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Abstract


Within the context of the Swedish prison system, this thesis aims to describe the work of prison officers and explain how the dilemma of rehabilitation and security in prison work influences the forming of occupational culture and identity. Empirical data consists of field notes from prison work, individual and focus groups interviews, and a nation-wide survey of prison officers (n=806) in a three-year research project. Occupational culture and identity are explored by means of the concepts of social/professional representations, emotional labour, and interaction rituals. The occupational development is also discussed in relation to theories about professionalism. As a result of changes in prison policy, the Swedish prison organisation has developed in several ways. After a “personal officer” reform in 1991, most prison officers were formally assigned to rehabilitative tasks like counselling and social planning among a number of prisoners in their wing. In the following years the treatment programs in prisons expanded greatly. After some high profile escapes in 2004, the security measures were strongly increased. These changes have resulted in a growing number of specialised tasks for prison officers to perform in the differentiated prisons and wings of today. The occupational culture of different groups of prison officers are currently diverging. This can be seen in their social/professional representations, as well as in how they perform emotional labour and interaction rituals. This is creating subcultural patterns among prison officers along wing and group lines. Their occupational identities, i.e. how they view themselves as prison officers and the work they perform, are formed around the dilemma of keeping prisoners in safe, secure custody while also providing treatment to rehabilitate them for a life without crime. The emphasis varies along with their varying roles and wing placements. In managing the dilemma, they may feel inadequate to the task, or stick to the formal rules, or successfully manage to balance security and rehabilitation. The crucial emotional labour in prisons — managing inmates’ emotions while controlling one’s own — follows a common low-key style with some variations due to wing and role. In certain situations, this style is challenged and differs more between wings and roles. Prison officers’ levels of experienced strain are primarily associated with their role, i.e. the intensity and closeness of prisoner contact. There are fewer opportunities for recovery for “strained” groups, as time and space to be “backstage” during the working days are limited. The occupational development is an example of organisational professionalism, where the employer controls the development of the occupation with goals of efficiency and standardisation. While the specialisation of the work is a technical means to manage the increased dilemma of security and rehabilitation, the occupational culture and identities of prison officers are collective, social, and individual ways to manage it.
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1. Introduction

What happens in our prisons is the subject of many headlines in the daily press and news magazines, but the scope of the reporting is quite limited. What everyday prison life is like, and how prison officers do their work in prisons are fairly unknown subjects to many people in society. Like prison news in general, stories about staff focus on extra-ordinary events in their work. ''Prison officer taken hostage by escaping prisoners'', ''Prison officer had intimate relationship with lifer'', and ''Prisoner hung himself, prison officers did not cut him down'', are three examples of headlines from Swedish newspapers in recent years. This limited information, however, does not seem to be an exclusively Swedish problem. Also in other countries, it is argued that sparse and selected information often characterises media reports, focusing mainly on shortcomings of the prisons and their staff, or on the dangerousness of prisoners. When no other sources are available, these images often tend to be or become persistent and stereotypical (Jewkes, 2007 p. 449; Johnson, 2002). The limited information, as well as the stereotypes, also affects the prison officers working there. Prison officers often sense that they are invisible and misunderstood, owing to the media reporting and the lack of reliable knowledge (Liebling et al., 2011 p. 39; Crawley, 2004a).

There are of course other sources, and there is more advanced knowledge about prisons and prison work. In prison research, the traditional prison officer role as a ''smug hack'' or as a ''mere turnkey'' (the stereotypes also shown in many movies, own remark) has for many years been regarded as a non-functional mode of operating in the prisons of today (Johnson, 2002; Liebling & Price, 2001). Prison work today is far more complicated, requiring greater relational and social skills. For some reason the knowledge about prison officer work and the occupational evolution, does not reach people to the same extent that the media picture does. This is not only an argument for more research on prisons and prison work, but also for the public to benefit more widely from it (Jewkes, 2007). As this thesis concerns prison officers, their occupational culture and identity, it is an attempt to improve our knowledge of prison officer work. The thesis consists of a critical introduction ("kappa" in Swedish) with eight chapters, followed by four journal articles.

The prison as institution is a fairly stable phenomenon in almost all societies (Foucault, 1977) despite massive critique citing its inhumanity and constant lack of positive effects (Mathiesen, 1988; Sparks et al., 1996). Some characteristics of incarceration, like deprivation and social disad...
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The prison as institution is a fairly stable phenomenon in almost all societies (Foucault, 1977) despite massive critique citing its inhumanity and constant lack of positive effects (Mathiesen, 1988; Sparks et al., 1996). Some characteristics of incarceration, like deprivation and social disadvan-
tages (Sykes, 1958; Goffman, 1961) seem to change only marginally over
time. Even if alternative sanctions served in the community are promoted
for both humanitarian and economic reasons, the prison populations are
tending to increase in many countries (Garland, 2001). The changed thinking
about imprisonment, meaning risk assessment and incarceration of
groups without individual ambitions of rehabilitation, named “the new
penology” (Feeley & Simon, 1992), has influenced many prison systems.
The new penology is characterised by actuarial risk-assessment of groups
and has brought changed discourses, objectives, and techniques. Western
prisons in the late modern era certainly also have common features, e.g.
concerning electronic monitoring and the indirect exercise of power
(Sparks et al., 1996; Crewe, 2009), but the Swedish prisons are also argued
to belong to a Scandinavian tradition with more developed humanity and
somewhat better facility standards (Pratt, 2008a, b).

There are also changing expectations in society on prisons of today. The
double commission of the prisons – safe custody and active rehabilitation
to avoid recidivism – has been expressed more frequently in recent years
(Liebling, 2001; Johnson, 2002; Hammerlin & Matthiassen, 2006; Robinson,
2008). Through occupationally based relations with prisoners, many
prison officers are assumed to carry out not only service and peacekeeping,
but also increasingly qualified forms of social work (personal officer, pro-
gram leader, etc.). In recent years the security thinking and risk manage-
ment in prisons have also evolved (Carlen, 2008; Crewe, 2009; Hörnqvist,
2010). Despite these developments, the work in prisons on the whole
strongly resembles that in e.g. young offender institutions, juvenile deten-
tion centres, drug abuse treatment centres, etc. The difficulty of combining
the two tasks of control and rehabilitation is well known in these institu-
tions as well.

These similarities are also a reason to write a thesis about prison em-
ployees in the academic discipline of Social Work. While the work in resi-
dential institutions for young people is acknowledged and receives atten-
tion in social work literature (see e.g. Berglund, 1998; Degner & Henrik-
sen, 2007), prison work is not. Work in the probation services is often
regarded as an area of social work (see e.g. Flexner, 1915/2001; Svensson,
2001; Geiran, 2005), while the attempts to include prison work are fewer
(see e.g. Smith, 1992; Shaw, 1974). Intervention is argued to be a founda-
tion in social work theory-development (Johnsson & Svensson, 2005)
whether the context is voluntary or coercive. Running programs and serv-
ing as personal officers have become regular duties for prison officers in
many Western countries. Hence, with little substantial arguments left to
disqualify prison work as not being social work, there is good reason to
consider bringing vital parts of the prison officer work of today into the field of social work research. A similar double task of control/protection and rehabilitation is essential in most kinds of social work performed in Sweden today, be it in child protection, youth care, or drug abuse treatment. Hence, the contribution of the thesis to social work might be to highlight the field of prison work research as increasingly social to its character.

But this thesis also has roots in two other research traditions. First, prison research is a part of a criminological and penological tradition, where issues about imprisonment are main targets of research. Here, many of the classical as well as more recent studies of prison life and prisoners are found (Clemmer, 1940; Sykes, 1958; Crewe, 2009). What happens in a prison is, in traditional prison studies, often viewed from the angle of the prisoners and their lives, while the staff perspective is sparsely but increasingly researched (Liebling & Price, 2001; Crawley, 2004a). In more recent prison studies, staff is included as a natural part of the research on prison life (see Crewe, 2006, 2009). Second, prison work is also frequently researched from the perspective of work and organisation, in sociology or in psychology, where two main streams of research are found. One concerns job satisfaction and work conditions of prison staff, and the other focuses on the work performance; styles, types, and “orientations” (i.e. values and attitudes toward prisoners and one’s own work practice), in prison work. So, even if this thesis is written within the discipline of Social Work, I hope its contribution to the research will be just as much to the other two large fields of social research, criminology and the psychology/sociology of work, where conditions and changes in prison work have previously been researched.

**Swedish prison officer work today**

Even if prisons have been staffed for several hundred years, it is not until the end of the 19th century that a culturally consistent occupation of prison staff is possible to discern in Sweden (Nilsson, 1999). Since the classic prison studies (Clemmer, 1940; Sykes, 1958), prisons in western countries have changed in several ways and this will probably continue. The prisons of today are characterised by risk and needs assessments of prisoners (Carlen, 2008; Andersson & Nilsson, 2009; Hörnqvist, 2010) but also by an accompanying increasing differentiation of prisons and wings. This has resulted in prisons being arranged into security categories, and in many countries also divided into units and wings with different security levels and prisoner categories. The public demands on prisons in general have increased in the late 20th century and concern “the dual main commis-
tion”, on the one hand protecting society through safe custody under humane conditions, and on the other active rehabilitative efforts to return ex-prisoners to a normal life without crime. In Sweden as well as many other Western countries, the technical equipment, with electronic surveillance and rigorous shell protection, combined with pro-relational “personal officer” work and program expansion, are signs of the increasing “duality”. A greater variety in the job tasks of the occupation of prison officer seems to be a general trend today (Tewksbury & Higgins, 2008 p. 291).

In Swedish prisons, the personal officer reform implemented in 1991 was a crucial point in the recent changes. This re-organisation meant that most prison officers were expected to perform counselling and social planning tasks with a number of prisoners, and to be able to perform this work the officers had to be placed in one wing only. Parallel to the reform an implementation of several cognitive programs had taken place, and this expanded rapidly during the following decade (Andersson & Nilsson, 2009). After a number of escapes from Swedish high-security prisons by means of “break-ins” and hostage takings in 2004, security and safe custody have become highly prioritised in all kinds of prisons (see Pratt 2008b). The policy-change and the subsequent reorganisation after 2004, with its emphasis on security, came to impact most of the content and regime in all prisons in the following years. After these “turns”, the policy “pendulum” now seems to be somewhere in between the two.

The prison policy and organisation become frames for what is possible and prioritised in prison work in general. The on-going elimination of the opportunities to escape from prisons has also increased the demands on line staff to manage many different situations within the prisons. The differentiation has necessitated a growing specialisation of the work in wings and units, and even led to proposals for a formal division of the Swedish prison officer role. This could be seen as an organisational answer to the increased demands on the prisons of today. Hence, Swedish prison officer work has become more specialised and divided in several ways. Apart from the main distinction between security specialists and officers with rehabilitative tasks, there are gate staff, security officers-in-command, etc., as well as motivational and treatment program leaders, ASI-experts, leisure officers and program planners, all with special functions or duties.

Culture among prison officers has received growing interest in recent years. The concepts of occupational culture and occupational identity, however, are not much used in prison officer research. Most literature in the field has tried to discern a single, integrated prison officer culture, while the discussion about subcultures in prisons is limited. The many American studies in the framework of psychology of work have been com-
implemented by important, mostly British, sociological studies (see Liebling & Price, 2001; Crawley, 2004a; Tait, 2008; Crew, 2006, 2009). Identity is sometimes used in connection with culture in prison studies, though explicit studies on identity among prison officers are few in number. Both concepts will be further discussed in this thesis, so they will only be tentatively defined here. Occupational culture primarily comprises shared patterns of thought and their subsequent manifestations, developed and maintained in a certain occupation; while occupational identity consists of individually internalised patterns of thought connected to a certain occupation. Both are closely intertwined with the daily work practice. Or, roughly put, while occupational culture is connected to prison officers’ thinking, feeling, and acting in work, occupational identity concerns their thoughts about themselves as workers.

Despite several decades of research on prison officers, the vast majority of studies are quantitative, based on survey data, and frequently grounded in a work psychology tradition. The remainder are mostly qualitative interview and/or observation studies. Research designs in studies explicitly on prison officers, that use both kinds of data, are rare but do exist (c.f. Härenstam, 1989; Liebling, 2004). To find not immediately observable patterns in the explaining of what “happens” in prison work, this scope is unavoidable. The multi-strategic approach chosen in the research in this thesis is connected to a methodology that sees reality as differentiated, stratified, and structured. Only by combining the extensive methods, which are grounded in formal categories and general variables, with intensive approaches, studying complexity and meaning in unique contexts, is this made possible (Danermark et al., 2002). This design has only rarely been used in prison studies or prison officer research (see e.g. Lindberg, 2005).

This thesis is written within the framework of a three-year research project on Swedish prisons, conducted from 2007 to 2010. The name of the project was “Prison officers – Occupational culture, occupational identity, and job satisfaction” and this thesis is a part of the presentation of the project’s findings. But why the interest in prison work? As a social worker for many years, and also as probation officer for a short time, I have occasionally studied prisons as a visitor and observer, which is one reason for my curiosity about the work there. A decade of lecturing in Social Work for prison officer recruits, as a part of their basic training, is another. Lastly, and just as important, was a meeting between university representatives and the local Prison and Probation Service in Örebro in the year 2000, which resulted in an agreement to develop a research program. One of the most urgent issues presented by the local service at that time was the challenge for staff to manage the double commission of the prisons within
prison work: to actively rehabilitate prisoners while still keeping them in secure, safe custody in prison.

The aim of the thesis
The aim of the thesis is, within the context and development of the Swedish prison system, to describe prison officer work and explain how the dilemma of rehabilitation and security in prison work influences the forming of occupational culture and identity among prison officers.

Research questions

- What impact do changes in the prison policy and organisational conditions have on the prison work practice and on the occupational culture and identity of prison officers?
- What are the characteristics of the occupational culture and identity among prison officers?
- How do the collective creation of knowledge, management of feelings, and acting correspond to occupational culture and identity among prison officers?
- How do different prison contexts and work practices contribute to the shaping and reshaping of the occupational culture and identity of prison officers?
- How is the growing specialisation in prison officer work affecting the occupation?

There are three dedicated contributions to prison officer research in this thesis. The first one is contemporary, and is intended to fill a gap in the existing prison officer research. Specifically it highlights the impact of a slow change in many prison systems, not least the Swedish one, towards an increasing specialisation of wings and roles to confront the growing risk-and-needs thinking of the late modern prisons. The last two decades have witnessed a development of prisons, wings, and units for different prisoners and purposes: for solitary confinement, high security, vulnerable prisoners, sex offenders, physically disabled or psychiatrically problematic prisoners, and of course, regular wings. There are prisons for women and prisons/wings for young offenders. But there are also a growing number of treatment wings, program units, and in-prison therapeutic communities for prisoners assessed as motivated and capable of change. How this growing differentiation and its accompanying specialisation are affecting the occu-
The second contribution is theoretical, namely to develop the use of two closely related concepts, culture and identity, in the study of the occupation of prison officers. Many studies of prison officers mention culture or identity in one way or another, but few have actually reflected on the contents and operational use of these terms, or defined them. How can the concepts of culture and identity be defined and used in prison officer occupation studies? This is a theoretical question addressed in the thesis and forms a major part of the comprehensive theoretical chapter in the thesis. What other theoretical concepts might fill out and enrich these broad and often vague concepts? Are there sustainable definitions of the occupational mode of these concepts?

The third contribution is mainly methodological. On the whole, much of the prison officer research is purely quantitative, based on surveys including new or established scales of one or several variables. Many have been criticised for being fairly small and local (Philliber, 1989). Nation-wide surveys of prison officers are not very common in international prison research, including in Sweden. On the other hand, a small but important kind of research is purely qualitative, based on semi-structured interviews with prison officers, individually or in groups, or using ethnographical methods like observation, shadowing, and in-situation interviews (see Crawley, 2004a; Crewe, 2009). Studies using both quantitative and qualitative research methods and data are rare, and, in addition, most of them use the methods and data in isolation from each other. The most common approach is to use the qualitative study as a “pilot” for a larger survey (see e.g. Härenstam, 1989). The complexity of this particular field of the social sciences, prison research, gives reason not to view causes and effects too narrowly (see e.g. George & Bennett, 2005). To integrate and coordinate data of different kinds and from different levels of prison work reality is a methodological design rarely found in prison officer research.

**Definitions of some empirical concepts**

*Prison officer* is the job title of the dominating occupation in Swedish prisons, and of the majority of all employees in the Swedish Prison and Probation Services. *Occupation* (lat. occupatio, meaning to occupy or to seize) originally means to use or take control over time and space, for the purposes of a certain endeavour. It is more than an activity or a task, as it has a certain purpose and meaning (Christiansen & Townsend, 2004). Because it is regarded as having a political, cultural, or economic value it has become a paid occupation, which is close to “a job”. In Sweden the occupa-
tional title is “kriminalvårdare”, or in short, “vårdare”. This sounds like “warder” but the actual meaning of “vårdare” would in English be closer to “carer”, which could be argued to indicate some cultural differences in the perception of the occupation. The main content of the job, however, is similar to that of prison officers in other Western countries, for example Great Britain and the rest of Scandinavia. The wide implementation of personal officer\(^1\) tasks for most prison officers in the 1990s, accompanied by a reduction of social workers and wing supervisors, is perhaps a particularly Swedish trait. The number of prison officers working in Sweden in the autumn of 2008 was 6,241, when including short-time temporary staff and officers working in remand jails. In this study, the focus is on prison officers employed on monthly salary by the prison services to perform prison-officer work in prisons. Prison officers in prison-based remand units are included, while those employed in regular remand jails are not. The reason for inclusion is that the former are working within a prison. Listed prison officers assigned to temporary special tasks (coordinators, administrative work), but working within the prisons, are included. When the total number is reduced by the number of short-time temporary staff and remand-jail staff, the number of “regular” prison officers in the 55 prisons\(^2\) (the population of this study) was between 3,500 and 4,000 prison officers in 2008. The term “prison officer” is used in general in the thesis, although American language and literature often uses the equivalent term “correctional officer”. In quotes from literature, however, the original expression is used.

The Swedish Prison and Probation Services (Kriminalvården) is a federal authority under the Ministry of Justice that manages the Swedish prisons, remand units, probation, and transport services.\(^3\) It is managed by a general director, has a headquarters (in Norrköping), and since 2006 has been divided into six regions with regional offices. In the thesis the authority is sometimes abbreviated SPPS, and when discussing only the management of the prisons in general, prison services is sometimes used.

---

1 In the second article, the term “contact person” has been used synonymously.
2 From the Swedish Prison and Probation Services’ website. The number of prisons in Sweden has varied during the last decade between 55 and 60. New prisons have been built, old ones have been closed, and the categorisation has changed.
3 This organisation is similar to other Scandinavian countries and could be compared with e.g. the British NOMS (National Offender Management Services), but in Sweden these services have been integrated for several decades.
Disposition of the thesis
In chapter 2, the previous research on prison officers and prison staff is reviewed. First the prison officer research in general is briefly discussed. Then the most relevant studies are reviewed through the lenses of prison officer culture and prison officer identity. Finally, the Scandinavian studies on prison work are presented. In chapter 3 the prison policy and its changes over the last decades are presented and analysed. Chapter 4 describes the organisation of the Swedish prison and some characteristics are analysed with relevant organisation theory. Furthermore, the employees, the prison officers, are described in historical and contemporary perspectives, and the occupational development is viewed in terms of professionalism. In Chapter 5 the meta-theoretical foundation for the thesis is outlined, and the framework of theories is presented. The first-order concepts of culture and identity are elaborated by means of the literature, and the “second order” concepts social representation, emotional labour, and interaction rituals are presented. The methodology and the research design are presented and discussed in chapter 6. The methods of data-collection, sampling, and analysis are presented and discussed, and ethical considerations are made. In chapter 7 the four articles are summarised and related to the thesis, and chapter 8 consists of a discussion of the results. The four articles are attached at the end of thesis as Appendixes I–IV.
This chapter will present research on prison officers that is of particular relevance for understanding the implications of occupational culture and identity. After a brief overview of prison officer research in general, I will present prison officer research explicitly concerned with the two concepts of culture and identity. Hereafter, international studies on prison officers' thinking, attitudes, and professional orientations about their own work, as well as studies on their work practice, acting, performance, emotions, and rituals in work are presented. Some comparisons are made with police and caring occupations. In the last part, some of the Scandinavian and Swedish studies on prison work are reviewed.

Prison literature has traditionally been preoccupied with the conditions of prisons in general and the destructive impact of the prison environment on the well-being of prisoners (see Goffman, 1961; Mathiesen, 1988; Garland, 2001). Imprisonment has thus been viewed more from the perspective of prisoners' lives and the prison environment than in interactional terms. Prison staff, the inevitable counterpart and company of prisoners, has for a long period of the twentieth century been forgotten in research (Liebling & Price, 2001; Crawley, 2004a). The important writings on effects of imprisonment (Clemmer, 1940) and deprivations (Sykes, 1958) provide little information about the impact of the work of staff.

Many of the early ethnographic prison studies were case studies of a single prison, often of a high-security character (see Clemmer, 1940; Sykes, 1958; Jacobs, 1977). They have all been important through their providing an inside view of the conditions and everyday life in the closed world of the prisons. These single-case studies, however, are weaker when it comes to describing the broad variety of prisons and differences in this respect. Further, the concern with prison staff is limited in most of this literature. Sykes (1958 p. 54) argued, however, that the role of the prison guard is a complex compound of several work roles, and Goffman (1961 p. 75) highlighted the difficult position of prison staff who are monitored by management, by 'watchdogs' in society, and by the prisoners. More recently, however, ethnographic studies have been conducted explicitly on prison officers, and have produced more knowledge on the acting and interactions of prison officers in single prisons (Riley, 2000; Crawley, 2004a; Tracy, 2004) or are partly focused on staff, as an important ingredient in fully understanding prisoner conditions and prison life (Crewe, 2009).

An increasing number of survey studies on prison officers, especially the vast majority of those produced over the course of more than two decades...
2. Previous research

This chapter will present research on prison officers that is of particular relevance for understanding the implications of occupational culture and identity. After a brief overview of prison officer research in general, I will present prison officer research explicitly concerned with the two concepts of culture and identity. Hereafter, international studies on prison officers’ thinking, attitudes, and professional orientations about their own work, as well as studies on their work practice, acting, performance, emotions, and rituals in work are presented. Some comparisons are made with police and caring occupations. In the last part, some of the Scandinavian and Swedish studies on prison work are reviewed.

Prison literature has traditionally been preoccupied with the conditions of prisons in general and the destructive impact of the prison environment on the well-being of prisoners (see Goffman, 1961; Mathiesen, 1988; Garland, 2001). Imprisonment has thus been viewed more from the perspective of prisoners’ lives and the prison environment than in interactional terms. Prison staff, the inevitable counterpart and company of prisoners, has for a long period of the twentieth century been forgotten in research (Liebling & Price, 2001; Crawley, 2004a). The important writings on effects of prisonisation (Clemmer, 1940) and deprivations (Sykes, 1958) provide little information about the impact of the work of staff.

Many of the early ethnographic prison studies were case studies of a single prison, often of a high-security character (see Clemmer, 1940; Sykes, 1958; Jacobs, 1977). They have all been important through their providing an inside view of the conditions and everyday life in the closed world of the prisons. These single-case studies, however, are weaker when it comes to describing the broad variety of prisons and differences in this respect. Further, the concern with prison staff is limited in most of this literature. Sykes (1958 p. 54) argued, however, that the role of the prison guard is a “complex compound” of several work roles, and Goffman (1961 p. 75) highlighted the difficult position of prison staff who are monitored by management, by “watchdogs” in society, and by the prisoners. More recently, however, ethnographic studies have been conducted explicitly on prison officers, and have produced more knowledge on the acting and interactions of prison officers in single prisons (Riley, 2000; Crawley, 2004a; Tracy, 2004) or are partly focused on staff, as an important ingredient in fully understanding prisoner conditions and prison life (Crewe, 2009).

An increasing number of survey studies on prison officers, especially the vast majority of those produced over the course of more than two decades...
starting in the late 1970s, were conducted in a predominantly American psychology-of-work tradition. The studies were often small and geographically local, and nation-wide surveys were almost non-existent. Two main areas can be detected in this research: one on the impact of the job on officers, for instance in terms of satisfaction, stress, etc., determined by individual or environmental factors (Lambert et al., 2002) and the other, more “cultural”, stream on prison officers’ thinking about prisoners, themselves, and their job content. Some of this research will be presented in this chapter, but the emphasis will be on the latter part of it. Some of the shortcomings of this tradition have been highlighted and criticised. It is argued that with these relatively local-sampled studies, “researchers tend to write ‘beyond’ their data, drawing wide implications from relatively thin information” (Philliber, 1989, p. 10). Another problem is that studies use differently defined populations. While some only examine security prison officers, others include all line staff or use the entire prison staff as their objects of study (Lambert et al., 2002). Even though the methods of statistical analysis have improved since the start, many studies in this tradition today are still small-sized and regional.

Owing to the large amount of research in this tradition, however, it would be unwise not to review some important findings, even if they are not directly connected to occupational culture or identity. The research on stress among prison officers has shown little agreement or evidence concerning either the severity or sources of stress. In a review of eight studies, however, some reported sources were inmate conflicts, co-worker absenteeism/conflicts, management/organisation, role conflicts, and danger (Finn, 1998). A single medium-security prison study discerned career development, qualitative work overload, and safety concerns as the three most important factors associated with work-related stress. They did not find any significant individual coping-mechanisms among officers, probably because the stressors were primarily organisational (Tripplett et al., 1996). In a first meta-analysis of prison officer stress studies, including twenty studies from predominantly the USA and Canada, dangerousness of position had a high and significant impact while security level, shift, contact hours, and years of experience did not. Notable was also the finding that a rehabilitative orientation to work was associated with lower levels of stress, while a custodial/punitive orientation was associated with higher levels (Dowden & Tellier, 2004). Griffin (2006) found only small differences between men and women in any form of stress, but that a negative impact of the prison work on one’s own family was a severe stressor for both men and women. Several kinds of stress have shown a negative correlation with job satisfaction (Grossi et al., 1996; Robinson et al., 1997).
problem in much of the self-reporting research is the often vaguely defined concept of stress, which demands individual interpretation of the meaning of the concept (Dowden & Tellier, 2004 p. 42).

Job satisfaction has been defined as “a subjective, individual-level feeling, reflecting whether a person’s needs are or are not being met by a particular job” (Lambert et al., 2002 p. 116f). The many studies on job satisfaction among prison staff have explored its association with both individual/demographic and environmental variables. Among the individual variables, gender and education have most often showed significance. Female prison officers often have higher job satisfaction, while higher educational level has most often shown a connection to low job satisfaction (Farkas, 1999; Lambert et al., 2002). While the impact of individual variables generally is weak, the environmental ones often have strong association with job satisfaction (Hepburn & Knepper, 1993; Riesig & Lovrich, 1998; Lambert et al., 2002). Among the environmental factors, different forms of stress have negative correlation, as mentioned above, just like role conflicts and role ambiguity (Van Voorhis et al., 1991; Hepburn & Knepper, 1993). Autonomy, decision latitude, and good relations with supervisors often are connected to higher job satisfaction (Hepburn & Knepper, 1993; Grossi et al., 1996). Many of the factors associated with stress are inversly related to job satisfaction. Most of these are also commonly found in studies of other occupations, while e.g. danger has particular relevance to prison officers (Dowden & Tellier, 2004). Here, though, it might be important to take into consideration the differences in the prison systems.

To summarise, the early studies on prisons as prisoner societies have been complemented by later studies incorporating, and even concentrating on the role of staff in prisons. The research on prison officers of the last three decades has mainly focused on two main streams. The first concerns job impact on prison officers’ health and well-being. Stress is found to be most closely associated with dangerousness at work. The research on job satisfaction shows a stronger connection to environmental factors (e.g. stress, conflicts, and relations to management) than the individual factors, like gender and age. The second stream concerns professional orientation in work, and will be referred to in more detail in the following parts of the chapter.

**Studies on occupational culture or identity among prison officers**

The concept of occupational culture is rarely used in prison officer research, and when it is, it is mostly seen as one single homogeneous culture among prison officers. Jurik (1985a) discussed an “informal” (masculine) occupational culture as a crucial barrier to equity for female prison offi-
cers. Another study has explored the “sense-making” among prison officers through some activities in their work, and found three common routines that in particular promote a negative thinking about prisoners: the reading and discussing of prisoner files, the explaining of prisoner rule-breaking and staff rule-discretion by the violent or unpredictable nature of the prisoner, and finally, the procedure of reporting prisoner misconduct to a disciplinary board (Riley, 2000). Others have used an organisational approach to explore differences between organisational levels and discerned an “occupational culture” among prison officers that differs from the cultures of middle management officers and top management in prisons. The authors found these three segments in the organisational culture, but regard all the rank-and-file prison officers as one single culture. Because prison officers are literally locked in together with the prisoners, exchanges tend to be more routine-based and ordered in their work, while higher levels have more external contacts and spend less time face-to-face with prisoners (Farkas & Manning, 1997). Crawley (2004a) studied occupational culture and the “working personalities” among prison officers. Prison officer culture is argued to consist of prison officer values, beliefs, attitudes, customs, and working practices. She also notes the impact of this on the regime and relations in prisons (Crawley, 2004a).

The expression “prison officer culture” is more often used in research than “occupational culture”. Prison officers are often regarded as adhering to a number of important norms (Kauffman, 1988), mainly concerning their working relationships to colleagues and prisoners. New prison officers are accepted to the extent that they are willing to follow these norms of unity and solidarity with colleagues, and of promoting a distance to prisoners. Similar to police literature, Crawley argues there is a working personality among prison officers, where a general adherence to the norms, but with certain minor exceptions, is a common trait (Crawley, 2004a p. 35). The exceptions in the following of norms could be due to age, status, or experience. Others have argued that there is a manifold of different views on the prison work, held by different (English) prison officers. The balancing of these views in a particular wing is a basis for how culture is developed. Extreme values are rejected, and an inert but fairly decent service attitude predominates in the presence of prisoners. When acting backstage, however, disparaging expressions are more frequent. A distrust of management, based on a view that prisoners are treated as more important than staff, contributes to their seeing their own position as vulnerable, and the prisoners as favoured (Crewe, 2009).
The existence of different subcultures\textsuperscript{4} within the frame of an occupational culture is not much discussed in prison officer literature. It is argued that there are differences between entire prisons in this respect, owing to organisational cultures and structural differences, i.e. prison security category, and also that there are individual differences in the adherence to the norms (Liebling & Price, 2001; Arnold et al., 2007; Crawley, 2004a). Expanded to include prison staff, a British study found that relationships with senior management and personal efficacy (in role and responsibility) had a strong impact on work culture and climate (Arnold et al., 2007). Different wing-based styles for how to exercise discretion in the following of rules have been discussed in a study (Liebling, 2000). Others have found that wing loyalty was more important than loyalty to the whole uniformed force of the prison (Crewe, 2009). Adherence to traditional (and less traditional) cultures has been suggested as relevant among prison officers, and e.g. prisoner distress, neglect of prisoner needs, and resistance to change, as well as prison suicides, have all been found to be related to prisons dominated by the former (sub) culture (Arnold et al., 2007, Liebling, 2007). Another study of a British prison discerned several subgroups among older and younger prison officers, depending on their view of the job. The tone of the staff-prisoner relations was, however, formed by a dominant benign group of experienced personnel, who also reprimanded new recruits who had the wrong approach. Despite this fairly humane and predominantly rehabilitative rhetoric and practice, there was also widespread inertia and a lack of vision in the performance and service-delivery to prisoners, taking the form of, e.g., delays and inactivity (Crewe, 2009 p. 50ff).

Within the culture and identity research, there are a group of studies aiming to construct “types” or ideals of prison officers, elaborated from different kinds of data. Kaufmann (1988) in her ethnographic single-prison study, made a theoretical typology based on prison officers’ positive or negative perception of themselves as well as of prisoners. Polyannas were positive to both prisoners and prison officers, while the Burnouts were negative in both respects. Positive to only prisoners were the White hats, and the prisoner negative group was named Hard asses. There was also a middle group of Functionaires. Relying on 79 interviews with prison officers, Farkas (2000) developed a similar typology of officer opinions about themselves and other officers. She categorised them into five types: Rule enforcer, Hard liner, People worker, Synthetic officer, and Loner, all with

\textsuperscript{4}The concept of subculture in the prison officer literature is used either as a minor “deviant” under-culture or as one or several “part-cultures” within an overarching culture. In this thesis it is used in the latter sense.
differently (sub) cultures. Rule enforcers were the largest group in her study (43 percent) and they emphasised rule following and strong collegial support, and were negative to negotiations with prisoners. Hardliners made up only 14 percent, but were tough, sometimes abusive and often had military backgrounds. The people workers made up 22 percent of the group, and tried to understand prisoners’ behaviour, emphasising verbal skills and common sense instead of collegial support. 28 percent were synthetic officers, who were somewhere in between the rule enforcer and the people worker. They were flexible, but aware of the goals. The loners comprised the smallest group, with only 8 percent, and were often female or had minority status. Three other minor groups, that did not perform well, were found in interview data but not among interviewees. Crawley (2004a) similarly found four types of prison officers in her study of two prisons in England. In these descriptions, it seems that the typologies are bridging some of the gap between culture and identity, as they could be seen as both individual and as belonging to subcultural patterns. Or, as Crewe (2009) could be interpreted as saying: it is the mix of identities that together constitutes the subculture in a wing. Another benefit of the typology descriptions is that they are often recognisable to some extent. But, their relations to the structures and forces that develop them are rarely explained. Why do they emerge? Farkas has argued that more research is needed to “to further examine the impact of the organisational context on styles of working with inmates” (Farkas, 2000 p. 448).

