

Hostels - Greenhouses or Warehouses?

**An Ethnographic and Theoretical Study of the
Origins, Development and Purposes of Approved
Premises**

Francis Bartholomew Cowe

**School of Social Sciences
Cardiff University**

Ph.D 2008

UMI Number: U584264

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI U584264

Published by ProQuest LLC 2013. Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.



ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

Summary of Thesis

This thesis explores the development of hostels / approved premises and considers the existence of an 'unexplored' past that may help cast light on their current purposes. Drawing on historical and theoretical domains it constructs a hinterland from which to undertake critical exploration of their current practices and possible futures.

A staged ethnographic study of two hostels is offered, with a four year gap in between to allow consideration as to whether hostels are changing and whether wider policy shifts impacting on probation more generally, can be seen to be shaping hostels' possible future(s). Observations, interviews, engagement in both formal and informal meetings with staff, residents and managers have been used to develop a view of hostels from the underside of practice.

Critical theorising and exploration of hostels' past has been located against both the wider social and political shifts that may be seen to have impacted on the rehabilitative and re-integrative role of the hostel, and the emerging themes emanating from the ethnographic work.

Key points of discussion include: an argument for a longer history of hostels than is currently suggested, an exploration of the relationship between hostels and the wider probation service and criminal justice system, the centrality of re-integration to rehabilitation and the impact of new punitiveness on hostels' changing role and function at the start of the 21st century. It is argued that a retreat from integration of offenders into society and a devaluing of their social agency and moral worth is now at risk of becoming accepted as part of hostels' 'new' public protection role.

Consideration is given to how staff and residents may be experiencing the 'risk driven' changes that are taking place and what wider implications this works findings may have for policy, practice and rehabilitative theory. An alternative penology is offered that both takes account of hostels past and acknowledges their changed clientele.

Contents

| | Page |
|---|-------------|
| Acknowledgements | P.X |
| Chapter One - Introduction | |
| Why Hostels? | P.3 |
| Key Questions | P.5 |
| Plus Ca Change? | P.6 |
| A Theoretical Overview | P.8 |
| Rehabilitative and Re-integrative Theory | P.9 |
| Framework of Thesis & Construction of a Hostels' Narrative | P.17 |
| Chapter Two – An Historical and Theoretical Hinterland | |
| Evidence of Rehabilitative Precursors | P.24 |
| Early Influences | P.26 |
| 'Training Schools' - A Reasonable Starting Point | P.27 |
| Early Staffing Models | P.30 |
| 'Troublesome Youth' | P.32 |
| Apprenticeships and Bonded Labour | P.33 |
| Child Labour and Recognisance as an Alternative to | P.37 |
| Ragged Schools, Industrial Schools and Reformatories | P.41 |
| Discipline, Work and 'Education' | P.43 |
| An Alternative Approach | P.45 |
| A More Familiar Story 1907 – 1969 | P.49 |
| An Early Probation Home | P.51 |
| Policy Developments | P.53 |
| The 1948 Criminal Justice Act | P.56 |
| Re- integrative Developments in a Changing Context | P.57 |

| | |
|--|------|
| A Clear Role for Hostels? | P.60 |
| Hostels a Complex Picture | P.62 |
| Tentative Structures for an Analysis of Hostel Development | P.63 |

Chapter Three - A Background to the Contemporary Hostels Story

| | |
|---|------|
| From Welfare to Market Society | P.67 |
| The Welfare Paradigm | P.70 |
| A Context of Change | P.75 |
| <u>Table 3.1</u> | P.77 |
| Deconstructing Local Ownership and Identity. | P.80 |
| The Advent of Managerialism – a paradigm shift. | P.82 |
| Centralisation and 'Nationalisation' | P.84 |
| The Demise of Welfare | P.86 |
| Probation for Sale? | P.87 |
| A Restructuring Agenda | P.88 |
| The Contemporary Context | P.89 |
| The Expansion of Punishment into the Community | P.90 |
| A triumph of Ideology? | P.98 |

Chapter Four – From treatment and rehabilitation to public protection and offender management - a paradigm shift .

| | |
|--|-------|
| Who were hostels for? | P.104 |
| The Potential Impact of the Hostel and the Role of the Warden | P.109 |
| Hostels for Adults – Care Versus Control | P.113 |
| Who Should Hostels be For? | P.115 |
| A Rising Prison Population | P.118 |
| Developing Ideas and Missed Opportunities | P.120 |
| Carlisle House, Culverlands and Hostel Practices in the 1980's | P.122 |
| Bail an Instrumental Interest? | P.127 |
| The Impact of New Discourses | P.132 |

| | |
|--|-------|
| Risk, Public Protection and Punishment – The New Context | P.136 |
| Summary | P.138 |
| <u>Table 4.1 Old Penology vs New Penology</u> | P.141 |

Chapter Five – Methodology

| | |
|--|-------|
| The Research Questions | P.145 |
| Setting the Scene | P.146 |
| Critical Theory | P.151 |
| Developing a Broad Perspective | P.153 |
| Ethnography | P.159 |
| What is Ethnography | P.160 |
| Gaining Access and Selecting the Hostels | P.161 |
| Initial Fieldwork and Trials – Getting Started | P.166 |
| Getting Acquainted with the Hostels | P.167 |
| Giving it a Structure | P.169 |
| Strengths and Weaknesses of the Approach | P.173 |
| Research Settings and Data Recording | P.174 |
| Analysis of Data | P.176 |
| Observation, Objectivity? Hard Work and Fun | P.179 |
| Developing and Maintaining a Balanced Picture | P.181 |
| Ethical Considerations | P.182 |
| Professional Integrity | P.184 |
| Informed Consent | P.185 |
| Use of Data | P.186 |
| Non Harm to Residents and Staff | P.187 |
| The Informal Setting | P.188 |
| Outcomes of the Findings | P.189 |

Chapter Six

Letting Hostels Speak for Themselves a View from the Underside

| | |
|---|-------|
| Identification of Core Themes | P.198 |
| The Role of the Keyworker | P.199 |
| Challenges of Revised Role and Training | P.209 |
| Enabling Long Term Change | P.211 |
| Hostels as a Mechanism for Getting Individuals Out of Chaotic and Problematic Life Circumstances | P.215 |
| Continuity of Purpose and Consistency Across the Day | P.229 |
| Factors in Developing a Re-integrative Environment | P.232 |
| Mixed Hostels as a Mechanism for Change | P.233 |
| The Regime and the External World | P.238 |
| Assistant Managers View of Their Roles | P.240 |
| Conclusions so Far | P.245 |

Chapter Seven - The Emerging Policy and Practice Context.

| | |
|--|-------|
| Hostel Specific Research | P.248 |
| The Wider Context | P.254 |
| Legislative Changes and Developments | P.257 |
| The Development of NOMS | P.261 |
| A Changing Service Delivery and Management Structure | P.265 |
| Hostel Specific Policy and Developments | P.270 |
| Hostels as a Risk to their Residents? | P.278 |
| The Public Face of Risk Averse Policy Making | P.279 |
| Overview of changes between 2002 and 2007 | P.283 |

Chapter Eight – Returning to the Field.

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| First Impressions | P.291 |
| Mixed Hostels | P.295 |
| The Role and Focus of keywork | P.298 |

| | |
|--|-------|
| Changes and Differences in Approach | P.302 |
| Buying in 'Care'? | P.311 |
| Domestic and Ancillary Staff | P.314 |
| Enabling Long Term Change | P.315 |
| Hostels as a Mechanism for Enabling Transition | P.317 |
| Differences and Splits | P.322 |
| Morning Meetings | P.326 |
| Factors in Developing a Re-Integrative Environment | P.329 |
| Bored Men Doing Nothing? | P.332 |

Chapter Nine – Greenhouses or Warehouses?

| | |
|--|-------|
| What Have Hostels Been? | P.341 |
| Changes and Missed Opportunities | P.345 |
| Renewed Policy Attention | P.347 |
| What do Hostels do and How does this fit with their Past? | P.348 |
| Revised Policy, Purposes and Practice | P.349 |
| Reduced Access to External Activities and the Exclusion of the Community | P.335 |
| Changes in Staff Resident Relationships | P.358 |
| Holding Risks? | P.371 |
| How Could Hostels Position Themselves? | P.374 |
| <u>Table 9.1 An Alternative Penology</u> | P.381 |
| Hostels Back To The Future | P.382 |

| | |
|----------------|-------|
| Summary | P.385 |
|----------------|-------|

| | |
|--------------------------|-------|
| Glossary of Terms | P.390 |
|--------------------------|-------|

Appendices and Tables

(All tables and appendices are initially numbered in relation to the first chapter in which they are discussed)

Table 1 – Appendix 1:

| | |
|---|-------|
| Overview of Hostels as Resource Relative to the Prison Population | P.386 |
| Table 3.1 – Hostels and Old Penology | P.77 |
| Table 4.1- Hostels and New Penology | P.141 |
| Table 9.1 – An Alternative Penology for Hostels | P.380 |

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Appendix 1 – Table 1 | P.386 |
| Appendix 2.1 Example of An Early Court Warrant | P.387 |
| Appendix 5.0 Research Approval From | P.388 |
| Appendix 5.1 Summary of Hostels Average Monthly Occupancy | P.396 |
| Appendix 5.2a – 5.2w Resident Profiles for Auldhouse and Newhouse during the period of Ethnographic Study 2002 and 2006-2007. | PP.397 - 420 |
| Appendix 5.4 Sample of Letter Sent | P.421 |
| Appendix 5.3 Interview Schedule for Residents – Semi Structured | P.422 |
| Appendix 53 Interview Schedule for Ancillary Staff | P.424 |

| | |
|--|-------|
| Appendix 6.1 Summary of Semi Structured Interviews : | |
| March 2002 – August 2002 | P.425 |
| Appendix 6.2 Summary of Semi Structured Interviews : | |
| October 2006 – March 2007 | P.428 |
| Appendix 6.3 Hostel Regime 2006-7 | P.432 |
| Appendix 6.4 Hostel Regime 2002 | P.433 |
| Appendix 6.5 Approved Premises Rules | P.434 |
| Appendix 8.2 Considerations for Phase 2 of Fieldwork | P.435 |

| | |
|-------------------|--------------|
| References | P.443 |
|-------------------|--------------|

Acknowledgements

To all of those who created the space for this research to take place and who provided the author with support encouragement and patience – thank you.

In particular to Sioni for having put up with a *more than usual* mess of my books and papers around the house, my disappearing off to work on this thesis and never complaining at the amount of time that this work took out of our time together, particularly at 'holidays' and 'weekends'. Ethnography it seems can often mean *not being with!*

To my supervisors Lesley and Mark for their patient feedback, clear messages of support and for knowing when to tell me to just get on and write and knowing when to encourage me to hold back, think more and do less.

To the staff, residents and managers for sharing this journey and being open to my intrusions, observations and questions.

As Wax (1971:52) notes:

'In many cases, the finest insights of the fieldworker are developed from interaction with the self...'

The space required for this is contingent on others generosity and willingness to indulge a researcher's interest and share their thought provoking interactions, reflections, vulnerability and experiences with the researcher.

Hopefully this work will add to the reflective potential of others involved in hostels, policy, practice or theory.

Introduction

Chapter One:

This thesis will critically explore the development of Probation Hostels in England and Wales as a rehabilitative and re-integrative mechanism.¹ It will draw attention to hostels as a relatively neglected area of study and will argue that their origins are disputable. Their role and possible contribution to probation practice, it will be argued, has for the most part been out of step with wider probation developments. Such divergence makes their study potentially fruitful and may be, of wider theoretical and practice significance. A question that will run through this thesis is whether their role and asynchronous development is changing. If they are changing what implications does this have for hostels in a rapidly changing probation context? Do hostels have something to contribute to wider theoretical and practice focussed debates on the currency of rehabilitation and reintegration within an expanding criminal justice system?

The enquiry into the hostel story will in part be an unexplored and unconventional exploration. Hostels have attracted relatively little attention from theorists and practitioners. In the words of Sellin (1972) regarding theories of punishment cited in Rotman (1990: 28):

'The history we are studying is not like a ladder, on which each rung marks a clear distinction between one stage and the one above. It is more like a river, arising from several tributaries , some of which , owing to the operation of changing climatic factors, tend to grow more powerful, while others show signs of drying up, yet, all are adding their respective flow to the mainstream.'

¹ Throughout this thesis the words 'probation hostel' or 'hostel' and 'approved premise' will be used interchangeably.

This chapter introduces the research topic, probation hostels and offers the reader a rationale for an exploration of potential precursors to the modern hostel alongside an ethnographic study. The author is explicitly seeking to make use of historical and theoretical perspectives to make sense of the contemporary hostel story and its possible futures. Together, the historic and ethnographic approach, aim to offer the reader a range of perspectives from which to consider current hostel theory and practice. As Scharfstein (1989) suggests providing context is both essential and a dilemma:

'If one thinks of it as a background, one sees that it is contrasted and paired with a foreground, and that the two are reversible....explanation is impossible or seriously incomplete unless context is taken into account.'

Scharfstein (1989:1)

In developing a thesis that looks at current policy, practice and context and sets this against a set of wider pre contexts and influences the author was reminded of the words of Scharfstein (1989: 1) on the origins of the word context:

'The term context...is derived from the Latin word contextus, the past participle of contextere, which means to weave together or join together.'

This thesis weaves together ethnographic, theoretical and historical perspectives. As part of that signposting of perspectives and influences a brief explanation of the author's relationship with probation practice will be provided in order to place in context the researcher's perspective. The chapter will then proceed to outline the relative academic disinterest that has surrounded hostels (although this is changing) including the problems this may pose for those interested in understanding their practices, clientele and purpose. Finally an outline will be provided of the overall thesis structure and aims.

Why Hostels?

From an academic perspective hostels are a fascinating and relatively unexplored phenomenon. Depending on which sources one consults and whom one asks probation hostels for adults variously appeared to have commenced as a result of the 1969 Children and Young Persons Act (CYPA) or as a continuation of a much longer pre history. This thesis will explore the modern story with its convention of locating the development of adult hostels alongside the implementation of the 1969 CYPA and will critically explore the possibility that there was an earlier pre history, suggesting in chapters two and three that a discernible set of influences, policies and practices can be constructed as a theoretical and practice hinterland from which more recent developments can be explored.

Part II, Section 46 of the Children and Young Persons Act, 1969 legislated against the existence of

'approved school, remand home, approved probation hostel or approved probation home within the meaning of the Criminal Justice Act 1948...'

Stating that:

'in consequence of the establishment of community homes...the institution as such is no longer requiredit shall cease to be an approved institution...'

In the years that followed the legislative framework for the separation of children and adult criminal justice services, a new framework was created for adult hostels i.e. Statutory Instrument 1976/626: Approved Probation Hostel and Home and Bail Hostel Rules 1976. The 'hostel story' is most often presented as relatively short and as a subjective matter of relative disinterest to current policy makers and practitioners (Burnett and Eaton 2004). Wincup (2002) and Barton (2004) appear as exceptions here, making good use of historical perspectives to explore and make sense of current themes and issues.

The work of Vanstone (2004) and Barton (2004) suggest that hostels for adults in the Criminal Justice System may have had a much longer and more interesting history than is generally suggested. It will therefore be important to explore and question the convention (Burnett and Eaton 2004) of linking hostels origins to the 1969 Children and Young Persons Act and the 1972 Criminal Justice Act. Later chapters will explore whether an abbreviated account of hostel history is helpful and consider whether its acceptance has the potential to divert both, academic and practice interest from a much wider and potentially revealing, vantage point on the development of rehabilitative discourses in the Criminal Justice System (CJS). This thesis explores whether the lack of policy and academic interest in hostels has occasioned missed opportunities for better understanding of rehabilitative and re-integrative mechanisms in theory and practice.

From the author's perspective all ideas start with an individual and all individuals are influenced by their contexts. All ideas are therefore context bound. Individuals are limited in their construction of ideas by their knowledge of contexts and individuals. So it is important that the author is explicit with the reader as to how he became interested in hostels and what relationship the author had to the research.

This research started with the author leaving the field of probation practice in 1999 after almost 10 years. During that period the Probation Service had, as will be explored in chapter three, undergone considerable change and the author had become interested in teaching, research and exploring 'what works' from the practitioner and service user perspective. The author had previously worked and volunteered in residential settings outside of the CJS and within the CJS had worked in a probation day centre having some contact with hostels as a probation officer. There was an interest in how things got to be as they were along with a curiosity as to why hostels in the CJS had relatively little written about them and why their existence appeared to be more dependent on individual interest and chance encounters as opposed to being key in either policy or practice.

Hostels had not been mentioned during the author's training as a probation officer (1989 -1991). Initial attempts to enquire into the origins of hostels alerted the author to a relative lack of academic and practice related interest. Both policy making and practice guidance had become highly centralised, over this period while, from a practitioner perspective, hostels appeared to have been an exception to this process.

A mixture of practice experience, academic interest and general nosiness, which I have been assured, is a good asset in a researcher, led the author to explore systematically how hostels originated, what their role has been in probation and the wider CJS and consider whether they were being used to good effect in rehabilitating offenders. A year of 'private study' and interest from friends and ex colleagues convinced the author that this was a subject worth pursuing in more detail.

More recently the impact of personal perspectives and age were reinforced for me when working with an undergraduate student who was 8 years old when the 1991 CJ Act came into being. For her probation had always been about punishment in the community and public protection with rehabilitation appearing as a way of achieving these! Contexts shape our perspectives.

Key Questions

The thesis explores whether the accepted convention of the hostel story commencing in 1969 should be accepted and whether there is an unexplored history of hostels, which may be of interest to academics, practitioners and policy makers.

It also seeks to ascertain, if there is a 'hostels story', whether any continuity and coherence can be found in their function which has been overlooked. This will entail a consideration of the impact of relative academic and practice disinterest and exploration of the extent of any continuity of purpose or role

that may be detectable today. This exploration will include connection with staff and residents in an attempt to construct a 'view from the inside'. The conclusion of the thesis will consider whether a hostel story and reflection on this has anything to contribute to both the future of hostels and wider debates about the role of rehabilitation and re-integration within an increasingly punitively orientated community justice system (Pratt et al 2005).

Plus Ca Change?

On a regular basis claims have been made that probation is at a crucial stage in its development;

'The probation and after-care service has never been free from change, but at present it is at a crucial stage in its development...'

Haxby (1978: 15)

In many ways this thesis reiterates this perennial claim but does so by focusing on a much neglected area of probation theory and practice, hostels, considering the extent to which the rehabilitative potential and purpose of such institutions has become transformed over time and whether these purposes may be at risk of being redefined and remoulded into a form of 'new punitiveness' (Feeley and Simon 1994, Pratt 2002, Pratt et al 2005).

However as McAnay (1984) implies, times of challenge and change offer systems and individuals the opportunity to rethink and reconsider how policy and practice could be conceived and developed. Probation has a relatively recent history of one hundred years.² Contemporary sources e.g. Burnett and Eaton (2004), suggest that hostels have had a much shorter history within this, originating in the late 1960s to early 1970's. Table One (Appendix One) provides an overview of the growth of hostels within this post 1970 period.

² Probation celebrated an official 100 year history in 2007; see National Probation Directorate (2000) A Century of Cutting Crime 1907-2007.

The author will put forward the proposition that changes in policy and practice in hostels have until the late 1990's been asynchronous to mainstream probation developments. This positioning may offer the academic and practitioner an alternative viewpoint from the mainstream and make visible some of the tensions and contradictions that bedevil the wider set of relationships between the state, the individual 'offender' and the 'community'.

The location of their origins in 1969 – 1970 is surprising as this is precisely when faith in the rehabilitative project, undermined by Martinson's (1974) 'nothing works', was about to signal a retreat. It will be argued that hostels were relatively untouched by this rehabilitative scepticism and have a much longer pre history that, to date has been largely ignored. As Feely and Simon (1994: 178-9) note:

'New formations rarely grow on ground totally cleared of the past. They develop alongside practices created at various times, which have accrued social and political weight against the demands of coherence and reform.'

This work is concerned to explore whether any continuity of purpose or role can be determined for hostels. It will consider the centrality of notions of rehabilitation and transformation in their past and consider, to what extent, recent changes in criminal justice policy and practice may have begun to impact on hostels transformative and rehabilitative potential.

Such an exploration is not straight forward due to a relative lack of academic and practice interest in this area, as Thurston (2002: 207) notes:

'As any student of hostel practice will quickly discern, there is a paucity of scholarly endeavour in this field.'

There will therefore at times be gaps in the story which reflect gaps in academic interest alluded to by Thurston and gaps in policy and practice

interest. These gaps may also represent missed opportunities for hostels to have a more central purpose within the criminal justice system.

The exploration of hostels' history is therefore potentially problematic as the author may be tempted to construct a coherent story ignoring the multiple influences, policies, individuals and occurrences that coincided and misrepresent to the reader a narrative which is more appealing but less reflective of the, at times, disjointed reality. The next chapter will lay out an argument for an earlier history than is traditionally suggested.

Having introduced the broad area of enquiry and highlighted some of the difficulties a potential student of hostels faces, the author will now proceed to locate the proposed research against some more familiar territory. This next section aims to meet two broad purposes; to provide an overview of some relevant wider theoretical debates about rehabilitation and reintegration and then to provide an overview of the thesis, thereby providing a contextere for the proposed exploration as a whole.

A Theoretical Overview

Analysis of theoretical contexts and tensions may assist in deepening our understanding as to whether current changes and developments signal surface changes or deeper shifts from previously defined purposes. For example, Allen (1981: 87) exploring the decline of the rehabilitative ideal in American penal policy and social purpose notes that:

'Individuals and societies find it difficult, however, to distinguish an age's wisdom from its pathology, often because wisdom and pathology are obverse sides of the same coin.'

As Allen (1981) implies a critical exploration of changes in purposes and practices, may disclose complex and intertwining discourses that are not amenable to simple juxtaposition. Theorising about hostels may not be a straightforward endeavour. It is therefore important to begin this thesis with

reference to general theories of rehabilitation and suggest that such theories both reflect the views and values of theorists and is influenced by their historical antecedents, including social and policy contexts. More contemporary policy contexts and influences will be explored in chapters four and seven.

Before exploring whether hostels have and can act as rehabilitative and re-integrative mechanisms it is important to explore the concept of the rehabilitative ideal and provide a brief theoretical background to the meanings of these concepts.³

Rehabilitative and Re-integrative Theory.

Theories of rehabilitation and reintegration reflect the views and values of theorists as to how we should treat people who have committed offences. There is no guarantee that a justice system will have such a focus. Indeed a purely retributive system has no requirement to include rehabilitation as a goal. Rachael's (1997: 473) in La Folette (Ed, 1997) suggests only four rules for a just retributive system.

1. Only the guilty deserve punishment
2. Equal Treatment
3. Proportionality
4. Excuses

Retributive systems operate on the basis of a consensus of what is morally right and acceptable and project onto the offender the moral characteristics of moral and social wrongdoer. Social change and individual circumstance are not necessary components or considerations of such a justice system.

³ A contested notion throughout this thesis will be whether hostels are in fact non-custodial. The author will consider the extent to which their regimes and focus move residents towards or away from community as worthy of critical consideration. Probation Hostels have been traditionally understood as non-custodial.

Proponents of rehabilitation and reintegration may forget that conceptually, morally and practically they have to present a case as to why rehabilitative ideals warrant inclusion in a 'justice system'. As Bean, an anti rehabilitationist, notes commenting on responses to his early work on Rehabilitation and Deviance (Bean 1976):

'.. it was almost as if rehabilitation had become a belief system which was open to challenge only from non believers.'

(1981: vii)

Moreover as Bean (1981) sets out, questions about the nature of punishment and the role of rehabilitation in this tend to reduce to either two types of argument, one moral which is about justification and the other empirical which is about the efficacy or outcome of practice. This thesis considers the extent to which hostel regimes have been and could continue to be a form of rehabilitation. Punishment may be a more or less prominent feature of such regimes (Sinclair 1971, Fisher and Wilson 1982 and Hudson 1981) and is a priori neither conceptually included nor excluded. It remains for empirical evidence to demonstrate the extent to which punitive practices or approaches contribute to or undermine the restoration of the offender to society, i.e. from a state of diminished citizenship to a state of restored 'normative' social agency. Bean (1981) writing at a highpoint of rehabilitative scepticism would have considered such a juxtaposition of punishment as a possible component of rehabilitation as offensive. However the tide of history has shown that harsher sentencing practices alone do little to reduce rates of offending or recidivism and that prison in particular appears to have become an organic form of punishment that the state grows and feeds at an alarming rate (see Table 1).⁴

Rotman cited in Lewis (2005: 122) defines rehabilitation as providing the minimum necessary services for an offender:

⁴ The 2006 NOMS Five Year Strategy for reducing re-offending graphically demonstrates that overall two year re-offending rates are now significantly higher for those who receive custodial sentences compared with those who receive community sentences.

'...to reintegrate into society as a useful human being.'

Core to such an approach is the active participation of the offender i.e. an engagement of their social agency. Lewis goes (2005: 6) on to note that in practice this means:

'For some there will be the restoration of a former state. For others, it will mean the receipt of services, the acquisition of skills, and the establishment of rank, rights and responsibilities previously denied.'

Recognising the possibility for conceptual and practical confusion as to what practitioners and academics mean by rehabilitation Raynor and Robinson (2005: 12) note that:

' ... in the correctional model there is no assumption that the offender has ever conformed to the desired norm...rehabilitation may involve restoration to either a previous or a 'proper' condition/ status, although how the latter is defined will depend on the perspective taken.'

Implicit in this plea for clarity is a recognition that what rehabilitation means for individual offenders is as intrinsically tied up with their social conditions as their social agency. Raynor and Robinson (2005: 172) are strong advocates for a rehabilitative ideal that balances offender accountability with a humane solidarity. Practices and understandings of what works may change over time but:

'... the ideals are remarkably durable.'

The next chapter marks out some of the early ideals and practices that shaped the hostel as a rehabilitative mechanism. Moreover it will argue that the institutions and practices that shaped the emergence of residential reformation informed and shaped our current understandings of rehabilitation and integration as well as the development of hostels per se. Later chapters will consider the extent to which the modern hostel demonstrates the

durability of the rehabilitative ideal and whether modern practices may be understood as re-integrative.

The author asserts that although it is possible to separate out these concepts in the criminological domain they are interconnected and may be seen to be mutually dependent in practice i.e. it is difficult to conceive of reintegrating an offender into the community who has not been rehabilitated, unless one believes that deterrence or imprisonment alone works.⁵ Likewise rehabilitation without reintegration appears as a rather one sided contract.

On a conceptual level the understanding of what rehabilitation is, appears more complex and to its opponents more opaque than concepts of punishment or retribution. Rehabilitation is not conceptually vacuous as an idea. However our understanding of rehabilitation is more intrinsically linked to particular sets of complex social practices and relationships for historically located individuals whereas concepts of punishment can more easily be reduced to universal notions of loss, deprivation and pain. Exploring the historical origins of hostels may assist in developing an understanding of what rehabilitation has meant and whether its meanings and practice remain today.⁶

Lewis (2005: 119) has suggested that there is a widening gap between theories of rehabilitation and their presentation in contemporary penal policy and practice and that the development of a:

⁵ A scrutiny of reconviction rates for those leaving custody would suggest that deterrence alone is not effective for the majority of imprisoned offenders. Burnett and Maruna (2004) completed a ten year reconviction study to explore Michael Howard's assertion that 'Prison Works'. Their study suggests that individual self belief in the ability to change is a core factor in reducing recidivism. The study claims that rational choice and threat of custody appear to have little deterrent effect on those who have already been in custody.

⁶ Exploring the past may produce its own intrinsic knowledge and perspectives but can also act as a kind of intellectual and conceptual practice ground from which the present may be more easily distanced and seen in its own possible contexts.

'rehabilitative rhetoric, might provide sound opportunities for sound rehabilitative strategies to be developed and pursued by workers in the field.'

Lewis (2005: 131)

It will be important to explore in the conclusion of this thesis whether contemporary hostel practice and policy is moving away from its theoretical and historical antecedents. Rehabilitative rhetoric may be usefully explored as much in its social and policy contexts as in its theoretical domain. Linking concepts and concrete practice may enable a greater scrutiny of both practices and ideals.

Lewis (2005) like Crow (2001) links notions of rehabilitation with the practice of resettlement. Such understandings see the restoration of the individual as linked to that individual becoming integrated or reintegrating into social membership of a community. As Palmer (1992: vii) notes diverse responses are open to society in dealing with those who break the law. The aims of these responses are usually to varying degrees aimed at protecting the public, providing order, and making society more stable. Sentencing offenders:

'offers four ways to accomplish this; retribution, deterrence, incapacitation and rehabilitation.... Rehabilitation attempts to change the offender so that she or he loses the desire to offend.'

The latter of these, rehabilitation, may be understood as an expression of social solidarity and recognition of the potential for all citizens to transgress and the potential value of welcoming back the penitent transgressor.

Rehabilitative ideals then are not always presented as solely focused on the immediately tangible good of society. In fact McKorkle and Korn (1954: 94-95) caution against justifying human intervention strategies with offenders solely on the basis of the desired outcomes they will achieve for society:

'It is the tragedy of modern correction that the impulse to help has been confused with treatment and seems to require defence as treatment. One of the more ironic difficulties with this position is that when one makes 'rehabilitation' the main justification for the human handling of prisoners one has manoeuvred oneself into a position potentially dangerous to the humanitarian viewpoint. What if human treatment fails to rehabilitate? Shall it then be abandoned?...the bleak fact is that just as the monstrous punishment of the eighteenth century failed to curtail crime, so the humane handling of the twentieth century has equally failed to do so.'

McCorkle and Korn (1954) prior to the huge expansion of the American penitentiary system were forewarning that just as punishment may fail to reduce recidivism so too might certain forms of treatment or rehabilitation. Research around rehabilitative practices should be careful and morally mindful of not conflating effective rehabilitative practice with justification for moral and humane treatment, these too may need to be argued for in their own right. In considering how hostels treat residents this may be an important consideration as depending on whom they capture, some groups may be, and be perceived to be, more or less amenable to the rehabilitative endeavour.

Rehabilitation and reintegration may take many guises, as Allen (1978) suggests. The diverse guises are historically and culturally located and to be properly understood need location against a broad context. Looking backwards to look forward may be useful for both practitioners and theorists. The next three chapters aim to provide much of the broad context for studying the modern hostel as a potentially rehabilitative mechanism, looking backwards, identifying where possible diverse guises of and influences on concepts of the rehabilitative ideal in history, policy and practice.

Within these varying potential guises society's responses and prevailing social conditions may be seen as influential. Two social policy areas that appear to have been of particular relevance to hostels throughout their history are housing and employment. Recent resettlement research (Clancy et al 2006)

restates the importance of these factors. Indeed, these may be seen as core to rehabilitation generally. Crow (2001: 199) considers these as the:

'Two areas of social policy central to successful rehabilitation.'

That is we cannot separate out our understanding of rehabilitative criminal justice policy and practice from the broader social policy issues of the day which focus on people's social and economic life chances. Recent research has reinforced the importance of these constants in the rehabilitative discourse (Harding and Harding 2006). In the 21st Century accommodation and employment are still being seen as key factors in tackling poverty and enabling social inclusion. Chapter seven will flag the importance of accommodation within the current pathfinders discourse. Robinson (2001) drawing on the work of Bauman, suggests that 'social problems' such as homelessness may be understood as manifestations of poverty and as part of a wider picture of social disadvantage.

Robinson (2001) explores a hostel model for engaging the homeless in a 'post modern' world. The next chapter will suggest that such models of engagement through the promotion of active social agency are not new and may transfer well to the modern hostel setting. For now it is important to flag that interventions with marginalised groups need to be understood in both their wider social context and the wider circumstances of individuals' lives and not just the presenting problem.

Theories of rehabilitation and reintegration need to sit alongside theories and policies relating to our contemporary understanding of why people offend. For example in the modern era psychological explanations of crime predominate. Palmer (2003) explores suggested responses to offending founded on theories of moral reasoning and personal deficits associated with the work of Piaget (1932) and Kohlberg (1958,1959), exploring how, on the basis of current research, this might be applied to work with 'offenders'.

Reintegration through the use of transitional community based facilities has been a common feature of late 20th Century juvenile justice and social welfare approaches focused on young offenders (see Harris and Webb (1987) and Palmer (1992: 87 and 114). Key also to the historical development of re-integrative approaches and rehabilitative discourses has been the concept of developing tangible social bonds and unlearning delinquent behaviour or relearning pro social behaviour that might lead to improved access to either paid work, education or voluntary work. That is, as well as benefiting the individual, reintegration puts responsible and productive social agents back into society. According to Garland (1997: 6) rehabilitation in the modern era has become but one aim on a possible menu of rationales and purposes for intervention with offenders:

'It is no longer viewed as a general all-purpose prescription, but is instead targeted upon those individuals and groups most likely to make cost effective use of this expensive service.'

This iterates with the earlier point that rehabilitation is not a necessary component of a 'justice' system. However this thesis will suggest that hostels have to date had a rehabilitative ethos and by implication therefore have sought to integrate or re-integrate their residents back into wider society. If this aim were to be lost for hostel residents then we may need to ask whether they are becoming some new kind of 'semi-penal institution' (Barton 2005) with quite different aims and purposes. However unpalatable and gender ridden the semi-penal institution Barton describes, the regimes described by her still sought, however consciously or unconsciously patriarchal in their motivation, to place albeit it feminised 'transformed' and 'normalised' women back into society. Garland (1997), Feely and Simon (1994) and Nash (2006:188) point towards the possible abandonment of:

'the grand narratives of reformation and rehabilitation.'

Hostels it will be argued have not only been part of this narrative but have informed its content and discourse however gendered and stereotyped. They

may offer the potential to develop both theoretically and practically less exclusive narratives which have no need to juxtapose 'new penology' against 'old penology'. The conclusion of this thesis will return to this question informed by both a broad based theoretical enquiry and a detailed but specific ethnographic enquiry. Pulling together these findings can offer an alternative perspective from which to see future transformative possibilities.

Framework of Thesis and the Construction of a Hostels' Narrative.

Chapter Two will explore the possibility that hostels have much earlier antecedents. It will consider whether there is evidence of the use of hostels prior to 1969. That is, do hostels appear suddenly on the rehabilitative radar in 1969 or have they perhaps a longer pre history?

The chapter will offer a perspective that suggests that ignoring the past for the sake of being seen to be new may ignore important formative influences that shape the ebb and flow of hostel practice. As Nellis (2007: 26) suggests it is important to understand what it is that the:

'the new modernisers have set themselves against'.

The author will seek to balance the close up approach of ethnographic research that will form the bulk of this thesis, based on two six month periods of fieldwork, with an attempt to develop a longer view and potentially broader perspective as to where and how hostels emerged. It will open to consideration the possibility that the 'guise' that hostels' rehabilitative practices take flow from earlier influences and practices. An exploration of these may be fruitful in constructing and stimulating debate about the role of the modern hostel.

In looking at evidence for an early hostel story two time frames will be explored. Firstly those practices and developments that may be seen to predate the general probation story and are asynchronous to the accepted probation history (Whitehead and Statham 2006, Vanstone 2004, Crow 2001).

Secondly it will explore that time frame which is synchronous to the general probation story but is generally ignored or underplayed in that story. Authors such as Vanstone (2004), Whitehead and Statham (2006), Barton (2004), Wincup (2002) and Le Mesurier (1935) lay a trail that provides evidence of residential homes, probation homes, Howard houses and hostels prior to 1969 .

Chapter Three will consider the wider legal and social policy context to the contemporary hostel story. This will allow judgements to be made as to the influence this may have had on hostels' development and to ascertain whether there has been a shift in direction in hostels' role and purpose that signals a change in direction or purpose. Developments in hostel purposes, policy and practice require location against the broader social policy context within which criminal justice developments have occurred. It will be important therefore to map some of the broad trends and influences, which have shaped penal policy and in particular probation policy and practice.

The chapter will outline and highlight some of the key influences in social policy since the late 1960s impacting on probation and suggest that the effect of these changes, in social and economic policy, contributed to a partial transformation of prior probation purposes. The focus will be particularly on those developments post 1970, which is when the modern hostel story is generally accepted as commencing. Such changes it will be argued paved the way for a revision of the function and practices of the probation role in how it defined and worked with its traditional 'client' group and how it understood its relationship to the state. The context provided in this chapter will run up to and including 2001, i.e. just prior to the commencement of the ethnographic research (chapters six and eight). Chapter seven will provide an overview of developments taking place during and between the two phases of fieldwork

Chapter Four will act as a literature review of the 'accepted hostel story' i.e. from 1969 through to 2001. The roles and functions they performed in this period will be explored. It will be argued that a shift can be detected over this period from a treatment and rehabilitation paradigm towards a public

protection and then an offender management focus and that throughout this period hostels, for the most part sat to the side of wider probation story. Moreover a renewed interest in academic and Home Office research is discernible from 1999 onwards (e.g. Barton 2004, Wincup 1996, 1997 and 2002, Burnett and Eaton 2004, Home Office 2005, HMIP 2007/8).⁷

Chapter Five will provide an overview of the methodologies used in this thesis and the balance developed between conventional literature review, ethnographic study and sociological theorising. The research design and the rationale for two distinct periods of field study will be explored and consideration of how the data was analysed. The potential strengths and weaknesses of the approach will be discussed. The author will provide some discussion of the ethical considerations such research demanded and reflection on the ongoing process of improvement that the novice researcher experiences when undertaking field research and critical theorising. The author will also reflect on the process of this type of research and the relationship between being in the field and being out of the field, reflecting on this experience of being a novice researcher and balancing what and how much could be written about and what is possible and pertinent to write about. It will also be important to highlight that the author was familiar with some of the ethnographic territory being explored but made conscious efforts to stand back from his previous role and the types of thinking that such a role had previously encouraged. Having previously been a part of the probation world, the author will recognise that his reflections and relationships in the field may have been both eased and constricted by this baggage.

Chapter Six and Eight 'Letting Hostels Speak for Themselves' and 'Returning to the Field' will report the findings from two stages of an ethnographic study in two hostels conducted over the period this thesis was completed. One

⁷ At the time of writing up (toward the end of 2007) a further HMIP inspection of hostels is about to take place. The terms of reference for this are; To assess the effectiveness of the contribution of Approved Premises to the management of offenders in the community who pose a high risk of harm to others and to examine the treatment of residents in such establishments. This is due for publication in March / April 2008.

hostel was about to be opened in 2002 the other had been established since at least the 1969 CYPA. The chapters will critically examine the impact of the wider developments in probation on hostel policy and practice at a micro level. This will include consideration of how the developing NOMS agenda may be shaping their role and purpose.

Chapter Seven will explore the wider probation and hostel specific policy and practice context that occurred during and in between the two phases of field research. It will build on the contexts explored in chapter three and consider whether between the end of 2001 and 2007 hostels continued to sit to one side of wider criminal justice policy. This chapter will explore the contemporary policy messages hostels and hostel staff receive about their possible role(s) and purpose(s) and consider whether there is evidence that hostels can still be excluded from or ignored in major policy reviews. It will argue that for a range of reasons, hostels have now come to the attention of policy makers, researchers and the media. It will also highlight some research that was taking place across this period that may be seen as impacting, or having the potential to impact on hostels' development.

Chapter Nine will reconsider where hostels came from, what they have done, what they do now and how they are currently positioned in terms of key policy developments in the criminal justice system. The chapter will consider their possible future(s). It will explore whether the findings of the ethnographic work evidence a shift in hostel purpose and function. It will consider whether the modern hostel remains a rehabilitative mechanism and explore to what extent wider changes in policy and rhetoric have impacted on the modern hostel. Do hostels remain to the side of mainstream probation practice or have they been pushed forward by a current of risk orientated thinking to take a more central place in service which is focused on risk of harm and public protection? Are shifts in clientele, role and regime apparent? Has the current probation tendency towards a focus on risk, dangerousness and risk management (Spencer and Deakin 2004: 215) impacted on hostels' transformative potential?

It will also consider whether possible theoretical implications arise from the findings of this thesis.

The next chapter will begin this research journey and explore the possibility that hostels might have much earlier antecedents than some cotemporary authors suggest (Burnett and Eaton 2004).

An Historical and Theoretical Hinterland

Chapter Two:

This chapter will explore the possibility that hostels have antecedents prior to the 1969 watershed suggested by Burnett and Eaton (2004). It will suggest that hostels do not appear suddenly on the rehabilitative radar and have a longer pre history. This 'hidden' history has in fact always been there to be discovered but to date, has largely been seen as peripheral by those with a wider interest in probations' origins and development (Vanstone 2004, Whitehead and Statham 2005, Crow 2001 and Ostler 1995). However these and others lay a trail that the student of hostels can follow.

As well as contributing to the overall thesis this chapter will provide a theoretical and historical hinterland from which to observe and understand the ethnographic work in later chapters. The chapter will adopt an approach recognised by Barton (2005: 161) as:

'looking backward in order to look forwards'.

It will open to consideration the possibility that the 'guise' that hostels take today, flows from a stream of earlier influences and practices. An exploration of these may be fruitful in constructing and stimulating debate about the role of the hostel today and its possible futures.

Two time frames will be explored in looking for possible evidence of an early hostel story, the period from 1756 to 1906 and from 1907 to 1969. In the former period it will be argued that roots required for a residential rehabilitative practice develop prior to the formal establishment of probation more generally and signal a move away from traditional notions of punishment and transportation prevalent at the start of that period. In the latter period, synchronous to the development of the probation service, it will be argued that hostels develop to the side of an emerging probation service and that there is

evidence of them being considered and used for adults as well as children. This chapter will therefore signpost ideas, institutions and individuals who may be seen as part of a hostels hinterland and focus on providing an outline of a possibly much longer re-integrative story.

Before commencing, it is worth stating why such perspectives may be politically as well as theoretically valuable. Not all are convinced of the possible merits of understanding and critically engaging with probation history.

Wallis (2001: 5) the then director general of the 'New' National Probation Service explicitly stated that she wanted to take probation away from its past wishing to:

'lead the Service against the grain of its past history and traditions'.

This chapter will offer a perspective that suggests that ignoring the past for the sake of being seen to be 'new' may ignore important formative influences that shaped the grain of hostel practice. As Nellis (2007) and Vanstone (2004) suggest the past may offer models and lessons that the modern theorist, policy maker or practitioner can gain insight from. This chapter seeks to balance the close up approach of ethnographic research that will form the contemporary core of this thesis, with an attempt to develop a longer view and potentially broader perspective as to where and how hostels emerged.

This chapter will also critically consider how the hegemony of the rehabilitative ideal (Allen 1981), discernible in the precursors of the modern hostel may in fact hide a range of influences including interests of coercion, social control and the specific promulgation of societal norms e.g. the work ethic. Like Vanstone's (2004) observation on more general probation origins it will be suggested that a range of motives and influences facilitated and influenced the 'birth of the hostel'. In fact hostels may be seen as having their origins in a range of early 'social intervention' practices that current criminal justice genealogies tend to ignore.

The author will conclude by suggesting that there is evidence for a credible pre history, arguing that both adults and children have previously been the focus of 'hostel-like' residential and rehabilitative interventions. Such intervention and practice has been seen as a way of working with 'offenders' for longer than has been traditionally argued. This is not to claim that hostels have in any sense been a major policy instrument in the past but to note that their precursors did exist and were considered by some policy makers and reformers. The chapter will conclude by considering whether a shift is detectable from the formative influences and ideas of specific individuals towards a political interest and influence in their possible use prior to the accepted watershed of the 1969 Children and Young Persons Act.

Evidence of Rehabilitative Precursors

According to the National Association of Probation and Bail Hostels, NAPBH (2002) probation hostels have their discernible origins in the use of residential homes which acted as substitute families for children and young people who were temporarily separated from their families for social reasons or reasons of 'delinquency'.⁸ NAPBH unlike Burnett and Eaton (2004) relate the origins of hostels to the period 1907 – 1935 and links them closely to the development of Reformatory and Industrial Schools in this period. This usefully opens up a line of enquiry clearly predating the 1969 CYPA. However such historical location appears somewhat too convenient. It allows for an immediate link with the 1907 Probation of First Offenders Act and co locates hostels' origins with those of the wider probation service. The author found that this coincidence is but one academically convenient point in the history of hostels where the use of the hostel as a means of intervention by the state or others may be mapped into the criminal justice system.

Probation histories tend to locate the origins of probation with the key male figures of John Augustus and Frederic Rainer (Vanstone 2004) referencing

⁸ In November 2007 NAPBH was re-launched as NAPA (National Association of Approved Premises) see www.NAPA-UK.ORG.

developments to early legislation such as the 1887 First Offenders Bill and the 1907 Probation of Offenders Act. Interestingly Vanstone (2004) does discuss minutes of the London C.E.T.S's (Church of England Temperance Society) Annual Council Meeting in 1889 when a Mission fund was suggested for the purpose of giving grants to match the funds raised by the Diocese for the appointment of police court missionaries. Further exploration of these minutes and a reading of Vanstone's PhD thesis from which his book is developed, revealed reference in the CETS (1889) minutes that the monies referred to above were also being allocated for the:

*'...setting up of Shelter Homes.'*⁹

Ostler (1995) provides one of the few probation history texts with a chapter dedicated to the work of hostels. He too signals earlier origins to the hostel story:

'Some of these hostels had been set up as far back as 1820 when there was a growth in the formation of societies to help offenders on their discharge from prisons...'

Ostler (1995: 101)

Although discussed as a side issue to the development of Probation, Vanstone (2004) and Ostler (1995) lay a trail that suggests a use of residential or semi residential rehabilitation contemporaneous with and possibly pre dating the birth of the modern probation service. The beginnings of this trail led the author to delve further into a search for earlier examples of residential rehabilitative mechanisms. The findings of some of that search are presented in the remainder of this chapter.

From an initial starting point that suggested that there would be a paucity of material predating 1969 the author uncovered a wealth of material too vast to

⁹ Interestingly the Church of England Temperance Society began its life as the Church of England Abstinence Society but one year on with a limited membership reconsidered its core purpose and name!

include in this thesis. Some of this material will now be explored as evidence of early practices that shaped the 'birth of the hostel'.

Early Influences

This section will now explore the possibility of a hostel story predating the traditional probation story. It will suggest that early forerunners of the modern hostel are discernible. They had explicit aims to separate out individuals from their fellow citizens because of their offending or identified risk of offending. There is a clear, if at times mixed, desire to work with specific populations in a broadly residential setting with a concept of regime, clear purpose for intervention and crucially that there is an end goal of integration into society or work. Three examples will be explored from this early period, gathered from a range of research material on, 'training schools' and the related development of 'Sunday schools', 'bonded labour' and 'apprenticeships' The author will suggest that together these informed a new rehabilitative discourse underpinning the development of early hostel like interventions. Some offered accommodation and access to employment, including labour yards offering work and security for discharged prisoners (Kelly 1857, Le Mesurier 1935, Vanstone 2004, Probation Journal, Times Digital Archive). The direct forerunners of hostels and probation homes, industrial and ragged schools, are recognised as having taken many young people out of the prison system (Le Mesurier 1935: 22). The work of some key individuals who developed these will be briefly explored before turning to more recognisable hostel developments.

The author will suggest that there are clear links between these and the later hostel story that will be presented in chapter four. In line with the contemporary history of hostels (Burnett and Eaton: 2004), this section will suggest that hostels have their roots in work with children and young people, as well as adults and that those roots go further and are much earlier than has hitherto been suggested.

'Training Schools' - A Reasonable Starting Point?

