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Abstract

Previous research has clearly demonstrated the positive impact of therapeutic interventions on offenders’ well-being. Much less is known about the impact on prison staff facilitating and delivering such interventions. We employed qualitative methodology to capture a deeper understanding of the work of therapeutic prison officers. Seven prison officers working in a U.K. Category B therapeutic community prison were interviewed about their working lives, including their own participation in therapy. Following a thematic analysis approach, key findings indicated that the physical and cultural work environment was very important to staff; the therapeutic element of their job role, although demanding, was both satisfying and rewarding; and that working in a therapeutic prison environment provided the opportunity for personal as well as professional development. We conclude that further attention should be given to the unique nature of therapeutic prison work and the positive impact it can have on well-being at work.
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In discussing the origins of the therapeutic community prison (TCP), Stevens (2010) writes, “prison-based democratic therapeutic communities have evolved from their unlikely wartime psychiatric antecedents, into a well-established, internationally respected , alternative model of imprisonment and treatment” (p. 19). Her Majesty’s Prison (HMP) Grendon, for example, which is the only fully dedicated TCP in the United Kingdom, is divided into separate therapeutic wings, each of which operates as an autonomous therapeutic community (TC). These communities are based on four key principles: responsibility, empowerment, support, and confrontation (Cullen, 1994). Routine procedures within the prison embody these principles on a regular basis. Chief among these procedures are small therapy groups and feedback. During therapy groups, prison officers encourage prisoners to talk, among other things, about their offences to address offending behaviour and antisocial attitudes. Following this, feedback informs community members about what took place in the small groups— highlighting any traumatic or sensitive issues (Wilson & McCabe, 2002). The approach of staff within secure therapeutic settings forms an integral part of the therapeutic process and helps to facilitate respect and a sense of community.

Many studies have been conducted looking at the efficacy of therapy on offenders’ psychological and emotional health and well-being during their time in custody. One such innovative example was the Good Vibrations project, which aimed to help develop offenders’ team-working and communication skills through a series of gamelan (Indonesian percussion) workshops. The study concluded that participating in the project had a sustained and positive emotional and psychological impact on participants (Wilson, Caulfield, & Atherton, 2008). The results of this and other similar initiatives may, therefore, help to promote further facilitation of therapeutic activities. Although the benefits of therapy for offenders’ well-being are well established in the literature (e.g., Rivlin, 2007; Wilson & McCabe, 2002), little is known about the motivational and affective experiences of prison officers working in such prisons.

The centrality of staff–prisoner relationships in aiding and maintaining the rehabilitative process is consistently acknowledged (Crewe, 2009; National Offender Management Service, 2008). Yet, despite this, Liebling, Price, and Shefer (2011) note that prison officers are still regarded as the invisible ghosts of penality and this is especially apparent in the paucity of research examining the day-to-day experiences of the working lives of prison officers compared with that of other public uniformed professions such as police officers. Research looking at hazard exposure in police work (Collins & Gibbs, 2003; Houdmont, Kerr, & Randall, 2012) has found policing to be a stressful occupation; this is despite police officers having much less prolonged contact with potentially troubled individuals. The relationship between offenders and prison officers is often a more sustained one, in that, prison officers spend a continuous amount of time with the same prisoners in their care, many of whom have suffered personal traumas.

Research that has focused on the broad nature of prison work gives a clear picture that this is a stressful occupation, which can result in burnout and poor work–life balance. In particular, it has been found that excessive job demand negatively affects prison officers’ mental health status (see Kinman, Clements, & Hart, 2017; Schaufeli & Peeters, 2000), leading to symptoms of emotional exhaustion and burnout. Similarly, a study conducted by Johnson and colleagues (2005), looking at the experience of work-related stress across occupations, found poorer psychological health among prison officers than most other occupations (including nursing, firefighters, and veterinary surgeons). The harmful consequences of burnout are wide ranging for both organisations and employees. There is evidence that prison officers who are more “burned out” report poorer physical and psychological health problems, less job satisfaction, and commitment (Griffin, Hogan, Lambert, Tucker-Gail, & Baker, 2010; Lambert, Barton-Bellessa, & Hogan, 2015).

