ESRC Transforming Social Science Scheme

Locating trust in a climate of fear: religion, moral status, prisoner leadership, and risk in maximum security prisons

Alison Liebling, Ruth Armstrong, Richard Bramwell and Ryan Williams[1]
Prisons Research Centre
Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge

Key Findings

Summary

Our research has been methodologically and conceptually transformative. Using a combination of person-centred social science, appreciative inquiry and ethnography-led measurement, we have been able to describe fundamental differences in the moral climates of apparently similar high security prisons, which lead to significantly different levels of anger and alienation ('political charge') and which shape, or make possible, what types of faith are expressed by prisoners in each environment. Both our methodology and our innovative way of reconceptualizing 'the problem' (which we have described as a problem of risk, recognition and the 'moral self') as a problem of *trust*, have opened the way for closer and more meaningful dialogue with participants, as well as more accurate measurement.

We have been able to describe and capture empirically, differences between 'disabling' environments that damage well-being and character, and 'enabling' environments that support human growth or flourishing, and the reduction of risk.

One of the innovations in this study has been to include expertise in religious studies, and in hip-hop and cultural studies in the team. The findings have significant political relevance.

1. Research aims

The aim of this study was to provide accurate, authentic and *generative*[2] description of life and experience in two high security prisons. We aimed to explore the role of trust, risk, religion, religious and moral identities, and leadership in particular.

More specific aims were:

- To diagnose and describe the moral and cultural environments of two high security prisons, and the quality of life in each.
- To understand the approach each prison took to risk, and to identify and describe the presence of 'intelligent trust' in risk management.
- To describe processes or recognition, misrecognition, fairness, kindness, forms of discrimination and their effects, and to explore the extent to which these experiences differed between prisons.
- To discover new and helpful ways of thinking about risk identification and management in prison.

[1] Additional research and administrative assistance has been conducted by Katherine Auty, Deborah Kant, Bethany Schmidt, Thomas Akoensi, Giulia Conto and Aiden Cope. We are most grateful to these PRC team members for their valuable contributions.
[2] The language of the inquiry has important outcomes embedded in it.

- To investigate the utility and validity of several groundbreaking methodological approaches, which together constitute *person-centred social science.*

- To find out whether it is possible for prisons to uphold social order: that is, to detract from, rather than add to, the 'brokenness' that brings them into existence, and if so, to describe what that looks like.

The two key risks in prison are violence (in prison and on release), and of recent concern in particular, extremist violence (in prison and on release). Because of the potentially catastrophic nature of the dangers involved, risk-related security activity is highly prominent in high security prisons. Questions are rarely asked about whether or not these activities are fair or proportionate or what the legitimate scope of security activities might be.

Because of their controlled and contained nature, but also because of the population they house, high security prisons constitute important environments in which to study the ethical life of institutions and their ethical *effects.*

The five main working hypotheses were:

1. That high security prisons will differ empirically in their levels of trust. These differences can be measured and will have major effects.
2. Some intelligent trust will generate more constructive faith exploration/identities or 'spiritual capital'[3], as well as personal growth, and lower the risk of violence; faith conversations have a more open nature in prisons where some intelligent trust flows.
3. Higher levels of trust will characterise a prison, and become extended into staff groups and between departments as well as between all staff groups and prisoners.
4. Prisons will differ in the amount of 'political charge' they generate. 'Failed state prisons', paralysed by distrust, will generate more 'political charge' and (therefore) more dangerous, power-laden faith identities, as well as stagnation and damage to well being and character.
5. Different types of prisoners will be esteemed, or rise to the top of the prisoner hierarchy, carrying influence, in these different kinds of climates.

2. Methods

We exceeded our original aims, methodologically. The research took place in two of the five high security prisons in England: Full Sutton, in York and Frankland, in Durham, and an additional prison, Long Lartin (see below). The team (of four, including the PI) was an important part of the methodology, combining expertise in i) prison sociology, Appreciative Inquiry, Dialogue, and ethnography-led measurement, ii) theology and religion, trust-religion-risk relationships, networks, iii) hip-hop/black culture, iv) life post-release, and faith based provision in and out of prison. The team conducted fieldwork over a five month period in each of the two main prisons.[4] At each site, slow entry into the field was achieved, and observation, participation, a Dialogue group[5] or rap class[6], Appreciative Inquiry, shadowing, and towards the second half of the fieldwork, long interviews were conducted with 68 staff (37 at Full Sutton, and 31 at Frankland) and 100 prisoners (60 at Full Sutton and 40 at Frankland). A Trust diagram

[3] 'Spiritual capital' is not confined to religious belief, but refers to the fundamentally human need for moral purpose and value.

[4] More than 200 person-days were spent in each prison.

[5] A discussion group with a regular group of prisoner students, facilitated by the research team and organised thematically, by consensus, and based around selected readings. See Liebling, Arnold and Straub 2015.

[6] In Full Sutton, one of the team led a RAP course for 8 prisoners, which involved close critical analysis of RAP poetry, oral performances and discussions of prisoners own work, as well as discussions of scholarly work on black British culture. This was well received, and offered prisoners an opportunity to be authentic and critical as well as self-reflecting, on their own terms.

(showing the location of trust in the prison with people and in places) was completed (a version of the Social Field Generator) in as many cases as possible. Revised Measuring the Quality of Prison Life (MQPL) surveys were conducted with 632 staff attending full staff meetings and 506 randomly selected prisoners (including new dimensions of 'trust', 'intelligent trust', 'hope' and 'political charge'; see Table 1).[7] The questionnaires were explained and completed in focus groups, including some discussion afterwards, and opportunities to ask questions or seek clarification.

Table 1. MQPL and SQL Surveys conducted

	Full Sutton Mar-14	**Long Lartin May-14**	**Frankland Aug-14**	**Total**
MQPL (Prisoners)	167	174	165	506
SQL (Staff)	183	203	246	632

Of the 100 prisoners interviewed in the two main sites, 42 per cent were Black, or mixed race, and 21 per cent were Asian. 32 per cent were White. Almost half of the sample described themselves, or were described by the prison, as Muslim.[8] A quarter of the sample were Christian, 13 per cent were atheist, and a handful were Buddhist or Rastafarian. Most had been convicted of serious crimes of violence involving drugs, gun or gang-related violence, or murder. A disproportionate number had been convicted on 'joint enterprise' charges, and were appealing against the conviction on the grounds that their involvement had been peripheral. Their sentences were long, and several were facing tariffs of 35 years or more. Two were serving natural life sentences. Several were many years beyond their tariff, and still Category A. Others were at relatively early stages in their very long sentences.[9]

The sample included ten prisoners who had been charged with an offence against the Terrorism Act (TACT offenders), a small number of whom had carried out acts of extreme violence. Most of this number (like the general population of TACT offenders) had been charged with planning or supporting terrorist activity rather than carrying acts out. Others in the sample (3) were regarded as 'at risk' (of radicalisation) in prison and were being monitored, either at the time of the interview or in the recent past, by the prison system's monthly risk management procedure (two from Full Sutton, of 12 at the time) and one from Frankland, of 2. Several acts of violence which were framed in religious terms occurred between prisoners during the research. Only two of the TACT prisoners we approached for interview chose not to participate.