Outside of the longer monastic tradition the earliest records of residential rehabilitation that may be seen to have had a focus on the general 'offender' population are to be found in 1756 with the setting up of schools for the children of convicts.¹⁰ This was both the earliest non monastic and non medical reference that the author traced and provides a convenient starting point, over 100 years prior to that of most general probation histories.¹¹

According to Young and Ashton (1956: 163) schools for the children of convicts were set up by the Marine Society in 1756. The society was founded in the same year by Jonas Hanaway, a Philanthropist and member of the Russia Company. The society's stated aims were:

'to encourage poor men and boys of good character to join the navy.'

(The Marine Society A Brief History – 2.10.02)

A detailed reading of the history of the Marine Society reveals that its' focus was not so much on boys of good character but in transforming street urchins and the sons of convicts into boys of good character who might be able to serve King and country. In practice this might mean children found roaming the streets were taken to such schools in order to prevent or stop criminal behaviour. The publicity surrounding such interventions stressed their advantages to the young men. The training was in effect pre-sea training as opposed to training for immediate societal reintegration. However it did offer

¹⁰ Raynor (2005: 33) citing Pugh (1970) and McConville (1981) draw attention to the early use of correctional reformation within the monastery prior to the sixteenth century. Such practices were for the most part based on notion of rehabilitation via isolation and religious practices including fasting and penance. The isolation/ contamination principles behind Bentham's Panopticon and solitary confinement have their roots here.

¹¹ The author felt it important to exclude the development of hospitals, retreats and prisons from this work and to maintain a clear focus on those interventions which could be specifically linked to concerns about criminality and the purpose of reintegrating those individuals into society. The Poor Law of 1558 allowed 'the idle' to be committed to 'houses of correction'... early examples of the criminalisation and institutionalisation of 'the poor' and conflation of these groups are of interest and as will be seen informed some of the early forerunners to hostels.

the promise of paid employment and an acceptable identity in society, two key 'criminogenic factors' that Andrews and Bonta (1990) would recognise.

This early use of residential training 'schools' was developed under the guise of philanthropic motivations i.e. care or concern for the children of convicts, as well as other boys and men. However under the surface of these benign motivations appears a mixture of aims in practice. At an early stage the mixing of motivations, justifications and populations in a residential setting is apparent. These schools appeared to create a setting whose output also met a particular need or function of wider society, in this case providing sailors for a navy (for a specific war). Taking potential trouble makers off the streets, is then nothing new, nor is the offer of transformation via a residential regime. However at this time this was a novel approach and set against a more normative use of physical punishment or imprisonment. At the end of the Seven Years War the Marine Society had recruited 5,451 men and 5,174 boys. The aim of a 'free school in every port' came with an explicit goal of keeping the Navy supplied with 'suitably trained boys.'

www.marine-society.org.uk/history

Such interventions with boys aged mostly 12 to 16 years needs to be seen in the context of the establishment of the penal colonies, practices of transportation and the notion of a dangerous class of criminals who are in need of treatment. Hanaway (1784: 4) described crime as:

'... disease which spreads destruction like pestilence and immorality as an epidemical disorder which diffuses its morbid qualities.'

Hanaway's development of 'training ships' present a convenient starting point from which to begin to develop an understanding of hostels or hostel like mechanisms, not because it is a definitive starting point but because it clearly illustrates the complex nexus from within which non custodial residential interventions with offenders or those deemed at risk of offending, arose in the late 18th Century. His training schools, which were in effect harbour or even

land based, reveal a complex relationship between state, individuals and private companies. The founder of the Marine Society is presented as a philanthropist first and a member of a private company or government linked organisation second.¹² Moreover what was originally premised on a philanthropic discourse soon found itself located within a legislative framework i.e. the 1772 Act. Ignatieff (1981: 53) like Vanstone (2004) cautions against taking philanthropic accounts at face value:

'The idea of authority permeated conceptions of philanthropy in the 1770's. The benevolence of early factory masters and institutional reformers is often interpreted as an effort to introduce an idealized version of rural paternalism into an industrial and institutional context... this meant replacing the indiscriminate almsgiving with a systematic attempt to distinguish between the deserving and undeserving poor.'

Selection of 'residents' for such interventions required the ability to distinguish between cases. It also opened up the possibility of suitable alternative interventions being introduced i.e. might society develop alternative interventions for these young people? The possibility of a rational, deliberate and differential management of individuals on the basis of their diverse needs and in line with a degree of moral culpability that could be attached to an individual's 'condition', has roots that predate probations' official history. It is possible to detect here the early origins of an interventions 'science' being put forward as justification for practices that may have had multiple or hidden ends.

Relationships between the individual 'offenders' and other citizens, even other inmates in a prison were understood by Hanaway to be key to enabling change. Lack of social interaction via solitary confinement was considered the ultimate non physical censure but also the most humane (in comparison with the alternative harsh physical punishments or deportation / exile orders that were common at that time). Citing Offray de la Mettrie he states:

¹² Perhaps an early example of a public private partnership?

'He who torments mankind becomes his own tormentor.'

Hanaway (1776: 141)

Later chapters will consider the extent to which modern hostel regimes promote social interaction both within the hostel and between the hostel and the wider community. Social isolation was recognised by Hanaway and others as counterproductive to change focussed practices. There was an early recognition of the dual concern that individuals could harm society and that society's interventions could harm offenders. Hanaway's schools sought to temporarily protect society from those at risk of offending and in the meantime provide them with a purposeful training and career that would eventually lead to their reintegration into society as individuals with a trade and income. The usual training period was two years with a job offer on a ship at the end.

Early Staffing Models

The early staffing of training schools included *'A superintendent assisted by a Mate, School Master, Boatswain and Cook'* (Kelly 1857: xx).¹³ The training institution sought to provide tuition in the social structures and practice to which the resident / trainee would progress. Staff were quite specific role models for future employment. However the immediate benefit of such labour was to be as much for the institution as the individual. Residents could be promoted through the system to different roles.

The Beatty, the first 'training ship' in 1786 took onboard 30 boys. All male staffing of such enterprises has been questioned by authors such as Seth Koven (see Parker 1992) for the potential risk it put children at from abuse and for the lack of scrutiny of male philanthropists who could easily capture vulnerable young boys. The question of separation and the potential

¹³ Quarterly Record of the Progress of Reformatory Schools and Prison Discipline (pagination refers to pages after page 1280. pi to pxxxvi.)

vulnerability of populations will be explored later in this and subsequent chapters. However Koven's concerns should not undermine the very real difference that humanitarian interventions could make for the individual, as an alternative to prison, physical punishment, the poor house or transportation. Such practices had tangible benefits for the wider community in terms of producing normative productive members of society often engaged in work or labour that might otherwise be difficult to fill. They also created a temporary space between those at risk of offending and wider society whilst meaningfully engaging the individual in work which had benefits for them too. Watson (1896) highlights government concern to measure the efficacy of the ragged and industrial schools that grew from these.

These early schools and training ships had clear and explicit requirements for a hierarchical staffing structure associated with particular functions of the 'ship'. This hierarchy had the dual aim of replicating authority structures in society and creating a structure for moving trainees on in a way that prepares them to accept and engage with such authority. Early concern with crime prevention and loss of respect for authority can be seen in Fielding's (1751) work. Hanaway complemented Fielding's approach to new 'policing' (Dodsworth 2007) methods by focussing on what to do with offenders or potential offenders, introducing the possibility of intervention as opposed to a focus on detection and punishment.

Some 100 years after Hanaway began sea training ships, evidence of a range of 'training schools' in Scotland, England, America and Ireland can be found (Kelly 1857 Smith et al 2004) that maintained the semi familial and hierarchical staffing structures. Sea training was retained but agricultural training (Kelly 1857: x), became popular too. The general staffing structure and aim of reintegration through employment and training remained present, Kelly notes Carpenter's work which extended such interventions to girls in Bristol.

Before proceeding to look at reformatory practice which began to build on the linking of rehabilitative training and labour as responses to crime and poverty

in the 19th century, it is important to briefly note two emerging themes that shaped the development of reformatory interventions. The targeting of specific populations by reformers and the existence of 'public concern' about those at risk of offending. These themes are not new and can be seen in 18th century attention to young people in cities. One example of this will be explored below.

'Troublesome Youth'

Concern about 'troublesome youth' and what to do with them is not the preserve of the post-modern society. Although not an example of residential work Sunday Schools and their influences are important to briefly consider in developing a broader context for the examples that will be explored in the second half of this chapter. Moreover, they provide another early example of 'public concern' about those at risk of offending and the early targeting of specific populations that are perceived as problematic.

'In 1781 the Sunday School was first founded by Robert Raikes of Gloucester...'

Carpenter (1968: 111)

The Sunday School movement came into being some 25 years on from the aforementioned development of Hanaway's sailing schools. Their origins appear to owe less to the divine or holy nature of the Sabbath and more to the fact that it was the only day of the week when multitudes of children who otherwise worked in factories, pits or as apprentices were free. Raikes in a letter to Colonel Townley in 1783 quotes a woman in the street (op.cit: 111):

*'Ah Sir...could you take a view of this part of town on a Sunday, you would be shocked indeed: for the street is filled with multitudes of these wretches, who released on that day from employment, spend their time in noise and riot...'*¹⁴

The guise of religious instruction i.e. the Sunday School could be understood as having been used as a means of social control of a juvenile workforce by predominantly male members of the adult middle and upper classes. Women like Carpenter (1807-1877) ran such 'schools' and developed experience in managing the 'unruly classes'. Local factory owners benefited from the control of young people by such organisations, e.g. they were less likely to be drunk, cause problems for the middle classes (factories pulled in large numbers of young workers to city centres), were less likely to appear in court and were more likely to turn up for work on a Monday.

How some groups use their free time, where they go and in what numbers appears as an early concern for reformers. Instruction (initially religious) may be presented as both lessening the risks such groups present and be a more hidden mechanism or means of temporarily removing them from sites of risk or structuring their use of 'free time'. Chapters six and eight will consider to what extent the modern hostel may be seen as performing such a function.

Apprenticeships and Bonded Labour

Within a similar context of industrialisation and a perception of 'troublesome youth' a process of separation and reformation through work and training can be discerned in the development of 'houses of refuge' across the Atlantic some forty four years on from Raikes' first Sunday School and almost seventy years after the first training ships. Young and Ashton (1956: 156) identify these as:

'places where young people are apprenticed to masters.'

¹⁴ The motivation behind Raikes' Sunday Schools' appears to mirror almost perennial concerns about young people as being at risk of crime and large numbers of young people in public spaces being perceived as 'risky'.

Schlossman (in Morris and Rothman: 327) cites the New York House of Refuge which opened on the first of January 1825 as '...the first of the early reform schools' and links their development to the 1788 development of the London Philanthropic Society founded for the prevention of crimes and for reform among the poor. The shift from being apprenticed to a particular individual 'master' or employer to a hostel like approach is detectable here. He notes that...

*'by the time Grimscom visited the society in 1818 its institutions had begun to accept juvenile offenders.'*¹⁵

A transatlantic cross fertilisation of ideas about how to respond to criminality and poverty has a lengthier pedigree than some modern probation histories and criminal justice policy research might suggest (Jones and Newburn 2007, Tonry 2001). Residential work in hostel like settings is part of that longer history. These Trans Atlantic developments were in a context where slavery still existed and the delineation between paid work, servitude and other forms of bonded labour was unclear. Montgomery (1991: 181) states that:

'... a few years after the census of 1850 had been recorded, the number of wage earners ten years of age and older for the first time surpassed the number of slaves over ten years of age.'

The gradual demise of slavery and its labour may have assisted employers to see offenders as a potential asset or resource. Prior to this demise such a vision was mostly individual and not linked to general court practices. Apprenticeships as a form of rehabilitation for young people and adults owed as much to labour requirements as any wish to engage in humanitarian rehabilitation. Such apprenticeships were in evidence in both the UK and USA. Theorists of hostels may wish to bear in mind the impact of wider social contexts as relationships between stated purposes, market needs and social

¹⁵ John Grimscom was a Quaker Teacher and Philanthropist and member of the New York Society for the Prevention of Pauperism.

contexts are often intertwined. Melossi and Pavarini (1981: 38) draw attention to the relationship between punishment and social structure suggesting that in 18th and 19th Century workhouses:

'the work was usually pointless, having no real importance, being designed for the needs of discipline and training than for profitability'

However we will see below that some early forms of bonded labour as alternatives to custody did not see profitability and punishment as motives which were mutually exclusive.

Providing an historical context to the development of rehabilitative practices may enable a broader understanding of what residential rehabilitation might mean today. Examples explored make explicit that a range of relationships can be detected between those who sanction rehabilitation (courts, government and society), those who engage in rehabilitative practices and those who may profit from them. Raynor and Robinson (2005: 14) have recently reminded academics and practitioners that:

'...we cannot necessarily assume that those who contribute to discussions about the merits and problems associated with offender rehabilitation share the same understanding or vision of the 'rehabilitative enterprise'.

Differential understanding impacts on how policy makers, theorists and practitioners have ascribed the boundaries that should be placed upon the social agency of those whom hostels capture and as to the interventions that are perceived as beneficial to the individual or society. As Raynor and Robinson (2005: 160) note:

'the ideas that exercise a political hegemony at any particular time are not necessarily the same as those which inform the actions of practitioners.'

Making sense of bonded labour, houses of refuge and apprenticeships as forerunners to hostels requires an acknowledgement of the differential

citizenship that existed in the 18th and 19th centuries. Montgomery (1991: 182) draws attention to the differential citizenship status of individuals with regards to their rights, freedoms and social membership. Full citizenship with voting rights could be denied on the basis of race, gender, non-ownership of property or land and being bonded as a worker. Montgomery (1991: 188) draws attention to the dynamic between freedom, work and citizenship:

'Hand-in-hand with the right to vote came destruction of legal sanctions binding a worker to a particular employer'

and goes on to note that at the same time in Great Britain

'Parliament was considering amendments to the British master-and-servant law, the American iron manufacturer Abram Hewitt asserted, "I have never known a master to go to court" to force a worker back to a job he or she had quit. He considered enactment by a state legislature of a law allowing such action both politically impossible and "very undesirable."

Labour in the community as opposed to in the penitentiary or colonies opened up the possibility of a more visible transformation of offenders to citizens.

Social structures and contexts appear to have had a determining relationship on the form and content of historically specific rehabilitative mechanisms.¹⁶ Appendix 2.1 provides an example of a 19th Century Court Order from the State of Pennsylvania for the capture of anyone escaping from such an apprenticeship. The similarities between this and slave warrants denotes the extent to which loss of freedom and citizenship were part of an 'offender' identity. Whilst depriving of liberty such apprenticeships developed the notion

¹⁶ Developing an historical overview of rehabilitative practices allows the past to be understood from the context and meanings of the present with the possibility of critical hindsight. An exploration of hostels' modern purposes and practice is in part overshadowed by contemporary contexts and social structures which are experienced as normative. Both recognising and overemphasising changes experienced within current contexts may require the distance and lens of history to place their significance in context. History provides regular examples (Allen 1981) of those who would claim that definitive shifts are occurring.

of punishment in the community via labour as opposed to punishment in the penitentiary.

Practices which may be seen as degrading and inhumane to the rest of the population can be reconstructed as both beneficial and warranted if the 'offender' is seen as standing outside of the rest of society but potentially benefiting from such practice or that practices result in a resource for society. Interventions that offer a benefit to society or at least to parts of society may offer 'offenders' an opportunity to literally 'work off' their offending identities.

Appendix 2.1 suggests that jurisdictions which granted such apprenticeships were keen to have the responsibility and right to have 'offenders' returned to them should the terms of their rehabilitation be broken. Such offenders were seen as an asset to the community or private 'master' because of the labour they could provide. Employment, albeit forced employment, was seen as simultaneously both punishment and rehabilitation often with a strong element of direct reparation or labour involved.¹⁷ The 19th Century was not concerned with justifying enforced labour, ratified via the courts. What apprenticeships and bonded labour introduced was a new possibility that labour may be seen as rehabilitative as well as punitive. Those offenders who cannot be constructed as potential assets to the community may find differential understandings of rehabilitative policies and practices applied to them. It will be important to consider in later chapters whether hostels' modern purposes and practices entail a differential scope to rehabilitative practices with those offenders society may be less able to construct as a potential asset.

Child Labour and Recognisance as an Alternative to Custody.

In 1841 in England Matthew Davenport Hill, a Recorder in the Birmingham Courts established a register of men who could take children from court for work instead of sending them to custody, Young and Ashton (1956: 173), note

¹⁷ Extremes of this philosophy have been used to justify or mask inhumane and degrading treatment in the 20th Century 'Arbeicht Mein Fre' welcomed the 'residents of Auschwitz' the irony being that no matter how hard they worked the aim was never to free them or see them as equals. Transformative projects require scrutiny of their rationale and reality.

the ability of men to separate out and select predominantly young boys. This was at a time when convicted children were still being transported from Parkhurst to the British Colonies.

Hill released juveniles to the care of guardians who had to sign for them and the parents if present had to sign away their rights over their children. Vanstone and Raynor highlight this and Edward Cox's (1887) practice of 'recognisance' for adults as well as children, as early precursors to the general probation system stressing that as far as one can discern this did entail:

'releasing people in order for them to prove their good intentions'

Vanstone and Raynor (2002: 13)

However the space within which such proving took place inevitably entailed an enforcement of the will of others over them. That is release was conditional, contingent and did not entail free social agency. Discharge could be to:

'a place, or a refuge, or a charitable institution or some charitable person...'

Cox (1887: 47)

These practices can be seen as forerunners of both probation and probation with conditions of residence which will be discussed later in this chapter and which can be seen as direct influences on the development of hostels.¹⁸

It is of note that 'the sentences' devised by Hill and Cox were not a formal part of the criminal justice system or legislation at that time. Populations who are at odds with the law may find themselves prey to the interests, vested or morally respectable, of individuals and companies who would otherwise have

¹⁸ Probation with a condition of residence was formalised in law in the 1907 Probation of Offenders Act section 2.2.

no power or sanction in their lives and whose actions might otherwise appear questionable.¹⁹

Children for example could be lodged with their 'guardian' either in their home or in lodgings linked to the place of work or trade. Work and accommodation were often tied to each other as much to the benefit of the owner as the labourer.²⁰ The medieval principle of 'parens patrie' may have been the forerunner and underpinning rationale for this.²¹

These may be seen as a forerunner of the shelter homes, labour yards and hostels (Moore 1921, Le Mesurier 1935, Forsythe et al 2000, Barton 2005, Home Office 2007) that developed prior to and then synchronously with the more general probation story. More recently Raynor and Robinson (2005: 32) have highlighted the roots of offender reform or correction as overlapping with the period suggested above. A period described as:

'... a key turning point in thinking about how best to deal with offenders. In both the work of Foucault (1977) and Ignatieff (1978) the period between 1775 and 1850 is highlighted as inaugurating the reform or 'correction' of offenders as a legitimate and practicable penal reform.'

This thesis argues that from 1756 a movement and interest around the use of interventions with offenders that is neither custody nor freedom in the community can be traced. The concept of 'treatment' halfway (Perlstein and Phillips 1975) between a total institution and the community was emerging against an 18th century treatment paradigm that had held separation and the cordon sanitaire as key to minimising the potential spread of both disease and crime. Sending criminal children to lodge with 'guardians', putting children and young men at risk of crime in local training schools and apprenticing offenders

¹⁹ This may be of interest when considering the possible role of the private and voluntary sector in the running of hostels.

²⁰ This was true for more generic 'philanthropic' endeavours such as the work of Robert Owen, who developed the Mills at New Lanark, ensured that the workers spent their wages in his shops, renting his houses and using his tailors, cloth and hardware!

²¹ Parens Patrie – the right of the State / Crown to intervene in families in the interest of children.

to local employers marks a steady shift away from seeing offenders as best treated apart from society. These shifts have to be seen as significant moves at a time when transportation (the penal colonies) and public physical and capital punishment saw humane imprisonment as a moral and practical alternative to harsh practices. That these were the norm can be seen from the preface to the 1948 Criminal Justice Act. Poor prison conditions and physical hardship were commonplace (Ignatieff 1978: 207-209).

Attempts to push against these norms can be seen in the work of John Howard (1726 -1790), Elisabeth Fry (1780 -1845) and the Howard Association who worked for the improved conditions and treatment of prisoners. Towards the end of the 19th Century Herbert Gladstone (1895) (cited in Raynor and Robinson 2005: 47) was supporting notions of rehabilitation linked to moral improvement. The status of institutions as primarily places of punishment had begun to be questioned by government and reform could now appear as a legitimate aim of penal policy.

Hostel like developments are worthy of attention as they offer a non custodial paradigm, focussing not only on more humane treatment but recognition of the offender as a potentially useful citizen. Without such recognition, re-integrative discourses can too easily be curtailed. Thus far we can see that a range of hostel like strategies were possible. Containment, separation, isolation and punishment now had alternatives. It remains to be seen how far and for whom government would take forward these, hostel like, alternatives. The author will return in the ethnographic work and conclusion to Barton's (2005: 37) caution against an uncritical acceptance of reformist alternatives to custody necessarily being a good thing. She critically appraises the development of notions of supervision, highlighting the gendered practices this could entail.

'The concept of reform (like the twentieth century concept of rehabilitation) is rooted in the notion that the individual requiring such treatment is suffering from some fundamental weakness of deficiency and this can only be remedied through external help...,hence the concept of supervision.'

She goes on to point out that,

'the situation for women in probation hostels can sometimes be more difficult than for those in prisons...'

Barton (2005: 32)

The developing concept and practice of labour as treatment (as well as punishment) coupled with the use of accommodation and training in the community, appears to have focussed attention on the possibility of new interventions with mostly young people and discharged prisoners. These new interventions it will be argued shaped the discourses, clientele and practices that the modern hostel story emerged from.²² These developments built on the use of bonded labour, training schools and apprenticeships. The next section will explore some of the less formal and individual approaches that came before and arguably led to interest and formal recognition by government that hostel like interventions might be used with certain groups of offenders.

Ragged Schools, Industrial Schools and Reformatories

In 1846 only some five years after the commencement of Hill's establishment of apprenticed labour as an alternative to custody Mary Carpenter (1807 - 1877) established a school for ragged children in the slums of Bristol. Carpenter (1968: 117) felt that John Pounds a poor shoemaker of Portsmouth who died in 1839 aged 72:

'...deserved to be remembered as the first originator of 'ragged schools' ... he tempted children to his school with food.'

²² Barton (2005) provides a clear history of the development of hostels for women and argues that the framework for this stretches over 200 years (p32).

Pounds was a disabled cobbler who with his nephew, ended up taking in as many as forty children at a time. Carpenter notes that Pounds provided, book learning, a trade (cobbler), food, clothes and sports for exercise. Although Pound's effort was individual we can see here both the early seeds of some kind of formal regime and the retention of young people within the community who might otherwise have gone to prison.²³ Albeit one would presume that his cobblers business grew with such an injection of labour. It remains to be seen whether the modern hostel can be seen to provide such a range of interventions with their residents.

Carpenter's schools were constructed around an ideology of certain young people being 'moral orphans' (see Young and Ashton 1967: 169) and developed the discourse of the transformative potential of labour linked to accommodation and support.²⁴ However unlike 'apprenticeship' or 'bonded labour' this development included staff support, an intervention which has been recognised as an early form of social work input. Bosanquet refers to these developments in 'Social Work in London' (1914: 58-59). The link between Sunday Schools and Ragged Schools is commented on by Carpenter (1968: 111). Their development has to be understood against a social context which continued to problematise the presence of young people in cities and the moral panics which surrounded them (Cohen 1972). Ferguson (2007) has argued that such institutions could be abusive as well as transformative and that harsh treatment ran alongside gendered regimes.

'... Another point which greatly exercised the public mind was the number of criminal and 'roughs' by whom it was believed London was infested.'

Bosanquet (1914: 3)

That is concerns about risk from a particular group drove the developments of these interventions. Who hostels capture may turn out to be more influenced

²³ Including 'book learning' as opposed to just on the job training would have been unique at this time and begins to establish the separate role of education in rehabilitation.

²⁴ The role of 'moral deficits' appears live and well in modern criminological and rehabilitative theories - see Palmer (2003) and Hudson (1981).

by the concerns of the time than any rational policy making approach. Carpenter introduced an early bifurcation in policy and practice between the 'perishing' and the 'dangerous' (Carpenter 1968: 2).

Discipline, Work and 'Education'

By the end of the nineteenth Century education as a 'criminogenic' factor had been added to the reform strategy. Carpenter (1968: 228) details early experiments in developing 'Industrial Schools' aimed at *'these young pests of society'*:

'On the 1st of October 1841, a dozen scholars were brought in by the police, and informed that they would be fed and taught and allowed to depart when they pleased provided they did not resort to begging. The School was opened for "the children of the poorest classes, and chiefly those found on to infest the streets, begging and stealing;"... the immediate effect of opening the School was greatly to diminish petty offences and juvenile delinquency.'

Although not necessarily a long term success (ibid: 227) attempts were made to formalise the approach, giving one example from Aberdeen when:

'...instructions were communicated to the police on the 19th of May 1845 to convey every child found begging to the premises provided for this school. In the course of the day 75 were collected, of whom only four could read!'

(ibid: 229)

Such interventions were with mixed and at times undifferentiated populations of the homeless, vagrant, begging, petty criminal and those deemed at risk of offending. Carpenter (1968) notes the potential use of the schools as an alternative to a custodial sentence (1968: 255), their desirability as places to release people to from prison (ibid: 252) and as rescuing people from vagrancy and crime (ibid: 259). As we shall see in a review of hostels' more

recent history in chapter four these foci appear in more recent considerations as to who and what a hostel might be for (Rolph 1971).

Carpenter's rehabilitative 'benevolence' founded in the context of the 1845 Poor Law Act, was seen as of financial benefit to society. She notes that during 1845 in Aberdeen alone 1,750 people were on the pauper's register in the district. She highlights the reduction in costs to the parish that industrial schools brought noting a drop in expenditure from £406.14s in 1844 to £251.7s .11d in 1850:

'Now though in the absence of further data , it would be unsafe to affirm that this wonderful diminution in the number of paupers was , and in the amount of monthly payments, is solely to the establishment of Industrial Schools; yet as we do not hear of such decrease in other quarters, during the same period.... We are justified in the assertion that the industrial Schools have not increased pauperism, but have most probably diminished it.'

Carpenter (1851: 236-237)

Modern rehabilitative practices may learn from Carpenter's ability to publicise the economic benefit of work with marginalised groups for the rest of society.

Carpenter's book 'Reformatory Schools for the Children of the Perishing and Dangerous Classes and for Juvenile Offenders' became part of an established body of literature to which Bosanquet (1914) refers. Carpenter (1968: 226) addresses head on the challenge of dealing with those who are offenders and cites the 'Aberdeen Juvenile Vagrant and Industrial School' as an example of this. She notes (ibid: 211) plans of the Philanthropic Society:

'to take all children from 10 to 15 years of age found repeatedly begging or stealing, and give them a brief training in 'some house of occupations'...'

but then deport them to the colonies. Some early reformers did not share the re-integrative vision of Carpenter, being more informed by prevailing practices

of deportation than by emerging notions of integration. Carpenter advocated a condition of residence at an industrial school as a disposal of the court (ibid: 255) as an alternative to custody. Carpenter's rehabilitative optimism is clear:

'.. as a general rule, all children, however apparently vicious and degraded, are capable of being made useful members of society...if placed under right influences, and subjected to judicious control and training.'

Carpenter (1968: 347-348)

The author asserts that this coupled with her call for 'legislative enactments' (ibid: 349) to enable residence in 'reformatory penal schools' as opposed to prison, forms a clear basis for the principles and practice of probation hostels.

Interestingly Carpenter did suggest a separate focus for interventions with boys and girls with not only segregation between the sexes, but differences in the rehabilitative aims that should be pursued (Carpenter: 1968) Boys – Independent and Enterprising Life. Girls – Home, Domestic Service or Motherhood.

Barton (2005: 46) notes the gap between differential and apparently empathetic approaches to women in reforming institutions and the 'hidden penal' aspects of such regimes. The ethnographic research will explore whether the issue of separate or integrated interventions on the basis of gender remains an issue for modern hostel practice. It will consider the possibility of a hidden penalty, within discourses of rehabilitation and resettlement.

An Alternative Approach

In setting out influences on hostels' developments it is important to briefly highlight that there were practices which moved away from the institution, even the half way house and moved intervention and discourse firmly into community provision of accommodation and away from the traditional hostel

like domain.²⁵ They provide an insight into early casework type relationships predating the work of Biesteck (1961). Such practices can be seen to have influenced the development of early Probation and Social Work. They offer alternative considerations as to how hostels transformative and re integrative aims, including support and supervision may be provided in the community. Hill's work has largely been ignored in 'malestream' accounts of probation history.

Octavia Hill (1838-1912) grew up helping her middle class mother teach children in a ragged school to make dolls furniture. This was in effect part of wider Christian cooperative set up to provide work and shelter for unskilled women and girls. By the age of 14 she was appointed to manage a group of children from a ragged school (Whelan 1998).

Hill is of interest to the hostel story because of her rehabilitative aims and the way she sought to achieve these. She initially set about providing private model lodging houses for the poor, aiming to bring people to better conditions, but facing opposition from local landlords, home owners and neighbours she ended up buying three tenements bringing reformation to the 'community'. The properties she bought up were:

'bursting at the seams with roughs and rowdies.'

Whelan (1998: 5)

As a founder member of the Charity Organisation Society, (Bosanquet 1914) and a co-founder of the National Trust, she was opposed to state welfare and believed that the potential and self sufficiency of the individual were key to their taking responsibility for themselves. Belief in the importance of engaging the social agency of individuals in the change process (Maruna 2000, Robinson 2001, Palmer 2003) is not new and has roots traceable in this earlier approach.

²⁵ Modern Housing Associations providing supported and sheltered accommodation have their origins in this work .See Whelan (1998).

She refused to give money or allow tenants to run up rent arrears developing:

'an approach to helping the poor which was based on befriending and advising them , without free gifts, whilst at the same time striving to bring rich and poor together...'

Whelan (1998: 4)

Probation historians will recognise here some of the early aims of the probation service, to advise, assist and befriend. Her aim was to improve both the tenants and the tenements. In her address to the Royal Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes on the 9th of May 1884 she shared her methods of intervention:

'The difficulty with these people is not financial, but moral; and, therefore, I know nothing for them but some individual power and watchfulness. They must be trained... You have a destructive drunken man, whom neither Sir Sydney Waterlow's, nor any other society , would take into their building at all, for he will not conform to the rules; the only way I know of getting hold of him is buying up the house in which he is, exactly as it is , and making him profit by his own care...I say to them ' You must either do better or you must leave; which is it to be?'

Cited in Whelan (1998: 6)

As well as reinforcing the discourse of 'training' there is explicit recognition that compliance with rules in an institutional or hostel type intervention may be problematic for some and that engaging individuals in their own change is key. This landlord tenant relationship was an enforced one though and one in which the tenant had no choice but to enter into, or leave. A power relationship with threat of the street or prison has been part of the rehabilitative process from its earliest days.

Hill promoted personal hygiene, sobriety, thrift and saving. Social activities, education and employment were encouraged, trips out, shows and a full range of social activities were promoted, with a final aim that they

'..might render themselves independent of me, except as a friend and leader'.

Cited in Whelan (1998: 7)

Here we see the emerging development of a holistic practice, not just employment or skills based in its focus, but recognising the potential to connect individuals to wider society. It echoes Pound's and Carpenter's earlier work. Modern hostel managers may be interested to explore Whelan's (1998) résumé of Hill's system, rules and commitment to residents. By the time of her death in 1912 she is estimated to have been managing some 1,800 properties housing around 10,000 people, an endeavour larger than the current hostel estate! Hill (Young and Ashton 1967: 220) saw her enterprises as opportunities to make a profit. Rehabilitation was as a potential source of income generation and did not necessarily entail a cost to the state. Both tenant and landlord were seen as beneficiaries.

It is important to note that the early history of residential rehabilitation in the community discloses tensions between 'house' or 'cottage' style approaches and the larger scale institution. In America this debate was known as 'cottage' versus 'congregate'. The impact and success of the 'small scale' approach typified by Octavia Hill was in direct contrast to the planners and grand theorist who wanted to engineer new mass solutions. Hill's system of transformation may hold lessons for modern planners of a 'hostel estate' in terms of both scale and management. The use of friends or associates to manage a limited number of properties, as part of a much larger reformatory enterprise, hints at the importance of a key role for those managing such projects being in regular contact with residents and for residents the potential successful influence of an ongoing one to one relationship with an identifiable individual who provides a mixture of support, boundaries and sanction. Whelan (1998: 30) notes that Hill:

'... warned that, if ...projects became too large... then the tenants would become unmanageable as they would no longer be treated as individuals with their own needs and circumstances.'

Recognition of the importance of a one to one relationship with a key or named worker predates the work of CETS and early Probation. Later chapters will consider the extent to which modern hostels make use of this approach. Hill offered a more supervisory and less familial model than Carpenter.

A More Familiar Story 1907 – 1969

Having demonstrated that there is evidence of residential rehabilitative practices predating the probation story, the remainder of this chapter will now explore developments that may be seen to have arisen from and or were influenced by these. It will also clearly demonstrate that hostels existed and that their story, whilst it may sit to the side of the traditional probation story, runs alongside it and did not suddenly appear in 1969.

The early police court missionary was tasked with interviewing drunks and presenting a plan to the courts that would attempt to put *'the offender on the straight and narrow'* Osler (1995: 15). Probation histories tend to suggest that early understandings of criminal causality were often linked to notions of vice and sin (Vanstone 2004). The probation officer role and probation practice was explicitly concerned with securing the individual's moral well being. This early role was in part influenced by a biblical Christian tradition. Offending could be constructed as a 'temporary' fall from grace. Restoration requires a new relationship with authority and acceptance of responsibility within the society. The 1907 Probation of Offenders Act was premised on the efficacy of the offender being, advised, assisted and befriended by someone and assisted in finding employment (ibid, Section: 4d). Moral leadership and guidance were linked to practical and specific aims.

The probation officer as moral lead (more latterly pro social influence) resonates with the work of Hill and Carpenter. The gradual development from reformatory and industrial schools to hostel and the clarification of the different aims and populations can be seen in the 1913 Report of the Departmental Committee on Reformatory and Industrial Schools:

'The broad distinction between these two types of school is that young offenders sent to the reformatory schools must have been convicted of offences punishable in the case of adults with imprisonment or penal servitude, but have not been found begging, or with bad parents, with no home residing in a disorderly house...'

BOPCRIS (Abstract of Report: 1).

So distinctions between 'care' and 'punishment' informed interventions pre - dating the 1969 CYPA. It is of note that a 'child' could be sent to reformatory from the age of 12 and remain until 19 years of age but those sent to industrial school must be 14 and must leave at 16 years of age. Implicit in the work of this and other committees was the suggestion that the ragged and industrial school approach needed to fit and keep up to date with developments in criminal justice legislation which increasingly differentiated between those in need and not breaking the law and those who are in need but were also 'offenders'.

The use of hostels as a possible means to provide offenders with a moral lead can be seen in the 1914 Criminal Justice Administration Act, which formalised the practice of establishing the provision for a residence requirement in a Probation Order. The 1928 Report of the Care of Children Committee, notes 700 children residing in approved probation homes and hostels out of a total of 124,000 children being provided for by the Home Office (another 200,000 were thought to be in private care arrangements). Barton (2005: 56) notes that probation made widespread use of the homes and refuges run by private and charitable organisations. In 1928 this private and charitable sector accommodated over 40,000 children (1928, BOPCRIS, p1). Despite later claims that Probation lost a significant part of its caseload as a result of the

1969 CYPA, this provides a context that demonstrates that the voluntary and charitable sector actually provided the vast majority of residential facilities to under 18 year olds.

Although not a major policy tool in this period, it will be argued that at various points it was suggested that hostels could be. It is clear that hostels did exist and in the early part of this period a range of influences, increasingly more political than individual, began to shape the movement of hostels from the focus on predominantly children and young people towards adult offenders long before the 1969 CYPA. Four factors are identified here as appearing to have shaped the context within which hostels emerged, by the end of this period, as a possible policy tool within the criminal justice system.

- a) A rise in the adult prison population
- b) Concerns about specific social problems including homelessness and alcohol abuse
- c) Concerns about reintegrating those who have been in custody and may either be institutionalised and/or pose a risk or re-offending.
- d) A growing realisation that casework alone could not deal with offenders' accommodation and support needs.

It will be suggested that public response to and 'communities' rejection or resistance to plans for adult hostels is nothing new.

An Early Probation Home

The 1914 Criminal Justice and Administration Act formalised inclusion of conditions of residence within a Probation Order. This would appear to have been followed by a growth of and interest in probation homes, of which Robin House is but one example.

Robin House in Croydon (Moore 1921), appears as one of the early recorded hostel like ventures existing within 14 years of the Probation of Offenders

Act.²⁶ Remanded or sentenced young people were held at Robin House whilst a place was found for them at a Reformatory or Industrial School.

Moore (1921) details the impact of two children 'boy burglars' escaping and re-offending from a makeshift 'home' and his attempts to secure and develop hostel like accommodation in the area. Eventually he secured commitment from relevant authorities to purchase a large house approved and inspected by the Home Office. The house is probably one of the first formally approved by the Home Office for remand and detention purposes and eventually as a short term 'industrial school'.

The house was run by a 'superintendent' and a 'matron'. Moore (1921) details one boy attending the local school from the 'hostel' and the complaints from the community about this. To counter this early experience of community resistance to reintegration the home established a tour for locals of the premises and put on talks by the hostel superintendent to provide reassurance.

In this model the superintendent 'Brown' and matron lived there with their daughter.

'How are the naughty boys, some of them even little thieves, too - converted into 'Brown's Angels'? Well that is Superintendent Brown's Secret. Personally I think it is contact with a really good man (and a kindly though strict man) and a motherly, good woman the Matron for probably the first time in their lives.'

Moore (1921: 280)

The extent to which residential support is of long term effect was an early consideration for staff of such hostels. Moore notes concern as to what happens to those when they finish there and return to homes that are inadequate. He suggested plans to have a 'club' that the boys can return to

²⁶ Cole, H. A (1963, p127) cites Hornby Boys Home in Liverpool as being the first to receive full approval as a probation hostel in August 1927.

one or two nights a week. This evening group or support work can be seen as recognition that for many residents return to the community entailed a return to adverse life circumstances. Croker-King (1969) sees this part of the probation home as an important part of the wider 'control setting' (Croker-King 1915, Le Mesurier 1935, Vanstone 2003, Vanstone 2004). Later chapters will consider whether such concerns remain and how they might be addressed.

Policy Developments

The probation homes that emerged from the 1914 Act were intended to accommodate young offenders and were managed by voluntary associations with government support. This by and large reflected the mutual relationship between government and hostels up to this point. However in 1927 a departmental committee (Report of the Departmental Committee on the Treatment of Young Offenders) recommended that:

- Their provision should be extended
- The Home Office should approve and inspect them
- They should receive a grant from local public funds.

The policy outcome of that committee can be seen in the 1928 Circular to Justices issued in July 1928 and reproduced in Le Mesurier (1935: 319-328) that explicitly sought to reduce the use of custody particularly for 16 - 21 year olds.

'The Home Secretary....wishes to express an earnest hope that every Court before committing a young offender to prison will satisfy itself that this course is inevitable and no other method of treatment can properly be employed.'

Home Office Circular 20th of July 1928 - Le Mesurier (1935: 320)

The circular goes on to mention a range of alternatives including, 'the use of hostels' which is seen as particularly effective as it:

'...provides them with a good home, regular meals and supervision during the hours of leisure. The system has been tested in one or two towns and has produced successful results. Residence in such a hostel can be made a condition of recognizance when the young offender is placed on probation.'

Home Office Circular 20th of July 1928 - Le Mesurier (1935: 322)

Attempts to shift court perceptions of probation as a disposal for children and not adults are challenged in this circular and strong and clear messages are provided that government wants the courts to make greater use of probation in general for adult offenders and not just first offenders as the 1887 Act (repealed by the 1907 Act) had allowed.

'... in some places the services and uses of the probation officers are seldom or ever used for older offenders...this is a misconception. While probation may be a valuable way of dealing with children who have reasonably good homes and do not need training in residential school, it is equally valuable in proper cases for lads and girls who have been at work for some years and for adult offenders'.

Home Office Circular 20th of July 1928- Le Mesurier (1935: 327)

A desire by government to increase the use of hostels as a sentencing avenue for the courts as an alternative to custody is evidenced in this 1928 guidance to Justices. A movement by policy makers towards a greater use of non custodial options for adults may have been influenced by some of the literature and debates of the day.

Sidney and Beatrice Webb (1922) *English Prisons Under Local Government* critically explored the impact of prison on offenders as demoralising and dangerous. Hobhouse and Brockway (1923) *English Prisons Today*, argued for a greater use of alternatives to custody.

By 1930 the Home Office had requested that areas cease using unregulated homes and hostels (Le Mesurier 1935: 332). The 1934 Home Office Directory listed those Home Office approved premises, five hostels for boys, Manchester, Birmingham, Leeds, Portsmouth and Cardiff and one for girls run by the Catholic Church in Birmingham.

The 1938 Criminal Justice Bill proposed the development of 'Howard Houses'. Newburn (2003: 15) notes the influence of Sir Alexander Paterson who had earlier been involved in prison reform and championed the care of discharged prisoners. The 1938 Act made radical proposals for the growth of hostels as a direct alternative to custody.

'Where a person is convicted of an offence for which the court has the power to pass a sentence of imprisonment, and it appear to the court that he is not less than sixteen but under twenty one years of age, the court if it has been notified by the Secretary of State that a Howard House is available ...may in lieu of any other sentence, pass a sentence of residential control.'

1938 Criminal Justice Bill (Part II.S.30 (1))

Newburn notes changes between the social and penal policy context of the pre and post World War Two years:

'The reformist tradition that had held sway in the decades leading up to the Second World War, and that was associated with Paterson did not survive long...the Criminal Justice Act past in 1948, which contained many reforms that had been close to the statute book a decade earlier, was by no means a uniformly liberalising piece of legislation...the pre-War idea of 'Howard Houses'... was dropped, whereas pressure from the Magistrates Association for a new short-term, military- style, custodial sentence was successful.'

Newburn (2003: 19)

That said it did allow potential growth of the use of hostels as a general condition of a probation order:

'The Secretary of State may approve premises for the reception of persons who may be required to reside there in as part of a Probation Order...'

1948, Criminal Justice Act (Part II.S.46.1)

Army style detention i.e. training within borstals and closed institutions, however won the day over more liberal, familial and reformist discourses of homes and hostels. Between 1945 and the early 1970's a very different social and policy context is presented that shaped both what probation would do and who it would work with. The next chapter will explore some of these changes in more detail and consider the extent to which their broader influences on Probation in general, impacted on hostels development in particular.

The 1948 Criminal Justice Act

The 1948 Criminal Justice Act did empower the Home Secretary to approve and regulate probation hostels which took offenders between the ages of fifteen and twenty one years. The purposes of these post 1948 hostels were to provide a supportive and stable environment in which to deal with the needs of offenders. The Act also saw a reversion to earlier interests in the 'training' that sentences could provide.

The Act did not mirror the detail for hostels as it did for borstals and remand homes, requiring them to provide a training scheme for residents. Barry (1991) and Barton (2005) note the similarity between these post war 'training' schemes and those in penal establishments. Despite these shifts, within hostels, a familial type model prevailed in hostel staffing structures with warden and matron roles mirroring husband and wife, father and mother models. The 1949 Approved Probation Hostel and Home Rules, allowed the details of regimes to be worked out by local committees and staff. Thus discretion and differences existed between hostels. This in part led to a lack of

clarity as to whom and what hostels were for (Grimsey 1963). Ten years on from the 1948 Act, the 1959 Departmental Committee on the Probation Service was amongst other things to:

'inquire into and make recommendations on the approved probation hostel system in England and Wales and Scotland'

(1962: Cmnd, 1800: 1)

The Morison Committee as it became known was to take some three years to report.

Re- integrative Developments in a Changing Context.

Probation's growth in the post war years was welcomed but the changed context noted above was not at the forefront of reflections in probation literature. Commentators emphasised changes in penal policy as opposed to potential missed opportunities in community based rehabilitation (e.g. Howard Houses). It was not foreseen that scepticism about the efficacy of prison might eventually be followed by scepticism about the efficacy of probation. Younghusband (1978: 98) notes:

'By the early 1950s the probation service was entering a post-war era of more generous provision resulting from a great wave of social reform. In a post-war climate of opinion of the Criminal Justice Act, 1948.'

The 1948 Act had been influenced by the Howard League, National Association of Probation Officers (NAPO) and the Institute for the Treatment and Study of Delinquency as well as emerging Probation Service Boards and Councils. It did in part signal a move away from harsh penal practice, a rapid development of alternatives to custody and a decline in crime rates. A rehabilitative optimism from government was assumed. Younghusband (1978: 99) notes that some looked back on this period as the *'golden age of probation.'*

Hostels for adult offenders were run by voluntary agencies in this period. Younghusband (ibid: 194) provides details of 'Norman House' opened in 1954 for homeless adult recidivists noting that in this type of hostel;

'...the staff lived entirely with the residents in a close family group with the aim of unfreezing isolated people.'

The 'casework relationship' was perceived theoretically (Biesteck 1969) and politically (Morison 1962) as both the catalyst and vehicle through which rehabilitation would occur. Hostels provided a unique setting for this and opened up the possibility of more intense group work (McCullough 1962). The casework relationship was assumed to be most effective in its 'natural' environment i.e. in the community and not in custody. However relationships out of custody did not remove the negative impact of urban deprivation, peer influence and criminogenic sub-cultures. Hostels appeared to offer a solution to this, allowing both the avoidance of custody and the treatment and rehabilitation of the individual. Concern about a variety of potential client groups throughout this period (HMSO 1966) demonstrates a clear and growing interest in the potential use of Hostels for primarily Adult Offenders. Rolph (1971: 5) details work in the mid 1960's of that Home Office Working Party (1965):

'to consider what contribution voluntary effort could make to the after-care of discharged offenders. And to advise on what particular projects should be considered for assistance from public funds.'

The report identifies around 100 hostels at this time and although focussing on the potential to use hostels for a variety of classifications of discharged prisoners also recommended them

'... as a possible alternative to imprisonment.'

Rolph (1971: 5)

Hostels throughout the 1948 Act appeared as a useful mechanism for an intervention base which recognises the dual influence of individual / personal factors and structural / environmental influences on behaviour. Within this post war period the role of personal relationships and paternal / maternal influences remained core in hostels although the wider practice context was changing.

The purpose of Hostels was to provide a stable and supportive environment in which to deal with the needs of young offenders, the majority of whom would be going to work in the day and reintegrate them back into society. By the 1960's this interest had broadened out to discharged adult prisoners and as a possible alternative to custody for adult offenders.

Hostel aims, at that time, fitted well with a post war welfare discourse of meeting needs. The benevolent paternalism of 'Beveredgian' welfarist ideology was reflected in the State's relationship with those who broke the law but were not deemed as deserving of custody or who had received custody and now needed assistance resettling in society. Under such an approach the potential resident was still perceived as a fellow citizen. In the later chapters it will be of interest to note the extent to which the ethnographic research reveals continuity or departure from this welfarist and fellow citizen paradigm. However questioning of possible aims (Rolph 1971) is evidenced in this period.