To sum up, there are studies that explicitly focus on occupational or prison officer culture, while explicit studies on prison officer identity are rare. In the, predominantly ethnographic, studies on culture among prison officers, the concept is apprehended in different ways. A number of studies have tried to discern typologies among prison officers, but these often differ amongst themselves. The studies on prison officer culture or staff culture use more of an integration perspective on culture than a perspective focusing on different subcultures.

**Prison officer patterns of thought**

A main part of culture is composed of the patterns of thought, e.g. values and attitudes, that guide action and the creation of symbols (Alvesson, 2001) and there are a large number of studies concerning the occupational thinking, attitudes, values, and professional orientations among prison officers about how to do the job. Even if they are not explicitly connected to the concept of “culture”, they provide clues about the cultural aspects of the occupation.
Starting in the 1980s, there was a growing, mainly American and psychological, research interest in prison officer work. Many of these studies have contributed to the understanding of a staff or prison officer culture, although in the research this has often been described under other headings. One body of research has measured or described the attitudes among prison officers towards prisoners and their interaction with prisoners, often aiming to predict or explain prison officers’ acting in work. The attitudes towards prisoners are often extended and described by the term “professional orientation”. Professional orientation, according to one definition, “reflects the values, goals, and attitudes of an individual as he or she functions within a specific organisation” (Griffin, 2002). One of the first “orientation models” was constructed by Klofas and Toch (1982). They developed four factors/dimensions: social distance, counselling roles, punitive orientation, and concern with corruption of authority – all with acceptable reliability. In this kind of research the dimensions are kept separate and are compared with other variables. Social distance and counselling roles express a kind of rehabilitation attitude, while the last two are more connected to negative views of prisoners (Farkas, 1999). This 17-item scale has been used in several later studies, often with somewhat lower reliability values (Whitehead et al., 1987; Whitehead & Lindquist, 1989; Farkas, 1999) but has also been further developed and revised in other more recent studies (Arnold et al., 2007). Similar, but less tested instruments have been developed by others to measure prison officer thinking in terms of attitudes or professional orientation (see Melvin et al., 1985; Hemmens & Stohr, 2000). Later, Griffin (2002) has recommended an orientation scale with three orientations: rehabilitative, custodial, and punitive. This was in response to a perceived inadequacy of regarding custody and punitive thinking as the same, as done in many studies. This opinion is not, however, supported by any greater comparative reliability of her scale, and there is no general agreement on this issue. The limitations of these kind of instruments, even if they are found valid in one or several studies, is that the findings rarely contribute to answering the simple question “why?” in any credible way, since the role of contextual factors is downplayed.

Orientation measures are often compared with individual, demographic variables. Gender has shown differences in many but not all studies. Some have shown that female staff prefer the human service/rehabilitative approach to the role more than male colleagues do (Jurik, 1985b; Hemmens & Stohr, 2000; Griffin, 2002) while other studies found less or no gender differences in rehabilitative thinking (Cullen et al., 1989; Whitehead & Lindquist, 1989). Age, entry age in prison work, and years in service are other variables that have shown contradicting impacts on orientation;
while some have found age or tenure differences in orientation (Whitehead & Lindquist, 1986; Cullen et al., 1989) others have not (Jurik, 1985b; Hemmens & Stohr, 2000). Most studies have found that education is not correlated with any orientation (Jurik, 1985b; Hemmens & Stohr, 2000; Griffin, 2002). However, contradictory findings in these kinds of professional orientation studies are not unusual, and in general, professional orientations are only minimally affected by individual level variables (Griffin, 2002).

Organisational or environmental factors are in most studies found to have a somewhat stronger correlation to orientation among prison officers than the individual variables have. Role conflicts have shown a correlation with custodial orientation in some studies (Cullen et al., 1989) but not in others (Whitehead & Lindquist, 1986; Griffin, 2002). So, correlations between orientation and individual as well as environmental variables are weak and often contradictory in different studies. In addition the studies are often conducted in one or a few prisons in only one American state (Philliber, 1989), which could explain some of the contradictions. The complexity of the forming of prison officer thinking about prisoners and about their own job seems to be only partly explained by the research on professional orientations.

Similar to the “orientation research”, some studies have focused on staff attitudes to the possible goals of imprisonment and how these are viewed and ranked among prison officers (Cullen et al., 1989; Kifer et al., 2003) and by their supervisors and top managers (Cullen et al., 1993). The common goals of imprisonment, i.e. retribution, incapacitation, rehabilitation, and deterrence, were initially briefly explained and then ranked by staff. Concerning prison officers, Cullen et al. (1989) found that deterrence (29 percent) was regarded as the most important goal of imprisonment, followed by retribution and incapacitation (around 25 percent each), while only around 10 percent of the officers saw rehabilitation as the primary goal. In their study on prison wardens (Cullen et al., 1993), they found these managers to view incapacitation and rehabilitation as the most important goals of imprisonment in the studied American prisons.

Others have found that when examining a sample of local jail staff and prison staff, individual/demographic variables explained only 5 percent of the variation in their view of the goals of imprisonment. Higher age and shorter experience were both associated with more positive attitudes to rehabilitation among prison staff, while gender explained most of the positive attitude toward rehabilitation in the jails (Kifer et al., 2003). The authors however concluded that the study would have benefitted from being expanded to include other variables. Others have tried to relate thinking to
acting by introducing various measures of “readiness to act”. Griffin (2002) compared the orientation of prison officers (rehabilitative, custodial, punitive) with readiness to use force, measured on a scale. She found that the custodial orientation was most connected to readiness to use force, but also that supervision quality, role conflicts, and fear of victimisation raised this readiness. Liebling et al. (2011 p. 39) have argued that different levels of punitiveness among officers could be connected to variations in prison cultures.

Despite the described limitations and complications of the research on “patterns of thought” among prison officers, it contributes to the exploration of the complex concepts of occupational culture and identity. To sum up, this research has tried to discern “professional orientations” valid for prison officers, and has analysed them together with individual backgrounds and other variables. Many findings have been contradicted by other studies. Some findings are probably also valid elsewhere, while other results might be related to the American context and be less valid in Scandinavian prisons.

**Prison officer acting in work**

The separation between thinking, feeling, and acting used in this review is, of course, analytical. In human life they are almost constantly intertwined, while researchers often try to study them one by one, or with an emphasis on one of them. The management of emotions in work, often termed emotional labour, is a form of acting performed closely related to the managing of one’s own feelings. Emotional labour theory and research was originally developed to understand emotion management in work, initially in studies on aircraft cabin crews and bill collectors (Hochschild, 1983), and for many years it has been dominated by studies on typical service occupations (Bolton & Boyd, 2003). Later, other occupational groups such as police officers, nurses, and prison officers have been studied. The research on the emotional labour of prison officer was sparse despite the emotional nature of prison wing work, until the beginning of the new millennium. Crawley (2004a,b), in an ethnographic study, argued that prison officers were afraid to make mistakes or to fail in their emotional performance, i.e. to lose their mask and respond with the wrong emotion. They used several strategies to manage this in structured ways, like (black) humour combined with strategies of de-personalisation and detachment; and they especially avoid displaying feelings regarded as traditionally female. They also use a coping and detachment rhetoric, combined with switched-off feelings. Crawley (2004a,b) also highlighted the importance of certain “emotional zones”, a kind of backstage locations (see Goffman, 1959) where prison
officers could let out feelings that are not in accordance with the display rules of prison work in the wings.

Others have argued in a similar way that when prison officers try to fulfil the contradictory organisational norms in their work practice (be suspicious, do not take things personally, follow rules, be flexible, etc.), they construct “emotionally harnessed identities, marked by paranoia, withdrawal, detachment and an us-them approach toward inmates” (Tracy, 2004 p. 529). In doing prison work, the prison officer identity is also marked by a sense of being invisible to and misunderstood by the outside world (Crawley, 2004a; Liebling, 2010). Prison officer work is similarly argued to belong to the category of “dirty work” (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999), relying on Hughes’s (1951) description of “dirty work” as being “tasks and occupations that are likely to be perceived as disgusting or degrading”. While Hughes also used the concept for lowly kinds of work, existing in many occupations, they argue that groups personifying the lowliness of the occupations become regarded as “dirty workers”. This means, according to the original definition, that the work is “physically disgusting”, and “a symbol of degradation, something that wounds one’s dignity” or “in some way goes counter to the more heroic of our moral conceptions” (Hughes, 1951 p. 319). It is work that is physically, socially, or morally tainted, and prison officers are argued to belong to the second category owing to the low occupational prestige this group derives from their regular contact with stigmatised people in prisons (Hughes, 1951; Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999). This has two important consequences. First it affects people’s relationship with the dirty workers in general in different ways. Second, dirty workers try to manage the stigma connected to their work by creating strong occupational or workgroup cultures. They use defence mechanisms like ideological reframing and social restructuring processes, to change the meaning of dirt and moderate the pressure from outside perceptions. This “taint management” is important to making and sustaining identity (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999). Tracy (2004), referring to Brodsky (1982), similarly argues that the stigma associated with prisoners “rubs off” onto staff in the eyes of outsiders. According to an annual Swedish survey, prison officers still have the lowest public confidence among the criminal justice occupations (SNCCP, 2009) even if the level of confidence has grown slowly in recent years. In the discussions about emotional labour, it is argued that the discussion about depth in this work is less relevant. Instead, the impact of organisational processes and discourses of power are better determinants of prison officer identity, and of the emotional labour (Tracy, 2005). In short, emotional management is easier to perform when it confirms a preferred identity, than when it does not.
Masculinity is regarded as a traditional constituent of the prison officer culture and identity. Because an extreme macho-style among male staff is less successful in most prisons and wings today (Liebling et al., 2001), there are often negotiations between alternative male images instead. The “calm and professional” prison officer is preferred in many situations, instead of the traditional confrontational one (Crawley, 2004a p. 222f).

Others have argued that this is still a profession where being tough, macho, and hardened serves as a “badge of belonging” (Tracy, 2004 p. 523). In prisons with male and female officers, male officers are often worried about their female colleagues having too close personal relations to prisoners, and about their maintenance of security (Zimmer, 1986, in: Crewe, 2006).

The acting in work of prison officers is an important cultural expression. In prison officer research, there has been a great deal of focus on the management of emotions. Other angles are the managing of the fact that one's own work is regarded as a “dirty occupation”, and also the masculinity of work-styles.

**Police and caring occupations**

The dilemma of reconciling rehabilitation with safe, secure custody is a reason to look at research on closely related occupations that share these characteristics, e.g. police officers and caring occupations. Many prison officer studies have actually made comparisons with, or used results from the more established research on police officers. In particular, research on police culture is used to explore similar issues in the few cultural studies of prison officers. It is argued that there are many similarities between these two law-enforcement occupations, but also some important differences (Liebling, 2000; Crawley, 2004a). But prison officer work also has similarities with caring occupations, and a caring perspective has also been introduced in prison officer research (c.f. Tait, 2008), which is why some studies in this field will also be reviewed below.

Solidarity is argued to be crucial in police culture as well as prison officer culture for three reasons: protection from harm at the hands of prisoners, from outside distrust in general, and from investigations of staff failures. Conflicts are, however, also considered necessary to strengthen solidarity. Their silent management of danger and fear in work is argued to be a cultural expression that designs the reliability of new officers (Crawley, 2004). This kind of testing of newcomers also becomes a barrier that makes it more difficult to accept female officers (Crawley, 2004a p. 34). In the comparison between police and prison officers, Farkas and Manning (1997) argued that they have four features in common – both are: people
(controlling) work; often involve managing conflicts; are performed in a situation of constant uncertainty/unpredictability; and finally, have important norms of secrecy.

Some authors state that studies on police culture originate from the observation that the work practice is characterised by wide discretion and is rarely a copy of the legal precepts (Chan, 1997; Waddington, 1999). Liebling and Price (2001) argue that studies of culture are an important part of efforts to change organisations, and are relevant for understanding how the balance of discretion is exercised, “between the use of discretion for legitimacy and the use of discretion against it” (Liebling & Price, 2001 p. 148), with the latter including discrimination and stereotyping. Several authors have emphasised that suspiciousness and group solidarity are essential ingredients of police culture (Chan, 1997; Waddington, 1999) together with other characteristics. Waddington also argues that there are gaps between what police officers say and what they do, and hence it is important to ask for more than general attitude studies among officers (Waddington, 1999). In a Swedish study on patrolling police, Granér (2004) found that their occupational culture was varyingly formed between a formal legalistic perspective on police work and an autonomous one.

The emotional part of police work is argued to be gender oriented, with the work of “fighting crime”, which involves tougher emotions, being preferred by male officers, while more soft tasks, like investigating missing persons or intervening in domestic violence, are regarded as female, and women police officers are wanted for these tasks. Emotions are also essential in rituals, events, and ceremonies to maintain culture, and emotional display or suppression are crucial in recruitment processes (Martin, 1999). Others have similarly found that police detectives (mostly men) prefer emotional confrontations with offenders, rather than the awkward encounters with angry or sad victims (Stenross & Kleinman, 1989).

The differences between police work and prison work are important to note, as they set limits to the use of police research when studying prison officers. First, prison work is characterised by long-lasting personal relations between officers and prisoners, with them often having almost daily and all-day contact (Liebling, 2001). Another difference is the domestic character of the prison, which actually serves as the prisoners’ home for a long time. They eat, sleep, go to the toilet, and watch TV in the prison wing, and at the same time this is part of the workplace for the officers (Crawley, 2004a). To actually understand prison life, it is argued, it should be “recognised as a quasi-domestic sphere” (Crawley, 2004b p. 415).

The other side of the prison officer dilemma, rehabilitation, bears similarities with the caring occupations. Changes in cultures of caring occupa-
tions have been studied in relation to the organisational transition of hospitals in Sweden. In this “levelled” organisation, different changes related to power are emerging in the occupational groups. It is argued that the former collective spirit among base-line caring staff, which previously also was their main form of access of power, is decreasing. This, while the nurses have developed corporative strategies that bring power to their occupational group. (Lindgren, 1999). This development is of particular interest as prison officer seems to be an occupation with decreasing collective unity and limited power as occupation (Liebling et al., 2011, Nylander, forthcoming).

In studying long-term psychiatric care, Enarsson et al. (2007) found that the staff members negotiated with each other to reach agreement on how to deal with disturbances among patients. Their approaches differed depending on the type of incident and were not stable over time. Others found that there were two contradictory treatment regimes in Norwegian psychiatric wards. A bio-medical regime was dominant in the staff room, while a milieu therapeutic approach with human relational exchange was common in other parts of the ward. The milieu therapy was weaker than, but also resisted the bio-medical regime (Skorpen et al., 2009).

Management of emotions in work has been widely studied in nursing and health care (James, 1992; Lopez, 2006; Erickson & Grove, 2008). One dilemma is the ethical balance between being honest or trying to calm the patient, when it comes to questions from patients about e.g. chances of survival. Erickson & Grove (2008) have discussed the cultural and organisational antecedents in emotion management at work. They argue that there could be several competing sets of rules for how to behave in health care work, cultural as well as imposed by the organisation. Professional or occupational expectations are used to bridge these differences and to ease the performance in work. Similarly, others have emphasised the importance of the organisation and management to how the emotional work is performed. In different settings, the caring work might differ emotionally to a large degree, from being prescribed and routine-based, to advanced and autonomous (Lopez, 2006).

There are similarities between the above and prison officer work, especially in wings with more caring approach, e.g. drug treatment wings and somatic/psychiatric wings. The clash between sets of rules as well as the “dilemma of honesty”, are both transferable to the prison context. The majority of health care research, however, concerns work with formally voluntary patients, unlike the involuntary prisoners who are the subjects of prison work. As with prison officer research, research results on these oc-
cupations in other countries are not always transferable to the Scandinav-ian context and tradition.

**Scandinavian studies on prison work**

It is argued that the prison policy, and hence prison work, in Scandinavia differs from that of many English-speaking countries (Pratt, 2008a,b). Hence, there could be reasons to pay the few Scandinavian studies extra attention because of the cultural similarities between these countries. In Scandinavia the prisons are often smaller, with a better standard (Pratt, 2008a) and in several of them the institution of the personal officer has been implemented. The early Scandinavian research on prison life and consequences for prisoners, most of which are in the “abolition tradition”,\(^5\) are widespread and well known (Bondesson, 1974; Mathiesen, 1988; Christie, 1993). However, research studies on prison work and prison officers are few in number, so some relevant studies produced by the Prison Services in these countries will also be included in the review.

A large Swedish study was conducted in 1983--86 among prison staff, with a nation-wide random sample of 2,000 personnel, the majority of whom were prison officers. Besides measuring stress-related physical symptoms, this study included a survey of work-related items and interviews. One of the main findings was a high level of stress and comparatively frequent heart problems among prison officers. The rates of sick leave were high among elderly prison staff. The growing number of prisoners with drug problems seemed to be one important negative factor, but the type of leadership and a number of traditional environmental factors e.g. job satisfaction, goal clarity, participation, climate, etc. were also significant. There were large differences between the prisons in terms of these factors. An overall conclusion was also that a substantial part of the health problems and dissatisfaction had to do with the simple and boring nature of the tasks in their occupational role (Härenstam, 1989). The study led to discussions about the prison environment and job enrichment, and was important for the implementation of the personal officer reform a few years later.

Some studies on prison life have focused on interaction and rituals among prisoners and staff. How conflicts turn into rows in the interaction between staff and prisoners is a process described as starting with an invitation phase, followed by a loading phase. But also the avoidance of a row

---

\(^5\) The Abolition Movement is a loose network of writers, researchers, organisations, and groups, who have in common that they regard imprisonment as bad and ineffective, and that the prisons should therefore be abolished or totally reformed.
has its dynamic, in keeping one’s cool and returning to the calmness of the wing. In the rituals surrounding rows, three “sacred objects” are found to be important: the self, the institution, and masculinity (Wästerfors, 2007). In a study of a women’s prison it has been found that prisoner and staff cultures have similar codes and social representations of each other, and these serve as mechanisms to increase distance and prevent rehabilitative work. High-status prisoners and experienced staff are found to be the maintainers of this traditional culture (Lindberg, 2005). Kjelsberg et al. (2007) have studied attitudes towards prisoners among 387 prison employees in four Norwegian prisons. They found that prison officers were more positive than other prison employees, and that female staff were more positive than their male counterparts. They also found that staff working in female prisons was more positive than staff in male prisons.

How organisational factors affected the implementation of two common criminal-behaviour programs in Sweden has been studied from a staff perspective. Using surveys and interviews with (at least part-time) program leaders in prisons and on probation boards, it was shown that program staff found their work meaningful but marginalised and vulnerable. Organisational support, supervision, and social recovery were important prerequisites of their program work (Holmberg & Fridell, 2006). In an interview study of prison officers about their work, it is argued that in the prison organisation of today, with no wing supervisors but wing-based working groups instead, together with the emotional and risky environment, prison officers create strong informal rules built on certain representations of prisoners. They perform a particular kind of emotional labour, and use interaction rituals and power rituals to strengthen the working group. But with the emergence of more specialised wings they also create representations of other wings and staff groups than their own (Nylander, 2006).

In a Norwegian study, prison staff and prisoners were interviewed about how they have experienced changes in the prison work in recent years. The personal relations, and the closeness between prisoners and prison officers, varied with the local prison structures, resources, and staff competence. The changes were mainly due to the introduction of personal officer tasks for prison officers, which have enriched the occupational role and improved the personal relations between officers and prisoners, but which also articulate the balancing between care and control. Prisoners were positive to the personal officer arrangement, but also critical of the adverse effects of new regulations, lack of staff resources, and increased control (Hammerlin & Mathiassen, 2006). There are many similarities with a Swedish contemporary interview study with prison officers. The personal officer tasks were seen as enriching the prison officer role, but there were
also problems finding the time and resources to do this job. This study also discussed the problems with increasing specialisation in the wings and of the prison officer role (Nylander, 2006).

In accordance with the British quality-of-prison-life studies, a Swedish study examined the climate in motivational and drug-treatment wings in Swedish prisons (Krantz, 2010). In total, 19 treatment wings and 31 motivational wings were included. The British Measuring Quality of Prison Life prisoner questionnaire, part 2, including 97 items, was used (Liebling, 2004). Prisoners in the wings answered it, and the staff answered the same items by providing their assessment of how prisoners would answer. In most of the wings, staff predicted that prisoners’ opinions about the climate would be better than the prisoners’ answers actually showed. Johnsen & Granheim, (2011) have studied quality of life in work among Norwegian prisoners and prison officers by means of translated British MQPL and SQL (staff) questionnaires. Compared to the British results, other dimensions emerged as “strong” in the Norwegian results. Prison size was an important predictor of staff quality of (work) life in the Norwegian prisons, with the small facilities scoring higher. Among several reasons for this were the closer relationships and faster decisions in small facilities.

The problems connected to the conduct of prison research have been discussed in several international studies (Liebling, 1999; Patenaude, 2004; Crewe, 2009, etc.) but are not discussed to the same extent in Scandinavia. An ethnographical study of an open prison found that the prisoner group as well as officers guarded and disguised information that may reach outsiders, which is a crucial condition to take into account in prison research. In the low-trust environment of a prison, the prison researcher will experience sometimes being an insider and sometimes an outsider in relation to both these groups (Nielsen, 2010). This kind of involvement in the “research object” seems difficult to avoid in prison research.

Violence towards prison staff, including threats, harassment, and physical violence, has been found to be quite common in Sweden. Around 40 percent of the prison officers have experienced at least one of these during the last year. The closed prisons in the low security category were overrepresented and younger male officers were the most common targets, while younger male prisoners were the most frequent perpetrators of violence. Denied requests and rejected applications were high-risk situations (SNCCP, 2006). In Norway, statistics show 223 reported incidents of violence in the Prison and Probation Services during the year 2008, mostly from prisons. Often different forms of corporal and psychological violence seem to be combined in the same incident. Male officers were targets in 67 percent and female officers in 33 percent of the cases (Hammerlin & Rok-
kan, 2008). Interestingly, the most frequent violent situations were similar to the ones discerned in the Swedish prisons.

**Concluding remarks**

The studies concerning occupational role, culture, and identity among prison officers are not emerging as a single, easily identifiable research field. Authors using these concepts adopt widely varying perspectives and understandings of the concepts, and the perspectives are not easily comparable. This variety might, however, also be something unavoidable if one remembers that culture and identity are quite complex ideas (Alvesson, 2001; Alvesson et al., 2008).

It seems that while some studies focus on patterns of thought, like attitudes, orientations, social representations, etc. among prison officers, often using survey or interview data, other studies are more concerned with behaviour, performance, rituals, and emotional work, often preferring different qualitative data sources, like interviews or observation field notes. It seems important to remind oneself of Waddington’s warning, not to mistake thinking for acting among law enforcers. Advocates of professional orientation research argue that orientations “must have at least some impact on interaction patterns between officers and inmates” (Whitehead & Lindquist, 1989 p. 69). But it must be more fruitful to study both thinking and acting. Acting is an expression of culture, and patterns of thought might hence be traced in actions. The use of both quantitative and qualitative methods is relevant when describing occupational culture and identity of prison officers, as the latter is to be preferred when studying acting.

The thinking, acting, and emotion management in prison work are to some extent being researched. This is formulated in many different ways, using expressions like professional orientations, attitudes, values, etc., as well as performance, emotion management, interaction, etc. Many of these studies measure the subject of interest individually, and make comparisons with other individual variables. A small part of the studies regard or research the thinking, acting, and emotions as something collectively developed and connected to culture and identity forming.

Comparison with research in both police and caring work is fruitful for the understanding of prison officer work. This area of research is more extensive and has a longer tradition than that on prison officers. However, even if parts are transferable to the understanding of prison officer culture and identity, it is wise to also remember the differences. The psychiatric care staff-agreements on how to manage disturbances are transferable to prison wings. The basically voluntary context of the health-care sector, however, differs from the situation in prisons, and the domestic character
of prison work, with long-lasting daily contact, is not common in police work. In addition, there are also differences in status and length of education/training, with some of the other occupations being a bit ahead.

Even if there are similarities between prison officers in different countries and cultural spheres it is important to also highlight the differences, e.g. in organisation, recruitment, and traditions. The Scandinavian research, despite its smaller size, is contributing some interesting findings. First, it provides a critique, from an occupational-health perspective on a national basis, of the problems with a “turn-key” prison officer role with little autonomy or rehabilitative responsibilities (Härenstam, 1989). Second, there are some studies concerning the benefits and problems with a developed institution of the personal officer and increased prison-staff interaction (Nylander, 2006; Hammerlin & Mathiassen, 2006; Wästerfors, 2007).
3. Prison policy and changes

It is not within the scope of this thesis to give a full picture of the societal and overall organisational conditions surrounding the prisons, but it might be important to describe some Swedish prison policy changes and the organisational development of the prison organisation, particularly in later decades, as a framework for the working situation of the prison officers. Prison policy is sensitive to public opinion, media attention, and critical incidents, and in recent decades it has been subjected to some rapid and partly unexpected changes. In order to understand these sudden changes, theories on policy change will be briefly presented. After a description of the policy development and some important actors in the field, policy theory will be used to analyse the changes. Prison policy is not mainly the result of a political struggle between parties, but rather of a complex of many actors. Even if the prison organisation is present in both the chapters, chapter three will focus on prison policy and governing, while chapter 4 will mainly concern the organisation and work in the prisons.

Prison policy and its changes are of fundamental importance to its “inhabitants”, i.e. to prisoners as well as to the occupational groups (Sparks, 2007 p. 73). Policy processes have been explained in many theoretical ways, and here only a brief selection of the most widely used frameworks will be presented. Theories on policy processes have in common that they have to grasp a large number of actors, processes, programs, debates, and values. Therefore there is an inevitable simplification of reality, perhaps more far-reaching than in many other fields (Sabatier, 2007). The basic assumptions are similar in some of the theories, so it is reasonable to briefly summarise a few of them. While change in Swedish prison policy concerns a sub-policy field that is not easily predicted, transparent, or regularly processed, some of the theories are less usable. I will here briefly summarise three alternatives before choosing a fourth one.

• The Multiple-Streams Framework is perhaps the most advanced theory in the rational choice tradition. It emphasises a flow of separate streams: problems, policies, and politics; and then entrepreneurs working to connect these. And as they sometimes succeed, a “window” will occur where the streams meet, and a major change will take place resulting in an output (Zahariadis, 2007). A criticism of this theory is that it highlights mainly the political actors and presumes rationality. As a prison policy theory it has limitations in
both these regards, since prison policy is very sensitive to occasional incidents and public/media opinions (Sparks, 2007; Jewkes, 2007).

- The Punctuated Equilibrium Framework stems from the network tradition and emphasises changes in the balance of a system as crucial to policy changes. Policy systems are normally presumed to be stable with slow changes over time, but when several processes of attention cooperate to present a new “image”, there will be an “unbalance” and major changes take place. For example, it is argued that intense media coverage changes in public opinion, and frequent congressional hearings, together resulted in changes in the United States federal crime policy in the 1970s (True et al., 2005). The framework was originally used for changes in legislation and later to analyse budget fluctuations in United States.

- The Social Construction Approach, finally, starts with the constructions of target populations and the failure to make the right constructions of e.g. public opinions (Ingram et al. 2007). The theory is thereby most useful for explaining why some policy processes fail to cause major changes, while this study is concerned with sudden major changes. In Swedish prison policy, the main issue seems not to be “failing” policy design, but rather the unpredictability of the factors involved and affecting the agenda when changes occur.

Among the several theories aspiring to more or less understand or explain policy change, one of the most advanced is the Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF), developed by Sabatier and colleagues (Sabatier, 1988; Sabatier, 2007). ACF is often used to understand changes in environmental policy but also in other political subsystems, where policy issues are long-lasting, owing to the defence of important values among involved parties. The fundamental concept of ACF is that coalitions are formed in policy subsystems. A coalition could contain private and public actors, media representatives, scientists, etc. Coalitions are formed on the basis of values and beliefs, and arranged into the levels of deep core beliefs, core policy beliefs, and secondary beliefs. The two latter layers of this “tripartite structure” are possible to change, while the first is very stable. The framework presupposes policy-learning, but in this “adaptive” learning between coalitions, information which challenges the core beliefs of the coalition is “filtered out”. However, more abrupt shocks (e.g. incidents, rapid developments) affect the process and are often a primary source of change. But if this fails, since change is an inevitable goal of coalitions, the situation might be resolved by a policy broker, often a widely accepted politician or
civil servant, who is trusted by the coalitions. Hence, the theory connects structures and actors, but it also serves to explain mechanisms behind policy change.

One strength of the theory is that it deals primarily with policy process changes, and another is that it emphasises motives and actors. Criticisms of the theory have concerned the nature of the theory, as well as ontological and methodological arguments (Hajer, 1995), but also the pragmatic consideration that it simplifies or overlooks important factors like public beliefs and context. Several authors have argued that it must be used in a more flexible and context-adapted way (Hysing & Olsson, 2008). The theory has been widely used in studies of other sub-policy fields, like environment policy, etc. When applying the ACF to Swedish prison policy, within the aims of this thesis and the data available, it is not possible to discern the political coalitions in detail or to use the theory for more than a tentative explanation of the major changes in the last decades. The theory also adopts an exclusively political perspective, while sociological viewpoints on the changes in society are set aside. However, as a way to provide some explanation of the political dynamics in a wide sense, it could be of complementary value to the plain description of the recent changes in prison policy.

**Swedish prison policy**

The Swedish prison policy of the 20th century was characterised by an ambiguous position and a struggle between the traditional social control of the poor and a “treatment ideology” with its roots in the growing welfare state (Amilon & Edstedt, 1998; Andersson & Nilsson, 2009). The Swedish prison policy in the first half of the 20th century saw a break with the strong Swedish cell-prison era (Andersson & Nilsson, 2009). The treatment ideology with an emphasis on individual rehabilitation through the penal institutions became the ideal after World War II. The meaning of imprisonment was renegotiated, and prisons built in the mid-century industrial expansion were often connected to a prison factory where a main target of prisoner treatment was the skilled industry worker (Hörnqvist, 2008). However, the failure of the prisons to reduce prison populations was increasingly criticised in the 1960s (Andersson & Nilsson, 2009).

In the early 1970s a second ideological shift had begun in crime policy. In the years of the “energy crisis” and with the growing awareness of the limited possibilities for eternal welfare growth, the fall of the ideology of individual prevention and treatment began. The new federal research council, the Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention, SNCCP (BRÅ in Swedish) was a main opponent of the Swedish crime policy in the mid
1970s, together with the international critique of treatment results in anti-
crime programs (Andersson & Nilsson, 2009 p. 114ff). But the Swedish
prison policy was not quite in phase with the general trend in the Swedish
crime policy, or with the international debate. Robert Martinson’s famous
statement in 1974, that according to evaluations no treatment programs
work, did affect much of the crime policy but had a limited impact on the
Swedish prison policy. In the 1974 Prison Service Act, the treatment ideol-
ogy in Sweden still continued to be an important framework, and the reset-
tlement and re-entry of prisoners into society was an essential part of this
law. One reason for the contradiction is argued to be a Swedish long-term
export of an exceptional prison welfare image (Nilsson, 2011). In 1972 the
occupational title of first line officers was changed from “guard constable”
to “prison carer” (SOU, 1977), which is still is the expression used for the
rank of prison officer in Sweden. This occupational title could also be seen
as a late symbolic expression of ambitions in line with the treatment ideol-
ogy and image. In all, even by the end of the 1970s, the treatment ideology
had never been rejected in the Swedish prison policy to the same extent as
in the rest of the criminal policy (Amilon & Edstedt, 1998 p. 25f).

