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Abstract

“Quis custodiet ipsos custodes?” is an idiomatic Latin expression attributed to the Roman poet Juvenal which literally translates as "Who is to guard the guards themselves?" (Isenberg, 2010). Despite the pivotal role that prison governors play in determining the contours of prison life for staff and prisoners, no empirical study has been conducted to date to determine the backgrounds, ideologies, motivations and values of prison governors in the Republic of Ireland. This area of study is important as governors play a seminal role in shaping and implementing penal policy.

The objective of this research is to bridge that gap and to contribute to existing penological and criminological literature. The author conducted an interview-based case study with fifteen senior governors in the Irish Prison Service in order to understand how their personal qualities and ideologies shaped their approach to managing prisons.

The findings indicate that contemporary developments in the management of Irish prisons have had a considerable impact on how Irish prison governors define their role and purpose and provides an insight into how the process of change is being accomplished, and at what cost.
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SECTION ONE - INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction and Background

In the Republic of Ireland (ROI), as in many other developed countries, deprivation of liberty is the ultimate sanction for those who transgress the law. The day to day implementation of this sanction is managed by the Irish Prison Service (IPS), an executive agency of the Department of Justice and Equality (DJE). The Director General of the IPS reports directly to the Minister of the DJE and is supported by six directorates, Operations, Finance, Care and Rehabilitation, Estate Management and ICT, Human Resources and Corporate Affairs. Nine ‘governing’ governors report directly to the Director General and bear responsibility for managing the complex daily strategic and operational aspects of fourteen prisons across the ROI. The governing governors comprise of various governor grades\(^1\) - Campus Governor, Governor II and Governor III, the level of which is dependent on the size and complexity of the institution. Unlike the UK, the ROI does not have a direct entry route to governor level. Therefore, all current serving governors have started their careers as recruit prison officers. The exception to this traditional career route to governor, which perhaps indicates the level of change occurring within the IPS, is the newly introduced grade of campus governor. The grade of campus governor is now the most senior operational grade in the IPS and was introduced to facilitate campus governance management structures which will provide financial savings and to facilitate the further expansion of shared services on each prison campus.

The serving governor of Mountjoy Prison was appointed as campus governor for the Mountjoy campus in March 2012. Shortly following his appointment, the posts of campus governor at Midlands/Portlaoise and Wheatfield/Cloverhill prisons were advertised by the Public Appointments Service in an open, external competition. Subsequent to this open competition, two serving governor I grades were appointed to the role of campus governor, despite the high level of interest external to IPS. However, this break from the traditional route to governor has heralded a new approach for the IPS in two areas, the move towards open recruitment and a move towards campus governance. The appointment of three campus governors was aimed at advancing the introduction of new

---

\(^1\) There are currently no governor I grades in the Irish prison service following the introduction of campus governance. However, two governor I posts have been approved for IPS HQ in the operations and human resources directorates but have not been filled to date.
Campus structures within these prisons, with eight separate prison management structures being combined into three amalgamated campus management structures (see revised IPS campus governance model attached in appendix I). The three recently appointed campus governors head the larger prisons in Ireland; Dublin West Campus, comprising of Wheatfield and Cloverhill prisons; Mountjoy Campus, comprising of Mountjoy prison, St. Patricks institution, the Dóchas Centre and the Training Unit; and the Portlaoise Campus, which comprises of the Midlands prison and Portlaoise prison. Each campus governor is supported by a deputy campus governor (at governor II level) and various other governor grades, the numbers and grades of which are dependent on the size and function of the prison. Other Irish prisons such as Cork, Limerick, and Castlerea are managed by grade II governors and the remainder - Loughan House, Shelton Abbey and Arbour Hill are managed by a grade III governor. Prison support units such as the Operational Support Group, the Prison Service Escort Corps, Building Services Division and the Training and Development Centre are also managed by a grade III governor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Governor</th>
<th>Governor I</th>
<th>Governor II</th>
<th>Governor III</th>
<th>Deputy Governor</th>
<th>Asst Governor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mountjoy Campus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountjoy Prison</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Patricks</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dóchas Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin West Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheatfield</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloverhill</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portlaoise Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portlaoise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cork Prison</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick Prison</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castlerea</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loughan House</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbour Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelton Abbey</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPSTDC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table one: Current dispersion of governor grades within the Irish Prison Service

(The current staffing level of governor grades in the IPS illustrated in table one above is currently in transition and has changed since initial invitations to interview were sent. Figures are correct as of November 2012).
1.1.1 Governors’ responsibilities

Governors in the ROI are appointed by the Minister for Justice, Equality and Defence and their statutory functions are contained in statutory instrument No. 252 of 2007 - Prison Rules, 2007 (House of the Oireachtas, 2007), government and IPS policies and other pertinent legislation. The 2007 Irish Prison Rules firmly establish the unambiguously central role of the governor in the management of all dimensions of the prison (Irish Prison Service, 2007). However, reading the formal responsibilities of their role as articulated in the prison rules does not capture the complexity of a governor’s daily work. Prison governors have particularly onerous responsibilities when compared to any other equivalent role in the private sector. They are charged with maintaining safe and secure custody, dignity of care and rehabilitation to prisoners in the often dangerous, complex environment of a prison (Irish Prison Service, 2012). Their responsibilities include managing 3248 prison staff across the prisons estate and for ensuring that the 4306 prisoners in custody (23rd November 2012) are treated in a manner which supports the IPS’s mission, vision and values. The prison rules do not reflect the change in their traditional roles brought about by contemporary developments in the IPS. Following his appointment in December 2011, the Director General of the IPS, Mr Michael Donnellan released the IPS 3 year strategic plan 2012 – 2015 in order to make public the high level objectives and key strategic actions the IPS intends to take during the period (Irish Prison Service, 2012). The IPS asserts that the strategy is ‘underpinned by the principles of dignity and respect’ and that these values are central to the objectives laid out in the document during the term of the plan (Irish Prison Service, 2012). The strategy also introduces a new mission statement for the service, to “provide safe and secure custody, dignity of care and rehabilitation to prisoners for safer communities” and a new vision of “a safer community through excellence in a prison service built on respect for human dignity.” (Irish Prison Service, 2012). The strategic actions identified in the plan include, inter alia; reducing the number of prisoners in custody; enhancing prisoner programmes; devising specific strategies for vulnerable prisoners; consolidating prison legislation; and “re-engineering the service to facilitate the principles of normalisation, progression and reintegration of offenders” (Irish Prison Service, 2012, p. 27).
1.1.2 A Time of Transformation and Change

“It must be considered that there is nothing more difficult to carry out, nor more doubtful of success, nor more dangerous to handle, than to initiate a new order of things”.

Niccolò Machiavelli²

Ensuring that the values and high level objectives expressed in the IPS strategic plan are achieved and embedded at the ‘coal face’ is a complex task. This task is further complicated by contemporary challenges for the IPS such as implementing the Public Service or ‘Croke Park’ agreement. The Public Service Agreement (PSA) came about following the financial crisis of the mid-2000s. As a result of worsening economic conditions, the Irish Government published a plan for public sector reform - ‘The Programme for Government’ (Department of the Taioseách, 2011). The programme for government established the foundation for wide-ranging scrutiny of public expenditure, a reduction in staffing and improving productivity and performance. The PSA was implemented as a result of the programme for government and expresses a commitment between the Irish government and sections of the public service to work in partnership in order to introduce financial and procedural efficiencies (DPER, 2012). The PSA contains a specific programme for the IPS and recognises that the IPS had already undertaken a substantial transformation in 2005 (Irish Prison Service, 2012). As a result of the PSA, the IPS is currently undergoing what must be the most transformational period of its long history. IPS implementation of the PSA is based on the premise that current staffing levels and rosters are no longer economically feasible and require transformation (Irish Prison Service, 2012). In addition, the PSA requires that any changes that are introduced must not have a negative impact on security or on the regimes available to prisoners. As a result, one of the principal challenges for Irish prison governors is to resolve complex issues such as reduced staffing, reduced budgets, implementation of revised rosters, the introduction of new prison service grades and other operational challenges presented by the PSA without causing a reduction in service for the prisoners in their care. To further complicate the issue, other contemporary challenges for the service such as overcrowding, increased scrutiny from external agencies and an amplified focus on performance management has created an environment where strong leadership from

---

governors is vital to ensure that the values articulated in the strategic plan are embedded in the organisation. The need for strong leadership in a time of change is discussed by Coyle (2008, p. 244) where he asserts that “change needs to be set in the context of an agreed set of ethical values linked to clear leadership”. Coyle goes on to claim that if this is the case, the change process will “lead to better managed prisons, which are more secure, safer and more effective; in which there is a respect for decency and humanity” (Coyle, 2008, p. 244). The Irish Prison Service has clearly established its corporate ethical values in the 3 year strategic plan. In order for the plan to be effective, it will require the support of moral ‘champions’ within the IPS. It is therefore important for the IPS to determine the ethical base and motivations of our senior operational managers in light of contemporary challenges to the service and in light of the values espoused in the IPS 3 year strategic plan.
SECTION TWO - LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review explores dominant themes relating to the central role a governor plays in a prison, the complexity of the work they do and the influence they have in determining the ethical framework of their prisons.

2.1 The pivotal role of a governor

Recent years have witnessed a dramatic increase in the use of imprisonment as a sanction in the ROI and the prison population has grown dramatically. This growth represents a 32% increase in the country’s prison population in the past five years with an increase from 3,321 in 2007 to 4,389 in 2011 (Deegan, 2012). During this period the overall number of committals to Irish prisons has also grown considerably, from 11,934 in 2007 to 17,318 in 2011, representing a 45% growth (Deegan, 2012).

Deprivation of liberty is an undoubtedly weighty punitive penalty and the ‘pains of imprisonment’ have been well documented (Sykes, 1958; Cohen & Taylor, 1972; Johnson, 1996; Crewe, 2011). Goffman’s (1961) depiction of a prison as a ‘total institution’ illustrates some of the difficulties prisoners face such as being isolated from the rest of society, losing their autonomy and being restricted from sustaining relationships with family and friends. Goffman describes prison as a “total institution...where a large number of like-situated individuals, cut off from the wider society for an appreciable period of time, together lead an enclosed, formally administered round of life” (1961, p. 11). It is apparent to the author that Goffman’s definition could be applied equally to prison staff and management also as they spend a great deal of their working lives in what Foucault calls the “the darkest region in the apparatus of justice” (1979, p. 256).

Despite the increased use of imprisonment in contemporary society, the “depth, weight and tightness” (Crewe, 2011) of the sanction and regardless of the pivotal role that prison governors play in determining the contours of prison life for staff and prisoners alike, little is known about the men and women who manage the state’s prisons on our behalf. To date, the core focus of sociological research on what Clemmer (1940) called the ‘prison community’ in penal institutions has been largely confined to the study of prisoners (e.g. Clemmer, 1940; Sykes, 1958; Irwin, 2009; Crewe, 2009) encompassing a multitude of areas including examining prisoners sub cultures, their origins, and reporting on their attitudes, sex lives and addictions. In contrast, fewer studies have been conducted on the
prison staff who are integral members of this community. The studies that have looked at
the role, experiences and influence that staff have within prisons (e.g. Thomas, 1972; 
Kauffman, 1988; Crawley, 2004; Liebling, et al., 2011) have seldom included research on 
governors, with some notable exceptions (e.g. Bryans, 2007; Crewe & Liebling, 2011; 
Liebling, et al., 2011; Liebling & Crewe, forthcoming). The substantial research focus on 
prisoners and prison officers is not surprising. Coyle expresses that the two most 
significant groups in a prison are frontline staff and prisoners and that the key to a well 
managed prison is the quality of the relationship between these two key groups (Coyle, 
2002, p. 13). From a staff perspective, Liebling and Price (2001) assert that the role of 
prison officer is arguably the most important in a prison and this assertion is supported by 
the author’s professional experience and opinion. However, prison officers must be 
strategically led, guided and supported by the prison’s senior management team. Liebling 
and Price cite that prison officers described that life was ‘at it’s best’ for them when they 
were being supported by their managers (Liebling & Price, 2001, p. 192). They also 
illustrate that a “strong and well liked management team can transform a prison, and 
provide the kind of leadership staff respond to well” (Liebling & Price, 2001, p. 184). Their 
study highlights that the legitimate authority and good practical and interpersonal skills of 
governors ‘gives shape’ to a prison officer’s daily work.