In recent years, a new construct called the *psychosocial safety climate* has been developed by Dollard and Bakker (2010), which is defined as “organisational practices and procedures for the protection of worker psychological health and safety” (p. 580). Examples of stressors inherent within the psychosocial work environment relate to the design, organisation, and management of work (Cox & Griffiths, 2002). A qualitative study conducted by Nurse, Woodcock, and Ormsby (2003), looking at the influence of environmental factors on the mental health of prison staff, found that prison culture, organisation, and staff shortages cause high staff stress level, resulting in staff sickness, which in turn caused greater stress for remaining staff. More recently, another study conducted by Kinman, Clements, and Hart (2016) examined the well-being of U.K. prison officers using the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) Stress Indicator Tool, which is widely used in the United Kingdom to assess key areas of psychosocial hazard in the workplace. Respondents reported lower levels of well-being for all hazard categories, and mental health and job satisfaction were poorer among prison officers than other emergency and security services in the United Kingdom.

The work of modern-day prison officers is no longer confined to traditional custodial “turnkey” tasks. Officers are now more increasingly being called upon to actively engage in prisoner rehabilitation, including addressing offending behaviour and promoting prosocial attitudes. The emphasis on rehabilitation and peacekeeping is particularly synonymous with prison officers working in a therapeutic setting. The next section discusses the unique role of officers in these institutions.

Understanding the Therapeutic Prison Officer Role

Democratic therapeutic communities developed for custodial settings are intended to help their members understand and lessen or overcome their social, psychological, and emotional problems (Stevens, 2010). The principal ethos of any secure establishment is to maintain the safety of all those placed in custody. Within mainstream establishments, the officer’s role is primarily focused around custodial duties (e.g., supervision of prisoners, security checks, control, and restraint). Although day to day, they assist in creating a safe and secure environment where prosocial behaviour and rehabilitation are encouraged, officers have no formal therapeutic job responsibilities such as leading and facilitating therapy sessions. However, in secure therapeutic communities, the officer’s role encompasses both that of a custodian and a treatment provider. As part of their role, alongside their custodial duties, therapeutic prison officers are required to facilitate therapy groups, and in doing so, they are potentially exposed to extreme emotions, distorted cognitions, and graphic details of horrific crimes.

Although prisons such as HMP Grendon operate as a TC, their primary identity is that of a prison, and as such, it could be said that the two philosophies of custody and therapy may appear to be incompatible. For example, any trust, openness, and mutual respect established during therapy groups could later be negated as a result of the staff conducting necessary security-related duties such as cell and/or bodily searches. In discussing the issue of maintaining order and control in a TC, Genders and Player (1995) wrote, “at face value, the prison and the therapeutic community appear to be highly incongruous cohabitees” (p. 120). Moreover, subsequent research has found that role conflict can occur working in this dual capacity (Castle, 2008; McManus, 2010). Role conflict has also been found in mainstream prisons between treatment and custodial staff; in terms of nurses’ relationships with prison officers, there is felt to be a professional divide in terms of underpinning philosophies of practice (Walsh, 2009). Therapeutic prison work is distinctive and requires subtle use of power through enduring and challenging relationships, which has lasting effects on the recipients. The dual role of providing treatment and being a custodian is highly skillful work, which requires further exploration as work such as this contributes significantly to offenders’ quality of life and to a prison’s overall moral performance.

As some previous research has concluded that prison work can be stressful and potentially damaging to an officer’s occupational well-being (e.g., Walker, Jackson, Egan, & Tonkin, 2015), this article sets out to explore the experiences of prison officers working in a dual role capacity and to understand how this role affects their well-being.