Many of the prisoner interviewees were members of our Dialogue group, who met with us regularly, or of the RAP class. Some had been interviewed in previous projects or had moved between the three prisons in the study, so we were able to continue to explore their experience in different settings. Interviewees engaged deeply and

---

[7] The 'MQPL' (Measuring the Quality of Prison Life) survey is a 'tick box questionnaire' for prisoners designed and refined over several research projects aimed at improving understanding of prison life and its effects. It has a highly standardised format, but has been developed analytically and inductively from extensive, grounded explorations with staff and prisoners about what matters in prison (see Liebling, assisted by Arnold 2004). The MQPL survey consists of a number of empirical-conceptual dimensions, such as 'respect', 'staff-prisoner relationships', 'humanity', 'fairness', 'staff professionalism', organisation and consistency', 'policing and security', 'personal development' and 'well-being', which reflect aspects of prison life that vary significantly, and that matter most to prisoners (see further Liebling et al 2011).

[8] This label included individuals who explained that this identity was a strategic choice ('you have to here – there are fewer of us') and had little ideological or religious meaning. Some of the sample had converted to Islam in prison. One prisoner 'kept his distance from the Muslim guys' despite being known by friends as Muslim, as he felt it was holding his progress back.

[9] The 93 prisoners about whom we had the relevant information had served a total of 814 years in prison between them, of a total tariff (minimum period to be served) length of 1723 years.

authentically in interviews and were willing and appreciative participants. The interviews lasted several hours, and were often completed in more than one sitting. They were digitally recorded, with permission, and fully transcribed. Some took place in segregation units (in closed conditions, through perspex), but most took place in private offices in education, workshops or on the wings. The interviews generally covered details of the sentence, the prison experience and quality of life, personal background, including what participants were 'most proud of in their lives', faith, ideology and religious practices, coping, progress and psychological survival, trust, relationships in the prison, and identity and moral character. Informal conversations continued on the wings, or on revisits to the prison. Prisoners submitted written accounts, including poetry and essays, gave us additional materials, wrote letters, and in one case, wrote and, at the end of the fieldwork, performed a rap for the project: 'T-R-U-S-T, trust'.

We collected a range of institutional data in each prison, including internal security practices (such as placing prisoners on 'no one to one contact' and managing challenging behaviour procedures, SMART data from Full Sutton, Equality Monitoring data from Frankland, discrimination complaints and responses, and security downgrades.

In addition, and as an extension of the originally planned fieldwork (requested by NOMS), a third high security prison (Long Lartin) was added to the project. At this prison we conducted more limited research: an 'MQPL +' exercise[10], involving surveys, interviews and observation.[11] 'MQPL +' fieldwork was also carried out at a high security 'core local' prison (Manchester), which, in additional to its Category B local population, housed prisoners unable to be located in any of the five high security prisons for sentenced prisoners due to inter- prisoner conflict on its one Category A wing.[12]

This research report constitutes a framework for writing, based on the analysis of an extremely rich and complex data set to date. Further analysis and reflection is underway.

3. Key Findings

The hypotheses were broadly supported. The prisoner hierarchy had developed in new and complex ways, which required a more nuanced and contextualised analysis (see below). Significant variations were found in most areas of the moral quality of prison life between the prisons, including in levels of intelligent trust and political charge. These differences were related to faith identities, personal development, and the handling of risk. Full Sutton was 'new penological' and tightly controlled. Frankland was more 'old penological', with slightly more freedom of movement, a friendlier climate, and more opaque practices. Prisoners said they 'felt like a statistic' in Full Sutton but 'like a person' in (parts of) Frankland. The populations were slightly different, with slightly longer tariffs in Full Sutton, more Black and mixed race (28-30%

---

[10] MQPL+ is an in-depth, intensively-conducted, descriptive analysis of the social environment for staff and prisoners in a prison establishment, using the conceptually validated version of the Measuring the Quality of Prison Life (MQPL) and Staff Quality of Life (SQL) surveys (developed by Liebling and colleagues, and also in use by NOMS), alongside detailed observation, and sensitive, appreciative interviews with staff and prisoners. The research exercise is conducted by a highly experienced team of at least six members of the research centre, who spend at least 70 person days conducting the work. Data analysis is carried out collaboratively, with data from many other prisons in mind, so that cultural diagnosis of the prison is well informed and fully contextual. Written reports provide senior managers with a thorough assessment of the quality of their prison, and a basis for understanding and improvement.

[11] Four additional members of the Prisons Research Centre team were recruited to assist with this fieldwork (Katherine Auty, Deborah Kant, Bethany Schmidt and Thomas Akoensi) so that an additional total of 32 person-days were spent at Long Lartin.

[12] This work was carried out as part of a related project by Katherine Auty, Alison Liebling, Deborah Kant, Charlie Lloyd, Zeta Kougali, Dev Maitra and Geoff Page.

at FS compared with 17-20% at FL) and a higher proportion of Muslim prisoners at Full Sutton (22%) than Frankland (which varied from 10-12% at the time of our research).