Prison governors carry out an extremely complex task in fulfilling the objectives of 
contemporary imprisonment. They are charged to manage the punishment of prisoners 
on behalf of the state by depriving them of their liberty and to rehabilitate them, all 
whilst maintaining good order, safe custody and providing constructive regimes for those 
in their care, a complexity of tasks which are illustrated by Sykes;

“Somehow [the administrator of the maximum-security prison] must resolve the claims 
that the prison should exact vengece, erect a specter to terrify the actual or potential 
deviant, isolate the known offender from the free community, and effect a change in the 
personality of his captives so that they gladly follow the dictates of the law – and in 
addition maintain order within his society of prisoners and see that they are employed at 
useful labour” (Sykes, 1958, p. 18).

Notwithstanding that Sykes work was carried out in the 1950s within a maximum prison 
in the USA, his observations still ring true today. In contemporary society governors also
have primary responsibility to protect the rights of and manage some of the most marginalised members of society within their prisons. In addition to shaping the ethos and regime of their prisons governors may, on behalf of the state, exercise a large amount of personal power over their charges. Under the Irish Prison Rules 2007, governors may *inter alia*; order prisoners to be physically restrained; place them in a special observation cell; transfer them to another prison; deny them physical contact with their visitors; deny them recreation or association with other prisoners; strip search them and have their possessions searched (Irish Prison Service, 2007). Governors are also influential in any decision on whether or not a prisoner should be released temporarily and in having prisoners transferred to open prisons, both actions which may have a substantial impact on an individual’s prison experience.

Prison governors are also charged with maintaining the ‘quality of prison life’ and defining the moral climate of their prisons by setting boundaries of acceptable behaviour for staff and prisoners and determining what ‘right relationships’ are (Liebling, et al., 2011). Ensuring that staff-prisoner relationships have the correct balance of control and respect is a complex task. In order for staff to be empowered to use their authority professionally in order to create decent environments requires highly skilled staff and outstanding leadership (Liebling, et al., 2011). Within the prison, governors act as ‘social control agents’ (Poole & Regoli, 1980) and oversee the daily life of the prisoners and staff in their charge. The apparent dichotomy of maintaining equilibrium between supporting staff and ensuring the fair treatment of prisoners is discussed by McDonnell (2000) who asserts that governors must maintain a balance of leadership and management skills in order to ensure an equitable approach;

“...*a governor walking along the top of a wall, on one side are the prisoners who expect you to be fair, on the other are your staff who expect you to be supportive. If you climb down the wall to one side or the other for too long it could undermine your position with the other. It is the good use of management skills and paying attention to detail that will keep you walking along the top of the wall*” (McDonnell, 2000, p. 13).

For IPS governors, maintaining this balanced approach may be further complicated by the recent reduction in financial and staff resources available to them. For example, reducing staff expenditure may undermine efforts to run legitimate regimes which could lead to
negative consequences for both prisoners and prison staff (Taylor & Cooper, 2008). Crewe et al. (2011) highlight the complex operational ‘balancing act’ faced by governors in ensuring that prison staff continue to feel valued while endeavouring to cut costs, an issue which is particularly salient in the contemporary Irish penal arena. Their study of public and private prisons in the UK revealed that public sector officers often made direct associations between their treatment and that of prisoners;

“Public sector staff appeared to have a needier relationship [when compared to private sector staff] with their employer, regarding prisoners almost as sibling rivals in competition for organizational attention” (Crewe, et al., 2011, p. 108).

Crewe et al. conclude by illustrating the consequences of not maintaining an equilibrium of support by asserting that difficulties arise if staff are overly anti-prisoner and anti-management, with officers over-using their authority and distancing themselves from prisoners. They also posit that difficulties can arise if staff are too compliant or favourable towards managers and prisoners as staff so orientated tend to trust prisoners excessively and avoid using their authority and highlight that a “positive staff ethos might lead to some negative prisoner outcomes” (Crewe, et al., 2011, p. 111).

Despite their pivotal role both in their prisons and in the wider criminal justice arena, there is a dearth of empirical data available on how governors define their roles, their backgrounds and other influences that shape the way they do their work. The lack of empirical research on governors is perhaps suprising as prison governors are a key professional group within the criminal justice system and play a key role in interpreting and communicating penal policy (Bryans, 2007). The lack of available research may be due to the difficulty of accessing senior managers and other reasons such as security and the time constraints imposed by busy prison schedules. Bryans (2000) states that the lack of empirical research in the UK is due to governors not being considered as an ‘elite’ group within the criminal justice system as there does not appear to be any consistency in governors’ social backgrounds, philosophy or education. Bryans goes on to state that when compared to Judges, Magistrates or the Police, governors carry out their work out of public view, and that governors themselves have resisted systematic study of their
work, preferring instead to characterise their work as *sui generis* and consequently too intricate to describe (Bryans, 2000). Liebling and Crewe assert that the lack of empirical study of senior prison managers is also due to the fact that “as power-holders, senior managers appeal less to critical scholars than prisoners do” (Liebling & Crewe, 2012). The area is in need of further study as “Governors are key actors in prisons and it is only by understanding how prisons are governed, and by who, that we will have a better insight into how our prisons operate” (Bryans, 2007, p. 191). The pivotal influence that governors have within a prison environment is also articulated by Conrad (1960, p. 245) where he states “A penal institution is the lengthened shadow of the man in charge”. This statement is supported by Dilulio who asserts that “prison management may be the single most important determinant of the quality of prison life” (Dilulio, 1987, p. 255). Dilulio goes on to assert that “if most prisons have failed, it is because they have been ill-managed, under-managed or not managed at all” (Dilulio, 1987).

2.2 The critical importance of values

It is widely accepted in the existing literature that governors play a seminal role within their prisons and have considerable influence in defining the contours of prison life for both the staff and prisoners under their care. There have been a number of studies of senior prison managers in the United States covering broad issues such as Dilulio’s (1987) comparative study of correctional management, Cullen et al’s (1993) study of the correctional orientation of prison wardens and Moster and Jelic’s (2009) study on prison wardens’ attitudes towards prison rape and assault. However, little is known of the values and beliefs that influence the work of prison governors. This is perhaps surprising, as it is generally accepted that a principled framework is essential for the ethical management of prisons (Coyle, 2008). In most developed democratic countries international human rights frameworks, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, constitutional and common law underpin and preserve the values of society (Council of Europe, 2010). Coyle (2002) posits that the most significant of these values is respect for the innate dignity of all members of society regardless of their social status. He asserts that the ultimate test for this value lies in the way that society protects the dignity of those who have transgressed against society’s laws. This philosophy is also supported by Mandela;
“It is said that no one truly knows a nation until one has been inside the jails. A nation should not be judged by how it treats its highest citizens, but its lowest ones” (Mandela, 1994, p. 233).

Coyle (2002) argues the importance of operating within an ethical framework, especially when one group holds significantly more power than another. He states that without an ethical framework this situation can easily lead to an abuse of power and that “the ethical basis of imprisonment needs to pervade the management process from the top down” (Coyle, 2002, p. 13). Coyle goes on to assert that those who manage prisons should look beyond technical processes and procedures and articulates that prison governors must be;

“... leaders who are capable of enthusing the staff for whom they are responsible with a sense of value in the way they carry out their difficult daily tasks...” (Coyle, 2002, p. 13).

Coyle states that first line staff in prisons will only be able to maintain their commitment to respecting the dignity and rights of people in their care if they get a “clear and consistent message from those in charge of the system that this is an imperative” (Coyle, 2002, p. 15).

The importance of establishing a leader’s professional background, influences and personal values is discussed by Davis;

“If the leader is a great person, then inspiring ideas will permeate the corporation’s culture. If the leader is mundane, then the guiding beliefs may well be uninspired. Strong beliefs make for strong cultures. The clearer the leader is about what he stands for, the more apparent will be the culture of that company” (Davis, 1984, p. 8).

Brown (1998) also asserts the most influential impact on an organisation’s sense of moral purpose is the management style, vision and personality of the dominant leader within the organisation. This concept may be particularly important in prisons as although governors are guided by a number of formal procedures, policies and legislation, they also have opportunities to exercise their discretion in a wide variety of areas. Bryans (2007, p. 109) highlights that a governor’s use of this discretion is influenced in part by his or hers underlying values and ideologies. This viewpoint is supported by Miller as he asserts that
“Ideology and its consequences exert a powerful influence on the policies and procedures of those who conduct the enterprise of criminal justice” (Miller, 1973, p. 142).

However, Rutherford states that the relationship between ideology and practice is both “complex and unpredictable” (1994, p. 2) and that senior practitioners may not make decisions based exclusively on their ideological preferences. Rutherford posits that the values and beliefs that shape criminal justice practitioners in the UK approach to their work falls into three dimensions or clusters of beliefs;

“The first of these embraces the punitive degradation of offenders. The second cluster speaks less to moral purpose than to issues of management; pragmatism, efficiency and expediency are the themes that set the tone. Third, ...there is the cluster of liberal and humanitarian values” (Rutherford, 1994, p. 3).

Lacey (1994) highlights that Rutherford’s ‘efficiency’ (or managerialism) credo can be combined with either credo one – ‘punishment’ or credo three – ‘care’. Liebling (2004) asserts that the pursuit of these credos in the UK may have changed in the decade following Rutherford’s work and that other credos have emerged, such as what Liebling terms the ‘effectiveness’ credo (Liebling, 2004, p. 7). Crewe and Liebling (2011) also highlight the importance of establishing senior practitioners’ orientations and ideologies given their dual role in shaping and implementing penal policy. They assert that the testimonies of professional ‘insiders’ such as governors are useful in order to identify the gap between official rhetoric and what is actually happening at the ‘coal face’ of the prison (Crewe & Liebling, 2011). Their study found that the connection between official rhetoric and what is happening in practice in HMP is closer now than ever. The possibility of uncovering a gap, if any, between official rhetoric and what is happening in prisons is particularly important from an Irish context as the recently published values and mission of the IPS clearly outline the corporate values of the organisation. Given the extent of discretion Irish prison governors’ have in their daily work it is likely that change will not be achieved within the organisation without their support. In this event, the published values and mission of the IPS will be in danger of becoming what Danzon (2006), albeit from a healthcare perspective, terms ‘a mantra rather than an agenda for action’.
Their study, based on interviews with eighty prison governors and directors in the UK, explores the relationship between professional values and prison cultures as part of their broader study of values, practices and outcomes in public and private prisons (Liebling, et al., 2011). They found that a prison’s principles and values are largely driven by the prisons senior management team and that the management team set the tone for staff behaviour. The study found that managerialist reforms have resulted in a reduced range of professional orientations as managers were recruited for their professional capabilities rather than their values. As a result of their background and training, few managers involved in their study had the capacity to discuss issues of penal management in any theoretical depth. The study also found that critical philosophical thinking amongst senior managers in the UK about what prisons are for has been replaced by management ‘speak’ and a focus on how prisons are managed. Crewe and Liebling posit that some governors in the UK have become ‘too compliant’ with the process driven framework of this new penology, and that they have become ineffective as dissenting voices (Crewe & Liebling, 2011). However, Coyle (2008, p. 235) asserts that how a country utilises its prisons is likely to affect the internal management of prisons. He goes on to state that issues such as overcrowding and a lack of resources may lead to a restriction on governors to provide anything other than basic services for prisoners, with simply no time to achieve higher objectives. It could therefore also be argued that senior managers in the UK are merely fulfilling official expectations of their role and do not engage in public discourse in order to support the system they have been charged to manage. Crewe and Liebling uphold Lacey’s (2008) assertion that communal values, specifically attitudes towards penal issues, are influenced by a nation’s cultural values, community and institutional arrangements. This is reflected in their finding of what appears to be decreasing levels of sympathy for offenders by both criminal justice professionals and the wider public (Crewe & Liebling, 2011). Crewe and Liebling’s research builds on Bryans’ (2007) work which was based on interviews with 42 prison governors and 10 senior ‘stakeholders’ in the UK in the late 1990s. The main emphasis of Bryans’ study is on contemporary developments in prison management in the UK, governor’s competences and how governors defined their roles. Bryans found that the beliefs and language used by his interviewees reflected the corporate values of UK prison service in the 1990s, with a focus on “performance, delivery and managerialism” (Bryans, 2007, p. 118). Bryans hypothesises that the cohort of UK
prison governors appointed since 2000 may share a more managerial orientation as HMP headquarters have adopted a more centralised managerial approach to running prisons in the UK. Bryans’ prediction is upheld in Crewe and Liebling’s (2011) research, which identified a move from philosophical discourse amongst governors in the UK to a more bureaucratic managerialist language. Bryans however recognises the limitations of his work and identifies that the prison service has changed since the 1990s and that “some new structures and organisational changes have taken place” (Bryans, 2007, p. x).