Method

The research proposal for the present study followed the process for consideration of research applications made to HM Prison Service, and ethical approval was subsequently granted from the HM Prison Service.

*Participants*

Prison officers working in a U.K. TCP were invited to take part in the study. A total of 24 out of 96 officers expressed interest in being interviewed and after a follow-up period, seven officers were still available for interview. All interviewees were male. The mean age was 49 years (*SD* = 9.8 years, range = 30-57 years). The number of years spent working at the TCP ranged from 2.5 to 22 years.

*Semistructured Interview*

A semistructured interview format was used to elicit information from prison officers about their therapeutic job role. As the interviews progressed, this ability to “modify one’s line of enquiry [and] follow up interesting responses and investigating underlying motives” (Robson, 1993, p. 229) was an evolving feature of this study. Although all participants were asked the same series of specific questions, each interview was characterized by personal anecdotes, which were followed up with further questions, thereby giving rise to slight variations in the interview schedule. This was viewed as a positive addition to the data collection process as it allowed for a variety of responses, promoting a greater and richer spread of information.

All the questions were open ended, designed to encourage disclosure of personal experiences and views and to avoid rigidity. In an attempt to help the participants relax and to develop rapport, the interview commenced with a series of introductory questions about their occupational background, what they enjoyed about their job, and what qualities they thought were required to carry out the prison officer role. The interview schedule included questions about the occupational background of the prison officers, as well as aspects of their working life, such as the dual role of encompassing both custodial and caring duties and the role of social support from colleagues (for example).

*Procedure and Analysis*

All interviews were conducted off site at a place of the interviewees’ choosing. Interviews lasted between 30 and 80 min and were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim. Meadows and Dodendorf (1999) note that transcribing can often have difficulties capturing the spoken word in text form because of sentence structure. All participants were given the opportunity subsequently to read and amend the transcripts postinterview. No amendments were made. One researcher, who had significant experience of prison work, conducted all the interviews.

The verbatim transcripts were analysed using thematic analysis (TA), described by Braun and Clarke (2006) as “a method for identifying, analysing, and reporting patterns (themes) within data” (p. 6). A second independent researcher also coded a portion of the data, and, after a review of the joint coding, it was deemed that there was a sufficient level of agreement between researchers in the identification of codes. TA has previously been utilized in other occupational health research, where it was shown to be a useful means by which to identify themes in qualitative data (Leka, Jain, Iavicoli, Vartia, & Ertel, 2011; Payne, Jones, & Harris, 2013).

Results and Discussion

Officers discussed several aspects of how their work, although challenging, had a positive impact on their occupational well-being. Examples included feeling rewarded for their therapeutic work in terms of job satisfaction and benefitting from a strong culture of peer support at work. Three main themes are presented, each reflecting different aspects of the participants’ experiences as a therapeutic prison officer: the *work* *environment, therapeutic job role*, and *occupational reward*. Each main theme contained subthemes as presented below.

*Theme 1: The Work Environment*

Most participants expressed that being a prison officer at a TCP was different compared with their experiences of working in other mainstream prisons. All the officers who were interviewed had worked in at least one other mainstream prison environment. The work environment encompasses some of the descriptions given by the officers detailing these differences including culture, staff/prisoner relationships, and peer support. Participants felt that the main thing that set therapeutic prison working apart from mainstream prisons was the working relationships that exist between officers and prisoners.

*Culture.* All participants reported that the TCP was a physically safe environment towork in, with instances of cell take-outs and control and restraint (C&R) teams rarely used.

You get kitted up sometimes but it’s very rare. The majority of the time the guys [prisoners] will walk anyway, they won’t get what we class as “wrapped up.” You know, they won’t get involved, talking is used. (Officer F)

HMP Grendon (for example) is one of 10 secure establishments in the South Central region of England, and the Ministry of Justice (2017) Safety in Custody statistics revealed that between 2000 and 2016, there were only twelve assaults on staff at the prison. This is extremely low in comparison with the other nine establishments in the region that collectively recorded 297 assaults on staff in 2016 alone. Participants who made the point that C&R episodes were rare, were also clear in highlighting that this was a very different experience from other prisons.