The key findings are organised under 11 main headings: approaches to risk management; staff-prisoner relationships; trust; social organisation; prisoner leadership; political charge; faith; progress/moral identity (enabling and disabling environments); identity and difference; management and leadership ; and methods.

i. Approaches to risk management

The prisons were most similar in their approach to the management of risk. Both approached internal security as an end in itself rather than as a means to social order, although there were exceptions to this at Frankland. Neither prison had an articulate vision of what the key risk or goal of security was (the prevention of violence) but 'pursued security' via intelligence-gathering, restrictions on correspondence, thorough searching, control of movements, internal administrative processes (such as –'no one to one contact'), use of segregation, and reviews of security categorisation. All 'risks' were treated equally (that is, they brought about the same activities and practices). Neither prison downgraded prisoners more than occasionally. This was changing at Frankland towards the end of the research. Frankland's approach to counter-terrorism was, however, imaginative and person-centred. Some selective 'seeing' and 'not seeing', based on evaluations of prisoners' moral identity, informed risk evaluations. Behaviour regarded as 'risky' included talking to the 'wrong' prisoners, talking with female staff, gathering in groups, eating together, body postures/gestures, dancing in a djing class, rapping in cell, open microphone performances, dominoes, or play fighting. Staff could also become the targets of risk reporting. Prisoners regarded many specific instances of security practices as illegitimate, and they restricted their activities (including observations of their faith) to avoid triggering security concerns. Perceptions of dangerousness were often circular, so that the many forms of labelling available (including inappropriate placement in the high security estate) were extremely difficult to undo. Many prisoners were 'stuck'. The 'professionalisation' or 'bureaucratisation of risk' created knowledge gaps.

ii. Staff-prisoner relationships

Staff-prisoner relationships were somewhat distant in both establishments, but their tone and nature differed, with relational dimensions at Frankland rated significantly higher. Full Sutton was 'heavy-present', that is, staff were vigilant, professional in their security tasks, and fully in control of the wings. The staff were, on the whole, professionally outstanding, but one-sided. The nature, tone and purpose of staff relationships with prisoners was security-oriented. This was largely as a result of its challenging early history (involving several losses of order). The staff group had made clear in-roads the over the years on order. A significant threat to staff safety (a hostage taking leading to serious injury to a member of staff) took place shortly before the main fieldwork period began, from which a powerful recovery was made. Staff at Full Sutton made effective use of their power to intervene in wing dynamics, disrupt problematic prisoners and provide a safe environment. They were fully and professionally in charge and took appropriate pride in this aspect of their work. However, there was a general tendency on some of the wings for staff to take only a superficial interest in prisoner circumstances and dynamics, with the issues underlying prisoners' behaviour, relocation, or serious incidents receiving insufficient analysis. A lack of depth in staff relations with prisoners, compounded by a challenging prisoner population, and restrictions on the availability of work and opportunities to progress, had a negative impact on the character of the prison.

Staff at Frankland were energetic, receptive and proud of their establishment. They were highly 'present' but 'lighter' in tone on the mainstream wings in particular. The 'Frankland Way' was friendly, helpful and good humoured. Frankland was a good place to work, largely because of the long-serving nature of the staff group, the professional competence of staff, the friendly culture, and the high regard staff showed for one

another. The work force were highly experienced,[13] and committed to the prison. The high degree of local commitment was qualified by a sense of alienation from the broader political and organisational environment. Staff at Frankland worked in ways that were competent, professional and relationally-based. They demonstrated some excellent skills; first names were routinely used. They prioritised interacting with prisoners, knowing them well, but they sometimes used traditional language and expressed conservative attitudes. Prisoners argued that relationships were "superficial": "they encourage conversation, but then use it against you." There were different visions within the staff group about appropriate approaches to prisoners, and VP prisoners described a more traditional and sometimes demeaning attitude among some staff. This undermined consistency and predictability in the prisoner experience. Prisoner evaluations of two wings in particular - a Psychologically-Informed Planned Environment (PIPE) and the Westgate Unit for Severely Personality Disordered prisoners were outstanding (regarding the way staff worked, and the climate). Prisoners felt known and recognised on these Units, even if it remained difficult to progress (be downgraded) out. Practices in these wings seemed to be carefully grounded in a concept of 'emergent personhood' (Smith 2010).

Staff at both prisons were overwhelmingly (97%) white.

iii. Trust

We found that some trust existed in high security prisons, at low levels, but to very different degrees, and different forms of it materialised.[14] Generalised forms of trust included staff doing what they said they would do, being straight and consistent with prisoners, and providing certain 'freedoms of choice' to prisoners. The best forms of trust were used as a way to connect with an individual or facilitate growth. They included getting to know prisoners, finding their talents and strengths, encouraging them to explore new avenues, and giving them (often creatively found) opportunities to demonstrate trustworthiness. Trust tended to appear in instances rather than be continuously present, cumulative and connected. It could begin to form a 'residue' if it were repeated (as could the experience of being distrusted, which often predated the prison experience).

'Bad forms' of trust included when it was used for self-serving ends, such as when prisoners were trusted with information about other prisoners that they should not be party to. This could put both individuals and the balance of order on a wing at risk. Managers might trust incompetent staff to do their job well rather than managing their performance when either were disengaged from the purposes of their post. 'Risk based trust' had two troubling consequences: it could misplace trust by placing too much trust in categories and processes, distracting attention from troubling details because 'the right boxes had been checked'. It could also result in distrust of change and transformation because procedures failed to capture important aspects of the person's narrative or development. Staff often distrusted the transformation and hard work of prisoners in their personal development. Prisoners distrusted the hard work and efforts of staff to negotiate a system that could be inflexible or irrelevant.

Where trust was used intelligently, it could have life affirming and damage repairing consequences. For example, one prisoner who was only a third of the way through a very long sentence, but was progressing well through his sentence plan, faced a difficult situation when he relapsed and took drugs. Despite passing his drugs test, he was honest about his failings and requested help from the drug team. He was helped

---

[13] Nearly three quarters (73%) of staff survey respondents had worked for the Prison Service for over 10 years, half of this number only at Frankland.
[14] At Full Sutton the mean score on trust was 2.65 (of 5); at Frankland it was 2.85; At Full Sutton the mean score on intelligent trust was 2.57; at Frankland, it was 2.91 (an almost neutral score). These differences are statistically significant.

with this set back, which had knocked his own confidence in his own reformation, and he continued to progress. Before the end of the study, he had achieved a progressive move out of the high security estate. His personal development and official progress were steadied at a moment of crisis through his offender supervisor extending a form of intelligent (and guarded) trust that could accommodate his failures without rupturing the work he had put in over the years up to that point. Another example involved the discovery of extremist CD's thought to be in the possession of a Muslim prisoner. Despite transfer to the segregation unit during the investigation, when it was discovered the CDs were not owned by the individual concerned, he was returned to the wing and given the opportunity to be reinstated into his trusted work position or go to education (this was not typical). The suspicion that had clouded out positive relationships and activities during the investigation period was lifted. Trust could also be used to encourage prisoners who were struggling to engage with the parts of themselves that desired to do better. Proactive trust, based in its potential, could encourage a trustworthy response. One prisoner described how, when he had been in trouble, a prison officer: 'placed trust in me to come back on the wing and behave, and placed trust in me more than that in giving me a bloody job … and as much as I was tempted to abuse that trust at times … maybe not abuse it, but tell somebody where to go, I've thought 'bite your lip … he gave you a chance on this job, don't let him down' … so I went out of my way not to let him down.'