Current research findings indicate that the ethical and moral values of a governor are a primary factor in determining a prisons moral climate and that governor grades can play a seminal role in ensuring that prison staff treat offenders ethically, fairly, honestly and with dignity and respect, values articulated in the IPS 3 year strategic plan (Irish Prison Service, 2012). However, the effectiveness of a governor’s authority in having an influence on a prisons quality of life may depend on a match between ‘the prisons current state, as well as their own personal and professional qualities’ (Liebling asst by Arnold, 2004, p. 426). In the UK it has been stated that some governors start their careers in the prison service with a strong sense of moral purpose and manage to retain that sense throughout their careers, but other governors claim that managerial challenges such as attaining performance related goals make it impossible to retain their initial sense of purpose (Carlen, 2002, pp. 45-46). One of the primary aims of this research project is to ascertain the ‘ethical base’, motivations and backgrounds of ROI governors and if they apply their personal values to their work. This objective is particularly important in light of contemporary developments within the Irish Prison system and in light of the values espoused in the IPS 3 year strategic plan.

It must be recognised that concepts like dignity, respect and humanity are difficult to “operationalize and practise” (Liebling, 2011). Contemporary research on the ‘quality of prison life’ (Liebling, 2004) provides empirical evidence that some prisons are less damaging than others, with prisoners describing huge variations in the value frameworks of prisons despite those prisons serving similar functions (Liebling, 2011). Liebling asserts that the ‘differences that matter’ to prisoners incorporate;
“...interpersonal relationships and treatment, and the use of authority, which leads to stark differences in perceived fairness and safety and different outcomes for prisoners, including rates of suicide” (Liebling, 2011, p. 530).

The research discussed in this review has been conducted primarily within penal institutions in the UK and USA. Ireland has a very small prison population when compared to the UK or the USA, averaging 4,300, 86,400 and 2.2 million respectively (ICPS, 2012). Consequently, this has resulted in a much lower number (14) of smaller capacity prisons in Ireland which in turn have ‘flatter’ management structures than the UK or the USA. One of the consequences of Ireland having only fourteen prisons and having no direct entry at governor level is that most Irish prison managers have known and worked with each other throughout their careers, at various different grades and roles. Another consequence of having a small number of governors when compared to other jurisdictions is that the Director General of the prison service and other senior managers at headquarters level know each governor personally, and are aware of their performance and their professional backgrounds. The relatively small scale of the Irish penal arena when compared to other jurisdictions combined with the current financial climate, the challenges presented under the PSA and the social and historical backgrounds of the Irish people has given rise to a unique culture within ROI prisons. The Irish penal system is therefore distinctive in many respects and the likelihood of transferability of current international research findings into an Irish context is questionable when viewed in context with the unique issues discussed above. In the ROI, information on prison governors and their work is confined to reports, prison service job descriptors and in one case, an autobiographical book from a former prison governor (Lonergan, 2010). No empirical information is available on Irish prison governors’ backgrounds, values, characteristics or the challenges they face in contemporary prison management. The objective of this research is to bridge that gap and contribute in some small way to existing penological and criminological literature.
SECTION THREE - METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Questions

The overarching research question of this project is;

How do the personal qualities and ideologies of prison governors shape their approach to the running of the prison?

This question was explored in relation to three dimensions:

The influence of governors’ personal and social backgrounds - how do governors’ perceive their age, gender and education influence their approach to their work?

Governors’ perceptions and motivations for their work - how do governors’ define their role? What are their key motivations for their work? To what extent is their job satisfaction affected by the contemporary developments in the IPS?

Governors’ ideologies and values - what values do governors’ hold to be important? To what extent do these values shape the contours of the prison? Is there a gap between ‘official rhetoric’ and governors’ personal beliefs and ideologies?

3.2 Research Design

The author was cognisant that careful deliberation of this project’s design was critical as there were limitations on both his and the sample group’s professional schedule. Other issues such as the potential financial cost of the research project were also taken into consideration. Taking these issues into account, the study was constructed using an exploratory research approach as the goal of this research was to investigate social phenomenon in a prison setting without any preconceived expectations from the researcher (Bachman & Schutt, 2011). A qualitative approach was adopted as the research questions required an emphasis on depth of understanding (King & Wincup, 2008) and it is unlikely that this objective could have been achieved by employing quantitative methods. In order to define this project, set boundaries, provide direction and to help plan a successful research project (O’Leary, 2005) the researcher designed an interview schedule which contained a number of open questions relating to key themes highlighted in the literature review (see appendix III). The open nature of the interview
questions was maintained throughout the research process in order that identified themes could evolve and new themes could emerge as the research proceeded (Robson, 2011). The author was influenced in his design by Stake who posits that a collective case study “is an instrumental study extended to several cases... They are chosen because it is believed that understanding them will lead to better understanding, perhaps better theorizing about a still larger collection of cases” (Stake, 2005, p. 446).

3.3 Sampling

As highlighted by Bryans (2007, p. 5) one of the key issue for researchers is deciding how to gather primary data. Given the time constraints available to interview participants, the researcher conducted secondary data analysis of official IPS records available to him as a practitioner-researcher to gather initial data on the ages, date of joining the service, current location and sex of governor grades in the IPS (see Appendix VI). Data gathered from the initial stage enabled the researcher to identify a purposive sample of governor grades which contributed to sample generalisability, which in turn contributed to the validity of this research. The researcher identified 30 potential participants (see appendix II for initial interview sample methodology graph) and a letter was sent to each governor grade identified (see appendix IV) which invited them to participate. In order to be “sympathetic to the constraints on organisations participating in research and not inhibit their functioning by imposing any unnecessary burdens on them” (British Society of Criminology, 2008) the author committed to conduct any interviews at a time and venue that met the needs of the potential participants.

Initially it was proposed to interview a cross section of governor grades, from assistant governor to campus governor and all governor grades in between. It was also decided to include 3 governors who work in support sections of the IPS in the sample as they play a seminal role in shaping the ethical framework of the IPS given the high profile and influence of their positions. With the exception of one assistant governor, only governors from deputy governor level up responded to the invitation. This did not dilute the generalisability or validity of the research findings, but contributed to the overall strength of the study as the final participants were representative of various senior grades and had a broad range of career backgrounds. As the research interviews commenced, a number of governor grades who had not responded to the invitation contacted the author in
order to participate. A number of respondents said that they had spoken to other governors who had completed their interviews and found the process interesting, enjoyable and reflective, and that was why they wanted to participate. The researcher commenced to conduct interviews with the 15 governors who were willing to participate. In the final analysis the sample group comprised of 3 campus governors, 4 governor II’s, 6 governor III’s and 2 deputy governors. The sample represents all of the nine ‘governing governors’ in the Republic of Ireland and a broad cross section of their senior managers.

3.4 Research Methodology

The researcher was influenced in his choice of methodology by Bachman and Schutt (2011) who assert that “Exploratory research to chart the dimensions of previously unstudied social settings and intensive investigations of the subjective meanings that motivate individual action are particularly well served by the techniques of intensive interviewing” (Bachman & Schutt, 2011, p. 300). This approach was appropriate as the researcher was closely involved with the research process as it was a small scale project and the researcher was also the interviewer (Robson, 2011, p. 285). In order to address the research questions the researcher designed an interview schedule (see appendix II).

The interview questions were constructed paying attention to the following three dimensions;

*Personal and social background* – The interview questions under this dimension were constructed by paying heed to the hypothesis that an individual’s approach to their work may be influenced by a number of individual factors such as their personal and professional background, standard of education, race, gender and age (Farkas, 2001). The researcher explored the relevance of both individual and organisational factors in order to determine the background and influences which have shaped the way participants approach their work.

*Opinions / perceptions of their work* – The interview questions in this strand were designed to establish participants’ interpretation of their work and to ascertain if contemporary developments in the Irish penal arena have had an impact on their motivation and job satisfaction. The questions were designed to uncover what tasks participants considered important in their day to day work, if they took a
philosophical approach to their work or if they are just ‘caught up’ in the day to
day demands of their role. The researcher also wished to uncover ‘who they are’,
how they define their role, their professional orientations etc. as their beliefs and
orientations shape their approach to the work that they do (Rutherford, 1994).

Ideologies and Values – The questions under this dimension were shaped to
determine the participants’ ideologies and values as each governor interviewed
has a dual role in shaping and implementing penal policy. Establishing the
participants’ sense of 'moral purpose' was important as governors define the
moral climate of their prisons by setting boundaries of acceptable behaviour for
staff and prisoners and by determining what ‘right relationships’ are. It was
particularly important for the IPS to determine the ‘ethical base’, motivations etc.
of governors in light of the values espoused in the IPS 3 year strategic plan. Some
questions in this dimension were designed to uncover the extent to which
governors applied their personal values to their work (i.e. the extent of their
professional discretion), and if their values have changed over time in light of
contemporary developments. An underlying strand of all the questions in each
dimension was to uncover if participants were orientated towards philosophical /
academic discourse or if they employed the ‘management speak’ of a purely task
orientated leader.

It was anticipated that some supplementary questions would be asked depending on how
interviewees’ responded and the specific wording and order of the research questions
would be modified depending on the ‘flow’ of the interview. This was reflected in the
researcher’s experience when conducting the interviews as some unforeseen interesting
topics were presented by a number of early participants which resulted in the researcher
‘reworking’ some questions to explore the issues they raised. The researcher selected an
intensive interview approach in order to gain an in-depth understanding of the
interviewees’ values, perceptions and experiences as it was unlikely this could be
achieved with more structured methods. However, Reiner asserts that ‘all interviews are
inevitably a form of reciprocal impression management’ (Reiner 1991, quoted in Bryans,
2007 p. 9). It is possible therefore that some participants were less than frank as the
researcher is in a central position within the IPS and the chances were that they would
see him again, rather than an outsider whom they would never meet again. Recognising the limitations that being a practitioner researcher presents, the researcher recognised that some governor grades may have told him what ‘he wanted to hear’ and some may have made controversial comments aimed at the audience who may read this research. These potential issues were not reflected in the researcher’s interview experience as the majority of participants disclosed information at various stages of the interview that was less than flattering to them personally. With the exception of one participant, it appeared to the researcher that the majority of the sample responded to interview questions openly, honestly and candidly. The participant that did not engage fully seemed to be concerned with his professional image and answered almost all of the interview questions in a hesitant, guarded manner.

The average length of each interview was 90 minutes, and all interviews were undertaken by the researcher in conditions of absolute privacy. The interviews were conducted either in the participating governor’s private office or in the researcher’s private office in the IPS training and development centre. It is noteworthy that all of the interviews that took place in a governor’s office were interrupted, in some cases three or four times, by staff looking for guidance or clarification on a number of operational issues. Those that took place in the researcher’s office were not interrupted. This highlights the ‘accessibility’ of governors in the sample and perhaps illustrates the dependency of staff on the central figure of the governor. The author conducted each interview personally in order to ensure the consistency of each interview, which in turn should contribute to the validity and reliability of the participants’ responses.

3.5 Data Analysis

The researcher took a systematic approach in analysing the qualitative data gathered from the interviews as he was cognisant that “serious and detailed attention needs to be given to the principles of his analysis” (Robson, 2011, p. 466). In order to record any initial perceptions of the data obtained the researcher compiled a written summary of each recorded interview directly after it took place. Transcripts of the interviews were produced and computer text files were stored on a secure CPU in the researcher’s office for each individual interview. The author personally transcribed the majority of the interviews in order to become more familiar with the data gathered. Given the time
constraints of the author’s professional schedule, it was necessary to have a number of the transcripts produced using the services of a professional agency. Following the delivery of transcripts from the agency the author recognised that there were considerable benefits to be gleaned by completing all further transcripts himself as familiarity with the data was central to optimising the potential of the data gathered. To further the researcher’s knowledge of the data set, the author played the recorded interview files at every opportunity possible. This strategy paid dividends and resulted in the researcher becoming very familiar with the data as time went on.

The researcher adopted a grounded approach (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) to analysis which allowed for themes to emerge from the data. In order to ensure that the approach was systematic, the researcher coded all parts of the data that were related to the research questions. All codes were then grouped into themes. The themes identified served as a basis for further analysis and interpretation. McMillan and Schumacher (1993, p. 479) assert that qualitative research is “primarily an inductive process of organising data into categories and identifying patterns among categories.” This was reflected by this researchers experience as meaning emerged almost organically from the data as the process evolved.

