law (Hearn and Pringle: 2006). It is this which accounts for the crisis in masculinity and, if men do equate their masculinity to being the family provider, a reduction in the capability to achieve this or indeed aspire towards this goal serves to undermine their purpose and to question their masculine identity.

The growth of women participating in the labour market and sharing or taking sole responsibility for the breadwinning role coupled with their increasing ability to become the educators and trainers of their children (Burgess and Ruxton: 1996) further compounds the destabilising of men's masculine identity. As argued by Ruxton (2006) fathers who are unemployed are much more likely to consider themselves as failed providers than most other fathers. Likewise Featherstone (2003) comments that whilst the role of the economic provider continues to be a central aspect to a father's identity, failure to access paid employment is experienced negatively by both fathers and their wives and children. One might well presume that if unemployed men regard themselves as failures as fathers, then they are likely to view themselves as failures as men in general. This is a point touched upon by the government green paper Supporting Families: A Consultation Document (Home Office, 1998: 39) that suggests

> "increasingly boys and young men seem to have difficulty maturing into responsible citizens and fathers. Declining educational performance, loss of traditional 'male jobs', the growth of a 'laddish' anti-social culture, greater use of drugs, irresponsible teenage fatherhood and the rising suicide rate may all show rising insecurity and uncertainty among young men".

If the 'traditions' which seemingly constitute male identities are being eroded by the changing fabric of British society and the labour market, then it is perfectly possible that insecurity and uncertainty features highly not solely amongst young men but men of all ages. Certainly if what it is to be a man is under question then undoubtedly what it is to be a father is also a matter for debate.

In view of this crisis, many debates are now seeking to answer the questions regarding what is fatherhood and what are fathers for? New cultural representations of fathers are casting men as the 'new man'. Whilst at one point the industrial father represented the separation of the man from the home, new configurations of the post-industrial father are bringing men back into the home. Thus the 'new man' also incorporates characteristics associated with the pre-industrial father of old in which men are to be actively involved in the business of child care (Williams: 1998). Likewise Burgess and Ruxton (1996) suggest that contemporary fatherhood has become politicised to the extent that there is a greater awareness of the barriers men face in actively participating in parenthood and that this loss is recognised as being at a personal cost to them. Therefore it is increasingly being recognised that fathers not only have rights to be a part of their child's life but that paternal feelings towards their children should be fostered and encouraged.

Consequently it is now acknowledged that "fathers and their children can have relationships as close and as mutually rewarding as mother-child relationships are perceived to be" (Burgess and Ruxton, 1996:7). In the language of the 'new man' of fatherhood, fathers are to take a more hands on approach in the care of their children and assume what was once thought of as the traditional role of the

mother. Here men share the housework and child care within dual earning homes and, as such, the implication is that man is highly nurturing as he becomes ever more so involved in their care and housework (Dienhart: 1998). In some cases men give up work altogether and assume the role of the househusband whilst the wife and mother assumes the breadwinning role. In Clarke and Popay's (1998) research they term such families as Egalitarian Families as they more closely exhibit these roles whereby mothers and fathers share the domestic sphere on an equal basis or the father undertakes solely the role of the househusband whilst the mother solely participates in paid employment.

In the adaptation to a changing world, various constructs of fatherhood have attempted to define, or at the very least, redefine men's relationship with both women and children, to the world of paid work and to their own masculine identity. This has ranged from the dominance of the father within employment and the home, the separation of the father from the home and ensconced in the realms of paid employment to finally reintroducing male domesticity within the home either to co-exist with or to replace participation in the labour market. Contemporary penal concerns exhibit many of these constructs of fatherhood within the new rehabilitation programme to reduce re-offending. Although, it must be noted, such constructs take men down a one-way street towards the concept of employability and employment outcomes as a responsible father. Again this reiterates the notion that the rights to a family life are simultaneously accompanied by responsibilities. The rights therefore to fatherhood coincide with the responsibilities of providing for their welfare best achieved through paid and sustainable employment.

Thus whilst it is encouraged that fathers become more involved within familial life and undertake paternal duties in line with more maternal duties, the overall aim of maintaining family ties with prisoners is that of employability. The amalgamation of the pre-industrial and the industrial father into the post-industrial father is not simply one of combining paternal and maternal roles within the domestic sphere and thus the option of whether or not to undertake paid employment. Rather the objective within penality is to foster familial ties that encourage prisoners and ex-prisoners to fulfil their paternal responsibilities along the more traditional lines of paid employment. Families provide a supportive environment and offer men a certainty of purpose in an uncertain world. Actively becoming involved in family life and having a purpose and connection within the home is fuelling the duty of men to assume the breadwinning role. Under the auspice of the new rehabilitation, families are serving to responsibilise men into fulfilling their family duties and, in this instance, the duty to be fulfilled is that of the provider through legitimate paid employment.

Research conducted by Niven and Stewart (2006) found that prisoners who received at least one visit from either a member of their family or their partner during their period in custody were significantly more likely to have ETE (Education, Training and Employment) and accommodation arranged upon their release. Therefore the current framework of the new rehabilitation of imprisonment sees a variety of parenting courses and work with families and prisoners being undertaken and promoted to responsibilise prisoners and increase their employability levels in order to achieve successful outcomes in terms of prisoner resettlement.

The following sections will discuss some of this work and consider the parenting courses offered by Safe Ground, the role of maintaining family ties in general within the new rehabilitative prison programme and the Storybook Dads project. Documentary sources from the aforementioned projects and official documents will be analysed through their discursive character to determine to what extent idealised man and the promotion of employability encapsulate the new prison rehabilitation programme through the maintenance of family ties.

4 Safe Ground: Learning to parent; Learning to Work.

Safe Ground has conducted some of the most effective work undertaken in prisons in order to encourage responsible parenting amongst male prisoners. Establishing itself as a charity in 1995, Safe Ground has become one of the key factors in promoting or, at the very least, maintaining family ties with prisoners. Indeed, as noted by Jarvis et al (2004), parenting classes are seen as encouraging the men involved and participating within them as helping to develop their role within a family network and thus contribute to the likelihood of reducing re-offending. Whilst Safe Ground primarily produced a drama based project for prisoners and young people at risk of social exclusion, they undertook a partnership with HM Prison Service to provide parenting programmes within prison as the Prison Service had begun to seek much more effective methods of motivating prisoners to participate in educational activities (Safe Ground: 2006a).

The result of this partnership was the initiative Families for the 21st Century and from this grew the parenting and family relationship programmes Fathers Inside and Family Man (Halsey et al: 2002). Both of which are designed to motivate

and engage male prisoners into learning the techniques and social skills required to maintain their personal and working relationships (Safe Ground: 2005). However as the vast majority of prisoners have significantly low levels of literacy, Safe Ground enlists the use of drama based activities to facilitate its programmes and incorporates role play, storytelling and poetry reading all culminating in a presentation given to an audience of fellow prisoners (Halsey: 2004) in which prisoners are able to demonstrate what they have learnt from participating on the course. Currently Father's Inside and the Family Man projects are operating within twenty four prisons (Boswell and Wedge: 2009) whilst Dowling and Gardner (2009) suggest that there are at least sixty two per cent of prisons running some form of parenting programme

The Father's Inside project is just one of the two courses offered by Safe Ground that uses drama to facilitate parenting skills. It is an intensive course covering a total of seventy five hours that enlists drama techniques, course videos and storytelling in order to engage and motivate learners from a variety of mixed abilities (Safe Ground: 2006b). As part of the project students aim to achieve at least seven learning outcomes covering:

- an awareness of the responsibilities of parenting
- understanding the rights and needs of other family members
- recognising honesty when communicating with children and other family members
- understanding the importance of listening to and offering choices to children
- recognising the differing stages of child development and an awareness of techniques used to cope with children's behaviour
- understand how children learn through activities
- an awareness of their own needs as parents and the ways in which they can be met
      (Safe Ground: 2003a)

On completion of the learning outcomes and the programme, students create, rehearse, direct and deliver a presentation to a select audience and thus demonstrate what they have learnt from the programme (Ibid: 2003a). Family Man on the other hand takes as its starting point the issue of family relationships. Here the programme is centred around prisoners developing a script group and devising storylines for the programme video, the production and performance of the video and the development of a marketing group to produce a logo and publicity materials (Halsey: 2004). The learning outcomes for this programme are to successfully facilitate the ability of prisoners to undertake a more active role in family life whilst in prison. Thus components of the course cover the ability to:

- describe differing family forms
- define the word role and how to use it appropriately within a family context
- identify the cause and effects of family problems
- define and understand appropriately the use of the word responsibility
- define the word need and consider its application in a variety of different situations

(Safe Ground: 2003b)

In both instances, the aims of the parenting and family relationship courses are to educate prisoners about all aspects of family life, understand what being part of a family entails and to develop effective communication between themselves and other members of their family. However, these learning outcomes can also be applied to effective communication with and understanding of people in general and thus become transferable skills from prison to the home, to the workplace and to the wider community.

The projects offered by Safe Ground have a dual function that befits not only the new prison rehabilitation but also contributes to the development of

idealised man through education and employment. Safe Ground's projects fulfil an educational criterion in which prisoners can achieve accreditation in what was once Parentcraft but is now part of the Social and Life Skills programme through the Open College Network. Parentcraft itself focussed upon contraception and sexual health matters; pregnancy and birth issues; children's development between the birth and five years; the role of the adult in supporting children's development; the role of the father; listening to children; managing behaviour; safety and first aid; and the responsibilities of parents incorporating both financial and legal responsibilities (Jarvis et al: 2004). In addition to this, the aims of the Social and Life Skills programme was to achieve the development of alternative self and society views; increase in self esteem, self confidence, social, personal and vocational competences and the attainment of nationally recognised qualifications (Boswell et al: 2004). The basis upon which both Parentcraft and the Social and Life Skills programmes are based also form the basis of the courses offered by Safe Ground and the completion of these courses are considered as providing multiple benefits to prisoners.

It is believed that prisoners completing the Fathers Inside and Family Man projects not only found improvements in their self-esteem and confidence but it is also that they will be more inclined to pursue further courses offered by the prison in which they are held. For some this could include education classes that will, in turn, increase their levels of employability. The following table (Table Four; Page 185) provides a resume of the numbers of students participating on the courses, their levels of achievement and progression to further learning opportunities.

Table Four: Safe Ground Student Outcomes

All SG programme student outcomes		
Programme Year	2003-2004	2004-2005
Commencements	267	960
Completions	201	781
Award Numbers	365	1571
Progression to further learning opportunities	171	820

SOURCE: Boswell G and Wedge P, University of East Anglia, 2009

This table indicates the extent to which more prisoners are being encouraged to participate in parenting programmes (through a growth in student numbers) but also that it encourages further pursuance of learning and educational programmes. As noted by Halsey et al (2002) the acquisition of parenting skills through the courses offered by Safe Ground increased the prisoner's literacy capabilities as several of the participants reported improvements in their reading, spelling, grammar and letter writing abilities. By the same token those who were somewhat resistant to the idea of education and learning now realised that education was within their reach and capabilities (Ibid: 2002). This is consolidated by research into the projects undertaken by Boswell et al (2004) who comment that parenting classes within prison have helped to implement behavioural changes amongst prisoners in which they are seeking and undertaking further education to equip them for legal employment.

Boswell et al (2004: 49) cite research participants as evidence of this from their evaluation of the courses provided by HMP Ashwell:

"Doing both Father's Inside and ETS has influenced me to go back to college (where I was before I got into offending). I've learned how to make 'legal' choices now and that this will improve my parenting and home situation."

"I realised I have to educate myself into legal employment. So I have done Community Sports Leaders Association (CSLA) course and am just waiting to hear about my assessment. I am also working towards a CSLA Gym and Sports Leaders award which I can use on release."

In assessing these comments, the importance of maintaining family ties obviously plays an important function in the new rehabilitation of prisoners. Legal employment and the underpinning philosophy of work benefiting family life is encouraging male prisoners to fulfil their familial obligations and responsibilities. Within this context idealised masculinity as the breadwinning father is sustaining the traditionally accepted status of men as the provider for the family both within an emotional as well as financial capacity. Therefore the successful resettlement of prisoners and thus for the purposes of prison rehabilitation, the overriding concern and focus is that of work and financial provisions for the family instilling a transfer from irresponsible marginalised man into the more productive and responsible idealised man.

Yet, for all of its potential benefits to prisoners, their families and the wider society, parenting classes are not without their criticisms. As I discussed at the beginning of this chapter, prisoners do not necessarily come from stable and secure or idealised family forms. Often their family life is fragmented, dysfunctional or marginalised in comparison. Therefore prisoner's own experiences of parenthood can be poor as they have been the victims themselves of either abuse, material disadvantage and thus unable to satisfy their own children's needs (Dowling and Gardner: 2009). As a consequence prisoners are often at risk of being unskilled at parenting prior to their

imprisonment and the prison environment merely compounds this. To be imprisoned leaves the father unable to practice and develop parenting skills within a natural home environment that can lower their confidence levels and result in them forgetting how to be a parent (Ibid: 2009). Indeed Howard (2000) notes that it is important to bear in mind that the majority of prisoners are young, are poor at the time of their arrest, have low levels of educational attainment and have a history of drug and alcohol dependency. All of this can negatively impact upon their ability to participate and successfully achieve the outcomes of parenting programmes.

By the same token, parenting classes will have very little impact on the further development of fatherly roles if children do not visit said parent. The Bromley Briefings from the Prison Reform Trust (2005) identify that during the course of their sentence, forty five per cent of prisoners lose contact with their families and separate from their partners. The NOMS National Action Plan to Reduce Re-Offending (NOMS: 2004) concurs with this and further explains the reduction in prison visits due to prisoners being kept further from their home and the increase in pressures on visiting areas and booking lines as having a detrimental impact upon the maintenance of family ties. Therefore parenting courses in themselves may only have a limited effect if it is not possible for fathers to have visits from their children. It is the opportunity to continue with further learning in this area following completion of the course that are of importance to students (Dennison and Lyon quoted by Jarvis et al: 2004). If parents complete the course months or even years before they are released (Ibid: 2004) then some form of interaction and communicative relations between prisoners and their families are required. Otherwise parenting classes are in

danger of becoming mere tick boxes and a crude measure of prisoners accruing qualifications rather than having an actual practical and useful purpose for the prisoner's prospects of resettlement and reintegration into family life upon his release.

In addition to this it is widely commented that little is known about prisoners as parents and very little data is collected on the parenting status of prisoners apart from inquiring if they are indeed a parent and even little is known about their children (Howard: 2000; Cunningham: 2001; Murray: 2007). With this as a given, again, the success of parenting programmes can depend on the ability of the course to adapt and match the needs of the student. If little is known about the parenting skills of prisoners and their own familial upbringing then a generic parenting course maybe of little significance and prove to be ineffective for the prisoner. Parenting programmes should not therefore be conducted and offered in a vacuum but need to be incorporated as part of a broader package of skills offered within the prison estate to tackle the multiple problems and disadvantages experienced and suffered by prisoners. This is particularly pertinent given the research conducted into the importance of maintaining family ties as not only a means of reducing re-offending but also as a key tool for the successful reintegration of prisoners back into the community.

5 Family Ties and Family Matters: Imprisonment and the Maintenance of Familial Relationships

According to the Prison Advice and Care Trust (PACT) Annual Review (2005) a prisoner receiving a visit from family or friends is a significant factor in helping to reduce re-offending amongst the ex-prisoner population and that this impact is

felt most strongly in helping them to settle into homes, training, jobs and communities upon their release from prison. Consequently it is vitally important that prisons provide the facilities in which prisoners can and should have access to their family through visitor's centres and schemes that enable family ties to be maintained. HM Prison Service (2005:1) quite clearly endorse this as one of their Prison Service Standards stipulate that "establishments enable prisoners to maintain close and meaningful relationships with family and friends..." whilst also "...taking account of security needs." The maintenance of family ties provides the mechanism by which idealised masculinity is exemplary and upholds a place within the new rehabilitation of male prisoners. Parenting, the role of the father and a place within one's household offers men a role and purpose in life in an era of increasing uncertainty. Families help to facilitate the reintegration of prisoners into society and can help to obtain work upon release thus contributing to men achieving their masculinity not only through the family but through employment. The breadwinning role and idealised masculinity functions within, by and through the family.

The most important aspect in which familial ties are maintained is through the various visitor centres within prisons that are often managed and provided by the voluntary sector. Prisoners are allowed to receive a minimum of two 60 minute visit every four weeks and, if the prison establishment is not overcrowded or short of either staff or space, more visits are allowed to take place (HM Prison Service: 2007b). Thus visitor's centres are considered as playing an important role within the rehabilitative process of prisoners and can assist in delivering the strategic aims which are thought to reduce re-offending

(NOMS: 2004). As consolidated by Peter Wrench (2003:13) the Head of Resettlement for HM Prison Service

> "There is research evidence to suggest that those prisoners released to a supportive family are less likely to re-offend. Family ties can therefore contribute to one of the government's top priorities of reducing re-offending. We need to be thinking about what we can do positively to strengthen or preserve family links during a prisoner's sentence in the same way that we target other potentially criminogenic factors."

Indeed one of the main ways in which family links can be strengthened is through the Prison Visitor's Centres. In research conducted by Loucks (2002: 4) one response from one of the managers at a visitor's centre in a Category C prison commented that the aim of the centre was to "provide a warm welcome for visitors and friendly support at all times; to provide help with practical difficulties; to provide information and a listening ear to those in need".

The role of the centre manager was perceived as providing basic support to families offering them the chance to relax after making the journey to prison. This was articulated thus:

> "Hopefully, to help reduce the stress of visiting, we encourage family members to persevere with what can be a very difficult commitment. We therefore hope to contribute to the maintenance of relationships to overcome the trauma of separation (Cat C training prison)"
> (Loucks, 2002: 10)

According to the Reducing Re-Offending National Action Plan (NOMS: 2004) there are over 100 visitor centres across the prison estate with at least 75-80 of those providing the full service to families regarding information, support and the opportunity to discuss any difficulties that they are facing. Indeed HMP Channings Wood have constructed a new Visitor's Centre to provide shelter, facilities and information for visitors in addition to family visits as organised through the Fathers for Families programme and day visits arranged for Therapeutic Community prisoners and lifers (IMB: 2006). By the same token

HMP Dartmoor have now employed a family liaison officer to co-ordinate family visits and a manager for the visitor's centre has been employed alongside the development of family days for prisoners (HM Chief Inspector of Prisons: 2006a). Research by Woodall et al (2006) consolidates the importance these schemes have not only for families but also for prisoners. Whilst visitor centres provide a buffer from the emotional stress of imprisonment of a loved one for families, they also provide prisoners with the chance to continue in their role as fathers and offer a supportive framework into which they can return upon their release from prison. This supportive framework not only provides a familial role for men but will also provide the impetus upon which to break the cycle of offending and return to the world of paid employment and a legitimate responsibilised lifestyle.

In their review of the Jigsaw Visitor's Centre at HMP Leeds Woodall et al (2006) comment that visitors to the centre judged the facilities to play a crucial role in the maintenance of family ties as the quality of the visit with either their partner, son or friend had improved due to the reduction of anxiety, stress and frustration that such visits can entail whilst prisoners stressed the importance of such visits upon their own mental well-being and of having supportive family network upon the completion of their sentence. Indeed "young fathers particularly commented on the importance of keeping links with their children and described how visits and special family visits organised by the Jigsaw Visitors Centre were important ways of maintaining their role as a father" (Ibid, 2006:24). Crow's (2006) discussion of the resettlement of prisoners highlights the importance of family ties for prisoners by reiterating the findings of a survey in 2001 to gauge the resettlement prospects of prisoners noting that, of the

2000 who took part, there was a significant relationship between the prospects of employment upon their release and having family relationships. Here those without jobs upon their release were less likely to have received any visits from partners and/or family during their sentence whilst those who had jobs upon their release were more likely to have been married or living with a partner than those who had no jobs upon their release from prison (Ibid: 2006).

In essence the indications overwhelmingly point to the fact that having a supportive family and friends increases the prospects of the successful rehabilitation of prisoners when they are released into the community (Harper and Chitty: 2005). It is families that often provide the support network and transition from prison into work and it is this that offers men a purpose and to resume their role within the family. Visitor centres afford male prisoners the opportunity to liaise, interact and communicate with their family and loved ones and it is this interaction and continuity of visitations that facilitates this transition. Again this is something recognised in the government plan to reduce re-offending. Here they comment upon a raft of new initiatives set up to provide support to prisoner's families and, as a by-product of this, provide support to prisoners in enabling their successful rehabilitation. The support service for HMP Dartmoor, HMP Channings Wood and HMP Exeter include:

- a new visitor centre in a separate location from HMP Channings Wood for prisoners' families
- employing two family support workers based in Plymouth and Exeter to work with families of prisoners from all three establishments
- establishing family friendly services at all three prisons, including play projects within prisons for the children, as well as relationship courses within prisons
- training volunteer mentors to support families pre and post sentence
  (NOMS: 2004)

192

Whilst the provision of these initiatives are a positive addition to the rehabilitation of male prisoners, it is widely recognised that most prisoners are held great distances from their homes. Therefore the Prison Service offers an Assisted Prison Visits Scheme to help meet the cost of travel for families on low incomes. As given by the Customer Service Guide, the Assisted Prison Visits Scheme aims to "promote family ties by contributing to the cost of prison visits by close relatives and partners who are in receipt of low incomes" (NOMS, 2006b: 1). The scheme itself is based upon the principles of ensuring a fair balance between how public monies are spent and also ensuring that family ties are maintained (HM Prison Service: 1999). Thus for people who hold a Health Certificate or claim either Income Support, Income-based Job Seekers Allowance, Tax Credits or Pension Credits (NOMS: 2006b) financial assistance is available to help meet the costs of travel for prison visits. The scheme covers all HM Prison establishments and those held in police cells due to overcrowding but excludes secure hospitals, local authority schools, Bail or Probation hostels, Secure Training Centres or Immigration Detention Centres and is available for close relatives, partners and those who act as an escort for people visiting prisoners (HM Prison Service: 1999).

Whilst there are, of course, benefits to prisoners and their families in providing visitor centres to enable families to remain close and together, numerous criticisms are levied at the lack of a widespread provision for the centres and the overall conditions of the centres themselves. Loucks (2002) notes that the underlying theme throughout her research was that some prison governors were unsure as to whether or not their establishment did have a 'real' visitor centre and prison staff also seemed unsure as to what or where their visitor

centres were suggesting that such facilities have a very low profile. Laura Cockburn, a visitor centre manager, supports this statement as given in her conference speech held by Action for Prisoners Families. Cockburn (2003: 2) comments

> "after spending five years setting up the support centre I was becoming increasingly concerned that prisoners were not aware of the support service we were offering to their families to strengthen family ties.....it still surprises me each week the number of prisoners arriving at Acklington have never been informed that there is financial assistance for families on benefits to visit. It does seem unfortunate that there is support mechanisms in place for these visitors, yet they are not aware that it exists"

Brookes (2005) argues that most visitor centres are provided by charities and that the biggest obstacle in providing adequate facilities and information is due to a lack of funding. He further comments that this reflects a failure on the part of government to deploy resources to supporting prisoners to maintain family links given the research that indicates family ties are important factors in reducing re-offending. Indeed, the Prison Reform Trust Bromley Briefings (2005) notes that a bid to establish a well resourced visitor's centres for every prison in the 2003 Spending Review has failed. Thus whilst rhetoric from government is commendable in that "visitors centres have an important role to play in helping to keep families together and enabling them to contribute to the rehabilitation process in a meaningful way" (NOMS, 2004: 37), Brookes (2005) argues that action in this area has been significantly poor.

Indeed the lack of mainstream statutory funding for visitor centres suggests that official support in this area is wholly inadequate (Setkova and Sandford: 2005) despite the political discourse which suggests otherwise. Thus there are wide variations in facilities provided by visitor centres ranging from unmanned, unstaffed waiting areas to those who are fully staffed and funded providing

194

services for counselling, support and advocacy for visitors, staff and prisoners (Loucks: 2002). This not only impacts upon the quality and availability of these centres but it can also make it difficult for family members of prisoners to receive the help and information required to cope when a loved one is imprisoned. Hudson (2007b) notes that prisoners actively discourage their families from visiting based on a lack of information about visits, the condition of visiting facilities, security rules and procedures and the fact that they are both time consuming and expensive. It is also difficult for families to arrange visits as booking lines are often difficult to get through to and families are often told at a late date that a prisoner's visiting entitlement has changed (Setkova and Sandford: 2005). The Action for Prisoners families (2007a) survey into booking lines highlights the problematic nature of organising prison visits.