I have been involved in two [C&R episodes] and only witnessed one or two and that’s in my whole time there, so very few and far between. And I think you know that’s why this place really differs probably from a lot of other prisons, it really is a real last resort. (Officer E)

The comparatively low incidence of C&R usage was explained in terms of both the working ethos of the TCP and the personal attributes and strengths of the staff.

If you can move people without anybody getting hurt then surely that’s the best outcome and that’s generally the kind of attitude here. I know some prisons are like, “let’s get kitted up and splatter him.” (Officer E)

Well thankfully because I think of the professionalism of the staff, the great interpersonal skills of the staff here, we very fortunately have very few C&R incidents. (Officer D)

Participants reported that maintaining the therapeutic ethos while upholding security often required them to be more tolerant and accepting of certain behaviours that, in a mainstream prison environment, would be more likely to result in formal adjudications. One participant, who identified himself as a “discipline officer” joined the TCP from a mainstream Category B prison, and recalled the difficulty adjusting to the workplace culture:

It was difficult, sometimes someone would come in effing and blinding in the office and first thing I’m looking for is the alarm bell. Early days I sat there in disbelief, and one other officer said . . . “go on and we’ll talk about it in the groups.” . . . and this was my learning curve, that there is an alarm bell but we won’t use it. (Officer G)

These quotes are a clear demonstration that TCP prison staff challenge disruptive behaviour therapeutically. The benefits of a therapeutic relationship between prisoner and prison officer may be that information can be gleaned about an incident before it happens and this has statistically proven to be an effective form of control. This outcome is similar to that found by Douglas and Caulfield (2014), who looked specifically at *control* in officers working at HMP Grendon. All participants held the view that aspects of control differ between HMP Grendon and the main prison estate, explaining that they used control through talking, as opposed to a reliance on physical and/or procedural control.

Within TCPs, there is still a requirement to maintain safety, which can lead to some complexity around not only accommodating for but also managing prisoners. In certain situations, this meant having a degree of flexibility in their approach to disruptive behaviour and dealing with prisoners in a more open and meaningful way.

I think you’d have to be as genuine as you possibly can and whereas you might hold back with some things in ordinary prisons, you have to be willing to be able to explain yourself a bit easier within this sort of setting. (Officer F)

Working within a democratic TC and being “genuine” is clearly aligned with the characteristics of working in a caring profession rather than “traditional” prison work. Pogrebin (1978) noted that viewing the prisoner as a person in need of treatment and also as someone who has violated the law can put the officer in an uncomfortable position.

However, it was expressed by most participants that being tolerant is made easier by expecting, that in a prison environment, individuals may get angry and “act out.” So, with this expectation in mind, disruptive behaviour can be accommodated for without compromising relationship boundaries or safety.

*Staff/prisoner relationships.* Participants were clear about the key difference betweenTCPs and other mainstream prisons, which was the nature of the working relationships that officers develop with prisoners. In mainstream prisons, it was felt that there is a “them and us” position between staff and prisoners, where close relationships are not expected to be formed. However, in doing therapeutic prison work, there is a requirement and an expectation to closely interact with prisoners. Most participants stated that forming close working relationships with prisoners was sometimes a challenging thing to do, with one participant describing his role as a “specialist.”

There’s been several staff that have come here from other mainstream prisons who just can’t do it, either because they really dislike prisoners and they think they should be basically banged up 24 hours a day . . . they’re a lock ‘em up and throw away the key job. (Officer C)

The above comment highlights that there may be a certain set of qualities that are needed to work therapeutically with offenders, which may be different to those required in a mainstream prison. Kent-Wilkinson (1993) conducted a study in a Canadian maximum security unit and wrote, “in some cases where the criminal offence is so horrific some professionals believe that respect for the offender is not deserved” (p. 25). Working in a TCP setting without understanding and accepting the need for rehabilitation would create cognitive dissonance within prison staff and this is evidenced by the comment below.