3.6 Ethical Considerations

As the researcher is employed in the IPS training and development centre and was interviewing staff, not prisoners, he was not obliged to formally apply to the IPS prisoner based research ethics committee for approval. However, the researcher was aware that qualitative research has potential to raise some complex ethical issues, especially research involving people and took full responsibility to meet his ethical obligations. The researcher was particularly cognisant that there is a potential for “harm, stress and anxiety and a myriad of other negative consequences for research participants” (Robson, 2011, p. 194). Taking these potential issues into account, the researcher took what Robson (2011) refers to as a ‘situational relativist’ approach. This approach involved the researcher making ethical decisions based on the issues applicable to this specific research project (Robson, 2011, p. 197). This approach is also supported by Crow et al (2006), who assert that homogenous consent regulations should be moderated by a degree of flexibility, dependent on the characteristics of the specific research project. In
order to minimise the impact of the six main ethical issues described by Bachman and Schutt (2011, p. 297) voluntary participation, subject well-being, identity disclosure, confidentiality, appropriate boundaries and researcher safety, the researcher designed an information letter for potential participants (See Appendix IV) and consent form (See Appendix V) which articulated that the research would be on a voluntary basis, and confidentiality assured. Walker et al (2008) suggest that only a small amount of information can be conveyed and absorbed prior to participants consenting. Therefore, the researcher was aware that participants may have only limited understanding of his project and their involvement, and followed up the information letter with an abbreviated email outlining the nature of the study. Following the participants agreement to partake in the study, in order to minimise the possibility of participant stress or anxiety, the researcher furnished each participant with the interview schedule by internal IPS email two days before the interview was to commence. The email outlined that the questions were provisional and were subject to be changed based on the flow of dialogue, but would form the basis of the conversation. The researcher also outlined the nature of the research and the participant’s involvement in it before commencing each interview. During this pre interview briefing, the researcher was also explicit that participants could decide to withdraw from participation at any stage. Following the pre interview briefing, the researcher furnished each participant with an informed consent form (See Appendix V) and read through it with them before commencing. Following each interview the author contacted each participant to thank them for their time and for their contribution to the project. A number of participants (5) contacted the author to express that they found the process interesting and that normally they would not have the time to reflect on such issues. This was of particular solace to the author as it was a prime objective to ensure that participants enjoyed the process in order not to ‘spoil the research field’ for future projects.

Respecting and protecting the anonymity of the research participants was a particular concern of the researcher. In a research project of this nature the researcher’s ability to ensure absolute anonymity was hampered by the small sample of participants. In order to address this issue, the researcher decided not to use consistent identifiers in this thesis as codes may have allowed readers to identify participants by ‘linking’ quotes. For the purpose of storing and retrieving data, the researcher assigned a random code to each
participant, Governor 1, Governor 2, Governor 3 etc. This code was used to title the interview voice files on the author’s secure encrypted computer and on the subsequent transcript files. Throughout the process of interview transcription, particularly where a participant named an individual or a specific prison, the author removed any reference that would enable a reader to identify the participant based on the details he / she divulged.

Finally, the researcher was aware that his position as an employee of the IPS may in itself present ethical issues and that he would have to guard against bias. Robson highlights that research cannot be value free or politically neutral, and that research is “based upon presuppositions reflecting the values and background of the researcher” (Robson, 2011, p. 225). To address the potential negative effects of this issue, the author endeavoured to ensure that this research project is technically sound, with data appropriately collected, analysed and interpreted.

3.7 The Advantages and Disadvantages of Practitioner Research

The role of practitioner researcher is fraught with potential difficulties and it is important to understand the limitations that being a practitioner researcher presents. Apart from the potential of being influenced by political sensitivities within the IPS, this practitioner researcher could be alleged to be too ‘close’ to the subject matter to be objective. The researcher recognised that the dangers of ‘over rapport’ with the interviewees was also an area for concern (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983). As Bryans (2007) highlights, all researchers have a tendency to bring their own beliefs, values and prejudices into the research field with them. As a practitioner, the researcher endeavoured to ensure a balanced approach by reflecting on the personal assumptions, beliefs and preconceptions he had at each stage of the study.

Notwithstanding these limitations, the researcher’s position of what Brown (1996) calls an ‘indigenous insider’ may have paid dividends in a number of unanticipated and anticipated ways. Gresham Sykes highlighted that - “A prison is founded in part on secrecy and the observer from the free community is inevitably defined as an intruder, at least initially” (Sykes, 1958, p. xx). Due to his role as Chief Officer in the IPS training and development centre, the author was known to all of the research participants and this
allowed privileged access to senior governors, access to prisons and reduced any potential complications with security processes and procedures when conducting interviews. The author’s role also provided access to existing data in human resources databases and his knowledge, experience and work related insights were of considerable benefit when designing this study and interpreting the data gathered. Reflecting Bryans’ (2007) experience, the author perceived that his position within the organisation may have influenced participants to be more open and frank with him than they may done with an ‘outsider’. This manifested itself in the tone of conversation during the course of the interviews, with governors assuming that the researcher would understand what they meant, as the following quotes indicate; and you yourself would have seen it... you and I both know....Richie, you have seen this.... as you and I both know.... you know yourself from dealing with prisoners.... I’m sure you have seen it yourself as a ranking officer etc. The researchers experience reflects Marquart’s (1986) assertion that acceptance as an insider can ensure unique data collection.
SECTION FOUR – RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.0 Who are the Governors?

4.1 Introduction

As illustrated by Farkas (2001) an individual’s approach to their work may be influenced by a number of individual factors such as their age, gender, ethnic background, personal and professional background and standard of education. This section analyses the age profile, socio-economic, education and professional backgrounds of the sample group.

4.1.2 Sex, ethnicity and socio-economic backgrounds

The research sample group’s socioeconomic status upon joining the IPS was defined using a number of variables including their occupation, their father’s occupation, their education and county of residence. The research participants were from either skilled manual (62%) or intermediate and junior non-manual backgrounds (38%). Of the 15 governors interviewed as part of this research project no participant in the sample was representative of an ethnic minority group. Of the total 47 governors of various grades throughout the prisons and prison support sections in the Irish Republic only 7 are female (14.9%) and no governor is representative of an ethnic minority group. These statistics are reflective of the general under-representation of female staff (17%) and ethnic minority staff (0.46%) throughout the IPS (N = 3248). Governors in the sample were born from 1952 – 1970, and the majority were over fifty years of age (83%). The age and service profile of senior governors may be a problematic issue for the IPS. Under the terms of their service governors may retire on full pension after thirty years of service with the proviso that they are over fifty years of age. Some of the most senior grades represented in the sample articulated that they were very aware that they and their senior management teams could decide to retire at any time and that was occasionally an issue for them when deciding who to delegate work to, as they were aware that their management teams were overworked.

*All my senior managers have their time done, and as you are aware, they’ve all taken cuts in salary and they’re now been asked to do more. We have another budget coming up, and if they have more taken off them….will I lose all of my senior managers? That’s a strong possibility. Then I’ll go from a chaotic to chronic position.*
Another implication of governors’ awareness of the ageing profile of their senior managers is that it might detract from their long-term strategic view. The knowledge that their staff are overworked may limit the extent to which governors’ want to introduce initiatives which increase workloads. Following conversation around the possibility of losing senior managers a number of governors expressed that they felt that the current model of succession planning within the IPS is insufficient. A number of the sample stated that local knowledge would be lost if their management teams left without passing ‘local corporate knowledge’ on.

*I can see it in all of my people, they’re overworked, overworked, and all that’s coming down is more and more. You’ve heard of the straw that breaks the camel’s back? Well we’ve been adjusting to this for the last three years, it can’t keep going on. Who calls it? I don’t know. I think that people will just leave...I know colleagues at my own grade who have just said that’s it I’m gone, my time is done. Let somebody else take up the mantle. And that’s the biggest fear because you are losing all that expertise, probably before time.*

*If you are there for a while you know all the blackguards, you know all the good guys and you don’t have to start the learning process all over again.*

Few governors in the sample explicitly expressed that their backgrounds shaped their approach to their work. However, the majority of participants joined the IPS during a recession in Ireland in the late 1980s and early 1990s and this may have shaped their work ethic and their expectations of their staff;

...*prison officers today don’t realise that there’s 500,000 people unemployed. They think that the state owes them a salary...I can be down 15 or 20 [officers] a day, and some of my colleagues can be down more...our levels of sick are appalling, absolutely appalling... you can see some of your officers coming in and they’re gone today, here tomorrow, gone the next day...and it becomes a habit and that crucifies us...that means I’m locking down shops or whatever... stuff that keeps prisoners stimulated...and yet our people just haven’t got it.*

Furthermore, a number of female governors articulated that their gender may give them an insight that their male colleagues may not have the benefit of, and that their gender
played a role in both how they acted and how they were perceived by their male counterparts.

..... well I think being female you tend to be more maternal anyway. You can’t ignore that, and you can’t ignore the fact that you have a side to you that men might perceive as being soft, whereas we perceive it as being caring and understanding.

Some female governors in the sample expressed that, on occasion, their male counterparts appeared to view their ‘different’ approach as weakness rather than strength;

If you are progressing prisoners...sometimes that was seen as Oh you’re soft...you know? What they were missing was that the role should be to progress prisoners, no matter what system you’re in, doesn’t matter if it’s category A. The worst prisoner in the world, we are supposed to try and rehabilitate them. But sometimes I found that when I was trying to progress prisoners you were seen as being soft, as opposed to what you were actually doing...your job.

It is apparent to the author that age, background and gender has an influence in shaping governors’ attitudes and approach. Senior governors were more cognisant of consequences of economic instability than their workforce because of their longer experience. Insecurity about long-term strategic planning was also evident, perhaps due to the potential for senior workforce to retire. As the majority of senior governors in the IPS are white males, over fifty years of age who have come ‘through the ranks’ of the service, this appears to have led to a ‘totemic’ identity which evidenced itself during the course of this study in discourse and uniformity of attitudes. There appeared to be a perception by female participants that they have a more outwardly ‘caring’ approach than their male counterparts and they feel this approach can be perceived as a weakness by men. However, their male counterparts expressed caring attitudes towards those in their charge throughout the study and did not appear to consider such attitudes un-masculine.
4.1.3 Education

Smyth and McCoy (2009) assert that the type of education and the qualifications an individual achieves is indicative of their social and economic backgrounds. All but three of the sample had successfully completed the Leaving Certificate (the final examination in the Irish secondary school system) prior to commencing employment with the IPS. The finding of this research correlates with Bryans (2007) study of senior prison managers in the UK, with governors in the ROI tending to have higher success in education than others within skilled manual, intermediate and junior non-manual socio-economic groups before joining the IPS. Only two of the governors interviewed had a degree prior to joining the IPS. However, a further eight participants had studied part time whilst in the job and had attained higher educational awards also. Furthering their education, in combination with the salary structure laid out in table two below, may partially explain why most of the governors (88%) interviewed expressed that they regard themselves as socially upwardly mobile when compared to their socio-economic grouping before commencing employment in the IPS.

*I’d use myself as an example of somebody who could come in [to the job] with a very basic education, and through I suppose, the love of the job, and I suppose through the job loving me…it’s helped me to develop and has made me where I am at the moment.*

The table below illustrates the mean salary details of each governor grade, a combination of basic salary and allowances;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Salary €</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus Governor</td>
<td>126,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor Grade 1</td>
<td>113,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor Grade 2</td>
<td>100,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor Grade 3</td>
<td>85,540</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table two: Salary Details of IPS Governors (Dáil Written Answers, 2012).*
Most of the remaining sample cited a lack of time and their workloads as a factor in not undertaking programmes of higher education.

*I have very few courses done compared to a lot of governors, but I think that’s my own fault and what I do is say I haven’t time really, I’m too busy at the moment to do it...*

However, the majority of the sample (83%) had undertaken numerous work related training programmes. Despite successfully completing multiple vocational training programmes, a number of governors cited that there was a lack of training for senior managers;

*As you know, most prisons governors come from the floor, you get very little training as you move up.*

*When you get to the most senior grades...there is no training. You are gone from an officer on the floor and fifteen years later you are leading a team....and yet you get no specific training for it. No organisation on the outside would survive that sort of thing.*

The majority of governors in the sample who did not undertake higher level education felt that they did not necessarily need to do so as their practical experience was sufficient to perform their day to day tasks. This viewpoint may be detrimental for the IPS as recent years have seen an increased strategic focus on providing programmes of higher educational programmes for new entrants to the service\(^3\) and a ‘return of fees’ programme\(^4\) for other staff and management. If education and lifelong learning is not considered advantageous by some prison governors this may have a negative ‘trickle down’ effect on the attitudes of the staff under their leadership and management.