Their survey found that one third of respondents were frustrated at the inability to get through to the prison booking lines complaining that they continually received an engaged tone with one respondent commenting that it took them three hours to book a visit (Action for Prisoners Families: 2007a). A further ten per cent found difficulties in booking a visit as the lines were open for only a few hours during the day whilst, overwhelmingly, sixty five per cent and sixty four per cent respectively commented that they would welcome the opportunity to book via the internet or email as well as the telephone (Ibid: 2007a). Thereby increasing their prospects of being able to book visits to their loved ones in prison. However the problems encountered in booking visits, coupled with the fact that visitors are often turned away if they arrive late at the prison or do not have the required identification (Loucks: 2004), are not conducive to prisoners maintaining links with their family. Brooks-Gordon and Bainham (2004: 266)

195

further argue that "it is not unusual for families to arrive for a visit and be turned away when there has been a lock down owing to threat, riot or fire..." and that such experiences can add as a "...further disincentive to families to engage in future visits". By the same token the treatment of visitors to the prison establishment also has a negative effect upon the maintenance of family ties.

Cunningham (2001) cites research that indicates that most visitors to prison establishments felt like criminals themselves just for visiting the prison. Maxine, a prison visitor supports this by commenting

> "a visit to prison can be en extremely daunting, overwhelming experience and something needs to be done about this. My husband is now in one of the newest most modern prisons in the country. The one thing that [its] visitors centre does provide is a bullet proof glass enclosure to protect 'trained-uniform' staff from us marauding visitors whilst they process our application to enter the prison. The message their barrier gives to me and my children isn't subtle – it makes me feel like a criminal and the only crime I have ever committed is to care about the person I have come to visit."
>
> (Maxine, 2003: 7-10)

Woodall et al (2006) reinforces this as their research found that visitors to prison experienced both rudeness and disrespect from prison staff. Whilst an inspection at HMP Channings Wood found that visitors to see vulnerable prisoners were treated highly unsatisfactorily. In this instance there was no dedicated visitor centre at the prison for vulnerable prisoners and their families and visits were held in a room at the far side of the prison with no toilets or refreshments (Action for Prisoners Families: 2008). In some cases visitors were left to wait in the rain whilst others were subjected to a rub down search (Ibid: 2008). This merely serves to undermine the ability of prisoners to maintain contact with their families as the treatment of visitors at the hands of prison staff further punishes the prisoner and his family rather than ensuring the right to a family life that prisoners have.

Coyle (2002) argues that prisoners have the right to maintain contact with their relations, that prison authorities have a responsibility to ensure that these relationships are maintained and developed and that the loss or restriction of family contact and/or visits should not be used as a punishment for the prisoner. He cites the Universal Declaration of Human Rights Article 12 in that "no one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence..." and the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners Rule 37 that "...prisoners shall be allowed under necessary supervision to communicate with their family and reputable friends at regular intervals, both by correspondence and receiving visits" (Coyle, 2002: 95-97). However whilst the maintenance of family ties may well be a right under both Human Rights law and the Treatment of Prisoners Rules, the reality is often very different.

Diver (2008) argues such a point in that whilst access to one's family is an essential factor in preventing the recidivism amongst ex-offenders, in Northern Ireland the judiciary regard it as an exceptional rather than essential factor. As Humber and Burrows (2009) suggest there is little or no regard given within the Prison Service as to how families and friends might maintain regular contact with their loved ones especially when prisoners are transferred hundreds of miles from their families. Even though the Prison Service Rules stipulate that the prisoner is to be encouraged and assisted to establish and maintain relations with persons and agencies outside of the prison, Humber and Burrows (2009) state that the primacy given to the governance of the prison rather than to the welfare of prisoners and their families makes family contact not only difficult but often impossible. Consequently this can only impact negatively on

the successful rehabilitation and resettlement of prisoners through the maintenance of family ties and, as discussed, results in prisoners deterring families from visiting them in prison.

Wheeler (2003) remarks that families are rarely involved in preparations for the prisoners release and few dedicated family centres negates any quality time that prisoners can spend with their children. Taken in conjunction with Gampbell's (quoted by Wheeler, 2003: 2) comment that "if you treat families like the next lot of prisoners coming in, and you treat kids like scum, then it is no wonder they will stop visiting", far from enabling the development of idealised man the outcome will be as Hairston (1988) suggests that the prisoner merely functions in those roles ascribed to him as a prisoner rather than those of a family man.

Another contributory factor in the possibility of families visiting prisoners is the distance that prisoners are held from their home. An investigation by Wheeler (2003) of BBC News Online Magazine found that family visits to prisoners had dropped by a third over the past five years and that one of the major reasons for this is the length of distance most prisoners are imprisoned from their home and family location. As of 2003, 26,134 prisoners were held over 50 miles from their committal crown court, 10,880 were held over 100 miles away and one quarter of prisoners families faced round trips of five hours (Setkova and Sandford: 2005). Travel is a problem often experienced by those who are visiting family relations in HMP Dartmoor.

The Independent Monitoring Board's (IMB) Annual Report (2004) of the prison commented upon poor public transport for visitors to Princetown. This they cite as having a detrimental effect on the maintenance of family ties as the consequence is that visits do not take place as often as they should thus contributing to a breakdown in relationships (IMB: 2004). Likewise HM Chief Inspector of Prisons (2006a) found that HMP Dartmoor should explore ways of providing or subsidising transport for visiting families from local railway stations but that this had not been achieved. In addition travelling to visit prisoners is not only time consuming but also expensive and whilst the Assisted Prison Visits Scheme does pay for two visits per month, payment is only made after the visit (Mills: 2004). Therefore some families experiencing financial hardship may find it difficult to pay for travel, food and accommodation costs up front (Ibid: 2004). The problems of distance from home are also recognised as a concern affecting visitors and prisoners at HMP Channings Wood.

The IMB Report of HMP Channings Wood (2006) argues that although efforts are made to enable prisoners to maintain contact with their families many find themselves far from home causing them great stress and that this is often reflected in the number of applications for transfer to prisons closer to home. However "even when there are compelling reasons for transfer there are often long delays due to a lack of places and also problems with transport to a different part of the country" (IMB, 2006:13). The remoteness and isolation of prison establishments also hinder the prospects of families being able to visit prisoners. Indeed research conducted within HMP Camphill on the Isle of Wight confirm this as a problem as fifty five percent of prisoners had not received any visits since arriving at the prison (Murray quoted by Mills: 2004). To remedy this

problem it would be beneficial for the Prison Service to keep prisoners closer to home as this would significantly decrease the cost of travel, provide easier access for family visits and reduce the problems involved in taking children on long journeys across the country on public transport (Salmon: 2006). However it is difficult to envisage how this system could be implemented when the importance of family visits for prisoners are given much credence in the written text but scant attention in reality.

Whilst it is evident that family ties are important to the new rehabilitation of male prisoners, the reality is that many prison visitors centres are inadequate in providing the necessary facilities to make this possible. Prison regimes and the governance of prisons hinder rather than develop positive and practical solutions to the problems experienced by prisoners and their families. Political discourses may well promote idealised family life for the idealised man but very little commitment from government in relation to both human and financial resources leave idealised man as merely a rhetorical device on behalf of government to address the problems of offending behaviour. This same argument can also be levied at other forms of communication that the prison provides for prisoners to maintain links with their families.

Letters, Talk and Storybook Dads: Bringing Fatherhood back home

Communication between prisoners and their families or loved ones can also be continued through telephone calls, letters and, for the maintenance of a fatherly role within the family, the Storybook Dads project. Convicted prisoners are allowed to send one free letter every week with the postage paid for by the Prison Service with any additional letters paid for by the prisoners themselves

200

(HM Prison Service: 2007b). In general prisoners can write not only to their family and friends but also to newspapers and can contribute to radio and television programmes as well as submitting articles for publication (Ibid: 2007b). Letters are an effective method of maintaining familial relationships and maintaining a role within family life should prison visits be infrequent or lacking in privacy. The isolation of prison life can leave male prisoners feeling far removed from their families and in their role as a father. Thus letters can help prisoners to feel part of family life and can help them to stay in touch with the realities of the outside world. As discussed by Action for Prisoners Families (2007b) partners and loved ones can use the post to involve prisoners in decisions about the home and house by sending brochures and/or catalogues in relation to buying new appliances for the home or to assist in choosing the colour scheme or plants for the painting and decorating or gardening of the home. However at times letters can be read by prison staff and there are restrictions placed upon the sending of letter. These include:

- the discussion of escape plans or saying anything which affects prison security
- helping someone to commit a criminal offence or an offence against prison rules
- threats or blackmail
- anything that may affect national security (such as instructions for making a weapon or coded message)
- commenting upon anything that may be racially offensive or obscene
  (HM Prison Service: 2007b)

Telephone calls are equally as effective as letters in contributing to the maintenance of family ties. As it is widely recognised by the Prison Service that prisoners have problems with literacy and numeracy skills, telephone calls allow prisoners to communicate verbally with loved ones and family members when writing and visiting is troublesome and not possible. Again as noted by Action for Prisoners Families (2007b) in these circumstances phone calls are

considered as a lifeline for the prisoner and for their partner or family. Thus prisoners are either given PIN numbers to use a pinphone or phonecards in which credit can be purchased and automatically deducted from either their PIN account or from their phonecard (HM Prison Service: 2007b).

Perhaps one of the most significant ways in which male prisoners can maintain their familial and therefore fatherhood role within the family is through the Storybook Dads project. As with telephone calls Storybook Dads can also be a lifeline for families and is considered as playing a key role in helping to maintain the family unit whilst separated (Storybook Dads: 2007). As it involves the reading of stories for their children, which is digitally recorded onto CDs complete with sound effects, all prisoners can participate regardless of their reading ability. Here prisoners who experience exceptional problems with their reading can be guided by a mentor by repeating the story, as spoken by the mentor, one sentence at a time with the mentor's voice and any other distracting noises edited out afterwards (Prison Service Journal: 2006). By sending a CD of themselves reading a bedtime story to their children, male prisoners are able to fulfil a natural parenting and fathering role from behind bars (Storybook Dads: 2007). In addition to this HMP Dartmoor, as well as other prisons, also offer creative writing courses whereby imprisoned parents can write and record their own story (Prison Service Journal: 2006).

Based in HMP Dartmoor, Storybook Dads is a registered charity established in 2002 that has expanded over the years so that it now offers its editing service to other prisons and over 1700 prisoners have participated in the project since it began (Storybook Dads: 2007). The eligibility criteria for prisoners wishing to

participate in the project are decided upon by participating prisons vetting their own prisoners for suitability (Storybook Dads: 2009a). Table Five provides information on the prisons participating in the project.

Table Five: Prisons participating in the Storybook Dads Project

Storybook Dads: Participating Prisons	
Prisons without their own editing suite	Ashwell; Belmarsh; Blundestone; Blantyre House; Bristol; Bullwood Hall; Camp Hill; Cardiff; Castington; Chelmsford; Coldingley; Dorchester; Dovegate; East Sutton park; Erlestoke; Everthorpe; Exeter; Featherstone; Forest Bank; Full Sutton; Garth; Grendon; Haverrig; High Down; Hindley; Hollesley Bay; Huntercombe; Kingston; La Moye; Lancaster Castle; Lancaster Farm; Leicester; Lincoln; Lindholme; Long Lartin; Lowdham Grange; Maidstone; Manchester; Military Correction and Training Centre; Moorland; Mount; North Sea Camp; Norwich; Onley; Parkhurst; Portland; Prescoed; Preston; Ranby; Risley; Rochester; Rye Hill; Spring Hill; Stocken; Swansea; thorn Cross; Wakefield; Warren Hill; Wheatfield
Prisons with their own editing suite	Altcourse; Askham Grange; Durham; Foston Hall; Gartree; Glen Parva; Guys Marsh; Hewell; Grange; Peterborough; Staford; Sudbury; Verne; Whealstun; Winchester

SOURCE: Storybook Dads, 2009b

One major benefit of the Storybook Dads project is that it not only aids the maintenance of family ties but it can also encourage prisoners to access further learning opportunities that they previously may not have explored. Therefore benefits for the prisoner participating in this project include:

- "improved confidence and sense of achievement;
- understanding the importance of reading and storytelling for children's development and imagination;
- improvement in prisoners self-esteem and perception of themselves as a valued parent through doing something tangible for their child;
- in some cases the prisoner will break new ground as far as their experiences of parenting are concerned because many prisoners were never read to as a child and have not read to their children before;
- prisoners feel happier because links with the family are being maintained and;

- participants may be encouraged to explore learning opportunities on offer in the prison for example parenting, literacy or creative writing courses"
(Prison Service Journal, 2006: 3)

The benefits in helping fathers in prison maintain links with the families and children through letters, telephone calls and the Storybook Dads project are invaluable and can plug the gap left by the inadequacies that some families experience with prison visitor centres. Yet these other forms of communication for prisoners are not without their criticisms and can also have a detrimental impact upon them being able to maintain links with their families.

A major problem that will inhibit the writing of letters is the poor literacy and educational attainment that prisoners have achieved. As mentioned in Chapter Three, the SEU (2002) identified that eighty per cent of prisoners suffered from deficits in their writing skills whilst the introduction to this chapter highlighted that twenty two per cent of young men in prison had truanted from school (Walmsley et al: 1992) with the SEU (2002) suggesting that prisoners are ten times as likely than the general population to have truanted from school. Collectively this results in many prisoners having a poor level of education and the ability of prisoners to be able to write letters home to their family is severely limited. For those who do endeavour to maintain links with their family through letters, the cost of keeping in touch may make it difficult for prisoners to maintain contact. Loucks (2004) argues that prisoners only have one letter a week paid for them whilst the Action for Prisoners Families Annual Review (2009) suggests that the increase in the cost of stamps is not matched by the increase in prison wages and, as such, might make it difficult for prisoners to keep in touch.

Likewise, the cost of telephone calls as a communicative tool between prisoners and their families, hinder the ability of prisoners to maintain links with their family. Mills and Codd (2008) note that telephone calls made from prisons are five times more expensive than those made on the outside. Indeed Allison's (2007) article in the Guardian newspaper identifies the campaign of a prisoner to reduce the cost of telephone calls as he argues that it breaches the human rights of prisoners to be charged five times the national call rate and for BT to receive a ten per cent commission from the sale of phone cards to prisoners. Humber (quoted by Allison: 2007), who is representing the complainant, argues that the charges are at odds with the Prison Service's pledge to promote the rehabilitation of prisoners through keeping in touch with their families. Action for Prisoners Families (2007c) concurs with this.

They comment upon the high costs of telephone calls for prisoners and their campaigns to have these reduced particularly in light of the fact that prisoners are now being held further from home and that, for some, they are becoming increasingly reliant upon the telephone as a means of keeping in touch. Their former director Lucy Gampell (quoted by Action for Prisoners Families, 2007c: 7) argues

> "phone calls are a lifeline for families of prisoners, but the exorbitant costs of calls means that prisoners are limited to brief conversations. If the prisoner has more than one child, the limited time means it can be very difficult to speak to each one. Innocent children and families are being penalised by these charges."

In this instance it isn't just the prisoner who is somewhat penalised by his imprisonment but also his family. Again the charges for telephone calls implies that whilst the political rhetoric promotes the promotion of family ties the reality of expensive telephone calls can make contact impossible.

Loucks (2004) takes on this mantle and moves it one step further by arguing that telephone contact between the prisoner and his family is highly unlikely given that prisoners cannot receive incoming calls and, with limited funds, they have to make the choice between contacting their partner or children. Caddle and Crisp's (1997) research into imprisoned mothers highlights these problems. Here their research found that women prisoners cited expense (forty nine per cent responded a lack of money to but telephone cards), long queues (twenty four per cent), noise (twenty nine per cent) and a lack of privacy (twenty nine per cent) as frequent problems when making contact within the prison (Caddle and Crisp: 1997). These problems experienced by women within prison establishments can also be applied to the male prisoner population. This is consolidated by the SEU (2002) comment that telephone calls can be an expensive medium in which to communicate with family members and, as such, increases the pressure upon families to provide the cash to buy phonecards when they are suffering from financial hardship (Mills: 2004). It is difficult to counteract such an argument and merely adds to the fact that whilst official guidance remains serious about the maintenance of family ties as an aid to prevent re-offending and promote the successful reintegration of prisoners back into society, the mechanisms by which it seeks to do so are extremely limiting.

On the other hand, the positive of implementing and providing prisoners with the ability to produce reading materials for their children in relation to the Storybook Dads project is difficult to criticise. However the critique applied to parenting classes can be equally applied to this project. Whilst the preparation of bedtime stories does help fathers to maintain links with their children, it is essentially parenting at a distance. As Dowling and Gardner (2009) remark imprisonment

does not allow the father to parent in a natural home environment and thus they can experience a lack of confidence in their ability to parent. In addition the numerous problems, as discussed in this chapter, in relation to family visits to prison can indicate that the prisoner is unable to continue to forge links with his child or children during face-to-face contact. Consequently his ability to be a father to his children only occurs in the spoken text and is not reinforced through prison visits. Taken in conjunction with the fact that prisons themselves are to vet who is and who is not eligible to participate in the project (Storybook Dads: 2009a), some fathers in prison may be the victims of a discriminatory process that prioritises certain prisoners for projects such as these over others. Again, the Storybook Dads project itself falls victim to the problematic nature of the governance of the prison system.

6 Concluding Comments

It is evident that the maintenance family ties with male prisoners not only serves to fuel the increases in reductions in re-offending but that this can be achieved through the promotion of the active subject within the family setting. The risk management of offenders as exemplified within the new rehabilitation of the new penality is serving to identify men within an idealised masculine framework that underpin their process of character reformation. The family plays an important role and function in this process as it enables the development of idealised masculinity through the role given to men within the family. However as noted by Codd (2004:3)

> "promoting family life has to be balanced against the interests of prison security; facilitating community re-entry has to be balanced against the societal desire to see criminals punished; the desirability of parents maintaining contact with their children has to be balanced against the

potential negative effects of children spending time with their parents in a prison environment."

The maintenance of family ties within prison undoubtedly has to be measured and checked against these balances but the positive connotations derived from them can have long lasting effects on both the family and the imprisoned father.

Visher and Travis (2003) comment that the ability of prisoners to re-establish a commitment to family roles after their release from prison can be a critical factor in developing a pro-social identity and, whilst this transition from imprisonment back into the role of husband and father will not be easy for some, it is of importance in their identity transformation towards that of a law abiding citizen after their release. However the benefits of maintaining family ties with prisoners are hampered by a number of negative factors resulting from men's imprisonment and their enforced separation from their family. At times the very nature of the prison environment undermines familial ties and the possibility of men becoming successfully reintegrated into home, family and working life. It is within this context that Fraser's (1997) affirmative reform analysis is most significant. Whilst it is argued that the focus upon families as the major factor in the prevention of re-offending should be reinforced and supported, it is to be achieved without changing the underlying conditions that make familial contact difficult.

As noted by the Every Child Matters green paper and reinforced by the SEU (2002: 112),

> "no one has day to day responsibility within prisons for ensuring that links between prisoners and families are maintained, families are not involved in the process of rehabilitation, there is no one person the family can contact for information and there is generally no one they can pass on concerns to about the prisoner's welfare or mental health."

Given that it is widely acknowledged that families are a vital source in the prevention of re-offending of prisoners upon their release, it is an oversight on the part of the Prison Service that no one person amongst the legitimate authority of the prison estate has responsibility for maintaining the family ties of prisoners. Whilst traditionally it was the Probation Service who undertook the work for family support, this is no longer the case due to their changing role within penality (Salmon: 2006). Consequently "no organisation has statutory responsibility for working with the prisoner and the family despite the well documented contribution made by families in the reduction of re-offending" (Salmon, 2006: 4). This implies that the services provided for families and for prisoners in terms of maintaining the family unit can be fragmented and, in some cases, nonexistent. Indeed these circumstances merely serve to act as a reminder or denote that family contact and the maintenance of family ties for prisoners is a privilege that has been earned rather than as a right or a method of social integration (HM Inspectorate of Prisons: 2001).

Mills and Codd (2007) comment that whilst a number of specialist measures do exist to aid the development and maintenance of familial relationships and familial involvement within prisoner's lives, these measures are limited to individual prisons or to individual projects that are run in a small number of prisons. Consequently, provision for maintaining family ties are limited and seemingly are not widespread throughout the whole of the prison estate. As a result there is much talk but apparently little action in promoting the family ties of prisoners.

By the same token, as one of seven pathways in the National Action Plan to Reduce re-offending (Home Office: 2004b) the Children and Families pathway has been subject to much criticism. Actions for Prisoner's Families (2004) argue that it has been a missed opportunity for positive change as there is a failure to tackle the lack of services and support for prisoner's families. Indeed Hudson (2007b) reiterates the fact that NOMS recognises that the Children and Families of Offenders pathway is one of the most underdeveloped pathways. Therefore Salmon (2007) is well placed to comment that whilst the recent political drive to embrace and strengthen governmental support for children, young people and families should be applauded it fails to incorporate the children and families of prisoners. As children and families of prisoners are the most disadvantaged and vulnerable amongst society it seems incomprehensible that they are somewhat forgotten and missing from both the political and policy agenda (Ibid: 2007). In respect of this, contemporary penal policy to reduce re-offending fails to provide any resources to maintain and strengthen family relationships, they fail to meet the needs of prisoners families and they also fail to encourage families' potential role in the realms of resettlement (Mills and Codd: 2007).

Indeed Gampbell (2006) argues that families experience selective visibility by policy makers and, as such, they can be highly discriminating when including familial considerations in their decision making and policy planning. Therefore the families of prisoners are of a concern to policy makers as and when it is politically suitable and expedient for them to be so. In addition there is an assumption that prisoners either have families upon whom they can rely and thus have strong connections with them in order to facilitate their rehabilitation and reintegration back into the community. However, as previously discussed,

prisoners come from disrupted and somewhat marginalised families and "for prisoners with no family ties such as those who have grown up predominantly in local authority care, social capital provided by family bonds may simply be absent" (Mills and Codd, 2008: 15). Consequently the benefits prisoners may have from maintaining links with their family are severely limited and for some non-existent. The reliance upon the family here is a poor reflection upon a government that is unwilling to recognise and act upon not only differing family forms that exist within society but also that some people may not have a family to rely on.

Although the emphasis upon the maintenance of family ties with prisoners is put at the heart of offender management (Woodall et al: 2006), the reality of the situation is clearly different. "Existing provision to help prisoner's families is piecemeal, heavily reliant on the voluntary sector and predominantly based on short term funding" (Mills and Codd, 2008: 19). Yet the family and the man's role within the family are constituted as providing a purpose for men in the outside world and underpins much of the political discourse and policy formulations that comprise the new rehabilitation of male prisoners. The construction of idealised man occurs by and through his family and is considered as facilitating the responsibilisation of male prisoners within the new rehabilitative function of the prison. However the lack of commitment and support to the maintenance of family ties across the whole of the prison estate will merely negate and undermine this process. There needs to be a much greater focus, emphasis and commitment on behalf of the government to appoint someone responsible for the children and families of prisoners and to actively engage in funding programmes and services by which this can be made

211

possible. If not the concept and promotion of idealised man within the new rehabilitation of male offenders will be a rhetorical device that gains much credence in the literature but fails to materialise in the practical lived realities of many male prisoners and their families.

CHAPTER SIX

Penal Workfarism and Employability: Idealised Man as Idealised Employee through Education, Training and Skills

1 Introduction

In the previous chapter I argued how idealised masculinity is a governmental tool of policy makers by which to formulate and implement a programme of the new rehabilitation, that of maintaining family ties. This chapter continues and develops this theme through the provision of education, training and employment (ETE) skills. Official discourses relate poor educational attainment and a deficit of skills necessary to compete in the contemporary labour market as one of the key factors that contributes to offending behaviour. It is therefore worthwhile re-iterating the multiple problems that offenders have in accessing legitimate employment. Rolfe (2001) states that these are:

- Health problems (including drug/alcohol misuse)
- Housing problems and homelessness
- Family or relationship problems
- Low self esteem and lack of confidence
- Poor basic skills (including numeracy and literacy)
- Truanting from school and leaving school at an early age
- Low educational attainment
- History of unemployment /experience of long term unemployment
- Little experience of legitimate employment
- Low motivation to find employment

Taken collectively, all of these problems have been articulated into one of seven pathways to reduce re-offending. One of the major pathways relates to education, training and employment. As stipulated in the National Reducing Re-Offending Delivery Plan (NOMS: 2006a) it is a lack of employment and the basic skills by which to attain employment that contributes to offending and re-

213

offending. Therefore the government's overall policy is centred upon supporting offenders into sustainable employment (NOMS: 2006a).