The introduction of Parole via the 1967 Criminal Justice Act was primarily motivated by a Home Office desire to decrease a growing prison population (Newburn 2003: 25-26). Hostels could have been considered as a more major player in this policy to reduce the prison population and arguably (Morison 1962) this had already been suggested. By the end of the 1960's probation's use of hostels in comparison with the growing numbers in custody and the prior numbers that its forerunners had attracted were both modest and relatively absent from actual legislative change which could have seen them become a major policy instrument. The 1948 CJA formalised their funding but did not see through the pre war vision of Howard Houses. The Morison

Committee (1959 -1962) and the work of Rolph (1965-1970) suggested wider possible uses of hostels for adults. Brandon (n.d) was unique in this period in exploring a hostel role for women. Later chapters will explore the extent to which hostels for adults developed a clear role in criminal justice policy and consider whether their resource became targeted at particular populations.

A Clear Role for Hostels?

During the second world war in 1942 the National Association of Homes and Hostels was formed, probably influenced by the optimism of the 1938 CJ Bill for Howard Houses and in an effort to bring together a disparate range of hostel providers. Some national identity, or at least movement towards a possible shared answer as to who and what hostels are can be seen to slowly gather pace in the post war period. The existence of hostels prior to 1969 and official interest in them was exemplified both in the remit of the 1962 Morison Committee and in the subsequent commentary on its work. Its purpose cited in the Probation Bulletin Vol 10, No 3, 1962: 41 was stated as:

' ..to enquire into and make recommendations on the approved probation hostels system in England and Wales and in Scotland.'

The major recommendation impacting on England and Wales presented the potential for local services to make use of and develop hostels:

'.. probation committees should be given power to open hostels and establish management committee from their own membership with additional co-options.... the ...recommendation is designed to meet the conclusion accepted by the committee that present hostel provision is inadequate, but that in agreeing that more hostels should be provided does not accept the proposal that there should be specialised hostels...'

Probation Bulletin (Vol 10, No3.1962: 42)

The possible influence of the National Association on policy is detectable in the Probation Journal (Volume 10, No8, 1963: 116 - 118). The then Home Secretary Henry Brooke attended their anniversary dinner and gave a speech that recognised the impact of the 1948 Act on the work of hostels and alluded to tensions between the voluntary sector and growing Home Office interest in their regulation and usage:

' ... Of course the Home Office was interested in the earlier development of hostels and homes as purely voluntary institutions, and we can appreciate the regret that some of you felt because change was made from a voluntary to official status....But there is no getting away from it the sort of work you undertake is too onerous for private funds to bear..'

Brooke (1963: 116)

An early interest by government in what might constitute an effective regime and the role of external links and employment for offenders is of note:

'I am greatly interested in some of the experiments some of you have been making along the lines suggested by the Ingelby Committee and Morison Committee in following up the training given within your hostel or home by outside employment... but it is an excellent thing that going out to daily employment should take on an aura of privilege... I want to say 'thank you' to each one of you for the value of your contribution in the battle against delinquency and immorality...'

Brooke (1963: 117)

Prior to the 1969 watershed in probation and hostel history, government demonstrated a growing interest in hostels but had remained relatively laissez-faire about how hostels developed, allowing them to 'experiment' in a fairly ad hoc manner and at the same time seeing hostels as able to make a contribution to rehabilitating difficult and disadvantaged individuals. What did emerge, despite a lack of clear resolve as to how hostels should function, was a clear wish from the Home Office to regulate and monitor developments.

Grimsey (1963) leaves no doubt that although hostels were now on the formal probation agenda there remained a lack of clear purpose:

'In the absence of any guiding principles about the function of hostels, fantasies of what hostels could or should provide will continue to bedevil probation officers and wardens'

Grimsey (1963: 41)

It remains to be seen in the ethnographic research as to whether such ambivalence and freedom of practice exists today.

Hostels a Complex Picture

This chapter has argued that hostels have identifiable roots and influences, both pre dating and overlapping with the traditional probation history and its recognisable waypoints and by ways. It has presented evidence which supports the suggestion of a credible pre history, focusing specifically on residential interventions located within or associated with the criminal justice system.

Whilst recognising the traditionally accepted origins of hostels as lying with children / probation homes, it has set out evidence that hostels for adults were a consideration prior to the 1969 Children and Young Persons Act, arguing that a range of hostels and hostel like interventions existed and were considered as possible methods of rehabilitating and reintegrating variously child and adult offenders.

The Children and Young Person Act 1969 is a key point in the hostel story as it prohibited a Probation Order being made on those under the age of 17. As a result the potential for hostels to draw their clientele from this group of reduced. However, this chapter has shown that the loss of under 17 year olds, may not have been that significant or sudden a step in 1969. A more adult focus for hostels was signalled as early as 1928 in the Circular to Justices.

Moreover this circular notes an age range of work with 16- 21 year olds already urging at that time a greater focus on work with adult offenders.

Tentative Structures for an Analysis of Hostel Development

Although appearing broadly social welfare orientated the historical examples explored in this chapter demonstrate the existence of interventions either implicitly or explicitly making links between broad social welfare concerns, that are well documented elsewhere and specific groups or classes of individuals who are being targeted because they are either:

- a) at risk of criminality
- b) already offending or ex convicts
- c) related to offenders or ex convicts
- d) or constructed as in need of moral guidance less they offend

These classifications in practice often predated formal recognition of such risk categorisation in legislation. Who was deemed as a potential hostel resident or recipient of structured socialisation within a residential setting, appears in part to have reflected the whims and predilections of those setting them up or having the economic and social capital to justify their intrusions.

In so far as modern 'approved premises' for adults can be seen to have had their influences and origins in work with children, early examples of rehabilitative endeavours within a residential setting may be seen to have been influenced by a range of practices including training schools, bonded labour, apprenticeships, ragged and industrial schools and probation homes. Young and Ashton (1956: 47) put these criminal justice developments in a wider context of the use of institutions. They note that in 1846, some 707 workhouses existed in 643 poor law units of England and Wales with an average of 210 inmates in each. Samson (1996) in Turner (1996:59) notes that between 1849 and 1909 the numbers of those in asylums in the UK grow from 27,000 to 105,000. By the 1950's this had peaked at around 143,000. Rehabilitative

institutions, located in the community may be seen as having a much wider range of precursors and influences than is commonly suggested and into which space curtails further exploration. Hostels emerge from a broad background of such interventions.

The more general social history of institutions and the development of social knowledge and power disclose useful analogies for the student of rehabilitation. Scull (1993: 344-63, cited in Turner 1996: 60):

'explains the proliferation of the asylum population in terms of both professional imperialism and the increasing proclivity of the public to view public mental hospitals as disposal sites for their unwanted relatives'

It will be important to consider in the ethnographic work whether today's hostel purposes and population represents continuity with themes of integration and resettlement or signals a new boundary between certain 'unwanted' sections of society, confined to a dislocated and unwanted status like the early patients of the asylums. Who hostels are for and how this is changing will be explored in later chapters.

Summary

The range of influences explored in this chapter present an alternative perspective to the convention that the hostel story can be seen as having a recent and clear starting point in 1969. The early evidence of rehabilitative and re-integrative practices explored uncovers a trail that current probation related academic literature has tended to ignore or underplay.

This may be indicative of the general status of hostels as to one side of core probation practices and their relatively small size (see table one) when compared with the use of, growth of and interest in custody or it may be part of a wider and growing disinterest in Probation's pre 'Social Work' roots.

This exploration has implied the existence of gender myopia in probation histories and that alongside Mathew Davenport Hill and Edward Cox women such as Octavia Hill and Mary Carpenter may be seen as having provided foundations for later theory and practice.

Core to this exploration has been the process of 'looking backwards in order to look forwards'. The exploration of prior influences and individuals who shaped concepts and practices associated with rehabilitation and reintegration provide a platform from which too explore the modern hostel story.

This thesis argues that not only was the period from 1756 clearly influential in revising understandings of what forms of punishment and rehabilitation might be but that the antithesis to carceral punishment i.e. community punishment and rehabilitation have discernible origins here and that these formed foundations for new forms of rehabilitation and reintegration that were halfway between prison and community.

Hostels have a pre history at least equal to if not longer than traditional probation work. The next chapter will provide a backcloth to the contemporary hostel story, exploring the impact of more recent contexts on hostels' development and consider whether there has been a shift in the rehabilitative optimism of earlier policy makers.

A Background to the Contemporary Hostels' Story

Chapter Three:

Providing a backcloth to the contemporary hostel story is important to allow judgements to be made as to the influence this may have had on hostels' development and to ascertain whether there has been a shift in direction in hostels' role and purpose that signals a change in direction or purpose.

Developments in hostel purposes, policy and practice therefore require location against the broader social policy context within which criminal justice developments have occurred. It is then important for this chapter to map some of the broad trends and influences which have shaped penal policy and in particular probation policy and practice.

The chapter will outline and highlight some of the key influences in social policy impacting on probation since the late 1960s and suggest that the effect of these changes in social and economic policy contributed to a partial transformation of probation purposes. The focus will be particularly on those developments post 1970, which is when the modern hostel story is generally accepted as commencing. Such changes it will be argued paved the way for a revision of the function and practices of the probation role in how it defined and worked with its traditional 'client' group and how it understood its relationship to the state. These revisions were externally imposed by successive governments and must be understood against a changing social and economic context. While their impact on hostels at the time may not have been immediate or recognisable, the context, climate and discourses they created may signal decisive shifts in purpose and practice.

The context provided in this chapter will run up to and including 2001. The ethnographic research which will be presented in chapters six and eight took place in two separate six month periods in 2002 and 2006-7. Chapter seven will provide an overview of developments taking place during and between the

two phases of fieldwork i.e. filling the gap between the end of this chapter and the end of the ethnographic study.

The previous chapter began to locate hostels' development and rehabilitative practices in a wider historical context. The aim being to enable prospective students of hostels to make sense of the meanings, purposes and influences shaping current and previous policies and practices. This chapter seeks to provide the policy and context to that time frame traditionally associated with hostels' development and prepare the ground for a literature review of hostels in that period in the next chapter.

From Welfare to Market Society

Probation policy and practice, and the development of hostels in the modern probation service, can best be understood when set against broad developments in social policy and welfare in England and Wales. Blakemore (2003: 98) identifies three major 'leaps' in welfare development in the last century that have impacted on British society:

- The Liberal reforms of 1906 – 1914 including the introduction of the National Insurance Act.
- Labour's welfare programmes of 1946 –1951 particularly the creation of the National Health Service and a comprehensive welfare system.
- Conservative social reforms beginning in 1979 and carrying on to the 1990's typified by privatisation and the dismantling of universal entitlement to benefits (by 1992 the White Paper, Partnership in Dealing with Offenders in the Community, was to suggest private tendering for the provision of hostels).

Hostels developed in the modern criminal justice system between the cusp of welfare ascendancy and the new wave of market economics. Changes emanating from the above policies and discourses also reflected real changes

in the relationships between individuals and between individuals and the state. Chapter seven will explore some of the more recent developments that have taken place under 'New Labour'.

Hostels for adults in the criminal justice system are usually seen as arriving in the latter third of the 20th century, which in its middle years had witnessed a shift from the laissez-faire ideas of the 19th Century towards a more interventionist welfarist approach.

Blakemore (2003) notes that a defining difference between 19th and 20th century liberalism was the extent to which the individual was expected to take responsibility for planning and providing for their own welfare. The period between the first and the second world wars sharply highlighted the deficiencies of laissez-faire welfare when the economic context militated against the ability of individuals to take responsibility for themselves via insurance and personal thrift. The depression of the 1930's could not be assuaged by any amounts of personal thrift or societal prudence. Beveridge's revisions of social security in the 1940's led to the repeal of the much-hated Poor Law, the introduction of a state pension, unemployment and sickness benefits and various maternity, death and widows' benefits. The rise of welfare may be seen to have reached its peak in the twenty-five years following World War Two.

However, a prerequisite of broad ranging welfare state intervention was also the state's commitment to the goals of full employment and preventative health care. The conceptual context was of a generation who had experienced a national economic crisis in the 1930's and then gone to war at the end of that decade to defend King and country. Beveridge's twin track approach, of providing welfare support alongside developing an expectation and context where individuals could gain employment, was designed to tackle the five 'giants' of want, ignorance, squalor, disease and idleness. Individuals may be tempted to recall the latter goals but forget the broader contexts and purposes upon which these were premised. Many of the individuals who were influential in the development of hostels were influenced by their experiences

of this and for some too, personal experiences of considerable human suffering and misery in prisoner of war camps e.g. John Dodd the founder of Langley House (Searle 1973).

Developments in social and economic policy have a tendency to disclose governments' beliefs about the limits of the individual freedoms and responsibilities of citizens and test out the extent to which States seek to impose social control. Benyon and Edwards (1997: 336) cite the 1996 'zero tolerance' approach of Jack Straw married with the rhetoric of paying attention to the 'underlying causes of disorder' with the pre election ratcheting up of get tough criminal justice policies and Blair's communitarian conflation of rights and responsibilities. Policy may also be indicative of the degree to which citizens identify with one another, that is, when there are common goals and a relative homogeneity of concerns, citizens and governments may be willing to work together for the 'social good'. Criminal Justice policy making may be in the interests of such a good too, however given its selective focus, it has the potential to impact on the lives of some citizens in relatively hidden ways that may be unlikely to attract general public interest. The minority may not figure constructively in the majority concerns. This ability to identify with one's fellow citizens may be important to consider later when exploring whom hostels now capture.

Social policymaking can in part be about social control i.e. putting in place policies and conditions that direct the lives of citizens in one direction as opposed to another [Harris and Webb (1987) have explored the development of the juvenile justice system as a function of such state control over a particular population]. Blakemore (2003: 101) identifies two types of social control:

'Directly Coercive' i.e. aimed at an individual's autonomy or freedom in a deliberate and suppressive manner

And

'Subtly Oppressive' i.e. designed to encourage individuals to fit into accepted social roles or suppressing of individuality in less obvious ways.'

These formulations of social control may be useful to return to at a later stage when considering the impact of social policy developments within the probation service and in particular how the role and function of the hostel is understood. Professionals in the various welfare services may find their mode of interaction with 'clients' being determined by underlying policy goals of government to disable and control certain categories of individual. Recent probation literature by Burnett and McNeil (2005: 222) citing Bhui (2001: 639) has noted a:

'reformulation of the probation identity in the language of law enforcement and risk rather than social work and rehabilitation '

This change towards a more directly coercive probation practice, evident today had, it will be argued, its origins in wider social policy changes that occurred between the late 1960's to the early 21st century. Later chapters will assess the extent to which such reformulations and risk discourses impact on the role and function of the hostel.

The Welfare Paradigm

As Vanstone (2004) and other academics have noted probation was primarily located within a welfare paradigm in the early 1960s. The influences of psychology, sociology and politics may be traced in the interventions and general casework approach used in this period variously informed by the work of Freud (1986), Skinner (1971), Pavlov (1994) and Eysenck (1960). The development of interventionist policies aimed at working to improve or support local communities was influenced by the deviance theory of Sutherland (1960) and later by the work of Young (1971) and Cohen (1979). Social policy attended to structural arrangements through welfare policies aimed at equalising access to work and social welfare (influenced for example by Marx 1976, Beveridge 1944 and Bevan 1961).

The 1960s may be seen as a highpoint of optimism on behalf of government to invest in penal reform. The Streatfield Report (1961) and the Morison

Report (1962) had considered the role and function of the probation service. A possible role for hostels for adults within the probation service begins to develop as an interest within the CJS (Grimsey 1963, Dalzell 1966, Cook 1968, Trotter 1969) and with some policy makers (Streatfield 1961, Morison 1962, 'The Home Office Advisory Committee on the Penal System – Non Custodial and Semi Custodial Penalties' 1970). Hostels may be seen to 'arrive' on the political radar as a possible sentencing option for adults at the high watermark of welfarism. Various potential purposes, it will be argued, were predicated, all of which had in common a rehabilitative and transformative optimism. Chapter four will explore these influences and developments in more detail.

The social context, at this time, was supportive of 'rehabilitative casework' and the development of non-custodial penalties was promoted by the Morison Report (1962), specifically the rehabilitative potential of hostels. The casework approach typified by Biesteck's (1961) 'The Casework Relationship' and discussed by Vanstone (2004: 111) exemplifies the influence of such approaches on the development of probation policy and practice. Practices, which could claim a basis in the social sciences, appear to have been readily taken up by the government of the day. However as Vass and May (1996: 64) have noted even the early Morison report, predating the development of modern adult hostels post 1969, reminded the service of its duty:

'to protect society and ensure the good conduct of the probationer.'

Concerns about public protection are not new and as the last chapter suggested, have a longer genealogy than current policy initiatives suggest. However the wider social policy context, within which such concerns are framed shapes and determines the extent of their impact on probation practice. Vanstone (2004) notes that the Seebom Report (1968) stimulated a debate as to whether probation should become a correctional service. This debate is alive and well today but within a much changed policy context e.g. see Chui and Nellis (Eds) (2003), Raynor (2006) and Gelsthorpe and Morgan (Eds) (2007).

Both the 1967 and 1972 Criminal Justice Acts (CJA) sought to reduce the prison population by offering the courts 'alternatives to custody' via the probation service i.e. Parole and Suspended Sentences and new alternatives to custody such as day training centres, hostels and community service. As Smith (1996: 228) has noted these changes, particularly in parole and suspended sentences:

'...meant that probation officers had to work with offenders who had been convicted more often, and in many cases of more serious crimes, than they had been used to; and with this came the expectation that parolees should be supervised more intensively, in the interests of public protection, than had been usual in probation practice.'

At this early stage, one could argue that this brand of 'rehabilitative' optimism and expansion included within it seeds of a raised expectation for probation services. Implicit in these legislative developments, was the introduction of an increased focus on public protection and the potential for probation to shift its attention away from its traditional clientele towards those the government wished to divert or take out of custody. The 1967 and 1972 CJA's policy aims may be seen to be concerned with reducing the prison population via the introduction of increased community based surveillance accompanied by an expectation in these new policy developments that probation focus its resources on higher risk cases.

This brave new role was quickly seized. The 1968 Seebohm Report had implicitly suggested that probation should be subsumed within or brought into line with the new social services departments. The Social Work Scotland Act of 1968 had abolished the probation service and new social work departments had taken on responsibility for offenders. Probation's 'threatened position' in England and Wales is therefore nothing new.

The 1969 Children and Young Person's Act came into being in 1971 on the same day as the new generic social services departments. Overnight,

probation lost a significant part of its clientele. The Act abolished probation orders for juveniles and clearly marked out work with 'offenders' as separate territory from mainstream social work in England and Wales. Prior to this probation officers had both provided much of the 'after care' for the approved school system and had been used to working with children as young as 10. S.13.2 of the Act transferred the supervision of 10 to 13 years olds to social services but allowed some work with 14 to 16 year olds to be a matter of local negotiation. To put this shift and its implications for probation practice in context it may be useful to take note of Le Mesurier's (1935: 41) account of court disposals in 1932:

'In the Juvenile Courts 12,867 children and young people were found guilty of indictable offences, of whom 85% were dealt with under the Probation of Offenders Act in the following manner : 22% were dismissed after the charge had been proved, 10% were bound over without supervision, 53% were bound over with supervision'

She goes on to note of the 43,124 Adult offenders in the same category that:

'19% were bound over with supervision.'

In 1932 this equated to probation supervision for adults accounting for around 8,193 cases and their supervision of young people accounting for 6,819 cases. The courts appear to have readily seen probation as a suitable disposal for adults albeit that a higher percentage of juvenile cases were receiving supervision as an outcome. The 1969 Act marked a shift in emphasis and focus. However work with adult offenders was not something new for the probation service in 1969 and the loss of probation involvement in this area may have been overplayed by some. Probation involvement in the running of probation homes for young people (for an example of such a home see Moore.1921) did however cease with the implementation of the 1969 Act. Young people had been a significant part of probation work for over sixty years. Unable to work with young people in custody or in probation homes, probation became associated with working with the 'troublesome' as opposed

to the 'troubled' (Harris and Webb 1987: 54). S.19 (2) of the 1969 CJ Act laid the foundations for probation and social services joint involvement in intermediate treatment. The Act as a whole signalled for probation an overall reduction in its involvement with children and might usefully serve as a starting point in exploring the development of modern multi agency Youth Offending Teams (YOT's).

As a result of such challenges to its purpose and existence probation's relationship with the Home Office from the early 1970's has been one of arguably unhealthy interdependence. That is, there has been an increasing sense of the probation service being guided and directed in how it defines its function and purpose, becoming both politically and legislatively dependent on the Home Office for a continued role within the CJS. CMND (1976: paragraph 50) indicates that changes of role did not necessarily mean a shrinking service:

'In the period 1972-1975 the number of whole time probation officers increased by 32 per cent, bringing the total to 4,869.'

This represented a trebling in staff from 1958 and was in the context of losing children as a significant client group and gaining a new focus from the early 1970s on alternatives to and diversion from custody. For probation areas:

'The price to be paid for this was, of course, that increasing constraints were imposed on their previous autonomy, an autonomy often exercised idiosyncratically but excused by the confidentiality and uniqueness of the officer-client relationship.'

Harris and Webb (1987: 43)

Early seeds had been sown in the care versus control debate, slow but clear shifts were now detectable in probation's role, moving from a social work tradition towards something different. These changes were to steadily shape probation policy and practice over the coming decades and as later chapters will suggest were not to disappear. As Bilton (1979: 9) notes the

implementation of the Local Social Services Act in 1971 meant that the DHSS would take over responsibility for children's services from the Home Office:

'This left the Home Office as substantially the ministry for the wicked and undeserving, with the DHSS looking after the deserving poor and sick.'

Whom hostels have been for in this period and whether such wider probation policy changes impacted on them will begin to be explored in the next section and in the literature review which follows this chapter.

A Context of Change

To comprehend how changes in England and Wales were arrived at one must look at their broader social precedents. For example the 1970s saw a decade of rising unemployment and a lack of investment in (nationalised) industry coupled with problems of low profitability and a growing national debt. Land (2004: 253) notes that by 1976 inflation was running at 26% and unemployment had passed the one million mark for the first time since the depression of the 1930s.

The 1970s represented a decade of disappointment and loss of faith in welfarist solutions with adult offenders. Hostels gain attention in probation practice on the downward cusp of a belief and commitment to social welfare and social work values within the wider CJS. The official hostel story commences from the 1969 Children Act when belief and investment in rehabilitation may be seen to have been at its peak in adult criminal justice practice. The 1972 Criminal Justice Act marks a watershed in defining the role and purpose of probation. The Government planned to provide 1,650 new hostel places over the next five years. However even at this early stage:

'It was made clear that the speed of development would depend on the result of the various experiments and the availability of resources.'

Haxby (1978: 27)

Political rhetoric was positive about what role hostels might have however Table One (Appendix One) shows that the actual number of hostel spaces did not reach 1,650 until after 1979 !

Even in this relatively early period Haxby speaks of the growth of a new 'correctional service' whose aim would be to provide a range of community based treatment provisions. However this corrections service was located within, or at least had its roots in, a social work tradition and generally welfarist paradigm with aims that were still treatment orientated. A loss of faith in government's attempts to deal with crime and social problems via state intervention became associated with the demise of the then Labour government and welfare orientated policy failings. The decline of faith in rehabilitation has been most closely associated with the Martinson 'Nothing Works' and Brody's (1976) Intensive Matched Probation After-Care and Treatment, (IMPACT) study findings. Ironically in the 1970s it is in this context of a loss of faith in rehabilitation that hostels, as a form of rehabilitation for adults in the community, develop within the CJS.

The schism between a criminal justice context and a social services context, present in the wider probation service, opened the way for a revised discourse, which would eventually see a split in language in the 1980s of 'client' and 'offender' and a change of training arrangements for those working with 'offenders' as opposed to ordinary citizens. However for the time being hostels presented a domain where welfare and needs orientated work could continue. The author will refer to such an approach as 'old penology' in juxtaposition to Feeley and Simon's (1994) 'new penology'. From a reading of the research surrounding hostels in the late 1960s to early 1970s the construction of table 3.1 (over) emerged. The next chapter will consider whether this construct remained valid in the years that followed. The ethnographic work in chapters six and eight and the conclusion will consider whether new purposes and penology are shaping modern hostel practices.

Table 3.1

| Hostels In the 1970's | Old Penology |
|------------------------------|---|
| Focus | Individuals Guilt Responsibility Diagnosis Treatment |
| Themes | Transformation of the Individual Change |
| Practices | Rehabilitative Programmes Needs Based Work Preparation for Freedom Welfare Therapy |
| Workers | Relative Independence Professional Discretion Welfare / Change Orientated Positivist Outlook To the Side of Mainstream Practice |
| Role of Institution | Rehabilitation Care / Control Assistance Reintegration / Resettlement |
| Status of Individual | Client Rehabilitated / Recidivist In Need of Help, Support and Direction Possibly Homeless or Alcohol Problems Released from Prison or... On Probation |
| Community | As Capital (Spencer and Deakin 2004) |

How hostels see and understand their residents may prove to be indicative of their underlying purposes and be disclosed by how workers interact with residents. This thesis explores what the stated and developing purpose(s) of a hostel has been and may be, exploring how they may be changing and why. Interestingly hostels have always had the relatively neutral term of 'resident' open to them. As will be discussed in the next chapter the work of; Cook (1968), Trotter (1969), Sinclair (1971), Rolph (1971), Wallich (1976) and others reveals a general welfarist influence and approach in early hostel purposes in this period. Although as will be seen (Hinton 1975), debates about control and freedom (Fisher and Wilson 1982) were soon to emerge. Although not evident in hostels, new alternative purposes for probation were slowly emerging.

If 'welfarism' was to later diminish across the board, a 'new punitiveness' (Simon and Feeley 1994) would arise in probation that already had its roots in a dyadic system constructed for those labelled as 'in need', but essentially deserving and those who could be labelled as in need and 'less deserving'. Later chapters will consider whether new categories are now being developed to justify further differential treatment of those with whom probation and more particularly hostels work.

Such a split paved the way too for the conceptual separation of 'risk' and 'needs' as typified in tools such as Level of Service Inventory Revised (LSIR) imported from Canada on the basis of work by Bonta and Andrews (2003(3rd edition)). This split coincided with the development of private sector involvement in probation training e.g. LSIR was promoted in the UK by the 'Cognitive Foundation', run by ex probation staff, who ventured to set up their own private company when internal restructuring led to the closure of an internal regional staff development unit. The Home Office began paying ex probation staff to provide services that they had previously provided as part of their role as employees.

Within a framework that had the potential to separate out risk and needs, punishment could be juxtaposed with transformation and support, and even

rehabilitation might cease to gain ascendancy in probation discourse. As Cavadino and Dignan (2002: 139) note on debates about probation's role:

'At the heart of the debate was a deep-rooted philosophical conflict between rival 'welfare' and 'control' functions which probation may be made to serve...'

Hostels, were at least initially, relatively untouched by such debates and developments allowing the possibility for interesting alternative interests to be developed there. One example of this, which will be discussed in chapter four, is the brief interest in the role of hostels in providing bail placements to avoid detention in custody and keep bailees in the community.

By the early 1980s Jordan (1983) could argue in the Probation Journal that probation, in general, was at risk of becoming a modified form of imprisonment as opposed to a modified form of liberty. Christie (1993) cited in Smith (1996: 243) noted that the changes that took place in America around this time:

'...probation officers had to choose sides – between being social workers without jobs or crime-controllers with both jobs and guns. They chose the latter alternative...'

The changes that occurred in England and Wales may have (thus far) been less dramatic than those in America however the potential for the development of a punitive climate and lack of faith in probation as a form of social welfare were similar.

The disentanglement of welfare from control, tended to assume that welfare was not a form of control and ignores Blakemore's (2003) formulation of directly coercive and subtly coercive control. That said some e.g. Conrad (1984) argued for the separation of surveillance and welfare services reinforcing the possibility of the development of a conceptual and practice framework that could bifurcate risk and needs.

Within a welfarist paradigm society may readily accept calls for humanitarian treatment of offenders but calls to develop hostels for offenders in times of high unemployment and social unrest may be neither a priority for government nor society at large, particularly if these calls are constructed when a welfarist paradigm is in demise. However as has been suggested above hostels might have the potential to sit out such changes and present interesting alternatives not open to mainstream practice e.g. a role in bail.

Deconstructing Local Ownership and Identity

If the 1970s had been a decade of uncertainty and change for the Probation Service the 1980s were to offer only more change not only in the wider public policy context but in criminal justice approaches and in particular in the role of the probation service itself. By 1979 when Margaret Thatcher was elected and Labour was defeated, unemployment had reached 2 million. The Conservatives had pledged to both cut the public purse and to increase spending on the fight against crime:

'We will spend more on fighting crime, whilst we economize elsewhere.'

Conservative Party Manifesto (1979)

The welfarist concerns of the 1960s had been replaced by a commitment to increased public spending on crime control and decreased investment in social welfare. A new form of criminal and community justice was being created literally at the expense of welfare. Muncie and McLaughlin (1994) have noted that between 1982 and 1990 public expenditure on police, courts, prisons and probation rose overall by 70% with much money going on the building of new prisons and the development of a strong police force. However the actual number of hostels declined from 105 to 103 in this period, experiencing only a modest increase of less than 6% in 1991 from its baseline 1982 figure (see Table 1). The number of hostels has remained fairly static for around 25 years.

The 1980s saw a rolling back of the state under Thatcher and the introduction of market models into criminal justice. Moreover parts of the CJ system were used as key players in dealing with threats of civil disorder which threatened the retreat of state (e.g. the well documented use of police in the miners' strike).

The actual impact on crime rates (British Crime Survey 1982 and MORI 1996) of investment in law and order appear to have been in inverse proportion to the amount of political attention and public finance. Between 1979 and 1992 official crime figures more than doubled. It may be suggested that if citizens see increased spending on crime control and at the same time experience an increase in crime alongside a decrease in expenditure on broad social welfare, then sympathy for investment in rehabilitation will be at best severely restricted.

A sign that the status quo was not to be maintained in probation policy was signalled in 1984 by the Home Office, Statement of National Objectives and Priorities (SNOP) which set out a series of priorities for the probation service in which three key functions of probation were defined as:

'diverting high risk offenders away from prison, reducing crime and making a cost effective use of resources.'

Mair (1994: 5) states that SNOP: *'sent shock-waves through the probation service'*.

As Smith (1996: 232) suggests SNOP underscores three shifts;

- The increased interest of the Home Office in the running of the probation service.
- The move away from each local service developing its own separate policies and practice.
- The consequent undermining of individual autonomy and discretion.

The move away from local ownership also signalled a move towards practice or at least initially, practice priorities being prescribed by the Home Office and Executive. The shift in focus towards measurable outcomes and targets related to risk of custody and reduction in the use of custody reflected a lack of interest in what worked at an individual level. The next and subsequent chapters will seek to detect whether these shifts can be detected in hostel' purposes and practices.

As Burnett and Mc Neil (2005: 229) note:

'The advent of Thatcherism, with its emphasis on managerial approaches and budgetary restraint in the public sector, brought the probation service under increasing scrutiny. A more target driven approach was introduced which focused on defining inputs and measuring outcomes. As for other public professions, probation services were challenged to produce a more unified sense of purpose and to introduce new organisational structures and processes which would increase efficiency and cost effectiveness.'

This shift in policy led to real shifts in practice with National Standards (1990) and other practice guides moving the focus of the service away from the welfare and needs of the individuals it supervised to being a deliverer of community punishments with a sharper focus on victims and public protection. The 1991 Criminal Justice Act moved probation firmly away from social work and welfare to the brave new world of punishment and public protection.

The Advent of Managerialism – a paradigm shift.

A loss of faith with the rehabilitative project and a centralisation of policy initiatives led to a focus on outcome driven policies whose processing were to become known as 'management by objectives'. This managerial shift has been commented on by James and Raine (1998) who have argued that criminal justice policy and practice in the 1980's and 1990's were shaped by the interplay of four key dynamics:

- Managerialism
- Administrative Processing
- Public Voice Participation
- Politics

'Each has been seen to have its own separate logic and rationale and in particular that the competing paradigms (and their underlying values) arose during the Conservative tenure between 1979 – 1997 as a result of the growing 'crime problem'.

James and Raine (1998: 4-5)

By the 1990s the 'crisis' in criminal justice had not disappeared. Sparks (2000: 141) has noted a conflation of a modernisation agenda with demands for more effective and more visible punishment. These demands may also have been attempts to redefine organisational purposes and outcomes as a correctional as opposed to welfare service. This conflation of managerialism with interests in effective punishment were critical to the 1991 Criminal Justice Act which transformed probation from a 'local' rehabilitative, alternative to custody to a 'centrally regulated' form of punishment in the community.²⁷

It will be argued that for the most part hostels were relatively untouched by these developments in the 1970's and 1980's and were not seen as part of the social control agenda. They did not begin to feel the policy and practice implications of such shifts until the late 1990's. However as can be seen from Table 1 the indirect impact of this isolation was that hostels not only continued to be on the periphery of policy and practice developments but that investment in their capacity relative to the prison population almost halved between 1992 and 2004. As will be seen in the next chapter hostels continued to exist and offer a range of possible purposes but it was as yet unclear how they would fit into the new order of 'community punishment'.

²⁷ This Act had its roots in the 1988 Green Paper, Punishment, Custody and the Community, Cmd.424. London, Home Office, which presented probation as a 'community punishment' as opposed to an alternative to punishment. Probation and its purposes were being changed.

Sparks (2000: 139) has observed that there has been an 'infiltration of risk orientated thinking 'on probation practice however this risk infiltration has not been the only influence on practice. He reminds us of Melossi's (1985) concept of "*the 'differing wavelengths' of historical time upon which the formative influences of penal affairs are carried*". Hostel developments appear to fit well with this metaphor. Although influenced by risk orientated thinking, chapter four explores the possibility that in hostels there have been interconnected and overlapping influences and developments e.g. bail (1976 Bail Act), the possibility of specialist interventions (Hudson 1981), welfarist concerns around homelessness (Fisher 1975) public protection interests around risk, academic interest in regimes, gender debates, mental health, waxing and waning interests in the potential for more rehabilitative and re-integrative practices etc... all managing to co exist in hostels to the side of mainstream managerialist policy and practice.

Centralisation and 'nationalisation'

Outside of the hostel arena moves towards a national service and a centralisation of policy via legislative and structural changes weakened the influence of practitioners and undermined the notion of the probation officer as a caseworker and professional.

The 1990's saw a sharp demise in penal liberalism in both policy and practice and the CJS and probation service in particular moved away from an intermediary role between the 'offender', the state and the courts towards becoming a mechanism of punishment and social control on behalf of the state. A penological trend that the punishment should fit the offence rather than the offender was the political message. Whilst practitioners were being routinely trained to target interventions to meet the risks and criminogenic needs of the offenders they supervised (Andrews and Bonta 2003) the 1991 Criminal Justice Act made probation a punishment in the community and by association hostels became places of punishment or at least punishments.

Young (1999: 45) citing Feeley and Simon (1994) saw the task of 'the new administrative criminology and actuarialism' as being about:

'...creating barriers to restrict such opportunities and to construct a crime prevention policy which minimises risk and limits damage. An actuarial approach is developed which is concerned with the calculation of risk rather than individual guilt or motivation. Such an approach is...not an inclusionist philosophy which embraces those found guilty of an offence and attempts to reintegrate them into society. Rather it is an exclusionary discourse which seeks to anticipate trouble ... and to exclude and isolate the deviant.'

The 1990s saw a brief return to penal liberalism, signalled by the initial de-carcerative aims of the 1991 Criminal Justice Act, David Waddington's initial aim had been to reserve the use of custody for the most serious cases and to create and 'strengthen punishment in the community'. Jones and Newburn (2007) caution against reading stated policy purposes as equating with desired policy outcomes. Although referring to policy transfer on an international level they caution:

'We must be constantly vigilant of the danger of imposing too much order on processes that are inherently disorderly.'

Jones and Newburn (2007: 162)

A bifurcatory policy did appear to have some success (see Table One 1989 – 1993 prison figures, Appendix One). In fact as a proportion of those in custody the hostel capacity actually reached a peak in this period of 5.95 %. Hostels appeared to flourish under a legislative and political framework which explicitly stressed the 'proper' use of custody and the use of community penalties as sentences in their own right. However attempts to run together support for decarceration alongside being seen to be tough through the use of community punishment on offenders were short lived under the Conservatives. The abandonment of this twin track approach appears to have been fatal for both hostel growth and the spectre of an ever rising prison population. Discourses

of social inclusion and 'responsibilisation' of the individual, influenced by the work of Amitai Etzioni, were to be New Labour's flagship. In its efforts to get elected and then in government, 'New Labour' attempted its own bifurcatory policy of being 'tough on crime and tough on the causes of crime', albeit the extent to which any government is willing to delve into the complexities of the latter, whilst under the public gaze remains to be seen.²⁸ Chapter seven and the conclusion of the thesis will explore whether this New Labour discourse had any noticeable effect on either the use of hostels or custody.

The Demise of Welfare

The balance between public and private had been carefully measured under general welfarist policy to ensure provision assured a minimum basic standard available to all in areas of health, education and social welfare. The development of a market society in the 1980s saw a real and decisive shift with the 'rolling back' of earlier welfarist provision by the state in favour of individual responsibility and personal gain. Pitts (2001: 125) notes that the arrival of a market society:

'...signalled the demise of an earlier solidaristic politics and the fragmentation of the political constituency, in the labour movement, Parliament, welfare, education and the academy, which had championed the idea of 'progress'.'

Thatcherism was to see a radical revision of all welfarist programmes that was to lead to a questioning of the role and purpose of Probation. The potentially paternalistic advise, assist and befriend approach could not offer evidence of quantifiable and predictable outcomes in crime reduction.²⁹ The language and discourse of major public services was subjected to redefinition and

²⁸ Tony Blair whilst Shadow Home Secretary in 1992 mounted a challenge to the then Conservative Governments claim of being the party of 'Law and Order'. It would appear that this politicking as to who can be toughest on crime remains a powerful policy standard, which both Labour and Conservatives are reluctant to relinquish.

²⁹ Had the original 'and to assist in finding employment' (Probation of Offenders Act 1907) been retained alongside advise, assist and befriend, Probation's core purposes may have been seen as less irrelevant to a market society that encouraged individuals to 'get on their bike'.

restructuring in line with the imperatives of the new project of marketisation and privatisation (Drakeford 2000). The 'balance' sought in the corrections field appeared to be centred on the delivery of targets related for now, to diversion from custody and reduction of harm to the public. As Barnes and Prior (2000: 19-32) have noted more generally of welfare ecology the underpinning 'moral ideology' was constructed around notions of sustainability and risks. However, today these risks are presented within the criminal justice sphere as individualised as opposed to structural and endemic. Individuals are not at risk but risky and potentially costly. The social good is to be obtained by focusing controlling resources on those who threaten the sustainability of the general good because of their actual or potential individual costs and risks. Later chapters will explore this in relation to hostels in more detail.

Probation for Sale?

Drakeford (2000: 22) citing Linneman and Megbolugbe (1994: 636) suggests that privatisation and marketisation are best seen as distinct phenomena; the latter is a form of 'load-shedding' aimed at reducing the government's role from the financing and production of services whilst the former is a form of sector-shifting 'empowerment', whereby government funds public goods and services but their delivery and production is by the private sector. From the 1990s the former 'load-shedding' model has been detectable within the criminal justice system in the UK.

This 'load-shedding' in the 1990s entailed a transformation in the role and focus of management. This was required to produce a shift in attention from individuals and practice towards targets and outcomes.

The three E's, Economy, Efficiency and Effectiveness (Mair 1989: 37) were to be applied to public service provision and probation was to be no exception. Budgets, targets and resources were to be the focus of managers, not casework or individuals. Failures of services to meet agreed targets were constructed as the result of too much worker autonomy as opposed to the

targets themselves being problematic. Offenders could breach orders and the service became evaluated not on its individual interventions but on its collective achievement of corporate targets.

As McLaughlin and Muncie (1994: 123) note this shift in focus led to a move by middle managers away from supervising practice and contact with their front line staff (and offenders) and a focus on what James and Raine (1998) have called administrative processing. However the focus of hostel managers, with their tradition of being very much on the premises and in daily contact with staff and residents, including being on call and carrying out sleep in duties might prove to be less easy to divert from individual staff and 'offenders'.

A Restructuring Agenda.

External reports by the Audit Commission in 1989 - The Probation Service, Promoting Value for Money - hinted at partial privatisation in the wider service if a clear focus on a more controlling agenda in line with government policy was not achieved. Modest suggestions perhaps, but the structural changes in the role of management created to achieve these were to be more influential than the 'modest' changes themselves. Veiled sticks were also to be accompanied by carrots in the form of performance related pay for senior managers who achieved their targets.

As Land (in Ellison et al (Eds) 2004: 251) states:

'The Conservative Government elected in the summer of 1979 openly challenged the fundamental assumptions upon which the British post war welfare state had been founded, The relationship between social and economic policies changed...'

Glennerster (2004: 234) in Ellison et al (231-250) notes that the 'Gini' coefficient of inequality moved ten points in the fifteen years from 1979. Britain moved from being one of the most equal societies in the world, pre

Thatcher, to being one of the most unequal of all advanced economies. Pre 1979 measures suggest that broad tax and benefits policies had previously had an equalising impact on wealth distribution. Probation attention shifted from welfare concerns towards issues of economy, efficiency and effectiveness as part of a Criminal Justice System. These shifts have continued under New Labour.

Policy is indeed a powerful tool that can shape individual citizens' lives and transform their value and meaning. The managerialist era saw the role and function of welfare and corrections services being challenged and redefined to meet the needs of a government, which believed in the value of the 'private' self-supporting individual over any collective societal values.

Marsland's (2004) suggestion that a move away from a 'welfare state' towards a 'welfare society' belies the stark reality that Thatcherite policy not only transformed the economic sphere but also radically restructured the moral relationship between citizen and citizen, between citizen and state and between probation officers, their managers and their 'clients'. Criminal Justice on a micro level was not immune from this impact.

Later Chapters, particularly the ethnographic research, will explore the extent to which a changed relationship can be detected at a micro level between hostel staff and hostel residents. Moreover it will be important to evaluate the effect any such change has on the rehabilitative and transformative potential of the hostel.

The Contemporary Context.

The 1990's saw the then 56 probation areas of England and Wales being pushed towards a more punitive agenda. Instead of being seen as providers of alternatives to punishment, services were being told to gear up to be managers of sentences in the community. Moreover there was no assumption that existing state 'providers' were best suited or the most desirable to carry out these redefined tasks. The moral regeneration of the 'hapless and

helpless' (Harris1987: 42) was to be replaced with crime prevention and non-custodial containment.

The birth of managerialism in probation may be seen to have its roots in an earlier marriage between government (Home Office) and non probation officer grade staff. It was noted earlier that from 1958 – 1975 the probation service enjoyed an equivalent increase in manpower of over 300%. However as Harris and Webb (1987: 43) remind us this increase came with the development of supervisory and management grades, offering a career structure and increasing range of possible work. Such restructuring, managerial growth and redefinition may be seen as streams of influence which were to eventually converge into the development of NOMS (National Offender Management Service).

The government's decision to grow and expand a revised probation role was co-terminous with general disillusionment about the efficacy and economics of the institution (Scull 1977), a trend favoured by both left and right at the time for different reasons. This institutional disillusionment included; psychiatric hospitals, care homes and prisons. It is therefore somewhat ironic that modern probation hostels for adults were developed and officially recognised at a time when both faith in rehabilitation and institutional solutions to societal problems are no longer in favour. A somewhat un-auspicious birth!

By dint of the 1991 Criminal Justice Act hostels became places of punishment in the community. This thesis will explore the extent to which the modern hostel is now a place of punishment and / or rehabilitation. Chapters six and eight will explore whether such a shift is detectable in practices today.

The Expansion of Punishment into the Community

Probation policy and expansion in the late 20th century was influenced by a desire by government to reduce costs and to reallocate or redistribute treatment and punishment functions from the institution to the community.

Cohen (1985: 49) has been critical of the extent to which such policies have been successful on either front:

'If community programmes were replacing institutions, then systems high in community places would show a less than average use of institutions. But if community was supplementing institutions, then systems high in community would also have an above-average use of institutions and this is just what seems to be happening.'

Recent prison population figures (see Table 1) and the financial investment in the creation of the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) would suggest that such expansionary forces continue apace. Hostel numbers have remained relatively stable for over a decade, however prison numbers are on an upward trajectory.

Market liberalisation in the corrections field is premised upon the assumption that it is both possible and desirable to deliver a greater quality service and derive a profit for shareholders or at least reduce costs for government in creating a competitive paradigm.

Drakeford (2000: 23) notes that:

'The period with which we are concerned here is one in which the boundary moved, against the tide of recent history, away from public provision and in favour of private responsibility.'

In applying both market liberalisation and potentially privatisation, one does not necessarily follow from the other, there is potential for ideological conflict between the underlying purposes and functions of institutions and the new reconstituted forms these may take as a result of these processes. This thesis is not suggesting that public provision is a pre requisite to good rehabilitative practice. In fact chapter two suggests the prior existence of effective rehabilitative practices outside the public realm. However what is of interest is how a criminal justice service which is about transforming and

rehabilitating individuals to see their connectedness and responsibility to the wider social good, collectivism, transforms its practices and goals when pushed to operate under a drive to be more efficient and cost effective? That is, might managerialist concerns and forms usurp rehabilitative practices?

Hostels appear explicitly on the 'privatisation radar' in the 1992 White Paper, Partnership in Dealing with Offenders in the Community. Private tendering was suggested for the provision of hostel premises. Like social services and health departments before them, albeit to a lesser degree, chief probation officers were tasked with spending 5% and then 7.5 % of their budgets on partnerships. In reality it would be the end of the decade before privatisation was to impact meaningfully on hostels. Chapters seven, eight and nine will touch upon the specific impact of this shift on hostels today.

Privatisation and marketisation redefine relationships. Within probation clients, who have become 'offenders' become a commodity which providers can bid to provide services to and supervision and surveillance of. Management will potentially become the customer purchasing or tendering for offender services and interventions. It is difficult to see how the relational aspect of rehabilitation and re-integration will fare in this.

Service Managers will become consumers and purchasers wielding the power to define the product they desire. A redefinition of the relationship between citizens and the state within the criminal justice system begs questions as to which the customers are and whether the recipients (or private providers) of services can or should have a say in the 'services' offered. Moreover the evidence suggests that the role (and investment return) of public services may be undermined too. Cavadino and Dignan (2002: 251) citing Lawrence (1986: 662) warn that to see the delivery of punishment as a purely technical matter that can be outsourced is problematic with the possibility that the outsourcing of coercive state powers may become used:

'to further private rather than public interest.'

These private interests may be individual as well corporate: e.g. Cavadino and Dignan (2002: 252) list the numbers of senior ex prison service employees who were 'poached' by private companies in the prison privatisation of the early 1990s. Privatisation may have 'unintended' consequences of removing expertise from the public sector, which has been built up and paid for from the public purse. Moreover policy makers may be at risk of creating an arena where their policy decisions on justice have possible financial benefits attached to them and promoting a world where civil servants including, inspectorate members know that they and their decisions have corporate as well as moral capital attached to them. Later chapters will consider whether privatisation within hostels has had intended or unintended consequences on their function.

Allen and Hough (2007: 586) suggest moral and practical limits to this outsourcing suggesting that, despite the Home Office seeing no conflict of interests in this approach, others within the system remain to be convinced:

'The Home Office sees no conflict of interest in the idea of a private company preparing pre sentence reports yet a sentencer made it clear in evidence to the Home Affairs Committee ...that she for one would struggle to take such a report seriously.'