The 1970s and 1980s, however, saw the emergence of a growing divi-
sion in the perception of offenders. An acknowledged majority of crim i-
nals, committing “everyday crimes”, were often judged to deserve some
form of rehabilitative efforts during the sentence; and these were often
placed in local prisons or received non-prison penalties, like probation or
community service. But, in the debate there were also warnings about a
growing minority of organised and persistent criminals, not deemed to
deserve rehabilitation, and who were hence placed in national prisons with
This “bifurcation” of the prison population seems to be a general trend in
other countries as well (Nilsson, 2002 p. 28) Governing by risk and control
had now become the dominating language in US prison policy (Feeley &
Simon, 1992; Garland, 2001), and in Sweden most of the earlier treatment
ideology of the welfare state was expelled from the prisons, and replaced
by new ideas of risk and needs assessment (Hörnqvist, 2010). This took
place without any dramatic increase of the Swedish prison population,
contrary to the mass imprisonment that took place in the United States,
and somewhat later occurred in Great Britain.

In the early 1990s, ideas about effective treatment programs were intro-
duced in Sweden, imported mainly from American and Canadian prison
projects and research (Andersson & Nilsson, 2009). A growing number of
prisoners with drug problems, as well as the increasing demands for de vel-
oping the prison officer role, added energy to this trend. But these new
treatment ideas were built on individual risk and needs assessment and not a general belief in curing in prisons, as in the treatment ideology decades. The new “program ideology”, promoting mainly cognitive behavioural programs, has so far shown moderate results in internal evaluations (SPPS, 2009). The programs have also been questioned in general terms as interventions (Hörnqvist, 2008). Two other major prison changes in Sweden in the last two decades were i) the personal officer reform implemented in 1992, and ii) the “security turn” starting around 2005. The personal officer reform together with the growing implementation of programs was a considerable rehabilitative prison-project, and in some respect the two major changes were expressions of the struggle between rehabilitation and secure custody in prisons, but as they are of crucial importance to the work of Swedish prison officers, they will be returned to later in this chapter. In short, the reforms have once again articulated an ever-present dilemma in prison work, to rehabilitate prisoners on the one hand, while keeping them in safe and secure custody on the other.

Official audits and committee reports

A Committee Report (SOU, 1977) on the roles of prison staff was initiated by changes in prisons, stipulated by the Prison Act in 1974, towards an emphasis on rehabilitation and re-entry. In the investigation, a “personal officer” role was described but not proposed, because of the risk of resistance to the schedule transition that would split prison officers into night and day shifts. The most important proposal was to increase communication and co-operation between all occupations in the prisons. But the proposed organisational principle was to have the prison governor as leader, and for all other staff to cooperate in teams in the rehabilitative work (SOU, 1977).

The Swedish Prison and Probation Services have for many decades been organised as a separate authority under the Swedish Department of Justice. The Minister of Justice has been a crucial actor in the debates around imprisonment and the prison system. The power of the general director of the Prison and Probation Services (SPPS) has long been limited by a relatively strong political board, the Board of Prison and Probation Services. In this organisation, the prisons were separate units led by the governors or the Local SPPS Managers. In 2006 this organisation of the SPPS, consisting of a large number of local authorities with relatively high formal autonomy was replaced. The new SPPS organisation (“One Authority” 2006) has strengthened the power of the regional level and the general director, at the expense of both the political level and the local administration (SNAO, 2009).
Most of the official audits and committee reports since 1999 have been concerned with efficiency and cost-reduction in the prison and probation system. But they have also considered issues of special importance for the prisons. Some of them are worth particular attention. In 1999 and 2002, the Swedish National Audit Office (SNAO), Riksrevisionen in Swedish, scrutinised the SPPS with a mission to “identify obstacles to cost efficiency” and issued some critical remarks on the prison organisation. On the organisational level, these concerned too many local authorities, the management organisation, and insufficient measurement of results and costs. There were, however, also several remarks about staffing, organisation, and governance. Other demands concerning the prisons were the adaptation of the location of prisons to suit current needs, expanded staff training, and a more flexible use of staff. The educational needs, expressed by the prison officers, were first and foremost connected to the rehabilitative part of the work (counselling, programs). Finally SNAO (2002) proposed dividing the prison officer role into rehabilitation/program prison officers and security staff. The “personal officer” tasks, introduced several years earlier, were found to be too divergent, in terms of both time and content, among wings and prisons.

In the turbulence following several spectacular escapes from Swedish prisons in 2004, a rapidly initiated “One-man-committee” report was conducted in only seven months by the former head of the Swedish Police, Björn Eriksson. In the political turbulence after the incidents, the General Director was dismissed and replaced with the former Chief of Police Crime Investigation. In this committee report SOU (2005a) the security issues were crucial and formed a core theme.6 The name of the report was “Safely locked up?” and, as the question mark indicates, much emphasis was put in the proposals on “shell protection” i.e. electric fences, mobile phone disturbance, and x-ray equipment. Despite the short duration of the investigation, many of the proposals made there had already been carried out by the SPPS when the report was released. The unofficial channels, actually highlighted in the same report, were obviously important in guiding SPPS in their work on these issues during the investigation.

Another committee report, (SOU, 2005b) concerning the whole penal system, argued for a further division and specialisation of the prison officer role. “Better efficiency” was the main motive for this recommendation, but how the transition was to be conducted was a bit unclearly explained. Dif-
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6 A simple word count shows that the term “security” was used 175 times in the 175 pages of the Committee Report SOU 2005:6, while the term “rehabilitation” was not mentioned at all.
ferentiation of prisoners and specialisation of wings were also the underlying motives for proposals on easing solitary confinement and implementing a system of earned privileges for prisoners. The latter, however, just became a smaller project within four prisons, and the outcome was evaluated as a near total failure (SPPS, Internal report 2008-04-23, unpubl.). Also in this committee report, a division of the prison officer role was proposed, but not in a very detailed way.

A Swedish National Audit (SNAO, 2009) scrutinised the efficiency of the SPPS and its critique can be summarised as follows: the goals of SPPS and the daily regime are not consistent with each other; strategies are not implemented in accordance with the policy; important decisions must be preceded by more adequate analysis; a new audit authority for SPPS is recommended; and finally, the government must increase its control of the SPPS. A further specialisation of the prison officer work was questioned, and only the rehabilitative tasks were argued to need specially educated staff. There are, however, other actors in society, apart from audits and reports, who can have an impact on the forming of prison policy. The relative invisibility of clear political standpoints in prison policy at least offers a space for these other actors.

**Non-Governmental Organisations in the penal field**

There have always been debates between several actors in the field of prison policy. Besides politicians and the government, the media and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) have played crucial roles in recent decades. In the 1970s a growing number of social movements and NGOs organisations emerged to deal with different kinds of social problems in Sweden as well as in many other countries (Andersson & Nilsson, 2009; Amilon & Edstedt, 1998; SOU, 1976). The 1960s and the early 1970s saw the creation and growth of some important NGOs in the field of social problems; these were called the “R-associations” meaning they were national in scope. Besides the three NGOs working with psychiatric care policy, alcohol problems, and the policy on drug abuse and treatment respectively, there was KRUM, created in 1966, an NGO working for the “humanising of prison and probation policy”. KRUM had many members among prisoners but also many active members in the society outside prisons. The organisation KRUM played a vital role in the debates about prisons and was also involved in several prison-strikes and negotiations in Swedish prisons in the early 1970s (Amilon & Edstedt, 1998). The relative power and influence of the organisation declined in the late 1970s, and in 1984 KRUM was closed down.
Another NGO, KRIS (Criminals’ Return Into Society), formed in 1997, became important in the late 1990s. This is primarily a kind of self-help movement where ex-prisoners give newly released prisoners frequent support during and after release. Another aim is to provide information in schools about drugs and crime. KRIS has grown rapidly, and in 2002 the number of members was almost 1,500. They have also become well known for their work. Their rhetoric is quite different from that of KRUM, and the main focus today is on re-entry and support, not primarily on changing prison conditions in general. It is argued that KRIS is more suited to the individualistic view on “one’s own responsibility” prevalent in recent decades (Andersson & Nilsson, 2009) than was KRUM. In 2009, parts of KRIS formed a parallel NGO, X-cons, with similar goals, and this split is probably not strengthening the NGOs’ impact. Actually the critical opinions about the Swedish prisons of today, are mostly not delivered by KRIS, but are coming from e.g. international organisations like Amnesty International and the Human Rights Watch. In addition, there are voices of individual prisoners on Internet blogs and sites, but so far they rarely reach a broader audience. Also the Swedish “Prisoners Union”, which often works locally in the prisons, is a rarely heard voice in the public debate. To conclude, the impact of the NGOs on the prison policy during the two “turns” has been quite modest.

The prison officer trade unions

In Sweden there are three unions for uniformed prison staff, and other groups, like health staff, often have their own unions as well. Prison officers most often are members of the largest union, SEKO, or the smaller ST. The unions do not seem to have played an important role in the recent major changes of the prisons, with some exceptions. For several years SEKO was critical of the separate night and day shifts for staff that were introduced as a part of the planned “personal officer” reform. However agreement was reached on the issue in 1991 at a famous meeting held in the small village Kukkola in Sweden (Amilon & Edstedt, 1998), where SEKO agreed to the reform but not to the new schedule. They were critical of the schedule changes for several years, but at prison after prison local agreements were made (SEKO, internal documents, unpubl.). SEKO instead demanded better personal officer training courses and raised wages.

---

7 In 2009, SEKO organised 3,586 employees in the SPPS, most of whom were prison officers. ST had 1,741 members in the SPPS, of which around 1,000 were prison officers (SOU, 2009). SACP had 1,398 SPPS-employed members but probably only a minority of them were prison officers.
In the years after 1996, the big controversies seem to have entirely disappeared, and perhaps the situation with two unions partly diverging in their opinions is part of the reason, alongside a general weakening of unions in Swedish society in recent decades. So, all in all, today there tends to be less confrontation and more invisible non-governmental and union organisations in the field of prisons, and also less political actions and debate about prisons, compared to the case of the 1970s. A similar development, with reduced influence and weakened position for the union, seems to have taken place in the UK, with the Prison Officer Association POA (Liebling et al., 2010).

A few years ago, all three unions were asked to express their opinion about the training for prison officers. SEKO and ST favoured the same basic training for all prison officers, with some kinds of specialisation later, while SACO preferred more specialisation and more college-educated recruits. They all were positive to a longer basic training course than the present (SOU, 2009).

**The media and political parties as actors**

A crucial actor in the field of prisons is the media, including newspapers, radio, and TV. Despite an increasing interest in crime and punishment in contemporary society, there often seems to be poor knowledge among the public in general, and a disinterest on the part of media as well as politics, about what the closed worlds of the prisons really are like and how the work there is performed. When a prison issue receives political attention, the debate is often heated because of deterrence populism, but there is also a growing human rights voice in the debate (Sparks, 2007).

Prisons are generally considered a favourite topic in the press, but the picture presented there is rarely a prison-favourable one (Jewkes, 2007; Crawley, 2004a; SNCCP, 2007). The major media position is often guided by the principle of “less eligibility”, which means they often highlight prison facilities that might have better standards than in the outside world. In most kinds of media, stereotypical assumptions and frequently repeated themes are the rule in many countries. Jewkes (2007) found that some themes were more frequent in British media writings, such as prisons having too much eligibility, prisoners escaping too easily, or sometimes the reverse: prisoners being badly treated by staff. While other important issues, like young people in custody and the eternal failure of the prison rehabilitation, are rarely examined in depth. This kind of sporadic and selective media reporting does not contribute much to the knowledge about prisons, neither among politicians nor to the citizens in general. Still, the political sensitivity to media-reports on prisons is strong.
Following from this, at least in Sweden, the Prison and Probation Services also seem to be easily affected by the media. Media criticism one day often leads to rapid but organisationally not always well-prepared changes in the internal rules and policies the next day. Whether this is initiated internally in the SPPS, or a result of the informal communication channels, is not possible to discern, but an immediate reaction from SPPS to media criticism has been the dominant pattern in recent years. A Swedish national survey has shown that the Prison and Probation Services have lower public confidence ratings than the police and the courts, and it is argued that the media image contributes to this low legitimacy (SNCCP, 2007). The media in Sweden also played a crucial role in the rapid changes after the escapes in 2004 and the debate on the escapes was heated and thus served as a trajectory for the changes.

How the most important political actors in the field of prison policy affect the prison development and organisational changes is not easy to grasp. The populism often heard about crimes and sentencing, is not as evident in actual prison policy. There seems to be a striving for a kind of quiet political consensus in prison policy today, and one reason might be the complexity of the system, with risk and group assessments that differentiate prisoners (Andersson & Nilsson, 2009). There are of course left-wing and right-wing minority positions, e.g. abolitionists and a harsh-prison opinion, with varying levels of impact, and the majority consensus view shifts slightly from time to time. One of the best examples of this is the change after 2004, when a consensus that formed around more security became mainstream policy.

In the regular political governing of the SPPS, the political majority has a direct impact. First, there is the official external connection from the parliament and government, via the Ministry of Justice, to the Prison and Probation Services. This strong channel of control that leads directly from the Department of Justice to the SPPS is an important feature of the Swedish organisation. Part of this is visible in the Annual Prison Orders, Budget Comments, and similar official documents directed to the SPPS. A reading of the Annual Prison Orders of only the last decade, indicates some of the changes in the organisation: from an emphasis on qualitative goals to measuring efficiency/productivity by “indicators”; from prioritising service to a security emphasis, etc.

The Annual Prison Orders from the Ministry of Justice to the board of the Prison and Probation Service point out the direction for “running the business”. Limiting ourselves to the organisational issues, we can follow the development and some trends in the organisation of prisons in the last years. The Annual Prison Orders seem to comprise a distillation of impor-
tant issues on the current political agenda. In the 2003 Order, the emphasis on efficiency and cost-reduction, following from the SNAO (2002) report, is traceable; for instance self-catering, (prisoners themselves doing parts of the cleaning and meal service provision in the wing) is an emphasised goal. In 2005, many aspects of security work and intelligence activities are highlighted in the order in the aftermath of the incidents in 2004. In 2007 the emphasis was on the “work-line policy” (arbetslinjen), one of the watchwords of the new right-wing government, and in prisons this meant increased demands on prisoners to perform work, in prisons as well as after release. The work-line policy in prisons is also an expression of the “less eligibility”-principle, which means in short that the conditions in prison must never be better than in society outside.

There are also occasional official “mission statements” from the government directed to the SPPS, ordering the organisation to prioritise particular problems or groups that have been topics of political debate (SOU, 2009). There are however, in this governance, also unofficial channels between members of the political sector and the top management of the Prison and Probation Services, acknowledged as just as important for the development (SOU, 2005a). Hence, the minister of justice rarely comments openly on the prison policy. One exception was a statement of support by the right-wing minister of justice for the personal officer reform in 1991, and another was the criticism from the socialist minister in 2004, which forced the general director to quit. All in all, the strength and the modes of the governance in the prison field are difficult to assess, as it consists of both formal and informal orders or contacts (SOU 2009).

**Policy change analysis**

Above, some important changes in prison policy in recent decades have been presented, heuristically and only partly chronologically arranged and without much effort to explain them in a deeper manner. This background is perhaps not enough to understand the changes in the work of prison officers in Sweden today. It is, however, possible to try to connect the various actions of the separate parties or coalitions of actors in order to get a deeper understanding of some of the policy changes. Of course there are other actors in the field of prison policy (researchers, SNCCP, individual debaters, etc.) and the impact of other actors in the field is also difficult to capture. There are also some journals focusing on prison and probation, but with only a minor impact on prison policy. In Sweden we have seen major shifts in prison policy that have fundamentally affected the work of prison officers. The first was the rehabilitative turn in the early 1990s with the personal officer reform, formalising an expectation that prison officers
should perform active relationship building and counselling work, in addition to an expanded use of motivational and treatment programs. How was this change possible? The other was the security turn in the mid-2000s, when the emphasis shifted from the new rehabilitative role to a primarily security-minded prison officer. What was behind this dramatic turn?

In prison policy, one of the main issues is how to prioritise between the two main goals of the prisons: rehabilitation and resettlement; or security and safe custody. But this issue is, of course, more complicated, since this is connected to other questions about organisation, personnel, facilities, regulations, budget, etc. There is, of course, also an underlying traditional left-right positioning in prison policy, with humane treatment values versus tougher sentences, but with numerous variations and exceptions. If we return to the first of the two changes, the personal officer reform, this was preceded by discussions and pilot projects starting in the 1970s. Much of the values at that time concerned humanising prison conditions and increasing efforts to rehabilitate (or not doing so). In addition there was the discussion about changing the occupational role of prison officers from a traditional guard into a personal officer. The exact coalitions formed around this specific issue are not easily determined. The large union, SEKO, was against the proposal to change the role, because the personal officer reform would also mean separate day/night shifts and also staff reductions, and SEKO was against this. According to survey results, a large majority of their members were positive to the changed role, though not to the changed schedules. The ministry and the prison services top-management obviously were positive (Andersson & Nilsson, 2009; Amilon & Edstedt, 1994) and they saw the reform as enriching the job, but also as a way to cut costs. Here one could argue that a smooth shock (or perhaps more of an accidental policy broker) played a crucial role in solving the issue. A large research project on prison personnel, which was conducted 1983–87 by Psychologist Annika Härenstam and Professor Töres Theorell, had a crucial impact on the debate.\(^8\) One of their main findings – that prison officers had quite an unhealthy and non-stimulating job (Härenstam, 1989) – was widely discussed in the prison organisation (Amilon & Edstedt, 1998). This seemed to be an important ingredient in the negotiations, or a mechanism, in ACF terminology, in favour of changing the work role of prison officers (see SPPS 2000, p. 30). In addition, there were

---

\(^8\) One example was several articles written by Härenstam on the subject in the influential Swedish journal on prison and probations, Tidskrift för kriminalvård (Journal of Prison and Probation, own translation).
difficulties recruiting prison social workers at the end of the 1980s. The proposed prison officer role was still regarded ambiguously by the union: accepting a more rehabilitative and qualified position, but also demanding less traditional time-schedules and tasks. The union agreed in negotiations held in the village Kukkola in 1991 to the personal officer function, but not to the schedule changes, which took another couple of years to fully agree on. Even if the minister of justice had promoted a change of the prison officer role at the beginning of 1991, the change would probably not have been possible without the impact of the research report presented some years earlier. The ensuing media debates and work-place discussions made way for a swing of opinion not least among the prison officers themselves, in favour of the institution of the personal officer. The parallel expansion of the motivational and treatment programs did, however, pass almost without conflicts.

In the second “turn”, the one towards security in 2005, the process was a bit different. First, many western countries had seen a changed criminal and prison policy the last decades – by some authors called “the punitive turn” (Wacquant, 2010) – but this era of mass imprisonment had not reached Sweden to the same extent. In Sweden, there had been an ongoing debate about dividing the prison officer role since the SNAO report (1999), to strengthen the security part of the work, and there were several local attempts in that direction. However there was also resistance from many prison officers and also from staff higher up in the organisation to splitting the original role too much. Rehabilitative matters were still regarded as most important and as demanding further training (SOU, 2005b). During one year, 2004, there were several dramatic escapes from Swedish high-security prisons facilitated by either hostage taking or a break-in from outside. Media provided intense coverage and large headlines on each of the four incidents within just half a year. This impact of these incidents shook the prison system; the media was outraged, the minister of justice was questioned, and the general director was dismissed and replaced by a new “pro-security man” from the police organisation. This changed the landscape of prison thinking, and the focus was now on security issues. Much emphasis was put on “shell protection” at all prisons, and this was also the start of an increase in the number of high security prisons and units. Officer training and the formation of subcultures were also discussed. This increased the division of the prison officer role and raised the status of security work in prisons. Here a kind of policy broker was the “single-investigator” of the SOU (2005a), Björn Eriksson, who worked to set the new security agenda and to strengthen the political unity surrounding it. He did so by negotiating, discussing, and visiting with several prisons and
political groups. Even if there were critical voices from individual authors and organisations, they were not really heard. A policy-learning process seemed to take place among many groups of actors, while some groups resigned themselves, and the “security thinking” became widely accepted and quite predominant. This could be compared to the changes in American crime policy, where the expression “the triumph of the border” (Simon, 2001 p. 19) has been used when previously marginal opinions conquer the middle-ground in crime policy debate. Once again there had been a rapid change in Swedish prison policy and this time the prison shock events in 2004 had served as a starting point, but one person, the investigator, also played a crucial role in securing the changing of the prison policy.

In the two cases above, the ACF-perspective has served to cast some new light on two major processes of change in the Swedish prison policy and organisation that have been crucial to the prison officer role. Of course using this model also involves reducing the full complexity of reality, but perhaps it can explain some more of the processes and mechanisms in the policy changes in the prison field. It also contributes some interesting, but not easily answered questions: Would these changes have been possible without the specific brokers’ interventions in the contradicting political views? What was the effect of the “shock incidents” of 2004 in themselves? Would they alone have been enough to get the, partly international, “security-ball” rolling also in Sweden? Would something else have mediated these major changes, already going on in some other countries? The two “turns” have together fundamentally changed the conditions for prison officer work, and made way for the growing specialisation of the work in prison wings and occupational roles.

**Concluding remarks**

The Swedish prison policy is not entirely consistent with the crime policy at large. While crime policy in the 1980s turned towards an emphasis on tougher punishment, the prison policy did not change to the same extent. The focus on re-entry in the 1974 new Prisons Act and the change of the occupational title to “carer”, were expressions of that “deviance” of the prison policy. A strong Nordic abolition-debate tradition on prisons could be one reason for this inconsistency in policy (see e.g. Bondeson, 1974; Mathiesen, 1988). The Swedish image of a welfare prison system could be another reason (Nilsson, 2011) just as comparatively low rates of imprisonment. There is also kind of “dual sensitivity” to media, meaning prisons endeavouring in practice to avoid acts of harshness but also of excessive leniency, because both might be criticised in media (c.f. Jewkes, 2007). The prison policy hence stands in contrast to the rest of the crime policy in that
respective. In this tradition of balancing, it seems to be the extra-ordinary initiatives that resolve prison policy dilemmas when groups and interests balance each other.

This brief analysis of prison policy indicates a crucial role of extra-ordinary interventions in the two “turns” in the policy process. This is not unexpected theoretically, due to a scenario with articulated difficulties to solve problems when different values are competing. A problem is that the core values of the stakeholders in the Swedish prison policy debate are not very easy to discern, there were few distinct polarities. That the top management and the prison staff unions were of different opinions at the end of the 1980s is quite clear, but the political divergences in the days of the 2004 events and policy changes, are not as obvious. Without reducing the importance of other factors, the interventions of “the research report” about prison staff that was frequently presented and discussed, and the extensive work of the “one-man committee” seem to have had crucial impacts on the policy changes.

The policy level is closely connected to the organisation, the arena for prison officer work. To explain the often unpredictable and sudden changes in the prison organisation, the policy level, with its many stakeholders, i.e. politicians, the media, the government (not least through the frequently initiated investigations of the prison system), non-governmental organisations, and trade unions, is crucial to explore. In prison policy, the coalitions seem weak and temporary, while most media often serve to strengthen “the trend of the day”. A complicating factor in the study of prison policy implementation and the political governing of the prison organisation is, as we shall see, that it is done through both formal and informal channels. Hence, theory on the policy level has to be able to take that into account, and the adapted Advocacy Coalition Framework gives at least tentative explanations of the changes.
4. The Swedish prison organisation and prison employees

The history of the Swedish prison officers and their work organisation will be further presented here. How prisons are organised, separately and taken together, is another foundation for understanding prison officer work. It has been argued that a prison organisation has to adopt Weber's idea of the developed administrative bureaucracy, simply to avoid chaos (Sykes, 1958). The prison services have organisational roots from the old military system of the 19th century, and the military hierarchy has, with some changes, followed the prisons for many years. Also, occupational titles similar to the military ones were in use for a long time in the prisons. In the Swedish prisons, the prison officer occupational title was ''guard constable'' from the nineteenth century until 1972 (SOU, 1977). And despite the change of title in 1972, the orders, decisions, and information within the organisation are primarily vertically processed in a top-down fashion, both by the local management as well as the top management. Together with the fact that the prison, figuratively as well as literally, is a closed world, this makes it difficult to find any more classical example of the hierarchical type of culture, in the terminology of Douglas and Wildavsky (1982), further described in the next chapter.

Some historical notes

The older history of the Swedish prison officer occupation is not very well documented. In the 17th and 18th centuries there seem to be several roots of the occupation, like military guards of war captives as well as assistants of the local police. Imprisonment was often used as a remand intervention, and these small jails were very inhumane, placed in castles and other official buildings. Regular prisons did actually not exist three centuries ago; instead the sentenced punishments were directed to the life and the body (SOU, 1977; Foucault, 1977). The moral duty of citizens to work was regulated by means of separate units, and large groups of poor people were without trial placed in compulsory work units.

Early in the 19th century, ideas about punishment were changing. The new humane thinking was consistent with the Enlightenment and punishment was frequently debated. The importance of more humane treatment grew stronger and was officially declared by the government. The use of corporal punishment was questioned and the building of prisons increased. In 1825 the first Prison Services authority (Fångvårdsstyrelsen) was created and by a new Prison Act in 1832 the Swedish prison era had begun. In the
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choice between the two dominating prison systems, the Auburn system, with silence in community, and the Philadelphia solitary confinement system, Sweden chose the latter with solitary cell confinement and individual cell work. In 1832 an expansive Swedish prison-building project started, and from 1844 every Swedish county was to have its own cell prison. By the end of the century Sweden had built over 40 prisons, most of them cell prisons, and a large number of local remand jails as well. Nevertheless, in the 19th century many male prisoners were sentenced to compulsory work at the large military fortresses and work prisons (SOU, 1977; Nilsson, 1999). In the cell-prison idea, the roles of the reform preachers and doctors were emphasised as crucial to the regime, while the guard staff was rarely mentioned at all (Nilsson, 1999).

From 1855 onward prison officers were regularly uniformed and they were still organised similar to the military ranks. Sergeants and guard-knights were common occupational titles among prison staff. A short sword was part of their uniform equipment. The semi-military character of prison organisation decreased toward the end of the 19th century (SOU, 1977). The line-staff in the prisons had low status and were poorly paid during the 19th century. Extra-legal punishments for staff misconduct were common. Frequent offences among prison staff were contraband smuggling and drunkenness. Until 1850 staff could receive corporal punishment, but later they received suspension, warnings, or jail (Nilsson, 1999). The military organisation was supplemented by civil regulations, but still a great number of the prison staff had military backgrounds. Most staff lived in or near the prison, as a part of their duty agreement and also as a practical necessity due to the long working hours, 90 hours being the regular working week (Nilsson, 1999). At the beginning of the 20th century the uniformed staff in cell prisons generally consisted of, e.g., “Guard Constables”, “Guard Supervisors”, “Guard Women” and the “Prison Governor”. Nilsson (1999) has argued that from an almost shared culture among prisoners and staff in the early 19th century, with similar living-conditions and social class, an occupational culture was emerging at the end of the 19th century. International prison conferences had also highlighted staff issues by this time. The attention on working conditions in general and the influence of the growing Swedish trade-union movement paved the way, and in 1906 the first Swedish union for prison officers was formed.

The idea of cell prisons was reconsidered and the system was abolished in Sweden at the end of World War I. The new prisons were built with the expectation of treating people to become reformed human beings without solitary confinement. Many new large prisons were built in the middle of the century, and the prison officer occupation became more regulated in
terms of working hours and duties. Since the beginning of the 1960s there have been national, detailed prison work orders for all prisons concerning staffing and officer duties. These special arrangements for prison staff were slowly replaced by general labour market agreements, as for other occupational groups. Still, as late as the 1970s the job of prison officer was still very much that of a “turn-key” and the principal officer made all the important decisions, while the senior officer enforced them in practice by means of the constables (SOU, 1977 p. 286ff). In the following, the organisational development of the Prison and Probation Services and the consequences for prisons and prison officer work will be described and briefly analysed, by means of relevant organisation theory.

**Organisation and employees**

There are a number of organisational characteristics shared by all the prisons in general. Centralised and hierarchical organisations, like prisons, often suffer from a great deal of internal inertia (Morgan, 2006). This means that new policies designed or passed on by the management, do not always reach the floor level of the organisations, e.g. the prison officers. Additional reasons might of course be that the management has not presented the reasons for or the benefits of the change clearly enough among staff within the organisation. The result of an implementation will also be affected by whether the idea is regarded as trustworthy by the employees (Alvesson, 2001). This organisational inertia was highlighted in one of the reports (SOU, 2005a) presented in the previous chapter, where the prison services were called a “disobedient organisation” (p. 110). A consequence of this is that internal policy changes, decided in the top management of the SPPS organisation will not always find their way through the different hierarchal levels and organisational filters, often because the motives behind these changes are not properly understood and accepted among the employees. In the report, this organisational “disobedience” was perhaps not as discussed as could be expected. In the neo-institutional thinking about organisations, the symbolic meaning of things can be as important as their factual impact. Hence, the symbolic value of a change might be more attractive or important than the real effects of a policy change (Alvesson, 2001). In the prisons, the dispersion of internal organisational policy changes into every single vein is not always as important to the top management as giving the impression of an active visionary leadership.

Hierarchical organisations like the SPPS are to some extent also affected by the recent trends in organisational thinking. Different trends or recipes for governance and management tend to travel around the world, to be adapted to and incorporated into different organisations (Rövik, 2000).
For example, there have been attempts to flatten the prison organisation in the 1990s, when the senior officer rank was abolished and many of the governors of small prisons were replaced by a local “authority governor” who also managed the remand prisons and the probation office in the district. The trend of flattened organisations, decentralisation, and self-managing production in work-groups was widely incorporated into the private sector in the 1980s but apparently only influenced the prisons somewhat later. Some years later this recipe was abandoned in favour of an organisational form with more levels of decision-making and managers.

Another example is a visible change in the Annual Prison Orders from the Ministry of Justice. Some years ago these orders became more detailed, probably influenced by the Management By Objectives (MBO) recipe, another circulating trend. The collective goals of the SPPS became more quantified and measureable, and were called “indicators” (SOU 2009). On the floor level, for prison staff, this also entailed more result-statistics to register and report, but their involvement in forming the goals seemed to be very limited, in contrast to the original MBO idea. The “One-authority-reform” in 2006 (see Proposition, 2004 p. 176) can serve as a third example of influences from new ideas. This reform reduced the autonomy of the former 37 local authorities, in favour of six regions with regional managers and expanded bureaucracy to manage several juridical, economic, and human-relations issues. But it also induced an expanded headquarters-administration (SOU, 2009), with, e.g., a growing internal research unit and intelligence department. A theoretical expression of this travelling trend is re-bureaucratisation, where old ideas of centralised power and control are dressed in “new clothes” and coexist with, e.g., more recent market ideas (Rövik, 2008). None of these ideas, however, have been fully implemented in the prison organisation.

The doctrine of New Public Management (NPM) could be seen as an umbrella covering different institutional standards, or as a cluster of ideas, like some of the presented examples above, about how to develop the organisation of different authorities. NPM is heavily influenced by, or rather imported from, the private business sector. At the core of NPM are ideas about professional leadership, explicit criteria for productivity and efficiency, control of results, disaggregation into self-governed results units, competition between units, and privatisation (Montin, 2007; Agevall & Jonnergård, 2010). Most of the signs characterising NPM can be found in the higher levels SPPS organisation, which affects the prisons. It is, however, important to stress that there are some particular limitations in the copying of private solutions into the prison organisation. Even if it does occur in other fields of the public sector, there is currently a political he-
gemony not to privatise Swedish prisons. But NPM influences the prisons in many other ways, e.g. the industrial production development of the prisons (with the new trademark “Made in Jail”) and coordinated supply of goods. There are always also “local” adaptations of the travelling trends, aiming to make the recipe fit into the importing context, and concerning the prison organisation this process tends to fragmentise the new ideas. An obvious effect of the hierarchical structure in this respect is that the possibilities for local prisons or even regions, to import new organisational ideas and recipes are very limited. The fragments of new ideas that are implemented into the SPPS are almost entirely implemented in a top-down fashion by the Ministry of Justice or the SPPS top management. The fact of annually changing demands is one reason for short-term changes in the local prison organisation and, hence, the working conditions of prison staff. In the prisons, prison officers are obliged to register new result-statistics, to make detailed plans for prisoners, and to follow more advanced security routines, which are just some examples of the practical consequences for prison officer work. Of course a constantly developing prison officer role is unavoidable, but rapid changes in the direction of current political issues that are insufficiently motivated might also be frustrating to employees.