Anne Owers (2007), the former Chief Inspector of Prisons, similarly argues that the provision of *real* work skills and education equips prisoners with better prospects of obtaining work upon their release from prison and that employment itself is heralded as the single most important factor to reduce re-offending and to assist the resettlement of prisoners into the community. The underpinning theme of these arguments is that the criminality of men is to be corrected via the aspirational conduct of idealised man and of inculcating the values of idealised masculinity. It is responsible idealised man who re-skills and improves his prospect of obtaining a job whilst it is marginalised man who remains on the periphery and continues to conduct criminal behaviour. Inclusivity within society is ultimately achieved through legitimate employment.

However, as I argued in both Chapters Two and Three, male employability in the 21st Century has changed significantly in the transition from a Fordist to a Post-Fordist world. This transition has created a void in which some men cannot compete due to a deficit of skills required for new flexible working practices and modes of labour. Economic restructuring has served to worsen and increase the prospect of men to face even more so poverty and social exclusion. Yeandle (2003) comments that men's relationship to the labour market has gradually eroded that of the male breadwinner role. Consequently this has created problems for the unemployed man as it is perceived as jeopardising the transition to adulthood, undermines the traditional work ethic and has created a lawless and aggressive masculinity linked to vandalism, theft, violence, racial

conflict and self destructive deviancy (Robertson Elliot: 1996). Yeandle (2003:14) summarises contemporary employment for men thus

> "work for men would [now] start later, finish earlier and be more varied in between. Skills would become obsolete or require updating ever more rapidly. Whole industries in which men had predominated for 150 years would disappear and in the future more work would involve interpersonal, clerical and technical skills, with much reduced call for manual labour, fewer unskilled jobs and a greater needs to re-skill and retrain, not just once but perhaps numerous times during the working life".

Yet for those who can track market fluctuations and can conduct an assessment of their skills and re-skill as and when required (Dawson: 2004), men can compete within the labour market and aspire to idealised masculinity.

It is within this context that policy concerns regarding the provision of ETE takes precedence and underpins political discourse surrounding the new rehabilitation. Thus, even though the dominance and prevalence of the male breadwinner is considered to be diminishing, the ideology of the male breadwinner family maintains a hold and continues to impact upon identity and expectations (Creighton quoted by Warren: 2007). As commented by the House of Commons Home Affairs Committee (2004: 5) "the best way of reducing re-offending is to ensure that prisoners on their release have the ability to get into work". It is idealised masculinity that provides the impetus and aspirations for men to reform and change their lives from one of offending to one of working and, as such, is indicative of the gendered nature of rehabilitation.

The remainder of this chapter will explore these issues further by looking at the quest to re-skill the population in general as well as relating this to offenders. It will then discuss the nature of education within prisons and the role of work and work based learning within the prison environment to demonstrate how ETE has

been integrated into penal policy for male prisoners and has formed part of the new rehabilitation for male offenders. As previously this chapter will also utilise Fraser's (1997) typology of transformative and affirmative reform development of employability skills of male prisoners. In this instance not only does governmental action occur at the affirmative level of reform and thus seeks to derive equitable outcomes through changes in the existing social arrangements but it also seeks to address and re-structure the structural conditions upon which these social arrangements are built. Consequently the recommendations given in relation to governmental activity addresses not only the barriers to employment as faced by the male (ex) prisoner population but also that government should intervene in the labour market and seek to stimulate the availability of jobs through job creation activities.

2 Education: Skills for Life in the 21st Century

The quest to develop prisoner education and skills for the labour market emanate not just from its perception as a means of reducing the prospect of re-offending but also falls in line with the general need to increase the skills of the whole population. The Department for Education and Skills (DFES) commissioned a survey to ascertain both the literacy and numeracy needs of the population within England. In summary, its findings concluded that low levels of literacy and numeracy were associated with economic deprivation, there was a strong correlation between respondent's literacy and numeracy levels and their educational history and that respondent's employment was strongly linked to the influence of their educational attainment (DFES: 2003). Overall, the implicit argument of the survey and its findings is that those who have a strong history of education and have an adequate level of both literacy

and numeracy skills are more likely to find themselves within stable paid employment. To some extent this is a relationship that runs in both directions. "Poor literacy hampers employment and a lack of employment experience hampers the development of literacy skills; the relationship between never working and poor numeracy is also strong" (Grinyer, 2005: 17-18). For male prisoners this undoubtedly appears to be the case.

Twenty per cent of the population are considered as having basic skills deficits whilst, for prisoners, sixty per cent have poor literacy skills and seventy five per cent have poor numeracy skills (NAO: 2002). Therefore it has been stated that up to ninety per cent of jobs available in the labour market are closed to prisoners thus making them more likely to be unemployed upon their release from prison and significantly doubles the likelihood of them re-offending when compared with those who have a stable job (DFES: 2000). This, in itself, can be considered as the catalyst for criminal behaviour and whilst the role of the provider is maintained, it is a role that is sustained through criminal conduct. Consequently the onus placed upon education to prevent re-offending has initiated a maelstrom of activities designed to increase the basic skills levels of prisoners.

Under the auspice of the Learning and Skills Council (LSC) and the Offenders Learning and Skills Unit (OLSU), educational attainment within the confines of the prison has increased vastly over a relatively short period of time. Of the key skills courses completed by prisoners, the figure given for 2002-03 stood at 130,500 and increased to almost 220,000 for the period of 2004-05 (NAO: 2005) As a result the prison establishment has become one of the largest

providers of language, literacy and numeracy education within England and Wales in which prisoners comprise over ten per cent of those who achieve a National Skills for Life qualification (Ibid: 2005). This undoubtedly links with the employment agenda as covered in the Government White Paper Skills for the 21st Century-Realising our Potential. The aim here is to "ensure that employers have the right skills to support the success of their businesses and that individuals have the skills they need to be both employable and personally fulfilled" (OLSU, 2004: 8) and in doing so primacy is give to idealised masculinity as it permeates throughout the education agenda within prison.

Poor educational attainment equates to no prospect of a job. No prospect of a job can translate into an inability to undertake the role of the provider for the family. Consequently building and developing a greater skills base amongst prisoners and, in doing so affording them of personal satisfaction, has the purpose of encouraging self-reliance amongst the prisoner population into acceptable modes of behaviour. The idealised masculinity of men underpinning political discourse dominates prisoner education to the extent that education received in prison is serving to provide men with the ability to become and remain employable.

The emphasis upon developing a skills foundation amongst the prisoner population is serving to cast prisoners within a specific role and identity upon their release in society. Although, to some extent, the aim is a positive move forward as it seeks to encourage prisoners to desist from a life of crime, to transform the illegitimate into the legitimate and inevitably to produce a productive and disciplined citizen; undoubtedly a citizen whose conduct is pro-

social and more befitting of the community in which he lives. As argued in Reducing Re-Offending through Skills and Employment (HM Government, 2005b: 5) "if we can turn offenders away from crime and give them the tools to exercise better judgement and become more constructive and productive members of society, the rewards will be great". However such rewards are focused upon achieving employment outcomes and benefiting governmental aims and objectives.

Consequently interventions become based upon a normalisation of prisoner and offender lifestyles through the provision of educational skills that will, in turn, equip them with the necessary skills to function successfully within society and as an employee (HM Government: 2005b). Employment outcomes ensure that prisoners receive rehabilitation through masculinity. Idealised man is realised within the context of the idealised employee. The rehabilitative function of the prison in respect of education provision casts male prisoners within a gender specific role encompassing that of the breadwinner where the attainment of a job and the need to normalise their lifestyle into socially expected and accepted norms of behaviour, suggests that all interventions become focused upon how to alter their skills deficits and achieve the much discussed employability and employment levels of prisoners upon their release from prison. Ninety five per cent of those in prison are men (DFES: 2006). As such it would not be a fallacy to suggest that prisoners are to be regulated through their gender and their gender ultimately ensures the type and mode of rehabilitation they will receive.

From OLSU to OLASS: The Offenders' Learning and Skills Unit and the Offenders' Learning and Skills Service

The primary aim of prison initiatives is to ensure that prisoners are equipped with the relevant skills and qualifications needed for work (DFES: 2000). As has been noted, low levels of literacy and numeracy are considered to negatively effect the population and, in particular, those within the prison population. Such deficits affect people's ability to interact with others, it impacts upon their ability to bring up their children and to hold down a job (NAO: 2004) and contributes to their social exclusion from mainstream society. Therefore education is an important factor in reducing re-offending and transforming the socially excluded into the socially included. As noted by Reuss (1999) education programmes in prison are expected to comprise part of what can be classed as a constructive prison regime enabling those participants towards leading and living a good and useful life. Originally, funded by the Offender's Learning and Skills Unit (OLSU), Heads of Learning and skills have become firmly established throughout the prison establishment and have been granted the responsibility of strategically planning and maintaining education and skills based training within prisons (Stationary Office: 2005).

Learning is now commencing within workplace learning pods with future provision centering upon the provision of work based and basic skills qualifications (Stationary Office: 2005). This serves to consolidate the prison estate as providing male prisoners with their masculine identity via the provision of work based and skills based learning and qualifications. Therefore it is hardly surprising that prison rehabilitation has focussed upon the responsibilising and moralising of offenders by addressing their educational deficits. By articulating

these deficits as bearing a negative impact upon prisoner's interaction with children and fellow adults, it further compounds the primacy and importance of idealised masculinity as the driving force behind such initiatives. In order to facilitate this process, responsibility for ensuring the imparting of this knowledge and education base resides with the Learning and Skills Council (LSC) as well as the OLSU.

The LSC is the body that has overall control of the educational needs of the population. The Council is the body responsible for funding and planning education and training for all those aged 16 and over in England other than within universities (LSC: 2006). The OLSU is representative of the partnerships framework that has developed between the Department for Education and Skills (DFES) and the Home Office. Again, in partnership with the LSC as well as the Prison Service, the Probation Service and the Youth Justice Board the OLSU has responsibility for taking forward and building upon the government's commitment to improving the quality and quantity of learning and skills for people in both prison and supervised in the community (DFES: 2006a). The overall purpose of the unit is to contribute to the provision of a safe, humane and well-ordered prison establishment in the quest to reduce re-offending. Indeed encouraging offender's learning and skills is seen as enhancing these goals as learning activities are considered as contributing to the effective management of prison regimes and that the right education and training matched to individual prisoners will make it more likely for offenders to get a job upon their release from custody (DFES: 2006b).

Since the OLSU was established in 2001 150,000 basic skills qualifications have been awarded to offenders in custody (Home Office: 2006). However, in providing basic skills education, the remit for this extends far and wide to much more than this initial premise. Whilst basic skills training within prisons tend to focus solely upon improving literacy and numeracy skills (discreet training) (Stewart: 2005), notions of literacy and numeracy are considered as being worth much more than the acquisition of basic skills.

> "They are founded on the idea that the skills of communication and application of number are central to all areas of learning and critical to enabling access to, and participation and progression in, education, training and employment, as well as promoting personal development"
> (DFES, 2006a: 21)

This is reflected in the work undertaken by male Category C Training Prisons.

At HMP Coldingley classes to support the literacy and numeracy needs of prisoners were established alongside education provision covering pre-entry to level 5 and courses that covered life skills, healthy living and parenting classes (HM Chief Inspector of Prisons: 2005). HMP Featherstone at the time of their inspection was found to have 112 prisoners enrolled as students at colleges external to the prison (HM Chief Inspector of Prisons: 2006b) whilst, in all areas and at all times, basic skills training was made available for prisoners. By the same token HMP Channings Wood was found to have a high level of purposeful activity available for prisoners with improvements having been made in both the provision in education and the opportunity to gain qualifications (HM Chief Inspector of Prisons: 2004). At all junctures education and its availability and access for prisoners is serving to underpin and inform prisoner rehabilitation and thus serves to indeed increase the prospects of prisoners finding employment upon their release.

Inevitably and as a consequence of the quest to achieve sustainable employment for ex-offenders, the underlying premise of the OLSU is to centre positive action upon the employment needs of offenders and the skills they need to stay in work (DFES: 2006b). Thus key features of the Unit and their ambitions for achievement are:

- That the service should be flexible to meet individual needs, within the constraints of the sentence
- Learning and development activities should be of the same high standards as those available for other learners
- Aim should be to improve the skills of offenders and improve performance in placing offenders in sustainable employment with a focus on both basic, key skills and vocational skills
- Continuity is crucial throughout the duration of the custodial sentence and beyond to keep learners engaged and secure positive outcomes.
  (DFES: 2006b)

Again such sentiments are reiterated within prison establishments.

An inspection at HMP Dartmoor found that attendance at education classes had seen an improvement amongst the prisoner population and an initial assessment of individual needs were passed to an employment allocation board that matched prisoners to appropriate education courses (HM Chief Inspector of Prisons: 2006a). This exemplifies the ambitious nature of the OLSU to provide a flexible service in meeting the individual needs of individual prisoners. It is a strategy that is employed at HMP Featherstone when drafting their resettlement programme. Here a needs assessment of good quality education had taken place amongst the prisoner population and this, in turn, has been employed to inform their resettlement strategy (HM Chief Inspector of Prisons: 2006b). Likewise, Heads of Learning and Skills had undertaken good input into this whole process and "key issues – such as the skill's shortages in prisoner discharge areas – had been taken into consideration in the development of the strategy" (Ibid: 17). As previously the underlying premise of education and skills

is that of employability and the ability to obtain and hold down a job. The breadwinning role as demonstrated within idealised masculinity and the identity of men as the provider finds its voice within prison education programmes and, as a consequence, the resettlement of ex-offenders and prisoners.

To further compound the fundamental principles as outlined by the OLSU and conducted within the prison estate, the Offender's Learning Journey offers practical guidance upon how to operationalise the individualised education package for offenders. In this instance Individual Learning Plans (ILP) provide the means by which offenders can negotiate the aims they wish to achieve throughout their learning experience within prison. As noted by the strategy document "the ILP charts the learning journey by setting out goals for a specified period of time for an individual learner, the smaller targets by which these goals will be achieved and the outcomes of regular reviews at which progress is discussed and recorded with the learner" (DFES, 2006b: 19). Here the regulation and monitoring of offender's and their learning is one of partnership between the offender and his learning mentor coupled with a certain degree of autonomy on behalf of the offender. Having been set key targets to achieve, offenders ultimately have the responsibility to meet those targets and, in so doing, become responsible for their own learning plan and achievements.

The work achieved by OLSU is now being undertaken by the Offenders' Learning and Skills Service (OLASS). OLASS went live across England in 2006 and continues to work in partnership with the LSC and acts as a means by which "existing delivery services are brigaded together and are focussed on to the particular needs of a specific group of learners" (DIUS, 1: 2007). Much of

224

the work implemented by the OLSU is developed and strengthened within OLASS including the Offender's Learning Journey whose agenda also covers offenders with special educational needs and has developed a new focus upon vocational training to more closely match the delivery of skills in line with employers needs (DIUS: 2007). OLASS is firmly embedded within the prison estate and all prisoners entering custody are screened to identify if they have a basic skills need and at induction the Careers Information Advice Service (CIAS) provide information on the skills opportunities available from OLASS as well as other providers (Davie: 2009). New prisoners also undertake an employability assessment and use this to identify their short, medium and long term goals and, for prisoners who neither want nor need learning opportunities, if necessary the programmes can be embedded as part of a variety of other activities they may be engaged with (i.e. cleaning or working in the kitchen or gardens) (Davie: 2009). Yet a large number of prisoners do undertake OLASS classes. Table Six provides data for the uptake of prisoners for OLASS skills programmes and demonstrates a year on year increase in the number of participants.

Table Six: OLASS Skills Programmes in Prison

% of CNA[3] in OLASS in English Prisons	Year (August – July)
36.1	2006/07
39.7	2007/08
42.5	2008/09

SOURCE: Davie B, e-mail communication, 2009

---

[3] Certified Normal Accommodation

Further Education and Information Technology: Idealised Man Riding the Information Superhighway

Whilst OLASS provides many of the basic skills courses that prisoners require (primarily literacy and numeracy skills), a number of other educational opportunities are available to prisoners. The option to undertake further education and to re-train for employment within the technological and computerised world of the contemporary labour market is gaining a foothold within the prison environment. In research conducted by Hughes (2005) focusing upon distance learners, many prisoners were engaged in learning opportunities other than those of basic skills. In this instance the prisoners who participated in the study were enrolled upon Open University Degrees, NVQs, GCSEs, A Levels and counselling courses as a method of increasing their employment opportunities upon their release from prison, to counter their prison record and to demonstrate that their time inside had been used constructively and as a reaction against the boredom of the jobs available in the prison workshops (Hughes: 2005). Jewkes and Johnston (2009) cite the All Party Parliamentary Group for Further Education and Lifelong learning as arguing for the enhancement of facilities that enable prisoners to participate in distance learning and e-learning whilst also making available supervised internet access for courses that require it. Some of which is already made possible through Learndirect whose installation of servers and networked PCs in twenty prisons is facilitating courses in literacy and numeracy and skills for employment (Ibid: 2009).

The growth in contemporary society in the use of information technology (IT) and computing is evidently a hallmark of the Post-Fordist realm. As noted by

Jessop (1994) and discussed in Chapter Two, the new technologies of the post-fordist world is typified by flexible machines and systems incorporating microelectronics, information and communication systems. Therefore policy makers and thus penal policy discourse enshrine idealised man as one who will become re-skilled by re-evaluating the skills that he currently has and updating them to fit the requirements of employers. Indeed it is workfare policies that underpin the re-skilling of the whole population in readiness for the demands of labour and, increasingly, the prison estate is striving to affect and replicate this.

As an example the Ministry of Justice (2009) released a press statement in which prisoners are now to be given the opportunity to change their ways by learning technology skills. Based at HMP Wandsworth, the PICTA (Prisons ICT Academy) project is a partnership involving Cisco and Panduit to train prisoners in voice and data cabling installation, an area in which the demand outstrips supply by twenty per cent (Ministry of Justice: 2009). HMP Wandsworth has also been involved in another communications project with the establishment of a radio station in partnership with Radio for Development (RFD). The development of Radio Wanna has led the RFD to broker a partnership between HMP Wandsworth and Lambeth College resulting in the delivery of a nationally recognised qualification in radio production (McDermott: 2004). In addition the new prison library specification has highlighted the need for Information and Communication Technology (ICT) provision within prison libraries to facilitate offender learning (White et al: 2006). Overall the implementation of information technology within the prison regime is a positive move forward not only in meeting the demands of employers but also in fulfilling prisoners' own beliefs in

the value of IT. Irwin's (2008: 518) recollection of learners on her education course in prison exemplifies this where a student comments

> "we just knew computers were important and to have computer skills was going to be essential in the real world."

The importance of vocational training for prisoners emerged quite strongly in research undertaken by Braggins and Talbot (2006). They found that prison officers wanted more facilities for education to be available to prisoners and that it should be available in all prison establishments with an increase in a wide range of vocational training. As one officer commented

> "vocational training is the key for these guys, we can offer a real life alternative (Cat C prison officer)"
> (Braggins and Talbot, 2006: 28)

The key feature highlighted here suggests that prisoner education offers the chance for prisoners to become rehabilitated and thus lead productive and useful lives upon their release from prison. In doing so, the endeavour to achieve skills and employment outcomes place the concept of idealised masculinity firmly within the penal spectrum. Idealised man is the idealised employee willing to re-train to meet the requirements of the contemporary labour market and it is this that underpins the work of OLSU/OLASS and their remit in providing prison education programmes for male prisoners.

Although it is widely recognised that there is a significant minority of prisoners who come from an offender population of women, black and ethnic minorities, people with disabilities and older people, the overwhelming majority of prisoners are male, white and aged in their twenties and thirties (HM Government: 2006) and it is this offender population that policy makers overwhelming address. It is indicative of how idealised masculinity is institutionalised within imprisonment

and prison regimes. If idealised masculinity has the male as the head of the family and thus the earner and provider for the family, then the provision of education only serves to consolidate how masculinity permeates throughout the prison estate. A sustainable job is only achieved through a demonstration of competency in a particular skills base. Therefore providing such opportunities for this to be achievable via purposeful activity, self-improvement, and connections to the world beyond imprisonment is considered as a vital factor in running a humane and decent prison regime (HM Government: 2006). Nevertheless barriers persist that can negatively effect the successful implementation of education within prisons.

Education within prisons is considered as having an extremely narrow focus with key performance targets that are inflexible and whose primary concern is upon the provision of basic needs resulting in prisoners attending courses unnecessarily (Stationary Office: 2005). As consolidated by the House of Commons Home Affairs Committee (2004) there are significant shortcomings in the opportunities available for all prisoners to access educational classes across the prison estate. These shortcomings are also apparent within the prison regime itself. At HMP Featherstone it was found that large numbers of prisoners were unoccupied at any one time during the day whilst those who were employed on a part time basis did not have access to all that the prison had to offer (HM Chief Inspector of Prisons: 2006b). This was also the case at HMP Channings Wood whereby prisoners in workshops had great difficulty in being released to attend education classes (HM Chief Inspector of Prisons: 2004). In both establishments early lock up and prisoners confined to their cells remained significantly high. By the same token, governance of the prison is

regarded as having a negative impact upon education classes where, at times, education is interrupted or terminated.

In their review of the St Giles Trust NVQ three in Advice and Guidance, Hunter and Boyce (2009) comment that the majority of prisoners failure to complete the course was due to their transfer to another prison where the scheme was not in operation. Indeed Irwin (2008) consolidates this as she argues that staffing and security considerations are given primacy resulting in frequent closedowns of many workshop facilities. Whilst Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (2001) report Through the Prison Gate found that prisoners did not always apply for education as they were serving short sentences had been refused, that the waiting lists were too long or that they simply did not know that they were allowed to participate. All of which are significant impediments to prisoners who want to improve their educational attainment and the prospects of a job upon their release particularly if access to education is denied.

In addition, in raising the concerns of the Howard League, the House of Commons Home Affairs Committee (2004) also recognised that increasingly placing the focus upon *basic* skills at levels one and two qualifications implies that access to further or higher education becomes severely limited. Therefore the education remit rarely extends beyond developing the skills base to a higher level than that required for governmental objectives. It is competency at level two literacy and numeracy that enables people to progress to learning higher level and technical skills necessary to support the government's economic goals (NAO: 2004). Consequently prison rehabilitation through education serves the government's economic agenda in establishing a skills base for the release of a

potential workforce thus contributing to a penal workfare state. In addition to this, the attitude of prison officers to education can also have a negative bearing upon the prison environment.

Braggins and Talbot (2006) found that at least two thirds of prison officers felt that prisoners were simply wasting their time on education, playing computer games and, as such, were merely using that time as an extension of their association or using it as an opportunity to pass information to each other or to supply drugs to one another. Hughes (2006) also found that simply being on the prison wing and the attitude of prison officers was detrimental to prisoners being able to study. She re-iterates prisoners' problems of studying in an environment in which there is an anti-education culture that serves to discourage them from attending classes and that prison officers who perceive education as a 'skive' provides a further disincentive to engage in classes (Hughes: 2006). Again Braggins and Talbot's (2006) research illustrates such a point. Here prison officers were quoted as saying that "education is the least of their concerns (local prison officer)..." and that the priority within the Prison Service itself "...isn't on education (high security prison officer)" (Braggins and Talbot, 2006: 26). With such negative attitudes it is hardly surprising that prisoners do not enrol upon education classes and thus further their ability to be qualified and employable upon their release. Similarly, the introduction of IT into the prison estate also falls short in enhancing the educational and employability prospects of prisoners.

White et al (2006) argue that the availability and access to ICT in prisons remains problematic as establishments continue to resist internet access due to

concerns over security. Whilst not universal, ICT resources are thus woefully limited across much of the prison estate (Ibid: 2006). Indeed Jewkes and Johnston (2009) note that this concern is focused upon the deception and cunning of prisoners as the use of technology will make it much easier for them to communicate with criminal networks and to intimidate their victims and witnesses. Just such an occurrence has already been documented in a newspaper article in The Sunday Times. Here Colin Gunn serving thirty five years for conspiracy to murder was allowed to set up a Facebook account by his prison governor and, as a result, he is rumoured to still be conducting his drugs and organised crime cartel from prison whilst also posting disturbing and frightening messages (Foggo and Fellstrom: 2010). Foggo and Fellstrom (2010: 1) cite one such message

> "I will be home one day and I can't wait to look into certain people's eyes and see the fear of me being there".