. . . and I think sometimes it’s difficult to get past the offences enough to actually do the work and I can understand that cos you hear some pretty horrible things when you’re on groups. (Officer C continued)

Interestingly, one participant made the point that prisoners who had spent time in mainstream prisons could also experience difficulty adjusting to the culture of a TCP and forming closer relationships with uniformed staff.

They’d stand there and you’d say “come in” and they say “I can’t” and they go away. It’s like there’s a brick wall there, our domain and their domain. (Officer A)

To overcome these barriers, participants felt that it was important to spend time with the men playing pool or having a chat as this helped to foster trust. Morse et al. (1992) suggest that a genuine concern for patients, with concomitant feelings of compassion and empathy, can be a motivating force to developing therapeutic relationships in forensic hospital settings.

Some TCPs are designed to allow for a higher staff–prisoner ratio, enabling officers more time to get to know the prisoners in their care on a more personal level, something which may not be possible in a more highly populated, understaffed prison. Working in a smaller prison is also beneficial for promoting interpersonal relationships between staff members.

I remember when I was at [Prison X], which is a big prison in London there was . . . you know there was people there that didn’t even know the others that worked there, it was that vast. There is a very personal touch about X. (Officer F)

Forming close links with immediate colleagues can lead to a greater sense of camaraderie and a stronger peer support network (e.g., Crawley & Crawley, 2008). Overall, there was a general opinion that strong relationships can and do occur within the TCP, making it a safe, friendly environment for staff and prisoners alike. In researching the social climate at HMP Grendon, Newberry (2010) also found that the “Grendon” environment is perceived as safer and relationships between staff and prisoners are more positive than in other prisons. Participants described feeling supported with work-related matters, having trust in their colleagues, and feeling safe.

It’s a brilliant tight staff group and I think it’s a fact and it’s one the things that makes coming to work a pleasure, because if you’ve got a good staff group to work with, no matter what the day brings, you can all have a bit of a laugh and get a bit of banter and that helps during your day and that’s the main thing. (Officer E)

*Theme 2: Therapeutic Job Role*

Therapeutic job role encompasses descriptions participants gave about the “human” element of their role in working therapeutically with offenders. This included a discussion of the interpersonal skills that officers felt were necessary for therapeutic prison work. Most participants described the complexities around aiming to be empathic and not only identifying with the prisoners as real people but also maintaining a professional distance. Previously, Crawley (2004a) described a “fear of moral contamination” in those who had prolonged contact with violent offenders, including listening to graphic details of their crimes (p. 217). However, most participants in this study discussed positive changes within themselves as a result of their therapeutic work.

*Skills required for the job.* Crawley and Crawley (2008) note that, “prison officers workin an occupation that has been thought to require the traditional male qualities of dominance, authoritativeness, and aggressiveness” (p. 141). As already discussed, therapeutic prison officers require a unique set of skills to work therapeutically with prisoners. Some officers had described that many prison staff used to be recruited from military backgrounds and how, over the years, things had moved away from a traditional disciplinary service to focusing more on welfare work and rehabilitation.