There were many other examples of relatively minor infractions resulting in a complete breakdown of trust. Prisoners could have years of compliant behaviour on record, and have successfully completed the necessary courses, but one infraction could 'set me back years'. Where offender supervisors were motivated they could use such episodes effectively as a basis for reflection, growth and progression, but small failures could also result in long-term stagnation. Individual members of staff had enormous power to hold prisoners back who they felt had broken their trust: "I was so annoyed and just thinking … just let down. I remember thinking to myself okay, like two can play at that game, and that is how I felt. Now you will see. I can never be your friend, but I can be a good ally, but I can also be the person that stops you going anywhere."

Placing trust intelligently depended upon relational knowledge and recognition. This was more prevalent in some areas of the prison than others. Trust was built in environments where cooperation in meaningful tasks was available. Areas such as certain key workshops (Braille, woodwork, horticulture), the gym, the chaplaincy, the art room, education more generally, and the music room allowed forms of trust to emerge relationally, and around achievements. It was built in areas where processes permitted 'whole people' to be present and common projects to emerge. This was observed even in adjudications, at Frankland, where disciplinary hearings were used to build relationships between staff and prisoners. Sentence planning could be such a common project, and examples of this were observed, but it was not routinely conducted, experienced or understood by staff or prisoners as such.

iv. Social organisation

Each prison's wings had different forms of social organization that ranged from high prisoner solidarity to more diffuse prisoner relationships, and these distinct organizational patterns related to differences in prisoners' relationships with staff. Consistent with existing sociological theories of prisoner organization, we found two models of prisoner solidarity arising from more distant or oppositional staff cultures. However, two additional models were found, in which staff were more present and directly contributed to more diffuse forms of prisoner organization. Models (I) and (II) represent distinct forms of prisoner solidarity marked by a social structure that is based on (I) 'power-seeking' or (II) the 'good' or 'harmonious society'. The power-seeking model is characterised by competition among prisoners and the harmonious model is characterised by cooperation. Models (III) and (IV) are distinguished by more positive staff-prisoner interactions, which provided a means for prisoners to advance objectives though staff, rather than exclusively through prisoners.

(I) Power-seeking: this social structure emerged when staff relationships were too distant or prisoners felt that staff were 'too scared', 'incompetent' or 'oppositional' to provide a useful and legitimate avenue to address prisoners' needs. It was dominated by the power-seekers on the wing who controlled their own interests and who abided by a strict form of norm enforcement. This form of social organization was described as 'prison Islam' (by which we mean 'a form of norm-regulating behaviour which is sometimes violent and exercised with reference to a righteous form of Islam'). There was a strict effort to enforce norms, such as attending and performing prayers, keeping the kitchen strictly halal, participating in violence or taking a particular side when violence broke out on a wing. Norm violators were punished to varying degrees, including through violence (punishment against homosexuality was a serious instance of this). More subtle forms of norm enforcement included questioning the authenticity of an individual's identity.

(II) The 'good' or 'harmonious society': this 'solidary' social structure also emerged where staff relationships with prisoners were too distant due to an oppositional orientation towards prisoners, fear or uncertainty, and lack of professionalism. Though the dominant staff culture was distant, some more competent or engaged staff on the wing served as outlets and resources for particular prisoners. The 'harmonious' prisoner society arose through recognition that cooperation was more advantageous than competition. In this context, a formally organised prisoner hierarchy, with informal (or sometimes more formal) leadership (see Key Finding 5, below) could serve to facilitate order, control and conflict resolution on the wing. There were also informal group 'peace-builders' who served to mediate conflicts as they occurred between groups. Cooperation arose for a range of reasons, including the desire for a stable life, to avoid damaging staff-prisoner relationships further and thus decreasing quality of life, or to avoid actions that could be injurious to a particular group. The hostage-taking incident on E Wing, for example, motivated cooperation between all prisoners a) because the incident damaged the image of Islam and (at first, and during the trial) led to poorer relationships and the risk of ill-treatment of Muslim prisoners; and b) because prisoners regarded such extreme acts as wrong, and a threat to safety and order.

(III) A 'rehabilitative culture': these forms of social organization were characterized by smaller staff-prisoner ratios and were common to therapeutic and 'enabling' environments where staff worked closely alongside prisoners. This collaboration (for example, in sentence planning) benefitted prisoners, serving personal objectives and growth. Prisoners relied on staff to problem solve, whilst also feeling able to have a voice, and staff were present and aware and thus able to penetrate and either support or concern themselves with prisoner solidarity. Prisoner relationships were more diffuse and individual, though often cooperative and materially and emotionally supportive. Staff relationships with prisoners reflected some shared vision, solidarity and confidence. Examples included G wing (the drug rehabilitation unit) in Full Sutton, and The PIPE Unit and Westgate in Frankland.

(IV) 'The good life': this model was relaxed but could stray into the somewhat collusive. Staff were present and there were generally good staff-prisoner relationships. These relationships contributed to a more diffuse form of social structure among prisoners, or the presence of smaller groupings of prisoners who generally coexisted without major problems. Examples of this model included wings where staff sometimes allowed (certain) prisoners to brew hooch. Staff were able to problem solve for prisoners. In Frankland generally, but on these and the above wings in particular, prisoners would 'go to a member of staff if they ever needed support or needed help'; whereas in Full Sutton generally, prisoners would 'go to their mates'—or to 'a handful' of good officers. This kind of social organisation was closest to, but not the same as, the model above.

v. Prisoner Leadership

Different forms of leadership emerged within these different forms of social organization. In the power-seeking environment (I), leadership relied on force. Power

relations were structured in a way that was 'gang-like': conflicts were resolved through violence. There was strict enforcement of rules, and little tolerance for different views or identities. Norms were particularly narrow in focus (as in 'prison Islam') with harsh forms of retribution for norm violators.[15] In more cooperative environments, a form of leadership emerged that was grounded in broader view of what 'prisoner society' meant. There was more incentive for prisoners to collaborate. Some Muslim prisoners described how they found that they could be more relaxed in Frankland. They could voice opinions more freely, with some exploring alternative religions such as Scientology and the Rasta faith. Leadership was defined relationally, so power lay in densely knit areas of overlapping interests, histories, and identities.

Power flowed through dominant individuals, but the role played by these dominant individuals were different in coercive social structures (I) compared to cooperative social structures. Both forms of social structure characterised by prisoner solidarity (I and II) had an ethical character that structured the flow of power and embodied the characteristics of its leaders.