The ethics of devolved powers to the private sector and restructured relations in the public sector are not straightforward and for the most part appear unexplored both morally and practically, in terms of their impact on the efficacy of the State apparatus to achieve rehabilitative goals with its citizens and the possible asset stripping of key staff.

McWilliams (1990) notes the risk of reducing probation clients to 'products' and tradable products at that, ignoring individuality and creating a 'technical' service more concerned with batch processing and cost-effective management. A shift away from a welfare orientation into a provider of services role 'demoralises' the relationship between probation officer and 'offender', reconstructing the core tasks and deconstructing core values. It

remains to be seen how this impacts on re-offending rates and public protection both in hostels and the wider service.

Without clear policy and practice boundaries being established between those in public and private sectors, concerns about vested interests could undermine public confidence in the legitimacy of sections of the justice sector. The de-professionalisation of the probation service in this period was, it would appear, for greater political purposes yet to be revealed by 'New Labour' in a 21st century vision of 'offender management'.

Probation's task was to, yet again, become centrally prescribed and redefined under Labour to the extent that it would become its role to implement the wishes of the Home Secretary and remove local variation and disagreements over community justice policies and practices. Probation Officers and Probation Boards were to be told what they must do; professional discretion appeared to be waning under the weight of new centralist forces. In a consultative document, *A New Choreography*: Eithne Wallis the first Director of the newly created National Probation Service was to state in 2000:

'Nothing short of deep-rooted culture change in the organisation can deliver these reforms and outcomes. Many probation areas have already made a good start and we will acknowledge and build on these achievements. Sometimes, however, I shall be leading the Service against the grain of its past history and traditions. As National Director, my primary strategic objective is to build the capacity of the NPS to deliver the Home Secretary's priorities and requirements.'

Both the historical perspectives and ethnographic study that will be offered in this thesis attempt to make explicit any changes or shifts such reforms have initiated in organisational practices and culture. The conclusion of this thesis will consider whether hostels are being led against their rehabilitative and re-integrative tradition.

Pitts (2001: 42) has criticised attempts to impose a homogenous culture on bodies being asked to work in multi-agency partnerships. In the case of Youth Justice he has noted:

'It seems that in its effort to construct a corporate youth justice system, the YJB has systematically confused the building of an effective multi-agency team with the eradication of professional difference and the denial of structural conflict.'

Moves towards a National, centralised probation / corrections service appear to, at best, distil if not ignore evidence of structural differences and pluralist approaches to achieving good practice. The development or at least the attempt to develop a cultural hegemony of a unified 'corrections' agency and workforce who are 'on message' is exemplified in reviews and attacks by government on Probation Officer Training. The removal of the requirement to have a social work qualification and the development of new separate training arrangements for probation officers in 1998 with the creation of the Diploma in Probation Studies which has a Home Office prescribed curriculum and contractual relationship with Universities who tender to provide this qualification typifies a growth in centralised definitions of both purpose and practice. Hostels have for the most part sat outside of this debate, as most hostel staff do not require a qualification.

However such overt social control, by the government in the domain of probation training exemplifies Blakemore's (2003: 101) first type of social control i.e. 'directly coercive', limiting the autonomy and freedom of a whole profession in a deliberate and suppressive manner. The Dews and Watts Report (1994) can be read as having been broadly supportive of the Social Work route and suggestive of changes to this approach as opposed to a complete scrapping of any recognised professional qualification and schism between social work and probation.

In removing the requirement to have a CQSW or Dip SW the Home Secretary did not replace this with any other requirement, so although currently

committed to a university based qualification incorporating an NVQ there is no legal bar to Probation Boards employing anyone as a probation officer.³⁰ Contact with probation services during the course of this research disclosed assistant chief officers and area managers now in post without prior probation training or traditional qualification e.g. CQWS, Dip SW or Dip PS. Policing, Legal, Military or Psychological qualifications now appear to be accepted by some areas, with no prior requirement of having supervised offenders on probation being required to be a service manager. The claim to a 'professional identity' and value base appears considerably weakened. The seeds of such change could be argued to have their roots in earlier developments such as the 1968 Seebohm report and the 1971 Local Social Services Act, which as noted earlier separated out the governance responsibilities and practice domains of 'Social Work' to Local Authorities and 'Probation' to the Home Office.

However as Harris and Webb (1987) suggest, reactions against power, from within, may not only reinforce and retrench the expansion of that power by co-constructing debates and practice but moreover may become central to its' expansion.

'the action which subverts also sustains.'

Harris and Webb (1987: 176)

The recruitment of non qualified staff and the ability to shape and influence curricula in direct and powerful ways subtly erodes the potential for dissent and allows current orthodoxy to be presented as 'best practice', allowing government, bearing in mind that governments can be of any persuasion, to directly define the knowledge and skill base required by a 'profession'.³¹ In

³⁰ At the time of writing this is under review and current contracts with the Home Office commenced their last cohorts of trainee probation officers in 2007. It remains to be seen what will replace this. There is some suggestion that a sub degree, modular qualification might include specific learning units for staff in hostels.

³¹ This recruitment of non qualified staff now extends to senior managers with no qualified practice base in either Social Work or Probation, managing and overseeing those who work with high risk offenders.

picking up the Conservative baton, New Labour has structurally redefined what probation is and whose interests it serves. By tendering out probation officer education and training it has run with, not from, marketisation and privatisation. It remains to be seen how 'street level bureaucrats' (Lipsky 1980) effect the implementation of such changes in practice.

The above typifies how hostels, for good or bad, have managed until very recently to sit to the side of core mainstream developments in policy and practice. Training for staff in hostels was not part of this debate and was never seriously discussed or considered by mainstream staff, the Community Justice National Training Organisation (CJNTO - the fore runner of Sector Skills Councils) or Higher Education (HE) providers. Home Office Circulars such as PC 41/05 aimed at PSO's maintained the silence on the training needs of hostel staff.

Hostels sitting to the side of mainstream practice and discourse may have signalled missed opportunities to better understand the extent to which they can rehabilitate or re-integrate individuals into the community. Hostels may be a source of learning for practitioners and policy makers keen to understand what works in enabling desistance.³² Research findings from hostels appeared to have little iteration or influence on the development on wider probation practice. The HMIP (1998) inspection report found that less than 4% of residents offended during their period of residence. Dr Phil Lockett author of the report was to comment at a Hostels Conference in 2002 that generally those who did re-offend in hostels were convicted of less serious offences than their index offence albeit there were some serious offences committed by a minority. Surprisingly few research studies or reviews have highlighted this considerable achievement.

³² Desistance refers to the processes by which ex-offenders reform. In the hostel context generative mechanisms may be present which enable this process. The work of Maruna (2003(3rd edition)) provides a helpful exploration of how 'deviants' may become productive members of the community.

A triumph of ideology?

The managerial focus of a post Thatcherite era has narrowed the focus of the probation practitioner and the wider organisation. As Pitts (2001: 43) notes:

'One way to dislodge this parasitic by-product of the welfare state is to dismantle the structures which sustain it'.

Direct links to higher education were by 2003 limited from nine HE Institutions to five post 1992 Higher Education establishments and practice has become measured by achievement of centrally defined targets. The increase in the employment of non probation officer grade staff and the appointment of managers with no probation qualifications undermines the potential size of dissent and lessens the likelihood of the subversion of corporate goals by the exercise of 'professional discretion'. HMIP (2000 and 2003) in relation to victim work has remarked on the growth of the PSO grade of staff and the relative lack of training beyond a period of 'sitting with Nellie'.³³

The language of 'service-user' and 'offender' has replaced that of client or individual. Pre Sentence Reports, Case Records and Risk Assessments all refer to the individual as 'an offender' whether they have ceased offending or not. This use of language may be shaping how staff view those they work with and how 'partnership' agencies view those probation refers to them.

Hostels it will be argued, at least until recently, have largely been ignored in wider attempts to create a unified and less professionally radical workforce. Pitts (2001: 43) suggests that wider de-professionalisation, tight time targets, increased throughput and bureaucratic targets all serve to induce 'initiative fatigue'. Hostels however have a limited number of residents and possible tasks for staff. An ethnographic study in later chapters will include an exploration of hostels staffing, considering whether Sinclair's (1971)

³³ An in service PSO induction programme has been introduced since 2005. The London Probation Service has made links with an HE provider to link this to a Certificate in Higher Education.

observations on a lack of training for such staff remains pertinent today and whether de-professionalisation may be seen to have impacted on the hostel sector. It may be important to consider whether the omission of hostel staff from Probation's wider attempts to create a homogenous workforce has impacted on staff perceptions of their role and function within the wider probation service. Moreover to what extent may they be seen to be part of a wider drive towards a 'correctional service' today?

The current focus of 'corrections policy' is on developing a National Offender Management Service, Home Office Bulletin 001/05 'National Offender Management Model' states:

'The NOMS Offender Management Model has been circulated to all areas. The model aims to provide a common understanding of the components and processes of effective work with offenders and a common language to accompany them. It is the result of many consultations held over the past year, to which numerous NPS staff have contributed. It is intended to provide a single framework within which the different organizations and staff who make up NOMS can unify. It is also intended to provide the overarching framework within which change and improvement projects can be located.'

Management is tasked with not only setting the agenda but also with defining the role, purpose and function of what was probation. The desire to create, buttress and secure a new common language and purpose appears unremitting. The service has changed its name or at least the function that manages it has, it has cut the umbilical cord with its welfarist past and now, in name at least, is running towards a future of managing offenders. NOMS as an organization and offender management as a process and aim have encapsulated 'management' as core to their definition, function and practice (Grapes 2005 and PC65/2005). NOMS initially failed to gain legislative approval. Chapter seven will bring this development up to date.

In less than 30 years 56 local services have been dismantled, nationalized into one body and had their identity weakened, their professional qualification

redefined, day to day working practices and the very language it used prescribed.³⁴ Much of this managerialist agenda has taken place under the direction and drive of 'New Labour'.

As Pitts (2001: 131) notes:

'New Labour was quick to appropriate both the language and the technology of second-wave new managerialism. Its emphasis upon the rationality of 'what works', 'joined up solutions', and 'empowerment' fitted well with New Labour's avowed commitment to rational public policy...'

However the apparent 'hands off' approach of government is now matched by a seemingly incongruous micromanagement of delivery to ensure that targets are achieved. A list of areas of policy and guidance from the Home Office in January 2005 is revealing:

- 001/05 National Offender Management Model
- 002/05 Chief Officer Appointments
- 003/05 Management of Offenders and Sentencing Bill
- 004/05 Updated National Standards
- 005/05 CS Regional Information Sheets
- 006/05 NPS Technology Upgrade
- 007/05 NPS European Projects
- 008/05 Living Leadership Update
- 009/05 STEPS 2 Project Renamed
- 010/05 NOMS Drug Strategy

The drive for further managerialist solutions to the crime problem under a centralised and highly politicised service appears unremitting:

³⁴ See NOMS (2006) Appendix 5 'The "New" Language of Offender Management, which prescribes the new role and task language to be used in offender management. The 'offender manager' is described as ' *The person of whatever grade and from whichever agency, with allocated responsibility for assessing what each case (offender) requires , for planning its delivery and for co-ordinating that delivery, as far as can be assured, the same person throughout any single period of continuous engagement with NOMS.*'

*'The Management of Offenders and Sentencing Bill was published on 13 January. The proposed new legislation aims to bring further reforms, already underway through the establishment of the National Offender Management Service, and changes to the sentencing framework. Some of the key aims of the Bill are: To establish the aims of NOMS and the core offender management function To give the Home Secretary greater powers to direct how probation boards can contract with the private or voluntary sector.'*³⁵

Chapter Seven will explore what happened to this Bill and begin to consider how NOMS may be impacting on hostels. The next chapter will take a step away from the broad policy context and consider the more traditionally recognised but relatively unexplored development of the modern hostel story from their legal inception in 1970 through to 2001, which the author will assert marks a turning point in hostels role and purpose.

The chapter will consider whether the shifts outlined in this chapter can be detected in the hostel story. Did hostels as suggested, sit to the side of wider probation story? What roles and functions did they perform and to what extent is there evidence of research or Home Office interest in what they do? The next chapter will present a more specific literature review of developments specific to hostels from 1969 – 2001.

³⁵ Initially (2006) this Bill was defeated but there was little evidence of any retreat from the aspiration to create a National Offender Management Service. In 2007 it eventually received parliamentary assent.

From treatment and rehabilitation to public protection and offender management - a paradigm shift

Chapter Four:

A potential weakness of hostel research in general is that, relative to wider probation studies, so little has been done that the preferences, interests and predilections of a few researchers may have to a large extent dominated and shaped any academic, policy or practice debate that has occurred. This is reflected in this work as Sinclair's (1971) influential study shaped the direction of much subsequent research and its focus on regimes. Sinclair's study carried out over 35 years ago with young male residents is still heavily commented on today e.g. Burnett and Eaton (2004) in their review of hostel literature. Sinclair's work drew attention to the importance of regimes, wardens and the internal workings of the hostel. The ethnographic work presented in chapters six and eight and the conclusion will consider the extent to which such attention remains warranted. The relative lack of research in this area has meant that even those authors wishing to redress this balance risk perpetuating the original focus of those few pieces of academic research published between 1969 and 1990 in this area.

However in recognising this, an attempt has been made to offer alternative viewpoints from which to consider hostels development and attention will be drawn to more recent research that has a wider focus.

This chapter will serve as a literature review of the contemporary hostels story from 1969 to 2001, just before the ethnographic research commenced (2002). Chapter seven will update developments in probation and hostels' policy between 2001 and the completion of this research in 2007. Having established that hostels have a much longer pre history than is generally recognised (Burnett and Eaton 2004, Thurston 2002), this chapter will explore who hostels were for and how they developed over this thirty year period. It

will examine whether an initial commitment to rehabilitation and reintegration is maintained and begin to map how some of the wider policy changes detailed in chapter three impacted on hostels development. Core to this will be an exploration of whether hostels developed a clear purpose and role and whether any such role was synchronous to the wider needs of probation or the criminal justice system. Who were their residents and did their focus change?

The author will explore and engage with some key pieces of hostel specific research that took place in this period including; Sinclair (1971), Hudson (1981), Fisher and Wilson (1982), Wincup (1996), HMIP (1993, 1998 and 2001) and highlight some specific research on Keywork in hostels (1998) and the use of hostels for bailees, Lewis and Mair (1998) and Drakeford et al (2001).

Hostels start this period with a relatively vigorous period of interest in their possible roles but over the 30 years this review covers, interest waxed and waned, at times being difficult to detect at all (Thurston 2002). Despite rapid and significant change in the probation service in this period, hostels although experiencing varied interest, for the most part sit to one side of mainstream probation developments until the late 1990s and the turn of the century. The exception to this is a period of interest in hostels for bailees in the 1980s and the later legislative developments which followed, opening up the possibility to hostels having new and different purposes.

Previous chapters have identified clear links between hostels' rehabilitative purpose and core practices of providing; accommodation, supportive relationships, education, the opportunity to access employment in the community and some sense of moral or personal development allowing a transition to a reformed status over time. This chapter will seek to ascertain whether such practices continued in this period and whether early differentiations between the 'perishing' and the 'dangerous' (Carpenter 1968: 2) are further developed. Did the drivers of, concern about the prison population, specific social problems, resettlement of those coming from

custody and a lack of continued optimism about the merits and limits of 'casework' begin to impact on who hostels were for? Hostels emerge in this period into a framework of 'empirical scepticism and political pragmatism' (Raynor 2003: 77 in Chui and Nellis (Eds)). Hostels that clearly focussed on offenders and those at risk of offending will be included in this review and not just those approved by the Home Office within formal legislation. Whilst much may be learnt from exploring hostels more generally those that did not have explicit links to rehabilitation and resettlement of offenders have been excluded from this review.

In making sense of hostel development in this period it will be important to note that some key developments in practice e.g. the development of 'accredited programmes' by pass hostels. However a review of hostel's literature will suggest that probation in general may benefit from a greater awareness of the rehabilitative efforts trialled and evaluated in this period.

The author will argue that the 1991 Criminal Justice Act sounds a warning bell to hostels' ability to remain to one side of mainstream practice. By the end of this period (2001) hostels are being pulled more centre stage in an emerging discourse and practice of 'offender management'. Indeed by 2001 there is an announcement of a hostel pathfinder (Home Office PC 110/2001). Later chapters will explore whether hostels changed, by way of an ethnographic study reported in chapters six and eight.

Who were hostels for?

Having outlined hostels' early rehabilitative roots in previous chapters, it is of note that at the start of the period being explored here hostels maintained a clear focus on the aims of transformation and resettlement. What was less clear in this period was who hostels should be transforming and resettling and how they should achieve this (Grimsey 1963). Despite claims that up until the early 1970s hostels were solely focussed on children and young people (Burnett and Eaton 2004: 2), it is clear from the work of Rolph (1971), Trotter (1969), Grimsey (1963), Bryan (1967), Dalzell (1966), Wilcox and Morley

(1970) and Cook Morgan and Pollok (1968), that a range of re-integrative purposes had recently been or were under consideration in this period with adult offenders.

Rolph (1971) outlined research on five distinct possible types of hostel:

A Multi Purpose Hostel

A Bed Sitter Hostel

A Hostel for Alcoholics

A Hostel for Aged Offenders

A Work Restoration Therapy Unit.

Set up as part of a 1965 committee to look into the needs of homeless discharged prisoners, such work should not be overlooked in exploring and understanding hostel's development. Rolph notes of hostels at that time (1971: 5) that:

'with two remarkable exceptions, those in existence were working in isolation from one another, and sometimes to one another's disadvantage...'

The exception included Langley House which continues to this day (HMIP 2007) and Norman House one of the earliest mentioned first probation hostels. Rolph (1971: 5) refers to these as 'halfway houses'.³⁶ That is for their residents they were half way back into the community either from prison or from their addiction or disenfranchised status. Although not strictly 'approved probation hostels' this work was supported by the Home Office, Local Probation Areas and their staffing included probation staff on secondment as wardens (Rolph 1975: 17) or as members of the hostels governing committee (Rolph 1975: 10). Moreover prisons and probation were the main source of referrals (Rolph 1975: 18 & 22).

³⁶ Opened in 1954.

The early model from training ships and industrial schools of residents being able to progress through the system is in part evidenced by how the hostels were staffed and the role that the residents could accrue by way of reward (ibid: 19) even to the extent of abandoning resident staff in one hostel.

Rolph also highlighted the ability of NIMBYISM to halt the development of a hostel with groups being stigmatised because of the potential risks they may present. He quotes the response of a local council officer:

'Would you advise the idea of a hostel within 100 yards of a girl's convent? Some of the men will have been separated from the opposite sex for years (No sex offenders would have been sent to the hostel).'

Rolph (1971: 26)

Around the same time that Rolph's work was taking place there were also experiments in developing hostels linked to prisons as a part of pre release schemes, providing work or training courses prior to release on parole. Trotter (1969) piloted pre release hostels linked to prisons:

'Living in the hostel, they went out to jobs offered whither by the manager of the labour exchange... or by the Assistant Governor Warden or Principal Officer...who..had built up valuable contacts with numerous employers, who looked with a friendly and humanitarian eye on the hostellers.'

Trotter (1969: 97)

She notes that;

'Once a man was admitted to the hostel, he was severed from all contact with the main prison'

Trotter (1969: 98)

Hostels in this case were a move away from custody and a previous identity as an offender / prisoner.

These hostels both carried on the longer tradition of seeing employment as core to rehabilitation and reinforced the notion that resettlement and support was required to achieve transition from an 'offender' to a reintegrated 'citizen' identity. Such work required real links to the community and demonstrates a continuation of the desire for some parts of the community to engage with offenders.

Estlea (1973) citing examples from New Zealand suggested a new and diverse purpose for hostels, i.e. the possibility of them offering periodic detention. The practice driver in this instance appeared to be a humanitarian concern to offset the damage that custody causes individuals and their families. Interestingly Estlea (1973) suggested a model that was linked to 'local' communities so that offenders and families could maintain work and familial relationships. Under such a scheme the local interest and the system interest would come together i.e. pressure could be taken off the prison system and offenders could be both punished and rehabilitated in a very visible way, whilst maintaining positive links with work and family. There is little evidence of wider policy or research in this period exploring the co-existence of punishment and re-integrative regimes with explicit links to local communities and families from the start of a sentence.

Had this approach been taken up it would have changed hostels from being halfway in the community to being halfway out, it could have offered a new hybrid between punishment and rehabilitation but like many suggestions for hostel's possible purposes was never taken up.

Prior to the 1969 CYPA the use of hostels to resettle adult offenders in the community was being trialled as a way of preparing men for release from custody. From Trotter's work (1969) it is clear that these performed a testing out role too and flagged at an early stage the possibility of the co-existence of care and control functions.

Probation's more indirect involvement in the development of hostel like responses to social need and offending can be seen in this period too in the

setting up of the Wallich Clifford Community by an ex-probation officer convinced of the links between homelessness, social deprivation and crime (Wallich 1976). Coker (1970) suggested that up to a third of those leaving custody were homeless and argued for the location of hostels near to where work could be found, i.e. in the community with fellow citizens and not in isolated rural areas. Writings by David Brandon ((1941-2001) cited in Smith 2006)) and his research work for Cathy Come Home (1966) typified a continuation of earlier reformers' concerns about the links between homelessness, crime and recidivism. Need and risk were not juxtaposed, in fact meeting need was perceived as away of averting future offending despite an emerging lack of faith with rehabilitation and reform in probation more generally (Martinson 1974, Folkard et al 1976, Croft 1978). Hostels and those involved in them present in the 1970s as strongly committed to the possibility of the transformation and reintegration of those whom they capture. Hostels sat to one side of more general rehabilitative scepticism and continued to receive calls for their expansion (Home Office 1970). Research and political enquiry into hostel's purposes and efficacy (Rolph 1971, Morison 1962, Seebohm 1968, Sinclair 1971) had begun. McNellie sounded a cautious optimism for their future reflecting the view that individual influence was of greater import than anything else:

'It (the provision of hostels) may have far reaching results, but everything will depend on the tact and goodness of the people who manage them; only people with a respect for personality can make them succeed.'

McNellie (1974: 77)

At the start of this period then, hostels have their roots in a re-integrative and rehabilitative tradition that sees hostels as providing a specific method of re-engaging individuals in society. Cook et al (1968: 40) highlighted the ability of a hostel:

'to build up long standing relations with men who had previously been estranged from normal social contacts for long periods...'

Echoing the earlier Morison Committee Report (1962: 5) which saw hostels as providing:

'training ...in living acceptably with contemporaries and older people.'

Hostels whoever they were conceived as being for, adults or children, were clearly and primarily a place for transformation, re-socialisation and re-integration. Hostels were halfway between custody and community, half way in that is, as opposed to halfway out. Table 3.1 in the previous chapter summarises the general focus and discourse of hostels at the start of the 1970s.

Renewed interest in the rehabilitative potential of hostels for adults was co-terminus with the 1969 CYPA but also part of a wider and longer 'hostel movement'. Post 1971 research that informed understandings of who hostels were for and what they did has been heavily influenced by the work of Sinclair (1971) which focussed on the regimes of 16 hostels for adolescent boys.

The Potential Impact of the Hostel and the Role of the Warden

Sinclair had been interested to explore the problems of running a small institution and had been keen to observe any possible impact of environment on delinquency. Sinclair's work may be seen as an early forerunner of the 'what works' movement. He explored issues of matching the right staff, to the right offenders and providing the right treatment. He suggested that:

'...a successful regime must satisfy two requirements;

- a) Allow feelings and problems to come out into the open...
- b) See that boys know where they stand.'

Sinclair (1970: 230)

Although focussed on work with adolescent boys, Sinclair's research was and to some extent remains one of the major and most quoted pieces of hostel research. Burnett and Eaton (2004: v) refer to this as 'a landmark study'. It is somewhat surprising that the work of Rolph (1971) and others noted above, that had focussed on work with adults, was omitted from their review. Much of the research that has been done on hostels (Fisher and Wilson 1982, Burnett and Eaton 2004, Wincup 2002, Thurston 2002, Barton 2005) has tended to use Sinclair as both a starting point and landmark in exploring how hostels developed, who they were for and what they did.

Sinclair's work is of more general utility too if it is understood as having focused hostel attention less on who they were for and when they started but more on what they could do and how. Key to his research findings were the four core areas of; regime, staffing, particularly the role of the warden and staff training, the impact of the hostel on reconviction rates and which type of residents benefited from living in them.

Sinclair found that a successful regime was dependent on the type of dynamic that existed between the warden, the other staff and the residents:

'A common pattern in successful regimes was...the discipline was strict but the warden kind... the warden had an understanding of the boy's problems and was supported by his wife'

Sinclair (1970: 230)

It is important to note the continued existence of a strong familial model being offered here with strong patriarchal overtones of the 'warden' being in charge. An exploration of hostel literature prior to the 1969 CYPA and in the years that followed, sees a continuation of familial (gendered) and therapeutic models (Hinton 1975). Such models were popular as they built on the preceding tradition and adapted these traditions to the theoretical (e.g. Bowlby 1971) and policy context (e.g. 1972 CJA) of the day.

'Hostels can provide their residents with a substitute family experience. Hostels structures are frequently built upon ... a converted family home, staffed by a happily married couple who are the fond mother and father (with a sort of uncle figure warden) ,living in perfect harmony with their adolescent grown up children. Regular wholesome meals, tidy bedrooms, sober living, good work habits, lights out at 11.00pm and abstinence for heterosexual behaviour, take the form of controls demanded by the regime in the name of treatment.'

Hinton (1975: 95-96)

Sinclair (1971: 101) highlighted the relationship between the warden's style and the impact this had on the success or otherwise of the regime. He found across the 16 hostels he researched a correlation between those wardens scoring highest on emotional distance i.e. the inability to communicate warmth and create a regime balancing care and control factors with an average 18% higher re-offending rate than those hostels with wardens with lower scores. Moreover if the warden was absent, on leave or sick absconding was over twice the rate as when he was present. Sinclair's research suggests that the withdrawing of key figures or change of key figures impacts on the efficacy of the regime. Even for limited periods such change can become associated with crisis. The implication in Sinclair's work is that the archetypical benevolent paternal warden is the most successful. This model had its roots in earlier training, ragged and industrial school type approaches. What remains to be seen is whether in the twenty first century such models persist or are useful.³⁷ Moreover for this model to work well there needs to be continuity of contact between residents and the hostel manager. Interestingly the withdrawing of 'warmth' as form of punishment was only effective as a sanction if there was basic underlying warmth in the regime / relationship. Modern probation practices in hostels and more widely on breach / enforcement may be able to learn from this.

³⁷ Such a model ignores the matriarchal role offered by the work of Carpenter and Hill discussed in chapter two and highlights the potentially gendered nature of research.

His research suggests that consistency in staff attitudes which balances emotional support with clear messages about expectations is core to a successful regime. This iterates well with Wollins' (1969) protective factors: optimism, commitment to rear residents to maturity, social integration, a healthy peer group, socially constructive work and a clear ideology and much later research findings (Trotter 1999) around pro social modelling. A focus on relationships, values and expectations appears core to success. Later chapters will consider both residents and managers (wardens) perspectives of the extent to which these remain relevant to current hostels purposes.

Not only was the relationship between warden and residents considered core but Sinclair found that the role and relationship with the warden's assistant was critical too. Sinclair identifies a range of negative attributes that assistant wardens might have that were perceived as problematic and likely to make them 'unsatisfactory' in their role with residents. These generated six 'categories'

'Homosexual, mentally disturbed, discipline troubles, bad influence, disloyal, immature and other.'

Sinclair (1971: 55-56)

Although today some of these categories are seen as potentially revealing of prejudice or particular personal values, what they did highlight was the need for consistency between the explicit model of the regime (familial) and the actions, values and activities of staff. This highlighted the need for wardens to feel supported and able to depend on their deputies (Worthington 1972). Positive staff to staff and staff to resident relationships appear core to hostels successful functioning.

Sinclair also found that delinquents from the most disturbed backgrounds tended to make the most rapid improvement whilst in the hostel but deteriorated rapidly on leaving. Sinclair (1971: 135) suggested that environmental impacts varied i.e. the extent to which the hostel impacted on

residents was individual and that it may have been that reconviction was more to do with the environments residents returned to on departure from a hostel. What is important to note and Sinclair perhaps failed to make enough of this, was that hostels appear to be able to stop or significantly reduce offending whilst residents are there, a finding picked up by HMIP (1998: 2.4). The ethnographic work which follows will consider whether hostels recognise or attempt to impact on residents once they leave. As to the possible impact of the actual hostel environment on the individual Sinclair asserted:

'If the environment exercises any effect on the hostel, it is through the warden rather than despite him.'

Sinclair (1970: 138)

Hostels for Adults – Care Versus Control

Following the publication of Sinclair's research and shaped by the legislative changes of the 1969 CYPA, who probation hostels were for moved away from inclusion of children and focussed explicitly on adult provision. The 1972 Criminal Justice Act transformed wider probation and hostel purposes. What Sinclair's research did was to regenerate interest in hostels as an alternative model of intervention in the Criminal Justice System. Wilcox and Morley (1970) suggested their possible use as resource for working with those discharged from prison and in need of resettlement. What was less clear was whether the aim of hostels was to provide general welfare and support or to provide 'treatment' for specific problems:

'Are we discussing the provision of good lodgings with relatively understanding parent figures or are we discussing residential treatment for those with problems?'

Wilcox and Morley (1970: 14)

Explicit in Sinclair's research is the message that hostels need staff to value residents and communicate well with each other. Residents need to know that

they are valued and treated with respect, whilst at the same time held accountable for their actions. A key debate that was to bedevil hostels and theorising about hostels would be how this 'care' and 'control' should be balanced and what impact differential approaches might have in policy and practice. Successful hostels in Sinclair's (1970: 230) research were associated with:

'..the warden having an understanding of the boy's problems and was supported by his wife... the discipline was strict but the warden was kind'

And in unsuccessful hostels;

'..the discipline was ineffective or harsh... or the warden was ill supported by his wife.'

Developments in hostels which followed this work were influenced by emerging tensions in the wider service regarding tensions between care and control and a rising prison population (see Table 1 - Appendix 1).

Younghusband noted the impact that the 1972 CJA had in creating tensions in how probation officers more generally understood their work:

'Probation Officers, like other social workers in time of change and conflict, continued to have divided views as to whether the offender or society was sick; whether they might be agents of change or agents of social control.'

Younghusband (1978: 106-7)

It will be important in the ethnographic work to consider whether more recent changes have impacted on how hostel staff, understand their role and function. From this point onwards it is evident that a debate is emerging as to the extent to which probation in general (Fowler 1975) and Hostels in particular (Hinton 1975), should act as agents of control. Early on in the more

general debate some stigmatisation of those seen to argue against 'control' is noted:

'The polarisation between "hawks" and "doves", "right" and "left" probably means that already, in the little I have said, I have attracted the appropriate label.'

Fowler (1975: 158)

Hinton (1975: 97) expressed an early but balanced scepticism as to what hostels can achieve in isolation, however she went on to stress the importance of hostels being engaged with the wider community and suggested that isolation or attempts to provide everything within the hostel in fact leads to:

'...an excessive and counter-productive use of control.'

Hinton (1975: 98)

Chapters six and eight will explore whether the modern hostel is integrated into the community and consider how this may relate or not to issues of control. If control is being used how is this apparent in the modern hostel setting i.e. is it directly coercive or more subtle in its approach?

Who Should Hostels be for?

By the mid 1970s a range of views as to who hostels might be for existed. Fisher et al (1975) reported on Home Office research into who probation staff thought hostels should be for. Hostels or 'hostelling' as it was then referred to was perceived to meet the needs of three types of offenders:

- i) The Homeless Offender
- ii) Those Needing a Change of Environment
- iii) Those Needing Hostel Help to Overcome Personal Problems.

These purposes although diverse are essentially positivist in outlook, that is, they reflect a view that targeted intervention at an individual level can affect recidivism (Crow 2001). Such approaches routinely seek to change, assist and rehabilitate the individual as opposed to more classical approaches which focus primarily on the offence or the offenders' membership or uniformity with other similar offenders.³⁸ Positivist approaches typify the ascendancy of a treatment focused approach in the 1960s and 1970s in probation work more generally. In the period being explored, hostel or hostel like approaches were also being used outside the realms of the Criminal Justice System, constructed around a variety of client needs or client groups often referred to as halfway houses or residential facilities. Hostels were:

'... used for residential facilities for persons with a wide range of needs, alcoholics, drug addicts, unwed mothers, formal mental patients, probationers and ex convicts...'

James (1975: 147)

Diversity of purpose and a belief that hostels could help transform individuals and re-integrate them back into the community prevailed in residential criminal justice spheres as it did in other residential work at that time. More specifically a lack, or decline, in the belief that casework alone could deal with clients' needs and problems was undermining probation more generally (Folkard 1976). Morgan argued that given the generally heterogeneous natures of offenders that enabling change in offenders was:

'dependent on more than brief probation interviews'

Morgan (1975: 113)

³⁸ It is important to note that from the mid 1970s to 1980s a 'new' group of victims and offenders were being 'uncovered' or 'rediscovered'. Colton and Vanstone (1996:2)note that *'In Britain, the number of children on the NSPCC register under child sexual abuse rose exponentially from 7 in 1977 to 527 in 1986'*. Discussions with those who were working in probation in this period suggest that the hostel estate housed a small but regular number of such offenders. By 1993 it was estimated that 260,000 men in England and Wales had a conviction for a sexual offence of which 110,000 of these were for an offence against a child (Calder et al 1999: 4). Later chapters will consider whether this 'new' population begins to emerge in hostel policy and clientele.

An opportunity may have been missed here to highlight hostels potential to augment casework and engage with offenders in way that casework alone could not. Hostels had the potential to present as an alternative or supplement to the casework approach. However different their clientele they highlighted their needs and offered 24 hour contact as an opportunity to focus on residents' rehabilitative or social needs. Chapters six and eight will explore the extent to which the modern hostel utilises the rehabilitative and re-integrative potential that such regimes appear to offer and will consider how the 24 hour ,seven day a week nature of such regimes is utilised.

Individual workers, residents and managers are for the most part invisible in the research discussed above with the exception of the hostel warden. The ethnographic work will try and rebalance the invisibility or silencing of these valuable perspectives. Hostel research and the diverse nature of hostels highlighted the possibility of matching offender needs to the right treatment or the right regime. A finding highlighted by Folkard (1976) in the wider Intensive Methods of Probation After Care and Treatment (IMPACT) study.

The IMPACT study underscored the need for probation officers to focus not just on work with the individual offender but to also act as co-ordinators of community resources too.³⁹ Despite the existence of research and practice in hostels that supported the ethos of IMPACT, hostels were not at that time seen as a key player in the rehabilitative arsenal. They could have been and opportunities were missed to draw on the hostel research that did exist. However hostels, for better or worse, sat to one side of the debates impacting on probation more generally and continued to develop to the side, doing their own things. Vanstone (2004: 123) notes that in probation more generally, the treatment paradigm experienced an assault in the 1970s and psychology began to prevail over probation officer driven approaches as casework in general was seen to have little sound theoretical basis for its effectiveness.

³⁹ A call that was to be made again in the twenty first century NOMS model (see Grapes 2005).

'Probationers on the whole do no better if they were sent to prison, and rehabilitative programmes – whether involving psychiatric treatment, counselling, casework or intensive contact and special attention, in custodial or non custodial settings- have no predictably beneficial effects'

Brody (1976: 37)

It would not be until the 1976 Bail Act that a possible system role for hostels would be flagged. In creating a presumption of a right to bail, a possible new category of hostel resident was emerging. That said it took almost a decade for hostels' potential to make a wider contribution to the Criminal Justice System, to become addressed in any systematic way.

A Rising Prison Population ...

By 1978 the prison population was rising (see table 1) and as was noted in chapter three, so too was inflation. Labour was concerned about the rising cost of imprisonment. The House of Commons Expenditure Committee recommended an expansion of the hostel system. The recommendation made explicit mention of bailees as a possible resident group. It is at this point that one could argue that government begins to see the potential for hostels to be seen as a mechanism that could act as a safety valve to a much larger prison estate, as well as having a very specific purpose in working with those who were un-convicted. The 1980 All Party Penal Affairs Group ; 'Too Many Prisoners; An Examination of Ways of Reducing the Prison Population' suggested hostels as a general solution to the rising prison population and in particular suggested that they might usefully serve the needs of 'mentally disordered offenders' (1980: 6 paragraph 24) and those on bail (1980: 34 paragraph 136).

It is important to pause and note that a specific purpose was being put forward by government for hostels. That purpose primarily being to reduce pressure on the prison system and reduce costs. Government identified potential populations, i.e. bailees and the mentally ill, who might be separated

out from others and managed differentially for the wider benefit of the criminal justice system. Cost, governance and managerial oiling of the wheels of a much larger system might not end up seeing or valuing the rehabilitative and re-integrative expertise that hostels had to offer. That said hostels and researchers appeared to have been able to carry on with business as usual choosing whether or not to engage with these issues.

Before exploring the impact of the above the next section will focus on developments in the 1980's concentrating on the work of Fisher and Wilson (1982) and will suggest that their research is illuminating but shows hostels and hostel research sitting to the side of the debates and issues impacting on the wider service. It is important to note that between 1978 and 1980 both Labour then Conservative governments saw a potential role for hostels in relation to the growing prison population; experiencing a then all time high of 44,800 in 1980. This opened up the possibility of a less individual focussed approach as to who hostels might be for and opened up the possibility of using hostels to perform a particular function or focus on a particular group. Chapter two suggests that some of this is not new. Government had focussed on young offenders and those on the streets before i.e. those who were seen as members of the 'perishing' or 'dangerous' classes. However what was new was that the drive for hostels to provide for bailees came from government and not hostels or philanthropists. The reason for attention to a potential use of hostels for these new groups is primarily driven by a desire to ease the management of the prison population and reduce system costs. Those new groups identified for hostels are not selected on the basis of the hostel being seen as being able to meet their needs or the hostel function necessarily fitting with a probation role. Bail interest was not focussed on rehabilitation and represented a change of role for hostels. The author will first though, explore the developments and ideas that preceded this allowing the nature of this suggested change to be seen in its stark reality.

Developing Ideas and Missed Opportunities.

Having explored developments in the 1970s the chapter will now explore how hostels were understood and developed in the 1980s and 1990s. At the start of this period there were expressions of scepticism about the growth and development of hostels. Fisher et al (1980: 21) exemplify this:

'we doubt that the resources and the will for implementation of more comprehensive hostelling will be married this century'

And prefix this with the statement:

'All said and done, experiences could yet show adult probation hostels to be a dead end in the maze of offender disposals.'

It would appear that even those with a genuine research interest in hostels were uncertain as to their centrality and purpose within the rehabilitative scheme. The work of Fisher et al (1980) suggested that the hostels probation staff want, may not be the hostels they need. Fisher et al (1980) undermines the argument for offence specific hostels in favour of matching offenders to specific programmes and regimes according to how well they are prognosticated to respond to such regimes. Their work is a good example of the dissonance and underlying tensions in hostel writing between wider policy contexts, the interests of individual research projects and the needs of offenders and communities.

Hudson (1981) reinforced the work of Sinclair (1971) and suggested that the warden's role was critical but went on to argue that there should be coherence between the warden's style and the resident's needs developing a theoretical argument that hostels could be developed along a range of different typologies that would engage with different resident need and states of maturity.

Core to Hudson's argument is the notion that the structured environment should be one in which the totality of the hostel, the style of the warden and the wider staff – resident relationships should be in harmony with one another and reflect the overall ethos of the hostel. Drawing on the work of Kholberg (1976) he argued that:

'It is possible to suggest which type of hostel regime might suit probationers at various levels of moral development'.

Hudson (1981: 13)

Hudson (1981: 14-15) echoing Wollins' (1969) six protective factors, puts forward six implications for hostels from the model of matching he suggests:

Internal Consistency

The Warden as: Source of Hostel Ideology

The Warden as Boundary between Internal and External Relationships

Ability of the Warden to Maintain the Style and Regime.

Flexibility in the Regime to Residents Development / Progression

A Healthy Resident Culture in the direction of Adult Expectations.

Core to all of this is the ability of the warden to make links between the hostel and the wider service and the hostel and the wider world (ibid: 16). Chapters six and eight will enquire as to what extent the contemporary hostel manager sees this as their role and consider whether managers today encourage and promote interaction between the hostel and the wider service and the hostel and the wider community.

The conclusion of this thesis will consider whether the theoretical and policy underpinnings of the modern hostel match with a developmental approach to residents growth and rehabilitation, that is are they primarily greenhouses temporarily looking after, developing and monitoring individuals with a view to a transfer to independent living or warehouses, storing and guarding those entrusted to them?

Carlisle House, Culverlands and Hostel Practices in the 1980s

Fisher and Wilson (1982) carried out a comparative study of two different experimental hostels for adult offenders, 'Carlisle House' and 'Culverlands'. Both hostels were within the Hampshire Probation Area. The 1972 CJA provided for Probation Hostels for Adults:

'... for use in connection with the rehabilitation of offenders'

Criminal Justice Act (1972 S.53.1)

Restating the expected rehabilitative link with external employment:

'probation hostels' means premises provided for the accommodation of persons who may be required to reside there by a probation order, being persons who are employed outside the premises or waiting for employment.'

Criminal Justice Act (1972 S53.6)

A lack of reference in Fisher and Wilson's work to employment and the wider debates of the day surrounding hostels is surprising and leaves the reader uncertain as to how real a role this had in practice. This lack of iteration with legislative and policy purposes may have reinforced the image of hostels and hostel research, sitting to one side of mainstream probation work with limited reference as to how hostel work linked with wider probation work, for either residents or staff. Hostel research has the potential to take place in isolation from probation and without reference to wider theoretical and policy developments, thus reinforcing their potentially disenfranchised status. Those who research hostels today may need to challenge this approach if as suggested by Fisher et al (1980) hostels are not to yet become the cul de sac of probation interventions.

Building on the work of Sinclair (1971) Fisher and Wilson (1982) explore the themes of 'authority' versus 'freedom', taking two hostels that exemplify

polarisation between these two factors. Carlisle House had a regime devised by the warden Steve Essex:

'a radical and pioneering experiment in the therapeutic use of freedom'

Fisher and Wilson (1982: 11)

It was informed by principles of having few rules, minimal use of staff authority and a democratic approach to day to day living. It was suggested that freedom from control and rules could be used to promote self control and self awareness. Care, challenge, demand and stimulation were the four drivers.

Fisher and Wilson found that residents felt that staff were not doing their job and actually wanted them to act with authority and make decisions. They concluded that the experiment was based upon a misunderstanding of freedom. That is, freedom cannot be understood without reference to law or restraint. The Ethnographic work will consider the extent to which staff and residents may perceive the converse of this as true today. Moreover it will be important to consider whether the probation service continues to permit staff the freedom to test out a range of intervention approaches.

Carlisle House may be seen to epitomise the worst stereotypes of the treatment approach that Martinson (1974), Brody (1976) and the Home Office lost faith with. Such failures, Carlisle House was soon closed down, helped undermine faith in social work with offenders and may have created a climate of distrust in letting probation officers have the freedom to design and devise programmes of intervention.

Culverlands on the other hand:

'...subjected the resident to a formal structure with a rigid hierarchy and strict discipline requiring him to work his way up the hierarchy by demonstrating a willingness to develop and grow...'

Fisher and Wilson (1982: 14)

This retained, in part, the idea of a resident working their way up through a system as those on sailing ships and in training and industrial schools had in the past.

Culverlands was unique in the probation hostel work of its day for its explicit experimental work in creating a regime that explicitly sought to:

- a) convert recidivists into law-abiding competent citizens
- b) explicitly seeking to achieve that aim by means of a comprehensive programme of communal therapy
- c) unequivocally accepting the control/ punishment implications of treating clients sentenced by the courts.

Fisher and Wilson (1982: 108)

Culverlands had an explicit focus on changing the individual with regard to their 'deviant lifestyles' and not just on meeting or assisting with their social or personal needs. It did not shy away from the imposition of a controlling regime:

'The resident is not permitted contact with any relative, friend or associate outside the community until he has become fully integrated into the programme and has shown that he can cope effectively with his own problems within the house.'

Fisher and Wilson (1982: 112)

This model linked to theories underpinning therapeutic treatment and was presumably informed by and aware of similar types of experiments in residential probation work evident in 1950s and 1960s probation work in the United States. An insightful case study of a hostel as a 'therapeutic community' for drug treatment and offender rehabilitation is provided by Sugerman (1974). It is important to highlight the growing discourse, influenced by therapeutic community work (Whitley 2004), that a period of separation and intense communal living with those who had similar problems could help

transform individuals. Culverlands unlike Carlisle House or 'Daytops' in Amercia (Sugerman 1974), sought to enforce change to enable residents to take up freedom.

Residents of Culverlands were kept out of the wider community, at least on their own, and access to the community or freedom in the community was a reward for conformity. In this instance community, out there, had little or no role in the rehabilitative process and was perceived as antithetical to this in the early stages of change. However the aim was to return a reformed and restored individual to society.

A range of interesting and with hindsight harsh and bizarre punishments, with their origins in older institutional regimes were constructed for misdemeanours including; '*haircutting*', '*dishpan*' and '*placard*' (Fisher and Wilson: 119).⁴⁰ It should be noted though that many residents in Fisher and Wilson's study had positive things to say about their experiences although nearly all appear to have found the regime stressful and absconding was very high.

This experimental regime was closed down as a result of a range of factors including high absconding rates, occupancy problems and a lack of ability to demonstrate any success, although many staff and residents argued that it had enabled fundamental change for individuals. Probation was not willing to invest in such a resource. Ironically the much maligned regime at Carlisle House could evidence higher retention rates and some degree of success.

Both approaches reflect different understandings of how society, or for that matter any institution e.g. family, church, school etc can impose normative, predefined roles and responsibilities whilst enabling the ability to live with freedom and individual choice. Both approaches rested on the style, interest and influence of a few key individuals, in the former case a charismatic manager, in the latter a Chief Officer with an enthusiasm for research and interest and belief in the work of a local residential treatment 'expert' with a

⁴⁰ Sugerman's (1974: 51-67) observations and reflections on the use of 'Social Control' within a therapeutic community iterate with and *explain* the rationale behind such punishments.

background in psychiatry and drug treatment. As with Sinclair's (1970) earlier research both regimes studied here were highly dependent upon the style and personality of the manager/ warden. This suggests as Hudson (1981) had, that regimes created for particular types of individuals, with particular styles of regime and manager may be more or less successful. For workers this may be controversial. Effective rehabilitation and reintegration in a hostel environment appears to require matching worker style and ability to residents needs. Who keywords which residents in hostels ought then to be informed by such findings. Keyword evaluations carried out by Services tend to ignore such findings (Staffordshire Probation Service 1998).

The Fisher and Wilson research is indicative of some of the wider penological and political debates about how best to respond to the problem of offenders. The use and possible abuse of power and authority in residential settings was not unique to or discovered solely within the Criminal Justice Arena. Earlier Stevenson (1972) had explored notions of power and authority in the social work arena, finding that a balance was needed between care and control. Criminal justice debates can bifurcate these tensions and may in residential work, miss an important opportunity to try and hold these competing tensions. Hard talk and hard action appear as ineffective as permissive regimes with no boundaries. Although both regimes were deemed by Hampshire Probation to have failed and were closed, Fisher and Wilson (1982) found the former i.e. hard talk and tough action alone, to be the most ineffective. Chapter six and eight will explore how the modern hostel balances notions of care and control, authority and freedom and whether residents are encouraged to integrate into the wider community.