You know rather than kind of like big beefy guys who’re just going to hammer someone into the ground, there’s a lot more emphasis on interpersonal skills and personality. (Officer C)

Zimmer (1986) wrote that more traditional female qualities are thought to be not merely unnecessary but actually “detrimental” to prison work (p. 3). However, when participants were asked about what personal qualities they thought were necessary to effectively carry out their role, they all described less traditionally masculine skills such as patience, caring, and understanding. Other research (e.g., Liebling & Price, 1998; Woodall, 2007) also reported the value of female prison staff and “feminine” skills in relation to staff–prisoner relationships. Part of the officers’ responsibilities is to encourage the therapeutic relationship and to form a rapport with prisoners. In speaking about nurse–patient relationships, McQueen (2000) writes, “since almost everyone engages in interpersonal social interaction it is easy for this to be overlooked as a skill and for such skills to be disregarded for their therapeutic value” (p. 730). If good interpersonal skills have a bearing on the quality of care that the officers can provide in a therapeutic setting, then this is something that needs to be explicitly recognised for all new prison officers within the wider prison service. One participant summed up the actual complexity of and qualities needed for the role, which directly reflects the delicacy in striking a balance between custody and care.

Someone who is a good listener, someone who can give good advice, someone who can be sympathetic but at the same time quite firm, because obviously it’s a TC prison, you need to have your boundaries as well cos it’s fairly difficult as we’re prison officers but also therapeutic, so you have to have the strictness of a prison officer, alongside the sympathetic calmness of a therapist. (Officer G)

*Empathy.* During a group therapy session, officers encourage prisoners to talk abouttheir offences to address their offending behaviour and antisocial attitudes. As a result of this, officers frequently listen to the details of crimes, some of which were described as “shocking” and “horrific.” Most participants felt that the ability to try to understand prisoners’ actions was essential to the therapeutic process.

It’s trying to get to the understanding isn’t it and the understanding makes the difference. So if you can understand what it is and a lot of them relate to childhood then you can see where it’s come from. They’re damaged people, right from small, so yeah, you don’t lose sight of it, you work with it. (Officer A)

Some participants did admit that there were times when being empathic was difficult. One participant explained that he thought more about the prisoner’s offence and their victim(s) when the individual was being disruptive, complaining about trivial issues, such as food portions at meal times.

And you think how dare you! Your victim would love to be sat here eating a sausage. And those times you go back to the offence and think—how dare you actually say that. But you can’t let that interfere with the work you’re doing. (Officer E)

The above comment is a very “human” and natural response and Crawley (2004b) notes,

The ways in which prison officers feel about the work they do and how they feel about prisoners can have significant implications. A failure to display the “right” emotions is to risk acquisition of a deviant identity—someone who is either not “one of us” or not up to the job. (p. 424)

This presents a real challenge of the job—having to set aside personal emotion so that therapeutic work can take place. TCP prison officers do attend weekly sensitivity meetings and also have access to feedback sessions and supervision with a member of clinical staff, but there were mixed opinions about its value. Some interviewees felt that it was a safe place to share anything that was difficult to absorb after groups and others felt that it was “*watered down*” (Officer B), and that uniformed staff attendance at these meetings is generally low.

*Personal growth.* All but one of the participants who were interviewed believed thatthey had changed and “grown” as a person since working in a TCP. Their personal growth and self-fulfillment was based on the key development of interpersonal skills, including a greater capacity for listening, understanding, and compassion.

I’ve seen things in myself that I didn’t recognise before. It’s been hard but I am changed for the better. I think I am less judgmental of people and more understanding, whereas if I wasn’t doing this work, I wouldn’t have the same view I don’t think. (Officer C)

This quote suggests that therapeutic prison work may have a positive impact on officers’ emotional intelligence. Another participant expressed how, as a result of his work, he questioned the manner in which he related to people:

I think I’ve become a bit more open towards people. I used to be more closed off before I worked here. I think that tends to be working in therapy, you see the prisoners and you work with them during therapy and you wonder . . . hang on a minute, how do I come across to people and you take that with you sometimes, I am now better with communicating with people. (Officer D)

The above participant describes his role as “working in therapy” and not as a prison officer and this may be a natural outcome of his job as much time is spent helping prisoners to focus on their interpersonal relatedness and, as a natural consequence, officers may examine their own mode of relating. It also highlights that therapeutic prison work can have an influence on officers’ actions and behaviours outside the job. Finzi-Dottan and Kormosh (2016) also report a similar finding among social workers; their results indicated that high compassion and professional self-esteem contributed to the participants’ marital quality.