A hierarchy was deemed necessary on some wings in Full Sutton to preserve the stability on the wing and to resolve conflicts. For example, the role of the Emir was deemed necessary to officiate conflict resolution and pronounce sound decision-making. Leadership in the cooperative environment was led by informal consensus within the Muslim community on who the effective peacemakers could be—whether in character or muscle power. The necessity of leadership to help resolve disputes on the wing, including disputes among Muslims, arose out of a realization that cooperation and self-imposed order and control was necessary, to avoid the 'negative ripples' felt throughout the Muslim community in prisons and more broadly in society: 'It's a ripple effect…because of those actions of maybe three or four Muslims, like with the hostage thing, it's affected the whole Muslim population in prisons. … And it is problematic. But I suppose with any religion group, gang, community, whatever group of people, it's the same thing happens: their actions always come back on the rest of the group…'

The necessity of the Emir was justified by recognition that the leader must be someone who was not a 'hothead', but someone who was reflective, calm and knowledgeable: 'that judge, in our situation, would be someone with the knowledge. [The judge] would be…the most respected Muslim on the wing'.'You go the person with the highest deen [faith]' for advice. 'Character' and a peace-making ability is important alongside Islamic knowledge'.'You pick someone who is very peaceful, a person who doesn't like violence because it's a situation where, if you use violence … you know that someone will be messed up in prison through the system'.

This 'elected' person may be involved in decision-making on the wing that serves to maintain stability and good relationships between Muslims and non-Muslims. (The relationships between Muslim and non-Muslim prisoners was, with a few exceptions, quite good.) The leader made decisions that would benefit the whole:

It is a respected person of knowledge who makes a judgment, but they only make judgment after they have got all the information that is involved. It is like a court, if you like, and they will go... and they will find out all the information, and say 'Right. This person is saying this. Is this person trustworthy? Is this person someone who you can information from? Is this person is someone that is selling drugs, we can't take information from them. If this person is gambling we can't take information from them. If he is not praying five times a day and he is listening to music you can't take

[15] Space/spaces were important: on some wings, norms being enforced included showering with underwear on; and cooking halal food only in the kitchens. In the more cooperative environments, these spaces were negotiated, and respect for difference was exercised. On A wing in Full Sutton, for example, Muslim and non-Muslim prisoners each described these spaces as places where respect for others must be negotiated ['don't cook bacon next to a Muslim's frying pan'].

information from him.' You can't trust his information. Even if he is trustworthy, you have to have that doubt because of the things that they are doing'.

A formal process of decision-making guided a 'council' of Muslim prisoners who served an advisory and investigative role and who acquired the facts related to a situation for the purposes of asking the Emir to make a judgement. The Emir would not make a pronouncement if the evidence was not clear. Individual Muslim prisoners would still act on their own accord if they perceived insult or felt compelled to action based on 'sacred values'). The purpose of the Emir in this cooperative social structure is to promote harmonious relationships rather than power, and promote stability and positive quality of life for all on the wing: leadership was given rather than acquired, and was based on having enough Islamic knowledge to make the right decisions, not only for Muslims, but for non-Muslims as well, 'because you can't be an oppressor'. This view of the role of the Emir is embedded within a cooperative vision of society, where a moral community can be built:

So, yeah, that's what it was down to, I guess, if you want to call that policing I'd say it's more just observing some of the religion, because it's to the benefit of the society, I guess, you could say that we live in. Because I don't feel like there's anything wrong in encouraging people to do good, and trying to keep them away from things which are bad. I think that should - that's one of the staples of society as a whole, innit?

Violence was a possibility within this model of leadership, 'as a last resort':

if it's something that... okay, I don't know, a person said he was going to stab him later on, and then someone comes to the Emir and says, 'Look, he said he's going to do this', then you know, in those situations I think it would be hard for the Emir, as long as it's confirmed that this person said he was going to stab him, or he wants to do something to that person, and that person is a Muslim, then it's pretty clear cut, you know, the Muslims will attack first, or attack when they see him, or whatever. But yeah, that's how it works, man.

Further consideration needs to be given to these complex dynamics, to the role of staff in policing and shaping them, and to the harnessing of cooperative potential.

vi. Political charge

The new 10-item dimension of 'political charge' (anger and alienation) worked well in the project and was informative. It included, 'my time in prison has made me angry', 'I dislike this prison's treatment of people like me', and 'I have seen things happen to other prisoners in here that are simply wrong.' Levels of political charge varied significantly. It was highest in Full Sutton (reported by lower scores; 2.61). This was significantly higher than at Long Lartin (2.72) or Frankland (2.94). These differences were felt by the research team as well as clearly described by prisoners – so Full Sutton had a more charged atmosphere; Long Lartin felt 'lighter', and at Frankland, prisoners were less tense, they talked about being treated as a person, and they engaged more willingly with staff. Four MQPL dimensions (reflecting the concept of legitimacy) accounted for 65 per cent of the variance in political charge: bureaucratic legitimacy (0.29); humanity (0.15); decency (0.12); and fairness (012).

White prisoners generally reported lower levels of political charge, except at Long Lartin, where Black prisoners reported less. In all 3 prisons, Muslim prisoners reported higher levels of political charge, but the differences between other prisoners in each prison and the experience of Muslim prisoners varied. Prisoners argued in interviews that being Black in Long Lartin was less of an 'added problem' than being Muslim in Long Lartin, or being either Black or Muslim in Full Sutton. Being Muslim was associated with higher political charge in Full Sutton than in Frankland. The question of whether cultural and/or religious practices are shut down or 'worked with' varied by prison, as did the question of who staff went to for help with prisoner dynamics. Whether diversity reps were seen as 'resources' or threats mattered in these dynamics. We are

detected ‘cynical’ versus ‘tragic’ orientations among staff towards prisoners, out of which distinctive constructions of race and religious identity were played out.

Prisoners expressed feelings of anger and alienation to varying degrees during interviews. Political charge arose for a range of reasons, including feelings being treated poorly or unfairly. Lack of access to family, or frustration over complex arrangements and location far from home, contributed. Feeling unrecognized or misrepresented, or portrayed as “a really dangerous person”, using ‘evidence, which I would say is either fabricated or exaggerated’ was ‘upsetting’: ‘when you read that piece of paper, and it's talking about me, and then I'm reading it, and I say, “I don't recognise this person they're talking about”. You know?’

Political charge was directed towards the ‘system’, towards politicians and the country: ‘As the system is run now, it's make you hate the system more.’ Hatred towards an abstract system was sometimes framed in religious language, as a source of brokenness, hopelessness, and evil: ‘… I don’t trust the system, because I find the system evil. I find them manipulative, and I find them like... How can I put it? The spawns of the devil, that’s what they are. Anyone that believes in God, whether they are Christians, whether they are Jewish, whether they are Muslims, the system is made up to break them down, because that’s what the devil does... they are all devil worshippers’.