There are influences between prison systems in different countries, one example being New Public Management, presented above, which is influencing many other prison systems (see e.g. Crewe, 2009). Another is the development of behavioural and treatment programs in prisons, the precursors of which were prisons in Canada and the USA in the early 1990s (Amilon & Edstedt, 1995). But this does not mean that all ideas are imported. In spite of the international trend of mass imprisonment in western countries in recent decades, with rapidly increasing prison populations (Feeley & Simon, 1992; Garland, 2001), the Nordic countries are exceptional with fairly constant imprisonment rates (Lappi-Seppälä, 2007; Pratt, 2008a). The western “era” of imprisonment is also argued to have created a new penal policy, with risk and group thinking as its main characteristic (Feeley & Simon, 1992), a policy that without mass imprisonment actually has reached the Swedish prison system (Hörnqvist, 2010). The Swedish manifestation of the idea of risk governance, however, is a bit different from the Anglo-American one. This might be due to a deeper Swedish welfare tradition; for instance it has added investigation of individual needs to the risk- and group-assessment procedure. Organisational ideas are also often reshaped and adapted to the specific organisation before their implementation is conducted locally (Rövik, 2000).
Public organisations or authorities that manage people, i.e. process, sustain, or change clients under different designations could be called Human Service Organisations (HSO). Even if this is a rough division, the distinction is useful for discussing the aims of such organisations. Hasenfeld (2010) starts with organisations as they are, and is less interested in their creation process. In this mainly “structural” approach, HSOs are regarded as relatively permanent phenomena with certain characteristics.

The HSOs in general have specific problems and conditions, and the managing of these is crucial. First, they have human beings as their “raw material”, and the raw material reacts to and affects the work. They can choose whether or not to actively participate and cooperate. In this way human beings are both the “raw material” and the “product” of these organisations (Hasenfeld, 2010). Second, the work of HSOs also often deals with moral concerns, about what is right, fair, or good. Prisons are as human service organisations both “people sustaining” and “people changing”, but the daily confrontation with people forcibly incarcerated is a special ingredient. The moral considerations are crucial since time and resources to help prisoners are limited, and morality is also particularly important when managing people in involuntary situations, as prison officers do.

Prison work today is not possible without some degree of participation by the prisoners. For prison officers, the ability to negotiate with prisoners is crucial. First, prison officers are dependent on fairly good personal-relations with prisoners, to make their work meaningful or even possible. Second, they are in the minority compared to the prisoners, so interaction and negotiation are inevitable parts of the peacekeeping in their everyday work (Liebling, 2000). Unlike most human service occupations, in which women are the vast majority (Hasenfeld 2010 p. 26), prison work is still a predominantly male occupation. Even if the number of female prison officers in the prisons is rising, and today in Sweden comprise more than 35 percent of the total, they are not equally distributed in prisons and wings, and the majority of officers in most prisons are men. In the literature it is often stated that female prison officers are more rehabilitative and relationally oriented (Hemmens & Stohr, 2000), hence they ought to be very important in the crucial personal-relationship work in the “prison production”.

Employees in human service organisations in the public sector could often be described as street-level bureaucrats (SLBs), working in between politicians, management, and the “public”, with the latter consisting of clients and patients, but also people in general (Lipsky, 1980, 2010). SLBs work in organisations with a constant lack of resources compared to the needs their employees meet among clients. These SLBs face increasing de-
mands for qualitative as well as quantitative services, unclear goals that are difficult to measure, and more or less involuntary clients. To work in this position means to be at risk of conflicts with clients as well as with the public. It also means a certain amount of autonomy and discretion in how to apply the rules, and how to distribute the limited resources (Lipsky 1980, 2010).

To manage the implications of their position, SLBs use several strategies. The first is to ration services by using costs (money or time), by queuing, or by developing routines (Lipsky, 1980, 2010). To prison officers, the time available for personal officer tasks is very limited today, owing to security routines, staff shortages, and administrative tasks. By forcing clients to wait or self-prioritise, i.e., whoever is first in line gets the attention, or by simplifying complicated tasks into routines, e.g. the distribution of medicines, they attempt to ease the time pressure on themselves. Routines are fundamental in the prison setting and are often mentioned as being necessary in order to fulfil control and security tasks. Routines, however, also serve to protect officers from client demands for responsiveness, and also to provide a legitimate excuse to avoid being flexible (Lipsky, 1980 p. 100f). Secondly, SLBs use their control of the distribution of services to prioritise among clients as a way to gain some visible results. Prison officers try to reach results like calmness in the wing or acceptable rates of decent re-entry planning, with the limited resources available. To prioritise the “easy cases” or the “nice guys” is an example of a way to achieve this in practice. But this economising of resources, and especially the exercise of rules and routines, will often cause reactions of different kinds among clients (Lipsky, 1980, 2010). Complaints and appeals, but also aggression and threats from prisoners, are common reactions to the rationing strategies, e.g., when prisoners receive negative decisions on applications. About 1,000 complaints a year are filed with the Ombudsman of Justice concerning the SPPS, 10 percent of which lead to audit criticism (SPPS Website). Labour-market statistics as well as official reports show that threats to staff from prisoners are common (SNCCP, 2006).

Despite changing prison policies over time, working in these organisations has a “moral” character (Hasenfeld, 2010). This means that the tasks constantly involve judgments about people, based on values and social worth, like needs assessment and distribution of resources. Actually, the very legitimacy of these public organisations is determined by how their moral performance is perceived, in relation to public opinion (Hasenfeld, 2010, Lipsky 1980, 2010). The sparse, selective, and stereotypical image of prisons – as well as of prison officers – which dominates the media reporting (Jewkes, 2007), naturally contributes to this perception. Although the
“prison services” are a special kind of human service organisation – more closed and less publicly known – many human service characteristics are easily recognised. The reliance of prison officer work on negotiation and rule discretion to maintain order in the prisons (Sykes, 1958; Liebling, 2001) is also an acknowledgement of prisoners as co-producers rather than objects. Lipsky’s (1980, 2010) expression “street level bureaucrat” also emphasises the position between the government/politicians, and the public, similar to Hasenfeld’s description of these public service organisations. Both, however, discuss a professional role that implies more individual autonomy in judgments and decisions than is the case among most prison employees in general.

Even though Lipsky and others discuss prison work and regard prison officer as an example of SLBs (Lipsky, 1980, 2010; Cheliotis 2007) one could raise a crucial objection in this case: the autonomy of Swedish prison officers is connected to the work groups – a partly group-based autonomy – within the still rather routine-based daily work. Others have argued that rules and routines do not necessarily reduce the amount of officer discretion; instead they could just as well increase it (Evans & Harris, 2004). This is because, in short, the more rules there are, the more the opportunities to judge and interpret. Later, Lipsky has argued that there are cases where the principles of New Public Management have focused more sharply on objectives, which has “resulted in administrative reforms that narrowed workers’ discretion” (Lipsky, 2010 p. 223), without eliminating it. However, the heart of the street level position, facing needy but unwilling and rarely thankful people or clients, as well as being in possession of less resources than the needs demand (Lipsky 1980, 2010), is a reality in the work of many prison officers (Hammerlin & Matthiessen, 2006; Nylander, 2006).

Even if prison policy and organisational development are here divided between two chapters, they are intertwined and constantly affect each other in real life. The prison policy, with its distinctive “turns”, has had a deep impact on the organisation of the prisons, and not least on the prison officer’s “street-level” work. The number of short-term leaves and furloughs for prisoners was reduced by over 50% during the first six years of the new millennium, and the escapes from prisons have in recent years dropped dramatically, owing to new security measures. These changes have required an increased ability among staff to manage prisoner frustration inside the prisons. Also, smaller prison policy changes could have a severe impact on prison officers’ work, an example of which is the organisational reaction to some media-reported suicides among prisoners a few years ago. The suicides in Swedish remand prisons were discussed in media in 2008,
which resulted in a rapidly implemented short first-aid course for all prison staff, although the suicide rate in the regular Swedish prisons this year, just like the previous years, was very low. The first-aid course, however, was given top priority in the operational orders, so many other courses, also important to staff, were cancelled during half a year. It would have been politically difficult for the top management not to display their ability to take action, and owing to the re-bureaucratised organisation, the first-aid-course order had an enormous impact on the system. The course-attendance was high among the prison officers, unlike many unclear policy implementations which often have had limited effect in practice. The centralised organisation, a striving among officers to acquire knowledge that makes their job less uncertain and unpredictable, and the internal blaming that occurs in cases of failures to follow rules and procedures that is common in hierarchical organisations (Vaughn, 2002), have probably been motivating factors. When it comes down to the “street-level” position of prison officers, the necessary rule discretion and individually based (in Sweden also group-oriented, own remark) understanding of “how to do the job” will to a large extent also determine the outcome of explicitly articulated policies and orders (Cheliotis, 2007).

The organisational strategies to meet the increased demands for both safe custody and active rehabilitation in the prisons include a differentiation of wings and a specialisation of the work within them. This has also led to a process of division of the prison officer role that has been advocated in several committee reports in recent decades. First, prisons are differentiated according to security category and regime. Second, all closed prisons today also have a variety of wings, which tacitly increases a specialisation of the prison officer work. Prison officers working in drug-treatment wings undergo treatment training and develop such skills, while prison officers in special security wings have other kinds of training relevant for their tasks. Prison officers in the 1960s and 1970s had a very uniform set of tasks and limited decision latitude (SOU, 1977). Starting with the personal officer reform in the early 1990s, prison officers received more varied and qualified tasks, first as personal officers but later also as program leaders, security specialists, and other special “function responsibilities”. A process of specialising the work and tasks of a certain occupational field, and an accompanying division of labour into separate units and employees, might be an early stage of development towards increased professionalism (Freidson, 2001).
Professionalism

The specialisation of work-tasks and the division of labour are fundamental processes of work organisation in the evolution of societies. Specialisation is not an absolute mode of organisation, but always occurs in relation to something else, to earlier forms of more “holistic” or integrated work organisation, or to alternative less specialised ways of organising. Specialisation requires knowledge of different kinds to function. Closely connected to specialisation is the division of labour, where specialised tasks are performed by different employees, in different steps, etc. According to Durkheim (1893/1997), division of labour is a sign of a developed society. Specialisation and division of labour often occur together when a work organisation changes, but changes do not occur without reason. There are social forces or powers that affect the processes (Freidson, 2001 p. 44).

There are, however, different modes of how to specialise and divide work. Freidson (2001) distinguishes between modes induced by markets, by bureaucracy management, and by occupations. In the market mode, customers have the power to exert influence through their preferences. In the bureaucracy mode, the managers have the power, through the more or less hierarchical structure, to organise work in accordance with goals, i.e., order and efficiency. In the third mode, occupations form and control the specialisation and work division themselves and in negotiation with other occupations.

Professionalism as a theoretical ideal state is argued by Freidson (2001) to exist when “an organised occupation gains the power to determine who is qualified to perform a defined set of tasks, to prevent others from performing that work, and to control the criteria by which to evaluate performance” (Freidson, 2001 p. 12). This means that neither individual buyers nor managers of firms have the power to control or prescribe the performance; this remains the privilege of the organised occupations. In reality, no occupations have fully reached that status, but those that are close to it are often in Anglo-American literature named “professions”. Scott (2008) argues that what is regarded as a profession varies in different times and places, since it is about ongoing institutional processes of acting and structuring. It is also argued that the individual autonomy and collegial controls are today slowly being replaced by hierarchical-managerial control of the professions (Evetts, 2006; Scott 2008, p. 234). Evetts (2006) argues that there are two competing modes: the traditional occupational professionalism and an organisational professionalism, containing standardisation of work practices, accountability, target setting, and performance review. In Freidson’s (2001) terms, this is close to a bureaucracy management mode of specialisation and division. Hence, there seem to both be
forces among occupations to professionalise themselves, and a counterpart among organisations, where the professionalism aims to control the occupations. The purpose of article IV is to discuss both of these professional processes in relation to Swedish prison officers.

In occupational professionalism, there are differences in the composition of the knowledge that is common in each of the kinds of specialisation. While mechanical specialisation, i.e. industrial work, mainly requires everyday “common sense” knowledge, the mental discretionary specialisation that is more connected to professions, demands formal knowledge. Formal knowledge, resting on theories and concepts, is crucial and dominant in professional knowledge, while it is not as important in the specialisations common in the market or bureaucracy models (Freidson, 2001).

Without doubt, the state-employed Swedish prison officers have the position of street-level bureaucrats, with their limited resources and (often) involuntary clients, but the limited autonomy and discretion available to them seems partly to be work-group centred. Freidson (2001) argues that professional status could be seen as an ideal that no occupational groups fully reach, although a few, e.g., general practitioners and dentists, come very close. It is, however, important to note the emphasis above on processes of change in the professionalisation of occupations (Freidson, 2001; Scott, 2008). The ongoing specialisation of prison officer work could be seen as a process of professionalisation in the occupation, as well as a top-down organisational process emanating from a bureaucracy and managerial interests of standardisation and efficiency.

A process heading towards occupational professionalism involves the development of an occupational knowledge built on formal theories and concepts, and a growing occupational impact on the formal qualifications and access requirements to perform the job (Freidson, 2001). In organisational professionalism, the knowledge and entry qualifications are controlled by the organisation and by the management. In article IV, the development of the occupational role is reviewed by means of the discussion in official documents and the prison journal debate. The required qualifications for prison officers today are completed upper-secondary school, and since 2002 the basic training includes eight weeks of academic studies. The unions have had an ambiguous position in the process of development and in the discussion on further raising the educational demands and training of prison officers. The SPPS have recruited an increasing share of employees with college education, and there are plans for an extended qualification period (including the training) to reach the prison officer grade. The college-educated recruits have acquired a general formal knowledge, which
is not specific to prison work. These changes in educational and qualification demands seem to be entirely organisational initiatives.

In many traditional professions as well as “semi-professions” (e.g., social workers) occupational ethics guidelines are common. For prison officers, however, the rules of conduct have been prescribed by the SPPS general director in the SPPS Internal Work Order, stating:

The Prison and Probation Services staff shall treat everyone fairly and properly. Furthermore, an employee must in all other respects contribute to a good working environment and strive to behave in a way that inspires confidence and respect. An employee must be courteous, respectful, and firm, observe self-restraint, and avoid whatever could be perceived as an expression of ill-will or pettiness (SPPS, 2007 p. 31, own transl.).

These rules are further developed in internal handbooks and instructions. Recently the union has introduced occupational ethics guidelines for prison work. These are argued to be a sign of professionalism (Freidson, 2001; Klason, 2010). Those recruited as prison officers are still a heterogeneous group, even if the tendency in the last two decades has been towards slowly increasing the required qualifications. It is argued that an increasing involvement by some of the prison officers in the use of evidence-based behavioural, motivational, and treatment programs, on the other hand, probably leads to an increased interest in, e.g., the theoretical field of social psychology (Holmberg & Fridell, 2006). According to article IV, the development of the occupation is, from a traditional professional perspective, ambiguous, while the signs of top-down organisational professionalism are numerous.

Finally, it is important to add that a development within an occupation towards more professionalism is not in itself necessarily something good. The professionalism of occupations in the field of crime control is especially questioned. It is argued that these professions also gain more power within their field, and this could be used not only to take care of problems, but also to maintain them (Cohen, 1985). The role of the prisons in this respect is already questioned for its ineffectiveness in reducing criminality (Mathiesen, 1988; Lipsky, 1980 p. 114), and the professional interest of occupational or individual survival might just as well be an obstacle to acknowledging the poor track record of the prisons and increasing the use of better alternatives. However, the signs of increasing professionalism among prison officers so far indicate more of a top-down process than an occupationally organised development.
Concluding remarks

The SPPS bureaucracy and the prisons in general are examples of hierarchical cultures. Even if these kinds of organisations are often inert – which is an obstacle to rapid change – they are not unaffected by new organisational ideas or “recipes” that are in circulation (c.f. Røvik, 2000). Traces of several recent trends can be found in documents as well as in the prison practice. The actual implementation of each of them, though, seems neither fully inclusive nor very successful. Even if their effect at the level of the “factory floor” in the prisons is often limited, they might constitute a symbolic value, as signifying organisational progress and a top management with ambitions for change. The prisons are also a kind of human service organisations, doing moral work with people who are clients as well as “co-producers” in this work. The co-production in prisons, however, includes rule enforcement that must be performed with discretion and a certain degree of negotiation among the officers (Liebling, 2001). Furthermore, it involves rehabilitative efforts, which demand some kind of alliance and cooperation between prisoners and the prison officer as personal officer. This might be further complicated by the basically involuntary presence of the first group, and the limited resources to prepare for a decent re-entry into society.

Prison officers have a position of street-level bureaucrats, even though their autonomy is partly work-group based. The husbanding of resources by means of selection and coping strategies is a part of the prison work today. Despite the development of prison officer work, the question of whether the prison officer occupation is developing towards a sort of profession cannot be fully answered, as such processes are slowly proceeding over time. There are factors pushing towards increased professionalism with an increasing specialisation of tasks and, to some extent specialised in-job training. But among the prison officers themselves, the driving forces to develop the occupation towards one or several professions are weak. Furthermore, the specific occupational knowledge is still more based on formal regulations, practical performance rules, and common sense, than on formal theories and concepts. The organisational mode of professionalism seems to be dominant.

The prison policy processes and the prison organisation development are complicated processes. It requires some simplification and the use of theory to understand policy changes as well as many organisational features. Within the frames imposed by the Swedish prison policy and the specific organisation of the SPPS, the prison work takes place. The frames also serve as preconditions and limitations of the forming and maintaining of occupational culture and identity among the prison officers working there.
5. Meta-theory and theoretical framework

This chapter starts with a brief summary of the ontological and epistemological presuppositions of the thesis, and their implications. The thesis is partly inspired by critical realistic thinking, and some fundamental ideas of critical realism are therefore briefly presented and applied to the prison research context. A research map is introduced as a model for methodological considerations as well as for the structuring of theory. In line with the theoretical ambition, the first-order concepts of culture and identity will be explored in detail. Culture will be elaborated in relation to organisations, groups, and occupations, and important perspectives on how to study culture will also be introduced. Identity will be elaborated in relation to collectives like organisation, group, and occupation, but also to the individual. Then the second-order concepts used on the "operational level", namely social and professional representations, emotional labour, and interaction rituals, will be explored. Finally, the theoretical concepts are discussed together in relation to the research map.

Epistemological approach

Previous research on prison work, as we have seen in chapter 2, represents a blending of research traditions as well as a diversity of epistemological perspectives, which may suffice to make it clear that this is not one coherent research tradition. Social research, concerning occupational groups as well as concerning prison research, most often belong to the large field of social science research. The objects of study in the social sciences are different from the ones in the natural sciences, and this affects the respective mainstream-views on the sciences. The research ideal in natural sciences is the "objective" scientist collecting as "clean" empirical data as possible about study objects unaffected by the research. This is still a dominating image in natural sciences, sometimes also used in studies of the social field, even if heavily criticised for overlooking the inevitable influence of our concepts and language on all data (Danermark et al., 2002 p. 17). Instead, in the social sciences it is argued that the objects of study are acknowledged as impossible to isolate from the surrounding world and from the researchers' activities. In this open system, prison work is "naturally" affected by different forces in the research, as well as constantly being in some kind of change. Hence, in the field of social sciences, a meta-hermeneutic is present, with the researcher always interpreting expressions of human meanings (Danermark et al., 2002 p. 159).
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One important ontological point of departure in realism is the question, “what must the world be like for science to be possible?” (Bhaskar, 1975/2008 p. 23). The answer, in a critical-realistic perspective, is that reality is differentiated. This means that parts of reality are not immediately visible and available to data collection and analysis (Danermark et al., 2002). Rather, reality contains three domains. The empirical domain consists of the experienced and/or observed, and is only a part of the actual domain, i.e. the events – everything that is actually possible to observe. But in the third, real domain, there are also mechanisms working outside of the experience and event domains, affecting the development we can actually experience (Bhaskar, 1975/2008 p. 13). Only fragments of the entirety of prison work might be possible to observe, and even if we could observe it all, we still would not understand why some events take place. Mechanisms might affect forces and events on other levels of reality than where the studied object belongs (Danermark et al., 2002) Our capacity for knowledge is due to the ontology: we can distinguish between the transitive, known dimension of study objects, and the intransitive unknown dimensions of them, with the first also being our present knowledge. Science is a form of work, like any other work, that aims to produce knowledge (Bhaskar, 1975/2008 p. 57). From this follows that all science is fallible, but not – as the relativistic standpoint postulates – necessarily equally fallible. The realistic view is that different theories are trying to explain the same world, and they might do this with unequal success (Collier, 1994; Danermark et al., 2002 p. 25). There is knowledge of better and worse quality, to put it simply.

Society is not only differentiated, but also stratified and structured, and researching social phenomena therefore means trying to capture something that is actually existing in a structured and levelled order, ranging from micro to macro levels (Danermark, 2002; Brante, 2001). This idea is transformed into a research strategy described by Layder (1993). Adapted to the prison officer work, Layder’s “research map” can be of help in choosing a theory as well as methods for this research:

![Figure 1: Layder's research map adapted to prison work.](image)

- **CONTEXT**
  - Prison policy, politics, and tradition

- **SETTING**
  - SPPS, The prison and wing environments

- **SITUATED**
  - Staff-prisoner relations and interaction

- **HISTORY**
  - A temporal perspective applicable to all the levels, but not necessarily with the same time-scale

- **SELF**
  - Individual motives

Individual biographies, because interaction has its own super-individual powers and capacities. Similarly, interaction between several individuals creates unique biographies, because interaction has its own super-individual powers and capacities. Similarly, interaction between several individuals creates unique biographies, because interaction has its own super-individual powers and capacities.
In this map, the first two levels consist of context, here society, the prison system, and prison policy, and setting, which in the case of prison work is the organisation, i.e. the local prison, wing, or unit. The following, third level consists of situated activity, i.e. the interaction level where the work of the prison officer takes place, and finally the level of self is the individual psycho-biographic level. The history dimension is a temporal perspective applicable to all the levels, but not necessarily with the same time-scale (Layder, 1993). While policy processes, for instance, might continue for years and decades, the individual thinking and the interaction might switch over the course of hours or minutes. Objects on one level e.g. interaction in prisons, are not reducible to an underlying level, e.g. individual psycho-biographies, because interaction has its own super-individual powers and capacities. Similarly, interaction between several individuals creates unique or emergent powers or capacities, which in this case are not found in the individual’s self (Danermark et al., 2002 p. 60).

As the different levels or strata often affect each other in more or less hidden ways, it is necessary to explore and use data from several levels of the social reality, even if we are initially studying an object that is regarded as belonging mainly to one specific level. When studying prison work, the prison policy (expressed in e.g. prison orders, committee reports, and official audits) is regarded as an important contributor to recent changes in the working conditions of Swedish prison officers, just as the recruitment of the individual prison officers, over time, might affect how the prison work.
will be formed. In addition, reflecting on how findings might be differently framed by theory, or what makes an object what it is, is important in social research (Layder, 1998; Danermark et al., 2002).

In sociology, one conflict has concerned the importance of human action in comparison to the impact of structures. In recent decades, several efforts have been made to connect these two major perspectives in theory (Giddens, 1984). The realistic approach emphasises a certain kind of “dualistic” view where actions and structures are neither reducible to each other, nor “two sides of the same coin”. Instead, they function in different ways, but constantly affect each other in cycles. Structures condition action, while action reshapes structures over time (Danermark et al., 2002). This view is summarised in a “transformation model” linking structure and action.

**Figure 2: The transformational model of social structure and agency (from Bhaskar, 1993, ref in: Danermark et al., 2002 p. 180)**

To study the structures conditioning the work of prison officers and the activities of which it consists means to choose among several possible approaches and practical research methods. In general, the aim of the study and the nature of the “object of study” must guide the choice of research methods. This has often meant the classic, and held to be unavoidable, choice between a qualitative and a quantitative approach. In recent years, however, the choice more frequently concerns what methods – of both kinds and in what combination – will give the most comprehensive understanding and explanation of the research problem. There are several ways to combine different methods, but the critical realist idea is not just to mix methods or data. The use of different kinds of methods serves the purpose of explaining the forces and mechanisms behind observable events, and to develop theory. This must guide the combination of methods used for data collection. Then the terms intensive and extensive methods are preferred...
(Danermark et al., 2002). In this research, the use of several kinds of data together with theoretical concepts, could uncover more of the “nature” of the studied part of the social field of prison work.

There is a discussion in social research on how to let theory influence the empirical data collection (Layder, 1998). Traditionally there has been a presumed choice between two dominating research approaches. The first is to test existing middle range theories (often abbreviated MRT), a hypothetical-deductive method. Theories on a middle range, between “grand” universal theories and not-too-subject-specific micro-theories, are regarded as useful for guiding research and for testing in various settings (Merton, 1967). The second method, called Grounded Theory, or GT, emphasises that research has to be grounded in data alone, and by collecting and categorising data, theoretical assumptions about reality will occur or be possible to make (Strauss & Glaser, 1967). Few defend the most extreme form of GT today, and the criticism concentrates on the utopia of finding clean data unaffected by theory (Danermark et al., 2002 p. 135ff); however, modified in this respect it is often used in qualitative research. Layder (1998) argues that there are reasons to let theory inform and inspire social research in several ways during the entire research process. This adaptive theorising means that theory includes

an amalgam of different influences and approaches that fall somewhere between what are variously referred to as deductive theory testing approaches and inductive theory-generating approaches (Layder, 1998 p. 5).

In the present thesis, neither of the two “classical” methods has exclusively been used. Instead, a third way will be followed, where the data are seen as closely connected to theory and the study as benefitting from using relevant theoretical concepts as well as finding some new or developed ones, during the course of the research. This does include an inductive way of working in many parts. The use and development of theoretical concepts, through its ability to connect to the real domain, is argued to be the heart of social science research (Danermark et al., 2002).

When drawing conclusions from the present data, the above two methods for doing research partly correspond with two classical modes of explanation: deduction and induction (Layder, 1998; Danermark et al., 2002). But in the social sciences, two other fundamental logical thought operations for drawing conclusions are proposed by the critical perspective.
The first is abduction, where individual phenomena or events are re-framed by means of certain abstract structures, expressed as concepts and theories, to give them a new meaning. It is argued that abduction has a threefold nature: first, as a fundamental aspect of all perception; second, a mode of inference different from induction and deduction; and third, an act of re-description and recontextualisation, which gives a new meaning to known phenomena. The third characteristic, in which recontextualisation is defined as “to observe, describe, interpret and explain something in a new context” (Danermark et al., 2002 p. 91), is perhaps the most widely used sense of abduction. When using a concept like emotional labour on the data concerning emotional situations in prison work, it not only confirms that this labour is prevalent, it also indicates different modes of such labour among sub-groups of prison officers, which takes the understanding of the object a bit further. Abduction has similarities with the hermeneutic method of analysis, with its altering of perspectives.

The other important method for drawing conclusions is called retroduction, and this is the method most connected to critical realism. It is not a formalised mode of inference, but nevertheless is a kind of thought operation (Danermark et al., 2002). The fundamental question in retroduction is: What makes a certain phenomenon possible? Or, in this thesis, one important question would be “what is necessary to make prison officer work what it is?” The arguments and the retroductive inference of the indispensable structures and mechanisms will give answers, but only with the help of theory. There is, however, no eternal truth in this answer; science is fallible and reality changes. George and Bennett (2005) argue that “process-tracing” within cases, and “congruence testing” between cases, similarly are methods to identify what has happened by means of a reconstruction of events and forces, in order to discern the necessary course of events in case studies. Hence, they criticise the frequently used two-variable explanations for oversimplifying a complex reality.

These presented ontological and epistemological presuppositions have partly guided rather than fully determined the research design. Next, in this chapter, the theoretical framework developed to understand prison officer work in particular will be presented, and in the next chapter, the methodological considerations and the research design are described.

The first-order concept “Culture”

There is no single accepted understanding of what culture is. Few concepts have been described in so many different ways as culture has. Some authors state there must be hundreds of definitions of culture, coming from all the sub-disciplines of the social sciences (Bang, 2000). That it would be
exceedingly difficult to go through all of these is an understatement. Hence, a selected few of them will be described and discussed, before narrowing the scope to organisations and groups.

In its most general and vague sense, culture is defined as “social patterns”, which signals that the ambition is not to explore the meaning or ideas behind it (Alvesson, 2001 p. 11). Some literature describes culture as substantial manifestations in acting, products, symbols, etc., while other authors claim that certain patterns of thought, i.e., opinions, values, representations, tacit knowledge, etc., constitute culture.

Yet others combine the two and express cognition and action together, but without any particularly well-developed idea about the connection between them. The most advanced definitions of culture also say something about how the two are related, and even how culture is created and maintained. Most authors also state that culture is collectively grounded, and several argue that it has primarily an idea-based character. An example of a general definition of the concept relying on this is presented by Alvesson (2001) who argues that culture must be seen as

> a shared and learned world of experiences, meanings, values, and insights that might be expressed, reproduced and communicated partly in symbolic form (Alvesson 2001:17)

Symbolic means that it contains meaning beyond its immediately apprehended content. Most authors who involve origin or development in their definitions underline that culture is not individually constructed, but rather created “between the minds” of individuals, i.e., developed in shared interaction (Alvesson, 2001 p. 12). It is also argued that culture is too complex to measure or use in causal relations, e.g., as variables. In that respect, culture is different from social structures, and the latter is rather a network of existing social connections that might be an effect of cultural meanings (Thompson, 1990).

Some have emphasised the structures, and hence have discussed culture in relation to social structures. Thompson (1990) has argued that culture generally refers to “the symbolic character of social life, to the patterns of meaning embodied in the symbolic forms exchanged in social interaction” (Thompson 1990, p. 12). But the symbolic forms are always related to “facts”, by being embedded in structured social contexts of power, conflicts, inequalities, etc. Hence, cultural phenomena are “symbolic forms in social contexts” (ibid.). From this standpoint, he argues that the descriptive conception of culture, that refers to a variety of values, beliefs, customs,
conventions, habits, and practices in a specific time or society, and the symbolic conception, with a concern for symbolism, i.e., symbols and their interpretation, both have shortcomings. Instead he prefers a structural conception, where cultural phenomena “may be understood as symbolic forms in structured contexts” (ibid., p. 123).

Thompson (1990) has argued that cultural analysis is the study of the meaningful constitution of symbolic forms, as well as their social contextualisation. Others have argued, from a cultural-studies tradition, that culture rests in human subjectivity, and that the most important function of cultural analysis is to show that the cultural level – the production of meaning – has non-determinant position, i.e. it can never be fully reduced into economical and social conditions (Trondman, 1999 p. 61). However it must always relate to the lived culture, to economical and social conditions” (ibid., p. 63). Cultural studies have some indispensable values, and these give an approach which could be briefly summarised as follows: starting from empirical data; connecting to personal experience; a distancing move; reaching for theories; and using several analytical levels (Trondman, 1999).

The core of cultural perspectives emphasises cultural patterns existing in society as well as in specific occupations and work organisations (Morgan, 2006). Drawing on the above-mentioned discussion on culture, culture as patterns of thought, manifested in actions, products, symbols, etc. (Alvesson, 2001), related to the social structures of the context, is a point of departure when elaborating on the concept of culture in organisations.

**Organisation and culture**

Organisational cultures – or cultural perspectives on organisations – are fairly frequently used perspectives in organisation theory (Morgan, 2006; Alvesson, 2001). Morgan argues that culture is a frequently used perspective or metaphor for organisation. A metaphor serves to give new insights, by adding certain ways of thinking about an object that make us see, understand, and manage it in distinctive ways. It is an “attempt to understand one element of experience in terms of another” (Morgan, 2006 p. 4). It is important to note that metaphors have advantages, but also can mislead and cause misunderstanding (Morgan, 2006; Danermark et al., 2002). Often used metaphors for an organisation liken it to a machine, a brain, or a culture. The culture-metaphor could be summarised as describing the organisation as systems of beliefs, routines, rituals, etc., either as patterns influenced from the wider society, or as created and developed within the organisation (Morgan, 2006 p. 116ff).
The metaphor of organisations as cultures, however, could also be understood as a number of different “second-order” metaphors; culture could mean glue, holding people together; a compass, pointing out the direction to follow; sacred objects, etc. (Alvesson, 2001). Each of these leads one to think about “culture” in a distinctive way. Culture could also be seen as rule-following or as enactment (Morgan, 2006), as created among members of the organisation, or as imposed upon them (Alvesson, 2001). Alvesson, like Thompson (1990), distinguishes between culture and social structure, which are often reduced to each other. He argues from an organisation perspective that while culture captures the meaning of actions, social structures are often consequences of actions in a social system.

In the studying of culture and organisation among engineers, Kunda (2006) has argued that culture is a “learned body of tradition that governs what one needs to know, think, and feel” (Kunda 2006, p. 8), and that the expressions of this are signs and symbols. But also the rules guiding the thinking are important to membership in organisational settings:

culture is generally viewed as the shared rules governing cognitive and affective aspects of membership in an organization, and the means whereby they are shaped and expressed (Kunda, 2006 p. 8).

Chan (1997) argues in a similar way that collectively shaped patterns of thought are what determine cultural habits in organisations.