*Theme 3: Occupational Reward*

All participants described feeling a deep sense of satisfaction from their therapeutic engagement with offenders. Occupational reward describes how valuable and effective therapeutic work can be for the well-being of staff and prisoners alike. This finding also demonstrates the professionalism of the staff and their strongly held beliefs in the therapeutic process, which is integral for the overall success of the establishment in terms of duty of care.

*Appreciation.* Genders and Player (1995) wrote that the success of the working practices at institutions such as HMP Grendon largely hinged on the extent to which the prison officers believed in the therapeutic process that they were being asked to work toward. The manner in which participants describe and discuss the satisfaction that they get from their work clearly highlights their strong belief in the benefit of the therapeutic process for prisoners. Indeed, it is difficult to conceive of institutions such as HMP Grendon succeeding if the staff who worked there did not uphold such convictions. Successful therapeutic processes require genuine compassionate care, which would be difficult to manifest if it were not based on a true belief in the principles of intervention and rehabilitation. However, it is clear this is not always an easy path for officers. One participant in the present study did admit to some reservations about the therapeutic process, but he found that observing a change in behaviour and seeing progress in the prisoners gave his job purpose and meaning.

I cared that this one individual that I saw progress through to the end. I can turn around and say I don’t give a toss but at the end of the day you turn around and see somebody like that who progresses and you think, that’s one that’s got through, that was something I’d personally worked on and I own a bit of that. (Officer G)

This belief and ownership, which is integral to the therapeutic process, can filter down into how much effort is expended by the officers into making the therapeutic regime “work.” All the officers who were interviewed felt that the purpose of their work was to assist in the rehabilitation of offenders. When talking about their work, all the officers spoke about their job role with a strong sense of pride. This was summed up in the following comment:

I actually think that I’m lucky to work in a prison like X. It’s an interesting place to work. We house and contain some of the most dangerous and damaged people in the prison system, no question about that whatsoever and I think we do it really really well. (Officer E)

All the officers described a powerful sense of reward and fulfillment in seeing a change in offenders’ behaviour. This was seen to be a direct result of the therapeutic work conducted with the prisoners, which also happens to embody Rule 1 of the Prison Rules published by the Home Office in 1964, “to hold [securely] those people admitted to custody and to encourage and assist them to lead a good and useful life.”

I think about the work we do . . . the way I look at it is, if you’re going to have these people in custody you know, you need to try and do something with them . . . even if just one of them goes and gets released and doesn’t commit anymore crime, that’s a victory. (Officer C)

I’d see people change. That was very rewarding when you would see people’s behavior and attitudes change . . . eh it’s so much more positive than just locking somebody behind a door. That’s where the reward is . . . you’re actually doing something to make a difference. There’s a huge amount of satisfaction from that sort of work. (Officer A)

These comments acknowledge the rewards that the officers gain from seeing tangible changes in behaviour as a result of the effort that they put into the therapeutic work. As well as seeing a change in behaviour, the officers also gained reward from being personally thanked by the prisoners for their part in their rehabilitation.

To see someone progress and see the results and not just hear about it and be there when they go . . . they leave in the morning and say thank you for all that you’ve done, never forget this place. It means a lot to get that acknowledgement and maybe something you’re doing has worked. (Officer G)

Sometimes someone gets a letter from one of the prisoners saying thank you very much for what you did for me . . . saying I didn’t appreciate it at the time but since being away I now appreciate it more and I’m working on this, this and this . . . and that’s nice, it’s massive as far as I’m concerned, that means everything. (Officer F)

This transaction between effort put into the therapeutic groups by the officers and reward given by the prisoners in terms of gratitude can have several benefits including role justification and greater self-esteem. Judge, Locke, Durham, and Kluger (1998) found that self-esteem and self-efficacy contributed to core self-evaluations, meaning, specifically, the way in which people see themselves affects how they experience their jobs and their lives. In light of this, external validation from the prisoners on “a job well done” could serve to increase self-efficacy and job satisfaction and help to protect officers against workplace stress, which is a positive outcome of their job role.