When not operating legitimately, the ‘system’ could contribute to a powerful perception of wrong-doing against particular groups: ‘what’s happening is it’s only reinforcing the stereotypes people have, especially Muslim prisoners’. Experiences of marginalization and alienation made some prisoners want to leave the country: ‘You see my time in prison I feel.... so discriminated against but I, don’t feel comfortable living in this country anymore’.

The politician Chris Grayling (at the time, Secretary of State at the Ministry of Justice) was well-known by prisoners and frustration was often expressed about his reforms. It was striking that experiences of the criminal justice system were ‘scaled up’ to a national level and reflected broader feelings of being unable to identify any longer with or feel a sense of belonging in the country, despite England being the country of birth.

Prisoners managed these feelings and experiences in healthy and unhealthy ways, including marking their lack of progression or the absence of hope via ‘dirty protest’. Some prisoners were more resilient in managing anger and alienation. This was supported by a range of factors, including a sense of higher purpose, meaningful development, and a desire to get out of prison in order to be with family. While anger was often expressed towards staff following a lack of respect shown for prisoners’ property or values, staff relationships with prisoners provided an important antidote to feelings of anger and alienation (‘Like I forgot all my anger with the other guy’..). Practices varied between prisons, so cell searches with dogs (considered dirty in Islam) were described as follows: ‘they’d just walk on your bed in Long Lartin and things like that...and I’ve seen a lot of people come back from work and start having arguments to say look, the dog’s been in my cell and things like that...the dog goes in your cell here, in this prison, but ...they’ve had the respect to tell you and you know...people appreciate that, whereas without any warning then, you know, they start being hated, then it’s they’ve done it on purpose, I’m a Muslim, you know, that’s what they start believing, umm.’ Courtesy and respect prevented or reduced the kind of political charge that was driven by ‘wrongs’. This was a constant risk in the application of uncomfortable prison procedures.

vii. Faith

Most of the prisoners in our research identified themselves as members of a religious group. 47 of 60 of our interviewees at Full Sutton and 32 of 40 in Frankland identified

themselves as religious.[16] Religion facilitated personal transformation and growth and served to help prisoners to cope with the pains of imprisonment. Religion could also facilitate conflict and violence under a variety of conditions. In the context of concerns about radicalization, practicing Islam was high risk territory for prisoners and establishments. For Muslim prisoners, practicing their faith could be risky because it could be misconstrued as an indicator of risk, which had negative consequences on progression and quality of life. Failing to practice their faith could erode a sense of self. Some Muslim prisoners practiced their faith covertly as a result. Others practiced their faith overtly or defiantly. There were 'risks' associated with some forms of Muslim association (e.g. Muslims praying together on their wing in their cells — no more than 3 prisoners were allowed at a time), books from the chaplaincy library (e.g. the Miracle of the Spider), the emergence of powerful leaders or teachers on the wings. There was confusion about what constituted 'legitimate practice' and what might constitute 'risk'.

Religion could facilitate transformation and personal growth through meaning-making activities, including personal study, learning Arabic, reading widely, teaching others, learning from others, sharing birthdays and other events through communal meals, providing hope, stability and increasing quality of life on the wing, and allowing self-efficacy/self-empowerment and self-expression. Religion filled a gap where there was a lack of meaningful and purposeful activity.

Most of the converts to Islam that we interviewed were making a deliberate choice and could be accurately described as seekers. One interviewee said he converted because the food was better during Ramadan, another said his decision was linked to the relatively low number of Black and mixed race prisoners in the prison and the need to belong to a 'constituency', another found that after he explored Islam, it was challenging to move away from it due to pressures from other prisoners.

Religion could facilitate conflict and violence when it was enfolded within a parochial moral code (for example, a code that drew sharp contrasts in the social world: 'F..king Kuffar', that was intolerant of homosexuality, or felt that retribution was necessary when Islam was insulted). Religion could facilitate conflict and violence when individuals had nothing to lose (e.g. very long sentences with no obvious route out). Power dynamics, as a well as dominant norms about Islam held by the 'powerful', or those who chose to uphold 'prison Islam', could facilitate conflict and violence. Resistance, polarization, political charge, marginalization, and fear could also contribute to conflict and violence. There were dangers in misinterpreting faith expression and identity as risk.

viii. Progress, personal development, moral identity and personhood

Making 'progress' (that is achieving a security downgrade or transfer out in order to take steps towards release) was difficult, particularly at the early stages of long sentences, but also well beyond this. Reducing risk was mainly achievable via the successful completion of a small number of accredited offending behaviour courses (in terms of provision) but prisoners' sentence plans often required much more than this, and 'the goal posts could frequently change'. Methods of achieving access to courses that were accredited to reduce risk, and specified in sentence plans, were opaque. There were long waiting lists, and courses were not always available. Many prisoners had no idea how to move forward, and little hope that they would be able to achieve this. Few staff, and fewer prisoners, believed in the reliability or effectiveness of the systems that were in place to achieve this (that is, in the sentence planning process or in the effectiveness or relevance of offender behaviour programmes). There were no courses available in the HSE for some types of prisoners (such as international drug smugglers) to reduce their risk. But because of their crimes, criminal connections and

[16] 20% of prisoners at Full Sutton and 19% of prisoners at Frankland were recorded as of 'no religion'.

financial capacities, they remained high risk and Category A with no idea how they could change this situation.

A number of prisoners were released directly from high security prisons, rather than progressing through the system and being resettled from a lower security prison environment, for these reasons. The limited number of places available on accredited programmes, the large number of Cat A prisoners with very long sentences, and the presence of determinate, shorter tariff and category B prisoners in each establishment, meant that prisoners with very long sentences were 'not a priority' for places. Long term Category A prisoners often became 'stuck', describing a sense of hopelessness and frustration.

The research coincided with politically led changes to the Incentives and Earned Privileges Scheme, which tightened the 'sentence planning' grip further, linking it more overtly to everyday behaviour. In order for prisoners to achieve 'enhanced' status, which brought with it higher levels of privileges such as access to personal money, which permitted more phone calls home, and more generous visits entitlement, prisoners were required to 'positively contribute to prison life and to their own rehabilitation'. Prisoners emphasized the need for personal development to be possible outside of officially recognised avenues of change. This included the areas of their lives in which they could find meaning, contribute to others, and exercise more positive aspects of their personhood. Prisoners needed these processes of change and growth to feel authentic and less contrived than many of the courses on offer, but also needed them to be officially recognised. Prisoners were conflicted and sometimes confused about these aspects of their prison experience. One, for example, requested that his letters to his victims should not be considered as positive behaviour for his sentence plan review because this would detract from their purpose, which was not to benefit him but to express his sorrow and remorse. Another prisoner spoke of having to help younger prisoners to read and write 'under the radar' once the IEP changes came about because he did not want to be officially recognised for this work, as it made it seem contrived and felt like 'blackmail'. For personal development to feel authentic, it needed to be subjectively owned and authored, or take place outside of official 'progress'. However, prisoners also expressed deep frustration that they were not recognised for important personal development achieved through education, art, or looking after other prisoners. There were tensions between authentic personal development and official progression. Prisoners felt like the objects rather than the subjects of attempts to 'address offending behaviour'.