Tensions between such approaches may be reflective of society's wider ambivalence about how best to respond to particular groups. Sinclair's work was rooted in practice with adolescent boys and welfarist paradigms appear to have sat well with this and similar groups. However post Martinson (1974) and post the 1969 Children and Young Persons Act probation regimes which gave adult offenders freedom as a way of dealing with their delinquency were less politically favourable. Moreover neither study appears to have given

much thought to the links back into the community for the individual and appears to have been overly concerned with internal mechanism and regimes as opposed to a holistic approach to rehabilitation that looks beyond the 'stop gap' of the immediate intervention. This may reflect staff and professional pressure to meet occupancy targets as well as a tendency towards introspection, as opposed to a realistic critique of how a hostel might lead individuals back into law abiding identities and lives.

Central to much of the foregoing research and evaluation carried out in hostels during the 1970s and 1980s was the potential impact of the hostel manager or warden on residents success. Such findings about the centrality of individuals and interpersonal skills have been replicated elsewhere in the criminal justice system:

'...much seems to depend on the quality of interpersonal relationships, which are difficult to replicate for the purposes of comparative study.'

Duff and Garland (1994: 24)

It is unclear whether any strategic approach was taken to sharing and exploring the implications of the above research for existing or possible future hostel regimes. The author will now explore the interest and developments in bail which overlapped with Fisher and Wilson's (1982) study.

Bail an Instrumental Interest?

Policy interest and related writings about hostels appears to wax and wane with little or no interest being detected in wider probation literature. By the 1980's there is evidence that use of and interest in Hostels was waning. A lack of research and practice interest was mirrored by a decline in their use. This is of note as it is precisely at this time that the focus on the wider function and purpose of probation was being questioned by government.

As Worrall and Hoy (2005: 143) note:

'By the 1980's however, the situation had changed considerably...There was a shortage of traditionally 'suitable' hostel residents and under-occupancy became a problem... the probation hostel became less a roof over one's head and more of a house of correction in its own right.'

Internal disinterest coincided with government interest in a rising prison population and considerations as to a strategic role for hostels in reducing this. The Parliamentary All Party Penal Affairs Committee 'Too Many Prisoners' (1980) suggested that hostels should be used for bail. Hostels could ease prison number by either taking those on bail who would otherwise be remanded in custody, be used as a direct alternative to custody or take those nearing the end of their sentence as part of pre release or early release.

Drakeford et al (2001: 13) refer to a '*remand crisis*' in this period i.e. the number of prisoners being held on remand had initially reduced as a result of the 1976 Bail Act. However by the late 1980s remand had come to constitute 22% of the prison population. Ambivalence around working with those who were not traditional probation clients, i.e. the un-convicted, appears to have undermined any long term commitment from the wider probation service to maintain the early impetus of bail information schemes set up in response to Home Office Circular 155/1975. Schemes that developed as a result of this included, bail information, bail support and bail accommodation.⁴¹ Hostels became known in this period as probation and bail hostels or in some instances just bail hostels if that was their sole purpose.⁴²

Interest to reduce remands in custody linked with the development of the Crown Prosecution Service in 1986. Godson and Mitchell (1991) found that the CPS was critical in influencing Magistrate's decisions to grant bail. Where the CPS did not oppose bail this was granted in 98% of cases. Some services were supported in this period with 'pump priming monies' from the

⁴¹ A rising prison population and the possibility of providing bail accommodation have reappeared in 2007. See Home Office Circular PC33/2007 – New Accommodation and Support Services for Bail. Hostels are not the core players here.

⁴² Differentiation between Probation and Bail Hostels ceased in 1992 (Probation Directory 1992).

Home Office to set up bail information schemes. In 1989 there were plans for an additional 700 bail hostel beds (Payne 1989: 37). Probation interest appeared to have been at best lukewarm and contingent on receiving additional monies for this 'new' work. Payne argued that there were:

'practical management difficulties in the control of two discrete legal categories of 'offender' and the moral and ethical dilemmas of mixing the different categories.'

Payne (1989: 40)

Bail intervention was primarily about the ability to return the bailee to court at the appointed time ensuring that bail conditions had been met. Pre and post trial interventions were mixed in hostels in this period. This appears to have been unhelpful in achieving success with either population. This mixing of purposes, where it occurred, ignored earlier findings of Sinclair (1970), Hudson (1981) and Fisher and Wilson (1982) who had suggested that hostels need a clear purpose and focus, with a warden, staffing structure and regime designed to meet this. Appendix 5.1 provides a snapshot of the extent to which hostels have a bail related function today. Of the 102 approved hostels in England and Wales in 1987 only 16 were specified as Bail Hostels

'formally providing 244 places exclusively for those defendants remanded on bail'.

Lewis and Mair (1988: 2)

What most of the research omits to mention in this period is that linking bail to hostels, led to an increased interest in the use of the hostel as a possible final sentencing disposal. Lewis and Mair (ibid: 5) note that sixty four of the 175 cases they explored fell into the bail assessment category. Such periods of 'bail assessment' as opposed to straight forward bail, would often result in the person residing in the hostel post sentence on a probation order with a condition of residence. What is unclear is whether hostels accommodated those who would have gone to prison or via the attention that bail schemes

attracted, became part of a net widening process that sought to demonstrate ever tougher community sentences.

Attempts to make hostels appear as similar to a remand in custody (ibid 12 & 42) may have shifted upwards the restrictive nature of hostel rules, curfews and prohibition of alcohol. Although limited to the London area, Lewis and Mair (ibid: 13) note:

'It is interesting to note that the hostels which are less controlling tend to be those primarily for residents on probation orders, rather than straight bailees.'

Breach of hostel rules and breach of bail conditions and the need to inform courts became intertwined, such that enforcement of rules might entail a remand in custody. For some engaging with this work created unease. Hostels were being tasked with restricting the liberty of those who were not convicted. Cameron argued that bail information schemes involved probation officers doing the work of defence solicitors.

'Probation Officers are doing something of dubious morality which is not their job'

Cameron (1989: 80)

Fiddes (1987) was more positive and argued that the 1987 bail pilots provided 400 defendants with bail who would otherwise have gone to custody. Lewis and Mair (1988) made no link to Sinclair (1971) or Fisher and Wilson (1982) and it appears that new ideas for hostels often ignore or at least selectively engage with prior research and practice.⁴³ At the time of the 1998 HMIP there were 2,263 bed spaces in 101 Probation and Bail Hostels (of the 101 hotels two were closed for refurbishment). This compares with a Prison

⁴³ Like much of hostels history the bail 'story' is more complex than presented here and origins for practices that emerge in the 1980's were trialled some ten years earlier. The first recognised 'bail hostel' was a wing of a salvation army hostel opened in 1971 in Whitechapel in London (OSP-16:39). Moreover individual studies of bail hostels took place too (see Lewis and Mair (1980) and Hardy (1997)). That probation's involvement in this was controversial is evidenced in Probation Journal entries e.g. Forrester and Stayner (1989).

Population of around 60,000 at that time. Apart from the relatively short lived interest in this period with their possible bail role there is little evidence of hostels more generally being seen as having a strategic role within probation services.

If the 1980s had seen a direct interest in hostels then the 1990s start off with hostels very much to one side of mainstream agendas. Hostels numbers begin to stagnate and interest in new uses for hostels is limited to more individual rather than strategic examples e.g. Elliot House in Birmingham was opened in 1994 for “mentally disordered offenders” (MDO’s) (Brown and Geelan 1998) maintaining both a probation and bail role but focussed on one ‘client’ group. Such developments were partially driven by earlier bail interests:

‘adequate support must be available in bail hostels both for the bailee and for the staff of the hostel to enable them to respond effectively to the needs of bailees who are mentally disordered.’

Home Office (1995: 18)

Despite such interest probations’ supervisory involvement with MDO’s had actually been reducing:

‘The number of probation orders with conditions of treatment has been steadily decreasing over the last 10 years’.

Home Office (1995: 19)

The emergence of wider partnership working between probation and psychiatric services and interest to divert MDO’s from custody; shaped specialist hostel developments. Bingham (2001) notes the impact of Home Office Circular 66/99 and the Reed report (1992) which urged the diversion of MDO’s from the criminal justice system wherever possible, it:

‘...recommended nationwide provision of properly resourced court assessment and diversion schemes, the further development of bail information schemes and public interest case assessment, along with wider

provision of specialised bail accommodation... and... the development of court diversion schemes...'

Bingham (2001: 199)

Interest to reduce the prison population may lead to particular groups being selected for their ease of categorisation and arguments that they deserve or require separate or specialist treatment.

Women offenders in hostels attracted research interest too. Wincup (1996) noted the lack of provision for women offenders, noting that in 1996 only 3 out of the 103 hostels were women only. Forty Six were still 'mixed hostels' in spite of an HIMIP (1993) recommendation that advocated specialist women's hostel provision.

The Impact of New Discourses

The emergence of risk in wider probation discourses (Kemshall 1996, Maguire et al 2001), research (Garland 1997) and policy (Home Office 1995 National Standards) for the most part by passed hostels in the early 1990s. Bail as a specific role diminished as the additional resources provided to support this work disappeared. In the wider service a risk focussed practice changed the relationship with offenders who had:

'come to be risks to be assessed and then managed, characterised by high risk or low risk profiles, and treated accordingly'

Garland (1997: 4)

Hostels sat within a changing and challenged service context. Penal liberalism and individual autonomy were markedly declining, despite initial aims of the 1991 CJA to reduce the prison population (CJA 1991: s1) which were short lived and replaced by Howard's mantra of 'Prison Works' (Burnett and Maruna

2004).⁴⁴ Hostels were conspicuous by their absence from this legislation. The Act made probation a punishment in its own right, transforming probation's more general purposes and by implication hostels too. Probation Orders were to be made in the interests of;

- a) securing the rehabilitation of the offender; or
- b) protecting the public from harm from him or preventing the commission of further offences by him.

Criminal Justice Act 1991(s.8:2.1)

As Bhui (2002: 232) has noted:

'Offenders were no longer given the chance to reform with the guidance of a probation officer, but were now to be 'punished in the community'.'

The 1990s saw:

'The transformation of the probation service from an agency which famously aimed to 'advise, assist and befriend offenders' to one whose main purpose was... to 'confront, control and monitor.'

Bhui (2002: 233)

The policy and practice influences that impacted on hostels from such legislative changes were initially indirect. However Probation and Bail Hostels became statutorily provided for under Sections 7 and 27 of the Probation Service Act 1993 which followed. All Hostels were to be approved by the Secretary of State and managed by probation services or voluntary management committees. Section 27 of the Act provided for the making of the Approved Probation and Bail Hostel Rules 1995, which addressed the management, and inspection of such Hostels. The Hostels Handbook (1995)

⁴⁴ Cavadino and Dignan (2002: 123) note the 'U-turn in penal policy which followed in the wake of the 1991 Act'.

was to define nationally the purpose of hostels and the client groups they should take and those they should exclude:

Admissions and Acceptance Procedures

'The National Standard requires hostel staff to give priority to those who both require and will benefit from the structured and supportive environment provided. Staff are advised not to accept:

- those who are charged with or convicted of offences too minor to justify a placement in an approved hostel
- those whose admission would present an unacceptable risk of serious harm to the staff, other residents or the immediate community
- those whose admission might place that person at risk of harm from other residents
- those whose sole need is accommodation and do not require the level of supervision provided (unless the person would otherwise be remanded into custody and only on the understanding that such an individual would be assessed quickly and alternative accommodation identified without delay)

Hostel Handbook (1995 Section 1: paragraph 3)

Hostels in the 1990s began to be reserved for those who required an enhanced level of supervision and were no longer meant to simply meet the accommodation or resettlement needs of offenders, public protection became a policy rationale of its own. By 2001 hostel purposes had become set against a background of significant and rapid change in the probation service. A range of documents were directed at hostels in this period. In 1995 the Home Office issued 'The Hostels Handbook', in 1996 a Guidance Manual for Assistant Chief Officers was produced, in 1997 the National Association of Probation and Bail Hostels in conjunction with the Home Office produced a guidance manual for voluntary management committees and in 1998 HMIP carried out an inspection of probation and bail hostels as part of the Home Office ongoing

Thematic Inspection of the Probation Service. Hostel's purposes were changing but what remained to be seen was what impact such changes had on who they captured and what happened in them.

Approved Premises Regulations (2001) and National Standards (2001) re-defined hostel purpose as follows;

'The Purpose of Approved Premises is to provide an enhanced level of residential supervision with the aim of protecting the public by reducing the likelihood of offending. Approved Premises are for bailees , those subject to community sentences with a condition of residence in the Approved Premise, and post custodial licences where their risk of causing serious harm to the public or other likelihood of reoffending means that no other form of accommodation in the community would be suitable. Exceptionally voluntary residents may be accommodated... for the protection of the public or that person ought to receive supervision or treatment and that residence at the Approved Premises is necessary to enable the offender to receive it.'

National Standards (2001 part F, F1.)⁴⁵

In 2001 an Approved Premises Handbook, pulled together the relevant, probation circulars, hostel national standards, guidance to staff and managers in one place. Hostels were now enmeshed within wider legislative changes, including the creation of a National Probation Service (Criminal Justice and Court Services Act 2000 implemented in April, 2001) and a revision of Probation's wider purposes:

To Protect the Public

To Reduce Offending

To Provide for the Proper Punishment of Offenders

To Ensure that Offenders are Aware of the Effects of their Crime on Victims and on the Public

⁴⁵ 2001 regulations replaced and revoked Approved Probation and Bail Hostel Rules 1995.

To Rehabilitate Offenders

Home Office (Probation Circular 25/2001)

Hostels found their role being questioned within this revised context in which rehabilitation and resettlement were in danger of being juxtaposed with probations new 'law enforcement' clothes;

'We are a Law Enforcement Agency. It is what we are. It is what we do.'

Paul Boateng (National Standards 2000).

Risk, Public Protection and Punishment – The New Context

Notions of risk and public protection which had began to systematically influence probation in the UK from the early 1980s (Newburn 2003) were from the mid 1990s impacting on hostels. The growth of risk assessment tools and risk management strategies had initially limited impact on hostels' purpose and practice. Hostels' focus had been for the most part on dealing with particular groups or individuals and worked at meeting their needs and preparing them for reintegration into the community. Hostel research tended to focus on the regime and staffing of the hostel and their impact on either absconding or re-offending. Boswell et al (1993) notes of probation more generally, that since the 1980s, there had been a discernible shift in probation's ethos and practice. She cites Harris (1992) reflecting on his earlier (1979) suggestion that probation should have a caring role with another agency carrying out the control:

'The political world was not that of the 1990s and the conceptual logic of the case I argued then can, ironically, only be followed by arguing almost (though not quite) for the reverse of this. For the deprived, distressed but marginal offender love and compassion can no longer be provided by the probation service...'

Boswell et al (1993: 200)

Care and Control were now being presented as juxtaposed and conceptually and practically incongruous roles for the service to hold together. A new 'realism' or neoclassicism within probation practice was being constructed as a response to a lack of faith in social work intervention as the main focus of a criminal justice agency. The new 'managerialism' (Worrall 1997) of economy, efficiency and effectiveness had arrived. As Boswell et al (1993: 201) note such an approach demanded a streamlining of services, greater accountability, shared information systems and a standardisation of practice.

The complete lack of mention of hostels and hostel workers in the 1998 'Evidence Based Practice Guide' demonstrates both the wider systems' ability to marginalize hostels and hostels' inability in this period to come centre stage and engage with developing notions of evidence based practice and risk.

Despite this marginalization from mainstream policy developments, hostels experienced a shift in interest from the needs of offenders typical of 'old penology' (Feeley and Simon 1994), towards interest in using hostels as a mechanism to manage particular groups of offenders or types of risk. Moreover, for those willing or interested to look, HMIP reports and the development of National Standards offered hostels to the probation service as a resource to use at the higher end of the community punishment scale. Thurston notes that by the 1990s the hostels were being faced with the prospect of justifying their existence:

'If you don't use them you will lose them 'and indeed several hostels were closed'

Thurston (2002: 208)

Thurston suggested that a shift from a collusive to an inclusive agenda took place. That is, hostels in the 1990s were influenced by the shift in discourse from probation as an apologia for offenders within the Criminal Justice System to seeing probation's wider role and purpose being at least as much focused on victims and the general public. As history has shown the move towards

probation as a punishment and the politicisation of the probation service have seen a more rule bound (National Standards 1991, 1995, 2000) and centrally prescribed practice (Evidence Based Practice 1998, The Joint Accreditation Panel 1999), stability was not to be the order of the day.⁴⁶

'Each revision of National Standards has reduced the number of failures an offender is permitted and sought to increase the chances of an order being terminated'

Hedderman (2003: 190)

Compliance and coercion appear to have eclipsed 'care' in the care versus control debate. Hostels at the end of this period had their own National Standards (1995) and stated aims and objectives (Probation and Bail Hostel Rules 1995). These had come from outside the service and been imposed as a result of wider legislative and policy changes impacting on the probation service.

Summary

This chapter demonstrates that a shift can be detected over this period from a treatment and rehabilitation paradigm towards a public protection and offender management focus. By 2001 Hostels can no longer be seen to be to one side of policy developments in probation. In theory at least they no longer represented the 'old penology' approach summarised in table 3.1.

Who hostels were for and ideas about who they should be for changed over this period. Children had been removed from the probation system and were seen as deserving of services specific to them (1969 CYPA) but as this and chapter two have shown, an interest in using hostels for adults was not new. The population that hostels captured changed over time both in terms of age and client / offender type. Ambivalence as to who hostels are for is evident.

⁴⁶ For an account of the shifts taking place in policy and practice see Raynor (2003). Raynor suggests that for the wider service at least such developments spelt a renewed interest in rehabilitation and that there are real risks in conflating changes in probation more generally with a supposedly negative impact of attention to 'what works'.

Moreover a shift in focus from internal consideration of regimes and interventions towards a structural consideration as to their wider role was evidenced in the 1980s. This set the stage for further such considerations but under revised and more punitive orientated frameworks.

What was crucial was that alongside probation, what they were for, changed. By dint of the 1991 Criminal Justice Act, hostels became part of community punishment. Residence in a hostel was no longer an alternative to a sentence. The Home Office began to take more interest in their role, costs and purposes (HMIP 1993, Home Office 1995, HMIP 1998). Hostels moved away from being part of a local service to being part of a National Probation Service in (2001). With the exception of bail, hostels had been constructed as places for the treatable. The development of a bail role made moved attention away from 'treatability' of the individual towards a possibly more functional role for hostels within the wider CJ system. The 1991 CJA offered the possibility of orders being made without a rehabilitative focus, although initially applying to 'community punishment' and 'combination orders' the Act created a context for punishment and public protection focussed work being conceived as potentially separate from rehabilitative work.

From a position of relatively ad hoc or individual research interest in the 1970s and early 1980s a renewed interest in academic and Home Office research is discernible from 1999 onwards (e.g. Barton 2005, Wincup 1996, 1997, 2002, Burnett and Eaton 2004, Home Office 2005, HMIP 2007/8?)⁴⁷

Garland (1990) has noted the tendency for criminal justice policy and practice to fill the space it is given. Hostels are no exception to this and no longer appear excluded from an expansionary potential. However the space they occupied in the early part of this period was relatively small, welfare orientated and to the side of the wider service. The rehabilitative possibilities outlined in

⁴⁷ At the time of writing up (toward the end of 2007) a further HMIP inspection of hostels is about to take place. The terms of reference for this are; to assess the effectiveness of the contribution of Approved Premises to the management of offenders in the community who pose a high risk of harm to others and to examine the treatment of residents in such establishments. This is due for publication at the end of 2007 beginning of 2008.

the early history were abundant and hostels began the modern era with a clear rehabilitative and re-integrative vision. They now found themselves part of a service that delivers and manages 'punishment in the community'. Opportunities for hostels at the start of a new century appear to be changing and becoming more aligned to probation's wider role as a punishment and public protection agency (Home Office 2000).

Hostels may be becoming less concerned with:

'providing an enhanced level of supervision to enable certain bailees and offenders to remain in the community'

National Standards (1995: 56)

They may be becoming more concerned with issues of containment and public protection. The ethnographic work will consider whether they retain their rehabilitative potential or whether they have shifted from being greenhouses to warehouses.

Table 4.1 reproduces the implicit 'old penology' from the previous chapter and contrasts this with a 'new penology' approach suggested by shifts detailed in this chapter. Chapters six and eight will consider whether such shifts are evident in practice as well as policy. That is, to what extent are the wider shifts in probation more generally and in hostel's policy and rhetoric impacting on work by staff with residents?

| Hostel | Old Penology | New Penology |
|-----------------------------|---|---|
| Focus | Individuals Guilt Responsibility Diagnosis Treatment | Managing Groups Risk Identification Risk Classification Risk Reduction |
| Themes | Transformation of the Individual Change | Managing Risk Protecting the Public |
| Practices | Rehabilitative Programmes Needs Based Work Preparation for Freedom Welfare Therapy | Actuarial Profiling Preventative / Pre-emptive Incapacitation Programmes Case Management |
| Workers | Relative Independence Professional Discretion Welfare / Change Orientated Positivist Outlook To the Side of Mainstream Practice | Monitoring Managing Prescribed Practice Administration/Classification Monitored Centrally Defined Purposes |
| Role of Institution | Rehabilitation Care / Control Assistance Reintegration / Resettlement | Punishment Change/ Control Public Protection Safeguarding The Community |
| Status of Individual | Client Rehabilitated / Recidivist In Need of Help, Support and Direction Possibly Homeless or Alcohol Problems Released from Prison or... On Probation | Offender Possible Risk / Danger In need of Monitoring Subject to Punishment and Control |
| Community | As Capital (Spencer and Deakin 2004) | As Public Voice (James and Raine 1998) |

In chapter three the potential for hostels to act as a 'cordon sanitaire' (Hudson 1981) was previously premised on temporarily creating space between offenders and possible negative influences on their rehabilitation. Space between residents and communities was for therapeutic purposes and of a temporary nature. However the concept of the cordon sanitaire in that context rests upon Scull's (1984) observation that the offender was perceived as victim. With shifts away from this perception there is little guarantee the cordon will not begin to function in very different ways. The 1991 Criminal Justice Act re-constructed the client as 'offender' and opened up new possibilities for intervention in hostels.

The changes outlined for hostels in this chapter reflect shifts in theory and policy with competing claims as to the extent to which behaviour can be altered and how best to do this. In exploring hostels in this period it is important to note that there have been gaps and discontinuity in hostel research, policy and practice interest, as well as similarities and congruence. The hostel story is a complex and relatively unexplored domain. The chapters which follow will seek to delve beneath the surface into the realities of contemporary hostel practice. The ethnographic work will consider whether there is evidence that the hostel has become a 'transcarceral system of control' (Pratt et al 2005: xiii) i.e. one where instead of focusing on saving, developing or reclaiming the individual the institution is now part of a wider policy shift that recycles and manages 'offenders' as risk entities under need of monitoring, control and surveillance. Table 4.1 presents as a theoretical construct of what a hostel might look like under the influence of 'new penology'.

As early as 1997 Garland was drawing attention to the nature and extent of the changes that Probation more widely was undergoing;

'Where rehabilitative interventions are undertaken their character is rather different than before. They are now much more focussed on control issues, much more concerned to 'address offending behaviour'... Offence behaviour rather than personality or social relations is the target of transformative work.

Changing the pattern of offending is the primary concern, and this may or may not involve engaging with the 'whole person' or underlying conflicts and difficulties he or she may have.'

Garland (1997: 6)

It remains to be seen to what extent modern hostel practice has in reality shifted its focus. It is also open to consideration whether both theoretically and practically the juxtaposition of individual needs and public risks or offender need and public protection implied by table 4.1 are, either helpful in terms of transforming individuals or protecting the public or necessarily mutually exclusive as current discourses imply.

Firstly though the next chapter will outline the methodologies employed in this thesis and stress the importance the author has placed on the development of a bimodal analysis focusing on both the historical temporal domain and current empirical research. It examines the research processes that were used to engage in an exploration of both the concept and practice of the hostel as a transformative mechanism.

Methodology

Chapter Five:

This chapter will provide an overview of the methodologies used in this thesis outlining the balance developed between conventional literature review, ethnographic study and sociological theorising. The research design and the rationale for two distinct periods of ethnographic study will be explored and consideration given to how the data was analysed. The potential strengths and weaknesses of the approach will be discussed. There will then be an exploration of what an ethnographic approach is and how it was put into practice in the context of this research. It will be important to acknowledge the impact of time and resource on the project as well as why this work should be considered as ethnographic as opposed to ethnography. The author will provide some discussion of the ethical considerations such research demanded and reflection on the ongoing process of improvement that the novice researcher experiences when undertaking field research and critical theorising.

The gap between the two periods of ethnographic study alerted the author to the ongoing nature of his refinement of skills and development of a critical overview, as well as an awareness of the impact that changing political climates can have on the ability to engage in research.⁴⁸ I will also reflect on the process of this type of research and the relationship between being in the field and being out of the field, reflecting on this experience and balancing what and how much could be written about and what is possible and pertinent to write about. It will be important to highlight the point that I was familiar with the ethnographic territory of probation practice in general and made conscious efforts to stand back from my previous role and the types of thinking that had gone with that. Having been part of the probation world, my reflections and relationships in the field may have been both eased and constricted by this baggage.

⁴⁸ Engagement with this issue alone encouraged the author to work with others in exploring this process as a separate undertaking. See Cowe et al in Smith (Ed) (2007). The author had to work hard to keep a focus on the core issues and either temporarily set aside or engage with elsewhere a myriad of interests the research brought up.

As Gertz (1988: 45) notes:

'All ethnographical descriptions are home made... they are the describer's descriptions not those of the described'.

I will also explore the strategies employed in analysing the data from the field research and explain how the documentary analysis, which informed both the historical analysis, literature review and field research were carried out and how the author attempted to weave the insights gained, through the research process and into the analysis.

I will conclude by offering some suggestions as to the potential value of this approach and append samples of consent forms and interview schedules.

The Research Questions

Do hostels represent an ongoing story of rehabilitation and reintegration with a longer history than has been suggested? Does the modern probation hostel act as a greenhouse continuing that history or act as a warehouse operating to new and discontinuous purposes?

In order to explore the above the author elected to use an ethnographic study of 'current practice' alongside critical historical analysis of hostel's origins and role(s). However the dichotomy implied by such a distinction of methods of enquiry may be misleading. The field research was both a source of data for critical theorising and place to explore whether theoretical and policy approaches represented in texts had application in reality. Together the fieldwork and the historical analysis provide the foundations required for an exploration of both the concept and practice of the hostel as a transformative mechanism.

An initial exploration in relation to the 'conventional hostel story' was explored in the previous chapter. Chapters two and seven provide a balance between

the conventional story and hostels' precursors and emerging purposes. These were engaged with both before, during and after the field research, influencing and shaping the authors' ideas and analysis.

Setting the Scene

The field research took place in two phases with a four year gap in between. At the commencement of the research one hostel was in existence and the other was about to be constructed. The hostels were located in separate probation services but by the time the research got underway the two probation areas had been amalgamated. The first phase of research took place over a six month period in 2002 with greater involvement in one hostels' informal activities as these had not yet developed in the new hostel.

For the purposes of the research the names and details of hostels, staff and residents have been made anonymous. Some details have been deliberately changed to protect the identity of the individuals involved.

The first 'Auldhouse' was a 26 bed approved probation and bail hostel. It had operated as a probation hostel or equivalent since the early 1970s and had a traceable 'history' within the probation area. The author was able to carry out field research and speak with staff to gain an overview of how the hostel operated and may have changed. The physical building was in good repair having been a new build project in the early 1970s that was well maintained.

The second hostel 'Newhouse' was about to be built in another city to replace a former longstanding probation and bail hostel which had been in an old building in a fairly run down town centre. 'Newhouse' was to be a new venture for the probation area introducing its first new build hostel in over 30 years and unlike Auldhouse would operate as a mixed hostel. It was a 25 bed approved probation and bail hostel with 4 bed spaces reserved for female residents. Its opening received both planning objections and media attention. Not in MY Back Yard 'ism (NIBYism) was evident in press cuttings and news

stories surrounding the development.⁴⁹ Key features of both hostels were their stated purpose taken from the Approved Premises Handbook (2001: 5):

'They provide an enhanced level of residential supervision in the community as well as a supportive and structured environment. They are intended to act as a base from which residents take full advantage of community facilities for work ,education, training, treatment and recreation.'

In order for the reader to make sense of the context of where the research took place and who was observed and interviewed it is important to provide a brief overview of the hostels stated common structures. In 2002 both had:

- 24 hour double staff cover
- a curfew between 11pm and 6.00am unless the courts order otherwise.
- A keywork system
- A set of rules for residents
- A constructive activities programme

Both hostels stated that they accepted a range of residents who might be:

- Bailees
- Bail Assessment
- Probation Orders
- Home Leave
- Parole/ Post Release Supervision

The hostels stated that they did not normally accept residents who were:

- charged with or convicted of minor offences
- whose sole or primary need is accommodation

⁴⁹ Tabloid press articles reveal the extent to which hostels may be portrayed as a negative asset within a community (e.g. News of the World, Sunday 26th of March 2006).

- whose admission might pose an unacceptable risk to others
- whose admission might place them at serious risk from others

Newhouse in addition stated that it did not normally accept referrals of those:

- With a history of arson or severe mental health problems
- Whose drug use is at a chaotic stage

Both hostels had a common staffing structure of:

Hostel Manager – Senior Probation Officer Grade (SPO)

Deputy Manager – Probation Officer Grade (PO)

Five Assistant Managers – no qualification necessary.

A pool of Night Workers and Sessional Staff.

A Cook

A Domestic

An Administrative Officer / House Keeper

A Secretary.

Each had a similar set of rules for residents (appendix 6.5).

Prior to commencing the formal research period I made a point of making some informal visits to both hostels and familiarised myself with the general routines, layout, staff and residents. Formal consent had been gained but before plunging straight into interviews and observation I thought it would be helpful to build a rapport with staff and residents.⁵⁰ Having been a practitioner and being known to the manager and deputy managers, I was familiar with what Darlington and Scott (2002) citing Schon (1983: 42) call the 'swampy lowland' of professional practice where situations can be messy and confusing. It was important not to assume that practice contexts or understandings between myself and hostel staff were shared and to check out the current organisational contexts and meanings surrounding practice. To

⁵⁰ Sample of letter seeking consent and the research approval process in Appendix 5.4

make sense of what was done and why it is important to note where the research took place, over what period and what the sample size was.

In phase one (2002) over a six month period approximately one day per week was spent between the two hostels. 24 residents and 24 staff formed the sample size for the semi structured interviews, 12 of each in each hostel.

In phase two (2006-7) a similar approach was taken and approximately one day per week was spent between the two hostels over the six months. Thirty residents and twenty four staff formed the sample size for the interviews, 15 residents and 12 staff in each. The resident sample size in 2006-7 was slightly larger than in 2002 as there were less informal activities present in this second phase of research that could be engaged in. To maintain depth of material and to some extent to justify being there, more resident interviews were carried out.⁵¹ Appendix five provides an overview of the resident population for both hostels during the research periods.

In 2002 one of the probation areas had employed a prison service psychologist who had a remit for working with sex offenders and who had some contact with both hostels. They had not known me as a probation officer, had not worked with me before and had not had a probation training background but knew the hostel context well. I felt it important to have a neutral sounding board, i.e. someone who was not hostel staff or directly managed by the hostel manager to gain feedback from in these early stages. With hindsight and more research experience I now realise that this may have been more a product of my novice researcher anxiety than any methodologically sound mechanism to ensure 'objectivity'. That said this person agreed to sit in on four of my initial interviews in each hostel to provide feedback on the interview process and their summaries. The interviewees agreed to their presence and I felt it was important in the early stages of my first field research to check out my perceptions and processes. A passage

⁵¹ In the second phase of research senior managers in the service were keen to know when I would leave and appeared less comfortable with me just being there. Saying that I had further interviews to arrange allowed me to equalise the amount of time spent in both hostels between the two phases of research.

from Darlington and Scott summarises the motivation and anxiety that accompanied this shift to researcher role;

'Research is essentially all about seeing the world in fresh ways, about searching again or researching the same territory and seeing it in a different light...this requires us to be very aware of the lens which we bring to the task..'

Darlington and Scott (2002: 20)

As Holloway and Walker (2000: 49-50) note:

'Qualitative research is generally carried out where little is known about the phenomenon in question, or where the researcher wishes to explore new interpretations to challenge existing explanations. The theoretical framework for qualitative research is not predetermined but develops out of the study'.

The methodologies employed in this thesis reflect the influence of a range of traditions in criminological and sociological writing and the thesis is structured around two distinct approaches: critical theorising including historical analysis and field research. In the later chapters the author will knit together the findings that come from these diverse approaches. The former is influenced by general approaches to historical analysis and social constructionism e.g. Berger and Luckmann (1985), Burr (1995), Calhoun (1996), Drakeford (1996), Feeley and Simon (1994), Garland (1991 and 2001), Harris and Webb (1987) and Melossi and Pavarini (1981). The field research is influenced by a long tradition of applied social science research and in particular ethnographic approaches including; Barton (2005), Becker (1963), Fisher and Wilson (1982), Goffman (1959), Noaks and Wincup (2004), Parker (1996), Ditton And Ford (1994), Sinclair (1971) ,Taylor (2002) and Wincup (1996 and1997).

Critical Theory

As Thurston (2002) notes there is a relative lack of research and theorising about hostels. Hostels have been peripheral in both academic work and probation policy. This lack of systematic data and theorising about hostels' roles and purpose(s) has encouraged the author to think critically about why this is so and what theoretical and practical precursors may have shaped current practice and theory.

As Hudson (1997: 452) has noted, criminology is part of the apparatus of control in modern society and as such produces knowledge that can be utilised by agents of control i.e. police officers, probation officers, prison governors and other criminal justice workers, not to mention politicians and private companies. Criminology and criminological research has a relationship to power. Theorising about hostels may lead to categories, classifications and diagnoses that are stigmatising and pejorative. Hudson (2000: 177) in Jupp (et al 2000), warns that strategies of control and punishment shaped by research have real implications ...

'..for the opportunities freely to move around our cities, and for rights and liberties, of those to whom they are applied.'

Undertaking criminological research increases the capacity for critique and the widening of practice alongside the possibility that the understandings it develops may be appropriated by those who wish to extend and grow punitive practices.

Foucault cited by Fabion (2000 Vol 3: xxxiv) has noted:

'The work of an intellectual is not to form the political will of others; it is, through the analyses he (sic) does in his own domains, to bring assumptions and things taken for granted again into question, to shake habits, ways of acting and thinking, to dispel the familiarity of the accepted, to take the measure of rules and institutions and, starting from that re-problematization ...

to take part in the formation of a political will, where he has his role as to play as a citizen'

Uncovering ideas, patterns or discourses and providing critical analysis of these, allows for their adoption, their adaptation and or a reaction against them. The relatively hidden discourses in the hostels field, in relation to those in the wider criminal justice system, may have allowed practices to continue unchallenged and un-scrutinised by major policy initiatives.

The responsibility upon the fledgling researcher is weighty. A reading of the recognised research on hostels e.g. Sinclair (1971), Fisher and Wilson (1982), Brown and Geelan (1998), Wincup (1997), Barton (2005) and the relatively recent review by Burnett and Eaton (2004) alerted the reader to two key issues; a relative lack of context within which to place individual studies and a strong impression that the focus of research in the hostel arena has been shaped and dominated by relatively few studies. Prior studies had a very specific thematic or resident group focus. Sinclair (1971) explored regimes, Fisher and Wilson (1980) examined authority and freedom, Wincup (1997) and Barton (2004, 2005) female residents, Geelan and Brown (1998) residents with mental health needs and Cook (1968) alcohol dependents.

Several of these studies, particularly the earlier ones, were very much reflections of their time and do not reflect upon the shaping influences of their particular social context and the significance of possible precedents. Barton (2005) and Wincup (1997) are exceptions here. Their work is thematically constructed around gender, making a useful contribution to the engendering of the hostels' story. Both in varying degrees recognise the importance of:

'looking backwards to look forwards,'

Barton (2005: 161)

For the most part hostel literature tends to give the impression that hostels appeared in the adult probation arena in the late 1960s to early 1970s with little or no precedents for this mode of residential rehabilitation.

Developing a Broad Perspective

In order to develop a wider base from which to construct a possible theoretical and practice focused analysis of the role and function of hostels and their potential uses the author sought to initially explore four key areas:

1. A historical understanding and analysis of the development of hostels, including consideration of any salient features in relation to wider social, policy or cultural trends.
2. A theoretical reflection on the above and an exploration of possible relationships, between the particular policy and social conditions and the ideas/ discourses supporting current practice.
3. An analysis of ideas and practices that have taken on a significance and identification of the language, concepts and practices which may be seen as formative in the hostel story.
4. An acknowledgement of and attempt to engage with the historically embedded nature of all understanding(s) including the ethnographic work put forward within this thesis.

This first 'methodology', a historically embedded critique, is considered key to developing an understanding of present practices and purpose and is explicitly reflected in the introduction, chapter two, the literature review and implicitly in chapters three and seven. Such an approach has been influenced by theorists such as Calhoun (1996).

'Only occasionally do we systematise in a more theoretical way, one that argues for an underlying order that cannot be found in any of the surface

characteristics of the object. Nothing presses this theoretical venture on us more firmly than the experience of historical change...'

Calhoun (1996: 431)

Probation has undoubtedly experienced change and hostels have to date been largely ignored, both in any analysis of the impact of such changes and in the more general probation story.

As Bourdieu (1990: 42) states:

'It is necessary to write a structural history which finds in each state of the structure both the product of previous struggles to transform or conserve the structure, and, through the contradictions, tensions and power relations that constitute the structure, the source of its subsequent transformations.'

Hostels' 'history' is embodied in both the relatively objective: texts, histories, buildings, recorded practices, etc and in the more subjective traditions, individual experiences, reflections on practice and social actions. This thesis suggest that choices about social practices in hostels and the shape that the 'objective' take are formed from a complex of relations between the history or context and the 'subjective' experiences of individuals who are at the same time producers of new histories and products of their relationship with older histories.

Berger and Luckman (1985: 69-70) remind us that:

'...social order is a human product, or, more precisely, an ongoing human production.'

Going on to note that;

'The development of specific mechanisms of social control also becomes necessary with the historicization and objectification (of) institutions...'

Berger and Luckman (1985: 79)

Criminal justice and hostels in particular may still have much to gain from engaging with such sociological observation and theorising.

This thesis seeks to bring together an 'objective' analysis of the wider hostel history and the subjective engagement with two specific examples of current formations of practices that have arisen out of that history. It deliberately avoids a thematic approach, with a narrow but in depth focus on one or two issues as favoured by the Home Office Inspectorate (HMIP 1993, 1998), not because these are unimportant, but in order to explore a wider theoretical and historical base that may be informing and shaping current practices.

Barton (2005) employed an historical analysis of documentary evidence surrounding the particular female hostel she was researching. Unfortunately, such material was not available in Auldhouse, as no such records had been retained and Newhouse was just beginning its story. The account presented in this thesis is drawn from a literature review of the modern hostel story (1969 onwards) archive searches and literature searches on Hostels, Homes, Rehabilitation and Residential Work with Offenders. The former was initiated by searching through all published copies of the Probation Journal, extracting articles and references with a focus on the above. Relevant findings from this were presented as a literature review in previous chapter.

Engagement with a lengthier historical analysis was inspired by Ignatieff's 'The Ideological Origins of the Penitentiary (1981), Priestley's Victorian Prison Lives (1999) and Harris and Webb's (1987) exploration of juvenile justice. The author felt that it was worth enquiring as to whether hostels had antecedents that had shaped their current formations potentially offering a theoretical hinterland from which to understand the present policy and practice context.

The historical material uncovered was surprising in its scope and the analysis of this could have presented a thesis on its own. Searches revealed numerous historical references to residential homes for offenders, workhouses as a form of punishment, industry and the state making use of offenders as a source of labour, historical figures that were influential in

suggesting hostels as a form of rehabilitation and a range of hostel like rehabilitative enterprises.

I also engaged with and followed up references to hostels found in 20th Century 'social work' histories e.g. (Bosanquet 1914), individual accounts noted fleetingly in mainstream probation histories e.g. (Vanstone 2004) and legislative (BOPCRIS) and newspaper archive searches (Times Digital Archive). All of these revealed rich evidence of a much longer hostel story than has previously been suggested.

The historical material was initially organised along a crude timeline, references noted and original searches carried out, leading regularly to a wealth of new historical data and source material. As the timeline gathered length and depth it became obvious that there was more than sufficient material to construct an argument for hostels having a much longer 'hidden' history. A decision had to be made as to how far back to go and for how long the research should continue. The author found himself in the unforeseen position of having too much material to include in this thesis. The author found a wealth of material that could be engaged with but consequently faced Scharfsteinsn's (1989) dilemma. That is that of context, knowing that focussing too much on contexts and their possible meanings would either lead to a work that was too long and relative or become a never ending search for a 'true story'. Whilst claiming that this thesis does make links with material in a way that to date probation historians and theorists have largely ignored, the author is aware, that a range of alternative histories could be constructed pulling for example on the wider 'history of the institution' and the two related but distinct antecedents of 'halfway houses' and 'care homes'.

The Probation story is regularly presented as beginning with the 1887 First Offenders Bill yet NAPBH (2002) have located hostel origins in the reformatory and industrial schools movement. Young and Ashton (1956), link early philanthropists and industrialists e.g. Jonas Hanaway with the development of residential interventions, with those who were offenders or considered at risk of offending due to their parents' criminality or absence.

The device of the 'training ship' the Beatty (1756) presented striking similarities with the hostel role and the early client group hostels sought to capture. These fleeting references encouraged the author to search out original historical material and contributed to the thesis development and shaping of issues by theme and type. The material that was explored was eventually broken down into sub categories that could be incorporated into an argument for a longer pre history of the modern hostel;

Legislative Evidence - including actual Legislation, Bills, Parliamentary Committees, Enquiries, local and national developments and use of hostels as a sentencing mechanism.

Academic Material - journal articles, books, chapters or references to hostels

Key Individuals - individuals who influenced and shaped the development of the hostel as a social intervention mechanism.

Rehabilitative History - A search for material and publicity relating to hostels and their forerunners including industrial schools, reformatories and the use of work as a form of re-integration in the community.

These were then reconstructed along a timeline that sought to establish a framework for an historical argument that hostels had a discernible history.

Methodological issues arise from the construction of an account from diverse origins. In particular, the extent to which such construction may be seen as an individualised perspective. This thesis suggests there is credible historical evidence for a story that has always been there but never 'read'.

Drakeford (1999: 19) in Brookman et al (Eds) (1999) notes the potential power imbalances between the researcher and the researched. Participants in interviews have the power to withhold information as well as to offer it in particular ways. Such critique can also be applied to authors, who have the power to present, withhold and construct information to fit with their purposes.

Key though to determining the value and accuracy of such research is the ability of the reader to go back and revisit the material and the context from which it was derived. The apprentice researcher is offering the reader an alternative account from the current mainstream view. This thesis makes no claim to the development of 'grand historical theory' rather it suggests that historical material, albeit it of differing types and status, exists which can be coherently constructed to suggest that hostels not only have a much longer pre history than is currently suggested (Burnett 2004) but that this history is useful in understanding and exploring the role and function of the modern hostel. Engagement with this historical, theoretical and policy related material provides a vantage point from which to explore and understand the modern hostel. The theorising about hostels that was mapped and developed from this process is presented throughout the thesis and highlighted in tables 3.1, 4.1 and 9.1. The latter incorporating the influences of the ethnographic work.

The author seeks to disclose the how, why and what of the research task by providing a critically reflexive account of the research process. The use of historical research in relation to developing an understanding of the contemporary has been with a view to seeing this as an endeavour that is worthy of enquiry on its own, i.e. there is a relative silence on the origins of hostels in the probation story, and as a tool for both providing a contextual baseline for the development of theory (and practice) in relation to the modern hostel story. The lack of recognition of an early hostel story means there is a lack of academic structure within which to locate this kind of work and a lack of documentary evidence of residents' and workers' perspectives.

The historical research is both through the lens of the current author and limited by the relative paucity of numbers of those who have thus far been interested in writing about hostels. As Noaks and Wincup (2004: 119) caution:

'It is always worth reiterating and re-emphasising the social construction of all potential documentary sources, and the difficulties, in practice, of separating their construction from the evidence that we can take from them.'

Ethnography

'Without the continued grounding in the empirical that scientific aspects of our tradition provide, our interpretative efforts may float off into literary criticism and into particularistic forms of history. Without the interpretive tradition, the scientific tradition that grounds us will never get off the ground'

Rappaport (1994: 76) cited in Wolcot (2005: 3)

Wolcot (2005) cautions that fieldwork research should, keep humans always visible, including in this the researcher and the researched. As Brewer notes:

'we are encouraged to be reflexive in our account of the research process, the data collected and the way we write up , because reflexivity shows the partial nature of our representation of reality and the multiplicity of competing versions of reality'

Brewer (2000: 129)

By being explicit about my prior probation background, knowledge of staff and familiarity with some of the practice territory I hope to reassure the reader that critical consideration has been given to the shaping influence of personal experience and values on the research task. The concept of 'reflective practice' (Martyn 2000) had been familiar to the author as a practitioner. The reality of becoming a reflective researcher and what this entails emerged over the experience of the research project. I have always had an interest in exploring why and how particular theories and practices emerged and why some become derigeur whilst others go relatively unnoticed. Hostels are an area of practice where their obscurity in relation to mainstream probation had figured in my practice background and in attempts to understand their origins.

As important as developing a critical historical analysis, has been the desire to get out there and see whether emerging theories, policies and changes are impacting on hostel practice, both for staff and residents. What impact have

wider historical and theoretical changes had on practice and the understanding of the purposes and limits of practice? How do hostels fit into the rehabilitative arsenal? Do they remain outside mainstream probation practice and ideologies? Is a process of change in purpose and function detectable today?

Therefore alongside the critical historical analysis the author engaged in an ethnographic study of two hostels in two distinct phases, with some four years apart to see whether in practice, on a micro level, changes in wider social and criminal justice policies could be seen to be shaping hostels' role and purpose.

What is Ethnography?

In line with Taylor (2002) some key features are worth setting out. Ethnography is a broad ranging approach and can be used in conjunction with a range of disciplines and traditions. It involves empirical work, in particular being with and observing people in their natural environments. Lareau and Shultz (1996: 2) stress that such work involves naturalistic studies, qualitative research and case studies. They positively encourage and promote researcher honesty in disclosing the learning process that the researcher has gone through in order that author and reader can learn more about how research actually gets done.

In defining ethnography as an approach they stress:

'Almost all definitions...include the use of participant observation as well as in-depth interviews with key informants. There is an effort to understand the view of the participants; researchers seek to be in the setting long enough to acquire some notion of acceptance and understanding.'

Lareau and Shultz (1996: 3)

Ethnographic research involves gaining access to the field. Unlike the public domain most social welfare settings and criminal justice domains in particular,

have no rights to roam that the researcher may use to gain access. However as will be discussed below a prior practice background and knowing the right people may help!

Gaining Access and Selecting the Hostels

Initially I was naïve as to both how much time fieldwork would take and how difficult it would be to gain access to hostel premises. Access negotiations proved to be a steep learning curve with the author's initial desire for a sample of five different hostels hitting against what Wincup (1997) refers to as the power of the 'gatekeepers'. From the literature review and my own prior practice experience I was aware of five different types of hostels that would have been useful to compare and contrast; the all male hostel, the all female hostel, the mixed hostel and specialist hostels particularly those with an explicit focus on mental health and substance misuse.