Organisational culture in work-organisations is often understood as being developed within the organisation by people and groups working on the floor or in other positions. But another perspective is also often used in management literature, one of culture as something that is imposed by the management and easily applicable to organisations: corporate cultures in companies and work-organisations. These are formed in order to present a certain image of the company (Alvesson, 2001) and concern values, rituals, anecdotes, and symbols. The development of a new “security culture” in the Swedish prisons owing to orders from the ministry and top-management, could serve as example of a partial implementation of a similar corporate culture. There are signs of a top-down development of new or renewed symbols in the SPPS: in 2006 a new heraldic shield-symbol was developed for the SPPS with two keys and a crown, symbols of the new policy, but also of solid tradition and trustworthiness. A new expanded uniform wardrobe/collection with equipment belt and military boots are other symbols. Anecdotes are also spread in the organisation about the general director, describing him as powerful, and as making wise but un-
conventional decisions. There are stories about him making late-night visits to prisons. Regardless of whether these are true, they are similar to stories that legendary top-managers of large private companies like to spread (see e.g. Morgan, 2006 p. 129). These examples from recent years of cultural rituals, signs, and symbols in the SPPS are probably imported ideas from management literature, from private business, and from prison systems in other countries.

Prison culture is a special form of organisational culture that has been used with a certain meaning. According to the literature, the term “prison culture” is almost never used of the formal organisation. Prison culture is sometimes regarded as solely an inmate culture. It is then either described as a specific culture, developing in the poor conditions of the prisons (Sykes, 1958; Goffman, 1961) or as a reflection of cultures on the outside just brought into the prisons by its incarcerated inhabitants (Jacobs, 1977; Ireland, 2002). The former idea is often called the “deprivation model”, the latter the “importation model”. Prison culture has subsequently often been regarded as including prisoners as well as staff and management (Ireland, 2002; Lindberg, 2005). Ireland (2002) argues that bullying among prisoners is closely related to the prison culture. To her, prison culture is mainly the inmate culture, e.g. how violating the inmate code of non-fraternisation with staff will be dealt with, together with levels of aggression and density in the prison. But staff culture must also be taken into account, not least because of their ability to prevent bullying. Others have argued that cultural differences between prisons could depend on differences in punitive professional orientations towards prisoners among prison officers (Liebling et al., 2011 p. 39).

Cultures in societies and other macro-social systems are studied from a large number of anthropological and sociological perspectives. Douglas & Wildawsky (1982) have, in their grid-group map, found four kinds of societies that differ according to how stratified they are and what kinds of boundaries they have. In other words the first is about level-order and the second about social bonds. Interestingly, the model has later been transferred into organisation culture research.
Prison culture is a special form of organisational culture that has been used with a certain meaning. According to the literature, the term “prison culture” is almost never used of the formal organisation. Prison culture is sometimes regarded as solely an inmate culture. It is then either described as a specific culture, developing in the poor conditions of the prisons (Sykes, 1958; Goffman, 1961) or as a reflection of cultures on the outside just brought into the prisons by its incarcerated inhabitants (Jacobs, 1977; Ireland, 2002). The former idea is often called the “deprivation model”, the latter the “importation model”. Prison culture has subsequently often been regarded as including prisoners as well as staff and management (Ireland, 2002; Lindberg, 2005). Ireland (2002) argues that bullying among prisoners is closely related to the prison culture. To her, prison culture is mainly the inmate culture, e.g. how violating the inmate code of non-fraternisation with staff will be dealt with, together with levels of aggression and density in the prison. But staff culture must also be taken into account, not least because of their ability to prevent bullying. Others have argued that cultural differences between prisons could depend on differences in punitive professional orientations towards prisoners among prison officers (Liebling et al., 2011 p. 39).

Cultures in societies and other macro-social systems are studied from a large number of anthropological and sociological perspectives. Douglas & Wildavsky (1982) have, in their grid-group map, found four kinds of societies that differ according to how stratified they are and what kinds of boundaries they have. In other words the first is about level-order and the second about social bonds. Interestingly, the model has later been transferred into organisation culture research.

This map suggests four different types of cultures, using the grid and group dimensions (Douglas & Wildavsky, 1982; Douglas, 1999). As one of the four, the authors discern a hierarchical type (upper right corner) and this is of particular interest when studying prisons. Within organisations, “hierarchical” thus means having strong boundaries to the outside world (group) but also clear, stratified levels within the organisation (grid). According to this, prisons could be regarded as one single hierarchy of staff and prisoners together, “The Prison” or as parallel separate hierarchies of a “prisoner society” (c.f. Sykes, 1958) and a staff organisation. The latter, involving staff cultures, is the main focus of this thesis.

When studying organisational culture, Martin (1992) has argued that there are three main perspectives that could be used, separately or together. The first is an integration perspective, apprehending the similarities and the shared patterns in a certain society or group. The second is a differentia-
tion perspective, emphasising the differences between (sub) groups within a larger unit. Third, there is a fragmentation perspective, denying similarities as an object of study, be they in groups or subgroups, in favour of irregularities and dissimilarities. If only this third perspective were used, it would question the whole idea of culture as shared patterns, but as a complementary perspective it might force the other two perspectives to sharpen their arguments (Martin, 1992).

**Occupational culture of prison officers**

As mentioned, the general concept of culture is defined in many ways, which is also mirrored in the variety of explanations. Few definitions describe what the occupational culture of prison officers or prison officer culture actually is or contains as well as how it is developed. “Staff culture” as well as “Prison officer culture” are used in some prison studies, but with a meaning ranging from staff/officers in one single prison to general patterns of the whole occupation. In this thesis, occupational culture is regarded as concerning the entire occupation and hence ranging across the whole SPPS organisation, but as limited in content to expectations on the occupational role. The concept of occupational culture has only been used to a limited extent in research on working-life, and within the field of criminal justice only a few studies can be found so far. In a Norwegian study on police culture, the term occupational culture is described as

a reduced, selective, and task-based version of organizational culture that is shaped by the socially relevant worlds of policing occupation (Glomseth et al. 2007, p. 96).

Police studies are often also useful points of departure for prison officer research (Crawley, 2004a; Arnold et al., 2007), but when closely scrutinised, this definition does not give an answer to how culture is formed. “The relevant worlds” could be further elaborated upon, as “worlds” are shaped by structures, forces, and mechanisms (Danemark et al., 2002). In relation to prison officers, Farkas and Manning (1997) argue that

an occupational culture is the values, beliefs, material objects and taken-for-granted knowledge, associated with a full-time occupational role. (Farkas & Manning, 1997 p. 57)

This definition is usable, but it says little about how culture is formed and it perhaps limits itself unnecessarily by demanding a certain number of working-hours connected to an individual role. Riley (2000) uses sense-making as the essential concept in prison officers’ shaping of their occupational culture. He exemplifies this with three aspects of their practice, cru-
cial to their creation of an occupational culture: reading and commenting on prisoners’ files, excusing rule enforcement and rule discretion by a disparaging view of prisoners, and the rituals surrounding the punishment board for minor rule-breaking. This understanding of occupational culture connects it strongly to the relationship to prisoners, while prison structures and colleagues are not as directly involved. The term “subculture” is not frequently used in prison officer research, but in one study the term is used to describe a masculine culture among some male prison officers that obstructs the work of female officers (Liebling et al., 2011).

Crawley (2004a) has studied occupational culture and the “working personalities” among prison officers. Prison officer culture is then argued to consist of

- the values, beliefs, attitudes, customs and working practices that influence the quality of the regime, the “tone” of the prison, and the consequent relationships between prison officers and prisoners, and between officers themselves (Crawley, 2004a p. 35).

Even if this is expressed in terms of prison officers, it is close to a general or organisational definition of culture. Others have referred to previous research that has discussed prison officer culture as (loosely speaking) widely shared patterns of dominant values among prison officers in general, like machismo, suspiciousness, and conservatism (Arnold et al., 2007), which is too divergent and general to serve as an occupational culture definition.

It was earlier argued that there could be benefits of making comparisons with the more extensive literature on police culture (Crawley, 2004a; Arnold et al., 2007). In police literature, there has been a discussion on whether there is one single police culture or several. Reuss-Ianni (1983) differentiated between cultures of street cops and of management cops, an organisational approach similar to Farkas and Manning’s (1997) above. Reiner (1992, in Liebling et al., 2010) has argued there is a (street) cop culture, the signs of which are as follows: regarding the job as a mission, suspicion, a sense of isolation underpinning strong collegial bonds, conservatism, machismo, racial prejudice, and, finally, pragmatism. Another study has criticised the writings on police culture for being monolithic, disregarding individuality, downplaying contextual factors, and not explaining change (Chan, 1997). She argues that Bourdieu’s terminology of field and habitus could be of some help. If “field” is regarded as the power relationships that structure police work, habitus refers to the forms of thinking and knowledge that guide their actions. Knowledge could be divided into knowledge about the people they encounter, about how to best
perform the work, about acceptable practices, and about how the basics in the field and habitus of police work affect each other, thereby changing police cultures. In short the cognitions are preceding the actions:

In time, these cognitions are imbued with emotions and acquire degrees of importance; they become habits of thoughts that translate into habitual actions. (Chan, 1997 p. 113)

Granér (2004) espouses a similar conception of culture in a study on Swedish patrolling police, and he regards their occupational culture as formed between a legalistic and an autonomous perspective.

First, it is important to use an idea of culture that explains how culture is developed and how it is displayed in work-practice interaction. Second, it is important to study culture in terms of integration, as comprising more or less general patterns, but also as differentiated into subcultures of different kinds (Martin, 1992). Starting from the tentative idea in the first chapter, a more developed definition of occupational culture would be:

Collectively created and maintained patterns of thought, developed within a certain occupational context, which are manifested in workplace practice – in actions, routines, products, and artefacts.

It is, however, also important to see its relationship to identity, and how this concept is used.

The first-order concept “Identity”

If culture is defined and understood in an endless number of ways, identity is an almost just as widely used and discussed concept. Few attempts have been made to find a sustainable definition of identity. Many have consciously decided to avoid the issue, and instead explored perspectives on, or modes of, this concept (Alvesson et al., 2008). Identitas means “the same” or “sameness” according to the Swedish National Encyclopaedia, and is a word that expresses stability and durability. Identity is often used synonymously with the “self”. Identities become meaningful only in contrast to something or someone else. In everyday life we often connect identity to relations to things, persons, places, etc. (Stier, 2008).

The different views and explanations of identity have roots in different scientific and epistemological philosophies. While the psychological (or essentialist) apprehension of identity emphasises something personal, consistent, and individually developed from childhood onward, a social constructionist perspective sees identity as socially developed and constantly changing (Stier, 2008). Webb (2006) argues that a definition of the self, and identity, is difficult to articulate since it consists of processes rather
than objects. But she makes the distinction that self and identity are not the same. While identities are fluids of intersectional labels that we adopt or are ascribed, the “self is our personal awareness of a continuity of being” which has a capacity of agency (Webb, 2006 p. 10). Others have argued that constant reflexivity in self-creation is a fundamental part of the late-modern self-identity (Giddens, 1991 p. 52). By using the expression self-identity, it is made clear that it is not a generic self. It is instead routinely created and sustained through individual activities. Nevertheless, it demands continuity, and is stabilised by, e.g., biography and narratives (Giddens, 1991 p. 5). Castells (1997) regards identity as closely connected to culture, as identity is:

the process of construction of meaning on the basis of a cultural attribute or related set of cultural attributes, that is/are given priority over other sources of meaning” (Castells 1997, p. 6).

Identity might furthermore originate from institutions, but it does not become identity until it is internalised by social actors. In a network perspective, the collective identities are created in relation to power, and these identity-processes lead to different outcomes in society (Castells, 1997). A crucial point seems to be whether or not there is a kind of core identity or stability behind the multiple fluid identities. Collins (1988) has argued that many theorists propose that we have some kind of core identity, guiding us among the several self-images or surface situational selves. The many situations in life form and demand several identities for it to be possible to adjust to the complexity. Among these, it is argued, there is a core self that is not a true, inner self, apart from society, but rather a ”stage-director or motivator” in the choice of surface self (Collins, 1988 p. 257f).

Identity could also be understood from several levels of understanding in a micro-macro perspective. On the bio-physical level, identity is closely connected to the body, while the psychological level emphasises a thinking, feeling, and acting human being as forming the identity. Furthermore, on a group and organisational level, group identities expressed through unity, loyalty, collegiality, and community are highlighted, while the societal level, i.e. cultures, religions, ethnicity, social class, and gender, emphasise larger, collective identities (Stier, 2008). Here, the tension in the theory of identity lies in the view on who creates identity: individuals and/or extra-individual forces, with the latter involving organisational as well as societal/cultural factors. Alvesson et al. (2008) argue that the explanations, drawing from the current theory development on identity, can be seen as belonging to different knowledge interests that will form the questions as well as the answers in the research on identity. Another frequently dis-
cussed aspect is the stability and durability of identity or identities (Alvesson et al., 2008; Stier, 2008).

What resources that are used to create identities could be important when regarding it as fluid or changing. Alvesson et al. (2008) have discerned six main possibilities that are also used in the study of identity. These are embodied practices (the actual work) and material/institutional arrangements (structural components), but also discursive formations of self, work, and organisation, story-telling performances (local narratives), groups and social relations, and finally, “anti-identities” (using the “other” to constitute the self as its opposite). While the first two are more “material” in a physical sense, and the latter could be seen as merely constructions, they could all be important resources in construction of identity. Others have criticised the post-modern view that there is no core of identity, but constantly flowing identities that could be picked by anyone at any time (Webb, 2006 p. 18). Social identity is a widely used concept that considers our belonging to social categories to be regarded by others and used by us as a part of our identity. By using labels like woman, parent, worker, Swedish, and so on, we communicate both personal and public meanings, but they are also cultural, as they have social consequences. Hence, it has relevance for our conditions in everyday life, but as a concept it has also been criticised for being imprecise and for seeing identity as either “determined by social forces or entirely individual and self-willed” (Webb, 2006 p. 17). The social identity of prison officers has implications for them in society among people in general, and, hence, affects their own acting (see e.g. Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999). Even if the concept of social identity will not be further utilised here, it serves as a bridge to the discussion of more developed collectively shared identities.

**Group- and organisational identity**
The use of identity in organisation studies has increased enormously in the last two decades (Alvesson et al., 2008). It is argued that the concept of identity is more widely used in organisations due to its value as a metaphor in organisations, combining novelty with polysemic meaning (Cornelissen, 2007). Organisation and identity could be related in many different ways. Cornelissen (2007 p. 44) states that organisational identity has a depth and profundity, covering and integrating different levels of analysis: the individual identity within the organisation, the collective identity belonging to groups within it, and finally, the organisational identity, the identity of the organisation as a whole. It is argued that our experiences of organisations are essential to our creation of identity. The tension between individual and extra-individual forces includes the discussion about to what extent,
and how organisations create or influence the individual identities of their members. Owing to our almost total dependency on organisations in today’s society, Webb (2006) emphasises how important our experiences of all kinds of organisations are, not only as workplaces but also as involved in many daily activities in our lives, in the shaping of “our sense of self and social identities” (p. 2). Identity is argued to be the vehicle to connect our self, as agent, to social structures. Hence she is critical of normative identities, ascribed to citizens by elites through organisations today, as e.g. employees, customers, etc., but emphasises the acting self as a source of resistance to them.

In her study on prison officers, Crawley has discussed “wing identity” as complementary to individual prison officer identities, and as also causing rivalry between the members of different wings (Crawley, 2004a p. 186). But she also argues that there is a common prison officer identity, which might be “spoiled”, if officers perform non-traditional tasks, e.g., work with sex offenders. Since this disadvantage is not acceptable to them, they try to renegotiate their identity in accordance with other values than the ones impeded (Crawley, 2004a p. 222).

Occupational identity is not much used in prison officer literature, but sometimes in studies of other occupations. It is often used to describe the preparation for and initial forming of an individual, in a certain occupation. Occupational identity is then widely defined as being used to describe the interdependence that exists between what humans do in their environment (occupation) and their perceived sense of self over time (identity). (Vrkljan & Miller Polgar, 2007 p. 31).

It is, however, also emphasised that this process is continuously ongoing and the understanding of it has to be dynamic. Hence the forming of occupational identity is constantly connected to the work practice of that occupation, and as this is often in interaction with colleagues and others in specific settings, the work practices could be called communities of practice (Wenger, 1998). In article II, occupational identity is seen as connected to professional representations that prison officers create about the core content of their own work and the qualities needed to perform this work. The dilemma between security and rehabilitation is crucial in these representations of the work, while the qualities are more centred around social skills and clear structure. The emphasises differ somewhat between prisons and wings, as do the occupational identity. A similar expression, professional identity, is more widely used in the professionalism literature. Even if the job of prison officer is far from being a traditional “profession” there are some interesting comments to make. It is argued that nationally, profes-
sions are becoming more diversified with many specialised sub groups and segments which affect the sense of shared identity negatively. Professional associations might serve as a counterbalance to this (Evetts, 1999).

The concept of identity is defined in many ways, in line with the perspectives of different authors. Even if one must note the reflexive and changing nature of identities, as an unavoidable feature of a rapidly changing society, many authors agree that there have to be stabilising factors, be they biography, narratives, or a “core coordinator”. This is probably not a stable inner core identity founded early in life, but rather a coordinator that is conscious of and adaptive to the world around it. A second important point of departure is that even if identity is connected to the individual level of a self, the interactional, the organisational, and even the societal levels involve factors affecting personal identity and its formation. However, organisational identity regarded as only belonging to organisations (Cornelissen, 2007) will not be the focus in the thesis. In the prison context, individuals employed as prison officers to some extent use their selves to choose and combine identities: this is neither random nor completely of their own free will. Furthermore, “prison officer” is a social identity with certain meanings in society, e.g. through its connection to prisons. However, it has less meaning as a marker inside the prison, to prisoners and to other staff. Here “sub identities”, such as security specialist or personal officer, might be more important. But even then, there are different perceptions of each of them. The conclusion must be that the complex forming of occupational identity, or identities, is multi-faceted and requires several other tools to be explained. However, this also might uncover new dimensions of the concept of identity. Occupational identity is hence defined in this thesis as

One or several understandings of one’s own occupational role, experienced in relation to collectively developed patterns of thought connected to the performance of a certain occupation.

But as many authors have concluded, identity and culture are closely connected.

Culture and identity

Finally, the concepts of culture and identity are intertwined in the sense that they are similarly defined. Actually they seem almost interchangeable to some authors, which ought not to be the case. Both are described as having organisational constituents, as well as group and individual components. Furthermore, both rely heavily on patterns of thought developed in
organisations and groups by their members. And finally they seem to connect to daily experiences.

A bridge to further connect culture and identity with the prison officer work is to view work in terms of communities of practice (Wenger, 2006). In such communities, e.g. in the context of work groups, we learn, create knowledge, and form identities in daily interaction. In strong separate work groups, subcultures will develop, at the expense of an overall occupational culture. In this cultural gap between work groups with different work practices and perceptions of their occupational role, the occupational identities will be formed, in the encounter between the individual and the social:

Building an identity consists of negotiating the meanings of our experience of membership in social communities. The concept of identity serves as a pivot between the social and the individual, so that each can be talked about in terms of the other. It avoids a simplistic individual-social dichotomy, without doing away with the distinction. The resulting perspective is neither individualistic nor abstractly institutional or societal. It does justice to the lived experience of identity while recognizing its social character – it is the social, the cultural, the historical – with a human face. (Wenger, 2006 p. 145)

Culture and identity have many definitions, and when studying the work practice of prison officers they are often too vague and broad to just use directly as items, variables, or themes. The collective nature of Swedish prison officer work, relying heavily on work groups in wings and units, is a basic feature for guiding our understanding of how to use them. To be able to say something more than very general opinions and comments on occupational culture and identity, we have chosen to let three other concepts used in and adapted to work in organisations, constitute parts of occupational culture and identity. In other words, the first-order concepts are used by using second-order concepts that together capture basic elements of culture and identity according to many definitions. In the case of culture, collectively developed patterns of thought and collectively formed manifestations (acting, symbolising, emotion management, etc.) of these patterns (Kunda, 1992; Chan, 1997; Alvesson, 2001; Bang, 2001) are used, while identity is studied as changing over time and place, mostly with regard to prison officers’ professional representations of themselves and their own work. Just as theory on criminal policy in society and organisation theory could explain important preconditions and limitations of prison officer culture and identity, the second-order concepts must be used to actually grasp the vital parts of the creation and maintaining of occupational culture and identity in the daily work practice. Hence, social repre-
sentations in the form of professional representations are used mainly to study the cognitive elements of culture and identity, while emotional labour and interaction rituals are applied to their enactment, though both are connected to thinking and to emotions.

**The three second-order concepts**

To be able to study culture and identity in the everyday interaction of prison work, three concepts are used to analyse the “thinking and acting” among prison officers. The concepts of social/professional representations, emotional labour and interaction rituals will be separately presented below.

**Social representations – a core of culture and identity?**

Briefly put, according to the theory of social representations, human beings in interaction create shared representations about their everyday reality. The social representations become a kind of lay thinking or common sense that unites people and helps them to sort out their everyday lives. In this way, social representations become an expression of our current culture with its symbols. The representations might concern actually experienced as well as non-experienced phenomena, and the theory helps to explain how these representations are created and gain wider acceptance, mentally and culturally (Danermark, 2004; Moscovici, 1996).

The theory was developed in 1961 by Moscovici, from Durkheim’s concept of collective representations, which Durkheim used as a blanket concept for a number of areas, such as science, religion, and myths. Durkheim argued that these representations were collective, stable, and viewed as a product of society. Hence, they are not a collection or an essence of many individual representations, but rather the origin of the individual ones. Durkheim’s theory of collective representations, however, had been only occasionally used for several years when Moscovici expanded it under a partly new name (Moscovici, 1996).

Moscovici’s ambition was primarily to develop the concept to be useful in the society of today, with its high intensity, mobility, social diversity, and an evolved science. This development makes it increasingly necessary for us to relate to the world around us; we share our time and existence with other human beings, so representations have to be social. Representations become a form of “lay knowledge”, not as evident or “sure” as scientific knowledge, but often created when there is a lack of knowledge of a scientific kind. In the larger perspective, media and institutions actively participate in the creation of social representations, one example being the writings when new diseases appear in society (e.g. HIV in 1980s, the Pig-
flu in 2009). In such cases, moral, religious, and other aspects, help to create the representations when well-grounded information is sparse. Actors charge the presented subject with different meanings, and then discussions in groups might create or develop a picture of how things work, which becomes the reality for the members. This affects the way they act and communicate in everyday life, or what is called the “representation’s social function and dynamic” (Jodelet, 1996 p. 31).

There are several definitions of the concept, emphasising either the content or the function of it. In one of his earlier writings, Moscovici described social representations as having the function of mentally organising but also communicating perceptions, when writing that they are a:

system of values, ideas and practices with a twofold function; first to establish an order which will enable individuals to orientate themselves in their material and social world and to master it; and secondly, to enable communication to take place among members of a community by providing them with a code for social exchange and a code for naming and classifying unambiguously the various aspects of their world, and their individual and group history. (Moscovici, 1973 p. xiii)

Jodelet (1996 p. 32) has later developed a shorter and more widely accepted definition of social representations. They are

a form of socially created and shared knowledge, which has a practical purpose, and contributes to the building of a reality, common to a social group. (Jodelet, 1996 p. 32, own transl.)

This is expressed by Chaib and Orfali (1996 p. 15) in a similar way, but with more explicit emphasis on the collective genesis and forming:

The theory is in short about how interacting subjects create a collective representation about the reality surrounding them. This representation… they develop together to a form of lay knowledge (“common sense”) which holds them together and helps them to orientate themselves in the social world. (Chaib & Orfali, 1996 p. 15f, own transl.)

Social representation as a kind of “knowing”, or knowledge, is made up of parts that are possible to study separately: beliefs, values, attitudes, opinions, and images. The role of “science”, or scholarship, is to explain the total meaning of these, and the connection between representations and social action. It is acknowledged that social representations orient and organise social action and communication, but also that they affect the dispersion of knowledge, learning, development (individual and collective), forms of expression, and social change (Jodelet, 1996).
A representation is an act of thought whereby the subject relates itself to an object. This object could be a human being, a thing, a mental or physical object, an idea, or a theory. These could be real or imagined, but an object is necessary. Otherwise there cannot be a representation, since a representation presumes an object and a subject. Representations all have in common that they replace the object, take its place, and make it present. The representation could be regarded as “the mental representative of the object” (Jodelet, 1996 p. 33) and as recreating it symbolically. The representation has a constructive, creative, and autonomous character. In terms of structure, social representations contain a “central core” and an internal structure of connected elements or expressions of a certain object. These are possible to discern by analysis, and to verify by argumentation and recontextualisation (Abric, 1996).

The theory has been used in an array of different contexts. In the field of working life and occupational groups, Danermark (2004) has used it to explain collaboration and different kinds of problems among occupational groups in the field of social services and psychiatry. The gap between occupationally and organisationally developed representations was found to be a barrier to developing collaboration. Guimelli & Jacobi (1989) have used the theory to study how changes in the working praxis of nurses also make them change their representations of the work content. Another example is a study on how craftsmen (furniture carpenters, hairdressers, and bakers) create social representations of the status of themselves and their occupational group, the competitive situation, and the expectations and values among customers (Mardellat, 1996) Finally it has been used in a Swedish prison study to understand the relations between prison staff and prisoners in a women’s prison (Lindberg, 2005).

In recent decades, a French research tradition on social representations among occupational groups has developed (Piaser & Bataille, 2010). They prefer to use the term professional9 representations when one or several occupational groups, which have specific social representations on subjects connected to this occupational belonging, are studied. An example of this is a study on professional representations among teachers about the Internet. This used a survey containing both open-ended questions, to allow for free association in the answers, and traditional survey items (Ratinaud & Lac, 2011). In this tradition, visual “association trees” are created in which

---

9 The term “professional” is in this case similar to “occupational” and does not refer to the Anglo-American discussion about some occupations with certain characteristics being “professions” nor to similar discussions about professionalism (see e.g. Freidson, 2001).
the strongest co-occurring associations are shown, and from these, “typologies” are discerned and compared. In article II, a similar method to discern representations is used, together with interviews and field notes, to analyse professional representations among Swedish prison officers (Bruhn et al. 2010). The association-tree is a frequently used method to grasp both social and professional representations.

Some criticism has been directed at the theory of social representations, and the arguments mainly concern four parts of the theory (Voelklein & Howarth, 2005). First, it is argued to be theoretically imprecise: too vague and too broad. Second it is criticised for social determinism, overlooking the individual capacity of actors. Third, it is on the contrary regarded as cognitive reductionism, putting too much emphasis on individual cognition at the expense of social and societal factors. And finally it is accused of lacking a power perspective and ideological thinking. While some of the criticism is easy to refute/revise, attention to some of it, particularly the last point, could develop the theory of social representations further (Voelklein & Howarth, 2006 p. 448). Another important criticism concerns the dualistic view of knowledge as comprising a “common sense” knowledge and a more reliable “scientific” knowledge. This division, as well as the general reliability of the latter, must be discussed in terms of power relations. Perhaps it is more accurate to speak of a continuum of knowledge with varying degrees of confirmation from research or evidence. Another opinion is that the concept of “attitude”, often used in Anglo-American research, could just as well replace social representations. Howarth (2006), however, does not agree with that proposal after comparing the two. She argues that attitude is more of an individual characteristic, while “theories of social representations are concerned with the interactive and dynamic relationships between social knowledge, common identities and social practices”, which means that it has a wider scope (2006 p. 695). Howarth concludes that the two concepts should not be compared since they emanate from two different scientific traditions (2006 p. 701).

Regarding the question of knowledge and power, Danermark (2004) argues that knowledge and social representations in compared occupational groups differ in strength when they meet each other in situations of collaboration. Concerning a certain issue, the professional representations of one group could dominate over those of another group. He uses the concepts “model-strong” and “model-weak” (Danermark 2004 p. 33) to describe these differences in “knowledge status” between groups. This could also be transferable to collaborating sub-groups with different tasks requiring special training within a broader occupation, like prison officers.
The theory of social or professional representations is applicable in many social and societal contexts where orienting and communicating are important, including prisons. Of particular interest here are the professional representations of prison officers, but they are sometimes difficult to view apart from the social representations of the prisoners, and from the social representations the prison officers develop outside their working life. An important reason for using social or professional representations in analysis of prison officer work is, in addition to Howarth’s (2006) point above, the collective nature of the Swedish prison work, with prison officer work-groups working in the wings, and supervisors regularly placed outside the wings.

**Emotional labour and consequences**

When Arlene Hochschild (1983) published her writings about emotional work and labour they were pioneering, but also a part of the emotional “turn” in sociology, a shift from cognitive and rational theorising towards an increasing interest in various aspects of emotions (Barbalet 2001 p. 20, Wharton 2009:148). The connection between emotions and working life was not new; it had partly been examined more than thirty years before, by Mills (1951 ref. in Hochschild, 1983) when writing on white-collar work. He studied the commercialisation of the feelings and conduct of service workers. Hochschild, however, with reference to the earlier research, made the necessary theoretical developments to apply the emotional labour perspective to working life.

A few words about the origins and understandings of the term emotions are perhaps necessary, though it is not possible to go very deeply into this issue. Feelings are argued to be the subjective element of emotion, while emotion also includes the understanding and displaying of feelings. Mode is argued to be a long-lasting feeling not linked to a specific object, while affect is connected to the expression and activity of feeling (Fineman, 2003). Emotion in itself is also argued to be nothing but a category, containing an array of different emotions like happiness, sadness, and shame (Barbalet, 2001). Two theoretical discussions on emotions are of some interest. How are emotions ordered in relation to other reactions such as cognition and arousal? One of the more famous theories argues that the first reaction to an event is thought, after which are generated both emotion and arousal (Lazarus). There are, however, other theories arguing another sequence. For this thesis, however, the micro perspective on emotion is not very important, even if it is argued that displayed patterns of thought, termed social or professional representations, are crucial to the manifestations in feeling and acting (see e.g. Chan, 1997; Alvesson, 2001),
even if there presumably is a circular process between them. I have also argued that social and professional representations, as patterns of thought, are socially created, developed, and maintained, and that the social perspective is just as crucial in both emotional labour and interaction rituals.

Emotions in workplaces are a wider area of research concerning all kinds of workplaces and comprising a more general topic. Emotions play a crucial and often underestimated role in all organisations, workplaces, and work interaction (Ashkanazy et al., 2000) Prisons are no exception in that respect; on the contrary, they are argued to be especially emotional places, because prisoners are held captive against their will, in small areas, together with people they have not chosen as company (Crawley, 2004b, Sykes, 1958). It is sometimes argued that prison staff also experience a kind of “imprisonment” caused by working in that environment (Crawley, 2004a). However, Hochschild transferred principles from our everyday emotion work, or management of emotions, to the paid work of employees, primarily in the service sector. Emotional labour is often described as

the management of feeling to create a publicly observable facial and bodily display; emotional labour is sold for a wage and has exchange value. (Hochschild, 1983 p. 7)

In other words, it is to arouse or suppress one’s own feelings to produce a certain “proper state of mind” in other people, like customers, clients, or patients.

Hochschild’s theory was based on a tripartite private-emotional system the first part of which consists of emotional work – the management and display of emotions in everyday life. This is divided into a surface mode, where one shows a smile or sorrow, no matter what one actually feels, or a deep mode where one tries to produce the expected feeling: “trying to feel what we sense we ought to feel or want to feel” (Hochschild, 1983 p. 43) in a given situation. Secondly, emotions are always managed in relation to a number of formal and informal rules, called feeling rules (Hochschild, 1983) or display rules (Wharton, 1999). The third part of the system is the social exchange of genuine feelings, according to the emotional work and feeling rules. This common system is argued to be used in all life situations (Bolton & Boyd, 2003).

But when transferred into working life, emotional labour is actually bought in labour markets, which has consequences for the system (Hochschild, 1983 p. 89f). She sees this as a parallel to the Marxist theory on exploitation of physical/manual labour. The private-life feeling rules are most of the time replaced by feeling rules imposed by the employer according to the kind of service or care performed. (The prison officer’s display of
Emotional labour is performed in a variety of jobs, often in service, caring, and social work sectors. Three criteria have to be present. First, face-to-face contact is crucial since emotional displays have to be apprehended (voice-to-voice is also possible) (Hochschild, 1983 p. 8). Second, the performer has to be able to produce a certain emotional state in the customer, client, or patient. This wanted state might vary; in service and caring it is often calmness, confidence, or happiness, but in other groups it might even be guilt or fear, as in the case of another studied occupation, bill-collectors (Hochschild, 1983; Sutton, 1991). Third, the employer often supplies training or instructions in how the emotional labour is supposed to be performed in that particular workplace. In the case of Swedish prison officers in general, the expected emotional labour, according to the current Prison Order (SPPS 2007), seems to be a mix of a service and a caring style, but also with the ability to adopt a harsher attitude when this is needed in order to fulfil tasks connected with violence and force. Here the initial prison officer training is crucial, as well as the informal training by other officers in the wing. In the third article of the thesis, the emotional labour among prison officers is found to vary in terms of deep and surface owing to wing and role assignment. Though officers use a common low-key style in everyday work, this style is challenged by heated emotional situations with prisoners, which can involve anger, sadness, or other feelings (Nylander et al., accepted for publication).