Some prisoners progressed by engaging with officially recognised routes of personal development, participating in offender behaviour courses, learning from them (often despite initial resistance) and then demonstrating the results of this learning on the wings. However these officially recognised routes to progression could be frustrating and fragile. Staff and prisoners frequently gave examples of prisoners who had done everything they needed to in order to progress but were still not being downgraded or moved onwards to a lower category security prison. Mistakes, or misunderstandings, could be catastrophic. There were exceptions (as discussed in Trust, above) such as an offender supervisor who working constructively with a prisoner returned from a Category B establishment having 'messed up' to get him back on a progression track. Sometimes prisoners chose avenues of personal development that were antagonistic to the prison environment – a beard kept long because it represented an authentic self and form of personal development was not censured and imposed. Other prisoners had to acquiesce to 'accepted' forms of personal development – studying English Literature or Roman Art and Architecture rather than 'modern languages', or history and as these subjects were deemed 'too risky', whereas English Literature and Roam Art represented 'safe' ways to develop personhood. Prisoners who chose not to engage with official routes to progress, no matter how personally transformed they were, had no hope of getting out of the high security estate. The reasons were often complex, and included being in denial of the offence, or finding the courses traumatic and lacking sufficient support.

In the instances where 'making progress' and individual personal development coincided, this involved prisoners experiencing a sense of ownership and control over the direction and pace of their journey – the route or course was preferred, it was relevant to areas they were 'ready to work on' and there was a sense, at least, of election to pursue it. Such individuals felt understood and supported by their offender supervisors, who were their champions rather than their managers. There were many instances where staff wanted prisoners to progress but could not get them on the necessary course, or get them downgraded by the establishment's local Category A board in order to move them to another prison to take a necessary course. There were also examples of staff who could be creative or relentless in order to help prisoners they 'believed in' to access the opportunities they needed to progress, sometimes quite early into long sentences.

ix. Identity and difference

The flow of trust was structured by 'race' in both prisons, with members of different ethnic groups experiencing significantly different treatment by officers. While in one prison white prisoners complained about limitations on family contact, being humiliated by their treatment in the prison and the impersonality through which officers dealt with prisoners, these experiences were intensified amongst black prisoners, who on average spent more time on Category A security status, were given significantly fewer opportunities to work in trusted positions in comparison with white prisoners, and were more likely to be subject to local security measures limiting contact with non-uniformed staff. In the other prison the reported differences in the experiences of black and white prisoners were much less. Black prisoners were aware of systematic unequal treatment in the second prison, but they were more likely to see this as 'discrimination' or unwitting racism and less likely to criticise the entire prison as being a 'racist jail' because of the friendlier relationships in general.

Managers responses to the official measures of the unequal treatment and outcomes experienced by different ethnic groups in both prisons, was focused around the management of 'prisoners' perceptions' and the need to maintain confidence amongst staff. Both managers and staff were sensitive to accusations of individual or institutional racism, but demonstrated little willingness to identify or to tackle discriminatory practices.

Collective identities amongst prisoners were viewed with suspicion, yet often reinforced through officers' unwillingness to work through difference or to engage with prisoners as individual human beings. Where officers emphasised care, the ability to approach prisoners with humanity, and a willingness to understand different perspectives, levels of trust between all prisoners and officers increased, and the differences between the experiences of members of different ethnic groups within the prison decreased. Lack of 'cultural' engagement produced higher risks and could disrupt the aim of reducing reoffending for particular groups of prisoners.

The flow of trust was also structured by religion. Particular ethnic identities interacted with particular faith identities in different ways in each prison. In general those with either non-white or non-Christian identities had poorer experiences than white Christian prisoners. However, the suspicion through which Muslims, for example, were viewed was moderated by ethnicity. Being Asian generally improved the experiences of Muslim prisoners. On the other hand being black tended to intensify staff suspicions as well as prisoners perceptions of their unequal treatment. We observed institutionally specific ways through which 'race' was conceptualised, conflated with religion and contributed to unequal treatment. Different groups of prisoners interpreted unequal treatment in different ways. Black prisoners drew on both their 'ethnic' and 'religious' identities to inform their understanding of the conditions of their incarceration. Many of these prisoners were also attentive to the way in which white prisoners who converted to Islam were treated poorly, sometimes describing the change in officers' treatment of white Muslims as a process of racialisation.

x. Management and leadership

Part of the explanation for the social and cultural organisation of each prison lay with the Governors and senior managers at each prison. Staff trusted in different aspects of their Governors' role (e.g., 'protection' vs 'vision'). The moral identity as well as professional priorities of Governors mattered in shaping staff attitudes and practices. Almost everything Governors did (including the selection of individual managers for key roles) provided either a support for, or undermined, an area or aspect of work. Senior managers could be 'enablers, leaders and catalysts', 'competent-limited', or 'blockers'. Some strong leaders were less morally driven, or were self-serving. Many outstanding staff had leadership qualities, and made a difference, despite not occupying leadership positions. The best Governors were 'moral dualists' or 'high Integrative Complexity' (complex thinkers).

xi. Methods

Four aspects of the methodology developed in this study were critical to its success and constitute findings as well as methods: the use of appreciative inquiry (for example, placing trust and experiences of trust at the heart of the project), the continued, cumulative development of 'ethnography-led measurement', the use of Dialogue, and related class-based exercises (such as the RAP class), and an 'I-Thou' approach to participants: that is, an orientation towards an 'experiencing subject', not an 'experienced object' (Buber 2010); as a person and not a category. This approach stands in methodological and theoretical opposition to existing frameworks: it is humanistic, not 'scientific-naturalistic'; it is creative and intimate, not objectifying and distant; it is 'yielding', not controlling. We 'meet the Other', or 'sit where they sit', as living, whole 'persons in mutual relation' (Buber 2010: ix) and in this meeting, 'no reduction of the I or of the Thou' takes place.[17] This is difficult in a research environment 'hardened into a world of It' (Buber 2010: 54). This research approach assumes a kind of 'theology of the person' that may appear to pose risks, but respects the human dignity of the researched. The research is *sociological* and represents *person-centred social science*.