It appeared to the author that governors in the sample who have undertaken higher education programmes have a more reflective approach to their work and were better able to articulate their role, values, motivations and priorities. This was evident during the

---

\(^3\) The Higher Certificate in Custodial Care (HETAC level 6) was introduced in 2007 as a mandatory two year programme for all recruit prison officers entering the IPS.

\(^4\) IPS staff and management can currently apply to have 80% of course fees returned to them on successful completion of a training or educational programme. Students can also apply for an additional 40 hours ‘study leave’ per annum to further support their educational endeavours.
interviews in the clarity of their statements and the philosophical approach to
descriptions of their role and ‘what prisons are for’. Some of the governors in the sample
who completed higher education programmes were also of the opinion that their
education contributed greatly to enhancing their professional performance and enhanced
skills such as report writing.

*Once I got into the study, I actually liked it. I enjoyed it, it was great and I have to
say, only for doing that course I wouldn’t be where I am at the moment.....because it
removed all the barriers and the fear...even simple things like report writing, you
know, ...and I used to dread doing reports.*

4.2 Motivations and job satisfaction

4.2.1 Introduction

Along with clarity of role, individual character, approach to work and education,
motivation is an important element of behaviour in the context of an individual’s work
performance (Hertzberg, 2003). Schomburg (2007) states that work motivation can be
viewed from a number of different perspectives and that work motivation can be
regarded as an individual’s somewhat unchanging quality, as his or her character. Luthans
(1998) warns that motivation should not be considered as the sole explanation of work
behaviour and asserts that motivation interrelates with and acts in combination with
other processes within an individual’s work environment. Job satisfaction on the other
hand indicates an affective state and can be considered as the condition of feeling at a
particular time towards achieving or not achieving the individual’s work goals (Saleh &
Pasricha, 1975).

4.2.2 Motivations for joining the prison service

All but two of the sample had no relatives working in the prison service upon joining and
had no preconceived notions of what the career entailed, although a number of
participants had relatives working in similar disciplined services such as the armed
services or the Garda Síochána. The vast majority of the participants cited that they were
completely unaware of what the role of a prison officer entailed or knowledge of
prisoners prior to joining;
I suppose at that time I would have thought that anyone in prison was...nearly all raving lunatics ...that they’d stand out. I wouldn’t have been able to imagine that someone at the bus stop might have been a prisoner....that I would have known the difference.

I remember hearing two fellas talking and one fella saying to the other I was up in the Joy [Mountjoy Prison] for three months, and I froze and thought what? Your man’s been in jail, Jesus! When I heard he’d been in .... it froze me to the spot, I was terrified of him. I was watching him; I wouldn’t go near him, but my perception of people who are in prison obviously has changed massively.

When asked their motivations for joining the prison service, almost all of the sample (83%) cited that they were motivated by extrinsic instrumental reasons such as the financial benefits of the job and security of tenure. Few participants identified any intrinsic non-instrumental philosophical reasons such as the social efficacy of the role as reasons for joining the prison service.

...and the whole economic situation changed outside and I took the job in the prison service. It was a complete and utter fluke.

I joined during the last big recession we were in...so the only jobs I could actually get that had any sort of decency to them or permanency to them was in the public service. So I had applied for all the say, civil service jobs...and I applied for the prison service as part of that programme and the prison service came up trumps for me.

However, the entire sample stated that their initial motivation for joining the prison service – security of tenure and financial benefits no longer motivated them in their current role although they still appreciated the financial benefits of a stable career.

4.2.3 Current motivations and job satisfaction

There was a clear variance in motivational drivers between pre-appointment and post-appointment attitudes and motivations. Most of the sample (92%) cited that their motivations were now intrinsic and non-instrumental and quoted motivations such as getting tasks accomplished and improving the lot of both the staff and the offenders in their care. The ‘higher level’ motivators (Maslow, 1954) such as achieving organisational
goals and being in a position of responsibility appear to have replaced initial lower level motivators of security of tenure and financial gain post appointment to the service.

... there’s also a whole host of areas where you can improve the quality of your colleague’s working lives and improve the lives of prisoners....you can also bring some degree of comfort to the families of prisoners in many cases. That’s my motivation.

I believe my total role is to do the best I can for the people in my care. And that’s both staff and prisoners.

Governors in the sample were asked if their role contributed to their job satisfaction. The objective of this dimension of research was to ascertain were they satisfied with their overall work and was not concentrated on any particular facet of their role. Some of the available literature on prisons suggest that prisons are essentially ‘dehumanising’ social settings (Irwin, 1980) and that they are damaging environments for both prisoners and the staff that work within them (Crawley, 2004). It would seem therefore that to attain a high level of job satisfaction within a prison, never mind when trying to manage the complexity of tasks within one, is unlikely. However this perspective does not appear to be reflected in the data as all of the governors in the sample (100%) cited that their role contributed to their job satisfaction and that they were very satisfied with their work. Gruenberg (1980) states that job satisfaction is positively related to occupational status which may go some way to explaining the high satisfaction rates amongst the sample. Governor grades in the sample gave a number of different reasons for explaining their high level of job satisfaction. For the majority of governors (86%) job satisfaction was derived from being in a position to develop and help the offenders and staff in their care;

..... I am in a position to hopefully assist someone during that day to make a decision that may affect their lives....literally every time I talk to someone, every time I pick up the phone, every time I meet a prisoner on the corridor, all those interactions.... it will also influence hopefully some aspect of some person’s life, whether it’s an officer or whether it’s a prisoner.

.....because I am in a position to make strategic decisions, I decide what way my prison is going, where I can help people.
Other participants were more task orientated and for them job satisfaction came from doing their job and doing it well.

*It’s getting the job done, you know? And that covers a whole range of aspects of it, you know? From the day to day running of the prison, to the broader strategic aims of the organisation. That, I deliver on those, from the simple to the large.*

However, despite the high levels of job satisfaction that were reported, governors in the sample identified a number of contemporary issues and challenges that may have the potential to diminish their commitment, motivation and job satisfaction. In particular, governors spoke of their increased workloads as an area of concern as the following quotes illustrate;

*....when I was a younger officer and I’d go into my governor’s office and there wouldn’t be a sheet of paper on the man’s desk. He was either very good at delegating or the same volume of work wasn’t there. Now unfortunately, by the time I got there... the sheets of paper...we’re inundated...*

*.... with today’s volume of work, my assistant, my deputy, they’re swamped with work, they’re swamped. So, we’re all running faster...we’re all told we need to do more with less and that’s grand, but we’re running faster just to stand still, just to keep up with the basic day to day issues.*

*I think that the workload nowadays and particularly now in the climate that we’re in, where we’re losing posts, there’s a greater volume of work being put on the shoulders of the individuals who are left to carry it on.*

The volume of work governors in the sample face on a daily basis was a common theme throughout all of the research interviews. Their perception of being overworked could be an issue for the IPS when considered in light of the age and service profile of the sample group as almost all of the senior governors can retire at any time if their job satisfaction or motivational rates diminish. Other common factors which were identified as potentially reducing job satisfaction rates included a lack of financial and staff resources;
....if you think that years ago with the ‘just lock them up’ culture you could do that with a very small number of people....but now, the population is climbing and the resources are shrinking.

We have X hundred people out there this morning and we have meaningful occupation for about a hundred. That’s hopeless, hopeless. So the biggest challenge is to get progression and regimes in place that are meaningful and then maintaining them.

....transformation is a huge challenge for us, absolutely huge. I think that getting buy in from all the relevant services is going to be huge for us. Every service, probation, psychology or whatever....they’ve all been cut back, they’re in the same boat as we are...ehmm...and we’re using this saying – we have to do more with less...

We have literally run into what I would call a perfect storm....the prison service, and this prison in particular, has lost a lot of its senior staff....and to try and maintain the services we had...well, it has put a lot of pressure on me and my senior management team.

Another common theme that presented during interviews was that governors did not have time for strategic thinking and most of their time was expanded on day to day tasks;

I suppose when you are doing HR courses you are told, as a manager you must delegate and sit at your desk and strategically think of how you are going to operate...the reality is that you have got two or three hundred officers in your prison, you’ve got all the agencies and every problem that they have will come to you. They all need time, require time and demand time....you have to be all things to all people.

....and I suppose the knock on consequence of that is should you be strategically thinking about what you are supposed to be doing, you don’t have time...you’re fire fighting from the time you come in the morning until the time you go home.

Notwithstanding the challenges governors are faced with in their day to day tasks, it appears that governors in the sample are highly motivated and enjoy high rates of job satisfaction. This is advantageous to the IPS as governors’ commitment to attaining the
strategic goals outlined in the IPS 3 year strategic plan appears to be high. However, it is apparent that governors perceive that the sheer volume of work they are tasked with reduces the time they have available to strategically lead those in their charge. Rather, they appear to be caught up in the day to day management tasks necessary to run their prisons. This seems to be particularly evident in the smaller prisons which have much smaller management teams than campus prisons. Smaller prisons still have the same diversity and range of business tasks as the larger prisons, but appear not to have enough people on their management teams to carry administrative functions out in a timely, efficient manner.

4.3 Defining the role of governor

The majority of the sample responded to the question ‘how would you define the role of governor? ’ by explaining how they saw their role from a number of broad perspectives. Replies to the question ranged from the philosophical to a more procedural, managerial discourse;

The governor’s role... is to be a part of the policy making process for the IPS. It’s my job to sit down with the Director General and other Directorates and strategize as to how the service can best move forward. My job as the governor then is to bring that back into the prison...and get the people under me...to implement that policy.

All were aware of the significant responsibilities their role entailed and the potential impact that their decisions would have on those in their care;

....the judge decides that, I am taking this person out of society, as a punishment and I am handing him to you Governor, and all of the responsibilities that rest with the detention of this individual, for the period of time that I have set for him, including the legal, the safety, even the social, are all on your shoulders, that this is your job.

...sometimes you forget the power you have as a governor you know? You’ve a lot of power. But you always have respect for that power and the ability to make decisions that ... can have a huge impact on a lot of things....people’s personal wellbeing...my decision making can have a huge impact.
Governors perform a number of routine roles and administrative duties which are common tasks for managers in any setting, inside or outside prisons. However, governors in the sample also identified a number of prison specific roles that appear to be unique to a custodial environment such as conducting adjudications at disciplinary hearings, maintaining ‘right relationships’ (Liebling, 2004) between staff and prisoners and ensuring the security and good order of their prisons.

4.4 Ethics, values and ideologies

4.4.1 Introduction

Governors are one of the most significant influences on defining a prisons ethical framework. Rutherford (1994) asserts that criminal justice practitioner’s intrinsic values and ideologies shape the way in which they approach their work. Given the significance of governors underlying values and how that may inform their approach to ‘governing’, this section presents findings on the values and ideologies of the Irish prison governors and the extent to which they felt they influenced their approach.

4.4.2 Where did their value framework come from?

Throughout this research governors commonly cited that their ethics and values were shaped by both their family backgrounds and their early career experiences. The majority of governors in the sample maintained that their values were strongly shaped by their early childhood experiences and felt that those values stayed with them throughout their career as they were an integral part of who they were.

You have a certain character, a certain makeup...and I’d say they’re formed in the womb, with your family, where you grow up, in school...I think that you hold your values all the way through. You can’t have one value today and another next year. They don’t change that much. You are the person you are. You’re either someone people can trust or you’re someone that people don’t trust...I’m saying that you stick to your core values.

Other participants stated that their values were shaped by other governors they worked with and they adopted the ethos of people they admired.
...and from my point of view, it was great to have a manager that can see your potential and wants to develop you. I always try to do that myself, I’ve failed a lot of times but I always revert back. I’m very keen to let people know that I want to develop them in the same way I wanted people to develop me. That was one of the best things about him, he’d see your potential and your enthusiasm, and he’d go the extra yard to bring it through.

However, others stated that their values were shaped by watching the negative behaviour of governors they worked with in the past and by making a conscious decision not to act that way if they became governors in the future.

It’s just that they didn’t have principles...they just didn’t know or didn’t care about the difference between good behaviour or bad behaviour, or what effect their behaviour had on other people, you know? The majority of the ones that I would have not have had time for was basically down to a lack of integrity, a lack of ability to do things the right way.