In view of this, it is not surprising why there is reluctance across the prison estate to implement the use of internet access for all prisoners. Yet, as Jewkes and Johnston (2009: 136) identify the benefits of the internet and access to the word wide web is invaluable as it would allow prisoners to "interact with potential employers and teach them information technology skills that many jobs now require..." whilst also providing prisons with "...a wider range of resources for delivering effective courses". However the primacy of security and the conditions in which to foster control and management of the prison and prisoners will continue to hold sway. The new rehabilitation of prisoners through education and skills occurs through a narrow set of prescribed programmes which, at times, may mean that prisoners miss the opportunity to better themselves and progress onto higher education or to adequately re-train for the

continuous up-skilling of contemporary society. In doing so, prisoner education can inspire excessive aspirations that may not necessarily be met. The same can be equally applied in terms of increasing prisoner's employability through prison work and work-based learning.

3 Workability: A Beacon of Employability and the Penal Workfare State

The ability and the capability to work have underpinned not only prison education but also, within the principles of employability, it has gained precedence as a mode of rehabilitation in its own right. It is within this sphere of the prison estate that idealised masculinity can more clearly be viewed as influential upon penal policy and practice. Again in reflecting a variety of governmental aims and objectives, it inevitably becomes central to penal workfarism. As note by a former Home Secretary Jack Straw "crime breeds when individuals are left without a stake in society.... getting a job is the best thing that any ex-offender can do" (quoted by TUC, 2001: 4). Undoubtedly a stake in society can only be attained through employment and work. Indeed underpinning purposeful activity within training prisons is the expectation that such work will be of greater quantity and greater quality (Stationary Office: 2005). However work is fuelled by education and the purpose of education as a process of rehabilitation within prison seeks to benefit and enhance the overall quality and quantity of work based training. Hence learning activities should, where possible, be relevant to regional employment priorities in the area where prisoners are to be released and thereby assist offenders in their quest to attain sustainable employment (DFES: 2004).

The overriding emphasis is seemingly placed upon work and, through the involvement of the family within this process, it is ultimately work that drives the process of rehabilitation and the reintegration into society of prisoners. The Howard League (2000) argues that prisons should adopt a process of normalisation whereby work reflects the similar range of incentives and benefits that legitimate work within the community provides. The work ethic is formalised into convincing prisoners that legal employment offers stability and opportunity demonstrated through realistic working conditions and recognised vocational training (Howard League: 2000). As part of their campaign for real work in prison, the Howard League launched a social enterprise within the Prison Service by which to fulfil this premise.

With the support of the Prison Service but retaining its independence, Barbed a graphic design business, was launched in HMP Coldingley in 2005. The business recruited, trained and employed a small group of prisoners and originally sought to provide both formal qualifications (NVQs) and modern formal apprenticeships leading to a recognised certification (Howard League: 2008). Its three primary aims were to

- Provide high quality and professional graphic design services employing a social enterprise business model
- Diversify the Howard League's existing, traditional funding streams for penal reform and
- Provide a model for a new and innovative approach to prisoner's work in prison

(Howard League, 2010: 2)

The Howard League also made it conditional for the prisoner's as employees to pay a thirty per cent contribution of their wages into a separate fund coupled with an initial agreement between the League and the Prison Service that the

prisoners pay Tax and National Insurance contributions (Howard League: 2008). All of which had the objective of replicating the world of real work within the community as the conditions of employment experienced by employees in the outside world underpinned the ethos of Barbed within the confines of the prison. However the good work undertaken by Barbed proved to be somewhat short lived as it fell victim to the governance of the prison system.

The closure of Barbed in 2008 was as a result of the "prison ethos and prison rules [that] made securing the profitability of the business ultimately impossible" (Howard League, 2010: 2) whilst HM Revenue and Customs decreed that prisoners working within the prison environment could not be treated as employees for the payment of Tax and National Insurance because the prisoner is working under prison rules and therefore cannot legally be treated as an employee (Howard League: 2008). At all junctures the real work programme of the Howard League faced increasing pressures to succeed in its objective of providing real work in prisons. The "sudden and unanticipated movement of Barbed designers to other prisons, lockdowns, the timing of random urine tests and staff training" (Howard League, 2010: 2) all provided impediments to the ability of Barbed to operate successfully due to a shortage of staff to complete orders and the reduction in its hours of operation. Yet the legacy of Barbed has been profound.

Two former employees, upon their release from prison, are currently employed as graphic designers whilst those who remain within the prison environment have seen their experiences of being employed in Barbed translated into a

range of transferrable skills, personal development and long term aspirations (Howard League: 2010). As noted by the Howard League (2010: 5)

"Working in a real work environment, being trained in a profession by experienced professionals, treated as serious designers and paid meaningful wages all contributed to a sense of expanded horizons and while most saw their futures in design, others felt confident to look beyond."

The work of the Howard League is one that should be applauded. However for such work to be a success there is a need to address a variety of barriers that may inhibit the possibility of sustainable employment and, to achieve this, work conducted in prisons need to reflect employability as experienced in reality. The stronger focus on employment as undertaken by the government and, by the same token, prisons implies that education is inevitably linked with employment outcomes. Therefore, increasing the work skills of prisoners and providing the means by which job search is more attainable and accessible becomes the mainstay of prison rehabilitation. Hence links need to be established between various skills programmes and labour market needs whilst more direct pathways into jobs for prisoners need to be introduced as, if training for offenders and/or prisoners is to lead to employment and jobs, it must also match the needs of employers and local job opportunities (HM Government: 2005b).

DWP and Jobcentre Plus: From Custody to Work

The Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) works in partnership with the Prison Service to provide a range of job search, programmes and assistance to help prisoners get back into work upon their release. In line with its mission statement, the DWP aims to help individuals to achieve their potential through employment, promote opportunity and independence for all and works to end

236

poverty in all its forms (DWP: 2006). In view of this DWP have a commitment to promoting work as *the* best form of welfare (NOMS: 2004) Again, in reiterating the sentiments expressed within education, all roads head towards employability and sustainable employment outcomes. Thus it is penal workfare and not welfare that informs prison rehabilitation and the focus upon workfare gives idealised masculinity within penality greater impetus.

Under the auspice of and as an executive agency of the DWP, Jobcentre Plus aims to enable the government to realise its ambition and get more people of working age into work (Jobcentre Plus: 2003). Since its inception in 2001, Jobcentre Plus has taken on the mantle of providing job search and work based support for all of those people who find themselves out of work and in receipt of benefits. It is stated as providing a work-focused service that is based upon the dual philosophy of balancing rights with responsibilities and ending the perceived system of writing off inactive benefit claimants to a life on benefits with little if no help (DWP: 2004a). In achieving this aim, the service is deemed as being able to focus more specifically on people who have the greatest disadvantage in obtaining employment and thus is able to offer support to those who face the biggest barriers in securing a sustainable job (Ibid: 2004a). People who face some of the biggest barriers to employment are prisoners and offenders. Thus Jobcentre Plus provides practical help for prisoners as part of the Prison Service Custody to Work Unit.

The Prison Service's Custody to Work initiative has, as its objective, the onus of achieving greater employment outcomes for prisoners upon their release and to have greater access to accommodation. With this in mind, there are three main

factors associated with this initiative. As stipulated by the House of Commons Home Affairs Committee (2004:49) these are:

- "Making prisoners more employable by addressing basic skills, vocational training, prison work, drugs, offending behaviour and motivational programmes
- Connecting more prisoners with jobs or training places and accommodation on release by closer joint working with employers, Jobcentre Plus, housing providers and the voluntary sector
- Connecting unemployed prisoners on release with employment, training and benefits advice and support available from their local Jobcentre through the FRESHSTART initiative, which involves liaison between the prison service and Jobcentre Plus to ensure all released prisoners have a new Jobseeker interview at their local Jobcentre to help them return to the labour market."

Thus the Prison Service Custody to work initiative is investing "£14.5 million a year in resettlement activity in prison with the main focus on employment outcomes including job search training and support coupled with through the gate job placement" (NOMS: 2004). In conjunction with the DWP Welfare to Work initiative, prisons have established a partnership with Jobcentre Plus and brought in this body of expertise into the prison estate in order to meet the needs of prisoners in terms of obtaining information and support in respect of gaining employment. Both the Custody to work Unit and the DWP Welfare to Work initiative have the objective of increasing the skills base of prisoners and providing the means by which prisoners have access to job opportunities and thus improve their levels of employability that, in turn, will enhance their chances within the job market (NAO: 2002). In bringing on board Jobcentre Plus, employment and benefit surgeries are being brought into prisons, along with controlled access to the internet to facilitate job search capabilities, in order to improve again levels of employability and to be a more supportive tool in aiding job search activity (HM Government: 2005b). Here it is hoped the advent of Jobcentre Plus surgeries throughout the prison estate would allow jobcentre

advisors to focus more specifically upon the employment and employability needs of the offender rather than solely focusing upon benefit enquiries and claims (Ibid: 2005b) prior to their release.

As an example of the collaborative work between the Prison Service and Jobcentre Plus Niven and Barnard (2005) conducted research upon the use of electronic job search facilities within prisons. The research aimed to evaluate the use of touch screen terminals or Jobcentre Plus kiosks known as Jobpoints and internet access to obtain information on job opportunities through Locked Down PC's within eight prisons as part of a pilot project. Many of the prison courses to aid the process of resettlement through education, training and job search enlisted similar programmes to aid preparation for work on release. Such programmes included health issues, finance, budgeting, help on writing a CV, mock interviews, help on job search techniques, access to yellow pages, local newspapers and telephones as well as access to Jobpoints and lock Down PC's (Niven and Barnard: 2005). This follows a similar course of action as highlighted in a previous piece of research evaluating a number of key factors that enable and enhance the employment prospects of prisoners.

Here Webster et al (2001) discuss the significance of job club, Welfare to Work and employment based training as a means of increasing the employability of prisoners upon their release. Both research projects discuss the positive benefits of providing such job search tools and job related projects for prisoners. Niven and Barnard (2005) argue that prisoners found their motivation to seriously find work and training had increased and there was greater awareness about they types and availability of jobs that would be on offer to them.

Meanwhile Webster et al (2001) also found that motivation was increased coupled with prisoners self esteem and confidence being given a boost, particularly in respect of gaining qualifications, and that generally prisoners were overall positive about the courses and/or programmes that they participated in.

In essence the increased motivation to participate in and the increased awareness of the labour market are enabling prisoners to prepare more fully and realistically for their release and reintegration within society. In doing so, the work related realm of rehabilitation is undoubtedly generating a work ethic amongst the prisoner population and the will to gain employment upon their release. It is within this realm that idealised masculinity and the regulation of prisoners is gaining greater significance. Work here is the means by which men can actively achieve their masculinity. In achieving masculinity through employability the penal workfare state is providing a body of men that are skilled, trained and adaptable to the demand and needs of the Post-Fordist labour market. The riskiness of individuals is being managed through and governed by gender specific practices that continually cast men within the breadwinning role. Again the prison estate and prisoner rehabilitation exemplifies this process. However it is not enough that help is given to look for work but help must also be given in the training and preparation to be work ready.

The New Deal and Prison Industry: From Worklessness to Work

The whole concept of preparation for work and thus be work ready for the job market upon release has meant that imprisonment has integrated the

government's flagship New Deal amongst its rehabilitation programmes the prison estate. As noted by the TUC (2001) ex-offenders face numerous difficulties in securing jobs but it is wrong to assume that they cannot be helped and it is here that the New Deal can make an important contribution in raising the employability standards of ex-offenders. There are a variety of New Deal schemes including:

- New Deal for Young People
- New Deal 25+
- New Deal for Lone Parents
- New Deal for Disabled People
- New Deal 50+
- New Deal for Partners

Such schemes therefore cover a wide range of people in differing circumstances and at differing stages of their working life. One of the aims of the New deal is to increase the number of people returning to work and this is especially relevant for those who belong to socially excluded groups (NOMS: 2004). The arrival of the New Deal into the prison estate is hardly surprising given its reasonable success in achieving employment outcomes and increasing the number of people entering work. 493,000 young people have moved from New Deal into work, 178,000 over 25's have found employment, 110,000 older workers have been helped into employment, 261,000 lone parents have found work and 30,000 disabled people have been supported into employment (DWP: 2004b). Such a pedigree cannot be ignored and consequently the New Deal could play a vital part in enabling ex-prisoners into work.

Incorporated within and managed under the governance of Jobcentre Plus, the aforementioned role and provision of services by Jobcentre Plus are also offered within the New Deal framework. As such the New Deal must be flexible to meet the needs not only of individuals who participate within the scheme but also of employers. Employers are *key* customers of the New Deals and in order for the schemes to work they have to meet the recruitment and skills needs of employers. (DWP: 2004b). As a consequence this entails recognising that employers require candidates who possess basic employability skills, positive attitudes, basic and interpersonal skills and have the ability to be trained for specific workplace skills (Ibid: 2004b). The oft-quoted phrase of work as the best form of welfare (NOMS: 2004) underlies the key principles of the New Deal schemes.

This is exemplified within the New Deal menu of help (Table Seven; Page 243). Developing and building a workforce with literacy, numeracy and work related skills for the labour market is the main focus of the New Deal and its integration within the prison environment. The aim of which is to produce a workforce compatible with the current requirements and demand of the contemporary labour market. In doing so, male prisoners are becoming ensconced within the principles underlying the breadwinning, idealised masculine man. However this entails aligning the individual needs of prisoners to those of labour and employers. The New Deal ethos represents the extent to which prison rehabilitation is actively shaping and manipulating the socially excluded into the socially included via the inculcation of the work ethic.

Table Seven: New Deal Menu of Help

New Deal: Menu of Help
Jobsearch assistance/support – individually tailored help focusing on jobsearch resources, including help with CV's or letter writing
Motivational assistance – helping to address individual motivational barriers to finding work, including better-off-in-work calculations
Employability skills – addressing generic skills gaps such as self-presentation, team work or understanding customer service
Skills training for local labour markets – work-focused training linked to current and anticipated local labour demand
Wage subsidies – financial incentives to encourage employers to offer work to clients that they may not otherwise consider
Work trials – providing an opportunity for clients to engage in employment without fear of losing benefits, providing valuable work experience and allowing employers to view potential candidates to fill their vacancies
Advisor discretion fund – a flexible fund allowing personal advisors to assist clients in overcoming financial barriers to work
Work experience – placements providing an opportunity for individuals to gain valuable work experience and relevant job skills
Self-employment – a range of support and advice to enable people to set up their own business
Career direction – advice and guidance about types of work available locally
In-work support – advisory support as appropriate for individual clients

SOURCE: Department for Work and Pensions, 2004b

In order to enhance and increase the employability levels and employment outcomes of prisoners and/or offenders, a variety of prison industries are available and operating across the Prison Service. However, there is the onus to work more closely with employers on providing work in prisons and increase the schemes whereby prisoners can train or work with an employer whilst in prison with the objective of them continuing this employment upon their release (HM Government: 2006).

As an example, the partnership with the National Grid and work within the gas industry has to date trained and employed over 200 offenders and is now operating in 15 prisons in conjunction with major companies from at least five additional industrial sectors (HM Government: 2005a). The advent of job developers and employer coalition schemes further increases the employability levels of prisoners as these developments aim to support offenders and identify potential employees with skills needed by employers and target training in job specific areas including welding, carpentry, metal work or fork-lift truck driving (HM Government: 2005b). At all junctures this serves to further promote training and job opportunities for prisoners. Yet it is not just partnership with industry and the industrial sector that enhances levels of employability. It is also the work undertaken by prisoners within the prison itself contributes to the acquisition of such skills.

The Statement of Purpose on prison industries identifies its aim as to "occupy prisoners in out of cell activity and wherever possible to help them gain skills, qualifications and work experience to improve their employment prospects upon release" (HM Prison Service, 2009: 1). Black (2008) suggests that there are

approximately 28, 600 prisoners employed within the prison estate with 16, 800

employed in administrative tasks and 11, 800 employed in workshops. Crook

(2009) argues that employed prisoners typically earn £10-15 per week and can

be employed within the following types of work such as

- Bicycle repair
- Computer repair
- Braille and large print
- Call centre training
- Horticultural nursery and garden maintenance
- Laundry
- Kitchens
- Carpentry
- Tailoring and textile manufacture
- Electrical assembly
- Packing
- Painting and decorating
- Industrial cleaning
- Gymnasium (PE instructor training)
- Communication
- IT skills
- CV and application writing
        (Inside Out Trust: 2004)

Setkova and Sandford (2005) group prison industries within three key groups as

(1) work to maintain and service the prison, (2) mundane and repetitive work

and (3) complex production tasks. The following table (Table Eight; Page 246)

provides an illustration of the work covered under these three headings.

Table Eight: The Nature of Prison Work

The Nature of Prison Work and Prison Industry	
Work to maintain and service the prison	Cleaning cells and landings; kitchen or laundry work; grounds maintenance
Mundane and repetitive work	Bagging nails; packing plastic cutlery; stuffing envelopes; packing and sealing birthday cards
Complex production tasks	External contractors; internal consumption; making window frames; making furniture; light engineering; double glazing manufacture (online marketing/web design)

SOURCE: Setkova L and Sandford S, New Philanthropy Capital, 2005
Black J, Criminal Justice Matters, 2008

Therefore the work undertaken in prison as part of everyday prison life not only contributes to the successful running of the prison but can also provide the skills that are transferable to the labour market. Thus prison work can provide prisoners with "employment upon their release, experience of work and the normal working day, a reduction in unstructured time whilst in prison and for those on day release interaction with members of the wider community"(House of Commons Home Affairs Committee, 2004: 49). The Statement of Purpose on Prison Industry adopted by the Prison Service highlights the importance work in prison contributes to the resettlement and employability prospects of prisoners upon their release. As noted by the Offender's Learning Journey (DFES, 2006a) the Prison Service is dedicated to increasing the opportunities for prisoners to engage in training that will lead to the skills and qualifications required by employers and various prison work areas including the kitchens, laundries, industrial workshops, industrial cleaning and horticultural areas.

HMP Coldingley is a prime example of how prison industries both operate and enhance the employability levels and the skills required for the labour market. It

focuses primarily on the resettlement of prisoners offering prisoners the opportunity to work hard and accept responsibility for achieving their resettlement goals and provides such opportunities for them via education, vocational training and employment (HM Chief Inspector of Prisons: 2005). According to the House of Commons Home Affairs Committee (2004) HMP Coldingley provides full time employment for 165 prisoners through three industrial workshops with all three workshop contracts covering both the internal prison market and the commercial sector incorporating:

- A general engineering workshop providing 60 work places for prisoners working 371/2 hours a week
- A signs workshop providing 54 work places for prisoners working 371/2 hours a week
- A laundry providing 60 work places for prisoners and turning over £1.2m of commercial contracts and £1m of internal prison work.

As part of its inspection report, HM Inspectorate of Prisons commented on the regime adopted by HMP Coldingley. They found that the prison had effective work allocation procedures whereby full employment was achieved, a number of workshops covered engineering, laundry and fabrication of signs, certificates were awarded or began in fork-lift truck training, industrial cleaning and employment opportunities with payment in line with the minimum wage had begun in design and desktop publishing (HM Chief Inspector of Prisons: 2005). The work offered within Coldingley was to be congratulated and held as a model that should be adopted by the Prison Service by the House of Commons Home Affairs Committee (2004).

By the same token HMP Dartmoor focuses its work provision upon the resettlement of prisoners. This has led to an Employment Unit being established by the prison whereby job vacancies could be advertised and tracked to ensure

that all spaces available are occupied and matched to the individual needs of prisoners as determined by their initial individual needs assessment during their induction (HM Chief Inspector of Prisons: 2006a). As noted by the former Chief Inspector of Prisons Anne Owers (Ibid: 2006a) Dartmoor has made vast improvements since their 2001 inspection and now provides access to a range of work related courses covering plumbing, carpentry and brickwork. HMP Featherstone continues in this tradition and provides numerous engineering workshops and new courses that cover performance in manufacturing, performance in engineering, warehousing and industrial cleaning (HM Chief Inspector of Prisons: 2006b).

Taken collectively the regimes offered by Coldingley, Dartmoor and Featherstone demonstrates the rehabilitative function of the prison as emulating the notion of idealised masculinity. The ideal of the breadwinner is dominant in the quest to provide and build upon the employability of prisoners and in doing so, promotes the traditional labour market roles of men in the workforce. Yet, the provision of work and work based learning within prisons is not without its criticisms.

One of the fundamental flaws in increasing the employability levels of prisoners and of relying upon welfare to work schemes such as the New Deal as stepping stones to employment is the significance placed solely on the supply side rather than the demand side of employment. Hence the onus is placed upon building the skills capacity and enabling people to be job ready without providing the jobs for people to enter into and, for prisoners, there is little prospect of a job to go to upon their release from prison. As noted by Peck and Theodore (2000) job

shortages and demand deficiency have been dismissed as the focus is placed upon the causes of unemployment as residing in individualistic and behavioural conditions in which those without work should price themselves back into work. Far from taking responsibility for promoting job security and providing job opportunities, current employment policy suggests that this is something to be achieved by individuals. Indeed individuals need to "build up their own skills, plan their future and so improve their ability to earn and achieve job security" (Levitas, 2005: 120). As the then Chancellor of the Exchequer, Gordon Brown commented "it can no longer be the responsibility of the state to create jobs nor can the state prevent a person losing their job..." rather the state has the responsibility to enable individuals to participate in the labour market and get a job and if that person loses their job the state should help that person to get their next job underlying the aim to "...re-establish the work ethic at the centre of our welfare system" (quoted by Michel, 1999: 4-6).

The underlying means in which to promote the work ethic incorporates developing an attachment to the labour force that relies heavily upon job search and job readiness activities to encourage jobseekers into available job vacancies (Peck and Theodore: 2000). One particular way in which this has or aims to be achieved is through the New Deal programme. Whilst this aims to equip prisoners with the ability to train, become employment ready and through jobcentre plus to gain assistance in job search techniques, the overall concerns residing with employment policy and welfare to work in general resonates with the New Deal programme.

In this instance the geographical dispersal of job opportunities and joblessness and the application of the New Deal programme as a means of creating an employable workforce will have a negligible effect in certain areas. Thus in what can be termed as depressed labour markets, the New Deal may raise employability without raising employment therefore the post-programme job chances of its participants are depressed in inner cities and high unemployment areas (Peck and Theodore: 2000). Consequently in areas that suffer from high unemployment the New Deal scheme will push its groups of eligible individuals into jobs within local labour markets that already suffer from an over-supply of labour (Turok and Webster: 1998). In addition the heavily subsidised nature of the scheme favours a decrease in the employment of unsubsidised labour, the sacking of existing workers in favour of subsidised labour and can lead to a revolving door of insecure and temporary employment that results in yet further spells of unemployment (Mizen: 2006). Welfare to work then incorporates a temporary rather than sustainable focus upon employment opportunities and, for the already vulnerable ex-prisoner population, this merely compounds the likelihood of their difficulties in securing employment outcomes.

This problem is particularly acute in areas where heavy industrial work and employment once thrived. As argued by Alcock et al (2003: 261)

> "in Northern Industrial areas the remaining jobs for manual workers often number just a fraction of what there used to be and new job creation has not occurred on a sufficient scale to plug the gap left by the old industries. As a result exceptionally large numbers of men in the worst affected areas still find themselves marginalised from the labour market"

In view of this it would seem as though the labour market and unemployment can vary between differing geographical locations. In areas where there are jobs aplenty the New Deal can have a positive impact upon developing the

250

employability of individuals and enabling them to secure stable employment. However in areas where jobs are already scarce the New Deal will have only a short term and somewhat one sided impact. It will increase the employability of individuals but if there are few jobs to go around, the majority will remain unemployed. Therefore policy solutions and various programmes and schemes designed to tackle unemployment should differ accordingly (Turok and Webster: 1998). However the underlying premise of the New Deal is based upon the concept that "returns to the economy can be maximised..." through the response of employers "...to an increase in the supply of knowledgeable, skilful and productive workers" (Mizen, 2006: 188). Yet this does not take account of the geographical dispersal of employment opportunities and whether or not employers need new employees.