Prisoners engaged with the research project deeply and meaningfully, many approaching the team on wings, or elsewhere in the prison ('are you the guys doing this study of trust?'). Apparently unreachable/'dangerous' prisoners also engaged in meaningful dialogue once convinced that they would be approached as more than their ascribed identity. Many of these prisoners told complex stories of (for example) their past or present propensity to use violence, and (in the case of prisoners regarded as extremists) were poised between confirmation of or disillusionment with their hatred or anger. This methodological approach shared some similarities with some best practices observed by the team, and described by prisoners. The research presence changed some practices and understandings.

4. Conclusion

The 'problem of faith', including the proper policing of faith- based claims, and 'the problem of trust' are new concerns for those managing high security prisons. The research found that 'relationships of recognition' are difficult, and staff are sometimes uncomfortable or uncertain in their work in this area. Faith now poses a risk, as it acted as a temptation, offered a source of power, and presented a source of meaning for prisoners in an otherwise bleak environment. We found strong, single narratives about who Muslim prisoners were and what it meant to convert to Islam in prison, in some areas of each prison. These strong assumptions often constitute what philosopher John Dunn refers to as a 'failure in comprehension' in individual cases (Dunn 2012, pers. comm., 10 March 2013): for example, where devout Muslim prisoners 'talked theology' with their more fundamentalist peers. A similar finding emerged in relation to Black and mixed race prisoners. Strong narratives about where danger lay made 'diagnosing the situation' (and therefore cultivating peaceful encounters) harder to accomplish. In this context, staff tended to back off, or to favour the kinds of prisoners they were

[17] Within appropriate professional boundaries.

used to. This created conflict and accusations of discrimination. These practices varied, with significant implications for outcomes in those establishments.

This research provides authentic description of what kinds of prison regimes or practices damage or repair order, via different kinds of relationships and practices. In high security prisons, varying conditions bring the relationship between 'environment' and 'survival', personal growth, and order into sharp focus. Prisons differ significantly in a number of ways that matter. In particular, prisons with more legitimate moral climates – that is, where prisoners feel they are treated fairly and with respect, where staff use their authority and professional skills competently, and where prisoners feel recognised and supported in their personal emergence – lead to better outcomes, including levels of political charge. This is extremely difficult work. Prisons with more legitimate climates tend to lead to fewer threats to order, and better orientations towards faith (that is, there are fewer attractions presented by faith identities linked to 'political charge'). A preoccupation with abstract concepts of risk in some high security prisons in particular can generate the kind of anger and alienation among prisoners that criminal justice practices should aim to avoid.

Existing approaches to the study of risk/extremism are often reductionist (flat and narrow) rather than stratified and deep. Combining risk assessment with 'intelligent trust' based on a broad concept of 'emergent personhood', and grounded in knowledgeable relationships, would *reduce* as well as manage risk more effectively.

5. 4 achievements

1. We have developed and refined a deep and sensitive barometer of the moral quality of prison life. The creation and testing of three key additional dimensions: trust, intelligent trust, and political charge, constitutes a significant advance.
2. The basic research hypotheses have been supported.
3. The study provides strong support for a 'critical realist personalist' approach to social science research (in this case, drawing on appreciative inquiry, ethnography-led measurement, and an 'I-Thou' approach to participants. In this sense, the normative is embedded in the methodology, which is robust. There are significant practical and intellectual benefits from adopting such an approach. This is what we mean by *person-centred social science*.
4. The study suggests a revised approach to the study and management of risk, incorporating the concept and practice of 'intelligent trust'.

5. Outputs and Impact

Reports on each prison have been written and shared with Governors and senior managers in the high security estate. A number of formal presentations have been given. A book (*Prisons and the Problem of Trust*) and two peer reviewed articles are underway, and four other peer reviewed articles are planned.

Our findings have captured the interest of scholars of trust, legitimacy and faith, and will significantly shape future research agendas in these areas, in criminal justice and in relation to broader social practices. The PI has been invited to participate in a two day event led by Lord Rowan Williams, in Dialogue with the Dalai Lama ('Growing Wisdom, Changing People') at the University of Cambridge, on the theme of Universal Responsibility, as a result of the findings of this study. Keynote presentations have been given at the Universities of Birmingham and Brussels, and invitations accepted at the Universities of Oxford, Griffith (Queensland, Australia) and at the International Corrections Professionals Association Conference in Melbourne, 2015. Senior and operational practitioners are engaged with us in active discussions of the new empirical-conceptual dimensions of 'intelligent trust' and 'political charge' and using data on differences between prisons (and wings) to a) disentangle personal growth and religious coping from the risks of radicalization; and b) better understand their establishments, and so improve outcomes as part of their work on 'rehabilitative

culture'. Practitioners are piloting the introduction of risk assessment and management strategies that incorporate 'whole person' and complex changes to/developments in religious and ideological trajectories. Legal officers at the European Commission (and elsewhere) have asked us to be involved in their deliberations on policies addressing the risks of extremism.

How have your findings been used?
This research is being used to increase the effectiveness of public services and policy. In England and Wales, our findings have been used to inform a newly launched 'rehabilitative strategy' in the high security estate and in the Prison Service more generally. We are contributing to/commenting on a series of training materials/policy chapters for use in creating a 'rehabilitative culture' in the high security estate. A new categorisation review process for risk assessing prisoners on Category A, informed by our work, was in the second stage of being piloted at the time of writing. This revised procedure has led to greater emphasis on long-term prisoners' progress and accomplishments outside the framework of narrowly conceived/insufficiently available offending behaviour courses. This highly visible transformation in practice has 'unblocked' a number of stagnating prisoners, leading to enhanced perceptions of legitimacy and greater engagement by others in those aspects of the system that help to reduce their risk. We have presented and discussed our findings at several high level seminars, including a NOMS Leaders Seminar on December 17 2014 ('Risk, Trust, Faith Identities and Personhood in High Security Prisons') and the Governing Governors Forum on 15 May 2015 ('Governing Good Enough prisons'). We are spending a day with 48 members of the Metropolitan Police on 1 June 2015, presenting our findings and discussing the implications of our results. Governors of the three prisons in our study (among others) have engaged with us enthusiastically throughout, and have observed that 'the I-It, I-Thou distinction' has 'nailed it' for them (that is, has described and explained their world authentically, and has opened up new ways of seeing and working with this complex population).

We wish to stress that this report constitutes the beginning of the analysis and writing process.