In a quantitative development of the concept, emotional labour is divided into measurable and tested variables. Emotive effort and emotional dissonance are two dimensions that have shown acceptable reliability (Kruml & Geddes, 2000). In short, emotive effort is how much one strives to perform the emotional labour, and dissonance is the gap between what is felt and what is shown. Both dissonance and effort are argued to be unhealthy in the long run, with dissonance causing strain and effort exhaustion (Hochschild, 1983 p. 90ff). Both men and women work in emotional labour jobs but there are differences based on gender in how this affects them. First women are in a disadvantaged position in general in society. It is argued that women more often are expected to express their emotional sides in work, and this is combined with their overrepresentation in emotional labour jobs. Because of their position they are less protected, more
vulnerable, and exposed to the consequences of emotional labour (Hochschild, 1983 p. 163f). In some emotional labour studies, the importance of areas where one is allowed to display improper emotions, called “emotional zones”, is discussed (Hochschild, 1983; Crawley, 2004a), and in Goffman’s terms these are seen as a kind of backstage, a place to “blow off steam” and express emotions not in accordance with the display rules in the particular job (Crawley 2004a, Nylander et al., accepted) This could either be sanctioned by the employer, or be an unacknowledged need.

The theory on emotional labour has served to explain emotion management in everyday life, but also to understand organisations and relationships in several kinds of occupations (Wharton, 2009). Emotional labour has now been theoretically discussed and empirically tested for several decades in different occupations and with different methodological approaches (Kruml & Geddes, 2000; Wharton, 2009). There has also been criticism of parts of the theory, some of which will be briefly reviewed here. Hochschild highlighted a general risk for alienation especially in surface-acting service labour, as the emotional effort is high under alienating circumstances, and since most emotional labour tends to be of a superficial nature, there will be a risk of high emotive dissonance in the separation between what is actually felt, and what is displayed. This has been questioned by some later research, arguing that even in monotonous service jobs, many employees develop skills, job satisfaction, and pride in their work (Wharton, 1999; Bolton & Boyd, 2003). Another discussion concerns the possibility to show a spontaneous, genuine feeling in work that is not emotional labour. Hochschild (1983) has argued there to be a form of “passive deep” acting in emotional labour, while others have argued it to be insufficiently described in the theory and in need of further exploration (Morris & Feldman, 1996).

Emotional labour or work is also performed in occupations with more autonomous status where the employers’ feeling rules or prescriptions are not laid out in detail. Some have then preferred to speak of “organised emotional care” instead of emotional labour (Lopez, 2006). Others have described this kind of autonomy as emotional “self-supervision” (Wharton, 1999; Kruml & Geddes, 2000). More advanced emotional labour in caring work has also been found to be stimulating and to increase job satisfaction, compared to forms of caring where the autonomy is more limited (Lopez, 2006). Emotions are also important in another concept on the interactional level, namely interaction rituals.
Interaction rituals and power rituals

In the writings of Goffman (1967), interaction rituals were an essential part of face work, i.e. how to behave in everyday life to preserve one’s mask or that of others and avoid to “losing face” in any respect. This is especially important in situations “where the action is”, which means situations where people challenge each other, take risks, and play games. He connected rituals to the idea of stage theory, where life was seen as a stage, which we are sometimes on, or frontstage, and sometimes off, or backstage. Frontstage, we all have a public way of acting, while backstage we often behave more privately (Goffman, 1959). The interaction ritual theory has been further developed by Collins (1988) who regards emotional energy as involved in all interaction rituals. Interaction rituals could be present in both of the stage situations, but are more important frontstage. He underlines that people with much power more often act frontstage than those with less power. Hence, rituals are connected to both power and to interaction. To perform a natural ritual, at least two persons have to be involved, and the interaction ritual is described as follows:

a mechanism of mutually focused emotion and attention producing a momentarily shared reality, which thereby generates solidarity and symbols of group membership. (Collins, 2004 p. 7)

The persons present have a shared focus on an object or an activity, and they thereby share the same mode. No matter what the mode, it will be strengthened in a “successful” ritual, and the persons involved will experience emotional energy, group solidarity, respect for the symbols of the group, and strong mutual bonds. Emotional energy leads to satisfaction and feelings of strength. On the contrary, a failed ritual will be boring, and have the opposite effects on the group and its members. Formal rituals and situations that involve exercising power induce a special emotional energy. In power rituals, there are not only winners, but also often disadvantaged groups with less power, who lose emotional energy in the ritual. Similarly, situations involving status, e.g. concerning membership and participation, are crucial to emotional energy (Collins, 1988). Interaction rituals take place in many daily interactional or power-charged situations in the performance of work, or in more relaxed workplace situations. This is advanced by others, who argue that power and status form a “vicious cycle” in workplaces, with higher status generating power, which generates status, and so on. Low status and less power similarly reinforce each other (Tiedens, 2000), which could be the case with prison officers and prisoners respectively. Collins has similarly discussed chains of rituals, linked together in everyday life, where emotional energy might be transferred from
one ritual-situation to another (Collins, 2004). Collins’s somewhat wide
definition above has been criticised for making it possible to find rituals
almost everywhere. Also, his emphasis on the situation, at the expense of
the group character, has met with some critique (Fine, 2005). Rituals have
been used in prison studies, mostly to understand interaction between staff
and prisoners (Lindberg, 2005; Wästerfors, 2007). For prison officers, both
interaction and power rituals are important in work, but while interaction
rituals mostly are informal (e.g. joint activities with prisoners or with only
staff), the power rituals are mostly formal (e.g. locking up procedures or
verbal refusal of requests). While the first (if successful) gives emotional
energy to all the participants, the latter strengthens the party with the most
power, while disrespecting the other.

**Concluding remarks**

Is there need for all the theories presented above? It is argued that theory is
an essential part of all kinds of social research, as social analysis is about
explaining rather than trying to find a single observable truth. Theorising is
an inevitable part of the research design, where theories and concepts are
used continuously throughout the research process (Layder, 1998). The
idea in the design of this thesis is mainly to let theory inform the thinking
about prison officer work, what makes it possible, and how its variation
can be understood. In the first article, occupational culture is explored
both as integrated and differentiated, by means of all the three second-
order concepts. In article II, occupational identity is studied by means of
professional representations among officers. In article III, the focus is nar-
rowed to emotional labour, primarily with regard to the cultural patterns
found earlier. But the benefit of this theoretical framework in prison re-
search will also be briefly discussed and evaluated at the end of the thesis.

The concepts of culture and identity are widely used in many parts of
the social sciences and other academic disciplines (Bang, 2000). Culture as
well as identity differs in breadth when used in studies of societies, nation-
alities, and ethnicity, compared to when they are used to study sub- or
group cultures, or individual identities. Their meanings are often as diver-
gent as their definitions. For the purposes of this thesis it most valuable to
focus mainly on the applied levels, i.e. how they are used in organisations
and applied to occupational groups and interaction situations. Instead of
yielding to the temptation to just grasp the most fitting or the most widely
used one, I have tried to explore some of them somewhat more deeply.
The idea is to try to develop the concepts when used in the particular oc-
cupational field of prison officers.
Most of the numerous definitions of culture start with human patterns of thought, in the manifestations of human thinking observed in acting, rituals, symbol creation, etc., or try to connect the two. Several authors have argued that the patterns of thought are the primus motor, and result in action, symbols, and other manifestations (Chan, 1997; Alvesson, 2001, etc.), and this seems to suffice as a fairly complete explanation, even if we can never ignore the constant feedback that manifestations, and also emotions, constitute.

The “operationalisation” of culture and identity into concepts on an operational activity level, and primarily into social/professional representations, is a choice that has some novelty and has not been tested in previous theorising about the concepts. There are alternatives in the prison officer literature, with professional orientation or attitudes more frequently used as concepts to understand prison officer thinking. In this Anglo-American prison officer research, orientation or attitudes are not immediately connected to culture or identity, but are in themselves compared with other variables. There are at least two arguments for the choice of representations. First, it is a broader concept than the other two, as it includes attitudes, orientation, values, etc. Second, it has a clearly expressed collective genesis, which is favourable when the object of study is the Swedish prison officers who are organised in partly self-governing work-groups but also have a similar occupational work practice.

The theory presented in this and previous chapter is relevant for analysing empirical data on different levels of reality, and it bears similarities to the research map above by Layder (1993), if adapted to the prison context. It is important to stress that the theories can only be tentatively ordered in the map model. The concepts of culture and identity belong to several levels of the map. While occupational culture is crucial in the setting level as well as in situated activity level of the research map, identity also has importance on the self-level. Even if the “second order” concepts are important on the activity level, they might also be used in others. As stated in previous chapters, the time dimension and tradition is particularly important in a changing occupation like that of prison officers.
6. Methodology and design

Here, the design of the study is described taking the ontological and epistemological considerations presented in chapter 4 as a starting point. Furthermore, the methodological considerations and the concrete methods of data collection or gathering\(^{10}\) are described and evaluated. This is followed, by the procedures and samples, which are discussed in terms of validity, reliability, and generalisation. Finally, some ethical considerations concerning the study are presented.

Research design

To be able to describe prison work, and explain how culture and identity are formed and maintained within the occupation in relation to the dilemma in prison work the earlier presented meta-theoretical assumptions are used as guides. First, the awareness of a reality consisting of domains is crucial. Even if it were possible to grasp all observable data from all prisons for a long period of time, the data would not explain everything that happens there. It is necessary go beyond the domain of observable events, and use theory and the operations of thought. Second, the stratified nature of society makes it necessary to investigate not only where the action is, i.e. the prison officers’ actual work, but also other levels where individual motives as well as organisational and political forces are in play. Third, actions are always impacted by the structures while structures are also changed by actions, so research must focus on both action and structures (Danermark et al., 2002). When the ambition is to study prison work, one could adopt the following premises concerning how to do research in this area of the social world. Prison work is performed mainly on an interactional level, in the encounters between staff and prisoners, but also staff to staff, and staff to others. This work practice is conditioned by the structures of the prison as institution, but also of each particular prison, wing, or unit. In addition, prisons, and the work there, are governed by the national prison organisation and prison policy, as well as being influenced by other actors and stakeholders on the societal level. Prison work and interaction also depend on micro-level processes of self and identity evolvement among the involved parties in the daily interaction. The occupational history and development is crucial for understanding the contemporary work practice, and the distribution of power in the prison organisation.

\(^{10}\) Gathering has been suggested to emphasize that, especially in qualitative studies, data are not merely “picked” but rather always gathered in reflective, intersubjective processes (Dahlberg et al., 2008 p. 172). In this chapter, however, the expression “collection” is used, including also the sense of gathering.
Just as to explain means more than just to observe regularities in the studied object, descriptives, statistics, and registers must be complemented by abstract explanations, to combine different sets of data and analyse them by means of theory. Abstract means here that only certain aspects of an object are examined (Sayer, 1992). The constant switching between the two as well as relating them to each other is essential in scientific work.

The ability to switch between abstract theorizing and observations of concrete reality, without yielding either to arbitrary theorizing or to short-sighted observation, is at the core of social science working procedure. (Danermark et al., 2002 p. 117)

Hence, theory must always be kept in mind, also when choosing the research methods.

The research-design in this project rests on a multi-strategic approach, meaning that several different research methods are used to cover different levels of reality (Layder, 1993; Miles & Huberman, 1995). Multi-strategy research is argued to give flexibility to the design as well as the process, to contribute to validity checking, and above all, to contribute to empirical and analytical density through the use of several kinds of data and multiple theoretical perspectives (Layder, 1993 p. 122f). In the project (called “Prison officers – Occupational culture, occupational identity, and job satisfaction) it was decided that the multiple-strategy should involve and combine data and methods of different kind. The reasons for this were, first, that in the pilot study, with interviews conducted among prison officers 2005–2006, the possibilities to discern forces on the macro-level affecting the work were limited (Nylander, 2006), nor could the pilot study answer questions of “how often” or “how much”. Second, different kinds of data about the same phenomena could serve as a “control” whereby coherence and anticipation between different sets of data could be used to strengthen the validity of data and conclusions. A third idea was to let the five intensive cases partly guide the design of the survey that was conducted later. The main reason, however, was that the use of both extensive and intensive data together with theory could help to uncover more than the immediately visible and observable events, i.e. the causes behind them. This is exemplified in article III, where observation and interview data are compared with survey data, all interpreted by emotional labour theory to explore cultural differences.

In chapter 5, Layder’s (1993) research map has been used to describe levels in the studying of prison work, from self to society, from individual motives to prison policy. Later, theories and concepts have been chosen and ordered by means of the same tool. The research methods, of intensive
and extensive modes, could also be ordered with the help of the research map (Layder, 1993 p. 112ff). Here, the choice of methods is not based on the level on the map, but instead qualitative and quantitative data can be used on all levels. On the macro-context level, national statistics, for example, are used and historical documents are analysed by interpretation in a hermeneutically inspired way, with regard to time, aim, and context. On the individual and interactional levels, motives, representations, and relations are expressed in survey figures, but they are first and foremost analysed through interview transcripts and in observation field-notes.

The five case prisons were selected for their different security categories and individual characteristics, e.g. size, gender, types of wings, and location. One treatment prison and one open prison were included. One of the prisons was for women. Here a brief description of each prison is provided. The prisons are named by the order in which they were studied, ranging from One to Five. The situation in 2007–2008 is described, as are the security categories A–F in use at that time.

Prison One was an open men’s prison in Category F, in the countryside by a lake near a large city. The prison had 108 places for prisoners, spread throughout several low buildings. The buildings were locked at night, while the rooms were not. The prison had a workshop, study-facilities, and a gym. During daytime prisoners had access to the whole prison area for walks. An administration building had an open staffed reception, but access to the rest of the staff-offices was only permitted for scheduled visits. Most prisoners had short sentences, but a minor group were serving the final part of their long-term sentences there. Most of the prisoners ate in a canteen, but a few buildings had self-catering. A few prisoners had day-leave to work outside during the last portion of their sentence. The fence was two meters high and a gate was opened from the reception area. Some programs were available at this prison, but release planning was the main mission. The staff consisted of around 40 employees.

Prison Two was a closed men’s prison in Swedish Category C, which means it had a high surrounding wall and a fence. It was built in the 1950s and had places for 112 prisoners in five wing-buildings, and was situated just outside a small city. One of the wings was larger than the others and had study-facilities, and it was separated from the other wings by a fence. The prisoners in the other four wings were obliged to work in the workshop/industry in the daytime. There were a few behavioural programs. Almost half of the prisoners in this prison were foreign citizens sentenced to deportation. The gym was open to the different wings at different times. All prisoners took their meals in their own wing and the food was brought
from the prison kitchen by one of the prisoners and a prison officer. The prison was staffed by around 85 employees.

Prison Three was a women’s prison with 113 places of Swedish Category D. This means it had two high fences surrounding the prison. It was in the countryside outside a village. It had several regular wings and a motivational/treatment unit. It also had a small wing for psychiatric care, and an open wing outside the prison fences. The prison also had a small segregation unit with a few places, and a reception unit for long-term female prisoners. There were study-facilities, garden plots, and a printing press. The visiting-facilities were better adapted to families and children than the average-prison. Prisoners were escorted by officers to their occupation and allowed to walk in a part of the prison area monitored by staff. The prison had around 120 employees.

Prison Four was a closed men’s prison with 78 places built in the 1980s, situated in a suburban area of a city. It was in Swedish Category E with high fences, accredited as one of six national treatment-prisons. The prison had a remand unit with 24 places, a motivational (regular) wing with 24 places, and drug-free treatment wing of 24 places. There were also six open places for re-entry training. Meals were partly self-catered in the wings. The prison selected drug-addicted prisoners and the treatment method used was inspired by the Twelve Step Program of Alcoholics Anonymous, (AA), which is a group-oriented method. Staff amounted to around 70 employees.

Prison Five was a closed high-security prison (Category B) on the edge of a village. It was built mainly in the 1950s and had 189 places. It had high walls, one electric fence, and several ordinary fences. The four regular wings had in total 128 places, and a “calm” regular wing (for mostly middle-aged and older long-term prisoners) had 14 places. The reception unit had 10 places, and a treatment wing 20 places. There was also a special security wing with 6 prisoners, and a segregation unit. Many of the wings were partly self-catering. There were workshops (industry), study facilities, and several behavioural or treatment programs. There were leisure-time activities and a gym. This prison had a staff of 193 employees.

There are several advantages of using a case-study method, especially in the identifying of indicators for theoretical concepts and in the addressing of causal complexity, while the major limitations concern estimating how much variables affect outcomes risks for selection bias (George & Bennett, 2005). To minimise the risk for selection bias, the case prisons above have been carefully selected for diversity and dissimilarities in several important parameters.
Below, the extensive and intensive methods used in the research project and the thesis, are presented. This is followed by a summary of how the four articles have used methods, data, and theory.

**Ethnographical observations**

The observations in the five prisons were partly structured by themes. A rule of thumb is to register both what you see and hear, and to expand notes beyond the immediate observations (Silverman, 2005). The observations in this study were conducted according to an observation-scheme and partly structured with selected themes and chronologically described activities. Observations were carried out as we, with as little participation as possible, closely followed one prison officer each during a full working day, a method called shadowing (Crewe, 2009). This means observing and noting the different places, situations, and interactions in the working day of a prison officer, while interfering as little as possible in the actual work. Observation is an important research method in ethnography (Silverman, 2005), as ethnography highlights the importance of research methods that can discover and explore these everyday activities and their positioning within extended sequences of action (DeVault & McCoy 2006, p. 18).

It was necessary to take regular notes due to the complex sequences of action in the prisons. The field notes were transcribed shortly after the shadowing day. In all, 120 hours of observation were conducted in this way. As the observations were done the day before the interviews, some of the observed situations, etc., could be connected to the interview questions. During the shadowing we also conducted small complementary interviews with officers when there was time. Ethnographical observations are flexible in choice of sample as well as methods, and closely connected to studies of cultures and subcultures (Silverman, 2005 p. 49). In the shadowing, it was sometimes impossible for the researchers to avoid interacting with prisoners. The natural curiosity and also suspiciousness among prisoners were casual and not exaggerated. The prisoners were informed by the staff about the purpose of our presence in the wing. Of course we answered questions directed to us from prisoners, but we tried to keep these interactions as short as possible, as it was not a part of the research project to interview prisoners. We were asked curious and suspicious questions by staff as well as prisoners, but we were not really “tested” or confronted, (see e.g. Crewe, 2009 p. 462ff) like we would have been if we had spent a longer duration of time in a wing. Reactivity, or reactive effects owing to the observation situation are important to consider. As observers we were
ourselves curious whether we could find signs of changed interactions, because of our presence. Either prisoners or staff might act differently than in the regular situation with no observers. Our overall impression was that we did not affect the normal interaction in the wing very much. We observed conflicts, discussions, anger, and despair in the interaction and we felt they were neither over-exaggerated nor held back in general. After a short “initial hesitation”, the daily life in the prison wings we visited just went on for the most part, simply because it had to do so. Even if prison officers would have tried do things more properly and “by the book” than on a normal day, they seemed to do what they usually do, in much the same way. The largest difference was perhaps that they now and then were asked by the researcher to explain something. A reason for our relatively unnoticed presence is that prisoners expect things to be “business as usual”, otherwise the tension and conflicts would probably increase.

**Individual interviews**

All the 25 individual in-depth interviews were made after the observations or shadowing in the same prison, and they were all conducted by single-interviewers, in order to promote more trust and openness in the interview situation. The interviews were semi-structured with a guide consisting of themes and questions, but follow-up questions were often added during the interview (Kvale, 1996). The semi-structured form of interview uses interview schedules but with enough flexibility to refine or reformulate the questions. It is also called the open-ended interview as opposed to interviews with standardised response spaces. The semi-structured interview is preferred when respondents have experience of the studied phenomenon, situations, and topics related to it, and it enables the researcher to perceive details of personal reactions, emotional expressions, etc. (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 1996; Kvale, 1996). In this study the interview technique was also inspired by the Appreciative Inquiry (AI) mode of interviewing. This means we tried to focus not only on problems, but also on what regular and good days at work are like. AI is argued to be especially suitable mode of interviewing in the prison setting, because of the often negative and problem-focused nature of the prison-life thinking (Liebling, 1999).

When the interviews started, respondents received information about research ethics, and were informed that anonymous quotes from interviews could be used in research reporting, and they also signed an informed consent. The interviews were conducted in a secluded room in the prison except for one interview, which was held at the university, at the behest of the respondent. In qualitative interviews, the main purpose is to gain a
specific kind of information. It is a certain form of common dialogical conversation but with the difference that it has a professional purpose. The researcher wants to know what someone else knows, thinks, wants, or simply has in mind (Merriam, 1994). The interviews did not only include their experience of the work, but were also narratives presented to us in different ways for different reasons (Silverman, 2005). That is one reason why it is crucial to compare the interviews with other data sources. The interviews lasted for 60–95 minutes, were digitally recorded, and transcribed afterwards. Three of the interviewed persons were regarded as informants, as they were not prison officers themselves at the time of the interview: an industry-production supervisor, a principal officer, and a personal officer supervisor. Two of these had worked as prison officers earlier. The prison officers were from special security wings, treatment wings and regular wings (including a reception wing, psychiatric wing, deportation wing, etc.) but also from Security/Gate/Night-groups and from an open prison without wings. 11 of the 26 were female officers. One of the interviewed prison officers had temporary coordinator tasks in his wing, while the others were rank-and-file officers. Several other short interviews with prison officers and other staff members were included in the field notes.

**Focus-groups**

In this study, focus-group interviews were conducted in all five case prisons. The use of focus groups has increased in many different research areas over the last few decades. Focus groups concentrate on specific themes that are introduced by the interviewer, and aim to collect qualitative data through the discussions between the participants (Wibeck, 2000; Tursunovic, 2002). In this study both focus-group and individual interviews are held in the same prisons, in order to capture both the individual and the collective thinking about similar issues. Strengths of focus groups are their ability to produce a lot of data on a specific topic during short time, and the interactional situation itself, which produces a unique kind of data (Morgan, 1997 p. 13f).

In two of the prisons, two focus-group interviews were carried out. In these focus groups, prison officers from different kinds of wings were separated. In the first prison there was a group of officers from regular wings, and the other group worked in a treatment wing and an open wing. In the second prison with double focus-group interviews, one group contained officers from regular wings and the other group came from special security wings. In the remaining three prisons, the single focus groups had prison officers from a variety of wings. The choice to use two groups came from
the idea that focus groups with homogeneous knowledge also give officers a feeling of safety to express their opinion (Wibeck, 2000 p. 51). In all, seven focus-group interviews were conducted. The interviews lasted for 80–90 minutes, were digitally recorded, and transcribed afterwards.

In the interviews, one of the researchers was the “leading” interviewer; the other one (or two) observed and asked the occasional question. The interview-theme was introduced by the interviewer, and then the group discussed it with each other. An advantage compared to individual interviews is that the interviewer has less impact on the interview situation, as participants discuss with each other most of the time, and the interviewer should be more “non-directing” (Merton et al., 1956). A letter of invitation was sent to the prison to be advertised or circulated. In the letter, four to six prison officers were requested to participate in the focus group, but often someone had to remain in the wing owing to staff shortages, etc. Hence, the number of prison officers in the groups most often was four. Another demand that was fulfilled was that the participants had to have been employed as prison officers for at least one year, because knowledge and experience in the field is essential in a focus group (Tursunovic, 2002). This can be regarded as a kind of theoretical sampling (Layder, 1998; Silverman, 2005), where knowledge and ability to provide information are judged more important than randomising and correct representation.

Document analysis
The research method of document studies can be either quantitative or qualitative. The qualitative mode is perhaps the most widely used, but content analysis is an example of the former. Documents are almost never created for a research purpose and can be unsuited to the purpose of the research. On the other hand, they are “non-reactive” to the researcher (Merriam, 1994). In this study, the documents consist of official investigations/audits, prison orders, internal SPPS documents, internal local prison documents, and to some extent, trade union documents. The original texts have partly been compared with literature of a biographical and historical nature, and of sufficient academic quality. The quality of the documents, as well as researcher awareness about aim, contexts, discourses, and weaknesses (owing to interests) in the documents, are of course of importance.

The qualitative analysis of the documents was the most important part, and it focused on some main themes. Policy and organisation were analysed in terms of actors, change, and conflicts. The prison officer role was another important theme, with similar points of analysis.
Survey
Several alternative ways to conduct the survey were initially considered. An Internet questionnaire linked to the workplace e-mail address of each officer was not possible at that time due to the restrictions of the SPPS intranet, so a paper questionnaire was the best available alternative. Mail questionnaires have the common disadvantage of low response-rates, but also the advantages of lower costs and greater anonymity than telephone or face-to-face ones (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 1996 p. 225). The researchers were also informed that all prison officers had been surveyed twice earlier the same year, which could affect their response interest. To enhance the response rate we preferred a “workplace administered” survey instead of a regular mail-survey to home addresses, as we had good contact with the unions and we assumed that a workplace-administered survey would result in less unnoticed and less unanswered questionnaires. The experiences from the case studies, together with some questions from earlier tested questionnaires, made up the foundation for the survey construction in this study. The Swedish questionnaire by Härenstam from the mid-1980s, together with the British survey “Measuring the Quality of Prison Life (MQPL) – Staff Questionnaire” (later SQL), developed by Liebling et al., were used. Alternatives were considered, e.g., the Correctional Role Instrument (CRI) developed by Hemmans and Stohr (2000) was translated. Finally we used a survey to measure job satisfaction, the Quality of Employment Survey (QES), developed by Quinn and Shepard in 1974, which had been used in large American studies on prison officer job satisfaction (Cullen et al., 1989). These instruments were translated into Swedish and tested in small pilot studies. There were problems with the CRI in the Swedish context, but also items about management in the SQL were problematic here. Finally, minor parts of the SQL and of the Härenstam questionnaire were used, together with three items from Quinn and Staines’s QES and a few items about emotional labour from Kruml and Geddes (2000). The rest of the survey content we developed ourselves. In total, the survey included 146 questions: 15 demographical, 2 open-ended descriptive questions, 3 questions with standardised answers (QES), and the rest items with Likert-5 or-4 scales. A preliminary survey was tested in a Swedish category C prison, and some adjustments were made, though the overall impression from the comments was that it was a well-functioning questionnaire.

The use of methods
The research methods presented above were all used in the data collection. The four articles in the thesis used the data but to different extents. When
the first article was written, one case prison study, and the survey had not yet been conducted. Instead the interviews from the earlier pilot study were used (see Nylander, 2006, for details). Below, the data sources for each article are described. The most important theoretical concepts used in each article are also shown in the table below.

Table 1: Overview of the methods, data, and main concepts in the four articles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Article I</th>
<th>Article II</th>
<th>Article III</th>
<th>Article IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articled</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articled</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articled</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample/Data</th>
<th>Case prisons</th>
<th>Case prisons</th>
<th>Case prisons</th>
<th>Case prisons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articled</td>
<td>24+18 interviews</td>
<td>32 interviews</td>
<td>32 interviews</td>
<td>32 interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articled</td>
<td>396 respondents</td>
<td>806 respondents</td>
<td>806 survey respondents</td>
<td>806 survey respondents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main concepts</th>
<th>Occupational culture</th>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Emotional labour</th>
<th>Social/ professional representations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articled</td>
<td>Social/ professional representations</td>
<td>Social/ professional representations</td>
<td>(Emotional strain) Social/ professional representations</td>
<td>(Occupational culture/ identity) Professionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articled</td>
<td>Emotional labour</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>Occupational culture</td>
<td>Professionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articled</td>
<td>Social/ professional representations</td>
<td>rituals</td>
<td>(Emotional strain)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articled</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Occupational culture)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Professionalism)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three researchers were employed part-time on this project, so my own contribution to the work ought to be specified. I have participated in the planning and in the writing of funding applications. I have conducted shadowing-days and taken field-notes in all of the five case prisons, participated in 6 of the 7 focus groups (in 2 of them as moderator), conducted 15 individual interviews (and all 18 interviews in the pilot study). Furthermore, I have transcribed most of the interviews I conducted and all of my own field notes. Concerning the survey, I have participated in the construc-
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11 The 18 interviews were carried out in the pilot study two years earlier (see Nylander 2006)
12 In the sample, all prison officers in a number of selected prisons were chosen, in order to be able to compare differences. This sample has been compared to a random selection of the whole sample of 806, concerning background variables, and no differences were found.
tion of the questionnaire, and done most of the survey administration work. In this research, I have used all three software tools in the study: NVivo8, SPSS/PASW18, and Similitude. The project also contains a great deal of other data, e.g. about job satisfaction, but mainly data concerning occupational culture and identity has been used for this thesis.

**Planning, sampling and conduction**

In the research project, “Prison officers – Occupational culture, occupational identity, and job satisfaction”, the choice was made to start with a case study of five prisons and let the results from these cases guide the development of the survey, but also to compare and combine the different kinds of data. The case prisons were chosen mainly on theoretical grounds (Silverman, 2005) to cover a range of different security categories and regimes. A choice of a more practical nature was if the study should include only those with prison officer rank, all uniformed staff, or all prison staff. The only large earlier Swedish study included “prison personnel” i.e. all prison staff (Härenstam, 1989). The arguments for choosing only those with prison officer rank were their special position as the staff on the “factory floor” with daily contact with prisoners, and the assumed collective similarities owing to this; but also their occupational role and its recent transition. As the official staff lists contained all prison-employees with prison officer rank who were employed on a monthly salary, it was not possible to distinguish between prison officers placed in wings and in other units, nor could their particular role or tasks be discerned. In these regards we had to rely on their own self-classification, made in the survey. In the interviews, some other staff have also been interviewed, but in that case only as informants about the prison officers.

To facilitate the data collection in the five case prisons, all three researchers in the project began by contacting the Swedish Prison and Probation Services to inform them about the project. During spring 2007 we discussed the project with the top management and later the general director of the SPPS. We also met with the three most important prison-staff unions (SEKO, ST, Saco). In all the meetings, the main purpose was to present our ideas about the research in the prisons, but also to discuss the samples, the practical interviewing, etc. We also received a great deal of advice and ideas that we have gratefully utilised. We were advised to take contact ourselves with each of the sampled prisons, while both the management and the unions used their different channels, e.g. their journals, to spread information about the research project. A reference group for the project was established with representatives from the unions, the top management, and a regional manager. The reference group met twice a year.
during the project, and all in all six meetings were held at Örebro University, where ideas and findings were presented and issues concerning the project discussed.

Aware of the many difficulties described in earlier prison research concerning organisation and culture (Liebling, 1999; Patenaude, 2004), the governors of the selected case prisons were contacted by researchers a couple of months before the data collection was planned to start. At three prisons, the initial contact and data collection took place in autumn 2007, and at the remaining two, in spring and autumn 2008 respectively. Paying a visit to the first three prisons was judged necessary, to inform the management about the research plans. The research project was still rather unknown to the prison management and staff, so gaining the support of local key persons was important. An additional reason was also to get ideas about how the data collection could be carried out in each specific prison (with their differing security categories, forms of organisation, etc.). Preparatory visits to the last two prisons were not necessary since information about the research had been spread internally in the prison services and we could plan the field studies by telephone and e-mail. The data collection always began with one day of shadowing three prison officers working in different wings and roles. The next day, focus-group interviews and individual interviews were conducted. Additional interviews of both kinds were made in the following weeks. No category-A prison is in the sample of case prisons, the reason being that the small number of category A and B prisons are very similar. However, a single interview was held with a prison officer who had worked in a category A prison for several years; this was only used for comparison purposes, and the answers do not differ substantially from the other interviews in high security prisons (B,C). That conclusion is also supported by the pilot study interviews two years earlier, where a category A prison was included.

Table 2: Timetable for data collection in the five case prisons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prison</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Data collection period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>F (open)</td>
<td>October 2007–November 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>November 2007–December 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>February 2008–March 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>October 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In preparing for the survey, the reference group served as our advisory board. The staff lists for the 18 sampled prisons (of 55 total), were provided by the Prison and Probation Services. These were, however, not quite complete, so they were updated together with each sampled prison. The management at each prison was responsible for delivering the surveys to the employees, while the head safety representative\(^{13}\) (HSR) issued reminders and collected the completed surveys.

Information about the survey procedures was addressed to the prison management (also for public announcement) and to the HSRs some weeks before the surveys were sent out. A missive letter explaining the intent and procedures was attached as the first page of the survey. Further, the ethical rules and the independent status of the researchers with regard to the SPPS were expressly stated. The surveys were distributed to each officer’s own mailbox at the workplace in an envelope, with an accompanying return envelope.