I worked with a governor who couldn’t tell the truth if you put a gun to his head. He was a bully, a thug, a bad communicator...I’ll sum it up for you, I can work with incompetence, but I can’t work with a liar...and I couldn’t work with that governor because he was a liar.

....I’ve seen the effects that he has had on peoples careers and their home life and that’s...that’s beyond repair, and I think that’s terrible.

A common strand within the negative attributes of governors they had worked with previously was a lack of honesty. This may have influenced the values that governors in the sample articulated as positive attributes illustrated below in section 4.4.3.

4.4.3 What values do they hold to be important?

Although few of the governors in the sample responded with any precise definition of their working values or ideologies, most gave explicit examples in relation to their approach to their work which can be seen in narratives throughout this thesis. When asked to define what values governors held to be important most governors in the sample responded with ‘integrity’ and ‘honesty’. Governors in the sample felt that the values of
integrity and honesty contributed to their credibility, which was a vital facet for successful outcomes when dealing with prisoners in their care and their staff.

To me one of the most important attributes that any governor, any leader should have is credibility. Along with credibility goes transparency, honesty, integrity... once you have those and once staff believe that you have those you’ll be a far more effective leader.

I think that sometimes if you come in and try to spoof your way through it and wind people up ...you know yourself from dealing with prisoners...no don’t talk to him, he’s a wind up...it’s all about credibility and I think that’s vital. Everybody has to have credibility, from a basic grade officer to the Director General. If you haven’t got credibility you’re going nowhere.

4.4.4 Predominant ideology

The majority of governors in the sample did not explicitly express their ideologies during the course of the research. However, it was evident from the narratives of governors used throughout this study that the majority of governors appear to be what Crewe and Liebling (2011) term ‘moral dualists’ in their typology of professional styles. They define ‘moral dualists’ as highly competent individuals that have a balanced approach between maintaining their values and ensuring the efficient management of their prisons (Crewe & Liebling, 2011). Crewe and Liebling (2011) go on to assert that managers that fall into this category tend to be insightful in regard to the dynamics of power and are emphatic towards individuals.

As prison officers, we have a huge amount of power...and even more so, there’s a huge power differential between those in our charge and us. So, there’s a huge obligation on us not to abuse that power....there’s a huge obligation on us to use that power that we have for good.

Moral dualists have clear ethical frameworks and see dimensions such as security and relationships as mutually reinforcing rather than conflicting.

....and from my experience of working in other jurisdictions and doing training courses, everybody, across the world is very envious of the prisoner – staff
relationship in the IPS. Very, very few others have that, like in the states, I’ve talked to lads in the American service and when you go into a prison they know the prisoners number and that he’s doing fifteen life sentences, and when you say what’s his name?, they don’t have a clue. I think we have a very positive relationship...

Some of the governors attributed positive staff-prisoner relationships to the uniqueness of Irish culture;

....and I do believe that in the IPS we have very good staff prisoner relationships, that staff get on well with prisoners and prisoners get on well with staff, in the main, and a lot of that is to do with the Irish psyche, the Irish approach and how we deal with people....

Their answers to a number of ‘targeted questions’ also indicate that the majority of governors in the sample fell into the moral dualist category and were most comfortable with ‘harmony values’ such as a respect for human dignity, respect, equality, progress and cooperation (Crewe & Liebling, 2011). When asked ‘what are prisons for?’ most of the sample acknowledged that although they could see a clear need for protecting the public from risk in the case of dangerous prisoners, they felt that prison was not suitable or desirable for people convicted of crimes at the lower end of the criminal justice scale.

Prisons should just be for the most dangerous people, to keep them behind bars...and they’re not. Prison doesn’t work in the sense that we have people here that don’t need to be here...but there’s nowhere else in society for them.

And I’ve often heard prisons described before as casualty departments of life, and they are, for the mad, the bad...sure you know, we get them all in. So I suppose... I view some of them [the prisoners] as victims....

...you want to do the very best for the prisoners you have because some of them are misfortunates. Some of them are in there because they’ve had one stroke of bad luck...couldn’t pay a fine, couldn’t do whatever because of unemployment, and you can see these things becoming more evident as the years go on, because of the recession.
Interestingly, when considered in the context of contemporary debate in the UK and some other jurisdictions as to whether or not prisoners should be allowed to vote\(^5\), 100% of governors in the sample responded that it has been a positive development in Ireland. Although no governor in the sample explicitly stated it, the conflicting attitudes between the two neighbouring islands on this issue may be due to the unique historical and social backgrounds of each country;

*Isn’t it good to think that we, as a prison community, can nurture people’s opinion? Even though they’re in prison and mightn’t get out for twenty years...as to how they see the country going, who are we to say they can’t have an opinion in that? I think that we should nurture that.*

*Well if we are trying to make them feel part of society...most of the people who come in here don’t feel part of society, so I think that it’s good that they can vote.*

Other questions within this dimension also received positive responses by governors in the sample. In particular, when asked how they felt about conjugal visits from a philosophical perspective, governors in the sample were almost unanimously in favour if adequate processes and resources could be put in place to minimise security risks.

*...it’s been proven through research that family contact is vital with prisoners and their families outside...and the more we can nurture family contact...they are six times less likely to reoffend with family contact. There’s huge, huge security concerns about it, but other jurisdictions are doing it and I think that it makes it much more...positive and healthy environment for the inmates, I think that....I think that we should do it.*

*The trouble with using the term conjugal is that it is focussed on one aspect of a relationship which is the purely sexual end of it... I see absolutely no reason, that if we recognise the detrimental effect of imprisonment to family life, which nobody can deny, well then what’s the problem of trying to put something in place to ease that?*
Only a very small minority of the governors involved in this study did not have the capacity to discuss issues in contemporary penal management with any theoretical depth. Rather, most governors in the study had a critical, philosophical approach to their work and most were well equipped to articulate issues in the broader criminal justice system.

4.4.5 Do their values and ideologies shape the contours of their prison?

All of the governors in the sample were confident that their values had an impact on their discretionary decision making which in turn defined parameters of expected behaviour for their staff and the prisoners in their care.

...if the prison governor has obvious values, by obvious I mean demonstrated values that are obvious to the people around them, those values because of the power imbalance between them, those values, in large part will be the values of the people underneath.

I have no doubt whatsoever that the ethos or the culture in a prison is not only influenced but is led by the governor of that prison...

I think that the whole ethos of the prison is based on the governor’s attitude and how we deliver.

The majority of governors in the sample cited that they ensured the communication of their values, priorities and ethos to their staff and the prisoners in their care through four key tasks; walking the floor of their prisons; conducting governor’s parade 6; conducting adjudications at disciplinary hearings and by managing and developing their staff.

i) Walking the floor

A key task identified by governors in the sample was the requirement to ‘walk the floor’ of their prisons.

I love to walk the prison on a daily basis. I love the interaction we have with staff, I love the interaction we have with prisoners...

---

6 Governor’s parade takes place in a room, generally in or near the prison’s accommodation area. Prisoners can seek to talk to the governor, usually to facilitate various requests such as extra visit time, temporary release requests and other applications. Normally held from 9.00am – 10.00am, disciplinary issues are usually also dealt with on ‘governor’s parade’.
Governors in the sample cited a number of reasons for walking the floor of their prisons whenever possible. Monitoring and inspecting their prisons enables governors in the sample to keep their fingers on the pulse of the prison, to communicate their values, to influence staff interaction with prisoners and each other, provide visible leadership to those in their charge and to show that their staff are valued;

.....a very important part of that is visiting posts, being seen around the place, talking to officers on the most routine posts. All it takes is saying how are things? Everything all right? Are you okay? Yeah, and that's all it is, but he knows that the governor appreciates that what he's there for and that he's not just dumped there.

Reasons cited for walking the floor of their prisons varied between the philosophical to a more managerial, task orientated approach;

One of the advantages of walking around in a prison is that as you are passing the workshops or a staff door is just actually talking to staff and asking them questions....and you can do that in a very general way by having a conversation...to see if your policies are being understood....How are you finding such and such? And if he’s looking at you as though you have two heads...it means your policies haven’t been driven down.

Governors in the sample cited that by visiting all areas of the prison they were able to evaluate information gathered from a variety of sources to discover problems and identify potential opportunities. A key reason for touring the prison cited by most governors in the sample was to allow prisoners to approach them directly, which also contributed to their knowledge of what was happening within their prison.

.....and after your parade you must walk the ground....simply to let prisoners know that they have access to you. You must be available to people...because you must understand, a prisoner is the most vulnerable person when he’s locked up in prison. He’s there against his will, he’s in a strange environment...a prisoner should always have access to the prison governor to air whatever issues he has...so prison governors must go on the ground, you must make time for it.
I make sure that there’s a good balance between staff and prisoner relationships by walking the prison and talking to the prisoners, talking to the staff, talking to the visitors, talking to the other agencies and seeing what’s happening, what’s going on. Prisoners will tell you quickly enough if there is a problem.

One of the key problems identified by the governors in relation to their statutory obligation⁷ to walking the floor of the prison is that it can be time consuming. A number of governing governors in the sample stated that they personally carried out this function as they felt it was vital to their role, but the cost was that they did not have sufficient time for administrative tasks. This issue appears to create a dichotomy for them between their philosophical ideals and their perception of an increasingly managerial, task orientated approach to prison management following the PSA.

**ii) Governors parades and disciplinary reports**

One of the more commonly identified (and most time consuming) tasks identified by governors in the sample was the importance of personally facilitating governors parades and adjudicating on disciplinary reports whenever possible. Again, key reasons cited for undertaking governor’s parades and conducting disciplinary reports personally rather than delegating the task to a more junior governor grade, was communication and contact with staff and prisoners.

...I’ll always make a point of sitting and talking to prisoners. Now he probably wants to get in and out as quick as he can, get his special visit or whatever, but I always try and engage them in conversation ...and to get as much information as I can to get a picture in my own mind as to how am I going to help him...and it lets them know that if they have a problem or whatever, that they can come to me formally or informally as I walk the prison, and I have to say it’s stood me in good stead...

The majority of governors stated that they use such platforms to measure the ‘ethical’ environment of their prisons and to access the state of relationships between staff and prisoners.

---

⁷ Rule 77. (1) of the 2007 Prison Rules states - The Governor shall make daily inspections of the prison including those areas of the prison where prisoners are accommodated or congregate or are otherwise held. The times of all such visits shall be at the Governor’s discretion and recorded in a manner as prescribed by the Director General. In the event that the Governor is absent from the prison, he or she shall ensure that the responsibilities to carry out the inspections under this Rule shall be delegated to a Deputy Governor or Assistant Governor.
prisoners. A number of governors stated that they used adjudications to define what they felt was important in the prison and to define boundaries of acceptable behaviour for both staff and prisoners.

The majority of governors in the sample stated that they used adjudications to communicate their priorities to staff and prisoners;

...I’ve a great belief that we have a huge responsibility to keep the staff and prisoners safe right? And to do that you must have discipline in the prison. Now if you’re going to be weak you’re not going to take hard decisions when they have to be taken. Say to impose harsh punishments or to deprive people contact with their families and so on like that, then you are going to be seen as being weak and if they sniff the slightest bit of weakness in you they will be on to you like rats on a dead bison, you’ll be gone, you know? And then you lose all your credibility. For example if somebody strikes an officer they’re going to get hammered, they’re going to get the whole lot no matter what the circumstances, it doesn’t matter right? And then work it down from that. But as long as both sides know what the rules are and that you are going to be strong when you need to be strong. That’s very important.

Most of the sample cited that one of the most important aspects of their role was maintaining their autonomy and the need to be seen as an independent authority by staff and prisoners. Participants used the example of conducting disciplinary hearings to illustrate the ‘balancing act’ they faced when trying to support their staff while protecting the rights of prisoners.

...prisoners have this perception that I’m in there [at adjudication] with the chief and we’re there to get the prisoner. That’s not the role at all, the actual role is I’m supposed to be independent...I listen to what the uniformed officers present as evidence on a P19 [disciplinary report form] and then I listen to what the prisoner says and then I independently assess it ... but I’m not there just to find that the prisoner is guilty because the officer said he was.

...you have to make sure that prisoners don’t see the governor as part of the game, if you know what I mean.
...one of the funny things about it is I’d have people coming into me now, promoted grades you know? Coming in to me say before I’d do a P19 and they’d be saying to me, listen, this is what happened there... and I’d be there saying eh, hang on a second and I’d explain to them what they’re doing and what I’m supposed to be doing and then I’d say now out you go and I’ll hear the evidence and if it’s right, then I’ll convict him, if it’s not right or if it’s flawed then I won’t and that’s the way it is.