Therefore the New Deal can be conceived of as a one size fits all approach to the problem of unemployment. As a consequence, far from building job capacity and enabling prisoners to return to the world of work, the scheme may well return ex-prisoners to prison furthering social exclusion rather than promoting a more inclusive society through the prevention of re-offending. Indeed it is marginalised man whose preservation is secure rather than that of idealised man.

By the same token, increasing the employability of prisoners will have a negligible effect on their employment outcomes if, assuming job opportunities are available, employers may be unwilling to employ those who have previously offended. BBC News (2005) cites research that indicates that just over thirty six per cent of ex-offenders would be excluded from employment opportunities by

251

one third of employers within Britain. In addition eighty seven per cent of employers considered ex-offenders as the least productive when compared with other workers and seventy five percent stated they were the least reliable (Ibid: 2005). This is somewhat consolidated by Nacro (2006a) who comment that many employers are both uncertain and concerned about employing offenders whilst some are openly resistant to the idea. Indeed the procedures and selection criteria in terms of recruitment practices also seriously disadvantage prisoners and offenders. Informal recruitment channels for job vacancies may be closed to offenders as they are dependent upon personal recommendations, job centres may actively screen out offenders from the recruitment process and private employment agencies may screen offenders for their clients (Fletcher: 2003) and thus close a number of jobs that may well be available for offenders. But it is not only the recruitment policies and procedures that negatively impact upon prisoners and offenders ability to obtain employment. Equal opportunities policies and the attitudes and perceptions of employers towards those who have offended can also constrain and limit the employment prospects of offenders.

Nacro (2003) comment that employers were concerned about adopting formal policies as their staff, the press, the public and their consumers may be left with the impression that particular companies were actively seeking to employ ex-offenders. Whilst those who endorse Equal Opportunities policies are less likely to recruit offenders as they are more likely to seek confirmation of a criminal record and thus offenders could experience difficulties in securing a job with that particular employer (Metcalfe et al: 2001). In doing so, employers with an Equal Opportunities policy are, according to Metcalfe et al (2001) more likely to

hold a criminal record against someone who has applied for a job within their company than those who do not have such a policy. As noted by Manchester Enterprise Research and Evaluation (2002) having a criminal record appeared to be a serious disadvantage for applicants to a variety of jobs with only half of companies surveyed in their research commenting that they would consider employing an ex-offender. This resulted in the group of people least likely to be considered or recruited for employment as that comprising of ex-offenders totalling 23 of the overall total of 3552 included in the survey (Ibid: 2002). Yet The Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974 can provide assistance for people who have been convicted of a criminal offence and have not re-offended since their prior conviction.

In this instance a period of imprisonment of less than two and a half years and no further reconvictions during the rehabilitation period denotes that convictions will be spent (CRB: 2007). Once a conviction is classified as spent, the individual does not have to disclose or reveal any criminal convictions in the majority of cases, the exception being working with children, the elderly and people who are sick, health and law professions, management positions in banking and finance and appointments that cover national security (Ibid: 2007; Nacro: 2007). However for those who have a conviction of more than two and a half years, the requirement to disclose this will remain with the individual for the remainder of their lives (Nottinghamshire Research Observatory: 2005). Some of the criticisms levelled at The Act are that most offenders are unaware of the provisions of the Act and, as such, often do not know when their convictions will be classified as spent or the procedures by which to disclose them to potential

employers (Fletcher: 2002) By the same token, the introduction of The Police Act 1997 merely exacerbates this problem.

As noted by Fletcher (2003) whilst The Police Act retains the protection afforded to individuals as stipulated under the 1974 Act, it also introduces three levels of disclosure overseen by the Criminal Records Bureau and it is this that may have a detrimental effect on the ability of prisoners to obtain employment. The three levels of disclosure include:

- Enhanced disclosure – available for vacancies that involve significant contact with children or vulnerable adults incorporating a more intense and thorough criminal record check,
- Standard disclosure – available for vacancies that regular contact with children or vulnerable adults incorporating details of all convictions including those which are spent and;
- Basic disclosure – for all other vacancies not covered by those already mentioned detailing all convictions that are not spent.
(Fletcher: 2003)

In particular the basic disclosure function may put considerable pressure on people to disclose and the very nature of basic disclosures implies that there will be a broader, less restricted and thus easier access to the criminal records of individuals applying for employment (Fletcher: 2002; Fletcher: 2003). As has been previously discussed, the perception of employers towards potential employees with criminal records seriously reduces their possibilities of obtaining employment. Indeed the Nottinghamshire Research Observatory (2005) comment that criminal record information is sought at the written application stage of a job application process thereby making it more likely that an applicant with a record will be rejected without being invited for an interview. Essentially this implies that the vast majority of vacancies that prisoners apply for will result in their rejection by potential employers (Ibid: 2005).

Consequently the attitudes and perceptions of employers towards prisoner and offenders can negatively impact upon their ability to obtain employment. Many employers tend to comment that they would have uncertainties and concerns in employing ex-offenders with a number of convictions or convictions for serious offences (Nacro: 2003). Therefore the attitudes toward people who have committed particular offences also limit employment opportunities. In this instance those who have committed rape and sexual offences are amongst those who are less likely to be recruited, vacancies that involve contact with the public on a daily basis are also less likely to be offered to those who have committed acts of shoplifting, other theft, robbery, burglary and handling stolen goods (Fletcher et al: 2001a). In addition employers are anxious in recruiting ex-offenders as they fear they may offend either against their company or their staff and for vacancies that involve working with members of the public, employers are again worried about incidences of re-offending and dishonesty (Fletcher: 2001a). Not only does having a criminal record bar entry into employment but also the prejudicial and discriminatory view employers hold of offenders also bars employment opportunities.

Prison Industries are also considered has having a detrimental effect upon the employment prospects of prisoners upon their release from prison. Crook (2009) argues that prison work isn't *real* work and it is neither designed nor made to offer value and incentives that inform real work undertaken within the community. This not only applies to pay but also to the conditions in which prisoners are to assume work. She further comments that prison workshops often suffer disruption due to the primacy given to security issues and other issues of staff shortages, miscounts and power cuts (Ibid: 2009). Black (2008)

255

identifies that far from all prisoners being given the opportunity to participate in prison industries and workshops, only one third of the prison population is engaged in any work activity. For those who are employed within prisons, much of the work bears little resemblance to the outside labour market as most of the work focuses upon traditional skills (Ibid: 2008). As noted by Hunter and Boyce (2009) this isolation of prison work from real work merely serves to raise prisoner's expectations without serious job prospects upon their release from prison.

4 Concluding Comments

The focus upon the education and employment deficits of prisoners does indeed add a positive dimension to the new rehabilitation of male prisoners. Taken collectively this constitutes and constructs male offenders into reasonably educated self-governing citizens. They become the responsibilised, entrepreneurs of Blair's generation and fulfil the requirements of contemporary capitalism in acquiring the skills for work and thus the skills for fulfilling familial and community duties and obligations. However ex-prisoners and offenders in general have multiple barriers to employment and this seriously impacts upon their ability to attain and maintain stable employment.

Within this scenario the characteristics that inhibit offenders obtaining employment incorporate both supply side and demand side barriers. The supply side barriers include "limited education and cognitive skills, limited work experience and substance misuse and other physical/mental health problems..." whist the demand side barriers include "limited skills, poor health and more general personal characteristics of offenders" (Holzer et al, 2003: 4-

7). These multiple barriers are exacerbated by the fact that economic recovery has placed offenders within a significant and large proportion of those classified as long-term unemployed and, as a result, policy makers have now recognised the need to assist offenders into sustainable employment (Fletcher: 2003). Indeed the poor skills and educational attainment of prisoners and offenders are thought to conflict with the skills and credentials required by employers even when they are trying to fill unskilled jobs (Holzer et al: 2003). In view of this Nacro's (2006a) response to the governments Green Paper Reducing Re-Offending Through Skills and Employment welcomed the provision of education for prisoners and the serious commitment to helping prisoners overcome the barriers they face in gaining useful employment.

Therefore in motivating and providing prisoners with the skills to become employable and thus find and maintain suitable employment upon their release, the underlying premise of work based learning is centred upon meeting the needs of employers. In doing so it involves an approach that entails a demand led and demand driven system as it is perceived as being one of the essential mechanisms in increasing the number of employment and job opportunities available for prisoners and offenders (Nacro: 2006a). As argued by HM Government (2006) the focus is to be clearly put upon jobs and it is employers who will increasingly drive and design the delivery of programmes. In addition, increasing links with employers through work in prisons has the objective of building in more schemes for prisoners who can train or work with an employer whilst in prison in the belief that they may then be employed by the work providers upon their release (Ibid: 2006). Indeed the focus upon welfare to work suggests that social cohesion and social inclusion can be achieved through

participation in employment (Alcock et al: 2003). As noted by Byrne (2005) wages and the world of work encourage social order and an income without having to resort to criminal behaviour as those who go to work are perceived as having little time to spend on disorderly and criminal conduct.

In this instance Fraser's (1997) affirmative and transformative is of relevance for my analysis. Here not only are the barriers to employment addressed but there is also intervention on the part of government to make a concerted effort in reinvigorating job creation opportunities However the positive work undertaken in prisons to equip prisoners with the skills required for the labour market may be of little value if employment opportunities are not wholly available upon the prisoners release from prison and employers are unwilling to employ those who have offended. Therefore whilst on the surface the re-skilling of male prisoners and partnerships between the Prison Service and industry is driving up employment opportunities for male prisoners, if the opportunities on offer are not tangible, realistic and long lasting then the male ex-prisoner population will remain on the periphery of society.

Thus regardless of work experience or educational attainment, if job opportunities are not forthcoming due to a lack of employer demand then ex-prisoners will remain unemployed and marginal to mainstream society. The costs of not securing employment upon their release from prison could imply that ex-prisoners abandon idealised man and instead re-establish their identity within the realms of marginalised masculinity. The inability to provide for oneself and one's family within legitimate contours could see a return to illegitimate modes of behaviour and welfare provision. In addition to this an individual in

possession of a criminal record is unlikely to be given the opportunity to utilise his new found skills and thus obtain employment upon his release from prison. Therefore it is not only prisoners who are in need of rehabilitation that is the key to preventing re-offending but also employer prejudices and discrimination. There is very little point in equipping prisoners with employability skills if their ability to obtain employment is closed to them by the very fact that they have a criminal record and are discriminated against by employers because of this.

In this respect, the new rehabilitation of male prisoners towards the constitution of idealised man will have very little impact if the work undertaken in prison to address employability deficits is to have a negligible effect upon the prisoner's release. Whilst it is to be applauded that the skills, education and employability deficits of prisoners are addressed within the prison environment, it offers little consolation if employers are unwilling through company policy, practice and attitudes to offer them employment in the first instance or if the work undertaken within the prison environment does not relate to real work employment in the outside world.

This is a theme touched upon by Linda Goult of Nacro. She comments

> "many of the people that Nacro works with suffer multiple disadvantage – creating significant barriers to employment – and we are disappointed that there are no detailed plans on how this will be tackled. The wider definitions of employability skills, such as timekeeping and communication skills, is welcome but it is unclear how barriers to employment other than vocational skills deficits will be addressed."
> (Goult quoted by Nacro, 2006b: 1)

The emphasis upon employer rather than employee requirements can leave many prisoners wanting and floundering upon their release from prison. The targeting of employment and training packages to the needs of employers is not

a realistic option for some prisoners as they do not possess the skills to compete at this particular level and could be less than employable (Nacro: 2006a). The multiple barriers that prisoners and offenders face in terms of obtaining employment also need to be considered and addressed within the new rehabilitation. Therefore rather than considering solely the personal needs of offenders and how they may wish to alter their educative or employability deficits, education and work within prisons is fundamentally founded upon the needs of employers and labour. Action and programme planning should not only serve to meet "skills deficits and employer discrimination but a wide range of personal and social problems need to be addressed as part of the efforts to return ex-offenders to the labour market" (Fletcher, 2001b: 885) A failure to do so may ultimately result in prisoners, upon their release from prison, being set up to fail.

CHAPTER SEVEN

And Finally...

This research has interpreted and analysed, through the use of discourse analysis applied to written policy documents, how policy makers have been influenced by the concept of idealised masculinity and how this has been utilised in the formulation of policy to reduce re-offending amongst the male prisoner population. This work has also analysed the outcomes of these policies to determine whether or not the intentions of the policies have been successfully achieved. In relation to the changing modes of governance, as expressed through Neo-Marxist theorising around Post-Fordism and Foucauldian debates around governmentality, I argued that idealised masculinity was a technique of government by which to manage the risk of re-offending amongst the male prisoner population. This was addressed by focusing upon two key aspects of the seven pathways to reduce re-offending. Namely Pathway Two: Education, Training and Employment and Pathway Six: Children and Families. These I felt most closely resembled my interpretation of idealised masculinity in the sense that idealised man refers to the socialisation of the heterosexual breadwinning role of men within society (Walklate: 2005; Wharton: 2005). In this case the onus is placed upon men to be the provider of the family through obtaining and sustaining legitimate paid employment.

For the prison estate, under the guidance of written policy documentation, idealised man was represented through policies and programmes that aimed to maintain the family ties of prisoners and the provision of work and education to upskill the male prison population. In relation to family ties, I argued that this was achieved through the provision of prison visitor's centres, Safe Ground

parenting programmes, the Storybook Dads project and the ability of male prisoners to write letters and make telephone calls to loved ones at home.

Prison visitor's centres are considered important in the maintenance of family ties as they not only assist in the rehabilitation process of prisoners by allowing prisoners to interact face to face with their families but they also assist in the delivery of the strategic aims that are considered as reducing re-offending (NOMS: 2004). For those on low incomes financial help is provided through the Assisted Prison visits scheme that helps to meet the cost of travel (NOMS: 2006b). Safe Ground parenting programmes had the aim of developing the techniques and social skills required for prisoners to be able to parent their children and develop effective family, personal and working relationships (Safe Ground: 2005). Storybook Dads are considered as enabling prisoners to fulfil a natural parenting and fathering role from behind bars and, in doing so, the recording of stories onto CDs helped to maintain and sustain the family unit (Storybook Dads: 2007). Letters and telephone calls are considered as providing a lifeline for prisoners. As an example, verbal and written forms of communication provided the means by which prisoners could become involved in making decisions about the house and home (Action for Prisoners Families: 2007b) that might otherwise have been closed to them. However the intent and objectives of these policies were not always an achievable outcome.

The most problematic area in relation to the maintenance of family ties is that no one in a position of authority has day to day responsibility for ensuring that links between prisoners and their families are maintained (SEU: 2002). Therefore the quest to improve facilities for and improve the involvement of

families in the whole rehabilitative process is wholly inadequate and seriously lacking. Indeed visitor's centres suffer from a chronic lack of funding (Brookes: 2005). Coupled with variations in facilities from those fully staffed and funded to those unstaffed and poorly funded, the poor conditions of most visitor's centres and the poor treatment of visitor's from staff making them feel like criminals (Cunningham: 2001; Loucks: 2002; Hudson: 2007b), it is of little surprise that the intended outcome of policy is neither effective or successful in maintaining the family ties of male prisoners and their families through the utilisation of prison visitor's centres.

Indeed, significant barriers persist in relation to the distance from home that prisoners are housed in prison. This can make travel arrangements extremely difficult and, as a result of this, visits are non-existent. The cost of travel and poor transport links (IMB: 2004) do nothing to resolve the issue. Likewise the cost of telephone calls and the posting of letters serve to increase the burden upon families to financially support their loved one in prison and the inability to do so results in limited and poor communication between family members. Therefore the cost of keeping in touch is a significant barrier in the maintenance of family ties and with telephone calls at least five times more expensive than those on the outside (Loucks: 2004; Mills and Codd: 2008), the ability of prisoners to maintain their familial role is doomed to fail. The same can be applied to the maintenance of the fatherly role from the prison.

In this instance both the Safe Ground and Storybook Dads projects suffer from the problematic nature of imprisonment. Here parenting occurs at a distance and the ability of fathers to parent their children is not reinforced through prison

visits. As a result imprisonment does not allow the father to practice and develop parenting skills in much the same way as he would in the natural home environment (Dowling and Gardner: 2009). Therefore his reintegration back into the family unit may become troublesome and transfer the problems of imprisonment into the home environment.

The provision of work to upskill the male prisoner population was voiced through the Offenders Learning and Skills Service (OLASS), the Custody to Work Unit incorporating the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) and Jobcentre Plus, the New Deal scheme and prison industries. The work of OLASS was to plan and maintain the education and skills based training agenda within the prison (Stationary Office: 2005) ensuring that the right educational and training programme was matched to offenders and increasing their ability to obtain employment upon their release from prison (DFES: 2006b). The remit for education extended far beyond simply basic skills and also included e-learning, degree programmes, NVQs, GCSEs and increasingly Information and Communication Technology (ICT) programmes (Hughes: 2005; Jewkes and Johnston: 2009).

The Custody to Work Unit's initiative was to achieve greater employment outcomes for prisoners upon their release from prison. Working in conjunction with DWP and Jobcentre Plus, the aim was to bring a body of knowledge and expertise into the prison environment to provide employment and benefit surgeries and controlled access to the internet in order to facilitate job search activities (HM Government: 2005b). Indeed working in partnership with third sector businesses was heralded as one of the key means by which to provide

employment opportunities for prisons on their release from prison. As an example a partnership with the National Grid saw over 200 offenders trained and employed (Ibid: 2005b) within the gas industry.

The New Deal scheme within the prison estate was considered as providing the means by which prisoners can become more job ready for the labour market with the aim of increasing the numbers of people entering into work (NOMS: 2004). Meanwhile prison industries sought to increase the employability of prisoners through the provision of prison work by helping prisoners to gain the skills, qualifications and work experience necessary to improve their employment prospects (HM Prison Service: 2009). However, likewise with the maintenance of family ties, the intent and objectives of these policies did not always result in achievable outcomes.

Education within prisons was given a narrow focus with some prisoners experiencing difficulties in being released from work to attend education classes (HM Chief Inspectorate of Prisons: 2004). Overall it appeared that the governance of the prison was often given precedence over the needs of prisoners. As an example many prisoners were transferred from one prison to another at times leaving them unable to complete any education or training courses (Hunter and Boyce: 2009). Meanwhile the use and access to ICT remained problematic. Here prison establishments resisted the use of the internet over fears of security breaches, increasing the ability of prisoners to maintain criminal networks and the ability of prisoners to intimidate their victims (White et al: 2006; Jewkes and Johnston: 2009). The attitudes of prison officers also created barriers to prisoners undertaking education courses. In this

265

instance, prison officers considered prisoners to be wasting their time or were perceived to be skiving off from other activities (Hughes: 2006; Braggins and Talbot: 2006).

In relation to the Prison Service's Custody to Work initiative, the focus was concentrated upon the supply rather than the demand side of employment. Here the onus upon individual skills deficits had not been matched by the will towards job creation activities on behalf of the government. Thus job shortages and demand side deficiency had been dismissed and in its place the focus was upon individuals pricing themselves back into work (Peck and Theodore: 2000). Therefore rather than the state and governmental activity providing job security through job creation activities, it was the individual that had to create his own employment opportunities by re-acquainting himself with the work ethic (Brown quoted by Michel: 1999). Likewise the New Deal, with its emphasis upon creating an employable workforce, simply served to push groups of people into labour markets that were already saturated with potential employees (Turok and Webster: 1998). Therefore although it was recognised that governmental activity endeavoured to create partnerships with business and thus job opportunities, it did so in a piecemeal fashion without considering the overall employer demand for employees.

As for prison industries, prison work itself was not seen as real work (Crook: 2009). This was due to the fact that much of the work undertaken in prisons by prisoners bore little significance and relevance to the outside labour market (Black: 2008). All of this coupled with prisoners having a criminal record barring entry into employment and the prejudices of employers creating yet more

employment barriers (Fletcher et al: 2001), the reintegration of prisoners into society as productive bodies of men implies that it is simply be an ideal that cannot be realised.

The importance of this body of work lies in the fundamental principles that underpin offender management and the ability of policy makers to effectively address those principles. Namely the quest to reduce re-offending, to break the cycle of offending and to produce a more socially inclusive society. The research has aimed to achieve this by questioning the development and formulation of written policy and to examine its outcomes, within the context of idealised masculinity, by focusing specifically upon the maintenance of family ties to inculcate men into the family unit with the fatherly and economic provider role and the re-skilling or the up-skilling of the male prisoner population to produce a workforce compatible with contemporary labour market trends. The analysis and evaluation of this policy matters because it can flag up potential problem areas or gaps in provision that may not have been the intended outcomes of policy and paves the way for policy to be re-formulated to address these gaps. Indeed recent policy proposals tend to exemplify this.

A Ministry of Justice (2009a) document entitled Reducing Re-Offending: Supporting Families, Creating Better Futures addresses some of the problems associated with prisoners maintaining family ties. The aim of which is to create a framework upon which to provide better services. Here the document stresses the need for a co-ordinated approach to local services in order to provide information and appropriate support to the families and children of prisoners, help to prisoners to communicate with their families through improved telephone

access and help with letter writing and, where identified, prisoners are to receive help with life skills (including relationship and parenting skills) (Ibid: 2009a). It further stresses the need for families and children to have a positive experience when visiting a loved one in prison through improvements in the quality of prison visits, family friendly visiting arrangements and the development of children/family fun days (Ibid: 2009a). All of which points to a positive move forward in male prisoners maintaining links with their families.

However, whilst this is a positive move forward, it again merely draws on existing arrangements. Prison policy should take a more forward looking approach and consider other means of communication that might be of benefit to male prisoners in maintaining links with their families. The use of e-mail or even mobile phones could be considered and replicates the changing nature of communication as experienced in the world beyond imprisonment. Whilst there are difficulties associated with this as discussed in Chapter Six and the recent proposals put forward by Jack Straw to use mobile phone blockers and body scanners to detect mobiles as they are perceived as increasing the supply of drugs with prisons (Ministry of Justice: 2008b), it does not mean that this should be dismissed entirely. With proper regulation they could prove to be a bonus in enabling prisoners to communicate with their families.

The framework also doesn't put forward proposals that will place the children and families of prisoners on a more formal footing within the policy arena. It is still the case that the children and families of prisoners are not fully integrated within the policy and political agenda. Even though the framework stipulates adopting a new National Crime Board to oversee strategic work to reduce re-

offending (Ministry of Justice: 2009a), it does not specifically assign this group to the children and families of prisoners. Given the belief that families are the *key* means by which to enable prisoners to reduce their propensity to re-offend upon their release from prison, it is an incomprehensible situation. Far from prisoners being successfully reintegrated back into society, they may well repeat past sins of the past and continually be going through the revolving door of imprisonment.

By the same token, recent policy proposals in relation to education, employment and training also seem to address the gaps in policy provision. In his review on prisons, Lord Carter (2007) called for the modernisation of the penal system arguing for the development of Titan Prisons. These were argued to provide 2500 places for adult male prisoners separated into five units holding 500 offenders that would be both cost effective and draw on current best practice in the work with prisoners (Lord Carter: 2007). However, after a consultation exercise, these proposals were rejected by government and modified. In its place 1500 prison places are to be created through modern purpose built prisons housing adult males in smaller separate units, with increased safety and security and with programmes to effectively address offending behaviour (Ministry of Justice: 2008b). In addition these new prisons are to be built within the areas from which prisoners originate enabling them to maintain their links with their families and, through reducing the need for inter-prison transfers, more prisoners will be able to complete their intervention programmes (Ministry of Justice: 2009b). In building the prisons in the regions from where the prisoners originate, prisoners are considered as being able to engage in meaningful employment where the employment needs of the area will be

matched to the location of the prison and thus, to the employment skills training of prisoners (Ibid: 2009b).

All of this bodes well for the future of prison and for male prisoners and their families. These policy proposals seemingly suggest that government is looking to extend what is required from employers and matching them more closely with prisoners. It would appear as if the demand and supply side of employment have an equal footing. However they are, as previously, designed around existing arrangements. There continues to be reluctance on the part of government to intervene in the labour market and actively tackle the structural inequalities that can be a barrier to ex-prisoners obtaining and sustaining legitimate paid employment. Unless this is addressed and unless there are incentives for employers to overcome their prejudices and offer ex-prisoners a chance to prove themselves, then prisoners will remain on the periphery of society.