Samples of these five 'types' were both formally and informally approached making use of the Probation Directory (2001) for named contacts of the hostel manager and local chief or assistant chief officer. Geographic proximity had to be realistic to undertaking the project. In addition I had to be able to afford the field trips. Time spent travelling would be time away from the field and the library.

Phone calls were made and / or letters sent to hostels that could be reached in less than two hours. The gatekeepers were contacted and the responses varied from 'we will get back to you' to requests for 'more detail for the Chief Officers consideration' to 'we only allow Home Office research in our hostels' or 'we are waiting to be part of the Home Office pathfinder'.⁵²

Two hostels one all male and one mixed agreed to take part. Both involved approximately one hours travel each way for the researcher. The former had been established as a hostel since the early years of probation hostels in the

⁵² A Home Office Funded research project into effective practice in hostels began in 2002 prompted by PC110/2001. This is explored in more detail in chapter 7.

1970s and was known to me, or rather as became apparent, I was known to them and they 'trusted' me. The second hostel was in the process of being built and was to be the first mixed hostel in the region. In both cases I had prior professional relationships and friendships with some of the key staff involved. E.g. in 'Auldhouse' I had worked in close proximity to the hostel in a day centre and knew some of the staff. In 'Newhouse' I knew the proposed manager and deputy for the new hostel from my prior probation work. I had previously worked with the Assistant Chief Officer in relation to providing training for that area's trainee probation officer staff. As a novice researcher I was quite shocked that it was very much who I knew that oiled the wheels of access and not the content or quality of any research proposal! Although in returning to the field the downside of this was to be experienced with the passage of time between the two phases of research.

As Salisbury (1994: 30) notes, citing Goffman (1959), the ability to draw on your own professional background in a field you are researching may allow you to do 'face work'. That is having been a probation officer for almost ten years prior to commencing this work I could present an identity to managers, workers and offenders, which could reassure them and get the information I required. Having left the field of practice, I could equally play at 'not being one of them' i.e. 'staff', particularly with the residents, and present as just being interested to know. Some of the dilemmas this created will be discussed later.

Despite the informal go ahead in both cases I formally wrote to the Chief Officer and the Hostel Managers outlining my research proposal and request for access. I felt it was important to clarify roles and purposes as well as try and guard against future access being denied as 'friends' might move on.

The denial of access to the other hostels should not pass without reference to two phenomena, which my subjective perspective sees as key as to why access was denied. Firstly, as Lipsky (1980) has noted, street level bureaucrats can wield considerable power in deciding how policy is translated into practice. In some instances it felt as if the Chief Officer was quite amenable to the research but on checking with the hostel manager or deputy

was convinced that it was not the right thing or time to get involved. Secondly individuals may have been acting as gatekeepers to their own practices being scrutinised either as hostel or service managers, at a time when Home Office scrutiny of probation performance and practice was growing (Worrall and Hoy 2005). As Other (1999) found with Health Service organisations, individuals can employ a range of 'wrecking' strategies to ensure that outsiders remain just that.

From the late 1990s onwards, with an accompanying centralisation of research activity probation appears to have looked in on itself and been wary of external independent research. An increasing top down approach to practice prescription (Chapman and Hough 1998) from the Home Office and the setting up of 'programmes' and their related 'pathfinders' (Underdown 1998) leading subsequently to the accredited programmes panels has been commented on by Mair (2000: 268-271) as evidence of this. More recently (2006) a decision was made not to publish for general release the Home Office Hostel Pathfinder research report. There is evidence of a methodological preferencing of research that fits current policy initiatives.⁵³ Walters (2006: 6-7) has gone as far with this critique as calling for 'self respecting criminologists, to refuse the Home Office shilling' and boycott their research projects. Gaining access to hostels for research is not straightforward in a climate of centralised research. On returning to the field in 2006 permission had to be renegotiated and evidence of more rigorous screening of research projects was in place.

A 'research approval form' had to be completed in returning to the field (see appendix 5.0). Initial email and telephone contact questioned whether 'given all the changes in hostels this was the right time to be doing this' delaying the start of the second phase. Tenacity in making use of email, phone calls and face to face discussion helped re-secure phase two of this thesis. By 2006 the Probation Area had employed its own internal research officer who was part

⁵³ See Criminal Justice Matters No 62 Winter 2005/ 2006 – a range of articles have been published here criticising the use of research to assist in the construction of 'knowledge' or 'evidence' to support governmental policy.

of the vetting process of any research and three explicit and one implicit concern appeared key to their considerations;

- That the research did not duplicate work already being done or induce research fatigue in staff or offenders.
- That the research had benefit to the service and that some report, presentations and work would come from the author to the service.
- That the research was not controversial or likely to bring the service into disrepute.

Implicit was a concern as to whether publication of the findings would in any way jeopardise or possibly advantage the service in any future 'contestability' surrounding the delivery of interventions. Who would have sight of the findings and would they identify the hostels were important gatekeeping considerations.

The research approval form had to be submitted to a research panel and be scrutinised by the Assistant Chief Officer with responsibility for approved premises. The research officer had to make recommendations as to whether it was in the interests of the service for the research to take place and took copious notes during my research approval interview. Had the work not been 'in progress' and had I not retained the initial letters, interview schedules and briefing notes for hostel staff and residents and not facilitated re-contact via one of the initial gatekeepers the work may not have been completed.

Researching live subjects, who are in relationships of power to one another and the state, can raise awareness of the rationales used to sanction particular practices and the real power these can then bring to bear on other actors. Asking questions in the second phase of research sometimes interfered with the process in that by seeking access to the hostel at the weekends it felt as if greater attention was then given to the weekend rota and who was on duty. One methodological weakness of this is that it can allow those in power the potential to 'hide' that which you may wish to observe in its

natural environment. One example of such practice was being kept out of both hostels whilst the Service undertook a charm offensive with local politicians, trying to raise support for their existence in politicians' constituency areas.

Being explicitly kept away from the politicians reinforced the message that research is often perceived as both an intrusion and a risk to an organisation's standing. Research findings may be limited by the extent to which the realities they are allowed to engage with have already been shaped for the researcher. Gatekeepers had the power to shape when the hostels could be accessed and who the researcher got to meet or not.

Home Office Circular (PC 95 / 2005), highlights the existence of a centralising tendency present in both knowledge acquisition and the dissemination of information within the modern probation service. Increasingly research has to demonstrate a connection to policy aims to gain funding or approval.

There was a much more formal feel to the process of gaining access to managers and negotiating access to service users. Decisions about research approval appeared to have shifted from a highly individualised approach towards a more formalised committee orientated approach. Expectations of 'product' and updates were explicit and recording by the Service of aims, purposes and methods was centralised.

It is easy though to forget as a researcher how much you are asking when you invade people's working and private lives for considerable periods of time. In the hostels to which I gained access the response of staff (and residents) was hugely varied and individuals had considerable power de facto to influence interview arrangements, select staff and residents or discourage participants from taking part.

Consent was obtained on three levels; from the management of the probation service, from the hostel manager and on an individual basis with hostel staff and residents prior to, and at the commencement of formal interviews.

A sample of a letter sent to the hostel manager of 'Newhouse' is included in appendix 5.2. This was sent after initial consent and clarification meetings had been completed. With hindsight I feel tremendously privileged to have been able to spend so much time both formally and informally with staff and residents.

Initial Fieldwork and Trials – Getting Started

As Brewer (2000) notes Ethnography has its' roots in a long tradition of travellers living and working amongst strangers and recording their lives. Being a novice ethnographer was much akin to being a traveller, looking at maps, feeling lost at times and occasionally wondering why I had set out on the journey in the first place. The field research process was both exciting and time consuming and as Noaks and Wincup (2004: 75) note:

'One of the unique features of qualitative methods is that it seeks to start from where people are at and actively looks for the means to enable them to share their experiences.'

However this enabling was not straightforward and what resulted in getting the most information from individuals about their experiences was not always congruent with obtaining verifiable data. The process was not ethically straightforward either.

I have to confess to a desire to 'go native' in the spirit of Goffman's (1959) work to see what it was really like from the inside. However fascinating though, this may have been I would still have only been 'passing' as either a worker or resident. Moreover I would have had to give up my current full time employment to achieve this.

There were occasions when less formal 'passing' took place. The process of gaining consent in a residential setting was essentially problematic. The turnover of staff and residents meant that one would often turn up and some

residents or staff might not know about the research project and who you were. That said some of the 'passings' this constructed were of interest:

Sitting in the resident living area in Newhouse and being asked by 'fellow residents' what I was in for and what I thought of a particular music therapy programme which the staff thought the residents enjoyed and which most of the residents saw as a joke, quite literally apart from one old resident who enjoyed playing the organ... so all the others agreed to go along. However as in all group settings it is difficult to determine the extent to which peer influences shape the responses given and the interpretation of such vignettes is subjective. Others were less than humorous:

Turning up in the evening at Auldhouse and not been visible on the CCTV camera and being asked what I wanted and being told to F...off. Then being apologised to when the member of staff realised it was I:

'Sorry Francis I didn't know it was you...'

Did he think if I was a resident his approach was OK?

Notes from field (2002)

Getting Acquainted with the Hostels

Before each phase of research I made visits to both hostels, meeting the management, staff and residents to provide an outline of what I would be doing there and why. These early visits, getting to know the hostel staff and residents and explaining what I was about was a useful and informative process. It became apparent that the range of staff and residents was wide and that at different times of the day hostels had a different feel and were often staffed by individuals with very different personal and professional backgrounds and agendas. As a result of this early experience I decided to plan my visits for different times and days. Who was a resident and which offences people had committed could also shape the feel of the hostel for staff and residents.

Sex offenders appeared to conform easily to the overt rules and regulations and were in many ways 'easy residents', often helpful and polite.⁵⁴ They generally made the easiest research subjects too. In some cases their internal compliance with the hostel regime may not have been indicative of changes in offending behaviour. Early visits to Newhouse suggested that staff were overly concerned about maintaining the physical fabric of a new building. There appeared to be a risk that residents might be responded to in terms of their ease of compliance with a regime as opposed to their rehabilitative potential. Younger, nosier, messier and less 'compliant' residents could easily be labelled as problematic.

These initial visits helped me realise that ethnographic research was going to have to be planned and considered with regular reflection and review, if any sense was to be made of the data that it revealed. Delamont (2001) cited in Noaks and Wincup (2004: 92) cautions that ethnographic techniques are a skill to be mastered as opposed to an innate ability or just rushing out, seeing and writing down. This learning process of undertaking an ethnographic study was and is ongoing. The reader may note differences between the first and second phase of field research and a growing awareness in the author of how the wider contextual factors revealed in the historical critique became a lens through which the ethnographic data could be viewed. This process was not one way. Experiences in the field pushed the author back into literature searches to more critically explore how current formulations of policy and practice might be shaping the experiences of the staff and residents he was engaged with and to continually explore and refine his understanding of ethnographic approaches. The four-volume text 'Ethnography' edited by Bryman (2001) was a useful catalyst for reflection and review.

⁵⁴ The term here refers to adult male sex offenders, predominantly those convicted of offences against children. The generic and imprecise use of the term reflects the generalisation and broad classification of offence types that hostel staff and probation officers reflected in their language. Having worked as a probation officer in the past it could be easy to uncritically take on board such informal category conventions. The predatory, non – grooming adult to adult sex offender did not appear to be responded to by staff in the same ways as is suggested here and their behaviour was less compliant. The mixed regime at Newhouse in phase one made it less likely that a male to female adult rapist would be accepted there.

Self reflexivity was sustained by links with and questioning from practitioners, supervisors, other researchers and research subjects. Fieldwork may create data from its visits and observations but its shaping and interpretation was filtered through the 'other' research, review and self reflective processes. Keeping and cross referencing fieldnotes, interview data and a research diary noting ideas, impressions, sights, changes, sounds, reflections and even at times smells(!) that each visit to the field brought proved demanding but informative.

'Fieldnotes are the backbone of collecting and analysing data. An oversimplified view of field notes is that they are the means by which the researcher jots down observations in order not to forget them later. However fieldnotes are much more than a memory tool. Their creation is part of the analytic process.'

Bailey (1996: 80)

That analytic process remained ongoing and was not completed by one reading or one analysis, returning to the goals of the thesis, the wider theoretical base and the emerging body of literature on hostels alongside recognition of my own personal feelings and emotions was important. Finding oneself regularly surrounded by mostly adults who had committed sex offences against children in the second phase of fieldwork was not what I had foreseen at the start of this study

Giving it a Structure

My initial visits to the hostels; to meet staff and get a feel for who the residents were was helpful in finalising the research approach. Knowing which spaces I could access and what happened at particular times of the day was important in understanding what my research could and couldn't capture.

An iterative process involved consultation with and support from academics, friends, ex colleagues, reflections on existing hostel fieldwork and some helpful trials of questionnaires and interview schedules with the assistance of a psychologist from the prison service.⁵⁵ As Wincup (Brookman et al 1999: 116) notes:

'The essential characteristics of ethnography include involvement in peoples lives for an extended period of time, watching what happens, listening to what is said and asking questions.'

Such watching, being with, questioning and listening to were performed by undertaking: semi structured Interviews, informal visits to hostels and involvement in social activities associated with the hostels. It also included an exploration of the hostel regime; its publicity literature i.e. stated purpose and its resident supervision (keywork) and staff supervision processes.

'To be able to judge the credibility of research, readers need to be given information as to how it was conducted'

Gomm (2004: 177)

Semi Structured Interviews (Davies 2000: 82-96 in Jupp 2000) were chosen for formal meetings with staff and residents. Notes were taken during the interview and then written up at the end of the visit off site. At the end of each interview I précised back the main points and checked out that we had a shared understanding of what had been said. I found it useful to use a digital voice recorder in the car in the hour long journey back after each visit to record key thoughts and impressions that were later written up in my research diary and could be stored as sound files on my PC.

A social survey approach was avoided as such standardisation might fail to recognise the varying abilities of staff and residents to engage with such a

⁵⁵ The questionnaires were trialled and the psychologist agreed to sit in on the first 4 interviews in each hostel in 2002.

process and ignore valuable information that could be disclosed verbally and more informally. Such standardisation would have potentially distorted the participant's responses and gone against the naturalistic tradition associated with ethnography. Questioning was considered important but not at the expense of getting alongside and underneath the surface of practice in the hostel. However the basic format and methods employed in the semi structured interviews with staff and residents was the same.

I wanted to create a more natural flow of information and to observe not only what I expected or was interested in but to allow the organic process of being and watching to evolve. I did not want to communicate an expected answer to the interviewees either in the structure of the interview or in the content of written questions. As Gomm (2004: 172) notes:

'.. it can be argued that what people do is nearly always influenced by the social setting in which they find themselves.'

If the interest was in hostels, then hostels were where the field research was to take place and not in an environment whose setting might contaminate the results. If the interview was more like an ordinary conversation in the individuals' own environment then it was to be hoped that the interviewee would feel free to discuss their views and perceptions. To balance the interview approach, considerable time was spent just being in the hostel, which allowed the author to see residents and staff, consistently over a period of time and in a range of structured, semi structured and naturally occurring contexts.

It is important to note that a hostel is a resident's 'home' for a period of usually up to a year but occasionally longer. Having a stranger turn up and look at your room, sit down with you in your sitting room when you watch television, see you do your housework and share meal and tea breaks with you is at least intrusive and has the potential to be oppressive. I am not sure I would have been relaxed about such research in my home!

For staff, hostels were a place of work and something they often had mixed feelings about. They variously enjoyed the opportunities for really getting to know the residents and see a difference their inputs could affect but at times too felt that the demands of hostel work, long hours and nature of the clientele were largely ignored by the wider service, leaving them feeling undervalued.

A one to one qualitative interview alongside observation allowed depth of information. What people feel comfortable to say in a group, in front of fellow staff or residents and on their own may vary. There needed to be some structure to the interview process though if I was to explore my questions. This structure was to be loose and act as a general guidance only for the interviewer to remind him to ask about some key areas. In both phases of the research I deliberately decided to visit the hostels and build some rapport and relationship with staff and residents before commencing formal interviews. The appendices (5.3) show the similarity in the interview schedules for staff and residents. Wherever possible the interviews took place in an area of the hostel where staff or residents would normally meet.

It did take a few weeks to notice in New House that staff were getting annoyed at my presence during the middle part of the day in a particular room; apparently this was where they usually ate their lunch! This in itself was useful as it alerted me to the official and unofficial boundaries that can occur in the regulation of space and time in a hostel as well as the unspoken boundaries that shape relationships between groups in a residential setting.

I interviewed staff and residents in informal spaces or in rooms that were normally used for keywork and wherever possible avoided spaces that staff and residents would find unfamiliar.

I planned my visits in advance and staff and residents were informed of times and days that I would be in the hostel. Residents and staff could then arrange to see me for the more formal interviews in a planned way and had a choice to be around or not when I came. On some occasions there were no formal

interviews and time was spent either informally in communal areas or shadowing staff. I also found it useful to informally approach new residents to ask if they would agree to an interview.

Strengths and Weakness of the Approach

The temporal distribution of the data over a relatively lengthy timeframe both during and between the two phases of fieldwork was an area for regular consideration and anxiety e.g. would I still have permission to go back as I knew turnover in staff was taking place in the hostels and amongst the 'gatekeepers'. Equally, hostel staff and gatekeepers were at times impatient with such a longitudinal approach occasionally asking whether the study would ever finish and what had I found? The time gaps allowed the author to review and refine both his ethnographic skills, and to structure his thoughts about the emerging data. Moreover the influence of the ongoing historical analysis shaped the authors' understandings and interpretations as the work developed. The time frame also meant that relationships with some staff had become reasonably long term and that the involvement in informal hostel related social events might encourage the staff to either forget the researcher identity or to be less mindful of what they said and did when I was around.

The flexibility of the ethnographic approach was matched with attempts to remain rigorously up to date about hostel developments on a macro level whether relating to policy, practice or the wider the probation service. Having two and not the planned five hostels generated more than enough qualitative data. It also allowed a considerable amount of time to be spent in each setting and between fieldwork, time to pay attention to the bigger picture and dig deep into and reflect on the rich data from these two specific case studies.

There can be no pretence that the whole project was cleanly and seamlessly executed. The realities of complex social developments in criminal justice policy and practice, individuals' subjective responses to these and the researchers' own thoughts and feelings developed not alongside but enmeshed with and influenced by the changing policy and practice climate

that hostels experienced. As Barton (2005: 160) found with her research in Vernon Lodge, interviews were not randomly selected. Residents and staff self selected or were 'encouraged' by the manager or deputy to take part. One cannot claim to be able to generalise reliably from the views and opinions of some hostel staff or residents to those in other hostels.

Moreover the human story of both staff and residents' lives became more apparent as the study unfolded. I was de facto refining my practice as the research evolved e.g. as a result of my initial impressions and experiences, coupled with the literature review, I began to feel that it was of interest to ask both staff and residents whether they had any prior experiences of residential settings. The research developed organically in response to what was being uncovered and in response to the historical analysis being undertaken alongside the ethnography.

LeCompte (2002) has noted that the ethnographic approach is open to claims of a lack of rigour in its experimental controls and its 'replicability'. With a qualitative study focusing on two different hostels it cannot be claimed that a less familiar individual in the area would have had the same responses from staff or residents. Moreover had different staff or residents inhabited the hostel at the time of this work the results may have been different. In many ways ethnographic work provides a critical snapshot of social life and social practices. That such work is no more but equally no less than, a structured ethnography across two distinctive periods in time should not be undermining of the picture and insights that may begin to emerge from such research.

Research Settings and Data Recording

Ethnographic research does not always allow for all interactions to be recorded. The ability to analyse the extent to which the interviewer has shaped the research process and outcomes can therefore feel hidden to the reader. However as Andersen (1993) suggests sometimes the unrecorded interview is the only kind the respondents will agree to.

Carrying out research in a criminal justice environment where tape recording is associated with police interviews and conviction / surveillance processes may not be the best way to get your interviewees to open up! Residents and staff were reluctant to be taped and much happier for me to take notes and feedback a summary to them at the end of the interview. Despite not tape recording I found Parkers' guidance (Soothill (Ed) 1999: 241-242) invaluable. Key features of this are:

- *Preparation*
- *Clear explanation of purposes and consent being gained*
- *The importance of open-ended questions*
- *Listening as much as possible without interruption*
- *Respect for the interviewee and anonymity*
- *Checking out what has been said and understood*

Research 'with' offenders whilst considering policy and practice developments surrounding offenders has been a sine qua non for the author. Whether this remains tenable in future research remains to be seen. The author contends that although potentially more politically and for some more academically favoured, large scale studies and alternative methodologies such as 'meta - analysis' (Lipsey and Wilson 2001 and Andrews and Bonta 2003), can make greater claims to validity on the basis of sample size and controls, they also lose the individual social actors whose lives and realities are enmeshed in such studies. The desire to retain links with practice in its actual setting and explore current contexts has entailed adopting an ethnographic approach that has a discursive focus. This has implications for analysis i.e. some of the analytic classifications may be a product of the research process and not those the author had initially considered. This study must be seen as ethnographic as opposed to 'ethnography'.

The research did not centre on hypothesis testing or the desire to prove or disprove any established set of facts. Issues of continuity and discontinuity are prevalent particularly in the overview and analysis in the concluding

chapters. That is, the research design required a gap between the different phases to ascertain whether changes in the modern context could be detected, had the researcher returned to the field at an earlier or later stage the findings may have been different. A constant theme for contemporary penal policy appears to be change however the extent to which this has impacted on the modern hostel has been assessed by two separate ethnographic studies. The source material for the ethnography has been restricted to two particular hostels, and as such is authentic but not necessarily representative. The reader can conclude whether the particular ethnographic analysis fits with the exploration of the wider critical historical analysis as suggested in the concluding chapters. The author 'tested out' his findings by presenting them in 2006 and 2007 to a group of Hostel Managers and Deputies as a contribution to their national training programme. Responses there iterated with the ethnographic findings of this thesis. Whether the findings apply to all hostels is a larger question.

Analysis of the Data

As Brewer (2002) notes ethnographic research does not lay claim to being an exact science. The research is best understood as an ongoing process rather than a discrete set of stages that are timetabled one after the other. That said analysis of the data should be neither haphazard nor chaotic. The author kept field notes as he went along and engaged in historical research as to the origins of hostels, exploring the possible theoretical frameworks that might assist in understanding the role and function of the modern hostel.

The influence of the field research on the critical theorising was ongoing e.g. when the regimes of the two hostels became apparent the author compared these with regimes of similar institutions that had existed previously and explored how these had been treated in contemporary hostel research. Thus when gender issues arose in the fieldwork the author explored the work of Worrall (2002), Barton (2005), Croall (1998) and others revisiting feminist critiques of the criminal justice system. When re-integrative themes arose in resident interviews these were cross referenced to literature on the

rehabilitative ideal (e.g. Allen 1981 and Raynor 2006) and considered in light of the emerging NOMS literature. The quantity of material from the field, the literature search and theoretical explorations was vast. However a mutual shaping and forming took place between the approaches. I kept a range of folders into which data was placed and cross referenced e.g. interview data was stored in a separate folder for each hostel and then folders were kept with notes and articles in relation to chronology and subject areas. From this indexing and cross referencing process key themes began to emerge which were then developed into sub folders of their own. If a distinct theme e.g. Keywork arose, interview data, hostel literature and relevant theoretical or historical data which related to this were put together. In the end several layers (or rather drawers) of folders e.g. Historical, Field Work, Theory in relation to rehabilitation, transformation, punishment, the wider Probation Service, HMIP Inspectorate Documents, NOMS, Dangerousness, Risk, Desistance, Legislation were created around core themes that emerged over the five years. At times this felt like 'information overload' and I was pleased and surprised at the quantity and quality of material that could be used as a base for which to develop theory about hostels, their origins and their transformative potential . I was uncertain how these would in the end cohere.

The supervision process was helpful here and being told that it was time to 'stop reading' or at least given permission or reassurance that there was sufficient material and ideas to justify the development of a proposed thesis pushed me to create order from the apparent chaos. Key themes were identified and mapped across the historical and theoretical data that had been gathered. Moreover interview and observation data were explored for key themes and evidence as to whether hostels were changing or not.

As Barton and Lazarsfield (1969) noted in McCall-Simmons (1969: 63):

'What can a researcher do when confronted by a body of qualitative data-detailed, concrete, non metric, descriptions of people and events, drawn from direct observations, interviews and case studies...?'

What appeared crucial was to provide an order for the material selected that would be accessible to the reader and a rationale for the typologies chosen under which the data is explored. The typologies used formed the underpinning structure for the chapters and sub-headings, which formed the building blocks of this thesis. The physical construction analogy seemed particularly relevant as one looks at the finished product with a mixture of pleasure at having completed (even on a sectional basis) and knowledge as to what could have been done better, as well as confusion as to how many other 'bits' are left lying around that could have been used but were not !

In the conclusion the author will put forward alternative typologies that may be of assistance in considering the rehabilitative potential of the modern hostel and in understanding the relationship between the modern hostel, its precursors and wider probation policy shifts.

As Glaser (1969) noted in McCall-Simmons(1969: 226-227) the shift from qualitative data and theoretical explorations to theory is at risk of being perceived as impressionistic unless explanation of how it was arrived at is provided, even if the findings are the result of months or years of hard study ! The discipline required in keeping track of the theory one is developing and the audit trail which accompanies this process of comparison, exploration of diverse sources and reconsideration of explanations appears to fit well with research that is concerned with analysis of process, sequence and change at an organisational and social level.

To be more than just a set of interesting stories about hostels the author has located the 'findings' against the main research question and the sub questions that emerged from these. Each chapter was written and rewritten several times and consideration was given to the extent to which the reader could access and gain a convincing sense of the thesis based on the data presented. The aim was to produce a thesis from which the reader would be able to conclude for themselves:

- Whether the accepted convention of the hostel story commencing in 1969 should be accepted and whether there is in fact an unexplored history of hostels, which may be of interest to academics, practitioners and policy makers?
- If accepted that there is such a story, whether any continuity and coherence can be found in the hostel function which has been hidden?
- To what extent hostels today may be seen as part of an ongoing story of transformation and rehabilitation, or conversely at a point of departure from this re-integrative discourse?

The emergence of the data presented and the exploration of the suggested hidden history were intertwined with the process of carrying out the field research. After having completing the ethnography and analysing the themes and data it created, I cross referenced my findings and reflections to hard data in relation to occupancy, throughput, and types of cases and length of stay etc. This is presented in appendix five and will be referred to in chapters eight and nine. It was felt important to offer both context and grounding for the findings. This also allowed me to reflect on the extent to which the quantitative data supports the arguments made in this thesis about the directions hostels may be taking.

Observation, Objectivity? Hard Work and Fun.

Ethnography entails 'being with', and as far as was practically possible I wanted to understand what else went on in an hostel as well as understanding the prescribed and recorded 'regime'. Early hostel research by Sinclair (1971) appears to have skewed the attention of subsequent researchers for some two decades to focus on formal regimes, ignoring for the most part differences between the formal and informal without consideration of a view from the

underside (Vanstone 2004: ix). By spending time just being there, I found out about charitable events, hostel quiz nights and outings arranged to promote residents wider social development and 'normalisation'.

These were usually arranged by staff or in one hostel by a group known as the 'Friends of Auldhouse' which had been set up to promote the hostels integration with the local community and with a specific remit to raise money for local charities. In the first phase of the research I was able to regularly access such events at Auldhouse. In the second phase such activities and opportunities were less evident and the reasons for this will be explored in later chapters. Some of the research therefore involved various activities not formally recorded in hostels literature or hostel publicity material. This included taking part in and helping to organise a number of charitable bike rides (on one I managed to crash 25 miles from nowhere and came back covered in blood and dirt), taking part in quiz events which were open to residents and members of the 'hostel friends' group, a treasure hunt fundraising event only open to staff and 'friends', several social events for staff (one of which was gate-crashed by residents, up until just before their curfew time! They left the pub at 10.50pm on their knees singing 'Hi Ho, Hi Ho it's off to bed we go.') including staff leaving do's and invites to Christmas parties and even a rather memorable fundraising event hosted by a celebrity drag queen at which one of the elderly male staff didn't quite get that she was a 'he'.

I went on coastal walks with residents and even ended up accompanying residents to hospital for medical treatment including, treatment for overdose and one person being assessed under the Mental Health Act. Having a car and a prior probation background meant that at times I was seen as a potential resource by both staff and residents. I witnessed a 'ghosting' - a recall of a resident on life licence where police surrounded the hostel in the early hours in riot gear and removed someone from their bed to take them back to prison. I occasionally ended up covering the front office / reception for brief periods. My prior role as a probation officer undoubtedly enabled me to

access roles and perspectives for which more traditional students may have faced vetting and censure procedures.

Developing and Maintaining a 'Balanced' Picture

Learning to 'be with' but remain neutral was a challenge. The research involved real people in at times quite difficult periods of their lives. Some would have been easy to like. Others would have been easy to dislike for the harm they had caused others. Gomm (2004: 227) citing Miller (1953) and Lidz (1989) has warned about the dangers of researchers developing 'over rapport' with their subject and being over sympathetic to their perspectives to the extent that they develop a 'sympathetic bias'. The opposite may be a danger too.

Reporting back on ethnography is always partial:

*'Researchers cannot simply go and look at 'naturally occurring' events and write an account of these 'telling it like it is'. Their report will always be a report by them, based on what was observed by them, excluding what they did not observe, informed by the sense they made their observations.'*⁵⁶

Gomm (2004: 217)

This experience of ethnographic research suggested that there can be a subtle pressure from participants to assert their account on the researcher or to more covertly hide their account from inclusion / analysis. Between the first and second phase of research I learned to take more regular field notes and early on realised the importance of writing up interview notes as soon as practically possible.

By having third party feedback from the psychologist in the early interviews and having put some years between my prior probation practice identity and

⁵⁶ Or what they were not allowed to observe, in regaining entry to the field the second time around this felt as if it was carefully choreographed.

novice researcher identity it was hoped that a balance could be developed between an empathetic and an objective understanding. Having someone else present in the early interviews breached Parker's (cited in Soothill 1999) suggested rules but was felt necessary to validate the interview process and interpretation of data. As a novice researcher in a field where I had been a practitioner I felt it necessary to check out and reinforce the researcher identity. This approach was used only in a small sample of the early interviews and was not used in the second phase of research.

Brewer notes that interpretation of ethnographic data is potentially problematic:

'With ethnographic research there are no statistical tests which others can use to check independently the researcher's interpretations and descriptions. The confidence which others have thus depends upon the evaluations of the ethnographer's integrity and good practice.'

Brewer (2001: 103-4 in Bryman 2001 volume IV)

At times I purposefully left out incidents and detail to protect the dignity and identity of individuals and, more selfishly, to ensure that research opportunities are not closed down to the researcher in the future.

However hard I worked to create a coherent methodological approach that would both 'do the job' and be scientifically rigorous, I was concerned throughout with a range of ethical considerations.

Ethical Considerations

As Wincup (2002) has noted hostel related research is not unproblematic. The fieldwork in this study was interesting, challenging and at times threw up moral dilemmas that required careful exploration and consideration e.g. in interviewing residents with a history of sex offending they could try and engage you in collusion with their understanding of their offence or provide information that suggested a risk to others. It was important to remain in a

researcher role. Having previously worked with sex offenders I found some of their attempts to elicit collusion tempting to respond to with challenge. Some attempts to gain my collusion made me feel angry and I left some interviews feeling dirty. It was important that this did not come across to the residents if they were to be open with me. I felt some discomfort in the shift from being a practitioner to being a novice researcher. I made use of my supervisors in this period to checkout and debrief my perceptions and feelings.

At times staff disclosed beliefs, behaviours or perceptions that as a practitioner I would have challenged or taken action on. I made clear to all involved that confidentiality was contingent. Confidentiality was only breached if there was identification of any risk to children or others being disclosed that was of concern.

On three occasions I breached confidence, twice regarding disclosures by sex offenders that suggested they were grooming potential victims. I had agreement in advance that I would share any such information with an assistant chief officer who would link with the resident's probation officer and ensure that the disclosure was not linked to myself or the hostel. Once I breached a resident's confidence that he was feeling suicidal with staff on duty.

To try and maintain a 'neutral' approach and to compensate for an unwillingness for interviews to be taped I both triangulated a sample of early interviews with a psychologist being present and us both independently manually recording our 'findings' and checking these out. I also verbally précised back to the interviewee the main points of what they had said at the end of each interview. I felt that it was important that the data was owned by those providing it and not shaped in these early stages by any analysis or coding. In developing and carrying out the research I found it helpful to consult general texts on applied criminological research such as Pawson and Tilley (1997), Jupp (2000), Noaks and Wincup (2004) and to engage with guidance from professional associations such as the British Sociological Association (BSA). During the early course of the research I joined the BSA

and found their statement of ethical practice and journal publications on research useful.

The BSA (www.britsoc.co.uk, 2002) recognises that styles of research are diverse and that the contexts within which research takes place create their own unique ethical and at times, legal dilemmas due to conflicts of interest and competing obligations. Having a professional practice background in probation was useful as I could engage readily with gatekeepers and participants about their concerns for anonymity, confidentiality and general concerns from the service as to how any public protection issues would be managed. However I needed to consider key principles suggested by the BSA in the design, execution and write up of the research project.

The basic principles and areas for consideration offered by the BSA (www.britsoc.co.uk 2002, updated 2004) include:

Professional Integrity

Informed Consent

Relationships with Gatekeepers and Participants

Principles for Data collection and Analysis

Non Harm.

Professional Integrity

Not accepting work you are not qualified to do ... As a novice ethnographer I was acutely aware of my relative lack of prior research experience but did draw upon a decade of interviewing and practice skills in the probation and social care sector that meant I was both used to dealing with 'clients' and respecting their autonomy and rights. Codes of practice issued by BASW (British Association of Social Work) and NAPO (National Association of Probation Officers) had been influential in my prior practice experience. Both of these bodies had encouraged a spirit of non-harm and respect for individuals. Moreover both encouraged workers to think about issues of discrimination and oppression. I was acutely aware that many of the residents

I would 'study' were both 'offenders' and 'victims'. My role now however was as a researcher and not as a social worker or probation officer. Reference to practice focused journals was a useful way of remaining engaged with practice and academic debates in the service.

Informed Consent

Participation in sociological research should be based on the freely given informed consent of those studied. This entails a responsibility on researchers to explain in appropriate detail, and in terms meaningful to participants, what their research is about, who is undertaking it, why it is being undertaken, and how it is to be disseminated and used.

The process of gaining formal consent was not without its difficulties, however once achieved the ethical mistake would be to assume that organisational consent entailed individual consent. Gatekeepers may not speak on behalf of participants. With this in mind I was careful to start individual interviews with a reminder of the nature and purpose of the research and the right to decline involvement. Some residents did take this opportunity to decline and said they had only turned up because their name had gone on a list to see me. Moreover the withholding of consent could be subtler, a few staff were seen to come and see me by their managers but for a range of reasons declined to engage in the spirit of the research interview. For example most interviews took between 45 – 90 minutes. Some interviewees would give only yes or no answers or in the case of some staff provide what can best be prescribed as expected answers fitting with current probation practice with little or no attempt to engage with the spirit of qualitative interviewing. Conversely others used the interview as a space to share and off load concerns. Some were unconvinced that their answers would not be fed back to management (or in the case of hostel residents – staff) and declined to comment beyond giving minimalist answers that could be found in the hostel' official flyers and leaflets. In neither case was feedback on non co-operation provided.

Consent is also linked with issues of confidentiality. The BSA (www.britsoc.org.uk 2004) caution researchers neither to give unrealistic guarantees of confidentiality nor to permit communication of research records to audiences other than those to which the research participants have agreed. A protocol was agreed with a senior manager outside the hostel that any issues that might arise with offenders or staff, where I felt information should be shared, I could discuss with her. This was agreed so as not to compromise the research by potentially being seen to 'grass up' staff or residents and lose their trust and also to create a safe forum to explore potential protection or safety issues. Staff and residents were concerned who would get access to their interview data.

Storing of information in the form of notes and data was an issue and the implications of the Data Protection Act meant that all notes from the field transcribed to the computer had to be anonymous. I did worry that I would lose my 'coded' list of real initials and details and not be able to match up the data at a later stage or that this would be stolen and someone would be able to identify individuals. However such concerns were unfounded and once completed all codings that could lead back to individual staff and residents are to be destroyed.

Use of Data

The extent to which the probation service can be said to have given consent to the whole is problematic. In the five years of the research there were several changes of chief officer, assistant chief officer and hostel management. However amid the myriad of changes probation experienced in this period, including amalgamation of probation areas, they appeared mostly happy to take me on trust. By the second phase of research this attitude and approach had changed and formal research approval forms, meetings with ACO's and discussion with the area research officer were required to regain access to the field. At key points e.g. returning for the second phase of research or moving from interviews in one hostel to another, services were reminded of what I was doing and requests were made to me for my interview

schedules. As noted earlier there was a concern that the research would not jeopardise either hostels' standing and I regained entry with a strong sense of being 'just allowed in'.⁵⁷ Prior to any publication I have agreed to offer the service feedback on findings, both in full and in the form of a summary report.

Non Harm to the Residents and Staff

A basic principle in all social science research (Jupp 2004: 171-172) is that the researcher should consider carefully the possibility that the research experience may be a disturbing one for the participant and should attempt, where necessary, to find ways to minimise or alleviate any distress caused to those participating in research. Staff and residents can be vulnerable when interviews and informal discussion lead to personal disclosure that is unplanned. This aspect of the research was unforeseen. I had forgotten as a practitioner how readily people will talk if they are given space and made to feel that they are not being judged. As Noaks and Wincup (2004: 83) note:

'Responsibility to the interviewee needs to be addressed at the various stages of the research process. This includes the initial approach; during the interview; and in subsequent handling of information acquired.'

Both staff and residents could be vulnerable. For staff, at times the information people revealed about their motivations for working in hostels and their prior life experiences strongly suggested an element of the 'wounded healer' (Keith-Lucas 1972). In the course of the staff interviews I explicitly explored what staff understood as their role and what impact they felt they had on residents. Such personal exploration and discussion of their experiences had the potential to be used by them to assist residents to change if the 'wounded-healer' had come to terms with previous issues but

⁵⁷ The second phase of ethnography coincided with an intense period of media scrutiny and public attention (see Chapter 7). I was explicitly not permitted to go to the hostels on days when politicians were due to attend as part of a 'charm offensive' to secure greater political support for hostels existence in the local community. My presence I was informed 'would have been too much of a distraction' on such days. I was not permitted to write about this process. Gatekeepers can wield significant power and close off to scrutiny those processes which they do not wish to be observed.

also left some staff potentially vulnerable if personal issues remained unresolved. As much as I had to stay in a 'researcher role' with the residents I had to ensure that I did not become a 'counsellor' for the staff.

Surprisingly, supervision of hostel staff appeared not to routinely take account of how their previous experience of 'victim' or 'perpetrator' status could impact on the work they do with specific resident populations.

'...the ethical adequacy of ethnographic research might be judged more appropriately in the context of respect for individual autonomy based on the fundamental principle stated by Kant, that persons be treated at all times as ends in themselves, never merely as means.'

Casell (Bryman 2001: Volume III: 358)

To respect staff and residents as persons, consent was re sought at the start of formal interviews and the research project was overt, discussed with supervisors and interview schedules were presented to hostel managers before being used with staff or residents. Agreements were put in place beforehand that moral dilemmas could be discussed with identified individuals external to the research process.

The informal settings

The above considerations were easier to regulate for in the formal interview and meeting type arenas. More complex was respect and mindfulness of the above principles in the informal process of just being in the hostel or just being with staff and residents in normal activities and events. Moreover it is difficult to get invited to the informal or gain access to the more hidden parts of practice if you constantly remind people that you are 'doing research'. As Hudson notes:

'Matters of ethics interact with the pursuit of validity and also with the political dimension of research. If the principle of informed consent is applied in full

and in such a way that subjects are aware of all aspects of research, including its purpose, it is highly likely that they will behave or react in ways in which they would not normally do.'

Hudson (in Jupp 2000: 171)

Understanding what staff thought of their role and purpose and how they understood what was happening in a hostel needed a wider context than just observation in the hostel. I explicitly chose to get to know the staff better but did not regularly remind them that I was a researcher.

Moreover my partner becoming a manager in one of the hostels during part of this research period opened doors into the internal workings of a hostel that I may not have otherwise been privy to but also closed down the willingness of some staff to be formally interviewed.⁵⁸ Understanding the 24 hour nature of hostels and the 7 day a week, 365 day a year staff – resident relationship convinced me that hostels provided a unique insight into offenders' lives but also constructed relationships and levels of mutual knowledge, stress and expectation that would not normally occur between probation staff and their clientele or between staff. Little research appears to have taken place as to the potential for promoting desistance in an environment where the 'offender' is both in the community and in daily contact with probation staff.

Outcomes of the Findings

Brewer (2001) notes that readers of ethnographic studies require what Atkinson (1990) has called the 'ethnographic imagination'. Brewer (2001) cites three dimensions to this imagination which are predicated on the calls for good ethnographic practice:

⁵⁸ My partner was no longer in this role in 2006-7 and there were several changes of manager and deputy between 2002 and 2006 in Auldhouse. It is important to acknowledge that in the second phase of research staff and residents in Auldhouse may have felt more able to be critical than during that period in 2002 when my partner became manager there about half way through the fieldwork.

1. The belief that fragments of recorded talk, extracts from fieldwork notes and reports of observed actions can reliably represent a social world which cannot be completely described in the restricted spatial confines of an ethnographic text, so long as the ethnographer has been reflexive and thereby established his or her integrity and the authority of the data.
2. The belief that small-scale, micro events in everyday life have at least common features with the broad social world, such that general processes permeate down to and are, in part, reproduced at the level of people's everyday lives. Thus, microscopic events can illustrate features of broad social processes; so long as the ethnographer sets out the grounds on which these empirical generalisations are made.
3. The belief that people make sense of their everyday lives, and offer accounts and descriptions thereof, involving a complex reasoning process, which must be analysed if that social world is to be understood in the round, rather than being ignored or accepted at face value.

Brewer (in Bryman 2001: 105 Volume IV)

This thesis aims to broaden the field of current discourse surrounding hostels in particular and to a lesser extent wider probation practice. The thesis neither seeks to maintain nor attack the status quo of hostels' policy and practice. It may though end up being critical of where hostels are going and suggest that government and probation in particular may need to rethink how this resource is being used.

There is no desire to cast individuals or services as villains or heroes. The thesis aims to provide a critical perspective and hopefully highlight some of the potential transformative practices that hostels could harness for individual offenders and the communities to which they belong.

This thesis will attempt to make use of a possible synergy between the domains of ethnographic research and critical historical analysis. It seeks to develop a broader hostels' story adding to the understanding of what hostels have been and where they might be going. Between phase one and phase two Barton (2005: 159) albeit having access to specific documentary evidence published hostel research with two distinct but equally important parts,

'these being a historical and contemporary analysis of the experiences of women within a particular institution'.⁵⁹

As a novice ethnographer it was encouraging to find research on hostels mixing ethnographic and historical approaches. Shaffir (2001) suggests:

'Our bottom line as ethnographers ought to be that to the degree that a clearer and sharper understanding of a slice of human lived reality is our primary objective, ethnographic – based research approaches yield highly credible data.'

Shaffir (Bryman 2001: 232)

By triangulating methodologies the author is looking at the world of hostels both close up and at a distance. The author asserts that the ability to perceive the world from more than one paradigmatic perspective is an asset in achieving a holistic overview of the subject matter. However, such an approach remains partial, open to critique and invites consideration of alternative perspectives and new paradigms. This piece attempts a 'new' approach to developing a theoretical and practical understanding of what hostels are, have been and could be.

'In combining methods, ethnographers are not suggesting naively that mixing methods will increase the validity of their data or that the data gathered from different sources can be used to produce a single unitary view of the "truth".'

⁵⁹ Between the 2002 and 2006, Barton (2005) produced her work *Fragile Moralities and Dangerous Sexualities*.

Wincup (in Brookman et al 1999: 116)

The development of practice and related discourses is an ongoing process and therefore analysis is unfinished. The 'truth' that can be reached by such methods although both partial and contingent on the research process, should contribute to a deeper understanding of the hostel story.

One implication of a two phase study was that a considerable period passed in which the author was 'out of the field'. In this interim I immersed myself in the news, reports, studies, findings and research that related to hostels, past and present and allowed these to both inform and shape my ideas about what had happened and to sharpen my critical engagement with how policy and practice were developing more generally in probation.

Snow in Bryman (2001 Vol: 382-397) suggests problems associated with 'the disengagement process' noting that 'the point of theoretical saturation' may signal the time to leave the field. As this work was time bound and had a target from the outset to spend two equal six month periods four years apart there were no doubts about when the right time to go was. That said this does not mean that the trust, relationships and interest to know more were not difficult to put to one side. Carrying out ethnographic work changed and shaped my view of the world of practice, simultaneously reading about hostels, their history and searching for academic work in this area informed and developed my own theorising and reflection. As my ethnographic involvement in hostels came to an end, opportunities arose to engage with hostel managers and deputies on a wider scale. On completing the ethnographic work I was able to present and explore research findings at a national level. This will be discussed in more detail in chapter eight. However it is important to note here that by the time I had completed all the field work I was able to formally discuss and explore my findings with managers and deputies from 26 other hostels. The author left the field at the stated time but remained engaged in the wider practice and policy discussions that continue to surround hostels.

The next chapter will report on the findings from the first ethnographic study which took place in 2002

Letting Hostels Speak for Themselves: A View from the Underside.

Chapter Six

Preceding chapters have outlined the case for a much longer pre history to the modern hostel identifying some of the key and underpinning philosophies, influences and policy contexts. Hostels have until relatively recently sat to one side of mainstream practice and been influenced by a range of individuals and been targeted at diverse offender groups; the young offender (Sinclair 1971), the homeless (Coker 1970, Rolph 1970, Berkley and Collett 2000), the alcoholic, (Cook et al 1968) , the prisoner i.e. aftercare / resettlement (Trotter 1969, Bryan 1967, Wilcox and Morely 1970), the adult offender (Fisher and Wilson 1982), the bailee (Payne 1989, Fiddes 1989, Cameron 1989, Drakeford et al 2001) and the mentally disordered offender (Brown and Geelan 1998).

In 2001 hostels continued to be targeted at a mixed population of: bailees, those under community supervision, post custodial licences and occasionally voluntary residents. Hostels were informed by revised policy purposes of utilising their enhanced supervisory capacity to seek to protect the public by reducing the likelihood of offending and to receive supervision and or treatment to this end (National Standards 2001).

Core to all prior purposes, has been continuity with the long tradition of rehabilitation and reintegration of individuals into the community, The hostel has served as a 'halfway house' allowing space for work with individual offenders. Chapters two and four argued that this work has built on a long re-integrative tradition that has made use of and recognised the importance of ; stable accommodation, employment, supportive relationships, education and or training and more recently (from the 1960s) a focus on treatment or therapy.

From the 1990s wider shifts towards a 'new punitiveness' (Feeley and Simon, 1994) detectable in probation, began to impact on hostel policy and stated purposes. The use of hostels for baillees and the explicit linking of them as a possible tool in lowering the prison population introduced the possibility of a more systems orientated role for hostels. Indeed the 2000 Criminal Justice and Court Services Act, made hostels part of the Crown Estate and further developed the possibility of their strategic use by government as opposed to local areas priorities.