In the survey sample it was important to cover a variety of prison categories. But since the numbers of prisons in each category differed greatly, we used a 1-step cluster-sampling method (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 1996), where all prisons were divided by category, and then an approximately representative number was randomly sampled from each category. Instead of a second sampling within these prisons, we included all prison officers employed on a monthly salary in these prisons. In the eighteen sampled prisons (1/3 of all the Swedish prisons) all prison officers placed at the actual prison during the period November–December 2008 received a questionnaire. The staff lists were adjusted for all the prisons, as of the 1,411 prison officers originally listed, 193 were not actually working where listed for a number of reasons (worked in other prisons, temporary studies, had resigned, etc.) and were not possible to reach. All the remaining 1,218 prison officers who actually worked where they were listed did get a questionnaire, and 806 responded (66%). According to the instructions, the questionnaires were to be placed in envelopes and collected in a mailbox at the prison-gate office, where all staff passes at least twice a day. The HSRs were accountable for the collection, and monitored the process. They also gave reminders directly, or by internal e-mail, and sent the collected questionnaires to the researchers at the end of the survey period.

In this kind of random sampling it is not possible to reach full proportionality without weighting the sample in accordance with the number of prisons in each category, or the number of prison officers working in each prison category. The latter alternative would perhaps have been the best,

\(^{13}\) Huvudskyddsombud in Swedish
but the staff lists were not reliable as a control. An internal SPPS study had similar problems discerning the officers actually working in the prison wings (Krantz, 2010). We chose a third alternative, comparing the sample with the population, concerning available official figures on some of the background variables.

Table 3: Number of prisons in sample/total population and number of responding prison officers, by prison category. (n=55, prison officers n=806)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prison Category</th>
<th>Prison sample/total</th>
<th>Responding officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cat A</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat B</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat C</td>
<td>2/5</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat D</td>
<td>2/6</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat E</td>
<td>6/22</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat F</td>
<td>4/13</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat DE Women</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat F Women</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18/55</td>
<td>806</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prison officers working in prisons are not separately shown in official figures, but they constitute around 75% of all prison officers, while most of the remaining work in remand units. Still we can compare the sample with the official figures on prison officers or SPPS employees, concerning some important variables.

The present sample of prison-based prison officers consisted of 61% men and 39% women. In the official statistics (March 2009) from the SPPS, all prison officers in prisons and remand units are specified, with men amounting to 62% and women 38% of the total (SOU 2009). Edbom et al. (2010) has noted the proportion of women among all prison officers to be 37% for 2008. In the entire SPPS (which also includes probation staff and headquarters/regional administrators), there were 54% men and 46% women in 2009. Prison officers born outside Sweden in the sample amounted to 14%. Available figures for all prison officers in 2008 are 14.5% (Edbom et al., 2010) and for the whole of the SPPS in 2009, the share born abroad was 11% (SPPS Website). The mean age of the prison officers in the sample was 41 years, while in official statistics (SOU 2009:80) the mean age for all prison officers, including remand jails, was 42 years. The conclusion must be that the sample is close to the figures for the whole population of prison officers concerning some vital comparable variables, even though exact comparison with only prison-based prison
officers has not been possible. The response rate was not the same in all
prisons. It seems non-responding was partly connected to temporary dys-
functions in the organisation in at least two prisons with the low response-
rates.

A non-response analysis where 10 percent of the non-responding were
randomly selected (41 out of 412) showed no significant differences to the
responding group.

Methods of analysis
In qualitative case studies, analysis begins already in the collection phase
and develops continuously during the research process (Layder, 1993;
Merriam, 1994). By analysing data continuously new questions are added
and others are developed. In the present research project the data were
analysed and discussed after each and every visit to a case prison. Informa-
tion was continuously used to deepen the questions and refine the observa-
tions; e.g. in the shadowing we observed the searching procedures closely,
and this could be used to refine an interview question. Or after following
the unlocking ritual in the morning more closely in one prison, we com-
pared it to the data from other prisons. Unusual observation data were
followed up by interview questions or focus groups, and so on. All the
intensive data from the observations, individual interviews, and focus
groups, were computed by means of the NVivo 8 software. This means all
data were categorised in theoretical and empirical categories. This is,
however, only a tool, and the analysis of meaning has been done with
meaning categorisation according to the adaptive theory (Layder, 1998)
and in a hermeneutically inspired mode with interpretation in accordance
with the different contexts.

All questionnaires were coded in a prepared matrix in the SPSS/PASW
18 software. Most background variables had standardised answer spaces,
but some also had an open-ended answer space, marked “Other”. Many of
the open-ended answers could later be classified into one of the standard
alternatives, which reduced the “Other”-answer group. Two questions had
only open-ended answer spaces, and the respondents were asked to list “up
to five expressions” describing the prison officer work and the personal
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14 Categories in NVivo are technically called “nodes”. These are sorted in “tree
nodes” of connected categories, and levelled in several subcategories, or in “free
nodes” separately categorised. The NVivo software makes it possible to read the
content of nodes or subnodes, together with the immediate context of the catego-
rised sequence, or with the whole interview/ observation day available at the same
time.
qualities judged necessary to perform it. These two questions were analysed by means of the French software tool Similitude, which measures and describes co-occurrences of expressions and is often used to discern social or professional representations (Ratinaud & Lac, 2011; Bruhn et al., 2010).

All the items with a Likert-5 scale (117 items) were explorative factor analysed, and after theoretical considerations, 23 factors were computed into indexes. We then chose indexes relevant to the aim of the thesis and analysed them together with background variables. When analysing emotional labour and strain, we have used the relevant items separately. In the third article, a reduced ordinal scale has been used for chi-two analysis, aiming to trace differences in the emotional labour/strain due to the background variables. To control reliability for the emotional strain items, we have used Cronbach’s Alpha. However, in the articles included in this thesis, mainly the single items with ordinal data have been used, together with the demographical data.

The intensive and extensive data have also been analysed together. In an abductive mode, the empirical data have been reframed and analysed by means of the theories relevant on each level of reality according to the Layder research map.

**Validity, reliability, and generalisation.**

Validity and reliability concern the quality of the results, which is important in all research. Validity is the most important; if the results are not valid, the reliability is not of much interest. Validity traditionally has a different meaning in quantitative than in qualitative studies. In quantitative studies, it is an expression of the extent to which the instruments are actually measuring what they are intended to measure, and not something else. Validity could be raised by the use of or comparison with already validated instruments that have been used in studies of the same areas. Three kinds of validity are often discussed in this process. The first, construct validity, is established by relating the instrument to a theoretical framework. In the second, empirical validity, i.e. predictability and actual results, often in comparison with the measurements from other instruments, is established. The third, content validity, concerns how the instrument is valued by researchers or colleagues, and how well the items mirror the possible alternatives in the real world (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 1996). In the development of the extensive questionnaire, many items were intended to capture social representations and emotional labour, closely related to the concepts of culture and identity among prison officers. The instrument used some items from several validated instruments, e.g. the MQPL, the
QES, and the Härenstam instrument mentioned earlier in this chapter. Also the knowledge and experiences from the case studies of five prisons were used in the development of the questionnaire. The questionnaire was pilot-tested in a category C-prison, which was not in the sample. The results and the comments from the pilot-respondents were positive, but some minor adjustments were made. Finally, background data from the survey was compared and found similar to official prison staff statistics.

Reliability is used in quantitative studies to describe how accurately the instruments measure. In the extensive method of this thesis, the survey, the procedure was planned to be equal in all the prisons, but we were not able to fully monitor this in person. However, we were in telephone contact with all the sampled prisons to supervise the survey process. All respondents had received the same information in the attached missive letter. The collection procedure with envelope and mailbox was similar in all prisons. In the two open-ended items about prison officer work and the personal qualities it demands (for the Similitude-analysis), a kind of inter-rater check of the categories was conducted with two of the researchers categorising the answers and regularly comparing their results with each other. The analysis of the two items was only done with a group of selected prisons, to save time. This group, however, was compared with a random sample from the whole group, and no differences were found in the background variables.

In qualitative research, validity is not connected to measurement, but to questions of how valid the study is in other respects. Internal validity concerns how consistent the collected information is with the reality from which it is derived (Merriam, 1995 p. 178, Kvale, 1996) and six basic strategies can be used: triangulation, participant control, extended observation, peer scrutinising, participant involvement, and highlighting of biases. Others have proposed that the elimination or refutation of rival hypotheses and the studying of negative or exceptional cases are also important to internal validity (Marlow, 2005; Silverman, 2005). In the intensive case studies, the prisons were theoretically selected in dialogue with informed representatives from the prison services as well as the unions. They were intended to represent a variety of prison types. Information was collected in several ways: observation, interviews, and focus-group interviews – with different sets of data being compared with each other. Another mode of triangulation was that some informants were interviewed who were not prison officers themselves. However, comparing different data or sources is in itself not necessarily strengthening the validity, if theory is left aside (Silverman, 2005). Participant control of the individual interviews was offered, but only a minority (6 respondents) agreed to read their own tran-
scribed interview, and none of the six wanted to add or change anything. Research colleagues, reference groups, and also prison officers have in different stages of the process participated in discussions about the results.

In qualitative research, reliability corresponds to accuracy and precision in the data collection as well as in the analysis of data, but also consistency over time and person in the categorisation of data (Hammersley, 1992). When it comes to the theoretical interpretation of information, perhaps trustworthiness in the reasoning and interpretations is a better way to put it. The categorisation of data in NVivo 8 has been conducted by all three researchers in the project, and as our databases have been regularly merged into a single one, all categorisation and interpretation is open to the other researchers. We have also partly worked together in the categorisation and analysis, (e.g. especially in the two open-ended items about the nature of the work and the personal qualities important to it mentioned above).

External validity, or generalisation, is about how generally the results apply to a wider context than the studied one. In the survey, the sample is a one-step randomised cluster sample of prisons, where all prison officers employed during the survey period were included, which comprised over 25 percent of all the prison-based officers. It is also a Swedish nation-wide sample. An exact weighting of the different prison categories in the sample was planned, but not possible to carry out. The sample is found reliable compared with national statistics of gender and age among prison officers, so it is reasonable to assume that the sample to a high degree is generalisable to the Swedish prison-based officers. In qualitative research, statistical generalisation is often replaced by theoretical generalisation. This means that based on similar conditions it is possible to assume generalisation to that wider population (Silverman, 2005). Here, critical realism takes this one step further and argues that the generalisation has to include trans-factual conditions – that which is necessary for something to be what it is (Danermark et al., 2002 p. 78). Empirical categories, e.g. women, are not explanatory in the way that abstract concepts, e.g. gender structures, are. To generalise, retroduction is necessary and other modes of inference are complementary. In this perspective, validity concerns not only design and method, but also the choice and use of theory (Danermark et al., 2002 p. 148).

**Ethical considerations**

It is important to take ethical aspects into consideration in all research, not least when human beings are involved in some way. There are several kinds of guidelines, national and international, aiming to lead researchers as well
as other professionals, in their work. Here primarily research ethics concerning participants in the study will be discussed.

The Swedish (HSFR) ethical guidelines for humanities and social sciences are summarised in four rules: voluntarism, participation confidentiality, and utilisation. Voluntarism is that participants must be informed about their role and the conditions surrounding participation, that it is voluntary and that they may break off their participation at any time. The participation rule is that participants must always be asked about participation, and for young people also their parents. A well-used ethical standard is informed consent. Informed consent means to provide information about the research that is relevant to their decision whether or not to participate, and to make sure that the subjects understand the information and ensure that participation is voluntary (e.g. by means of written consent) (Silverman, 2005 p. 258) This covers the first two of the HSFR rules. In the present study, the respondents in the individual interviews had signed a written information sheet stating their consent to participate and to be quoted anonymously. The prison-staff within the sampled prisons was informed about the survey a couple of weeks in advance, and the questionnaire had a first page with information about the research project and the ethical rules. The collection procedure, with the questionnaires in an envelope and placed in a mailbox was considered to give full anonymity at each workplace.

The ethical aspects are more complicated in the observation part of research in prisons. The shadowing of prison officers is partly conducted in the wings, which are “home” for the prisoners, at least for the moment (Crawley, 2004a,b) and the life there has a kind of domestic character. Even if the research primarily concerns prison staff as occupational group, their interaction often involves prisoners. Hence, the interaction, in which prisoners also participate, is part of the research. Informed consent is problematic because all people present in the prison during the course of a day will be involved. Instead they were all informed in advance by the principal officers about our presence that particular day, and it was assumed that staff as well as prisoners who did not want to participate, could avoid the researchers or inform us that they would not like to be part of the observation. No one, staff or prisoners, objected to our presence in the wings. If someone preferred to avoid us, we did not notice it very much. The prison officers being “shadowed” were informed and asked in advance, and had agreed to participate. The same went for participants in the focus group interviews.

To fulfil the rule of confidentiality, i.e. professional secrecy as well as protection of identities and ethically sensitive information, all field notes
and interview transcripts were made anonymous and original recordings
were securely locked away. Data have been utilised only for research pur-
poses, of which scientific articles as well as popular-scientific articles for
the occupational field are the most important. The whole research project
including the observation part has been approved by the Central Ethical
Review Board of Uppsala, Sweden (Dnr 2007/011).

The problems connected to research in prisons have previously been dis-
cussed in prison literature (see Liebling, 1999; Patenaude, 2004; Crewe,
2009). The tensions and inequality of power among staff and prisoners
make their presence felt in the arena of the research. Knowledge about
these conditions makes it possible to avoid many, though not all, of the
problems. All researchers in the project had prior experience of prisons and
of conducting research there. However the most important thing is to con-
tinuously reflect on the implications of the prison structures.

7. Summary of the articles

The four articles are briefly summarised below. The first article is in Swe-
dish, while the rest are in English. The articles are provided after the final
chapter. A translation of the Swedish article is also provided. In short, the
first article uses representations, emotional labour, and rituals of prison
officers, to discern subcultures evolving from different work-practices. The
second discusses occupational identity through the analysis of professional
representations of one’s own work and the personal qualities it requires.
The third scrutinises the emotional labour performed by prison officers in
different roles and wings in their encounters with prisoners, and connect s
this to emotional strain and recovery. In the last article, the ongoing devel-
opment of the prison officer occupation is discussed in terms of profession-
alisations.
7. Summary of the articles

The four articles are briefly summarised below. The first article is in Swedish, while the rest are in English. The articles are provided after the final chapter. A translation of the Swedish article is also provided. In short, the first article uses representations, emotional labour, and rituals of prison officers, to discern subcultures evolving from different work-practices. The second discusses occupational identity through the analysis of professional representations of one’s own work and the personal qualities it requires. The third scrutinises the emotional labour performed by prison officers in different roles and wings in their encounters with prisoners, and connects this to emotional strain and recovery. In the last article, the ongoing development of the prison officer occupation is discussed in terms of professionalisation.

Article I: Säkerhet eller rehabilitering? Om subkulturell differentiering bland kriminalvårdare
(Security or rehabilitation? About sub-cultural differentiation among prison officers.)
Per Åke Nylander, Anders Bruhn and Odd Lindberg

This first article concerns the occupational culture among Swedish prison officers in the years after a heavy increase in security measures. In the organisational changes of recent decades, with abolished wing-based supervisors and split day-night schedules, the work groups in wings and units have become of the utmost importance in prison work. In this article the aim was, in short, to explore factors important to the occupational culture of prison officers. How has the specialisation and division of labour into different wings and units affected their occupational culture and work practice? How does this division into separate wings and work-tasks impact the unity among prison officers and the occupational culture as a whole? Data comes from interviews and field notes from the five case prisons, together with interviews from a pilot study 2005.

In the theoretical framework, culture is discussed and elaborated by means of integration and differentiation perspectives and the three second-order concepts are used: social representations, emotional labour and interaction rituals.

Results show that the occupational culture among prison officers is closely connected to the work organisation and work practice in different wings and units. The relatively self-governing work-groups and the institu-
tion of the personal officer are crucial factors. In the work-groups, prison officers create social representations of prisoners, of other wings, and of prison officers with other tasks. They use different forms of emotional labour, of a deep or surface character, according to their kind of wing. In the mainly rule-governed prisons, officers emphasise different rituals of formal and informal kinds, all according to their wing-type and representations. The representations of other wings and roles serve to strengthen the own group and way of working, while the representations of prisoners are closely connected to following patterns of acting.

In the differentiated prisons and wings, this thinking and acting by prison officers create differing cultural patterns. In treatment wings, their representations of prisoners are more positive, and the emotional labour contains more deep acting, and rituals are “a necessary evil”. In special security wings, where the representations are of us-and-them character, the emotional labour is of a surface mode and formal rituals connected to security are crucial and pronounced. The many regular wings struggle somewhere in between, with representations of both kinds; they try to fulfil both the rehabilitative tasks and the security routines, with the latter often requiring the majority of the time available. In these wings no formal regulation on how to prioritize exists, both sides of the dilemma shall be upheld. How it is handled very much depend on how the local subculture develops. The presence of informal leaders may be of great importance here. Thus, the differentiated prison wings have created clear subcultural patterns among prison officers.

**Article II: The Prison Officer’s Dilemma: Professional Representations among Swedish Prison Officers**

Anders Bruhn, Per Åke Nylander and Odd Lindberg.

Based on the prison officer work in the differentiated Swedish prisons and wings, and the subcultural patterns developed in them, this article explores the occupational identity of prison officers. This is done by describing their expressed professional representations about prison officer work and of the personal qualities needed to perform it. Further, different idealotypical strategies to manage the ever-present dilemma of security and rehabilitation in everyday work practice are mapped out.

Data come from interviews, observations and two open-ended survey questions. The survey questions were computed by means of a French software tool called Similitude, which shows co-occurrences of expressions as patterns.
The professional representations about the character of the work were centred around security, with “contact with clients” as the strongest co-occurring expression. The whole picture shows connections between security-loaded characteristics and rehabilitative items. The distribution by prison category and wing shows that officers’ emphasis on security is lower in low-security prisons and in drug-free treatment wings.

The most important qualities centred around being “well-organised”, that is, professional, fair, organised, and precise, with “social ability” and “empathic” as the strongest co-occurring qualities. The generally weak position of “security-conscious” becomes stronger in high-security facilities, and very weak in low-security environments where the bindings between different qualities were more dispersed. This indicates a larger heterogeneity in the latter, and a more homogeneous role-apprehension in security settings.

The organisational solution to the dilemma of security and rehabilitation is the specialisation of wings and prisons. But every prison officer also has to use strategies to manage the dilemma in his or her own work. We discern three ideal-typical approaches to the dilemma. The first of these, the frustrated, try to fulfil their (often rehabilitative) ambitions but sense that this is very difficult owing to some other tasks that oppose this ambition. The second, the rigid, stick to the formal rules and routines, and have no higher ambitions than to “do things by the book” and to do them right. The third, the flexible type, perhaps the most common one, finds the dichotomy acceptable and expects prisoners to understand their double role. They sometimes bend rules, and often use discretion to solve situations and perform their work. Different strategies for managing the dilemma may trigger conflicts in the prison officer work-groups.

The professional representations of how to perform, and how to interact with and treat prisoners, are important, and form the common views on human beings as equal or good/bad. This in turn, will affect the interaction in the dilemmatic situations and further form the identity of the prison officers in the differentiated prison arenas.

**Article III: Emotional Labour and Emotional Strain among Swedish Prison Officers**

Per Åke Nylander, Odd Lindberg and Anders Bruhn

Accepted by the European Journal of Criminology.

Management of emotions is an important part of prison officer work. This has until now often been described as a single occupational mode of performance (Crawley, 2004b; Tracy, 2004). This article focuses on emotion
management and uses Hochschild concept emotional labour and her distinc
tion between surface and deep labour as a tool for analysis. The different
types of emotional labour and how these types affect prison officers’
feelings of stress and alienation are analysed in relation to division of la-
bour. What strategies do these prison officers use to manage emotions, and
what differences in emotional strain can be identified? Data come from
both the survey and the case studies in the project.

Prison officers are found to use a low-key strategy, with non-provocative
friendliness and respect, but with minor variations according to wing. Hu-
mour is used to various extents depending on setting. In encounters with
angry prisoners, the control of one’s own feelings differs depending on
relationships with prisoners. When delivering negative decisions, prison
officers use some common strategies to meet the prisoners’ reactions. If an
outburst leads to threats towards staff, this is more often downplayed than
reported, but this also depends on the relationship with the prisoner and
the understanding of the situation. When prison officers encounter sad
prisoners, the emotional labour risks eroding the professional strategy and
evoking suppressed feelings.

The low-key style differs between wings and roles, in terms of how
much of their true feelings officers feel free to show. Personal officers and
treatment-wing staff did so more than other groups. Also the view on tak-
ing an interest in prisoners and their problems differs similarly between
these groups. All in all we find that deep emotional labour is to a greater
extent connected on the one hand with treatment wings and open prisons,
and on the other with the institution of personal officer while surface la-
bour is more common in security wings and units. The former groups also
report significantly more emotional strain and exhaustion than other offi-
cers. Thus, stress reactions are connected to positions that demand a
deeper emotional involvement while indifference and alienation tendencies
is present first and foremost in security units. This is also related to the
presence of places for recovery at work. The groups that are most involved
in deep labour also have fewer opportunities for recovery, less access to
“backstage” areas. Instead, prison officers use a kind of “temporary back-
stage” in the wing-office, in moments when prisoners are not present.

The lack of time and space for recovery, especially for staff in treatment
wings, personal officers, etc., who experience most emotional strain, might
increase the risk of health problems. The latter group often also experi-
ences lack of time for personal officer tasks because of having to prioritize
other everyday duties. On the other hand, the institution of the personal
officer might neutralise the otherwise growing subcultural differences in
separate wings and roles.
Article IV: Prison officers in wing-differentiated prisons: Towards professionalism?
Per Åke Nylander
Manuscript

Prison policy changes in recent years have contributed to an increasing division of labour in Swedish prisons. A variety of wings, from drug-free treatment wings and wings for psychiatric care to different special security wings, have emerged. This is complemented by different prison officer roles, e.g. personal officers, program officers, and security prison officers. An accompanying subcultural division among the prison officers has taken place, in addition to differing occupational identities, all formed in daily work practices in wings and groups.

A division of labour and a specialisation of tasks are common signs of the professionalisation of an occupation (Freidson, 2001). Professionalism traditionally means when an occupation gains the power to decide who is qualified to perform it and who is not, and to control the criteria for evaluation and qualification. Few occupations reach this stage of autonomy. In recent years, with New Public Management in the public sector, there is also a growing organisational mode of professionalism, a top-down process implemented by managers to control work (Evetts, 2006; Fournier, 1999). The article aims to scrutinise the development of the occupation in terms of some of these perspectives on professionalism. This is done by studying formal documents on policy and organisation, together with data from the research project (observation field notes, interviews, and survey data).

Analysis shows that changes in prison policy due to rehabilitative efforts and later security demands are driving forces in the development of the prison officer occupation. The personal officer reform in 1991 was debated in mostly positive terms, while the unions were negative because of undesirable schedule changes. Later, in the program implementation process and the security turn, the union kept a lower profile concerning the role changes. While the Prison and Probation Services management controls much of the division of labour and specialisation, the large trade union has had an ambiguous position in the shaping of new occupational roles. The qualification and educational demands are largely in the hands of the prison authority and management. Rank-and-file prison officers are divided in their views on raising the educational and qualification demands, with around half being in favour. They also regret not being in a position to determine who will be employed and rejected as prison officers. Their expressed motives for working as prison officers are often characterised as...
having happened by chance or unspecified ambitions to work in a caring occupation. A majority of the prison officers regard their autonomy in work as limited.

The conclusions from all this are that the division of labour and specialisation among prison officers today largely comprise an organisational mode of professionalism. In the development of the prison officer role, the union has a defensive position. The educational demands and the qualification criteria are chiefly in the hands of the management. The occupational striving, among rank-and-file officers and the union, for status and traditional professionalism are fairly weak, neither there is there a clear strategy from the SPPS management how to develop the occupation.
8. Discussion

The aim of the thesis has been, within the context and development of the Swedish prison system, to describe prison officer work and explain how the dilemma of rehabilitation and security in prison work influences the forming of occupational culture and identity among prison officers. In the following, the research questions will be answered and some limitations and implications of the thesis will be briefly discussed.

What impact do changes in the prison policy and organisational conditions have on the prison work practice and on the occupational culture and identity of prison officers? Sweden’s traditional image of having an advanced welfare system has sheltered the country’s prison policy from much of the recent international rejection of the treatment ideology that characterised the crime policy in the late 1970s. The New Penology, which has affected many other prison systems, has not reached Sweden to the same extent. However, in the last two decades there have been two distinct and major turns in prison policy. The first turn was marked by rehabilitative thinking, and resulted in the personal officer reform of 1991 and the expansion of treatment and motivational programs in prisons in subsequent years. The second turn, in 2004, was towards increased security in the prisons, with major changes in the physical environment as well as in the commissions of the prisons. These turns have contributed to sharpening and polarising the demands on the double commission of the prisons. The public’s expectations of increased rehabilitation as well as safe custody in the prisons have become more articulated.

The internal organisation of the SPPS is a traditional hierarchy, but minor attempts to modernise it have taken place. Several organisational trends have reached the organisation, but with limited success. The impact of New Public Management ideas still remains in some areas, partly as a result of external as well as internal demands for efficiency and budget control. The limited resources in prisons are features that make them similar to other human service organisations, and the need to make both major and minor moral decisions is another. This also means that staff have to prioritise among duties and clients in their daily work. In terms of organisation, the prison policy changes have also contributed to a refined differentiation of prisons and prison wings. In prison officer work this differentiation has fostered an increasing specialisation and an ongoing division of labour among prison officers. In this, their work groups have become of the utmost importance for the work performance.
What are the characteristics of occupational culture and identity among prison officers? Prison officers have comprised an organised occupation for just a little more than a century. Swedish prison officers have been uniformed since the end of the 19th century and formed their first union at the beginning of the 20th century. All the time since then, there have been changing demands on prison officers, e.g. because of the abolishment of the cell prison in Sweden 70 years ago, and shifting rehabilitative expectations and security demands during the last decades. The occupation has “struggled” with problems of low status and doubtful social attraction due to its history and association with a stigmatised social category: the prisoners (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999). In this struggle, the prison officer union has played an important role in uniting and collectivising the prison officers.

Due to the organisation of the prison system today, with different kinds of wings and prisons, prison officer work contains more specialised tasks. The occupational culture is primarily composed of patterns of thought that are manifested in actions, products, services, etc. From the perspective of integration, we find cultural patterns of thought centred around vital expressions of security and control, combined with rehabilitative and social ambitions. The performance or acting in work is characterised by a calm, friendly, and orderly appearance and a generally low-key style in often emotionally charged daily encounters with prisoners. There is a common emphasis on the need for unity, usually extending to the own group, but in heated situations also to other groups or the entire prison staff. Viewed in terms of differentiation, the diversity of wings and specialisation of the work have created subcultures among prison officers that are weakening the overall patterns. There are at least three subcultural patterns that are common in different prisons and wings. A treatment pattern is present in many treatment wings, in many open and treatment prisons, and in some regular wings. A security pattern is common in security wings, and in large parts of high security prisons. A regular pattern occupies something of a middle-ground, and is rather a kind of struggle between the treatment and the security ideals. These patterns will be returned to more in detail later.

The occupational identity, in terms of one or several understandings of one’s own occupational role, is in short also closely related to the managing of the dilemma of security and rehabilitation. A common viewpoint is that the job is about respect and humanity. Most prison officers emphasise a rehabilitative view of their job, and many had the motive of “working with people” when entering prison work. But, their occupational identity is also marked by their managing of security and rehabilitation together, and this results in strategies to resolve the dilemma. The strategies are probably
a result of both individual and occupational experiences. This also indicates differences in the understanding of the job caused by the specialisation that represents a break with the historical development of the occupation.

How do the collective creation of knowledge, management of feelings, and acting, correspond to occupational culture and identity among prison officers? The collective creation of knowledge is common in forms of work that are primarily group based, and is an important part of both occupational culture and occupational identity. The concepts of social and professional representations are used to capture the patterns of thought and creation of knowledge. The results have shown patterns of common professional representations as well as differences. Prison officers create representations of officer groups in other wings and with other tasks, as a result of the division of work and in order to strengthen their own group. But, the officers’ representations of prisoners also differ between the main subcultural patterns. While they are more positive towards prisoners in treatment wings, they are more negative in security settings. Representations of their own work in general and the personal qualities it requires, show a similar theme with variations due to wing and prison category.

Emotional labour and interaction rituals are used to capture certain forms of acting and managing of emotions in work, two crucial ingredients in occupational culture. The emotional labour is found to be conducted according to a low-key style, but even this has variations depending on the kind of emotion and also the setting. Within the subcultural patterns, the treatment pattern has more deep emotional labour, while the security pattern often has surface acting in emotional situations. This also tends to cause strain that is exhausting in different ways. In treatment wings and personal officer work, officers report more exhaustion, while security staff are more at risk of alienation and cynicism. Natural interaction rituals are used in several ways: to create unity and solidarity in the staff work groups, but sometimes also with prisoners in well-functioning treatment settings. Formal power rituals involving prisoners are often enacted in routine tasks and situations involving control. In the subcultural patterns, formal or power rituals tend to be downplayed in the treatment pattern, while they are essential in the security pattern. Taken together emotional labour and interaction rituals constitute crucial manifestations of the occupational culture.

How do different prison contexts and work practices contribute to the shaping and reshaping of the occupational culture and identity of prison officers? Communities of practice are crucial in the shaping of occupational identities and occupational cultures. The communities of practice,
for prison officers consist of work groups in different wings and units in different prisons. The self-reported placements of prison officers in our 2008 survey showed that 69 percent belonged to a wing-based work-group, either a regular (38), a treatment (20), or a security (11) wing, while the rest, 31 percent, belonged to other units or groups (night staff, prison-based groups). The vast majority of prison officers regarded themselves as either personal officers (51 percent) or security officers (30 percent). Night staff (7 percent) and program specialists (3 percent) were fairly small groups. Even if all prisons have their unique organisation of staff, personal officers dominate in treatment wings, regular wings, and open prisons. Security officers dominate in security wings and units, in security groups, and in gate and night work. The many subdivisions of the work leads to different communities of practice where they work, form representations, and develop occupational culture and identity.

How is the growing specialisation in prison officer work affecting the occupation? Partly, this is reviewed in the first questions: prison officers develop subcultural patterns that challenge the homogeneous and integrated culture. Prison officers create different representations of prisoners in these subcultures, but also often negative representations of the other wings and work groups.

Specialisation and division of labour are often viewed as signs of professionalism of some kind. There are two kinds of professionalism, the traditional occupational one, whereby an occupation strives to “professionalise” itself by controlling its entry requirements and knowledge. The other mode is organisational, whereby organisations “professionalise” employees, aiming for efficiency and control. In the thesis it is argued that the specialisation in prison officer work has predominantly organisational characteristics. This is partly due to an ambiguous position of the union and diverging opinions among prison officers on the occupational role. How does this affect the occupation? On the one hand, there seem to be centrifugal forces, like the development of several kinds of “specialists”, e.g. personal officers and security specialists, among prison officers, each held accountable for their work. On the other hand, centripetal forces of centralisation and standardisation are still strong, and, e.g., it seems to be SPPS policy to retain the occupational title, strong common regulations, etc.

To sum up, the double commission of the prisons to provide safe and secure custody together with rehabilitation of the prisoners has become more pronounced after the turns in prison policy in the last two decades. The subsequent differentiation of wings and prisons, with an increasing specialisation and division of labour among prison officers, is an organisa-
tional answer to this. The occupational culture and identity of prison officers are formed around the dilemma of security and rehabilitation. The dilemma, hence, seems to be a kind of mechanism, affecting prison officer work in several ways. The occupational culture and the occupational identity seem to a large degree to be formed and developed to manage this dilemma in the daily work practice.

There are, of course, other questions of vital importance in the forming of identity and culture that have been only briefly examined within the thesis. The articles and the critical introduction have only briefly discussed the impact of gender and age among prison officers on the forming of identity and culture. In addition the ethnicity perspective on these processes ought to be more developed. The gender perspective will be further explored in a forthcoming report from the project, and so will also the other two perspectives. Another important question in the research project is the connection of culture and identity to job satisfaction among prison officers. This falls outside the scope of this thesis but will be treated in coming reports.

The two first-order concepts of the thesis, culture and identity, have guided this research on prison officer work. As organisations, the prisons are inevitably examples of hierarchical cultures (Douglas & Wildavsky, 1982), but are exceptional with their double hierarchies among prisoners and among staff. This provides an opportunity to also blame “the others” within the same organisation, and not only one’s “own” deviants. Adapted to the occupational sphere, the two concepts of culture and identity have been sparsely and variously used in prison officer research. Here, culture is understood as collectively created and maintained patterns of thought, developed within a certain occupational context, which are manifested in workplace practice – in actions, routines, products, and artefacts. These patterns have developed in the work-practice, predominantly in workgroups of prison officers, and are based on shared thinking and accompanied by shared modes of acting and symbolising. This does not exclude influence in the opposite direction; it is rather a circular shaping process. Neither is it one single process, but several ongoing processes, which together constitute the cultural pattern for the moment. The occupational culture of Swedish prison officers is much characterised by differentiation, i.e. the forming of subcultures among them, and at least three common subcultural patterns have been identified here.