Yet the movement towards a Post-Fordist economy and new modes of governance suggests that interventionism on behalf of the government is no longer a possible solution to the problems of unemployment amongst socially excluded populations. Or indeed, that intervention within the family can only occur on a level that does not go beyond surface solutions. New models of capital accumulation and regulation are quite heavily built and rely upon market mechanisms and the private enterprise of individuals to consume and compete for their general welfare needs, goods and services within the market economy. The onus upon the self regulated choices of individuals and the development of a more moral and responsible society and citizen creates a body of risk

managers amongst the populace who must guard against the hazards of labour market unemployment and the risks of family separation and breakdown.

The transition from a Fordist to a Post-Fordist economy and the evolution of the risk society denotes that government is unable or unwilling to intervene in market mechanisms and therefore governs from a distance. Contemporary social life has its basis within a self-regulating economy and society in which governmental activity can only enable or facilitate participation rather than actively intervene to create or provide opportunities for full economic and societal participation.

As argued by Brown (quoted by Michel, 1999:4) "it can no longer be the responsibility of the state to create jobs or prevent a person losing their job". Likewise the current political drive to embrace and strengthen governmental support for children and families seemingly neglects those children of families and prisoners (Salmon: 2007) as existing provision is reliant upon the good will of the voluntary sector, is often piecemeal in its implementation and characterised by short term funding opportunities (Mills and Codd: 2008). Therefore the implication in both examples is that it is not the responsibility of the state and government to prevent the loss of family ties or job opportunities but it is the responsibility of the individual to manage and prevent these risks.

This research has endeavoured to demonstrate how the formulation of policy is an important aspect of this philosophy. It is policy makers that give voice to this political agenda and it is their written policy objectives that determine the extent to which government facilitation of socially inclusive activities occur. It is policy

makers that offer prescriptive accounts that constitute society and citizens and it is written policy itself that offers transformative instruction on how this is to be achieved. In analysing the discursive content of documents, it has been possible to ascertain how written penal policy constructs idealised masculinity, how this is to be achieved within the prison environment and how the constitution of idealised masculinity reflects current governance mechanisms as applied within a society underpinned by the management of risk.

As this thesis has argued, not only here but also in previous chapters, policy is an important part of political, economic, societal and penal life and future research in this realm could develop the findings presented here by broadening the scope of analysis. There are three potential paths that could be explored.

Firstly all seven pathways to reducing re-offending could be analysed and interpreted to determine the extent to which they interconnect and contribute towards the articulation of idealised masculinity. The analysis could uncover how the seven pathways feed into one another rather than being treated as somewhat separate and distinct approaches. It could question why some pathways are given more focus than others and what influences, be they political or otherwise, prioritises particular pathways.

Secondly, the analysis of written penal policy could be explored more fully within the policy cycle. This research has focused upon the formulation and outcomes of written policy documents but the findings of this could be compared with how the policy itself is implemented. Here the research could include interviews with prison governors and prison officers to ascertain how

272

prison staff interpret, implement and thus deliver policy objectives. It could elicit their views on the practical application of policy within the prison environment and question the extent to which such policies are achievable within the prison environment given the security and governance constraints within which prisons must operate.

And finally, this research could be taken forward by analysing its impact upon male prisoners. Here interviews, focus groups or even a case study could be undertaken with male prisoners to examine their experiences of the implementation and application of penal policy. The work could gather information on male prisoners and their families, analysing to what extent provision within the prison is a positive or negative influence in enabling them to maintain family ties. It could also focus upon the availability, quality and relevance of education, employment and training for the men and whether or not they perceive this as helping them to lead a law abiding life as stipulated within policy documents. The research could analyse how the men engage with the courses and work opportunities on offer and, if possible, if this work has been successfully carried through on their release from prisons. Most importantly, further research within this realm can aim to demonstrate how idealised masculinity is realised by male prisoners within the prison environment and if, on their release, it is something that can also be achieved within the wider community or does work in prisons merely create excessive aspirations that cannot be realised in the outside world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbott P and Wallace C, (1992), *The Family and the New Right,* Pluto Press, London.

Action for Prisoners Families (2003), Submission in Response to the Green Paper Every Child Matters, http://www.prisonersfamilies.org.uk/opus554/Every_Child_Matters_Response_Nov03.pdf, accessed 9 November 2006.

Action for Prisoners Families, (2004), *Home Office Plan Undermines Blair's New Crime Strategy,* Press Release, 19th July.

Action for Prisoners Families (2007a), Don't Hang Up – The Results of the APFs Booking Line Survey, *Action News,* Summer, 6.

Action for Prisoners Families, (2007b), *Staying Close A Guide for Male Prisoners on Maintaining Family Ties,* Action for Prisoners Families, London.

Action for Prisoners Families, (2007c), News for Members – Phone Charges, *Action News,* Summer, 7

Action for Prisoners Families, (2008), APF and PRT Phone Costs Campaign, *Action News,* Winter, 6.

Action for Prisoners Families, (2008), An Inspector Calls, *Action News,* Winter, 6.

Action for Prisoners Families, (2009), *Annual Review 08/09*, Action for Prisoners Families, London.

Alcock P, Beatty C, Fothergill S, MacMillan R and Yeandle S, (2003), New Roles, New Deal in Alcock P, Beatty C, Fothergill S, MacMillan R and Yeandle S, (eds), *Work to Welfare: How Men became Detached from the Labour Market*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Allison E, (2007), Prisoner goes to Court over Cost of Phone Calls, *The Guardian*, 2 April, 7.

Alvesson M, (2002), *Postmodernism and Social Research*, Open University Press, Buckinghamshire.

Anderson E, (2002), Openly Gay Athletes: Contesting Hegemonic Masculinity in a Homophobic Environment, *Gender and Society*, 16, 6, 860-877.

Atkinson P and Coffey A, (1997), Analysing Documentary Realities in Silverman D, (ed), *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method, Practice*, Sage, London.

Bak A, (1999), Constitutive Criminology: An Introduction to the Core Concepts in Henry S and Milovanovic D, (eds), *Constitutive Criminology at Work: Applications to Crime and Justice*, State University of New York Press, Albany.

Barberis P, (1998), The New Public Management and a New Accountability, *Public Administration*, 76, 3, 451-470.

Barker C and Galanski D, (2001), *Cultural Studies and Discourse Analysis: A Dialogue on Language and Identity*, Sage, London.

BBC News, (2005), Ex-Offenders Face Job Struggle, http://www.newsvote.bbc.co.uk/mpapps/pagetools/print/news.bbc.co.uk/i/hi/business/4197, accessed 20 June 2006.

Beail N and McGuire J, (1982), *Father's Psychological Perspectives*, Junction Books, London.

Benton T and Craib I, (2001), *Philosophy of Social Science: The Philosophical Foundations of Social Thought*, Palgrave, Hampshire.

Berg B, (2001), *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Scientist 4th Edition*, Allyn and Bacon, Boston.

Black J, (2008), Prison Works?, *Criminal Justice Matters*, 74, 1, 6-7.

Blagg H and Smith D, (1989), *Crime, Penal Policy and Social Work*, Longman, Harlow.

Blaikie N, (1993), *Approaches to Social Enquiry*, Polity, Cambridge.

Blud L, Travers R, Nugent F and Thornton D, (2003), Accreditation of Offending Behaviour Programmes in HM Prison Service What Works in Practice, *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 5, 1, 69-81.

Blunkett D, (2004), *Reducing Crime – Changing Lives: The Government Plans for Transforming the Management of Offenders,* Home Office, London.

Boggs C, (1976), *Gramsci's Marxism,* Pluto Press, London.

Boswell G and Wedge P, (2002), *Imprisoned Fathers and their Children,* Jessica Kingsley, London.

Boswell G, Wedge P and Price A, (2004), *The Impact of Father's Inside: An OLSU and Safe Ground Parenting Course for Male Prisoners at HMP Ashwell,* De Montford University, Leicester.

Boswell G and Wedge P, (2009), *Family Man and Fathers Inside: A Summary of Safe Ground's Work on its Prison-Based Family Relationship and Parenting Programmes from 2005-2009,* University of East Anglia, East Anglia.

Bosworth M, (1999), *Engendering Resistance: Agency and Power in Women's Prison,* Ashgate, Hampshire.

Bosworth M and Carrabine E, (2001), Reassessing Resistance: Race, Gender and Sexuality in Prison, *Punishment and Society,* 3, 4, 501-515.

Bowling B and Phillips C, (2006), Racism in Prisons in Jewkes Y and Johnston H, (eds), *Prison Readings: A Critical introduction to Prisons and Imprisonment,* Willan, Devon.

Box S, (1983), *Power, Crime and Mystification,* Routledge, London.

Braggins J and Talbot J, (2006), *Wings of Learning: The Role of the Prison Officer in Supporting Prisoner Education,* Centre for Crime and Justice Studies, London.

Braithwaite J and Daly K, (1994), Masculinities, Violence and Communitarian Control in Newburn T and Stanko E, (eds), *Just Boys Doing Business: Men, Masculinities and Crime,* Routledge, London.

Brookes M, (2005), Investing in Family Ties: Re-offending and Family Visits to Prisoners, http://www.philanthropycapital.org/docs/investing%20in%20family%20ties.pdf, accessed 9 November 2006.

Brooks-Gordon B and Bainham A, (2004), Prisoners Families and the Regulation of Contact, *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law,* 26, 3, 263-280.

Brown M, (2000), Calculations of Risk in Contemporary Penal practice in Brown M and Pratt J, (eds), *Dangerous Offenders: Punishment and Social Order,* Routledge, London.

Bryman A, (2004), *Social Research Methods 2nd Edition,* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Bryman A, (2008), *Social Research Methods 3rd Edition,* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Bucholtz M, (1999), You Da Man: Narrating the Racial other in the production of White Masculinity , *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 3/4,* 443-460.

Budd T, Sharp C and Mayhew P, (2005), *Offending in England and Wales: First Results from the 2003 Crime and Justice Survey,* Home Office, London.

Burchell G, (1993), Liberal Government and Techniques of the Self, *Economy and Society, 22,* 3, 267-282.

Burgess A and Ruxton S, (1996), *Men and Their Children: Proposals for Public Policy,* IPPR, London.

Burgess A, (1997), *Fatherhood Reclaimed: The Making of the Modern Father,* Vermillion, London.

Byrne D, (2005), *Social Exclusion 2nd Edition,* Open University Press, Berkshire.

Caddle D and Crisp D, (1997), *Imprisoned Women and Mothers,* Home Office, London.

Canaan J, (1996), One thing leads to Another: Drinking, Fighting and Working Class Masculinities in Mac An Ghaill M, (ed), *Understanding Masculinities,* Open university Press, Buckinghamshire.

Carnoy M, (1984), *The State and Political Theory*, Princetown University Press, New Jersey.

Carrabine E and Longhurst B, (1998), Gender, Prison Organisation: Some Comments on Masculinity and Prison Management, *The Howard Journal*, 37, 2, 161-176.

Carter P, (2003), *Managing Offenders, Reducing Crime: A New Approach*, Strategy Unit, London.

Chapman T and Hough M, (1998), Evidence Based Practice: A Guide to Effective Practice http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmiprobation_1_pdf, accessed 1 October 2007.

Charles N, (2002), *Gender in Modern Britain*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Charles N and James E, (2005), 'He Earns the Bread and Butter and I Earn the Cream': Job Insecurity and the Male Breadwinner Family in South Wales, *Work, Employment and Society*, 19, 481-502.

Chiltern P and Schaffner C, (1997), Discourse and Politics in Van Dijk T, (ed), *Discourse as Social interaction*, Sage London.

Christopher S, (1994), The Fortress City: Privatised Spaces, Consumer Citizenship in Amin A, (ed), *Post-Fordism: A Reader*, Blackwell Oxford.

Clarke A, Simmonds R and Wydall S, (2004), Delivering Cognitive Skills Programmes in Prisons: A Qualitative Study, Home Office Online Report, http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk.rds.pdfs04/rdsolr2704.pdf, accessed 25 November 2006.

Clarke J and Newman J, (1994), *The Managerial State,* Sage, London.

Clarke J, (2005), New Labour Citizens: Activated, Empowered, Responsibilised, Abandoned?, *Critical Social Policy,* 25, 4, 447-463.

Clarke S, (1977), Marxism, Sociology and Poulantza's Theory of the State, *Capital and Class,* 2, 1-31.

Clarke S and Popay J, (1998), I'm just a Bloke who has had Kids: Men and Women on Parenthood in Popay J, Hearn J and Edwards J, (eds), *Men, Gender Divisions and Welfare,* Routledge, London.

Coates J, (2003), *Men Talk,* Blackwell, Oxford.

Cockburn L, (2003), A Day in the Life of a Visitor's Centre Manager, paper presented at the conference, *Visitor's Centres: Every Jail Should Have One,* Action for Prisoners Families, Birmingham, 1 April 2003.

Codd H, (2004), Prisoners Families: Issues in Law and Policy, *Amicus Curiae,* 55, 2-7.

Colebatch H, (2002), *Policy 2nd Edition*, Open University Press, Berkshire.

Coleman R and Sim J, (2005), Contemporary State Craft and the Punitive Obsession: A Critique of the New Penology in Pratt J, Brown M, Hallsworth S and Morrison W, (eds), *The New Punitiveness: Trends; Theories; Prospects*, Willan, Devon.

Coleman R, Sim J and Whyte D, (2002), Power, Politics and Partnerships: The State of Crime prevention on Merseyside in Hughes G and Edwards A, (eds), *Crime Control and Community: The New Politics of Public Safety*, Willan, Devon.

Collier J, Rosaldo M and Yanagisako S, (1992), Is there a Family? New Anthropological Views in Thorne B and Yalem M, (eds), *Rethinking the Family: Some Feminist Questions*, Northeastern University Press, Boston.

Collier R, (1998), *Masculinities, Crime and Criminology*, Sage, London.

Connell R, (1987), *Gender and Power*, Polity, Cambridge.

Connell R, (1991), Live Fast and Die Young: The Construction of Masculinity among Working Class Men on the Margin of the Labour Market, *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology*, 27, 2, 141-171.

Connell R, (2000), *The Men and the Boys*, Polity, Cambridge.

Connell R, (2002), Hegemonic Masculinity in Jackson S and Scott S, (eds), *Gender: A Sociological Reader,* Routledge, London.

Convery P, (1997), Unemployment in Walker A and Walker C, (eds), *Britain Divided: The Growth of Social Exclusion in the 1980s and 1990s,* CPAG, London.

Cope S and Goodship J, (1999), Regulating Collaborative Government: Towards Joined Up Government, *Public Policy and Administration,* 14, 2, 3-16.

Corti L and Thompson P, (2007), Secondary Analysis of Archived Data in Seale C, Gobo G, Gubrium J and Silverman D, (eds), *Qualitative Research Practice,* Sage, London.

Coyle A, (2002), *A Human Rights Approach to Prison Management: Handbook for Prison Staff,* International Centre for Prison Studies, London.

Craib I, (1997), Social Constructionism as Social Psychosis, *Sociology,* 31, 1, 1-15.

CRB, (2007), What is the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act (ROA) 1974?, http://www.crb.gov.uk/default.aspx?page=313, accessed 10 December 2007.

Crook F, (2009), Work in Prisons, *Prison Service Journal,* 182, 43-47.

Crewe B, (2007a), Power, Adaptation and Resistance in a Late Modern Prison, *British Journal of Criminology,* 47, 256-275.

Crewe B, (2007b), The Sociology of Imprisonment in Jewkes Y, (ed), *Handbook on Prisons,* Willan, Devon.

CRG, (2002), *Skills for Life: The National Strategy for improving Adult Literacy and Numeracy Skills What Works Early Findings from the Pathfinder Projects,* Department for Education and Skills, London.

Crime Reduction, (2003), Working with Offenders: What Works Reducing Re-Offending, http://www.crimereduction.gov.uk/workingoffenders.htm, accessed 18 June 2004.

Crotty M, (1998), *The Foundations of Social Research: Meaning and Perspective in the Research Process,* Sage, London.

Crow I, (2006), *Resettling Prisoners: A Review,* University of Sheffield, Sheffield.

Cunningham A, (2001), Forgotten Families – The Impact of Imprisonment, *Family Matters,* 59, 35-38.

Cuppleditch L and Evans W, (2005), *Re-Offending of Adults: Results from the 2002 Cohort,* Home Office, London.

David M, (1986), Moral and Maternal: The Family in the New Right in Levitas R, (ed), *The Ideology of the New Right*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

Davidson J, (2006), Probability (Random) Sampling in Jupp V, (ed), *The Sage Dictionary of Social Research Methods*, Sage, London.

Davie B, (2009), Enquiry from Helen McFarlane to Bill Davie, E-mail correspondence, helen.may@plymouth.ac.uk

Davies M, (1974), *Prisoners of Society: Attitudes and After Care*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.

Dawson G, (2004), Work: From Certainty to Flexibility in Hughes G and Fergusson R, (eds), *Ordering Lives: Family, Work and Welfare 2nd Edition*, Routledge, London.

Dean M, (1999), *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*, Sage, London.

Dean M, (2002), Liberal Government and Authoritarianism, *Economy and Society*, 31, 1, 37-61.

Dean Sinclair G, (2009), Homosexuality and the Military: A Review of the Literature, *Journal of Homosexuality*, 56, 6, 701-718.

Debidin M and Lorbakhe J, (2005), Offending Behaviour Programmes in Prison and Probation in Harper G and Chitty C, (eds), *The Impact of Corrections on Re-Offending: A Review of What Works,* Home Office, London.

Dennis N and Erdos G, (1992), *Families Without Fatherhood,* IEA Health and Welfare Unit, London.

Denscombe M, (2003), *The Good Research Guide for Small Scale Research Projects,* Open University Press, Berkshire.

DFES, (2000), *Improving Prisoners Learning and Skills: A New Strategic Partnership,* Department for Education and Skills, Nottingham.

DFES, (2003), *21st Century Skills: Realising our Potential,* Stationary Office, London.

DFES, (2005), Cutting Crime through Skills and Employment, http://www.dfes.gov.uk, accessed 7 June 2006.

DFES, (2006a), The Offenders Learning Journey: Learning and Skills Provision for Adult Offenders in England, http://www.dfes.gov.uk/offenderlearning/uploads/docs/adult%2docs%2dvo.5.doc, accessed 10 February 2006.

DFES, (2006b), Initiatives: A New Delivery Service for Learning and Skills, http://www.dfes.gov.uk/offenderlearning/unit_p.cfm?id=27, accessed 10 February 2006.

DFES, (2007), *Every Parent Matters,* Department for Education and Skills, Nottingham.

Dienhart A, (1998), *Reshaping Fatherhood: The Social Construction of Shared Parenting,* Sage, California.

DIUS, (2007), *The Offenders Learning and Skills Service (OLASS) in England: A Brief Guide,* DIUS, London.

Diver A, (2008), The Earned Privilege of Family Contact in Northern Ireland: Judicial Justification of Prisoners Loss of Family Life, *The Howard Journal,* 47, 5, 486-500.

Dobson G, (2004), Get Carter, *Probation Journal,* 51, 144-154.

Dowling S and Gardner F, (2009), Parenting Programmes for Improving the Parenting Skills and Outcomes for Incarcerated Parents and their Children, *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2005,* Issue 4, Art No CD005557.DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD005557.

Drakeford M and McCarthy K (2000), Parents, Responsibility and the New Youth Justice in Goldson B, (ed), *The New Youth Justice*, Russell House, Dorset.

Driver S and Martell L, (2003), New Labour: Politics After Thatcherism in Chadwick A and Heffernan R, (eds), *The New Labour Reader*, Polity, Cambridge.

Dunleavy P and O'Leary B, (1987), *Theories of the State: The Politics of Liberal Democracy*, Macmillan, Hampshire.

DWP, (2004a), Building on New Deal: Local Solutions Meeting Individual Needs Preliminary Paper, http://www.dwp.gov.uk/publications/dwp/2004/buildingonnewdeal, accessed 10 February 2006.

DWP, (2004b), *Building on New Deal: Local Solutions Meeting Individual Needs*, Department for Work and Pensions, London.

DWP, (2006), Homepage, http://www.dwp.gov.uk, accessed 10 February 2006.

Englander D, (1998), *Poverty and Poor Law Reform in 19th Century Britain 1834-1914*, Longman, London.

Fairclough N, (1992), *Discourse and Social Change*, Polity, Cambridge.

Fairclough N, (2001), Critical Discourse Analysis as a Method in Social Scientific Research in Wodak R and Meyer M, (eds), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, Sage, London.

Fairclough N, (2003), *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*, Routledge, London.

Fairclough N, (2005), Critical Discourse Analysis, http://ww.lincs.lancs.ac.uk/profiles263, Accessed 20 November 2009

Fairclough N and Wodak R, (1997), Critical Discourse Analysis in Van Dijk T, (ed), *Discourse as Social Interaction*, Sage, London.

Farrington D, (2002), Developmental Criminology and Risk Focused Prevention in Maguire M, Morgan R and Reiner R, (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology 3rd Edition*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Farrington D and Painter A, (2004), Gender Differences in Offending: Implications for Risk Focused Prevention, Home Office Online Report, http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs2/r196.pdf, accessed 21 March 2010.

Fay B, (1996), *Contemporary Philosophy of Social Science*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Featherstone B, (2003), Taking Fathers Seriously, *British Journal of Social Work*, 33, 239-254.

Featherstone B, (2004), Fathers Matter: A Research Review, *Children and Society,* 18, 312-319.

Featherstone B, (2006), Why Gender Matters in Child Welfare and Protection, *Critical Social Policy,* 26, 2, 294-314.

Feeley M and Simon J, (1992), The New Penology: Notes on the Emerging Strategy of Corrections and Its Implications, *Criminology,* 40, 2, 449-471.

Finnegan R, (1996), Using Documents in Sapsford R and Jupp V, (eds), *Data Collection and Analysis,* Sage, London.

Fletcher DR, Taylor A, Hughes S and Breeze J, (2001a), *Recruiting and Employing Offenders,* Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York.

Fletcher DR, (2001b), Ex-Offenders, the Labour Market and the New Public Administration, *Public Administration,* 79, 4, 871-892.

Fletcher DR, (2002), The Police Act and the Recruitment of Offenders: Towards the Limits of Social Exclusion?, *Government and Policy,* 20, 757-773.

Fletcher DR, (2003), Employers Recruitment and Offenders: Underlining the Limits of Work Focused Welfare?, *Policy and Politics,* 31, 4, 497-510.

Foggo D and Fellstrom C, (2010), Godfather ran his Facebook Friends from Prison Cell, *The Sunday Times,* pg 1.

Folkhard M, Fowles A, McWilliams B, McWilliams W, Smith D and Walmsley G, (1974), *IMPACT Intensive Matched Probation and After Care Treatment Volume One: The Design of the Probation Experiment*, HMSO, London.

Foucault M, (1979), Governmentality, *Ideology and Consciousness*, 6, 5-21.

Foucault M, (1991), Governmentality in Burchell G, Gordon C and Miller P, (eds), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, Harvester Wheatsheaf, London.

Foucault M, (2002), *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, Routledge Classics, Oxon.

Francis B and Soothill K, (2005), Explaining Changing Patterns of Crime: A Focus on Burglary and Age-Period-Cohort Models in Peelo M and Soothill K, (eds), *Questioning Crime and Criminology*, Willan, Devon.

Francis P and Padel U, (2002), Editorial: Crime and Families and Communities, *Criminal Justice Matters*, 50, 3.

Frankel B, (1977), Marxist Theories of the State after Leninism, *Theory and Society*, 7, 199-242.

Fraser N, (1997), *Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections on the "Postsocialist" Condition*, Routledge, New York.

Gampbell L, (2006), Action not Rhetoric in, *Breaking the Mould: Action for Prisoners Families Annual Review 05/06*, Action for Prisoners Families, London.

Garland D, (1985), *Punishment and Welfare*, Ashgate, Aldershot.

Garland, D, (1996), The Limits of the Sovereign State: Strategies of Crime Control in Contemporary Society, *British Journal of Criminology*, 36, 4, 445-471.

Garland D, (1997), Governmentality and the Problem of Crime: Foucault; Criminology; Sociology, *Theoretical Criminology*, 1, 2, 173-214.

Garland D, (2000), The Culture of High Crime Societies: Some Preconditions of Recent Law and Order Policies, *British Journal of Criminology*, 36, 4, 445-471.