The majority of governors in the sample were of the opinion that their decisions at adjudications influenced whether or not staff or prisoners viewed them as being ‘on their side’ and felt that by remaining independent of external influence and by paying heed to the principles of natural justice they could remain bipartisan.

**iii) Managing and developing staff**

Managing poor performing staff is also a key function for governors in the IPS and was a common thread of discussion throughout most of the interviews. The majority of governors in the sample said that they personally dealt with problematic staff, industrial relations, disciplinary hearings and some of the more difficult aspects of personnel management.

...about 95% of our staff are excellent...there is a small hard core there that should never be in the job, that will frustrate people at all grades, that do their level best to blackguard people through bullying and intimidation...and as one governor said to me, rather than win the lottery I’d love to be able to come into the prison and sack half a dozen people....I think that if every prison governor in the country had that option, I’d say they’d nearly all forgo the lotto.

...we have to deal with them, unless they are caught doing something and there’s witnesses and it goes to a disciplinary report, it’s hard to manage them...they are clever people. But, and I don’t want to emphasise those, the majority of our staff are excellent officers. They will treat people with respect and compassion, they’re there to help.

The majority of governors in the sample expressed frustration at the amount of time they had to spend addressing the non-attendance and poor performance of a small minority of
their staff, rather than spend that time developing, acknowledging and bringing on staff that deserved their attention.

....there’s a small hard-core of staff who will cause eighty percent of your work, because of the nature of the individuals. They’re not the better staff...they’re the problem people that you have to work with and manage the best you can. Staff generally will cause more problems [than prisoners]; they take up a lot more time.

One of the frustrations cited by the majority of the sample was that although governors are expected to manage poor performance directly and can practice their discretion in a number of other areas, they do not have the final decision over dismissals but are restricted to making recommendations to the Human Resources Directorate.

And we put people up to be sacked....and a fortnight later I got an email to say alright, we’re giving them another chance. You put people on the plate to be sacked, and they deserve to be...you get this, no, no, we’re giving them another chance. It goes higher than you...and I think the fact is dawning, eventually, that we’re going to have to lose some officers. None of us want it by the way....but can a governor do anything? He can only make recommendations; the decision is made beyond him.

All of the governors in the sample appeared to value their staff highly and were aware that they could not run a successful prison without their staff’s contribution. A high level of respect for their staff was evident throughout all of the interviews.

I’ve always believed that I get most of my good ideas from doing my rounds, from the staff on the floor because they’re operating at the cutting edge.

I think that what helps us as a service and what helps with the running of our whole system is the relationship...and I think that it’s a relationship between the AIS in the workshop and the prisoner attending that workshop...that relationship I have to say is gold. In the same way the class officers’ role is gold, it makes the whole prison run. If the prisoners don’t want us to run their prison, there’s no way on gods earth we can force them to....and, we can try and coerce them all we like...we only run prisons with their cooperation, which is true...but I think that it’s the relationships that...it’s all about the relationships.
For many of the governors effective personnel management is a vital aspect of their role as they believe that by treating their staff well, with dignity and respect, they could influence the way their staff interacted with prisoners.

....it’s not about talking the talk, it’s about talking the talk and walking the walk...most staff will see the governor as their leader, they will look to the management of the prison for the behaviour that’s expected of them....you’re setting standards that you expect from everybody else.

The majority of governors interviewed expressed that by ‘leading by example’ they could communicate their ethos and set boundaries of acceptable behaviour for staff and prisoners utilising the platforms presented by conducting governor’s parade, adjudications, managing prison personnel and walking the floor of their prison as often as possible. The aspiration that most of the sample expressed - to communicate their values in order to influence the contours of their prisons, is also reflected in their personal motivations and their perceptions of the role of a governor.
SECTION FIVE – CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The overarching research question of this study was to determine how do the personal values and ideologies of senior prison governors in the ROI shape their approach to managing prisons. It has been illustrated that governors’ personal and social backgrounds influence their approach to their work and that their age, gender and education play an important part in this process. Governors in the sample were confident that their values and ideologies made a significant impact on the contours of their prisons and they communicated these values to those in their care through four main platforms – walking the floor of their prisons, conducting governor’s parade, adjudications and managing personnel.

Governors in the sample appeared to be committed to ensuring that their values and the values espoused in the IPS three year strategic plan are implemented at ground level in their prisons. However, in other jurisdictions such as the UK, some prisons appear to be less harsh and more humanitarian than others (Pratt, 2008) and this may also be the case in the ROI. In order to develop empirical evidence of the effectiveness of each individual prison’s approach to ensuring that the values promoted in the IPS three year plan are upheld it may be desirable to develop a strategic research programme which can provide a quantitative measurement of the qualitative dimensions of prison life for both staff and prisoners. This approach could ensure that IPS corporate values and governors’ values are empirically measured in order to ascertain if there is a gap between official ideology and the reality of prison life for both prisoners and staff. Implementation of such a programme would provide an ethical ‘snapshot’ of Irish prisons and would provide senior management with a tool to empirically measure the variable quality of prison life for key stakeholders within each prison. In addition, implementation of such a system would provide IPS with a auditing process to ascertain if the prison services’ mission to “provide safe and secure custody, dignity of care and rehabilitation to prisoners for safer communities” and vision of “a safer community through excellence in a prison service built on respect for human dignity” (Irish Prison Service, 2012) is effective. Perhaps the most compelling reason for this recommendation to be acted upon is Behn’s maxim of “what gets measured gets done” (2003, p. 599).
This study has illustrated that the majority of governing governors in the IPS are white males over fifty years of age who have come ‘through the ranks’ of the service. The age profile and analogous backgrounds of senior managers in the IPS appears to have resulted in a ‘totemic’ identity, which was evident in the uniformity of attitudes and opinions expressed by the majority of the governors. Although most of the opinions, values and ideologies expressed throughout this study are in accord with official IPS rhetoric, in order to further diversify and enhance the pool of experience, knowledge and attributes of governor grades within the IPS the service may benefit from implementing an initiative to encourage more female and ethnic minority staff to put themselves forward for promotional competitions. If this is not possible given the restricted pool of ethnic minority and female staff currently employed by the IPS, consideration should be given to implementing an external competition for ‘direct entry’ or ‘accelerated career development’ to governor grade level. This strategy may also reduce the concerns expressed by senior managers regarding the aging profile of their senior management teams.

This research has demonstrated that the majority of governors in the sample are highly motivated, competent individuals who appear to have a balanced approach between maintaining their values and ensuring the efficient management of their prisons. However, as illustrated throughout this research, there appears to be a significant challenge between balancing time for general management tasks and providing ethical guidance and strategic leadership for those in their charge. The majority of the governors’ asserted strongly that the latter is the most important facet of their roles. Governors perceived that contemporary developments in the IPS and the subsequent increase in their workloads reduces the time they have to focus on what matters to them most. However, it appears that this has not impacted on their job satisfaction or their strong commitment to ensure the successful implementation of the IPS 3 year strategic plan notwithstanding the challenges it presents for them.

In conclusion, governors in the sample consistently reflected values and beliefs that are consistent with the IPS mission and the corporate values of the service. This is vital as the need for strong leadership in a time of change is well documented and it appears that there is little or no gap between official rhetoric and the governors’ professed core values. By setting change in the context of an agreed set of ethical values as current policy
intends, the change process within IPS should lead to more efficient, safer prisons in which there is an enhanced respect for decency and humanity.
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APPENDIX I – Revised campus governance model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Gov</th>
<th>Gov 1</th>
<th>Gov 2</th>
<th>Gov 3</th>
<th>D/Gov</th>
<th>A/Gov</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mountjoy Campus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin West Campus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portlaoise Campus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cork Prison</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick Prison</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castlerea Prison</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbour Hill Prison</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loughan House</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelton Abbey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPSTDC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Support Group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSEC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Assistance Programme</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Basic Campus Model

- Governance Leadership
- Regimes and Sentence Management
- Security and Accommodation
- Administration
Appendix II – Initial interview sample

Letters (See Appendix IV) inviting purposive sample to participate in this research were sent to indicated (30) Governor grades.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description and Location</th>
<th>Bed capacity</th>
<th>Governor I</th>
<th>Governor II</th>
<th>Governor III</th>
<th>Deputy Governor</th>
<th>Assistant Governor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mountjoy Prison</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Patricks Institution</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>1 (Vacant)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dóchas Centre</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Vacant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Unit</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheatfield Prison</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloverhill Prison</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (+ 1 Vacant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands Prison</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portlaoise Prison</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (+ 1 Vacant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cork Prison</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick Prison</td>
<td>(M) 290</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castlerea Prison</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loughan House</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbour Hill Prison</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelton Abbey</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Support Group</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above represents governor grades placements at time of invitation to interview (March 2012). The number and dispersion of governor grades in each institution has changed due to the introduction of ‘campus governance’ since the table was compiled.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prison Service Escort Corps</th>
<th>Provision of transport and staff for prisoner hospital and court escorts across the prisons estate.</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training and Development Centre</td>
<td>Providers of vocational training and higher education programmes for all grades of prison service staff.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

There are 14 institutions in the Irish Prison System consisting of 11 traditional "closed" institutions, two open centres, which operate with minimal internal and perimeter security, and one “semi-open” facility with traditional perimeter security but minimal internal security (the Training Unit). The majority of female prisoners are accommodated in the purpose built "Dóchas Centre" with the remainder accommodated in Limerick Prison (Irish Prison Service, 2012).
APPENDIX III – Interview Schedule

Interview Schedule for research project - Quis custodiet ipsos custodes? Governing Irish Prisons – the background, values, characteristics of and challenges faced by Governor grades in the Irish Prison Service.

I. Opening – Introduce Consent Form in Appendix V

(a). My name is Richard Roche and I am conducting this research as part of my studies on a Master’s programme I am undertaking through the Institute of Criminology, Cambridge University. I’d like to ask you some questions about your background, how you define your role, what motivates you, the values you consider to be important and what challenges Governors face in a modern prison environment. I hope this research will contribute to the few existing studies on Irish prisons as it will focus on the perceptions of the role of Governor by key personnel and will provide an empirical account of the people who are managing our prisons. The interview should take about 1-2 hours although I want to ensure that you have an opportunity to raise any issues that you feel are important, so I am flexible on time if it suits you. I will provide you with a complete transcript of the interview when it is transcribed and I will make a copy of the completed thesis available to you.

(b). Demographic and social background - I would like to ask you some questions about your personal and professional background, your education, the experiences you have had in order to learn more about you.

- What county where you born in?
- What county do you live in now?
- What is your marital status?
- How would you define your socio-economic origin when you joined the IPS?
- What was your father’s occupation when you joined the IPS?
- Do you have any relatives employed in the IPS?
- What educational qualifications do you hold?
- Depending on previous answer - Do you have a degree? What is it in? Was it obtained before or during your current career?
- What work did you do before you came into the IPS?
- How long did you serve as an officer?
- How many prisons have you worked in? At what grades?
- How many years where you in the IPS before you were appointed as a governor?
- At what age were you appointed as a governor?
- Time in current post?
- How many posts have you worked at as governor?

(c) Opinions / perceptions of their work

- What were your motivations for joining the service?
- What motivates you now?
- How do you define the governor’s role?
- Does the role give you job satisfaction? How? Why?
- What would you define as the prime challenge facing governors today? Why?
- What is distinctive about governing prisons in modern times?
- Is the modern prison workplace changing? How?
- Has the governing task changed?
- What new constraints do governors face, if any?
- Is leadership at corporate (HQ) level changing?

(d) Ideologies and Values

- Can I ask you to think of the best governor you have worked with – What were his / her attributes and qualities? What made him / her a good governor?
- Can I ask you to think of a governor who was not as strong – What were his / her attributes and qualities? What was it about him that made him not as effective as a governor?
- Can you tell me about any people, events or incidents that have shaped the way you do your job?
- What values do you hold to be important? Are your personal values relevant to the shape of your prison?
- What are prisons for?
- Do prisons work?
- Can prisons change people who are committed to them? How? Why?
- With your experience, do you feel that people are inherently good or bad?
- How do you feel about prisoners voting? Conjugal visits? Family visits?
- Can a governor ensure that their staff treat prisoners in a fair respectful way? How do you ensure that ‘right’ staff / prisoner relationships are maintained in your prison?
- Would you know if there was an imbalance?
- Have your personal values changed over your time in the IPS? How? Why?
- Do you feel that the IPS’s values have changed over time?
In your opinion what characteristics are necessary for an effective prison governor? Why?