The concept of occupational identity benefits from an understanding of identity as not an individual, stable self, predominantly founded early in life. Neither is the view of an endless number of constantly fluid selves, picked by the individuals in a fully free choice, a fruitful understanding of
occupational identity. The personal self is probably a guide or a motivator in the selection of occupational identities, which are further formed while learning a certain daily work practice. But, the occupational identity of prison officers is formed in the work-groups in interaction with prisoners and colleagues. An important ingredient in their identity is a view of how to manage the dilemma of safe, secure custody and the efforts to rehabilitate. Hence occupational identity is understood as one or several understandings of one’s own occupational role, experienced in relation to collectively developed patterns of thought connected to the performance of a certain occupation. Within the subcultural frameworks, there is a tolerance within limits for different identities, because the work-group benefits from a certain internal variety in its encounters with many different personalities among the prisoners.

This research, however, has most of all focused on the interaction and work practice. The concepts of social/professional representation, emotional labour, and interaction rituals are used throughout the project to grasp cultural and identity indicators in the daily work practice. Prison officers’ professional representations of prisoners and how to treat them are essential in the formation of subcultures. Professional representations about the content of the work and the personal qualities needed to do it are also crucial to the forming of identities. Emotional labour and interaction rituals have been used separately or together in other prison studies (Crawley, 2004; Tracy, 2004; Lindberg, 2005; Nylander, 2006; Wästerfors, 2007) but the present thesis has emphasised the importance of connecting them to the professional representations of prison officers, as representations guide the acting in work.

The choice of a multi-methodological approach has made it possible to let different parts of the data contrast or complement each other. While the intensive observation and interview data on, e.g., emotional labour among prison officers tells how and why it is performed in a certain way, the data from the survey indicates how common these kinds of performances are in the whole group and among certain sub-groups. While the political motives for changes could be traced in documents, the interviews and observations tells a lot more about how they are managed in practice.

In making prison officer work what it is, structures and forces on many levels are involved. Here I have pointed out the reasons for a few important changes in the prison policy, and several processes taking place in the organisation, which together have changed the working conditions. In accordance with the policy changes and organisational development, the occupational culture is formed in prison work. Under these structural pre-conditions, and with their own personal motives and interests, the prison
officers in their daily interactions at work, must always manage the same
dilemma between safe, secure custody and active rehabilitation, a dilemma
around which their occupational identity is also formed.

What do the findings tell us about the future of the occupation? Of
course many other occupations have changed during in recent decades due
to policies, it-technology, or slimmed organisations. The changes in the
prison system, however, have often been rapid, are partly unpredictable,
and are still relatively unknown, while there seems to be a fairly homoge-
neous political vision about humane and effective prisons. Future incidents
in prisons, exploited by media and politicians, will probably also heavily
affect the future changes. Nevertheless, in line with the Swedish prison
policy of the last decades and the increased demands on prisons, the differ-
entiation of prisons and wings seems likely to continue. The prison officers
tend to become further specialised and with more individual accountabil-
ity. Even if there are proposals to extend the training courses, the SPPS
efforts to increase the body of specific formal knowledge to perform prison
work are moderate. The increase of new prison officer recruits who already
have an academic degree, seems to be what will be changing the level of
education in the coming years. This also has the potential to contribute to
changing the internal culture and identity, as well as the external percep-
tion of the occupation. Compared to the often rapid political changes,
prison officer culture and identity seem to be changing in a more slow and
inert way. Still, the managing of the dilemma of safe, secure custody and
active rehabilitation, seems likely to continue forming prison officers’ work
in coming years.
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Hur ser kriminalvårdare på sin yrkesroll?
Vad tycker de om sin arbetsmiljö?
Hur är det att arbeta på kriminalvårdsanstalt?

Vi är tre forskare vid Örebro universitet som fått medel från Forskningsrådet arbetsliv och socialvetenskap för att genomföra forskning om kriminalvårdares arbets- och yrkesvillkor.

Vårt forskningsprojekt heter "Kriminalvårdare i anstalt". En viktig målsättning med projektet är att utveckla kunskapen om kriminalvårdares arbete och därigenom möjliggöra utveckling och förbättringar.

Det frågeformulär Du nu har i handen är en viktig del av detta forskningsprojekt. Vi vänder oss här till ett slumpmässigt urval av vårdare vid olika anstalter med olika säkerhetsklassning.

Detta har vi gjort med hjälp av såväl arbetsgivaren som facket. Du är en av ca 1200 som får formuläret.

En förutsättning för att resultaten av den här enkäten ska bli tillförlitliga är att så många som möjligt besvarar den. Vi är därför beroende av Din insats!

Vi garanterar konfidentiell behandling

För att säkra att Dina svar inte kan läsas av obehörig kommer undersökningen att genomföras enligt följande:


Ditt svar vill vi ha in senast den                 .

Skyddsombudet prickar av mot en namnlista och eventuella icke -svarare kommer alltså att få en påminnelse av skyddsombudet.


Resultaten av denna undersökning planeras bl.a. att redovisas i form av forskningsartiklar MEN även i mer lättillgänglig form via en rapport eller bok samt muntliga föredragningar.

Mer information om undersökningen kan lämnas av någon av oss undertecknade forskare:

Per Åke Nylander          Anders Bruhn             Odd Lindberg
Adjunkt/doktorand             Docent                        Docent
socialt arbete                       sociologi                      socialt arbete
019-                                   019-                             019-
Hur ser kriminalvårdare på sin yrkesroll?

Vad tycker de om sin arbetsmiljö?

Hur är det att arbeta på kriminalvårdsanstalt?

Vi är tre forskare vid Örebro universitet som fått medel från Forskningsrådet arbetsliv och socialvetenskap för att genomföra forskning om kriminalvårdarens arbets- och yrkesvillkor. Vårt forskningsprojekt heter ”Kriminalvårdare i anstalt”. En viktig målsättning med projektet är att utveckla kunskapen om kriminalvårdares arbete och därigenom möjliggöra utveckling och förbättringar.


En förutsättning för att resultaten av den här enkäten ska bli tillförlitliga är att så många som möjligt besvarar den. Vi är därför beroende av Din insats!

**Vi garanterar konfidentiell behandling**

För att säkerställa att Dina svar inte kan läsas av obehörig kommer undersökningen att genomföras enligt följande:


Resultaten av denna undersökning planeras bl.a. att redovisas i form av forskningsartiklar MEN även i mer lättillgänglig form via en rapport eller bok samt muntliga föredragningar.

Mer information om undersökningen kan lämnas av någon av oss undertecknade forskare:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per Åke Nylander</th>
<th>Anders Bruhn</th>
<th>Odd Lindberg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjunkt/doktorand</td>
<td>Docent</td>
<td>Docent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>socialt arbete</td>
<td>sociologi</td>
<td>socialt arbete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019-</td>
<td>019-</td>
<td>019-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Vilket är ditt nuvarande arbete?
   - Kriminalvårdare med huvudsakligen kontaktmannaskap
   - Kriminalvårdare med huvudsakligen säkerhetsuppgifter
   - Kriminalvårdare med huvudsakligen nattjänstgöring
   - Kriminalvårdare, med huvudsakligen annan inriktning

   Om Du svarat "annan inriktning", ange vilken...

2. Jag är
   - Fast anställd
   - Vikariatsanställd

3. Hur många år har du arbetat inom kriminalvård?  

4. Vid hur många anstalter förutom denna har du arbetat?  

5. Om Du är placerad på en viss avdelning, ange vilken typ
   - Normalavdelning
   - Behandlingsavdelning
   - Säkerhetsavdelning (SKI, isolering etc.)
   - Annan nämligen:

6. I hur stor utsträckning arbetar du i kontakt med intagna?
   - Största delen av min arbetstid
   - Omkring hälften av min arbetstid
   - En mindre del av arbetstiden
   - Ingen del av arbetstiden

7. Hur gammal är Du?  

8. Är Du:
   - Kvinna
   - Man
Enkät: Kriminalvårdares arbetsmiljö och yrkesvillkor

A. Bakgrundsdata

Första delen av formuläret innehåller frågor om din bakgrund och den anstalt Du arbetar vid. Var god sätt ett kryss i den ruta som passar, eller skriv på den rad som finns.

1. Vilket är ditt nuvarande arbete?
   - [ ] Kriminalvårdare med huvudsakligen kontaktnannaskap
   - [ ] Kriminalvårdare med huvudsakligen säkerhetsuppgifter
   - [ ] Kriminalvårdare med huvudsakligen nattjänstgöring
   - [ ] Kriminalvårdare, med huvudsakligen annan inriktning

   *Om Du svarat ”annan inriktning”, ange vilken .................................................................

2. Jag är
   - [ ] Fast anställd
   - [ ] Vikariatsanställd

3. Hur många år har du arbetat inom kriminalvård?
   ............

4. Vid hur många anstalter förutom denna har du arbetat?
   ............

5. Om Du är placerad på en viss avdelning, ange vilken typ
   - [ ] Normalavdelning
   - [ ] Behandlingsavdelning
   - [ ] Säkerhetsavdelning (SKI, isolering etc.)
   - [ ] Annan nämligen:
   ............................................................................................................................

6. I hur stor utsträckning arbetar du i kontakt med intagna?
   - [ ] Största delen av min arbetstid
   - [ ] Omkring hälften av min arbetstid
   - [ ] En mindre del av arbetstiden
   - [ ] Ingen del av arbetstiden

7. Hur gammal är Du?
   ............år

8. Är Du:
   - [ ] Kvinna
   - [ ] Man
9. Vilken etnisk bakgrund har Du?
   □ Född i Sverige
   □ Född i annat europeiskt land
   □ Född i land utanför Europa

10. Vilken formell utbildningsnivå har Du uppnått?
    □ Grundskola eller motsvarande
    □ Gymnasium eller motsvarande
    □ Högre eftergymnasial utbildning (t ex 2-årig KY-utbildning)
    □ Högskolestudier mindre än 2 år
    □ Högskolestudier motsvarande 2 år eller mer

11. Du som har utbildning över gymnasienivå: anknyter innehållet i denna till kriminalvårdens verksamhetsfält (t ex psykologi, socialt arbete eller liknande)
    □ Ja, absolut
    □ Ja, delvis
    □ Nej, knappast
    □ Nej, inte alls

12. Vilken intern grundutbildning har Du fått för att arbeta inom kriminalvården?
    □ Äldre vårdarutbildning (före 2002)
    □ Ordinarie KRUT-utbildning
    □ KAM-utbildning (via arbetsförmedlingen 2006-2007)
    □ Ej fått grundutbildning
    □ Vet ej

13. Hur många personer ska normalt arbeta på Din avdelning/enhet?
    OBS! Med avdelning/enhet i de följande frågorna avses den arbetsgrupp eller liknande Du tillhör och som utgör den organisatoriska indelningen på anstalten (team, enhet, avdelning, paviljong etc)
    □ Jag tillhör ingen avdelning/enhet
    □ 2 – 4 personer
    □ 5 – 9 personer
    □ 10 eller fler

14. Är ni flest kvinnor eller män på Din avdelning/enhet?
    □ Flest kvinnor (över 60%)
    □ Ungefär lika (40 – 60%)
    □ Flest män (över 60%)
15. Vilken är Din närmaste arbetsledare?

☐ En särskilt utsedd samordnare fungerar som närmaste arbetsledare  
☐ Kvinsp  
☐ Annan nämligen:  

.................................................................

B. Hur är en bra kriminalvårdare?

OBS! Det är viktigt att Du fyller i dessa frågor nu i början av enkäten – gå inte tillbaka i efterhand och komplettera eller ändra!

1. Nämn upp till fem saker Du förknippar med kriminalvårdararbetet

A. .................................................................
B. .................................................................
C. .................................................................
D. .................................................................
E. .................................................................

2. Nämn upp till fem viktiga egenskaper Du anser att en kriminalvårdare bör ha

A. .................................................................
B. .................................................................
C. .................................................................
D. .................................................................
E. .................................................................

Obs! Innan Du går vidare är det viktigt att du har besvarat avsnitt B!!
C. Arbetsmiljö och arbetsvillkor

Neutralt alternativ – varken instämmer eller avvisar – anges med ”Varken eller”

Ta ställning till följande påståenden:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Instämmende helt</th>
<th>Instämmende delvis</th>
<th>Varken eller</th>
<th>Instämmende knappast</th>
<th>Instämmende inte alls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Den fysiska arbetsmiljön vid den här anstalten är bra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Vi vårdare har ingen plats där vi kan ”prata av oss” ostört med kollegor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Jag känner mig trygg i min arbetsmiljö</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Som kriminalvårdare kan man känna sig säker i sin anställning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Kriminalvårdare vid den här anstalten har för lite eget ansvar i arbetet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Möjligheten att påverka den egna arbetssituationen är alltför begränsad här</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Ledningen vid anstalten uppmuntrar personalen att ta egna initiativ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Kriminalvårdare på den här anstalten har för lite inflytande över verksamhetens utformning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Den närmaste ledningen här har inte mycket att säga till om uppåt i organisationen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Kommunikationen mellan personal och ledning är bra på den här anstalten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Jag har tillräckligt med tid för att hinna med mina arbetsuppgifter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Det är ofta svårt att förenja de olika kraven som ställs på en kriminalvårdare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Jag har för det mesta tid att reflektera över mina arbetsinsatser under arbetstid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Administrativa uppgifter och anstaltsrutiner går ut över kontakten med intagna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Att ständigt behöva hantera intagnas känslor och känsloutbrott är det svåraste i det här jobbet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Att intagna kränker personal är ovanligt på den här anstalten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Arbetsmiljö och arbetsvillkor forts.**

Neutralt alternativ – varken instämmer eller avvisar – anges med "Varken eller"

Ta ställning till följande påståenden:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Instämmer helt</th>
<th>Instämmer delvis</th>
<th>Varken eller</th>
<th>Instämmer knappast</th>
<th>Instämmer inte alls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Det är ofta svårt att &quot;stänga av&quot; tankar och känslor när jag går från jobbet</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Risken för självmord och självmordsförsök av intagna är mycket stressande</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Jag får tillräckligt med vidareutbildning i mitt arbete</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Handledningsstödet till kontaktmän fungerar väl</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Det finns för få utvecklingsvägar för kriminalvårdare</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Jag får inte möjlighet att använda min kompetens fullt ut i arbetet här</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>När jag har svårigheter i arbetet får jag stöd och hjälp från min närmaste överordnade</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Jag känner stöd i mitt arbete från anstaltsledningen</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Jag får stöd och hjälp av kollegorna på min avdelning när jag har svårigheter i arbetet</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Jag känner mig väl informerad om vad som händer inom anstalten</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Uppskattning för mitt arbete är något jag sällan får</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Det är svårt att få ledigt härifrån när jag behöver det</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Mina arbetstider gör det svårt att kombinera arbetet med fritid och familjeliv</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Kriminalvårdarna är underbetalda</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Den känslomässiga ansträngningen på jobbet gör att jag knappt orkar engagera mig i mina anhöriga på fritiden</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Arbetsbelastningen är väldigt ojämlik på den här arbetsplatsen</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Arbetsdagarna blir aldrig som man har planerat dem i förväg</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Yrkesgemenskap och anstaltskultur

Neutralt alternativ – varken instämmer eller avvisar – anges med ”Varken eller”
Ta ställning till följande påståenden:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Påståenden</th>
<th>Instämmer helt</th>
<th>Instämmer delvis</th>
<th>Varken eller</th>
<th>Instämmer knappast</th>
<th>Instämmer inte alls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Jag har förtroende för ledningen för avdelningen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Jag har förtroende för ledningen för anstalten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Jag har förtroende för Kriminalvården allmänt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ledningen för avdelningen har för lite ansvar här</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ledningen för avdelningen finns tillgänglig när jag behöver diskutera en fråga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Jag har förtroende för hur våra arbetsinsatser värderas här vid anstalten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Den här anstalten är bra organiserad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Anstaltsledningen har man ingen kontakt med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Kvinspen är mycket närvarande i verksamheten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Jag känner mig respekterad av kollegorna här vid anstalten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Det är bra kommunikation mellan kollegor på olika avdelningar på den här anstalten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Respekten mellan kollegor med olika arbetsuppgifter är god på den här anstalten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Synen på hur en vårdare ska vara skiljer starkt mellan vårdare på olika avdelningar här</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Jag försöker att inte bli för inblandad i anstaltsledningens planer för den här anstalten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. På vår avdelning har vi i stort sett samma syn på hur en vårdare ska vara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Sammanhållningen mellan personalen på vår avdelning är stark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Det är ganska mycket ”vi och dom” mellan personalen på olika avdelningar här</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Jag känner lojalitet med anstaltsledningen här vid anstalten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Yrkesgemenskap och anstalskultur forts.**

Neutralt alternativ – varken instämmer eller avvisar – anges med ”Varken eller”

Ta ställning till följande påståenden:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Instämmer helt</th>
<th>Instämmer delvis</th>
<th>Varken eller</th>
<th>Instämmer knappast</th>
<th>Instämmer inte alls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Lojalitet känner man främst med kollegorna på den egna avdelningen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Vårt arbete på anstalten rimmar väl med kriminalvårdens visioner (Bättre ut)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Att intagna kränker personal är ovanligt på den här anstalten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Den allmänna atmosfären inom denna anstalt är spänd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Moralen är bra bland personalen vid denna anstalt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Den här anstalten har dålig ordning och disciplin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Säkerhetstänkandet har gått för långt på den här anstalten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Att personal kränker intagna är ovanligt på den här anstalten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>En del personal bara glider runt här på anstalten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Syn på yrkesrollen

Neutralt alternativ – varken instämmer eller avvisar – anges med ”Varken eller”

Ta ställning till följande påståenden:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Instämmer helt</th>
<th>Instämmer delvis</th>
<th>Varken eller</th>
<th>Instämmer knappast</th>
<th>Instämmer inte alls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Jag sökte mig till jobbet som vårdare för att jag ville arbeta med människor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Jag såg jobbet som vårdare som ett sätt att skaffa erfarenheter och meriter för annat arbete (vård, polis etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Det var en tillfällighet att jag hamnade i det här jobbet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Gemenskapen med arbetskamrater är nog den viktigaste orsaken till att man trivs med ett jobb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Ett arbete måste innehålla goda möjligheter att utvecklas för att jag skall trivas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Hyfsade arbetsvillkor (tider, trygghet, lön) är det viktigaste i ett arbete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Syn på yrkesrollen forts.**

Neutralt alternativ – varken instämmer eller avvisar – anges med ”Varken eller”

Ta ställning till följande påståenden:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Instämmer helt</th>
<th>Instämmer delvis</th>
<th>Varken eller</th>
<th>Instämmer knappast</th>
<th>Instämmer inte alls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>På den här orten får man ta de jobb som bjuds</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Jag känner mig inte motiverad att göra mer än precis vad som krävs i mitt arbete</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>De senaste årens inriktning på förbättrad yttre säkerhet har varit nödvändig</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>De mest tillfredsställande arbetsuppgifterna är de som innehåller kontakt med intagna</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Kriminalvårdens viktigaste uppgift är att hålla brottslingar säkert inlästa</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Kriminalvårdens viktigaste uppgift är att bidra till brottslingars anpassning till ett normalt liv</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Jag känner stark oro över den ökade betoningen på straff i samhällsdebatten</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Kriminalvårdarna skall arbeta med påverkansprogrammen</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Påverkansprogrammen leder inte till rehabilitering av intagna</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Jag tycker om att hjälpa intagna att arbeta mot uppsatta mål</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Vårdare i allmänhet är inte rustade för att utföra ett bra kontaktnarbet</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Att vara kontaktman för intagna är en av de mest stimulerande arbetsuppgifterna för en kriminalvårdare</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Det behövs mer utbildning kring skrivarbetet i kontaktnarrollen</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Utrymmet att bedriva ett gott rehabiliteringsarbete är för litet för en kriminalvårdare</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Personalen behöver mer träning och stöd för att hantera effekterna av självmord och självmordsförsök</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Det är viktigt att hålla distans till de intagna</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Intagna utnyttjar dig om du är eftergiven</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Syn på yrkesrollen forts.

Neutralt alternativ – varken instämmer eller avvisar – anges med ”Varken eller”

**Ta ställning till följande påståenden:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Instämmer helt</th>
<th>Instämmer delvis</th>
<th>Varken eller</th>
<th>Instämmer knappast</th>
<th>Instämmer inte alls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Kriminalvårdare måste få mer utbildning i att förstå etniska och kulturella skillnader</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Ibland måste man försvara en intagen mot kollegor</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Intagna måste hållas i strikt disciplin</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Om en intagen ljuger, så får den ingen hjälp av mig</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Jag känner mig ofta osäker hur jag ska stödja intagna och avstår därför</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>De flesta intagna kan bli rehabiliterade</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Den här anstalten är för bekväm för de intagna</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Regelsystemet vid anstalten lär inte de intagna någonting</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Det är viktigt att visa den intagne respekt</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Nära relationer med intagna underminerar din auktoritet</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Jag försöker bygga upp förtroende med intagna</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Att arbeta på den här anstalten är mycket känsomässigt krävande</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Jag försöker att bortse från mina verkliga känslor när jag arbetar med intagna</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Jag har tillräckligt med auktoritet för att utföra mitt arbete på ett bra sätt</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Intagna kommer gärna till mig med sina problem</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Det är viktigt att engagera sig i intagna och deras problem</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>De känslor jag visar intagna är de jag verkliga känner</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Att vara professionell i det här jobbet innebär ofta att hålla inne med vad man innerst inne känner</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Goda och fungerande relationer med de intagna är det bästa säkerhetsarbetet</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Syn på yrkesrollen forts.
Neutralt alternativ – varken instämmer eller avvisar – anges med ”Varken eller”

Ta ställning till följande påståenden:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Att regler och rutiner tillämpas lika av all personal är den bästa garantin för säkerheten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>På den här anstalten är det alltför många vårdare som överser med intagnas regelbrott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Kriminalvårdens ledning borde vara mer flexibel i hur säkerhetsregler ska tillämpas på olika anstalter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Manliga vårdare har ofta mer distans till de intagna än kvinnliga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>En jämn könsbalans i kriminalvårdarkåren är det bästa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Kvinnliga vårdare blir ofta alltför känslomässigt engagerade i att hjälpa intagna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Stark manlig dominans bland vårdarna på en avdelning leder till en alltför ”grabbig” miljö</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>För många kvinnliga vårdare på en avdelning skapar högre press på de manliga när det gäller säkerheten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Intagna söker sig gärna till kvinnliga vårdare när det gäller personliga problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Kriminalvården sätter värde på mig som personal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Kriminalvårdaryrkets status är alltför låg i samhället</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Jag undviker oftast att säga var jag jobbar när jag träffar nya människor på fritiden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>De formella utbildningskraven på kriminalvårdartjänster borde höjas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Alltför många som inte vet något yttrar sig i debatten om kriminalvården</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Media påverkar kriminalvårdspolitiken alldeles för mycket</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. Arbetstillfredsställelse

Ta ställning till följande påståenden:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Instämmer helt</th>
<th>Instämmer delvis</th>
<th>Instämmer knappast</th>
<th>Instämmer inte alls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Välj ett av svarsalternativen under varje fråga:

12. Med den kunskap Du nu har, om du skulle bestämma dig om att ta det jobb du nu har, hur skulle du besluta?
   a. jag skulle utan tvekan ta samma jobb
   b. jag skulle tänka över ännu en gång om jag ska ta jobbet
   c. jag skulle definitivt inte ta samma jobb

13. Allmänt, hur väl skulle Du säga att ditt jobb motsvarar den sorts jobb du ville ha när du började?
   a. mitt jobb är väldigt mycket som det jobb jag ville ha
   b. mitt jobb är någorlunda som det jobb jag ville ha
   c. mitt jobb är inte alls särskilt likt det jobb jag ville ha
14. Om en god vän berättade att han eller hon är intresserad av ett likadant jobb som ditt, hos samma arbetsgivare, vad skulle du säga till honom/henne?

a. jag skulle starkt rekommendera att ta jobbet

b. jag skulle ha tveksamheter till att rekommendera jobbet

c. jag skulle avråda min vän att ta jobbet

Om Du vill tillägga något – om Du har någon avslutande kommentar, skriv här:

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

Stort tack för Din medverkan!
14. Om en god vän berättade att han eller hon är intresserad av ett likadant jobb som ditt, hos samma arbetsgivare, vad skulle du säga till honom/henne?

a. jag skulle starkt rekommendera att ta jobbet
b. jag skulle ha tveksamheter till att rekommendera jobbet
c. jag skulle avråda min vän att ta jobbet

Om Du vill tillägga något – om Du har någon avslutande kommentar, skriv här:
………………………………………………………………………………………………………….
………………………………………………………………………………………………………….
………………………………………………………………………………………………………….
………………………………………………………………………………………………………….
………………………………………………………………………………………………………….
Intervjuguide för vårdare

Introduktion - presentation

Vilka är vi - vad sysslar vi med

Konfidentialitet

Bandspelare

Samtycke

Möjlighet att ta del av utskrift

Kan du berätta om dig själv och din bakgrund

Beskriv dina huvudsakliga arbetsuppgifter på anstalten. Hur länge i denna position

Hur länge på anstalten

Hur länge inom kriminalvård

Hur kom du dit du är idag - olika vägar

Tidigare arbetserfarenheter/arbetsplatser

Utbildning

Ålder - etnisk bakgrund

Varför valde du detta yrke - främsta motiven - tillfällighet/medvetet?

Vad karaktäriserar en vanlig arbetsdag

Berätta om en bra arbetsdag!

Hur är en vanlig dag arbetsdag?

Arbetsvillkor och yrkesroller

Vad kännetecknar yrket idag?

Hur fungerar kontaktmannaskapet - möjligheter – problem?

VSP - levande dokument?

Alternativa sätt att arbeta med kontaktmannaskap och VSP?

Andra typer av vårdaransvar - vilka - hur fungerar?

Arbetar ni med MI här (motivational interviewing)?

Finns det arbetsuppgifter du tycker är svåra att genomföra?

Dilemmat säkerhet - rehabilitering - hur handskas med i vårdarrollen?

Hur söker man arbetstillfredsställelse - vad är viktigt - vilka uppgifter?

Hur borde det vara - vad är viktigast i en vårdares arbete tycker du?

Subkulturellt språk - pratar vårdare intagnas språk? Syfte med det?

Går det att rehabilitera? - Hopplösa fall?

Kan man lita på de intagna? Vi - dom - distans nödvändig?

Ställs rimliga krav på de intagna - arbete, studier, program?

Är det för slött?

Arbetsmiljö - arbetstillfredsställelse

Vad kännetecknar vårdarnas arbetsmiljö sett ur ditt perspektiv?

Är du allmänt positiv el negativ till ditt arbete?

Den fysiska miljön - den psykosociala – stress?

Känslor i jobbet - i vilka situationer? kollegor – intagna?

– våld - hot - glädje - humor - depressivt beteende etc. ?

Hur handskas du med det? Känslostress?

Hot - har du blivit utsatt för sådana?

Trakasserier – har du varit utsatt? Varifrån?

Sjukskrivning - sjukorsaker - genomströmning av personal här?
Intervjuguide för vårdare

Introduktion - presentation
Vilka är vi - vad sysslar vi med
Konfidentialitet
Bandspelare
Samtycke
Möjlighet att ta del av utskrift

Kan du berätta om dig själv och din bakgrund
Beskriv dina huvudsakliga arbetsuppgifter på anstalten.
Hur länge på anstalten
Hur länge inom kriminalvård
Hur kom du dit du är idag - olika vägar
Tidigare arbetserfarenheter/arbetsplatser
Utbildning
Ålder - etnisk bakgrund
Varför valde du detta yrke -främsta motiven -tillfällighet/medvetet?

Vad karaktäriserar en vanlig arbetsdag
Berätta om en bra arbetsdag!
Hur är en vanlig dag arbetsdag?

Arbetsvillkor och yrkesroller
Vad kännetecknar yrket idag?
Hur fungerar kontaktmannaskapet - möjligheter – problem?
VSP - levande dokument?
Alternativa sätt att arbeta med kontaktmannaskap och VSP?
Andra typer av vårдарansvar - vilka - hur fungerar?
Arbetar ni med MI här (motivational interviewing)?
Finns det arbetsuppgifter du tycker är svåra att genomföra?
Dilemmat säkerhet - rehabilitering - hur handskas med i vår达尔ollen?
Hur söker man arbetsstillfredsställelse - vad är viktigt - vilka uppgifter?
Hur borde det vara - vad är viktigast i en vårdares arbete tycker du?
Subkulturellt språk - pratar vårdares intagna språk? Syfte med det?
Går det att rehabilitera? - Hopplösa fall?
Kan man lita på de intagna? Vi - dom - distans nödvändig?
Ställs rimliga krav på de intagna - arbete, studier, program?
Är det för slött?

Arbetsmiljö - arbetsstillfredsställelse
Vad kännetecknar vårdares arbetsmiljö sett ur ditt perspektiv?
Är du allmänt positiv el negativ till ditt arbete?
Den fysiska miljön - den psykosociala – stress?
Känslor i jobbet - i vilka situationer? kollegor – intagna?
- våld - hot - glädje - humor - depressivt beteende etc. ?
Hur handskas du med det? Känslostress?
Hot - har du blivit utsatt för sådana?
Trakassering - har du varit utsatt? Varifrån?
Sjukskrivning - sjukorsaker - genomströmning av personal här?
HUR TRIVS DU - VAD GÖR ATT MAN TRIVS OCH KÄNNER TILLFREDSTÄLLELSE?
TRÄKIGA ELLER JOBBSKA SIDOR? Roliga eller meningsfulla?
OLIKA SKIFT – GER DE OLIKA MÖJLIGHETER?
ARBETE - SOCIALT LIV - HUR FÅR MAN DET ATT GÅ IHOP?
ÄR DIN PARTNER OROLIG PÅG TA DITT ARBETE? PRATAR NI MÖKT OM DITT ARBETE HEMMA?

**Denna anstalt – organisation – ledning etc**

Leddningsorganisation och styrning, hur fungerar?
Vad utmärker klientele - vad kan man göra?
Ger organisationen och ledningen bra förutsättningar för att utföra bra Arbete?
Är ledningen öppen för förändringar?
Bra kommunikation ledning - anställda?
Blir du uppmuntrad till att ta egna initiativ på din avdelning/ anstalt?
Känner du lojalitet mot ledningen? Mot kriminalvården i allmänhet?
Ledarskap - skillnader mellan avdelningar?
Utvecklingsmöjligheter för dig? Borde man förändra?
Delaktighet - upplever du sådan här?
Krav - personalläge – arbetsbelastning?
Vi och andra anstalter? Om man jämför?

**Behandling - säkerhet på anstalten**

Hur fungerar ev påverkansprogram på anstalten/din avdelning?
Hur tillämpar ni säkerhetstänkande - arbetsdelning – organisering etc?
Känner du dig säker på din arbetsplats?
Behövs programverksamhet?
Finns det hinder att motivera intagna till behandling?
Differentiering av intagna - fungerar det?
Är det skillnad mellan vårdare på behandlingsavd och normalavd/säk?

**Avdelningar - inriktningar - grupperingar - gruppkulturer**

Finns det en sammanhållning och gemenskap inom vårdarkåren?
Synen på andra avdelningar - vi - dom?
Förekommer informella öknamn?
Hur stöttar man varandra - vilka ty r du dig till?
Informella ledare - vilka, med vilken profil?
Vad för samman vårdare i grupper - vad isär - splittrar?
Inom personalgruppen - mellan vårdare - gemenskapen?
Hård? Tillåtande? Omvårdande? etc
Känslor i kåren - kan man öppet visa sådana?
Konflikter mellan vårdare - grupper?
Exempel på oskrivna lagar/regler - traditioner?
Närhet mellan ledning och vårdare?
Facket och skyddsombudens roller?

**Hur/vad är en bra kriminalvårdare - vad krävs i praktiken**

Vilka egenskaper är viktigast - vilka kunskaper?
Hur blir man en bra vårdare - utbildning – träning i arbetet?
Hur bör man förhålla sig till intagna?
Kriminalvården idag - organisation - policy - utveckling - möjligheter
Organisatoriska hinder och möjligheter i stort?
Ledningsorganisation och styrning i kriminalvården?
Ledarskapet?
Utvecklingsmöjligheter - vart går utvecklingen?
Hur ser du själv på påverkansprogrammen i allmänhet?
Säkerhetstrenden de senaste åren?
Vart går utvecklingen - vad har förändrats - hur blir det tror du?

Kriminalvården i samhället
Samhällsbilden av kriminalvården - hur ser den ut - hur påverkar den Arbetsförhållandena?
Hur påverkas vårdarna - status - rekrytering - sammanhållning inåt - utåt?
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