Garland D, (2001), *The Culture of Control: Crime and Social Order in Contemporary Society*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Giddens A, (1984), *The Constitution of Society*, Polity, Cambridge.

Giddens A, (1991), Structuration Theory: Past, Present and Future in Bryant C and Jarry B, (eds), *Giddens Theory of Structuration: A Critical Appreciation*, Routledge, London.

Gil Robles A, (2005), *Report by Mr Alvaro Gil Robles Commissioner for Human Rights on his visit to the United Kingdom 4-12 November 2004 for the Attention*

of the *Committee of Ministers and the Parliamentary Assembly,* Council of Europe, Strabourg.

Gill R, (2000), Discourse Analysis in Baker MW and Gaskell G, (eds), *Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound: A Practical Handbook,* Sage, London.

Gittins D, (1985), *The Family in Question: Changing Households and Familiar Ideologies,* Macmillan, Hampshire.

Gomm R, (2004), *Social Research Methodology: A Critical Introduction,* Palgrave, Hampshire.

Gordon C, (1991), Governmental Rationality in Burchell G, Gordon C and Miller P, (eds), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality,* Harvester Wheatsheaf, London.

Gordon J, Kuipers J and Wilson K, (1980), Prison Welfare and Voluntary After Care, *British Journal of Social Work,* 10, 71-86.

Gough B and Edwards G, (1998), The Beer Talking: Four Lads and a Carry Out and the Reproduction of Masculinities, *The Sociological Review,* 410-434.

Gramsci A, (1971), *Selections from the Prison Notebooks,* Lawrence and Wishart, London.

Gray P, (2007), Youth Justice, Social Exclusion and the Demise of Youth Justice, *The Howard Journal,* 46, 4, 401-416.

Grinyer J, (2005), *Literacy, Numeracy and the Labour Market: Further Analysis of the Skills for Life Survey,* Department for Education and Skills, London.

Groombridge N, (2005), (Br)others in Crime: Masculinities, Crime and Criminology, http://www.groombridge.freeserve.co.uk/masculinity%20bcc1997.htm, accessed 12 April 2005.

Haas H, Farrington D, Killias M and Sattar G, (2004), The Impact of Different Family Configurations on Delinquency, *British Journal of Criminology,* 44, 4, 520-532.

Hairston CF, (1988), Family Ties during Imprisonment: Do they Influence Future Criminal Activity, *Federal Probation,* 52, 1, 48-52.

Hall S and Scraton P, (1981), Law, Class and Control in Fitzgerald M, McLennan G and Pawson J, (eds), *Crime and Society: Readings in History,* Routledge, London.

Hall S, (2002), Daubing the Drudges of Fury: Men, Violence and the Piety of the Hegemonic Masculinity Thesis, *Theoretical Criminology,* 6, 1, 35-61.

Hall S, Critcher C, Jefferson T, Clarke J and Roberts B, (1978), *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State and Law and Order*, Macmillan, Hampshire.

Halsey K, Ashworth M and Harland J, (2002), Made for Prisoners by Prisoners: A Summary of NFER'S Evaluation of the Safe Ground Family Relationships and Parenting Programme,http://www.nfer.ac.uk/publications/other-publications/downloadable-reports/pdf-docs/safereport.pdf, accessed 20 September 2006.

Halsey K, (2004), Parenting and Family Relationships Programmes in Prison, *Custodial Review*, 33, 10-11.

Hammersley M and Atkinson P, (1995), *Ethnography Principles in Practice 2nd Edition*, Routledge, London.

Hammersley M, (2003), Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis: Methods or Paradigms?, *Discourse and Society*, 14, 6, 751-781.

Hannah-Moffat K, (2005), Criminogenic Needs and the Transformative Risk Subject: Hybridizations of Risk/Needs Penality, *Punishment and Society*, 7, 1, 29-51.

Harper G and Chitty C, (2005), (eds), *The Impact of Corrections on Re-Offending: A Review of What Works*, Home Office, London.

Harris R, (1977), The Probation Officer as Social Worker, *British Journal of Social Work*, 7, 4, 433-442.

Hay C, (1994), The Structural and Ideological conditions of British Post-War Reconstruction, *Capital and Class*, 54, 25-61.

Hay C, (1995), Re-Stating the Problem of Regulation and Re-Regulating the local State, *Economy and Society*, 24, 3, 387-401.

Hay C, (1999), Marxism and the State in Gamble A, Marsh D and Tant T, (eds), *Marxism and Social Science*, Macmillan, Hampshire.

Hayes M, (1994), *The New Right in Britain*, Pluto Press, London.

Haywood C and Mac An Ghaill M, (2003), *Men and Masculinities*, Open University Press, Buckingham.

Hearn J, (1998), Troubled Masculinities in Social Policy Discourse: Young Men in Popay J, Hearn J and Edwards J, (eds), *Men, Gender Divisions and Welfare*, Routledge, London.

Hearn J, (1999), A Crisis in Masculinity, Or New Agendas for Men in Walby S, (ed), *New Agendas for Women*, Macmillan, Hampshire.

Hearn J, (2004), From Hegemonic Masculinity to the Hegemony of Men, *Feminist Theory*, 5, 1, 49-72.

Hearn J and Pringle K, (2006), Men, Masculinities and Children: Some European Perspectives, *Critical Social Policy*, 26, 2, 365-389.

Heidensohn F, (1987), Women and Crime: Questions for Criminology in Carlen P and Worrall A, (eds), *Gender, Crime and Justice*, Open University, Buckinghamshire.

Heidensohn F, (1996), *Women and Crime: 2nd Edition*, Macmillan, Hampshire.

Heidensohn F, (2002), Gender and Crime in Maguire M, Morgan R and Reiner R, (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology 3rd Edition*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Henry S and Milovanovic D, (1996), *Constitutive Criminology: Beyond Post-Modernism*, Sage, London.

Hepburn J, (1977), Social Control and the Legal Order: Legitimated Repression in a Capitalist State, *Contemporary Crises*, 1, 77-90.

Hill M, (1997), *The Policy Process in the Modern State 3rd Edition*, Prentiss Hall/ Harvester Wheatsheaf, Hertfordshire.

Hill M, (2005), *The Public Policy Process 4th Edition*, Pearson Longman, Essex.

HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, (2004), Report on an Unannounced Inspection of HMP Channings Wood,

http://www.inspectorate.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmprisons/inspect-reports/hmp_yoi_inspections.html/channingswood-04, accessed 24 November 2006.

HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, (2005), Report on a Full Announced Inspection of HMP Coldingley 14-18 November 2005, http://www.inspectorates.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmprisons/inspect-reports/hmp-yoi-inspections.html/coldingley2005.pdf, accessed 26 November 2006.

HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, (2006a), Report on an Unannounced Short Follow-Up Inspection of HMP Dartmoor 13-14 February 2006, http://www.inspectorates.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmprisons/inspect_reports_hmp-yoi-inspections.html/dartmoor.pdf, accessed 24 November 2006.

HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, (2006b), Report on an Unannounced Short Follow-Up Inspection of HMP Featherstone, http://www.inspectorates.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmprisons/inspect-reports/hmp_yoi_inspections.html/featherstone.pdf, accessed 25 November 2006.

HM Government, (2005a), *A Five Year Strategy for Protecting the Public and Reduce Re-Offending*, Stationary Office, London.

HM Government, (2005b), *Reducing Re-Offending through Skills and Employment*, Stationary Office, London.

HM Government, (2006), *Reducing Re-Offending Through Skills and Employment: Next Steps,* Department for Education and Skills, Nottingham.

HM Inspectorate of Prisons (2001), *Through the Prison Gate: A Joint Thematic Review by HM Inspectorate of Prison and Probation,* HMIP, London.

HM Inspectorate of Prisons, (2004), *Expectations: Criteria for Assessing the Conditions in Prisons and the Treatment of Prisoners,* Stationary Office, London.

HM Inspectorate of Prisons, (2005), *Annual Report of HM Chief Inspector of Prisons for England and Wales 2003-2004,* Stationary Office, London.

HM Prison Service, (1999), PSO 4405 Assisted Prison Visits Scheme, http://www.pso.homeoffice.gov.uk/pso_4405_assisted_prison_visits.doc, accessed 24 November 2006.

HM Prison Service, (2000), PSO 4205 Education in Prisons, http://www.hmprisonservice.gov.uk/library/dynpage.asp?page=214, accessed 17 April 2002.

HM Prison Service, (2005), *Prisoners Family Life,* HM Prison Service, London.

HM Prison Service, (2007a), Prison Population and Accommodation Briefing for 9th November 2007,

http://www/hmprisonservice.gov.uk/resourcecentre/publicationsdocuments/inde
x.asp?cat=85, accessed 2 January 2008.

HM Prison Service, (2007b), Prisoners Information Book: Visiting and Keeping
in Touch,
http://www.hmprisonservice.gov.uk/assets/documents/10000588pib_visiting_up
date.pdf, accessed 1 May 2007.

HM Prison Service, (2009), Prison Industries,
http://www.hmprisonservice.gov.uk/abouttheservice/prisonindustries, accessed
25 November 2009.

Hoch P, 2004, White Hero Black beast: Racism, Sexism and the Mask of
Masculinity in Murphy P, (ed), *Feminism and Masculinities,* Oxford University
Pres, Oxford.

Hodder I, (2003), The Interpretation of Documents and Material Cultures in
Denzin N and Lincoln Y, (eds), *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials,*
Sage, London.

Holzer H, Raphael S and Stoll M, (2003), *Employment Dimensions of Re-Entry:*
Understanding the Nexus between Prisoner Re-Entry and Work, Urban Institute
Re-Entry Round Table, New York University Law School.

Home Office, (1997), *No More Excuses – A New Approach to Tackling Youth*
Crime in England and Wales, Stationary Office, London.

Home Office, (1998), *Supporting Families: A Consultation Document*, Home Office, London.

Home Office, (1999a), *What Works: Reducing Re-Offending Evidence Based Practice*, Home Office, London.

Home Office, (1999b), *The Correctional Policy Framework*, Home Office, London.

Home Office, (2001a), *Probation Circular 53/2001*, Home Office, London

Home Office, (2001b), *Halliday Report Making Punishments Work: Report of a Review of the Sentencing Framework for England and Wales*, Home Office, London.

Home Office, (2003), *Making the Right Choices Helping Offenders Quit Crime – The Story So Far*, Home Office, London.

Home Office, (2004a), *Joint Inspection Report on Persistent and Prolific Offenders*, Home Office, London.

Home Office, (2004b), *Reducing Re-Offending National Action Plan*, Home Office, London.

Horton S and Farnham D, (1999), New Labour and the Management of Public Services in Horton S and Farnham D, (eds), *Public Management in Britain,* Palgrave, Hampshire.

House of Commons Home Affairs Committee, (2004), *Rehabilitation of Prisoners: First Report of Sessions 2004-05 Volume One,* Stationary Office, London.

Howard League, (2000), *Rehabilitating Work: What are Prison Workshops For?,* The Howard League for Penal Reform, London.

Howard League (2008), *Prison Work and Social Enterprise: The Story of Barbed,* The Howard League for Penal Reform, London.

Howard League (2010), *Barbed: What Happened Next? Follow up Story of Employees of a Prison Social Enterprise,* The Howard League for Penal Reform, London.

Howard S, (2000), Fathering Behind Bars, paper presented at the conference, *Family Futures: Issues in Research and Policy,* 7th Australian Institute of Family Studies Conference, Sydney, 24-26 July 2000.

Howlett M and Ramesh M, (2003), *Studying Public Policy: Policy Cycles and Policy Subsystems,* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Hudson K, Maguire M and Raynor P, (2007a), Through the Prison Gate: Resettlement, Offender Management and the Seamless Sentence in Jewkes Y, (ed), *Handbook on Prisons,* Willan, Devon.

Hudson K, (2007b), The SWing Model of Resettlement: Some Reflections in Hucklesby A and Hagley-Dickinson L, (eds), *Prisoner Resettlement: Policy and Practice,* Willan, Devon.

Hughes E, (2005), *Free to Learn? Prisoner-Student Views on Distance Learning,* Prisoners Education Trust, Surrey.

Hughes E, (2006), Changing Time: The Role of the Prison Environment in Influencing Prisoners Decisions Regarding Education, paper presented at the conference, *The British Criminology Conference,* University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, 4-6 July 2006.

Hughes J and Sharrock W, (1998), *The Philosophy of Social Research,* Longman, London.

Humber S and Burrows B, (2009), The Legal Rights of Families to Prison Visits, *Action News,* Spring, 18.

Hunter S, (2003), A Critical Analysis of Approaches to the Concept of Social Identity in Social Policy, *Critical Social Policy,* 23, 322-344.

Hunter G and Boyce I (2009), Preparing for Employment: Prisoners Experience of Participating in a Prison Training Programme, *The Howard Journal*, 48, 2, 117-131.

Hurst P, (1972), Marx and Engels on Law, Crime and Morality, *Economy and Society*, 1, 1, 28-56.

Inside Out Trust, (2004), *Turning Prisoners into Tax Payers: Employment Inside and Out,* Inside Out Trust, London.

IMB, (2004), HMP Dartmoor Annual Report 1 August 2003-30 September 2004, http://www.imb.gov.uk/annualreports/06_annual_reports_.pdf,_accessed 1 January 2007.

IMB, (2006), HMP Channings Wood: Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Office by the Independent Monitoring Board 1 September 2005-31 August 2006,http://www.imb.gov.uk/annualreports/06_annual_reports.pdf, accessed 1 January 2007.

Irwin T, (2008), The 'Inside' Story: Practitioner Perspectives on Teaching in Prison, *The Howard Journal*, 47, 5, 512-518

James A and Raine J, (1998), *The New Politics of Criminal Justice,* Longman, London.

Jarvis J, Graham S, Hamilton P and Tyler D, (2004), The Role of Parenting Classes for Young Fathers in Prison: A Case Study, *Probation Journal*, 51, 1, 22-33.

Jefferson T, (1992), Wheelin and Steelin, *Achilles Heel*, 13, 1-4.

Jefferson T, (1996), Introduction, *British Journal of Criminology*, 36, 3, 337-347.

Jefferson T, (2002), Subordinating Hegemonic Masculinity, *Theoretical Criminology*, 6, 1, 63-88.

Jepson N and Elliott K, (1985), *Shared Working between Prison and Probation Officers*, Home Office, London.

Jessop B, (1982), *The Capitalist State: Marxist Theories and Methods*, Martin Robertson, Oxford.

Jessop B, (1990), *State Theory: Putting the Capitalist State in its place*, Polity, Cambridge.

Jessop B, (1994), Post-Fordism and the State in Amin A, (ed), *Post-Fordism: A Reader*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Jessop B, (1995), The Regulation Approach, Governance and Post-Fordism Alternative Perspectives on Economic and Political Change, *Economy and Society*, 24, 3, 307-333.

Jessop B, (2003), *The Future of the Capitalist State,* Polity, Cambridge.

Jessop B, (2004), Capitalism, the Regulation Approach and Critical Realism, http://www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/soc07.html, accessed 26 January 2004.

Jewkes Y, (2002), *Captive Audience: Media, Masculinity and Power in Prisons,* Willan, Devon.

Jewkes Y, (2005), Men Behind Bars: Doing Masculinity as an Adaptation to Imprisonment, *Men and Masculinities,* 8, 1, 44-63.

Jewkes Y and Johnston H, (2009), 'Cavemen in an Era of Speed-of –Light Technology': Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Communication within Prisons, *The Howard Journal,* 48, 2, 132-143.

Jobcentre Plus, (2003), *Jobcentre Plus Vision 2003-2007,* Jobcentre Plus, London.

Johnston L, (1986), *Marxism, Class Analysis and Socialist Pluralism: A Theoretical and Political Critique of Marxist Conceptions of Politics,* Allen and Unwin, London.

Jupp V, (1996), Documents and Critical Research in Sapsford R and Jupp V, (eds), *Data Collection and Analysis,* Sage, London.

Katz A, (2002), Parents in Prison, *Criminal Justice Matters,* 50, 18-19.

Kemp P and Neale J, (2005), Employability and Problem Drug Users, *Critical Social Policy*, 25, 28-46.

Kemshall H, (2002), Effective Probation Practice: An Example of Advanced Liberal Responsibilisation?, *Howard Journal*, 41, 1, 41-58.

Kendall G and Wickham G, (1999), *Using Foucault's Methods*, Sage, London.

Kendall K, (2004), Dangerous Thinking: A Critical History of Correctional Cognitive Behaviouralism in Mair G, (ed), *What Matters in Probation*, Willan, Devon.

Kenny M, (1999), Marxism and Regulation Theory in Gamble A, Marsh D and Tant T, (eds), *Marxism and Social Science*, Macmillan, Hampshire.

Kerr D, (1999), Beheading the King and Enthroning the Market: A Critique of Foucauldian Governmentality, *Science and Society*, 63, 2, 173-202.

Kimmel M, 2004, Masculinity as Homophobia: Fear, Shame and Silence in the Construction of Gender in Murphy P, (ed), *Feminism and Masculinity*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

King D, (1987), *The New Right: Politics, Markets and Citizenship*, Macmillan, Hampshire.

King J, (1969), *The Probation and After Care Service*, Butterworths, London.

Kinsman G, (2004), Men Loving Men: The Challenge of Gay Liberation in Murphy P, (ed), *Feminism and Masculinities*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Lamb M, (1997), Fathers and Child Development: An Introductory Overview and Guide in Lamb M, (ed), *The Role of Fathers in Child Development: Third Edition*, John Wiley and Sons, New York.

Lea J, (1995), Post-Fordism and Criminality, http://www.bunker8.pwp.blueyonder.co.uk/misc/pford.html, accessed 3 February 2005.

Leacock V and Sparks R, (2002), Riskiness and at Risk-Ness: Some Ambiguous Features of the Current Penal Landscape in Gray N, Laing J and Noakes L, (eds), *Criminal Justice, Mental Health and the Politics of Risk*, Cavendish, London.

Lemke T, (2001), Foucault, Governmentality and Critique, http://www.thomaslemkeweb.de/engl.%20texte/foucault%20governmentality%20 0and%20critique%20iv.pdf, accessed 21 October 2003.

Levitas R, (2005), *The Inclusive Society? Social Exclusion and New Labour 2nd Edition*, Macmillan, Hampshire.

Levitas R, Pantazis C, Fahmy E, Gordon D, Lloyd E and Patsios D, (2007), The Multi Dimensional Analysis of Social Exclusion,

http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/media/cabinetoffice/social-exclusion-task-force/assets/research/multidimensional.pdf, accessed 11 November 2009.

Liamputtong P and Ezzy D, (2005), *Qualitative Research Methods*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Ling T, (2002), Delivering Joined Up Government in the UK: Dimensions, Issues and Problems, *Public Administration*, 80, 4, 615-642.

Loader I, (1999), Consumer Culture and the Commodification of Policing and Security, *Sociology*, 33, 2, 373-392.

Loader I and Sparks R, (2002), Contemporary Landscapes of Crime, Order and Control: Governance, Risk, Globalisation in Maguire M, Morgan R and Reiner R, (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology 3rd Edition*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Lord Carter, (2007), *Securing the Future: Proposals for the Efficient use of Custody in England and Wales*, Ministry of Justice, London.

Loucks N, (2002), *Just Visiting? A Review of the role of Prison Visitors Centres*, Prison Reform Trust, London.

Loucks, N, (2004), *'Prison without Bars': Needs, Support and Good Practice for Work with Prisoners' Families*, Tayside Criminal Justice Partnership and Families Outside, Scotland.

LSC, (2006), What we Do,

http://www.lsc.gov.uk/whatwedo/adultlearnerOLASS.htm, accessed 10 February 2006.

Lund B, (1999), Ask Not What you Community can do for You: Obligations, New Labour and Welfare Reform, *Critical Social Policy,* 19, 4, 447-462.

Lupton D and Barclay L, (1997), *Constructing Fatherhood: Discourses and Experiences,* Sage, London.

Maybin J, (2001), Language, Struggle and Voice: The Bakhtin/Volosinov Writings in Wetherell M, Taylor S and Yates S, (eds), *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader,* Sage, London.

MacInnes J, (1988), *The End of Masculinity,* Open University Press, Buckingham.

MacKinnon K, (2003), *Representing Men: Maleness and Masculinity in the Media,* Arnold, London.

Maingueneau D, (1999), Analysing Self Constituting Discourses, *Discourse Studies,* 1, 2, 175-199.

Majors R, (2001), Cool Pose: Black Masculinity and Sports in Whitehead S and Barret F, (eds), *The Masculinities Reader,* Polity, Cambridge.

Management of Offenders and Sentencing Bill, (2005), Management of

Offenders and Sentencing Bill,

http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/id200405/idbills/016/2005016.pdf,

accessed 22 March 2006.

Manchester Enterprise Research and Evaluation, (2002), *Barriers to*

Recruitment: Report for the Manchester Sub-Region Equal Programme,

Manchester Research and Evaluation, Manchester.

Mason J, (1996), *Qualitative Researching,* Sage, London.

May T, (2001), *Social Research: Issues, Methods and Process,* Open University

Press, Buckinghamshire.

Maxine, (2003), The Visitors Experience, paper presented at the conference,

Visitor's Centre: Every Jail Should Have One, Action for Prisoners Families,

Birmingham, 1 April 2003.

McDermott N, (2004), The 'Word' on Education in Prison: Radio Wanno,

Criminal Justice Matters, Summer, 38-39.

McDonald C and Marston G, (2005), Workfare as Welfare: Governing

Employment in the Advanced Liberal State, *Critical Social Policy,* 25, 374-401.

McEvoy K, O'Mahony D, Horner C and Lyner O, (1999), The Home Front: The Families of Politically Motivated Prisoners in Northern Ireland, *British Journal of Criminology*, 39, 2, 175-197.

McIvor G, Trotter C and Sheehan R, (2009), Women, Resettlement and Desistance, *Probation Journal*, 56, 4, 347-361

McLaughlin E and Muncie J, (1994) Managing the Criminal Justice System in Clarke J, Cochrane A and McLaughlin E, (eds), *Managing Social Policy*, Sage, London.

McLaughlin E and Muncie J, (2000), Beyond the New Public Management ? Modernising Public Services in Clarke J, Gewirtz S and McLaughlin E, (eds), *New Managerialism, New Welfare*, Sage, London.

McLaughlin E and Murji K, (2001), Lost Connections and New Directions: Neo-Liberalism, New Public Management and the Modernisation of the British Police in Stenson K and Sullivan R, (eds), *Crime, Risk and Justice: The Politics of Crime Control in Liberal Democracies*, Willan, Devon.

Merrington S and Stanley S, (2000), Doubts about the What Works Initiative, *Probation Journal*, 47, 4, 272-275.

Merrington S and Stanley S, (2004), What Works? Revisiting the Evidence in England and Wales, *Probation Journal*, 51, 7-20.

Messerschmidt J, (1993), *Masculinities and Crime: Critique and Reconceptualisation of Theory*, Rowan and Littlefield, Maryland.

Messerschmidt J, (1994), Schooling, Masculinities and Youth Crime by White Boys in Newburn T and Stanko E, (eds), *Just Boys Doing Business: Men, Masculinities and Crime*, Routledge, London.

Messerschmidt J, (1997), *Crime as Structured Action: Gender, Race, Class and Crime in the Making*, Sage, California.

Messerschmidt J, (1999), Making Bodies Matter: Adolescent Masculinities, the Body and Varieties of Violence, *Theoretical Criminology*, 3, 2, 197-220.

Messerschmidt J, (2005), Men, Masculinities and Crime in Kimmell M, Hearn J and Connell R, (eds), *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities*, Sage, California.

Metcalfe H, Anderson T and Rolfe H, (2001), *Barriers to Employment for Offenders and Ex-Offenders: Part One Barriers to Employment for Offenders and Ex-Offenders*, Department for Work and Pensions, London.

Meyer M, (2001), Between Theory, Method and Politics: Positioning of Approaches to Critical Discourse Analysis in Wodak R and Meyer M, (eds), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, Sage, London.

Michel A, (1999), *A New Deal for the Young Unemployed – Soundbite on Sound Policy?*, University of Herefordshire, Hertford.

Miliband D, (2006), *Social Exclusion: The Next Steps Forward, Speech by Rt Hon David Miliband MP,* ODPM, London.

Miller P and Rose N, (1993), Governing Economic Life in Gane M and Johnson T, (eds), *Foucault's New Domains,* Routledge, London.