Do you feel that governors can have a ‘dissenting voice’? Explain...

How would you describe your leadership style?

Has it changed over the years?

(e) Interview close

Thank you for taking the time from your busy schedule to facilitate me. Have you any questions that you want to ask?

Is there any area that you feel is important in understanding Governor grades that we haven’t discussed or that you would like to talk about?

Close.
APPENDIX IV – Letter to Participants:

(Adapted from University of Waterloo, Office of research ethics: Information letter for interview study downloaded from: http://iris.uwaterloo.ca/ethics/human/application/samples/B4_InfoLetter_Interview.htm on Saturday 7th April 2012.)

Training and Development Centre
Beladd House
Dublin Road
Portlaoise
Telephone: +353 (0) 877836569
Email: rcroche01@irishprisons.ie

Institute of Criminology
Sidgwick Avenue
Cambridge
CB3 9DA
Telephone: +44 (0) 1223 335360
Email: rr409@cam.ac.uk

Dear Governor,

This letter is an invitation to consider participating in a study I am conducting as part of my Master’s degree in in Applied Criminology, Penology and Management at the Institute of Criminology, Cambridge University under the supervision of Dr. Caroline Lanskey. I would like to provide you with more information about this project and what your involvement would entail if you decide to take part.

Title of Study: Governing Irish Prisons – the experiences, values, characteristics of and challenges faced by Governor grades in the Irish Prison Service.

Description of study: The objective of this research is to determine the ideologies and values of Irish prison Governor grades as it is they who have primary responsibility to ensure that prison staff uphold the rules regulating prisons and respect the rights and dignity of offenders. As Governor grades have a seminal role in shaping and implementing penal policy, the research will go on to explore the challenges Governors face managing Irish prisons, how they define their role and the influences which shape the way they do their work in an era of transformation and change. In order to achieve this objective, I propose to conduct semi-structured interview with you and a purposive sample of other prison Governor grades. If you decide that you wish to participate, the interview schedule will be sent to you in advance of the interview.

Information for Potential Participants: Participation in this study is strictly voluntary. Your participation will involve an interview of approximately 1 - 2 hours in length to take place in a location that suits you. You may decline to answer any of the interview questions and you may choose to withdraw from the study at any stage simply by advising me. With your permission, the interview will be audio recorded to facilitate collection of information. The information will be transcribed for analysis and a copy of the transcript will be made available to you. All information you provide will be completely confidential and your name will not appear in any thesis or report resulting from this study. With your permission anonymous quotations may be used to inform my thesis. Data collected during the study will be retained by me for
approximately 36 months in a safe in a locked office in the IPS Training and Development Centre. In the event that material based on this study is published, Dr. Caroline Lanskey my Supervisor and / or other staff members at the Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge may also have access to the data.

There are no known or anticipated risks to you as a participant in this study. I would like to take this opportunity to assure you that this study has been reviewed and has received ethics clearance through the Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge.

Benefits of Participation

There have been many studies of senior prison managers in the United States and the UK covering broad issues such as comparative studies of correctional management and studies on the correctional orientation of prison wardens etc. In contrast, there is a dearth of empirical data available on the work that Irish prison Governors do despite their pivotal role in both their prisons and in the wider criminal justice arena. This gap in empirical study is surprising as because as asserted by Bryans (2007) "Governors are key actors in prisons and it is only by understanding how prisons are governed, and by who, that we will have a better insight into how our prisons operate". To date, no empirical studies have been carried out on the career backgrounds, values, characteristics or how Irish Governor grades address the specific challenges they face in contemporary prison management. It is the aim of this research to contribute to the few existing studies on Irish prisons as it will provide an empirical account of the people who manage the complex daily strategic and operational aspects of Irish prisons. The results of my study should be of benefit to the Irish Prison Service as well as to the broader research community, and I hope that you can find the time to contribute to this research.

If you have any questions regarding this study, or would like additional information to assist you in reaching a decision about participation, please contact me at 0877836569 or by email at rxroche01@irishprisons.ie. I will be in touch by email in the coming weeks to ask if you wish to participate in this research.

I very much look forward to speaking with you,

Yours Sincerely,

Richard Roche,

Chief Officer, IPS Training and Development Centre.
APPENDIX V – Consent Form

(Adapted from University of Waterloo, Office of research ethics: consent form for interview study downloaded from: http://iris.uwaterloo.ca/ethics/human/application/samples/B4_InfoLetter_Interview.htm on Saturday 7th April 2012.)

CONSENT FORM

By signing this consent form, you are not waiving your legal rights or releasing the researcher or involved institution(s) from their legal and professional responsibilities. I have read the information presented in the information letter about a study being conducted by Richard Roche, student researcher at the Institute of Criminology at the University of Cambridge. I have had the opportunity to ask any questions related to this study, to receive satisfactory answers to my questions, and any additional details I wanted.

I am aware that I have the option of allowing my interview to be audio recorded to ensure an accurate recording of my responses.

I am also aware that excerpts from the interview may be included in the thesis and/or publications to come from this research, with the understanding that the quotations will be anonymous.

In the event that material based on this study is published, my supervisor Dr. Caroline Lanskey and/or other staff members at the Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge may also have access to the data gathered.

I was informed that I may withdraw my consent at any time by advising the researcher.

This project has been reviewed by, and received ethics clearance through the Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge. I was informed that if I have any comments or concerns resulting from my participation in this study, I may contact Dr. Ben Crewe M.St Programme Director or Dr. Caroline Lanskey, Supervisor at the Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge at +44 (0) 1223 335360.

With full knowledge of all foregoing, I agree, of my own free will, to participate in this study.

☐ Yes ☐ No

I agree to have my interview audio recorded.

☐ Yes ☐ No

I agree to the use of anonymous quotations in any thesis or publication that comes of this research.

☐ Yes ☐ No
Participant Name: __________________________ (Please print)

Participant Signature: ______________________

Witness Name: ______________________________ (Please print)

Witness Signature: __________________________

Date: __________________________
### APPENDIX VI – Governor Grade Demographics: secondary data analysis - Ages and term of service on 11.04.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Governor Date of joining service</th>
<th>Length of service to date - Years</th>
<th>Length of service to date - Months</th>
<th>Current Location</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>M/F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor I Date of joining service</td>
<td>Length of service to date - Years</td>
<td>Length of service to date - Months</td>
<td>Current Location</td>
<td>Date of birth</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>M/F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>04.11.72</td>
<td>39.41</td>
<td>473 months Mountjoy Campus</td>
<td>03.03.52</td>
<td>60.08</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>01.09.84</td>
<td>27.58</td>
<td>331 months Dublin West Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor II Date of joining service</td>
<td>Length of service to date - Years</td>
<td>Length of service to date - Months</td>
<td>Current Location</td>
<td>Date of birth</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>M/F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>05.03.83</td>
<td>29.08</td>
<td>349 months Cloverhill Prison</td>
<td>01.07.58</td>
<td>53.75</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>03.11.79</td>
<td>32.41</td>
<td>389 months Wheatfield Prison</td>
<td>21.03.59</td>
<td>53.08</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.02.77</td>
<td>35.16</td>
<td>422 months Limerick Prison</td>
<td>24.11.56</td>
<td>55.41</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.02.80</td>
<td>32.10</td>
<td>386 months Castlerea Prison</td>
<td>07.07.60</td>
<td>53.75</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.02.80</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>386 months Portlaoise Campus</td>
<td>04.10.59</td>
<td>52.50</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.01.74</td>
<td>38.25</td>
<td>459 months Midlands Prison</td>
<td>12.07.54</td>
<td>57.75</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.08.82</td>
<td>29.66</td>
<td>356 months Portlaoise Prison</td>
<td>13.03.56</td>
<td>56.08</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.30</td>
<td>399.66 months Portlaoise Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td>54.42</td>
<td>100% M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Governor III Date of joining service    | Length of service to date - Years | Length of service to date - Months | Current Location | Date of birth | Age | Sex | M/F |
| 10                                      | 17.01.81                         | 31.25                             | 375 months Portlaoise Campus | 26.05.59      | 52.91 | M   |
| 11                                      | 25.04.94                         | 18.00                             | 216 months Portlaoise Prison | 05.07.59      | 52.75 | F   |
| 12                                      | 25.09.89                         | 22.58                             | 271 months Portlaoise Prison | 01.09.65      | 46.58 | M   |
| 13                                      | 10.10.87                         | 24.50                             | 294 months Portlaoise Prison | 26.08.65      | 46.66 | M   |
| 14                                      | 17.09.90                         | 21.58                             | 259 months Portlaoise Prison | 06.05.68      | 48.91 | F   |
| 15                                      | 12.12.94                         | 17.33                             | 208 months Portlaoise Prison | 13.08.57      | 54.66 | M   |
| 16                                      | 05.12.87                         | 24.33                             | 292 months Portlaoise Prison | 17.01.62      | 50.25 | M   |
| 17                                      | 06.09.80                         | 31.58                             | 379 months Portlaoise Prison | 16.04.57      | 55.00 | M   |
| Mean                                    |                                  | 33.30                             | 399.66 months Portlaoise Prison |                | 54.42 | 100% M |

| Depute Governor Date of joining service | Length of service to date - Years | Length of service to date - Months | Current Location | Date of birth | Age | Sex | M/F |
| 18                                      | 13.12.86                         | 25.33                             | 304 months Portlaoise Prison | 15.03.65      | 47.08 | M   |
| 19                                      | 11.07.81                         | 30.75                             | 368 months Portlaoise Prison | 07.11.58      | 53.41 | M   |
| 20                                      | 07.05.91                         | 20.91                             | 251 months Portlaoise Prison | 22.06.67      | 44.83 | M   |
| 21                                      | 07.01.91                         | 21.25                             | 255 months Portlaoise Prison | 15.01.70      | 42.25 | F   |
| 22                                      | 29.11.86                         | 25.41                             | 305 months Portlaoise Prison | 03.09.63      | 48.58 | M   |
| 23                                      | 06.01.79                         | 33.25                             | 399 months Portlaoise Prison | 22.05.59      | 52.91 | M   |
| 24                                      | 25.04.94                         | 18.00                             | 216 months Portlaoise Prison | 21.09.67      | 44.58 | M   |
| 25                                      | 17.09.90                         | 21.58                             | 259 months Portlaoise Prison | 06.05.63      | 48.91 | F   |

| Assistant Governor Date of joining service | Length of service to date - Years | Length of service to date - Months | Current Location | Date of birth | Age | Sex | M/F |
| 26                                      | 04.10.86                         | 25.50                             | 306 months Portlaoise Prison | 23.02.63      | 49.16 | M   |
| 27                                      | 31.01.87                         | 25.25                             | 303 months Portlaoise Prison | 28.06.65      | 46.83 | F   |
| 28                                      | 20.09.80                         | 31.58                             | 379 months Portlaoise Prison | 13.10.60      | 51.50 | M   |
| 29                                      | 04.04.87                         | 25.00                             | 300 months Portlaoise Prison | 17.01.66      | 46.25 | M   |
| 30                                      | 01.07.91                         | 20.75                             | 249 months Portlaoise Prison | 04.11.66      | 45.41 | M   |
| 31                                      | 28.05.90                         | 21.91                             | 263 months Portlaoise Prison | 12.09.64      | 47.58 | F   |
| 32                                      | 28.11.87                         | 24.41                             | 293 months Portlaoise Prison | 07.04.64      | 48.00 | M   |
| 33                                      | 03.01.78                         | 34.25                             | 411 months Portlaoise Prison | 14.04.57      | 55.00 | M   |
| 34                                      | 15.04.91                         | 21.00                             | 252 months Portlaoise Prison | 21.03.71      | 41.08 | M   |
| 35                                      | 01.09.84                         | 27.58                             | 331 months Portlaoise Prison | 15.12.61      | 50.33 | M   |
| 36                                      | 06.02.88                         | 24.16                             | 290 months Portlaoise Prison | 27.05.64      | 47.91 | M   |
| 37                                      | 26.03.90                         | 22.08                             | 265 months Portlaoise Prison | 01.08.65      | 46.66 | M   |
| 38                                      | 10.10.87                         | 24.50                             | 294 months Portlaoise Prison | 30.12.62      | 49.33 | F   |
| 39                                      | 06.02.88                         | 24.16                             | 290 months Portlaoise Prison | 10.10.66      | 45.50 | M   |