This chapter presents the findings from the first phase of field research (2002) and seeks to ascertain the extent to which the modern probation hostel (approved premise) may still be understood as performing a rehabilitative and re-integrative role. It will begin to consider whether there is evidence in practice of a shift towards 'new punitiveness' (Feeley and Simon 1994) as outlined in chapter 4, table 4.1.

A key concern of this thesis is to engage with hostels from the inside and to ascertain the extent to which practice and policy come together, critically exploring whether hostels are changing and being influenced by the wider influences on probation practice explored in preceding chapters. It seeks to ascertain whether hostel purposes and practice are changing, that is are they still focussed on rehabilitation and reintegration? Do they remain to one side of mainstream probation practice? How do residents and staff understand and experience their purposes?

Both this and chapter eight present evidence as to whether there is now a break in this rehabilitative purpose and engage with worker's and resident's experiences of the modern hostel. The next chapter will provide a policy update, exploring what happened during and between the two phases of research between 2002 and 2006-7. Did wider developments criminal justice policy and discourse impact on hostels? Key to this is an interest in exploring changes in the transformative purpose and potential of the hostel.

Of interest is the extent to which residents and workers identify processes and inputs that may be understood as rehabilitative and re-integrative. As Chui (2003: 56) notes:

'One of the most pressing challenges to probation personnel is to look for ways to reduce offending behaviours by promoting offender compliance and enforcing the sentence effectively... the key question... is what can be done to assist offenders in the process of achieving successful re-integration, and the next question is 'how' to facilitate that change.'

The author seeks to ascertain whether the modern hostel retains a rehabilitative focus with a potential to re-integrate offenders, that is to return them to society as restored citizens. Such an activity is a two way process. It requires a reassertion of the individual's active social agency as a holder of rights and a demonstration that their active citizenship will extend to their carrying out their civic duties i.e. upholding the law and taking responsibility for their own livelihood. Such social capital is commented on by Gregory (2006: 50) in Gorman et al (2006) who cites Giddens (1998: 102-3):

'the new politics defines equality as inclusion and inequality as exclusion ... inclusion refers in the broadest sense to citizenship, to civil and political rights and obligations that all members of society should have... it also refers to opportunities and to involvement in public space'

The challenge in the modern context, where it could be argued that the offenders 'citizenship' is diminished in relation to the 'risks' they present, is whether it is possible to reconstruct 'offender rehabilitation' both in practice and policy, within a bifurcatory system that demands both punishment (1991 Criminal Justice Act) focused on individuals, and partnership in dealing with crime and criminals from communities and community organisations (Crime and Disorder Act 1998).

This chapter will explore possible answers to 'how' re-integration might be achieved in the contemporary hostel context and consider in the conclusion to what extent rehabilitation has become juxtaposed with new punitive and risk centric purposes. The student of the contemporary penal system would find it difficult to explore rehabilitation in probation without referring to notions of risk and public protection, conspicuous by their absence in most literature in the 1970s. As Hayles (2006: 67) notes:

'Risk as an organising principle in health, social welfare and criminal justice and is now a familiar and well-documented part of practice reality...'

An exploration of the modern hostel has to be mindful of the changes and developments highlighted in the introduction and contemporary literature review, remaining critically aware of the socially constructed articulation of what Allen (1981) called the 'rehabilitative ideal'. The conclusion of the thesis will return to an exploration of the modern guise of the rehabilitative ideal and the extent to which the current policy and practice climate for hostels is propitious for rehabilitative and re-integrative practice.

In engaging with the findings of the field work the author aims to be mindful of Sinclair's (1988: 10) warning that:

'... the desire to construct theory may encourage attention towards classification as opposed to dealing with plurality and difference'.

It has been important for the author to attempt to capture in the ethnographic work, a sense of what it is like to be a resident or worker in a modern hostel and to ascertain to what extent there is a shared understanding of the role and purpose of the hostel as a rehabilitative mechanism.

Identification of Core Themes

Chapters three and four have identified that the 'conventional hostel story' (Burnett and Eaton: 2004) locates the development of adult hostels at a time when welfare and rehabilitation were on the decline. The more recent probation story, outlined in the latter sections of chapters three and four, is within a changed context with an increased focus on risk, public protection and management / managerialism. Of interest in this chapter is the extent to which the field research provides evidence of hostels' purposes and practice being redefined. Is there evidence of a 'penitentiary science' (Garland 1990: 185) that has led to a 'new penology' (Feeley and Simon 1994) impacting on the role and purpose of the hostel or are rehabilitation and reintegration perennial features of the hostel function?

An analysis of the data from this first phase of research identified many broad themes, which may be seen to have direct relevance to this enquiry. The findings reported here were grouped under seven key themes in relation to the research question. As noted in the Methodology this grouping was an organic as well as a rational process and developed as the analysis and reflection deepened. It should be noted though that very similar themes to those identified in the approach taken by Sinclair (1971) could have been adopted, and some of the themes identified here iterate with that early work however such an approach was deliberately avoided as it may have added little to the broadening of the academic discourse surrounding hostels. That said it may be of interest for the reader to compare the findings of Sinclair (1971) summarised in chapter four and explored elsewhere e.g. Burnett and Eaton (2004) with the themes arising in this thesis.

The key themes in this analysis were: the role of the key worker, the training of staff, the ability of the hostel to enable change, the hostel as a mechanism for transition from chaos to stability, the role of space and time in differentiating hostels transformative efficacy, a re-integrative environment,

gender and mixed hostels, the creation of an internal regime versus engagement with the 'community'. Alongside this was an interest to observe whether the historical role(s) of providing access to stable accommodation, employment, supportive relationships, education and or training and a focus on treatment or therapy were in evidence today. Moreover were care and control becoming as juxtaposed in practice as they appeared in policy?

By the end of the chapter the author will consider whether the ethnographic evidence supports a modern day assertion of hostels' rehabilitative and re-integrative potential.

The Role of the Key Worker.

In both hostels residents and workers saw the key work relationship as an important mechanism for providing support and facilitating change. This links with earlier research (Sinclair 1971, Husdon 1981, Fisher and Wilson 1982) which emphasised the importance of interpersonal relationships as a vehicle for enabling change. All assistant managers were designated as keyworkers in both hostels. In both, the deputy manager assumed a keywork role themselves and supervised the other staff involved in this role. The manager of Newhouse did not take on a key work role. In Auldhouse the manager present at the start of the research did not, but when they left and were replaced, that manager did provide keywork to some residents. Staff and residents saw keywork as a core part of residents being in the hostel and getting to know, monitor and assist the residents. In Auldhouse the housekeeper also officially keyworked a small number of residents.⁶⁰

Auldhouse had developed a key work system which staff could clearly articulate and explain its meanings and purpose. This had been formally written up and circulated to other hostels as an example of good practice. One

⁶⁰ It was possible for staff who were in 'domestic' or night duty roles to fill in for permanent assistant manager grade staff during periods of absence or staffing pressure. Some staff developed skills in these temporary roles which they might then continue with – the amount of residents allocated to such staff was small and all keyworkers in Auldhouse were provided with individual supervision by their line manager which included a case review.

worker was so enthused by discussions about this that he provided me with several pages of typed up notes on how he understood the key work system and his role:

'Although there are 'Formal' Keywork Session, keyworking (with a small k) goes on continually and it's important that Pro Social Modelling is kept to the forefront at all times...'

From Assistant Manager's Typed Notes Auldhouse (2002)

Both hostels formally highlighted keywork as major feature of the structured supervision and support that hostels could offer:

'Keywork – Each resident is assigned a specific member of staff for regular, confidential and individual supervision sessions'

AuldHouse Information Leaflet for Courts and Probation Staff (2002)

'Every resident is different and to respect those differences, a specific member of staff is allocated to each resident. They will offer you time on a weekly basis to review your situation'

Newhouse Resident Information Booklet (2002)

Trotter (1999) stresses the importance of role clarification and relationships in enabling individuals to change. Key work may be understood as an important vehicle by which such change mechanisms may be facilitated. Locke (1996) cited in McMurrin and Ward (2004: 306) underscores the relationship between setting clear goals and developing motivation:

'motivation to change is greatest when the goal is specific rather than vague'

Keywork acted as a core mechanism for setting goals with residents in relation to their time in the hostel and plans to move on. Key work was understood by residents and staff as an individual focus on the resident's particular reasons for being in the hostel. As will be seen from the extracts below a 'rehabilitative' focus appeared core to the keyworkers' role where rehabilitation entailed resettlement in the community and a focus on reducing their risk of reoffending. For residents keywork could variously be seen on a spectrum of helping with practical problems through to challenging and enabling change. Keyworkers' personal life experiences could shape their approach and influence their understanding of how they balanced issues of care and control:

'I wish I had, had an opportunity like this when I was younger, No one gave me boundaries or support. I might have avoided going into care and then custody as a youngster if I had been given firm boundaries... no one cared. It is important they understand the victim's point of view and the harm they can cause. You need to keep tags on them and be firm ... you have got to be positive in your attitude but take no messing about. Help them with their problems get them to sort out their drinking or drugs use and get them to have a job...'

Staff Newhouse (2002)

This worker later disclosed that he saw his role as a hostel worker as paying the community back for some of the harm he had caused when he was younger. Although quite firm with the residents he saw no conflict between giving firm boundaries and the goal of rehabilitation.

In both hostels each resident was allocated a key worker on arrival at the hostel. This individual should see their allocated residents on a formal regular (weekly) basis where the resident is given an opportunity to explore their needs, personal issues, aspects of hostel life and plans for the future. This may include liaison with outside agencies and probation officer staff. However

the frequency of keywork sessions appeared to vary between hostels and staff with Auldhouse having more regular evidence of keywork and staff and residents seeing this as an important part of the culture. Newhouse was developing this system in the first phase of the research but was aspirational in its aim to have weekly sessions with residents. Chapter eight will pick up whether these differences remained. Residents appeared to value the attention and opportunity to talk about themselves and their problems. Maruna (2000) stresses the importance of individuals having an opportunity to explore and discuss their story. Boswell (1996) in Vass and May (1996: 35) stress the centrality of this type of communication with 'clients',

'Almost without exception, when recalling how they had established human contact with particular clients, the officers in this study spoke of the importance of putting them at their ease in order to create an atmosphere of trust and confidentiality in which the purpose of the contact and relationship between officer and offender could then be explored'

Hostels provide a unique setting, which can facilitate both formal and informal contacts between staff and residents. The 24 hour nature of that contact meant that staff got to know the residents and residents got to know much more about staff than would have been usual in a non residential fieldwork setting. Keywork was a formal mechanism for setting boundaries and structuring purposeful interventions. The residents saw the effective keyworkers as those who could listen and interact in both formal and informal settings. 'Having a genuine interest', was a reported measure that almost all residents used to assess the effectiveness of the keywork relationship. This echoed the findings of Ditton and Ford (1994: 92) whose ethnographic study of generic probation practice in Scotland found that:

'... probationers were very clear about what was required of the supervisor, good supervision being the most important factor in the probation process. Genuine interest, appropriate availability, the willingness to develop a good

relationship with the probationer and the ability to handle authority clearly and comfortably, encouraging and 'pushing' the probationer when necessary.'

The importance of the key work relationship for residents was evident in their formal and informal discussions:

'... I speak to other staff too but your key worker knows you more, if they are on duty you have weekly contact...check out problems, look into things for you...I have only had keywork once and I've been here a month but I have seen others too ...'

Resident Newhouse (2002)

Informally outside of keywork sessions, it was apparent that residents selected which staff to go to for advice and support and which they felt they would get a less favourable hearing from.⁶¹ This was not necessarily indicative of the quality of the support they would have been offered but may have been driven by their perception that the keyworker was both approachable and interested in them. One resident who was covered in tattoos took some weeks to talk to staff in Newhouse as he was convinced they were scared of him and could not see beyond his tattoos. Residents could acknowledge and recognise the dual role staff had in offering assistance and monitoring their behaviour:

'I see him (keyworker) every few weeks, always chatting to him though in the week. I can talk about my problems and have a moan. He is interested if he can help in any way – more strict though than others on drugs, he piss tests you ...'

Resident Newhouse (2002)

⁶¹ Residents knew which staff they saw as fair and even handed, which they thought were interested in them and which they thought lacked interest in them. They also appeared to be able to know whether there was a possibility of differential treatment between staff on particular issues e.g. when they could use the pool table, how strictly the internal curfew of being in your own room was enforced and which staff might give you food from the kitchen if you had missed a mealtime.

There were tensions for some residents between accepting the caring and controlling role that key work entailed. These tensions can be important for workers too and may be reflective of wider tensions surrounding the role and purpose of the modern probation service. McMurrin and Ward stress the importance of clarity in supervisory relationships with a therapeutic aim stressing that motivation to change:

'is sustained when the goal is clear and challenging, but nevertheless attainable, and when the performance standard is clear the individual knows he or she is performing according to that standard...'

McMurrin and Ward (2004: 306)

Staff worked to balance getting residents to keep the rules and attend meetings and appointments as well as enable them to explore their problems and set goals. Those keyworkers who could be explicit about their interest in the individual resident whilst keeping boundaries and being clear about a dual role of helping and monitoring appeared to be appreciated by residents and seen as approachable. Key workers were often compared by residents with other probation staff and key workers. Residents perceived that key workers who had a genuine interest in them made a difference. In contrast probation officers or key workers who expressed empathy but failed to follow this up with both supportive actions and clear boundaries were perceived quite cynically by residents:

'...they show concern but do f...k. all in the end, not seeing things through for you, their hearts in the right place but full of sh.t, you are on drugs for months before you get help...'

Resident Newhouse (2002)

This was of interest as offenders appear ready and willing to accept a rehabilitative relationship, which is both empathic and pragmatic in enabling

change. The challenges of defining rehabilitative practices in the modern era may be less of a concern for 'offenders' if they are treated in a holistic and enabling way. Resident appeared equally as dismissive of those they perceived as 'breach happy' and those who were seen as 'do gooders';

'We call him the sniffer, all he does is wait outside your room in the night to see if you are smoking...he just wants to catch you out.'

Resident Auld house (2002)

Residents structured their relationships with staff as much as staff structured their relationships with residents. Residents were as unlikely to go to those who they saw as 'breach happy' as to 'the do gooders', who would just listen to their problems:

'If you know they just want to breach you, or mean well but don't really know what your world is like it's hard to be honest. X and y are good though, you can tell them stuff and they help, but they don't take any crap either... they can have a laugh with you but they tell you what's what too.'

Resident Almshouse (2002)

Sinclair's (1971: 230) 'firm but fair' dynamic, appeared to retain its relevance. However some staff may need support and training that enables them to focus the content and style of their resident interactions on promoting an effective rehabilitative context for change:

'Most staff are OK , I need more help though the correct help...My supervisor in Bristol was a Trainee Probation Officer, I spent lots of time with him had

good support. I need counselling specific to my drinking and anger management worker A and B are Ok , I do the odd class to keep the staff happy... but I would like more supervision and counselling on my drinking'

Resident Newhouse (2002)

'I see my Key worker every two weeks; she's brilliant and more down to earth than the other staff here. She asks me about my life and what matters...if I need any help. I just tell her what's going on . All staff pick their favourites.. I saw the hostel GP he was hopeless, just in and out of your room, he doesn't care about anyone....the other staff only help you if they want something. The Manager has a condescending approach and talks down to you the boss is crap, the deputy (female) has helped me but nagged about my rent. The manager pulls his weight if someone important is coming...'

Female Resident Newhouse (2002)

'Residents can try and play one member of staff against another and try and get one assistant managers decision overturned by another. It's my role to enforce the hostel rules and encourage the key workers to do this...modelling to the keyworkers what could be done with the residents and getting them to identify if residents get forgotten. I am amazed at how residents treat you with differential respect, grooming you, calling me governor or bossman.'

New Deputy Manager Auldhouse (2002)

'I have never had any negativity before in the job (i.e. in previous non hostel roles) , I see this as difficult, generally negativity comes from the residents in the morning meetings when they are asking for things, like travel warrants...Things you have to say no to, this makes you unpopular. It's not

too straightforward here...requests can be unrealistic because we are trying to please on some things, keep the place nice, give good meals and are raising expectations...I try to choose a time to talk to everyone and give everyone the same amount of time... some residents are almost monosyllabic though and tell you little, the sex offenders are very cagey... '

Deputy Manager Newhouse (2002)

It is important to note that residents could be ambivalent about the balance between care and control that staff negotiated in their relationships, picking the bits of behaviour they liked and complaining about those they didn't. However overall those who were congruent in their relationships with residents had the controlling parts of their inputs more readily accepted.

'With lots of residents it's them and us... they (staff) can send you back to prison. It's been good getting clean (off drugs), I couldn't do that on my own, you can't get yourself together... I will get a GP now ...but they are always watching you and monitoring what you do...'

Resident Newhouse (2002)

Regular keywork that balanced an interest in the individual with clear support and direction whilst reinforcing boundaries seemed to engage residents in the process of change. Enabling residents to articulate and develop a positive life plan appears core to successful hostel work. The extent to which residents reported staff ability to do this varied tremendously and the extent to which staff would balance help as much as control varied. For those residents with low self-esteem and backgrounds in custodial and other residential settings this was important. The impact of a positive key work relationship could enable transformative processes:

'I see my key worker once a week, talk over changes in my life, feelings, he keeps me aware of my limits (how much I drink). He took me on the jubilee challenge (in own time) working with special needs kids on an assault course... I would like to do more like that...being here has helped me stop offending ... I could do with more support though to get a flat and things together..'

Resident Newhouse(2002)

40 previous convictions all drink related.

Despite the evidence of clear written policies on key work, national standards and staff roles it was apparent that residents could have a differential experience of key work. The field research evidenced this on two levels:

- 1) The actual frequency and number of key work sessions each resident received.
- 2) The differences in staff attitudes and the extent to which they carried out or went beyond prescribed processes and offered a supportive, challenging and facilitative relationship.

In developing an overview of what rehabilitative practices may look like in the modern hostel, the influence and power of street level bureaucrats to mediate practice, Lipsky (1980) appears live and well .Who and what hostels are for becomes mediated through the practice and perspectives of individual staff.

The fieldwork suggested that attention to the understanding and application of rehabilitative mechanisms is required if major differences are not to arise within and between hostels. The key work relationship provides what Gorman et al (2006: 202) have referred to as 'sites of engagement' i.e. spaces where

the social capital of the individual may be engaged with, in a sustainable and meaningful way. The next section will explore to what extent hostel staff felt prepared for their rehabilitative and public protection roles.

Challenges of Revised Role and Training

A major challenge for hostels' revised purposes under National Standards (2001) was to utilise their ability to add value to their residents' lives whilst demonstrating the difference hostels can make to public protection and the reduction of re-offending rates. The demand on staff to engage residents as pro social actors in their communities, whilst protecting those communities from residents presents a real tension. This tension reflects a contemporary reworking of care versus control roles (Hinton 1975). The fieldwork suggested that combining these roles can happen and is possible. However as Sinclair (1971), Fisher and Wilson (1982) and HMIP (1993 & 1998) found hostel staff training and development is required to achieve consistent practice. This appeared as an area that the wider service appeared to give a low priority to. During the course of this period of research various education and training initiatives were developed nationally and locally for probation service officer grade staff who may be seen as equivalent to assistant managers / key-workers. Hostels did not feature in the development of the Certificate in Community Justice aimed at these staff and did not appear on the wider training agenda until 2005 with the Hostel Pathfinder Programme. Hostel workers below Deputy Manager level remained for the most part unqualified and of low priority in National training. This is of concern as hostels, were increasingly housing high risk offenders and spending more time with offenders than any other community based intervention.

Staff tended to be expected to learn on the job and for the most part accepted this:

'I was quite naïve when I came here, I am much more wise now if someone talks to me about drugs or things , I don't get fazed and now know what they mean. I am not an expert but I know a lot more. You get to see a lot...'

Keyworker Auldhouse (2002)

The amount of training and support staff received appeared highly dependent on their manager rather than any national policy...

'I didn't feel supported for a long time in my role, there has been a change of manager now , it all depends on the personality of the manager as to what you get..'

Keyworker Auldhouse (2002)

Deputy Managers and Managers were more likely to be professionally qualified and to be directed to go on national training courses:

'I did the CQSW, Dip SW Probation route, I was trained as a practice supervisor and assessor before coming here and was put in Newhouse as a safe pair of hands. I have been on the new hostel managers four day training course. I have seen the new hostel through from planning to completion'

Deputy Manager Newhouse (2002)

Other staff, with managerial support, pro actively sought courses and training that would support their practice:

'I have no specific training but have done in-house training (training available through the wider service) on risk, motivational interviewing, first aid, fire warden and induction. My manager did offer me the NVQ L3 but for now I am too busy.'

Staff Auldhouse (2002)

Such differences in education and training may be influential in the earlier differences noted in how staff understood and engaged with the keywork process. The manager of Newhouse (2002) noted:

'The skills level of some staff needs improving. Often staff are students or people looking for jobs... we need people with life experience. We can't set the goals too high for them, otherwise they are unachievable, we need to set achievable goals and get staff with suitable skill levels'

Sinclair (1998: 10) in a broad review of residential work in the 1980s raised similar concerns echoing his early findings of a lack of training for hostel staff (1971). Non-managerial hostel staff were expected to work with the most high risk offenders and yet had the least formalised and most ad hoc training arrangements. At the time of this research it was relatively easy to obtain employment in the hostels with no prior experience of working with offenders. Understandings of rehabilitative mechanisms may then be expected to be less formalised than those in mainstream probation where core staff have a recognised qualification structure and are recruited through assessment centre processes. In Auldhouse many of the staff were locally recruited, in fact many applied to the hostel through word of mouth of other workers (most lived within a 2 mile radius of the hostel). They were often aware of what was and was not available in the community and had developed good links with local services. Newhouse on the other hand had a staff group who mostly lived outside of the city where the hostel was based and had few local connections of their own. The next section will consider the ability of hostels to enable long term change.

Enabling Long Term Change

Sinclair (1971: 129) found that those who did best during their stay in hostels were often the most chaotic offenders, who would soon re-offend once the

support and the structure of the hostel has been lost. If hostels are measured either on their breach rates or their successful completions (during residence) this may ignore the transitional, 'move on', post hostel phase which is key to long term transition to a law abiding lifestyle. Neither hostel had considered the possibility of continuing the keywork system beyond the period of residence. It was unclear how an individual moved from high support and highly accessible resources to coping on their own in the community. Probation Officers and key-workers could assume a case closed approach if the resident successfully completed their period of residence, if any order remained in existence, reporting and support for some could be minimal on return to the community. Individual workers sometimes 'went the extra mile' but there was no explicit requirement or guidance on this. Rehabilitative practices within the criminal justice setting which do not reach out into the community may be limiting their potential rehabilitative and public protection scope. A truncated understanding or engagement with the rehabilitative process appeared to be operating.

Auldhouse had a policy of allowing residents to return for assistance and advice and had a small but steady stream of individuals who came back for assistance with housing, job applications, seeking help if their drug or alcohol use was increasing or even to tell staff they had got a job or were getting married etc.⁶² One young man had arrived initially at the hostel having been living in skips and stealing on the streets. Despite an initial distrust of authority, outward aggression and poor communication skills I later met this person, after they had left the hostel, working in full time paid employment and living with friends. He had been in the care system and had a long history of offending, at that time Auldhouse encouraged such residents to call back in:

'The hostel gave me a chance to get my head straight, they even taught me how to eat properly, go for interviews and get up in the morning...some of

⁶² Auldhouse did have a banning policy if residents returned to the premises under the influence of drugs/ alcohol or were abusive. This could be permanent or time bounded and appeared to function at the discretion of the Manager and Deputy Manager.

them were tossers but the ones who listened and made you do stuff made me believe in myself... after being in care I never thought I would make a go of it in a hostel...'

Ex Resident Auldhouse (2002)

Such evidence iterates with Maruna's (2000) research that stresses the importance of individuals developing a positive life narrative. The development of these narratives require a listener to be available. A continuation of a keywork relationship would create a domain for the development of rehabilitative narratives post residence.

Newhouse discouraged ex- residents from returning and may not have been open long enough to see that residents often go around a cycle of rehabilitation and reintegration similar to the cycle of change suggested by Prochaska and Diclemente (1984) and McMurrin and Ward (2004) . Chapter eight will explore whether the potential for extending the rehabilitative influence beyond the residence period developed. The return of successful ex residents appeared to impact on staff motivation. Staff were often dealing with individuals at very high risk of re-offending.

One resident noted the positive impact key work had for him;

'I see him (keyworker) once a week to talk about my problems and have a chat, There is always someone there to help you. The city is new to me so I didn't know where places were...,Auldhouse has kept me out of prison. I am registered with a work agency and have had a days work here and there.... They give you a chance when you come here so I have not reoffended, I'm not sure what will happen when I leave...'

Resident Auldhouse(2002)

The individual contact through keywork and the general 'feel' of the hostel appear to be key in whether offenders think they can change and whether staff believe in offenders' ability to change. However the impact of keywork that occurs in the hostel has not been evaluated in any follow up studies and constructive desistance focused practice that occurs in the hostel may be undermined in the long term by a lack of relevant support on release.

Auldhouse was reported by residents as having a more 'homely' feel than Newhouse. This was reinforced if residents were transferred between hostels. Residents reported Newhouse staff as being more 'breach happy'. (This may have been a function of the Assistant Chief Officer, who oversaw the setting up of the new hostel, reminding staff that 'that the hostel had to show it was a 'punishment in the community that could manage risk'). Staff in Newhouse regularly used a language of breach, punishment and enforcement when asked what a hostel was for. Two of the residents interviewed in Auldhouse had, had experience of both regimes. They used the 'new building' at Newhouse as 'wind up'/ 'myth' in front of fellow residents and staff to say that the Newhouse residents lived in luxury and that they were going to seek a transfer back – none to my knowledge made such a request and both these residents stated:

'I prefer being here it's less formal and the staff here talk to you more.'

Auldhouse (2002)

Unlike other probation practices referred to by Farrall (2002: 175) hostel work is unique in the opportunity it provides in terms of the scale of influence that this form of rehabilitative practice presents as a percentage of the offenders life. HMIP(1998) suggested that reconviction during residence was nationally exceptionally low. Lowenkamp and Latessa (2002) in an Ohio study of

'halfway houses' showed a 10-30% reduction in recidivism in over half of the hostels in their study.

The 'What Works' movement has until recently ignored the possibility (PC110/2001) of the potential for developing constructive programmes that might facilitate desistance in hostels. To make sense of the rehabilitative potential of a period of hostel residence a critical exploration of reconviction rates in hostels is required. This could ascertain whether hostels enable desistance or whether offences committed during residence may not come to staff and Courts attention until after the period of residence.

Hostels as a Mechanism for Getting Individuals out of Chaotic and Problematic Life Circumstances

In determining whether the modern hostel retained its rehabilitative potential alongside its revised role, the ethnographic work explored the extent to which residents reported that they had changed, for better or worse, since coming to the hostel. No residents reported the hostel as not having had an impact on them. Some experienced the hostel as a real opportunity to have respite from an otherwise chaotic and challenging set of life circumstances. Staff who worked in the hostel could be more or less aware of hostels powerful potential in enabling change;

'We have a profound duty of care to residents and the public. I need to take a holistic approach- a good old fashioned approach. With enforcement, if I sanction them (the residents) properly they are capable of hearing it and knowing its wrong. Staff need to know how to sanction in a balanced way...we need to look after their social, health, welfare and safety ... get them to move away from offending back into mainstream society..'

Manager Newhouse (2002)

'The hostel is a means of integrating people back into the community, it's halfway between prison and the community, I suppose you call it community rehabilitation. There are lots of rules and responsibilities, like the rest of the service, but the hostel is more of a support to people, both practically and emotionally than general probation. Residents have ready access to people they can access people when they have their problems, the size of caseloads and volume of work in the field makes this unrealistic.'

Resident Community Psychiatric Nurse, Auldhouse (2002)

'The hostel is an alternative to custody, it's supportive and comfortable but is safe for them and the community. I am not sure how it fits with wider probation though As keyworkers we get looked down on by the rest of the service ...'

Keyworker Newhouse (2002)

Maruna (2000) has suggested that looking at the individual level may help practitioners and theorists to understand how to enable change from offending to non offending. Hostels implicitly seek to encourage desistance. A key factor in desistance in males aged 16- 25 noted by Graham and Bowling (1995) cited by Mc Neil in Chui and Nellis (2003: 150) is continuing to live at home. As Mc Neil notes:

'It may be that continuing to live at home is associated with desistance because of relatively positive relationships with parents and as a result, spending less time with delinquent peers.'

Although hostels throw together diverse 'delinquents' and may hold intrinsic risks of normalising offending amongst peers they also afford the opportunity

to have stability of residence and be surrounded with interested and pro social 'parent' figures i.e. staff. Moreover in this phase of research the resident profile (see appendices 5.2a – 5.2v) were mixed enough to mitigate against normalisation of one offence type. Contact with residents and observing their interactions suggested that pro social mentoring relationships between staff and residents are appreciated by offenders. Modern hostels still appeared to provide a 'familial' role for residents. Staff still expressed hope in the transformative ability of the hostel to enable residents to 'make good' (Maruna 2000).

'The purpose of hostel is to give residents a chance to change their lives around.'

Keyworker Newhouse (2002)

The manager of Newhouse (2002) felt that those who ended up in hostels needed considerable help to learn how to be with others and behave as citizens:

'We need to find a way of managing people who are not comfortable in the company of strangers ...More structured release plans (from custody) – let people settle into life – too many invest in one relationship for their future when they leave custody If that breaks down they get into trouble...they need a place for gradual reintegration into the community.'

A recurring theme for many residents was that the hostel made them feel safe. Some even questioned why they could not continue to stay in Auldhouse when their term of residence was coming to an end. It may be that for some individuals with little pro social familial support, and few extrinsic drivers, independent living is a not a prospect they welcome.

Residents saw the hostel as a place that offered the possibility of change. Becoming a resident could be experienced as a welcome contrast to their situation prior to coming to the hostel:

'The food is good though and since being NFA (Homeless – No Fixed Abode) and coming here I have put weight on ... I was underweight before stealing from M&S and Boots for sandwiches to survive. Not drunk much since I have been here. .. I would like to do more about the reasons why I am here. Being off the streets and having regular meals, tv, clean ,dry etc – the physical improvement has helped my depression .. I don't need to drink to get to sleep if I'm not on the streets. Apart from when I am bored it hasn't entered my head to offend since being here – the work with the kids stopped me'

Resident Auldhouse (2001)

Being encouraged to do something for others appeared to act as a motivating factor in creating a revised identity. In the informal meetings with residents a theme that arose was their feelings of being on the outside of wider opportunities that they perceived as open to others. A reality gap may have existed for some as to how much effort versus luck others had to make in order to achieve a reasonable standard of living. Winning the lottery and other unlikely events were mentioned more than once as a way forward. However the hostel environment and the activities it offered had the potential to challenge residents' misconceptions by providing a structure to their lives that others may take for granted, offering tangible ways back into society.

In Auldhouse a group called 'the friends of Auldhouse' ran events to raise money for local charities on behalf of the hostel. This group included ex staff, magistrates, local solicitors, the manager and deputy manager of the hostel and other interested individuals. It would raise money, for example, for a local youth team to buy football kit or to help with funds for a local community centre etc. The aim of the group appeared to be as much about making the hostel as acceptable to the community as engaging the hostel with the community. Residents were more or less involved in the activities of this group depending on the nature of the event that was organised. Good news

stories about the hostel presenting funds to a local community centre were a positive way of counteracting the potential for negative publicity about having a probation hostel within the local community. Such participation of the 'hostel' in the community was both a real and symbolic means of engaging residents in the lives of real people with needs and in constructing an alternative reality and narrative about hostels .

Auldhouse's involvement in other 'local' and 'public' activities also created positive press stories e.g. the local 'city in bloom' competitions. Involvement in this allowed residents to participate in gardening activities, which as well as being potentially constructive on their own also made the gardens and hanging baskets add ascetic value to the street and neighbourhood.⁶³ This kind of activity may be seen as a way of teaching residents skills in living with others in the community and taking responsibility for the impact you have on your neighbours.

Activities not defined in the official hostel literature may be at risk of being lost in critically considering which mechanism a hostel offers that may add to the rehabilitative and re-integrative potential that it presents. Probation research has recently tended to focus on the formalised activities of recognised accredited programmes and types of orders or punishments these sit within. Informal work with offenders may be as important in enabling transition to non-offending lifestyles. In fact Trotter (1999) and Ross and Fabiano (1985) suggested that, pro-social behaviour, needs to be reinforced and practiced by offenders and not just modelled by staff. Informal activities with 'offenders' and their engagement in appropriate voluntary work are conspicuous by their absence in current probation policy and practice.

⁶³ The rediscovery of the therapeutic value of such activity appears to be growing outside of Probation realm; see www.themontyproject.com such developments may signal a renewed philanthropic interest in some categories of offenders.

The voluntary work offered by one worker at Newhouse regularly featured in residents' discourses about how they could be different or do something meaningful. This discourse of change (Maruna 2002) appears key to ascertaining whether practices are in fact rehabilitative. If offenders do not define and internalise the process of being in a hostel with the process of change then 'rehabilitation' may be notional as opposed to real. Facilitating re-integration appears as key to any rehabilitative practice. Hostel staff appeared to be unconsciously operating with many residents on the interface between social inclusion and social exclusion. The residents' offences were usually only one factor in their potential exclusion. Core issues such as accommodation, literacy, employability, substance misuse, self esteem and prior life chances being blighted, presented as major factors to recognise and engage with. Engaging with interpersonal, intrapersonal and systemic blocks to change is a challenge for key-workers. Bearing in mind that most hostel workers had no formal probation, social work or psychological training any expectation of key workers to have an explicit ability to recognise, engage with and balance all these dynamics in the change process appears unreasonable. Barry and Hallet (1998: 9) suggest that we need to see the excluded as having social agency in bringing about change in their lives:

'... to see those who are currently excluded as diversely constituted groups made up of people who are not simply passive beneficiaries or dependents but as actors in their own right.'

Informal hostel activities may be an important factor in creating social agency and self-esteem. Probation hostels and key-workers have the challenge of encouraging and promoting pro active and pro social agency whilst explicitly discouraging and attempting to control specific undesirable choices that may harm others. The dual role of the staff in such situations reflects the dual status of the resident, as an offender who presents a possible risk to society and as an individual to be given or more forcefully lead towards a chance to change:

'I hope to have a positive impact, a pro social model, as they say, showing them they can please you , that there is a better life and that change is possible....get to the person behind the offences, offer constructive activities.... I have a duty of care .. I need to protect the community too, offer a service to a group of people, provide a foundation for change, give people a chance, give them the ability to take up offers they might not otherwise get...the manager and deputy have an overview of the bigger picture.'

Assistant Manager Newhouse (2002)

Hostel staff worked to respond to the presenting factors of risk, needs and motivation and to proactively plan for the residents' eventual departure from the hostel. A key overarching dynamic was the ability to enable the individual, as a social actor, to counteract previous disadvantage and harm and to clearly discourage and deter further offending. The relationship between risk, needs and reintegration was complex but central to discourses of transition. Most of the keyworkers were not professionally qualified and to varying degrees could articulate their professional comfort zones by emphasising in their work those areas they felt most comfortable with. Role discomfort appeared as a disabling mechanism for workers engagement with residents;

'...hostel workers don't appear to be rated very highly. We are not rated as competent enough to answer some questions. I don't think this can be overcome. It makes people feel humiliated and de-valued.'

Key Worker Newhouse (2002)

The same worker understood her impact on residents as dependent on residents and how much they got on with her. She appeared to work well with

those she felt comfortable with and whom she perceived as liking her. In interviews with residents a reciprocal relationship appeared to exist along the same lines. From a theoretical and practice perspective this was a concern as depending on the reasons workers felt comfort or discomfort with offenders, an opportunity for rehabilitation and reintegration might mean different things for different residents. Hudson's (1981) suggestion of matching staff skill to resident needs remains a relevant consideration for hostels.

Further exploration of these issues revealed a level of anxiety and mistrust of working with some groups of offenders and not others. Interviews with residents linked to this worker were revealing as the worker's approach to them was predictive of how good they thought she was at helping them to change. Unqualified staff may need considerable support and encouragement to ensure offenders are not led to believe that staff are not interested in them or believe they cannot change. Trotter's (1999) summary of principles of effective practice lists 'relationship' as one of four factors core to enabling change. Integral to this concept of relationship are empathy and challenge. Workers may be at risk of developing pro social roles with those offenders they feel at ease with and ignoring the need to communicate a belief to all offenders that they can change. Desistance (Maruna 2002) as core to rehabilitative scripts may be restricted by resident / worker relations if they lack communication by staff of the belief that residents can change. Qualified staff i.e. Deputy Managers appeared to have a much clearer overview of the need to balance the dynamic of belief that someone can change with their own feelings of like, dislike or unease with individual residents.

In Auldhouse each keyworker was given a specific area to be the link person for staff and residents, e.g. accommodation, drugs, constructive activities etc. This appeared to work well and there was evidence of individuals changing roles over time to develop greater expertise across the team and individually. This appeared to broaden their ability to work beyond personal comfort zones

or to individual preferences. Supervision and talking over cases was important to staff in building their confidence and competence.

'Supervision is a way of offloading, especially the traumatic cases, as well as receiving guidance. In working with cases, you are looking for positive strokes that things have gone well. Supervision allows you to set your goals ...Supervision and feedback allows you to mature and progress'

Assistant Manager Auldhouse (2002)

'I have monthly supervision and can see the deputy manager or manager. It's helpful now that the manager has changed, the approachability of the deputy and manager is important. The manager checks if you are doing the job correctly and efficiently... is the resident getting a good deal, you can talk about your personal issues too, supervision is more relevant than before...you have objectives and guidelines to work to – I feel this is important to know what you are doing'

Another Assistant Manager Auldhouse (2002)

Housekeepers, administrative and ancillary staff contributed to the overall rehabilitative and re-integrative potential of the hostel:

'I give out chores, there are gender issues for some having a woman bossing them around. I get involved in constructive activities – independent living skills, showing them how to shop if they have been in prison for a long time, resettlement work , I do less of this now than before, we need a follow up and support scheme for those moving on. I try to lead by example, show them a normal way to live, show them how to sew buttons...there is a fear of mixed

messages with the older ones – you have to be careful how they interpret this...'

Female Housekeeper Auldhouse (2002)

Workers could develop skills and sensitivity to issues that might not be associated with their job roles, moreover the housekeeper identified a need for post residence support absent elsewhere. Staff roles and skills could evolve and appeared to be influenced by the way the manager and deputy supervised and interacted with their staff. All staff were invited to and expected to contribute to team meetings and reviews in Auldhouse. However as can be seen from above domestic staff could be anxious in their roles particularly where there were gender differences. Informally female staff talked of their discomfort with some adult male sex offenders and noted that they had not been trained to deal with what they heard. At times a 'dark' humour was often used as a mechanism between staff for managing discomfort. If this was confined between the staff and away from the residents this was not discouraged. For example staff who were concerned or scared about the way serious offenders had committed violent or sexual offences might joke about what jobs they would or would not give a particular resident. Someone who had buried their victim might become a topic of such 'jokes' when gardening activities were being planned by staff, however these 'jokes' appeared to be ways of reminding each other to take precautions around particular residents and not to be alone on certain types of jobs with some individuals. It also gave permission for the 'unsaid' to be vocalised e.g. how many cooks and cleaners come to work and are surrounded by those who may have murdered, raped or abused children. The young drug user or car thief could easily become a 'likeable rogue' to staff who had initially been fearful of working with 'offenders'. An offender who has used a knife on a victim might be discussed by staff along the following lines...

'We'll get x to help you with the buffet but get him to give put out the crisps and set the tables , we'll ask y to slice the bread for you...unless x is feeling bored...he shouldn't get too cut up about it..'

The domestic staff might warn each other to watch out for a body under a resident's bed or to make sure they checked a resident was up and dressed before going into their room. Humour acted as a vehicle for transmitting subtle messages about risk and personal safety between staff.

Most staff worked hard at engaging positively with individuals in a respectful way who had committed serious and disturbing offences that were upsetting to discuss. Humour appeared to enable staff to 'self manage' and 'disclose' their fear, disgust and anxiety at particular offences, whilst acting as reminder to each others personal safety. The importance for space for staff to explore and express anxiety came out in the research process as some staff tended to use the interview as a cathartic process seeking reassurance about the approaches they were taking with particular cases. A gap in staff supervision strategies may be the extent to which ancillary and clerical staff need support and debriefing through supervision or involvement in team meetings.

Weekly resident's reviews involving managers, assistant managers and the housekeeper were evident in Auldhouse. Newhouse held these too but excluded ancillary staff. The Manager or Deputy could be core in shaping these meetings so that they were more or less shared agenda and explorations of 'cases' or information giving sessions with little or no opportunity to contribute. As Sinclair (1971) and Fisher and Wilson (1982) found the Hostel Manager played a key role in setting the general 'feel' of the hostel and approach of the staff. How the manager talked about other residents or staff could influence how staff interacted with each other and the residents. Informal shadowing and observing of staff as well as the interviews suggested that involvement and cohesion of the whole staff group is core to

creating an environment that is facilitative of individual resident's transformation.

Housekeepers in both hostels reported that residents would confide in them and that because they had a cleaning role they perhaps saw residents in their rooms in a way that other staff did not. Moreover both housekeepers interpreted their role as supportive:

'I help them with basic skills, health and hygiene, get them to shower and keep clean, like a mother really, you've got to encourage some of them to wash . I also do support work at the weekend and get involved in bits of the office jobs....I am a familiar face I tell them (residents) if they are fair with me I'll be fair with them. I suppose I'm a role model type of thing for them, if I do something stupid they'll see it ...it's important to keep to the rules and have a staff team that are willing to help. I can comment on things when I'm in their rooms and cleaning, have an informal chat. I ask their advice too... to pull them into things... give them positive messages about themselves, they appreciate it all.'

Housekeeper Auldhouse (2002)

Morning meetings when staff met each day with the residents were influential in developing a potentially collaborative atmosphere in the hostel. These could be very pressured for the staff running them, with up to 26 residents wanting to have a say and the mornings housekeeping duties to be allocated. The extent to which staff were willing to get alongside residents, do manual chores with them and be seen to listen and be fair determined the 'respect' residents afforded them. Humour, confrontation, questions and attempts to get staff to contradict each other could all be used by residents to 'test out' staff as individuals and as a group. Those staff who could balance 'taking a joke' with 'not taking crap' appeared to be held in high esteem by residents.

Those who were primarily reliant on 'authority' or threats to gain control in such settings may have been listened to on the surface but were mistrusted by residents. I witnessed staff who could shout at residents to do things and the resident would comply but once they were absent there might be no change in the underlying behaviour... One assistant manager in Auldhouse regularly used the threat of breach or the 'rules' as his first level of engagement whenever differences arose with residents. To his face residents were polite and did what he asked, however behind his back they were less respectful. Staff who were explicit about why smoking was banned in bedrooms and who allowed residents who had heavy addictions to come down stairs at night for a cigarette in the smoking room and then quickly return to bed were responded to well by residents. Moreover threats of breach that were used as first points of engagement meant that residents might hide more serious underlying problems such as a recommenced drug habit or a relapse into alcohol use.

Developing a respectful and open style with residents that also draws clear boundaries is a challenge. The following assistant manager could laugh and joke with residents and draw a clear line around what was accepted and not. Residents seemed to respond to her very openly and evenly:

'You have to build up trust and give advice, it can be a challenging situation here for some people if they don't like being told to do things... the personality of the client influences your choice or style of intervention, you need to see how they respond and develop a rapport....your initial style is putting out feeders, a fishing exercise, know their background- some like to talk a lot others not – get an understanding of what's going on for them. Not too formal but with some clients you have to try and be specific and with others more relaxed...some have fears of authority. We have a big opportunity because it's residential , more time to make a difference but you can get bogged down with the day to day, the office and clerical work..'

Assistant Manager Auldhouse (2002)

Staff had to cope with a wide range of residents some of whom would turn up semi undressed to see what staff would do, residents pushed boundaries around arriving on time etc. The group could discipline itself too when it worked well and had the ability to self regulate {e.g. other residents could censure behaviour of fellow residents leaving the running of the group not just to the staff}. Many qualified practitioners would have struggled with the daily demands of taking part in such meetings.

In observing morning meetings in both hostels one or two staff would manage a group of 20 plus residents , giving out morning chores, reminding people of their work or probation appointments, listening to and responding to complaints and suggestions, dealing with issues that may have arisen overnight and at times re-enforcing particular rules or challenging behaviours. Staff had to balance what was appropriate to do in an all group setting and know when to arrange to see someone afterwards. A knowledge and training in groupwork dynamics and knowledge of body language would have been helpful to untrained staff. Knowing when to listen and when to call a halt to a particular residents input was a particular skill. On reflection the diverse mix of residents and resident needs e.g. alcohol and drugs misuse, mental health, violent or sexual offending may have made the group as potentially intimidating for the residents as the staff.

Creating a constructive environment for change seemed to depend on the commitment and shared understanding of all staff as to what the hostel was aiming to achieve, and how best to make use of the day to day interactions with residents to facilitate positive role modelling. A commonality of approach was required from morning to night. Staff needed to work hard at developing this. Ancillary workers saw themselves as part of the hostel staff. In Auldhouse they were involved in staff meetings and knew about the individual resident circumstances. Staff were concerned that talk of privatised 'facilities'

contracts would not only threaten their jobs but make the hostel less of a whole, marginalizing their role in 'making the hostel work as one family'.

Staff meetings that were inclusive and recognised that all staff had a chance to both observe and interact with residents appeared to work well and be valued by staff in Auldhouse. Individual staff interviews revealed a desire for more time and formal space to explore their roles and relationships with residents.

Continuity of Purpose and Consistency Across the Day.

As noted, all staff roles offered potential to contribute to or detract from creating an environment that was supportive of change. This was particularly noticeable at different times of the day when the hostel was covered by different grades of staff. In considering the rehabilitative potential of the hostel differences in the culture of the hostel during the day and night were noticeable. At night professionally qualified staff i.e. managers and deputy managers were not usually present; moreover the night cover was often provided by staff who were not involved in keywork and had little involvement with the residents day to day needs. Such staff could be more or less engaging with residents. A regular issue of tension was the allocation of medication. Staff had to do this at fixed times and could be more or less understanding of resident's needs and fears. Residents potentially received mixed messages on different shifts and were variously treated with respect or ignored.

Night cover usually consisted of one waking night supervisor and one sleep in staff with the manager or deputy being on call. Night staff could retreat in to the office and reinforce a one way controlling dynamic as opposed to a holistic environment which both enforced rules but was also responsive to individuals.

There was potential for huge variation in the use of discretion and use of breach for breaking rules that was evident in both hostels. Neither experience of working with offenders nor experience of work in a residential setting was required of sessional and night staff. Induction could be minimal e.g. attending for a few shadow shifts before commencing role appeared the norm in both hostels for night staff.

Residents were aware of this lack of experience and knew which staff they could 'get away' with coming in drunk to or staying up late:

'I go to the pub with x (fellow resident) have a few pints and come in for the 11.00pm curfew, once your jobs are done you can be out all day. I usually stay out drinking with friends from the outside , you can't bring alcohol in but if I come in and go to bed straight away the night staff are ok'

Newhouse Resident (2002)

Further exploration with the above revealed that he was drinking with another ex offender from a prison where they had both served sentences for sex offences, and alcohol had played a part. The resident knew how to be polite and please the night staff whereas other younger more boisterous offenders were given warnings or breached for coming in under the influence. In creating regimes that facilitate change it is important that those who know how to 'please the staff' are not constructed as 'good residents' because they are easy to manage. Residents could learn to avoid the staff who would question them and time their presence to meet up with the staff they felt they could manipulate. If residents knew the manager or deputy was on the premises at night the hostel retained the same kind of culture that is had during the day. Managers knew this too:

'I know what kind of weekend we'll have by who is on duty...perhaps some of them (weekend and night staff) will never change. We need to train people and put them through a process and be clear about expectations there is a lot to learn...'