Mills A, (2004), Great Expectations? A Review of the role of Prisoners Families in England and Wales, http://www.britsoccrim.org/volume7/001.pdf, accessed 26 November 2007.

Mills A and Codd H, (2007), Prisoners Families in Jewkes Y, (ed), *Handbook on Prisons,* Willan, Devon.

Mills A and Codd H, (2008), Prisoners Families and Offender Management: Mobilizing Social Capital, *Probation Journal,* 55, 1, 9-24.

Milovanovic D and Henry S, (1991), Consitutive Penology, *Social Justice,* 18, 204-224.

Ministry of Justice, (2007), *Penal Policy: A Background Paper,* Ministry of Justice, London.

Ministry of Justice, (2008a), New prisoners Employment Training Initiative Launched, http://www.moj.gov.uk, accessed 8 February 2010.

Ministry of Justice, (2008b), Prime Minister Launches Titan Consultation, http://www.justice.gov.uk/news/newsrelease050608a.htm, accessed 28 January 2010.

Ministry of Justice, (2008c), *Titan Prisons*, Ministry of Justice, London.

Ministry of Justice, (2009a), Jack Straw sets out Prison and Probation Plans, http://www.justice.gov.uk/news/newsrelease270409b.htm, accessed 9 April 2010.

Ministry of Justice, (2009b), *New Prisons Consultation Response*, Ministry of Justice, London.

Ministry of Justice, (2009c), *Reducing Re-Offending: Supporting Families, Creating Better Futures*, Ministry of Justice, London.

Ministry of Justice, (2010), *Sentencing Statistics: England and Wales 2008*, Ministry of Justice, London.

Mizen P, (2006), Work and Social Order: The New Deal for the Young unemployed in Muncie J and Goldson B, (eds), *Youth Crime and Justice: Critical Issues*, Sage, London.

Monger M, (1964), *Casework in Probation,* Butterworths, London.

Morash M, (2006), *Understanding Gender, Crime and Justice,* Sage, California.

Morgan D, (2001), Family, Gender and Masculinities in Whitehead S and Barret F, (eds), *The Masculinities Reader,* Polity, Cambridge.

Morgan D, (2005), Class and Masculinity in Kimmell M, Hearn J and Connell R, (eds), *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities,* Sage, California.

Morris A, (1987), *Women, Crime and Criminal Justice,* Basil Blackwell, Oxford.

Morris L, (1994), *Dangerous Classes: The Underclass and Social Citizenship,* Routledge, London.

Muncie J and Wetherell M, (2000), Family Policy and Political Discourse in Muncie J, Wetherell M, Langan M, Dallos R and Cochrane A, (eds), *Understanding the Family 2nd Edition,* Sage, London.

Muncie J, (2006), Discourse Analysis in Jupp V, (ed), *The Sage Dictionary of Social Research Methods,* Sage, London.

Murray C, (1996), The Emerging British Underclass in Lister R, (ed), *Charles Murray and the Underclass: The Developing Debate,* IEA Health and Welfare Unit, London.

Murray J and Farrington D, (2005), Parental Imprisonment: Effects on Boys Antisocial Behaviour and Delinquency through the Life Course, *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry,* 46, 12, 1269-1278.

Murray J, (2002), Fathers in Prison, http://www.prisonersfamilies.org.uk/fathersinprison.html, accessed 10 September 2006.

Murray J, (2007), The Cycle of Punishment: Social Exclusion of Prisoners and their Children, *Criminology & Criminal Justice,* 7, 1, 55-83.

Nacro, (2003), *Recruiting Ex-Offenders: The Employers Perspective,* NACRO, London.

Nacro, (2006a), Reducing Re-Offending through Skills and Employment: Nacro's response to the Department for Education and Skills Green Paper, http://ww.nacro.org.uk/data/resources/nacro-2006070400.pdf, accessed 7 December 2007.

Nacro, (2006b), Employment for Ex-Offenders Paper a Missed Opportunity, http://www.nacro.org.uk/templates/news/newsitem.cfm/2006121300.htm, accessed 7 December 2007.

Naffine N, (2003), The Man Question of Crime, Criminology and Criminal Law, *Criminal Justice Matters,* 53, 10-11`.

NAO, (2002), *HM Prison Service: Reducing Prisoner Re-Offending*, Stationary Office, London.

NAO, (2004), *Department for Education and Skills: Skills for Life Improving Adult Literacy and Numeracy*, Stationary Office, London.

NAO, (2005), *National Offender Management Service: Dealing with increased Numbers in Custody*, Stationary Office, London.

Nellis M, (2006), NOMS, Contestability and the Process of Technocorrectional Innovation in Hough M, Allen R and Padel U, (eds), *Reshaping Probation and Prisons: The New offender Management Framework*, Policy Press, Bristol.

Neocleous M, (1996), *Administering Civil Society: Towards a Theory of State Power*, Macmillan, Hampshire.

Newburn T and Stanko E, (1994), Introduction Men Masculinity and Crime in Newburn T and Stanko E, (eds), *Just Boys Doing Business: Men, Masculinities and Crime*, Routledge, London.

Newman J and Clarke J, (1994), Going About our Busines? The Managerialisation of Public Services in Clarke J, Cochrane A and McLaughlin E, (eds), *Managing Social Policy*, Sage, London.

Newman J, (2001), *Modernising Governance: New Labour, Policy and Society*, Sage, London.

Niven S and Olagindaye J, (2003), *Jobs and Homes –A Survey of Prisoners Nearing Release,* Home Office, London.

Niven S and Barnard H, (2005), The Feasibility of using Electronic Job Search, Home Office Online Report, http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdf505/rdsolr2505.pdf, accessed 7 June 2006.

Niven S and Stewart D, (2005), *Resettlement Outcomes on Release from Prison in 2003,* Home Office, London.

Niven S and Stewart D, (2006), The Role of the Family and Friends in Successful Resettlement, http://www.hmprisonservice.gov.uk/resourcecentre.prisonservicejournal/index.asp?id=3312,3124,11,3148,0,0, accessed 24 November 2006.

NOMS, (2004), Reducing Re-Offending: National Action Plan, http://www.noms.homeoffice.gov.uk/downloads/noms-reducing-reoffending-national-action-plan.pdf, accessed 13 February 2006.

NOMS, (2005a), *Business Plans 2005-06,* Home Office, London.

NOMS, (2005b), About NOMS, http://www/noms.homeoffice.gov.uk/about-us, accessed 1 October 2006.

NOMS, (2006a), *The National Reducing Re-Offending Delivery Plan,* Home Office, London.

NOMS, (2006b), *Assisted Prison Visits Scheme: Customer Service Guide,* Home Office, London.

Nottinghamshire Research Observatory, (2005), *Barriers to Training for Offenders and the Homeless,* Nottingham Trent University, Nottingham.

Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, (2004), *The Social Exclusion Unit,* ODPM, London.

Oliver P, (2006), Purposive Sampling in Jupp V, (ed), *The Sage Dictionary of Social Research Methods,* Sage, London.

OLSU, (2004), Offenders Learning and Skills Service for Adults and Juveniles: Delivery Framework for England, http://www.dfes.gov.uk/offenderlearning/index.cfm?fuseaction=library.list, accessed 10 February 2006.

O'Malley P, (1992) Risk, Power and Crime Prevention, *Economy and Society,* 21, 2, 252-275.

O'Malley P, (1996), Indigenous Governance, *Economy and Society,* 25, 3, 310-326.

O'Malley P, (2000), Risk Societies and the Governance of Crime in Brown M and Pratt J, (eds), *Dangerousness, Risk and Modern Society,* Routledge, London.

ONS, (2009), Social Trends 39, http://www.statistics.gov.uk/socialtrends39, accessed 5 January 2010.

Owers A, (2007), Imprisonment in the 21st Century: A View from the Inspectorate in Jewkes Y, (ed), *Handbook on Prisons,* Willan, Devon.

PACT, (2005), Annual Review 2004/2005, http://www.prisonadvice.org.uk/files/annual%20review%202004-5.pdf, accessed 10 February 2006.

Palmer E, (2003), *Offending Behaviour: Moral Reasoning, Criminal Conduct and the Rehabilitation of Offenders,* Willan, Devon.

Pearce F and Tombs S, (1998), Foucault, Governmentality, Marxism, *Social and Legal Studies,* 12, 7, 567-575.

Peck J and Theodore N, (2000), Beyond Employability, *Cambridge Journal of Economics,* 24, 792-749.

Petersen A, (1998), *Unmasking the masculine: Men and Identity in a Sceptical Age,* Sage, London.

Pollitt C, (1990), *Managerialism and the Public Services,* Basil Blackwell, Oxford.

Potter J, (1996), *Representing Reality: Discourse, Rhetoric and Social Construction,* Sage, London.

Poulantzas N, (1973), On Social Classes, *New Left Review,* 78, 27-54.

Poulantzas N, (1978), *State, Power and Socialism,* NLB, London.

Pratt J, (1999), Dangerous and Modern Society in Brown M and Pratt J, (eds), *Dangerous Offenders: Punishment and Social Order,* Routledge, London.

Pratt M, (1975), Stress and Opportunity in the Role of the Prison Welfare Officer, *British Journal of Social Work,* 5,4, 379-396.

Prior L, (1997), Following in Foucault's Footsteps: Text and Context in Qualitative Research in Silverman D, (ed), *Qualitative Researching: Theory, Method, Practice,* Sage, London.

Prior L, (2003), *Using Documents in Social Research,* Sage, London.

Prior L, (2004), Doing Things With Documents in Silverman D, (ed), *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method, Practice 2nd Edition,* Sage, London.

Prison Service Journal, (2006), Storybook Dads: Keeping Families in Touch, http://www.hmprisonservice.gov.uk/resourcecentre/prisonservicejournal/index.asp?id=5066,3124,11,3148,0,0, accessed 24 November 2006.

Punch K, (2005), *Introduction to Social Research: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches 2ⁿᵈ Edition*, Sage, London.

Pycroft A, (2005), A New Chance for Rehabilitation: Multi Agency Provision and Potential under NOMS in Winstone J and Parkes F, (eds), *Community Justice: Issues for Probation and Criminal Justice*, Willan, Devon.

Reuss A, (1999), Prison(er) Education, *The Howard Journal*, 38, 2, 113-127.

Reynaud E, 2004, Holy Virility: The Social Construction of Masculinity in Murphy P, (ed), *Feminism and Masculinities*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Ritchie H, Casebourne J and Rick J, (2005), *Understanding Workers, People and Communities: A Literature Review*, Department for Work and Pensions, London.

Robertson Elliot F, (1996), *Gender, Family and Society*, Macmillan, Hampshire.

Robinson G, (1999), Risk Management and rehabilitation in the Probation Service: Collision and Collusion, *The Howard Journal*, 38, 4, 421-433.

Robinson G and Raynor P, (2006), The Future of Rehabilitation: What Role for the Probation Service?, *Probation Journal,* 53, 334-346.

Rodger J, (2000), *From a Welfare State to a Welfare Society: The Changing Context of Social Policy in a Post-Modern Era,* Macmillan, Hampshire.

Rolfe H, (2001), *Barriers to Employment for Offenders and Ex-Offenders: Part Two A Review of the Literature,* Department for Work and Pensions, London.

Rose N and Miller P, (1992) Political Power Beyond the State: Problematics of Government, *British Journal of Sociology,* 43, 2, 173-201.

Rose N, (1993), Government Authority and Expertise in Advanced Liberalism, *Economy and Society,* 22, 3, 283-299.

Rose N, (1996), Death of the Social? Re-Figuring the Territory of Government, *Economy and Society,* 25, 3, 327-356.

Rose N, (1998), Governing Risky Individuals: The Role of Psychiatry in New Regimes of Control, *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law,* 5, 2, 177-195.

Rose N, (2000), Government and Control, *British Journal of Criminology,* 40, 2, 321-339.

Rustin M, (1989), The Politics of Post-Fordism or the Trouble with New Times, *New Left Review,* 175, 54-77.

Rutherford J, (1988), Who's That Man? in Chapman R and Rutherford J, (eds),
Male Order: Unwrapping Masculinity, Lawrence and Wishart, London.

Ruxton S, (2006), Men, Masculinities and Poverty in the UK: Executive
Summary,
http://www.oxfamgb.org/ukpp/resources/dowlaods/men_masculinites_summary.
pdf, accessed 9 November 2006.

Safe Ground, (2003a), Fathers Inside Course Overview,
http://www.safeground.org.uk/pdfs/fi_teacher_material.pdf, accessed 29
November 2006.

Safe Ground, (2003b), Family Man Course Overview,
http://www.safeground.org.uk/pdfs/fm_teacher_material.pdf, accessed 29
November 2006.

Safe Ground, (2005), *Safe Ground Annual Review 2004-2005*, Safe Ground,
London.

Safe Ground (2006b), Fathers Inside Project,helen.may@plymouth.ac.uk,
accessed 1 August 2005.

Safe Ground, (2006), The Safe Ground Story,
http://www.safeground.org.uk/aboutus-story.php, accessed 30 November 2006.

Salmon S, (2006), Prisoners Children Matter,

http://www.hmprisonservice.gov.uk/resourcecenre/prisonservicejournal/index.as

p?id=3301,3124,11,3148,0,0, accessed 24 November 2006.

Salmon S, (2007), When Family doesn't include the Families of Prisoners,

http://www.politics.co.uk/campaignsite/action-for-prisoners-families.apf-

$36625854.htm, accessed 24 October 2007.

Saraga E, (2002), Dangerous Places: The Family as a Site of Crime in Munice J

and McLaughlin E, (eds), *The Problem of Crime 2nd Edition,* Sage, London.

Sarantakos S, (1998), *Social Research,* Macmillan, Hampshire.

Sarantakos S, (2005), *Social Research 3rd Edition,* Palgrave, Hampshire.

Scollon R, (2001), Action and Text towards an integrated Understanding of the

Place of Text in Social (inter)Action, Mediate Discourse Analysis and the

problem of Social Action in Wodak R and Meyer M, (eds), *Methods of Critical*

Discourse Analysis, Sage, London.

Scourfield J and Drakeford M, (2002), New Labour and the Problem of Men,

Critical Social Policy, 22, 619-640.

Scraton P, Sim J and Skidmore P, (1991), *Prisons Under Protest,* Open

University Press, Buckingham.

Seale C, (2004), Validity, Reliability and the Quality of Research in Seale C, (ed), *Researching Society and Culture 2nd Edition*, Sage, London.

Segal L, (1983), The Most Important Thing of All – Rethinking the Family: An Overview in Segal L, (ed), *What is to be Done about the Family,* Penguin Books, Middlesex.

Segal L, (1997a), *Slow motion: Changing Masculinities Changing Men,* Virago, London.

Segal L, (1997b), Sexualities in Woodward K, (ed), *Identity and Difference,* Sage and Open University Press, London.

Setkova L and Sandford S, (2005), *Inside and Out People in Prisons and Life After Release: A Guide for Donors and Funders,* New Philanthropy Capital, London.

SEU, (2002), *Reducing Re-Offending by Ex-Prisoners,* ODPM, London.

Shaw M, (1974), *Social Work in Prison,* HMSO, London.

Shaw R, (1987), *Children of Imprisoned Fathers,* Hodder and Stoughton, London.

Shearing C, (2001), Punishment and the Changing Face of Governance, *Punishment and Society,* 3,2, 203-220.

Sherratt N and Hughes G, (2004), Family: From Tradition to Diversity in, Hughes G and Fergusson R, (eds), *Ordering Lives: Family, Work and Welfare 2nd Edition*, Routledge, London.

Silva E and Smart C, (1999), The New Practices and Politics of Family Life in Silva E and Smart C (eds), *The New Family?*, Sage, London.

Silverman D, (2000), *Doing Qualitative Research: A Practical Handbook*, Sage, London.

Silverman D, (2001), *Interpreting Qualitative Date Methods for Analysing Talk, Text and Interaction*, Sage, London.

Silverman D, (2003), Analysing Talk and Text in Denzin N and Lincoln Y, (eds), *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials*, Sage, London.

Silverman D, (2006), *Interpreting Qualitative Data 3rd Edition*, Sage, London.

Sim J, (1994), Tougher than the rest? Men in Prison in Newburn T and Stanko E, (eds), *Just Boys Doing Business: Men, Masculinities and Crime*, Routledge, London.

Simon J, (1987), The Emergence of the Risk Society: Insurance, Law and the State, *Socialist Review*, 95, 61-89.

Smart B, (2002), *Michel Foucault*, Routledge, London.

Smith DJ, (2002), Parenting Interacts with Social Setting, *Criminal Justice Matters,* 50, 4-5.

Sparks R, (2001), Degrees of Estrangement: The Cultural Theory of Risk and Comparative Penology, *Theoretical Criminology,* 5, 2, 159-176.

Sparks R, (2003), States of Insecurity: Punishment, Populism and Contemporary Political Culture in McConville S, (ed), *The Use of Imprisonment,* Willan, Devon.

Spitzer S, (1975), Towards a Marxist Theory of Deviance, *Social Problems,* 22, 368-401.

Stationary Office, (2002), *Justice for All,* Stationary Office, London.

Stationary Office, (2003), *Every Child Matters,* Stationary Office, London.

Stationary Office, (2005), *Government Response to the House of Commons Education and Skills Committee Report: Prisoner Education,* Stationary Office, London.

Stenson K, (2000), Crime Control, Social Policy and Liberalism in Lewis G, Gewirtz S and Clarke J, (eds), *Rethinking Social Policy,* Sage, London.

Stenson K, (2001), The New Politics of Crime Control in Stenson K and Sullivan R, (eds), *Crime, Risk and Justice: The Politics of Crime Control in Liberal Democracies,* Willan, Devon.

Stenson K, (2002), Community Safety in Middle England – The Local Politics of Crime Control in Hughes G and Edwards A, (eds), *Crime Control and Community: The New Politics of Public Safety,* Willan, Devon.

Stewart D, (2005), *An Evaluation of Basic Skills Training for Prisoners,* Home Office, London.

Stier H and Tienda M, (1993), Are Men Marginal to the Family? Insights from Chicago's Inner City in Hood J, (ed), *Men, Work and Family,* Sage, London.

Storybook Dads, (2007), Storybook Dads, http:/www.storybookdads.org.uk, accessed 4 April 2007.

Storybook Dads, (2009a), The Storybook Dads/ Mums Scheme: Your Questions Answered, http://www.storybookdads.org.uk/new%20prison%20members, accessed 25 November 2009.

Storybook Dads, (2009b), Participating Prisons, http://www.storybookdads.org.uk/page18, accessed 25 November 2009.

Talbot M, (1998), *Language and Gender: An Introduction,* Polity, Cambridge.

Taylor I, (1999), *Crime in Context: A Critical Criminology of Market Societies,* Polity, Cambridge.

Tickell A and Peck J, (1995), Social Regulation after Fordism: Regulation Theory, Neo-Liberalism and the Global Local Nexus, *Economy and Society,* 24, 3 357-386.

Tilley N, (2002), Crime Prevention in Britain, 1975-2010 Breaking Out, Breaking in and Breaking Down in Hughes G, McLaughlin E and Muncie J, (eds), *Crime Prevention and Community Safety: New Directions,* Sage, London.

Tonkiss F, (1998), Analysing Discourse in Seale C, (ed), *Researching Society and Culture,* Sage, London.

Tonkiss F, (2004), Analysing Text and Speech: Content and Discourse Analysis in Seale C, (ed), *Researching Society and Culture 2nd Edition,* Sage, London.

TUC, (2001), *Employment and Ex-Offenders,* Trades Union Congress, London.

Turok I and Webster D, (1998), The New Deal: Jeopardised by the Geography of Unemployment?, *Local Economy,* 12, 4, 309-328.

Uden T, (2004), *Learning's Not a Crime: Education and Training for Offenders and Ex-Offenders in the Community,* NIACE, Leicester.

Urry J, (1973), Towards a Structural Theory of the Middle Class, *Acta Sociologica,* 16, 3, 175-187.

Van Dijk T, (1993), Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis, *Discourse and Society,* 4, 2, 249-283.

Van Dijk T, (2009), Critical Discourse Analysis, http://www.discourses.org/oldarticles/critical%20discourse%20analysis.pdf, Accessed 20 November 2009.

Vincent A, (1987), *Theories of the State,* Basil Blackwell Ltd, Oxford.

Visher C and Travis J, (2003), Transitions from Prisons to Community: Understanding Individual Pathways, *Annual Review of Sociology,* 29, 89-113.

Walklate S, (2004), *Gender, Crime and Criminal Justice,* Willan, Devon.

Walmsley R, Howard L and White S, (1992), *The National Prison Survey: Main Findings,* HMSO, London.

Warren T, (2007), Conceptualising Breadwinning Work, *Work, Employment and Society,* 21, 317-336.

Websdale N and Chesney Lind M, (1998), Doing Violence to Women: Research Synthesis on the Victimisation of Women in Bowker L, (ed), *Masculinities and Violence,* Sage, London.

Webster R, Hedderman C, Turnball P and May T, (2001), *Building Bridges to Employment for Prisoners*, Home Office, London.

Wedge P, (1996), Loss in Childhood and Paternal Imprisonment in Howe D, (ed), *Attachment and Loss in Child and Family Social Work*, Avebury, Aldershot.

Wetherell M, (2001a), Introduction in Wetherell M, Taylor S and Yates S, (eds), *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader*, Sage, London.

Wetherell M, (2001b), Minds, Selves and Sense Making: Editor's Introduction in Wetherell M, Taylor S and Yates S, (eds), *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader*, Sage, London.

Wharton A, (2005), *The Sociology of Gender: An Introduction to theory and Research*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Wheeler B, (2003), The Mystery of the Missing Prison Visitors, http://www.newsvote.bbc.co.uk/mpapps/pagetools/print/news/bbc.co.uk/i/hi/mag azine/3314701.htm, accessed 5 February 2007.

Wheelock J, (1990), *Husbands at Home: The Domestic Economy in a Post-Fordist Industrial Society*, Routledge, London.

White R, Halsey K, Martin K and Jones M, (2006), *Implementation of the New Prison Library Specification*, DFES, London.

Whitehead S and Barret F, (2001), The Sociology of Masculinity in Whitehead S and Barret F, (eds), *The Masculinities Reader,* Polity, Cambridge.

Whitehead S, (2002), *Men and Masculinities,* Polity, Cambridge.

Wicks R and Asato J, (2002), *The Family Report 2002: Lifelong Parenting, the Changing Shape of British Family Life,* Social Market Foundation, London.

Wigfield A, (2001), *Post-Fordism, Gender and Work,* Ashgate, Aldershot.

Williams F, (1998), Troubled Masculinities in Social Policy Discourses: Fatherhood in Popay J, Hearn J and Edwards J, (eds), *Men, Gender Divisions and Welfare,* Routledge, London.

Williams M, (2000), Interpretivsim and Generalisation, *Sociology,* 34, 2, 209-224.

Wilson S, Attrill G and Nugent F, (2003), Effective Interventions for Acquisitive Offenders: An Investigation of Cognitive Skills Programmes, *Legal and Criminological Psychology,* 8, 1, 83-101.

Wood L and Kroger R, (2000), *Doing Discourse Analysis: Methods for Studying Talk and Text,* Sage, California.

Woodall J, Dixey R, Green J and Newell C, (2006), An Evaluation of the Jigsaw Visitors Centre, http://www.leedsmet.ac.uk, accessed 2 January 2007.

Worrall A and Hoy C, (2005), *Punishment in the Community: Managing Offenders, Making Choices,* Willan, Devon.

Wrench P, (2003), A View from Headquarters, paper presented at the conference, *Visitor's Centre: Every Jail Should Have One,* Action for Prisoners Families, Birmingham, 1 April 2003.

Yates S, (2001), Social Interaction: Editor's Introduction in Wetherell M, Taylor S and Yates S, (eds), *Discourse Theory and Practice,* Sage, London.

Yeandle S, (2003), The UK Labour Market in Alcock P, Beatty C, Fothergill S, MacMillan R and Yeandle S, (eds), *Work to Welfare: How Men became Detached from the Labour Market,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Young J, (1999), From Inclusive to Exclusive Society: Nightmares in the European Dream in Ruggerio V, South N and Taylor I, (eds), *The New European Criminology: Crime and Social Order in Europe,* Routledge, London.

Young J and Matthews R, (2003), New Labour, Crime Control and Social Exclusion in Matthews R and Young J, (eds), *The New Politics of Crime and Punishment,* Willan, Devon.