*Practical Implications*

This study provided an insight into the working lives of prison officers who engage in therapy with offenders. Woodall (2007) noted that prison staff whose objective it is to not only uphold the organisational regime and policy but also show compassion and care to offenders have a contradictory and demanding role. Although participants in this study did describe their role as challenging, they also described significant positive attributes associated with their therapeutic prison work. Attention should, therefore, be given to the unique nature of working in a secure therapeutic setting, in terms of the positive impact it can have on occupational well-being (e.g., cultural work environment and job satisfaction).

At the workplace environment level, TCPs promote supportive cultural norms, where both staff and prisoners can work and live in a safe and respectful manner. Alongside academic research (e.g., Newberry, 2010), safety within TCPs is routinely reflected in statistics collated by the Ministry of Justice. At a time when prisons are becoming frequently documented in the media as being “toxic” and “dangerous” places, it is important to highlight and acknowledge a prison system, which contributes positively to the occupational well-being of staff.

At the individual level, owning and developing good interpersonal skills have clearly been shown to be effective in therapeutic prison work, which should also be transferrable to mainstream staff–prisoner relationships. Valuing therapeutic work has been shown to be an important motivating element in allowing those working in secure therapeutic settings to cope with potential stressors inherent within therapy. Development of these skills could be advocated as part of all prison officer–training programmes. Training such as this could go some way to reducing and promoting greater rehabilitation in the U.K. prison system.

*Limitations*

The present study does have a number of limitations, notably, the small sample size. Thus, the findings of this study are not generalizable to the entire prison officer population of the TCP in this study. However, the aim of the study was to explore the nature of therapeutic prison officers’ working lives and qualitative research focuses on the individual’s experience, meaning, and reality, and as such, objective measurement is not the goal (Payne, Jones & Harris, 2013). It should also be acknowledged that this study presents a “snapshot” of a TCP at one period in time, and work environment and well-being can fluctuate over time. Self-selection bias may also be an issue: For example, employees experiencing any occupational stress or mental ill health may not have participated in the study in case of further potential distress. Notably, this study formed part of an overall project looking at the occupational well-being of officers working at a TCP, and high levels of self-reported mental health symptoms were found among those prison officers (Walker et al., 2015). Conversely, those who have positive views about their work may have been more likely to participate in this study. Either way, all participants were experienced prison officers and well placed to discuss the quality of their working lives at this TCP.

Conclusion

The aim of the present study was to explore the working lives of therapeutic prison officers. Although participants did describe their role as challenging, working in a TCP and engaging in the therapeutic relationship with prisoners was deemed to be very rewarding.

The findings of this study demonstrate that therapeutic communities are unique in their operational role in comparison with mainstream prisons. This was primarily evidenced by the working relationship that is established between officers and prisoners and officers’ genuine belief in the efficacy of these relationships. As a result of this, a high level of job satisfaction was also reported, suggesting that engaging in the therapeutic relationship is beneficial for staff and prisoners alike.

Indeed, many of the themes and subthemes identified here, such as fostering good staff–prisoner relationships and cultivating safer workplace cultural norms, are applicable to mainstream prisons and, thus, the salience of the therapeutic relationship and the wider psychosocial work environment indicates that future research should explore this type of prison work on officer occupational well-being.

This study showcases some of “what works” when it comes to prison work, and should help to inform training for future prison officers. Ultimately, developing strong staff–prisoner relationships should have a more central role in daily prison life and this study has shown this to be beneficial for the individual officer, the prisoner, the organisation, and society as a whole.
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