Deputy Manager Newhouse (2002)

A differential quality between some of the 'day staff' and 'sessional workers' was accepted as the norm. Attempts were made to include them in training and shadowing more experienced staff but the uptake and impact of this appeared variable.

Creating a continuity of environment and a consistency of message 24 hours a day seven days a week was a challenge for hostels. Much effort and attention went into the shaping, structuring and monitoring of the regime from 0800 – 2300 (see appendices 6.1 - 6.2) particularly the period 0800 – 1730 when qualified staff were on duty. However the main concern at night was making sure that everyone had got back in time for the curfew and that the building was secure. Whilst essential to the hostel's credibility and functioning, as well as public safety, these security concerns overshadowed interest in the continuity of a rehabilitative environment. One could conclude at this point that a rehabilitative ethos was differentially present across the day and the week. Auldhouse appeared to tackle the weekend issue by arranging events with the 'friends' however these were not routine and could not be seen as covering every weekend. Chapter eight will critically consider the extent to which an awareness of this space, time differentiation is present for the service.

The construction of hostels as places for change and public protection requires the presence of suitably skilled staff at all times, who can act as team players (Bricker-Jenkins 1997) in the rehabilitative endeavour. In considering the hostel environment as facilitative of change, potential differential experiences of female residents are worthy of consideration and will be explored later in this chapter.

Factors in Developing a Re-integrative Environment

Social inclusion for offenders, in order to gain public acceptability, may need to be restructured as social integration, making explicit the twofold aim of increasing social agency and deterring particular anti-social actions and choices. Levitas (1996) cautions against developing integrative discourses which focus exclusively on individual actors and their pathologies, whilst ignoring wider social factors. In the criminal justice context the development of a re-integrative discourse appears less problematic if workers are able to balance the explicit roles of control and empowerment demanded of them. In relation to the hostel regime it may be useful to recognise the potential for negative role modelling and mixed messages. The fieldwork suggested that creating a broad context for change in the hostel seemed to relate to three key dynamics:

- The belief by staff that offenders could change
- The development of a prosocial context that supported integration in society
- The provision of support in developing and transiting to a pro social lifestyle

These three dynamics fit well with findings of other ethnographic studies of probation practice (Bailey and Ward 1992, Ditton and Ford 1994, Rex 1999). Porporino and Fabiano (2007) summarise a 'blend of style and skills' that emerge as core in effective correctional interventions. The conclusion of this thesis will consider whether, informed by the findings of this ethnographic work and the literature review, a more hostel specific practice approach can be determined.

The next section will consider whether female residents experienced the mixed hostel as offering rehabilitative potential.

Mixed Hostels a Mechanism for Change?

Barton (2005) and Wincup (2002) have gendered the hostel debate about effective practice. Comparative studies of mixed hostels suggest that:

'In mixed hostels ...a more likely outcome is indirect discrimination whereby the needs of female residents get overlooked.'

Wincup (2002: 131)

In Newhouse women residents were regularly conspicuous by their absence.⁶⁴ Staff were often ambiguous about the female residents and could construct their presence as either functional to male resident's normalisation and or as a group that required specialist skills:

'Specialist hostels are not seen as a good thing. There is more realistic learning in a mixed hostel, specialist hostels are necessary perhaps for Mentally Disordered Offenders and perhaps women. Specialist skills needed for MDO's – skills of those supervising them need to be higher. Mixed hostels are more work but better for rehabilitation to have both sexes- a chemistry that reflects the outside world - male residents have to watch language more in front of women and move away from macho culture although some women can be the same.'

Hostel Manager Newhouse (2002)

⁶⁴ Appendix 5.1 shows an average female throughput of 2.6 residents a month compared with an average throughput of 35.8 male residents a month in Newhouse.

Female residents expressed discomfort at being in a mixed hostel and with an average of less than three out of four such spaces being filled, the potential for isolation was considerable in an otherwise predominantly male hostel;

'I have never been in trouble before. I'm scared... the men...there's 24 of them, I'm the only girl...it's a bit wrong. I am only 20 and never been in trouble before. I just get on with it.'

Resident Newhouse (2002)

Moreover the nature of the offences that some of the male residents had committed were experienced as a source of worry:

'If I could change it...I'd have more females here – I'm the only female here, I know half of them are rapists and paedophiles, it doesn't take a genius to work that out.'

Resident Newhouse (2002)

Conversely women's offences were judged against a double standard of criminality and femininity. One resident who was on bail for child neglect, falling asleep and her boyfriend hitting their baby was judged by some staff:

'As a woman I just can't understand how she could allow that to happen and then still want to see him.'

Staff Newhouse (2002)

As well as facing possible double standards, women, by being in the minority were also more conspicuous either by their presence or absence. A male resident could come in and go out and only the reception staff would seem to notice, male residents seemed very aware if a female resident, arrived, left or

did not turn up for a morning meeting. Being one of a very few female residents at any one time made women and their offences visible. Residents and staff all knew 'what 'she' was in for.'

The hostel appeared to have been designed and constructed from a very specific view of what it was to cater for women's needs. As a new building the furniture was all new and clean. 24 rooms were all 'blue for the boys' and 'pink for the girls' Such stereotypical feminisation of space appeared to reinforce gendered expectation of female residents:

'You expect the men to swear and be rough and don't accept it but it's not nice hearing women talk like that... she's a nice girl but...'

Female Worker Newhouse (2002)

One female complained that she was paying rent and had only £10 a week left to herself but didn't have basic toiletries supplied:

'They don't supply tampax etc for women only soap and toothpaste.'

Female Resident Newhouse (2002)

The hostel didn't officially supply razors for men but an emergency supply could be found at the front desk. Women's needs were not at the forefront of basic provisions.

'In order to ensure equality of opportunity, consideration has to be given to the possible sources of disadvantage that women may face in such a setting...The situation is more complex than ensuring all individuals are treated exactly the same...'

Wincup (2002: 132)

The role of the key-worker and other staff in reducing isolation and promoting a positive gender aware environment, appeared as a huge challenge in a mixed hostel:

'All staff pick their favourites, some staff are snobby, turn their nose up. Some will try and help...it depends on who is on duty at the time. In the morning meeting they say thank you 'gentlemen' didn't acknowledge me at all. We (female and male) are not allowed in each others quarters. If I am on my own who do I speak to?'

Female Resident Newhouse (2002)

Little attention appeared to be given in the mixed hostel to the possibility that gender myopia may be a potentially oppressive dynamic in constructing a rehabilitative and re-integrative environment. Female residents invested in developing relationships with female staff and could be wary of male residents and male staff. Segregation for the 'protection' of female residents may be experienced as isolating and labelling. There could also be the mistaken assumption that the presence of another female resident being present created a more secure environment.

'There were two other women here when I arrived. Bernie was OK, Stacey was a bully but the staff didn't pick up on this ...'

Resident Newhouse (2002)

Any positive impact that was reported by female residents was usually in spite of the regime and not as a result of it:

'I hate it here, the only good thing is some friends. Most of the men here give me the creeps... one man was sitting watching my washing...he gives me the

creeps... puts it in the tumble drier for me without asking for it. Being here has made me a stronger person. I have had to stand up for myself.'

Resident Newhouse (2002)

The field research not only confirms Worrall's (2002: 136) assertion that:

'The Service has missed opportunities to remain a major player in the lives of women'

It also raises questions as to whether sufficient attention is being given to the gender differences that are now clear in the desistance literature (Graham and Bowling 1995, Rex 1999) and that have been consistently noted by researchers such as Barton (2005), Wincup (2002), Carlen and Worrall (2004). If 'narrative' is important to enabling desistance, mixed hostels may suppress women's capacity to construct and develop their narratives.

Gendered expectations of what a woman's narrative should be were explicit. Workers, both male and female, appeared more judgemental and less open to women residents and their story around their offending. In fact some female staff were keen not to have female residents as they perceived them as more problematic. In the case of a resident who has 'allowed her boyfriend to hit her child' whilst she was sleeping and under the influence of alcohol, some male and female workers expressed incredulity as to how 'she could let this happen', some gentle questioning as to whether they if parents had ever fallen asleep after a few drinks was met with a more considered response. Women residents in a mixed hostel setting appear to face a double standard of having transgressed against the law and having transgressed gendered expectations of their role.

Female workers could be as equally as scathing if not more so than their male counterparts. HMIP (1998) suggested that mixed hostels were not helpful to women's rehabilitation. At this stage this advice appeared to be ignored. The next phase of fieldwork will review the extent to which this gendered positioning remains in place. The next section will explore relationships developed between residents and the 'community' and the hostel regime and the 'community'.

The Regime and the External World

As Barton (2005: 6) highlights quoting Worrall (1997: 46):

'The term 'community' is one of the most promiscuous words in contemporary political usage'.

As noted in chapter one, re-integration is essentially problematic as an issue as it assumes a relationship of ownership and identity exists or existed between 'offenders' and 'communities'; in many cases this appears both mythical and wishful thinking. That said probation does seek to reintegrate offenders into wider society and as previous chapters have demonstrated, historically hostels have been a mechanism by which this can be achieved.

Some modern desistance literature (Porporino and Fabiano 2004) ignores the centrality of attention to environment as stressed by McMurrin and Ward (2004) in being core to enabling sustainable change. Hostels appear well placed to act as a mechanism that offers a transitional environment between custody and community.

The hostel can be seen as a welcome place to be and the support it offers may be something probationers want for a considerable period, offering a

protective role to both the public and the resident. Probationers in Ditton and Ford's (1994: 95) ethnographic study suggested a need for hostels in Scotland:

'See the likes of that hostel thing, it would be like a family. Maybe just ten in the hostel, a tele room and all that... They would be staff, but they wouldn't be staff to you because you'r adult now. They'd just kind of be your mates, Know what I mean. Do a check that the meals get made, the doors get locked or something. Just all take a turn in cooking the meals or something. And to hold open meetings where everybody talks about things.'

The next section will explore the extent to which staff view themselves and their roles as being centred on rehabilitation and reintegration, critically considering how well they were equipped for such a role.⁶⁵ Hostel workers routinely made claims to having specialist knowledge of offenders due to time they spent with residents and the worker – resident relationships mixture of structured and unstructured contact. A typical refrain of assistant managers was:

'We know them better than their probation officers and see the real person, this is like being in their home, you see them eat, get up the morning, play pool and they tell you their problems – probation only sees them for an appointment or programme...'

Auldhouse (2002)

Key workers in particular stressed the longevity of their experience in the hostel compared with managers or deputy managers. Some of this may have been symptomatic of their relative feelings of powerlessness when it came to the emphasis that new managers can impose on a regime, it was nonetheless

⁶⁵ See Wincup (2002) for an account of becoming a residential worker.

true that managers and deputies moved on to other roles outside of hostel work more readily than assistant managers and ancillary staff.

'We are the ones who stay and have to see things through, they (manager and deputy) come and go every three years or so.'

Assistant Manager Auldhouse (2002)

Assistant managers views of their roles

Staff interactions with residents felt quite different in both hostels. Auldhouse had more of an informal relaxed culture and residents did not report feeling watched. That is not to say that residents movements were not being monitored, sometimes there were covert 'room spins' to look for drugs, alcohol or restricted items. There were well developed relationships with the local CID in the Police too if staff had concern about a resident's risk to the public. Newhouse by contrast had an overt 'panoptic' feel to its design and staff saw 'watching the residents' as a key part of their role. As a relatively new hostel relations with the local police were less in evidence and some residents reported feeling at times as if they were in a 'goldfish bowl'.

Auldhouse had an established record of having a generic male population of high-risk offenders many of whom were sex offenders or individuals on life licence. In 2002 an informal rule between the deputy and manager was to keep child sex offenders at no more than eight or nine i.e. about a third of the hostels profile. Newhouse staff appeared keen to be seen as able to cope with a similar profile of residents but had not yet made the same range of 'community links' and were in some ways more likely to take child sex offenders than adult sex offenders as they believed this to be less risky to the female residents. Auldhouse mostly worked to bring agencies to the hostel who would then see the resident in the community, whether this was for

substance misuse, housing, employment or other needs. Newhouse tended to bring in agencies to provide services on site encouraging work to take place 'in-house'. As noted in chapter four Hinton (1975: 98) suggests this latter approach can lead to a '*counter productive use of control*'.

During this first period of research there was evidence of some mismatch between understandings of what 'accredited programmes' meant and their purpose and how Newhouse staff understood their role. Newhouse staff felt they would be judged (by the ACO) on what happened in the hostel and appeared to be under some pressure from some senior managers to become an example of a 'modern' intervention:

'What we need here are accredited programmes. We need to do 'what works', we should be having the residents involved in formal programmes, we need to show what we do here is accredited... the inputs from the local college held here are an example of accredited programmes.'

Staff Newhouse (2002)

One notable exception, to the looking in or looking out approach between the hostels was Auldhouse acting as the base for a forensic Community Psychiatric Nurse (CPN) for the local probation service. This was a relatively new development at the time and allowed keyworkers to easily refer or co work residents with the CPN. It also encouraged wider service staff to link with the hostel as a resource. The CPN developed appropriate links with community or forensic services for the hostel and wide service:

'My approach is based on a softly, softly approach, I do what people are happy doing explore psychological problems and psychiatric problems address reasons for their offending, particularly for sex offenders...I also support and deal with practical issues helping with housing and benefits, its quite similar to being a primary nurse in a hospital, you have to work

holistically with people, with all aspects of their life.. I refer them on to community mental health teams and community drug and alcohol teams, it depends on their receptivity to treatment.'

CPN Auldhouse (2002)

Chapter eight will explore whether this approach has been maintained and whether it has linked to other areas of support too. No follow up study was done with the residents so it is impossible to say whether the 'inreach' or 'outreach' approach worked best. However Auldhouse did appear to get more of its residents out during the day involved in work, links with partnerships or involved in constructive activities. Newhouse staff worked hard to provide a 'curriculum' for their residents and usually had more residents in during the day attending groups or classes. It was noticeably easier to catch male residents in Newhouse for interview purposes. The hostel manager and deputy there appeared keen to demonstrate that the hostel could provide a programme of activities and saw this as core to what the hostel should do.⁶⁶

Employment links were valued by residents in Auldhouse. Staff had links with employers and work agencies and helped ensure residents got up in time to attend shift work. Some staff managed to use the resident's individual successes as a vehicle for public reinforcement of an individual's progress and as a way of getting residents to see that getting work was possible. Morning meetings were a way of reinforcing such messages as well as the 'parenting' approach of asking residents how their day at work had gone and giving positive attention for success. There was some tension around residents getting their first pay packet and signing off and becoming responsible for their board and lodgings. Residents getting work could also create an interesting dynamic whereby some of the residents were personally working for and paying out of their own pocket for their rehabilitation. This

⁶⁶ In late 2007 a new policy is emerging for hostels that suggest that hostels/ approved premises will be required to show that residents are engaged in 21 hours of constructive activity a week. This is being explored by NAPA on behalf of the Probation Service and originated from recommendation in PC 37/2005.

dynamic had the potential to make 'move on' more realistic for residents as the shock of paying rent and buying their own food was not so great. For those who remained on benefit, move on could mean uncertainty over regular meals and a daily routine that had been built up whilst at the hostel.

Newhouse had only recently opened and it would be unfair to compare local links with employers that had built up over a period of time as well as supportive relationships with wider probation education and training advice workers. That said in this first phase of field research Auldhouse staff looked out to the wider community to find work, accommodation and support for their residents. Newhouse felt more introspective and cautious in developing relationships with the wider community. Initial 'Nimbyism' over the construction of the hostel and its location next to a homeless hostel and multi storey car park contributed to it's feeling of dislocation from the surrounding area. It could not be perceived as part of a local 'community'. Auldhouse had been in existence since the 1970s, was at the end of a street of terraced houses and literally had next door neighbours. Probation and or Social Services, had, had premises in that street for a number of decades and the local shopkeeper, post office and pool hall staff knew how to contact the hostel.

If hostel staff are to reintegrate offenders into the 'community' it would appear that having a real community as a base as opposed to a notional space in a city centre that is otherwise not populated gives staff and residents a head start. Such visibility did throw up concerns and challenges around resident's identity, visibility of 'offenders' in the community and risk management that was immediate and local. Chapter eight will consider whether with the passage of time Newhouse becomes more embedded into local community links.

The visibility of residents to a community, which can be problematic if / when things go wrong (as well as depending on whether the nature of the residents

offences are known) appeared to act as a reminder to staff and residents of the importance of good public relations. The existence of the 'friends' organisation and open days 'allowed' Auldhouse to take part in 'city in bloom' competitions and fund raise for local charities. Given the nature and range of offenders being housed it was surprising how few problems the hostel had with neighbours and the press. Auldhouse though managed to carefully balance developing these external relations e.g. appearing in the press for City in Bloom Competitions with a genuine concern to protect their neighbours and their residents. That said, had Auldhouse had to disclose the offence profile of its residents or that it housed some of the high profile offenders who were temporarily released there from other parts of the country ,the local 'community' may have been less understanding.

The hostel appeared to walk a tight rope between protecting the public, both known and potential victims, and reintegrating offenders back into society. Reintegration was, reintegration that was planned for and usually involved a range of other agencies, including housing associations, the police and other support agencies. Residents were however limited to the extent that they accessed such support by the length of their order of licence and the extent to which their offences allowed 'community' as a tangible entity to be engaged with. Community reintegration could be supported resettlement into society as opposed to any idealised notion of re acceptance by a group of individuals. Gessellschaft (Tonnie's 1955) type reintegration appeared more normative than Gemeinschaft like reintegration. Although potentially isolating, the anonymity of such arrangements, though not to the police and other relevant professional services, could offer residents the choice to develop gemeinschaft like relationships with those who would not judge them on their 'offender' status. For some individuals such resettlement was the first time they had had accommodation of their own and responsibility for bills and council tax. Informal discussions with residents at the end of their residence revealed a mixture of trepidation, excitement, hope and fear of failure.

'I am going to make a fresh start now and get a job, when I get settled I'll invite the staff round to see the place, but I haven't got it sorted yet...I 'm not going to let Danny and Billy know where I live now, I don't want to get dragged back down again into using drugs If they know where I live they'll ask me to do stuff for them.'

Resident Auldhouse (2002)

For those who left the hostel towards the end of their licence or order there was no guarantee of continued support in the community. The ability to return or re-access support from the hostel may be an area for further policy development/ research in terms of its impact on long term reintegration and public protection.

Conclusions so far...

This phase of the field research found that hostels in 2002 still held out transformative potential for offenders and the probation service. Newhouse appeared to be more aligned with a discourse of public protection, it felt as if staff there wanted to show they were on message with probation's concern to manage risk and protect the public. However this may have been symptomatic of a staff desire to show they were a 'good hostel' within contemporary discourses of risk management and public protection. Auldhouse was less verbal about this agenda but did have well developed risk management links with the local CID, Forensic Psychiatric Services, Accommodation Services and Drug and Alcohol Services.

Three key areas are suggested from the findings above as core to the rehabilitative enterprise in hostels:

- Committed and pro-social staff , who clearly understand and undertake their role and are able to develop links with the 'community' and the wider criminal and social justice systems. The Keywork system at Auldhouse was a positive example of this.
- The ability to give offenders the opportunity to engage in constructive activity outside of the hostel, whether work, volunteering, treatment, sport or socialising. The employment links at Auldhouse, the Voluntary work facilitated by a key worker at Newhouse and a range of 'constructive activities' arranged outside of the hostels allowed staff to facilitate and monitor progress.
- A holding of the care and control, risk management and helping, authority and freedom, enabling social agency and monitoring behaviour in equal and explicit balance appears core to residents being facilitated and at times pushed to develop new narratives about themselves which are realistic ,achievable and recognise their risks and needs.

In practice both hostels demonstrated evidence of elements of both 'old penology' (table 3.1) and 'new penology' (table 4.1) type approaches. Newhouse the more recently opened hostel, at this point in time appeared more keen to demonstrate its potentially punitive and enforcing credentials but in both hostels evidence of both types of approaches were differentially evidenced within the hostels between different staff approaches. Both hostels' managers and deputies appeared committed to running a hostel that could care as well as control. Control and surveillance though was more emphasised in the publicity, design and technology used in Newhouse. Chapter eight will explore whether such differences persisted. The next chapter will provide an update of wider developments in probation taking place concurrently with this research and in the run up to and including the next phase of ethnographic work which will be presented in Chapter 8.

The Emerging Policy and Practice Context

Chapter Seven:

In any ethnographic study it is important to provide a wider context for the research that is taking place. By its nature ethnography is up close and focused on the individual instances. Fetterman in Bryman (Ed) (2001 Vol iii: 311) notes:

'One of ethnography's most significant contributions to evaluation is its ability to provide the context required to interpret data meaningfully.'

This chapter juxtaposes this usual ethnographic turn and explores the wider policy and practice context throwing light on the ethnographic work of the last chapter and placing in context the final ethnographic study and conclusions which follow.

This thesis has been concerned to explore hostels' rehabilitative potential and the extent to which hostels have been core to or sit to one side of wider probation policy. This chapter will suggest that hostels and hostel staff still receive mixed policy messages about their possible role(s) and purpose(s) and that there is evidence that hostels can still be excluded from or ignored in major policy reviews. However in the period between the latter and next chapter hostels did come to the attention of policy makers, researchers and the media.

This chapter provides a policy and practice context, exploring the changes that took place in probation between the end of the first six months period of ethnographic research explored in the previous chapter (from the end of September 2002) and up to an including the second phase of ethnographic study from September 2006 to March 2007. It will also highlight some

research that was taking place across this period that may be seen as impacting, or having the potential to impact on hostels' development.

In particular this chapter will focus on those wider changes that took place in probation and that may be seen to have a bearing on this research, with potential to impact on hostels. It will conclude by briefly considering how these changes link to themes already explored in the previous chapter and how they might inform the next phase of fieldwork and conclusions.

Some of the key themes that will be explored include; the hostel pathfinder research, the Carter Report, the impact of the CJA 2003 and other legislative changes, the development of NOMS and the Offender Manager Model, resettlement research and specific guidelines and circulars that had a direct bearing on hostel policy and practice. As Kemshall and Wood note in Gelsthorpe and Morgan (Eds) (2007: 381):

'By the close of the twentieth century risk had come to preoccupy much of the Probation Service's agenda. This reflected increased policy, media and public concern with high risk offenders and notably sex offenders ...'

This chapter will also explore the extent to which risk continued to preoccupy the probation agenda and begin to explore the extent to which such a preoccupation (for policy makers and the media) may have impacted on hostels. The next chapter will specifically examine whether those whom hostels capture, is changing and being influenced by such focus. The conclusion will explore whether a particular role is envisaged for hostels within any changes that can be detected.

Hostel Specific Research

The National Probation Service (NPS) had been created just prior to the start of this research (April 2001). The NPS was launched with the then director promising the Home Secretary that;

'..it would do anything the government wanted it to do'

Cited in Senior (2004: 3)

As Senior (2004) notes the new found pragmatism of the NPS was based on forfeiting its much longer tradition of independence and willingness to put forward its own ideas.

'Compliance has been interpreted as necessary for survival and a crushing orthodoxy has been centrally imposed'

(ibid: 5)

It will be suggested that a new orthodoxy in Home Office research as well as in policy processes became more centralised in this period and that Home Office research findings and processes had become more hidden. At the start of this work it was unforeseen just how much the criminal justice system, in particular probation, would change and what these changes might mean for hostels. The next and concluding chapter will explore whether such 'crushing orthodoxy' has impacted on hostels. A hint that hostels had re-appeared on policy maker's radar was PC 111/2001 which set out an 'Invitation to develop a hostel's pathfinder'.⁶⁷ The main purpose of this pathfinder had been:

'... to look at how the hostel experience can prepare for, support and reinforce the learning offenders do on accredited programmes (which may be run in the hostel or in the community).'

PC 110 (2001:1)

Hostels are presented here as a potential adjunct to 'accredited programmes' and there is some suggestion of a specific purpose for hostels focussed on improving a particular area of service delivery. This echoes earlier

⁶⁷ Pathfinders are the Home Office process for a recognised programme of intervention with offenders being approved for delivery and considered as having a sound research base. Initially the 'pathfinder' was meant to allow and encourage trials of different approaches with a view to finding 'what works'. For an example of two competing perspectives on the role and influence of 'the accreditation panel' and the concept of 'pathfinders' see Mair (2002) and Raynor (2003).

instrumental use of hostels for bailees, i.e. they may be used by policy makers as a helpful adjunct to wider strategic purposes.

Having noted the re-emergence of hostels on policy makers radar we shall see that attention to hostels in this period was at times partial, non-existent in some major policy reviews or intense and driven by media attention e.g. Panorama 2006, News of the World 09.09.2004, HMIP 2007, PC37/2005.⁶⁸

⁶⁹ Moreover government in this period appeared to have developed an approach that saw research as 'private fact finding for future possible policy' as opposed to an open process whose findings should be shared and held up to peer review.

PC 110/2001 highlighted three key areas for development. The development of a generic hostel regime (which became known as Living Here Moving On, LiHMO), focus on assessment, induction, motivation and pro social modelling and consideration of the 'added value' of the hostel experience. As was noted earlier in the methodology section the Home Office interest in hostels at that time and the pathfinder work in particular were used as reasons by some hostels for not becoming involved in this research.

The Pathfinder began on 1st October 2002 and data collection ended in 2004. Its work overlaps with the research period of this thesis and the Home Office have to date never formally published its findings which were completed in December 2005.

Hostels may have had relatively little attention in the past but this chapter will suggest that when they do policy makers may be unsure what to do with their

⁶⁸ The Author was rejected access to the pathfinder research and its conclusions. The reason given for rejecting a Freedom of Information request to gain access to the Pathfinder research was that 'it would undermine Minister's ability to gather information to inform future public policy'. Private letter to author 2006 from Home Office.

Of note, several individuals made requests for this same information over a period of time, eventually a copy of the report was released to one person which was sent to me. The Home Office made no attempts to publish the findings of this work, paid for by public monies, or to ensure that those who have made previous requests were sent copies when a decision was taken to release it. It is thought that the use of the findings in a public journal article by a Home Office employee undermined their own privacy argument.

findings and appear to easily forget their existence in considering the overall challenges that face prison and probation / NOMS.

The conclusions section of the Hostel Pathfinder, Home Office (2005: unpublished) recognised the potential problem of running a fixed regime for a mixed gender hostel population;

'...it is important not to gloss over diversity within the resident group...whilst this raises questions about the extent to which approved premises can satisfy the different needs of women...further work on the pathfinder needs to be sensitive to gender differences'

Home Office (2005 unpublished: 60)

Such concerns echo with the findings of the previous chapter and it will be of interest to explore in the next chapter how provision for female offenders developed. The report also identifies potential problems with the new facilities contract:

'A further barrier to implementation (of a holistic regime) was the new facilities management arrangements. With the passage of time this became less relevant, but it is clear that successful implementation of the pathfinder regime requires all staff, including facilities management staff, to understand and be committed to the principles underpinning it.'

Home Office (2005 unpublished: 61)

At the time of the research in the previous chapter this partial privatisation of hostel staffing had not taken place. Indeed the ethnographic work in the previous chapter suggested that ancillary staff saw themselves as involved in and part of the process of rehabilitation. It will be important to consider whether any impact from the implementation of the 'facilities contract' can be detected in the next phase of field research. This did not pass without comment in the broadsheet press:

'The country's probation hostels have hired about 250 cooks and cleaners. With the odd exception, they are low-paid, working-class women who are employed to cope with offenders who could turn dangerous.'

Going on to add that:

'The contract to run the hostels was duly passed to Morrison's, a part of Anglia Water Group, which subcontracted the work to a consortium that included Pestokill, a specialist in controlling cockroaches rather than criminals.'

Cohen (2002 Observer)

One of the main aims of the pathfinders tender (PC111/2001) was to enhance and support the impact of accredited programmes. It is notable that the report found that;

'...the majority of offenders resident in pathfinder and comparison approved premises did not attend an offending behaviour programme during their period of residence although, when programmes were attended, completion rates were much higher than the national average.'

Home Office (2005: 37unpublished)

Hostels appear well placed to add a supportive element to the process of supervision and change focussed work. Understandings of what a hostel regime should include and how it links to the external world appear to assist workers in being clear about their role and task (Home Office 2005: 28-29) however it is of note that the Home Office stepped away from implementing the pathfinder on a national basis and there is some suggestion in the report that this may have been to do with cost.

The Home Office's own 'Correctional Services Accreditation Panel' provided formal advice from its March 2003 meeting to Martin Copsey the then Head of the Community and Reintegration Unit (letter dated 14th of April 2003 from Duncan Nichol) on the development of the Hostel Pathfinder, whilst stating their broad support some structural concerns about how 'pathfinders' in hostels might achieve accreditation were identified.⁷⁰ A précis of the panel's concerns appeared to focus on 4 principle observations:

1. Hostel populations are diverse in their risk and needs, therefore it is unclear how the proposed programme is targeted.
2. It was not clear how the proposed intervention linked to other intervention systems and how offenders were assessed and allocated to parts of the 'programme'.
3. Some of the proposed programme linked to external agencies inputs and it was unclear where the boundaries for accreditation being sought might lie.
4. The research basis for the intervention was not available and a literature review was required.⁷¹

An attempt to create and explore a holistic approach to effective practice in hostels appears to have floundered at least partially because it failed to meet pre determined programme specific criteria that were never designed to deal with the possible accreditation of a 'systems' approach for a hostel in the first place. If research findings and their practice applications have to go through the 'eye of needles' such as the 'Correctional Services Accreditation Panel' then concepts of developing effective practice in an open and evolving way

⁷⁰ Received under an FOI request.

⁷¹ Burnett and Eaton (2004) may be seen as a response to this particular concern.

may be lost, alongside the potential learning that may come from such ongoing attempts.⁷²

Hostel based research may sit uneasily alongside core programme approaches with researchers who are unfamiliar with the 24 hour nature of hostels and who may be unaware of the overall dynamic created by the 'system' as a whole. Moreover the holistic realities of residents' lives are presented to researchers in residential settings in a way that may be more hidden in other interventions focussed research. The next section will explore whether hostels or their residents featured in broader policy and context developments which were impacting on the CJS more generally in this period.

The Wider Context

The 'Carter Review' officially known as 'Managing Offenders, Reducing Crime' (Carter 2003) may be seen as one of the most influential reviews impacting on criminal justice policy in this period alongside the influences of the earlier Halliday (2001) review of sentencing . Carter a businessman and personal friend of the then Prime Minister Tony Blair was asked to review correctional services in England and Wales.

Carter (2003) highlighted very real issues of prison overcrowding, interventions with short term prisoners being almost non existent, a revolving door syndrome for recidivist offenders and a lack of joined up policy and practice between key agencies who are involved in working with offenders. An overarching agency which could pull together the work of the disparate parts of the criminal justice system i.e. prison, probation and by implication any intervention provider was put forward as a major policy aim. NOMS and Offender Management owe their origins in part to this review.

Halliday (Home Office 2001) did suggest that there was a need for an 'intermediate estate' but appeared to be referring directly for the need to

⁷² See Mair (2002) Credible Accreditation? in Probation Journal Vol 47(4):268-271 for a detailed critique of the panels role and wider purposes.

locate more sentenced prisoners in local 'community jails', linked to the notion of intermittent custody. Hostels may only be seen to be a possible part of this if understood in the context that Estlea (1973) suggested some thirty years earlier i.e. that they be used to facilitate the development of intermittent custody. Suggestions that hostels be used as a means of enabling prisoners to serve sentences at the weekend and remain in their local area are not new. Halliday (2001) however makes no link between the existing hostel estate and the intermediate estate required to facilitate local intermittent imprisonment.

Hostels are conspicuous by their absence from both the Carter Review and subsequent responses to it. Government appeared to continue to remain ambivalent about a possible role or policy aim for hostels in this period. The prisoner resettlement pathfinder phase two (Clancy et al 2006) run between 2002 and 2003 explored prisoner resettlement and noted that:

' .. the group that which receives the least assistance has both the greatest level of social need and the highest reconviction rate...around 60% are reconvicted within two years...'

Clancy et al (2006: 2)

Although cautiously put forward as indicative findings Clancy et al (2006: 97) suggest that both working with people whilst they are in custody and following them up with support once released in the community appears to impact on reducing reconviction rates. A holistic approach to dealing with offenders that recognises both a need for offence focussed work and personal and emotional support is required. These are not mutually exclusive approaches and in fact appear key to enabling change. Such findings may be relevant to hostel work but no connections have been made between this research and hostels. From a wider policy perspective hostels do not appear to have been considered as a model for prisoner resettlement. The government's approach to policy making in this period did not value the probation service or its staff as

a source of practice or possible policy development.⁷³ Approaches to 'what works' and more subtly who should do the work had been pulled away from local probation areas. As Raynor and Vanstone note:

'... the Carter report was seized on as the basis for policy announcements at the beginning of 2004, without a consultation period. Consultation was later offered on the details of implementation but not the principles'

Raynor and Vanstone in Gelsthorpe and Morgan (Eds) (2007: 77)

Concern as to where current policy drives may take probation practice and its ability to engage with offenders and communities is not understated;

'...if the wrong choices are made about contestability, centralisation and enforcement, we could move quite quickly towards a situation where little is left of the Probation Service of the past 100 years. An important vehicle for dialogue and reconciliation between society and its delinquent members will then be lost, and the necessary work of supervising offenders and helping them to stop offending will be done, if at all, by others. Such an outcome would be both extraordinary and perverse'

Raynor and Vanstone (ibid: 81)

With the prospect of contestability and further centralisation it remains uncertain where hostels will sit and how they will be understood within any proposed purchaser/provider split. Hostels' role and relationship to the criminal justice mantra of public protection and risk management may be becoming more clearly defined but how it relates to the community and the local probation areas appears less well defined. It is worth noting that from the 1st of April 2001, under the Criminal Justice and Court Services Act 2000,

⁷³ There were some exceptions to this e.g. the first NOMS research conference promoted by Christine Knott and held at St Anne's College, Oxford in January 2007 at which the author co ran with Mike Ashe a workshop on 'The Offender Practitioner Relationship', which critically explored the links between research informed practice and the raft of policy development on offender management.

Approved Premises became Crown Property and moved out of the ownership of Local Probation Areas. All Statutory Approved Premises are now owned by the State and have their purposes defined by the State. Local governance no longer applies to policy on hostels.

Legislative Changes and Developments

The 2003 Criminal Justice Act (to date not yet fully implemented) set out to perform a range of functions including, pulling together a coherent set of sentencing purposes, to create a new sentencing framework.⁷⁴ The five possible purposes of a sentence (CJA 2003:s.142) are listed as:

- The Punishment of Offenders
- Reducing Crime
- Reform and Rehabilitation of Offenders
- Protection of the Public
- The Making of Reparation by Offenders to Persons affected by their offences.

Seriousness is reintroduced as a key concern in sentencing and its consideration in sentencing is defined:

'In considering the seriousness of any offence, the court must consider the offender's culpability in committing the offence and any harm which the offender caused, was intended to cause or might foreseeably have caused.'

CJA (2003: s.143.1)

Reform and Rehabilitation remain sentencing aims, but as with the 1991 CJA these are 'possible sentencing purposes' amid a range of possible rationales for a community sentence. If hostels experience the same impact that

⁷⁴ At the time of writing in 2007 custody plus had not been implemented for 'financial reasons'.

probation has more generally they may find their reformatory and re-integrative purposes being diminished. Hostels are very briefly mentioned in the CJ Act 2003 (s.206) as an example of one of a menu of 'Community Sentences' (s199 –s214) that courts can impose.⁷⁵

ECP – enhanced community punishment (40 -300 hours)

Activity Requirement

Programme Requirement

Prohibited Activity Requirement

Curfew and Exclusion Monitoring

Exclusion Requirement

Residence Requirement to a specific place (hostel)

Mental Health Treatment Requirement

Drug Rehabilitation Requirement

Alcohol Treatment Requirement

Supervision Requirement

ACO requirement (Under 25's)

The prior need for the offenders' consent is removed from the residence requirement.⁷⁶

There is potential for much confusion and more cynically the creation of an appearance of change when strategically holistic pieces of legislation are passed by parliament and presented to the public as government response to crime but are then not resourced or have major sections put on the 'back burner'. The Criminal Justice Act (2003) has only ever been partially implemented. Probation / NOMS have to work with the sentences that the courts now deliver from the aforementioned list of community penalties but prison and probation have as yet to jointly deal with issues of custody plus or

⁷⁵ Allen and Hough (2007) in Gelsthorpe and Morgan (Eds) (2007: 565-590) provide a thorough exploration of the recent relationship between community penalties, sentencers, the media and public opinion. According to their research 're-branding' community sentences had to date had little impact on public confidence in them.

⁷⁶ However in reality residents are still expected to sign hostel rules on arrival. The Human Rights Act appears to be informing practice too.

intermittent custody. One could argue that the sentencing menu approach encourages sentencers to engage more with the content of community punishment and pushes probation / NOMS into a more provider style role.

'...it will be interesting to observe how magistrates and judges use the new community sentence with its 12 requirements and whether probation within the NOMS structure has the resources to work with a substantial increase in workload across the 42 areas.'

Whitehead and Statham (2006: 223)

It remains to be seen whether the renaming of probation officers as 'offender managers' may signal more than a surface change of name and further signal evidence of probation practitioners marginalisation from those whom they work with. Such shifts if they occur may be indicative of a move away from 'old penology' (Feeley and Simon 1994) and see offenders being treated as examples of risk entities. The next chapter and the conclusion will consider the possible impact of such changes on hostels and how hostel staff work with and understand their role with residents.

Sentencing Policy and Probation Practice in the post modern era have become shaped by public protection discourses built on over two decades of the politicisation of crime and responses to crime. Charles Murray (2005) argued in the Times in the UK in 2005 that:

'America has dealt with its crime problem, not by addressing the causes of crime or pursuing rehabilitation; rather it has simply removed the problem from the streets, so that in 2005 there were more than 2 million Americans in custody.'

cited in Whitehead and Statham (2006: 257)

Punishment and public protection appear to have become the policy maker's justification for continual review and reorganisation within the criminal justice

system. Reform and rehabilitation appear to be now reserved as optional rationales within the community sentencing framework and may no longer be probation's priority or major concern.

The Sexual Offences Act 2003 introduced three new orders:

- Sexual Offences Prevention Orders
- Foreign Travel Orders
- Risk of Sexual Harm Orders

Alongside the Criminal Justice Act 2003 (s.325-s.327) development of public protection panels, Probation and Prisons have become named as 'responsible authorities' along with partner agencies. Clarification of registration procedures for sex offenders reinforces a public protection focussed ethos of multi agency working with probation as key players. Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA) are now firmly embedded in legislation. Police, prisons and probation are core to this with a range of other relevant authority's e.g. housing, youth offending teams, social services and health services being placed under a duty to cooperate with these proceedings. Previously voluntary or recommended arrangements have now become enshrined in statute. During 2004 there was speculation that the Home Office were going to use Hostels as a strategic means of managing sex offenders (see Bright in The Observer, Sunday November 14th, 2004), although this never became an explicit policy of the Home Office Strategy Paper – Public Protection and Community Safety (2004), it did underline a growing focus on high and very high risk of harm cases for probation. Offender 'risk' management might usurp probation's former rehabilitative purposes. The next section will explore the development of NOMS and the possible purposes of offender management.

The Development of NOMS

The birth of NOMS – The National Offender Management Service was formally signalled by a second reading of the NOMS Bill in 2004 which eventually received Parliamentary assent on the 28th February 2007 with a majority of 25. Hough et al (2006: 3) note that NOMS was built on Carter's (2003) view of a

'...probation system braced by the tensions of marketplace competition.'

NOMS re-introduced the concept of 'contestability' into probation's modernisation agenda, or rather forced it and the threat of privatisation on probation.⁷⁷ Alongside contestability and one could argue to drive it, sits the notion of end to end offender management (Grapes 2005), a case management (and delivery?) model which seeks to ensure a seamless supervision of the offender through their sentence.

The national offender management model (NOMM) is designed to 'provide a single overarching framework for working with offenders.' Knott in 'The Noms Offender Management Model' asserts that:

'It 'makes sense' to practitioners. Some have described its offender –centred emphasis as having had a major bearing on the quality of their working lives. Change is always best implemented with the support of those who are required to implement it.'

Home Office (2006: 2)

From reading this one could wrongly assume that the model was already in practice, clearly defined and warmly welcomed and understood by practitioners. The gap between policy makers/ managers wishful thinking and

⁷⁷ Arguably this concept was veiled within the 1991 Blue Paper 'Organising Supervision and Punishment in the Community' which forced probation areas to spend 5% of their budget on external providers.

practice based realities covering the introduction of NOMS can be seen in Whitehead and Statham (2006), Hough et al (2006) and the 'Stop the Bill' Campaign run by NAPO in the run up to parliamentary assent. The arrival of NOMS was by no means an untroubled or wholeheartedly welcomed event as portrayed in the preface to the National Offender Management Model (2006).

Raynor and Maguire in Hough (2006: 21) suggest that:

'Ultimately, indeed, the success or failure of NOMS – in the eye of practitioners and observers alike – is likely to be judged mainly by the extent to which the new model achieves in practice the key expectations of its designers; in particular, the aims of (a) creating a more holistic and productive experience of sentence management for individual offenders, and (b) contributing demonstrably towards a decrease in reconviction rates.'

The core practices that they highlight from recent research as key to the NOMM model are defined as 'core correctional practices' (Raynor and Maguire in Hough 2006: 2):

- effective use of authority
- appropriate modelling and reinforcement
- the use of a problem solving approach
- the development of relationships characterised by openness, warmth, empathy, enthusiasm, directiveness and structure,

and that:

'case management (or offender management as it is now called) should aim to reinforce and support offenders' own 'narratives of change', in addition to helping them make the best use of available opportunities and interventions..'

The role of hostels and hostel staff appear unclear within a NOMS framework. In considering the role and purpose of keywork in the next period of

ethnographic work it will be important to consider whether the core correctional practices listed above are evident in the ethos and practice of day to day work with residents and whether a discourse of 'offender management' had begun to impact on hostel practices.

Raynor and Maguire add that in developing case / offender management:

'It is difficult to see how this can be done except in the context of a personal communication; that is, in the context of case management as a relational process.'

Raynor and Maguire in Hough (2006: 3)

The role of the personal relationship in enabling change and managing risk appears as core to achieving the rehabilitative aims of NOMs. The next chapter will consider the extent to which this understanding is evident in staff interactions and hostel practices.

On the 19th September 2005 the Home Secretary in a Speech to the Prison Reform Trust stated:

'I see no reason of principle or practicality why offender management should not be provided by the private or voluntary sector. And a very important part of the development of commissioning and contestability will be the ability to specify and contract for cross-cutting services, straddling the current silos of prison and probation, and making a reality of the end to end management of offenders.'

For 'New Labour' the linking of public service delivery to the success of NOMS was not a concern, in fact the public nature of probation now appears to depend on its ability to deliver success for NOMS. Carter (2003) had a vision of an integrated prison and probation service working together and pulling down silos. 'Integration' appears as a Trojan horse that has allowed the entry of commissioning. It remains unclear how introducing more providers and particularly providers driven by profit will of itself increase co-

operation across the prison probation divide and result in more 'joined up' rehabilitation for offenders or protection of the public.

When exploring hostel's practice in the next chapter it will be important to consider whether concepts of end to end offender management and the larger NOMS model have begun to impact on how residents are worked with and whether core correctional practice and relationships engage with what works research. Much of the NOMS model appears relevant and pertinent to hostels with its policy focus on rehabilitation and resettlement into the community and its practice focus on relational work with offenders. Indeed, the more negative practices which this model seeks to tackle include notions of poor transition from institution to society and a lack of continuity of case workers.

HMIP (2007: 83) notes that:

'... the hostel is currently the junior partner in the offender manager relationship but could do much more with better and not just more resources. We do not criticise probation areas for prioritising restrictive interventions over constructive measures if resources do not stretch to them both.'

It would appear that within a wider policy context of developing an offender management model, investment in restrictive and containing measures is both prioritised over constructive / rehabilitative focussed work as if these were quite different aims. Hostels and hostel staff remain to be pulled into a vision of how they might be involved and what this new offender management process will entail.

Hostels have had their purposes explicitly aligned with high risk of harm cases, PC20/2004 which deals with transfer of public protection and high risk of harm cases reinforces this role,

'The Approved Premises Estate will be considered within any resettlement strategy. Langley House Trust PPCU Enhanced Supervision Beds, or funding

resources from the PPCU to Approved Premises will be considered, as appropriate '.

(PC20/2004: 4)

It may be hostel staff too will start to see risk and needs as no longer co dependent in policy or practice. There may be a danger that hostels' potential contribution to dual aims, of constructive intervention and appropriate restrictions is ignored or developed in a one-sided fashion.

A Changing Service Delivery and Management Structure

Other wider integrative and rehabilitative policies that may have shaped hostel practice include the Reducing Re-offending Action Plan – Published by the Home Office in 2004 as part of a move towards delivering more joined up services for offenders. Paul Goggins the then Minister for Correctional Services and Reducing Re-offending stated that:

*'The Reducing Re-offending National Action Plan fulfils the Government's commitment to reducing re-offending through greater strategic direction and joined-up working. It aims to address concerns raised in a number of important reports on this issue, such as the Social Exclusion Unit's Reducing Re-Offending by Ex-Prisoners. Publication also takes forward two important manifesto commitments: to ensure that punishment and rehabilitation are both designed to minimise re-offending; and to improve the education of those offenders in custody.'*⁷⁸

Home Office (2004: 1)

However this commitment to service delivery was inextricably linked to a change of service structure and governance;

'The new National Offender Management Service, bringing together prisons and probation, will be responsible for reducing re-offending and managing the

⁷⁸ It is of note that government criminal justice policy documents are explicitly being used to 'evidence' delivery of labour party manifesto promises.

budget for offender services.⁷⁹ *These services will be managed at a regional level to enable effective links to be forged and joint strategies developed with complementary services and partners. Regional Offender Managers (ROMs) will be responsible for the end-to-end management of offenders in the nine English regions and Wales.'*

Home Office (2004: 1)

What have become known as the '7 Pathways' i.e. the core areas of intervention that are linked with desistance, were clearly identified with national and regional priorities being set out:

1. Accommodation; this mentions plans for a strategic plan for 'offender housing and approved premises' (p9)
2. Education, Training and Employment
3. Mental and Physical Health
4. Drugs and Alcohol
5. Finance Benefits and Debts
5. Children and Families of Offenders
7. Attitudes, Thinking and Behaviour

This Policy appears to recognise the importance of long standing factors associated with crime reduction and offender rehabilitation noted earlier in this thesis and linked with hostels original purposes i.e. provision of accommodation, supportive relationships, education, the opportunity to access employment in the community and some sense of moral or personal

⁷⁹ Underlining inserted by this author.

development allowing a transition to a reformed status over time. Of structural importance in the new policy is that location of the budget for commissioning the work needed to meet these aims sits with the ROM and there is in fact an assumption that probation will not provide most of these services directly.⁸⁰

As well as signalling that government was serious about implementing NOMS, ahead of actual legislative approval, the Reducing Re-offending Action Plan shows that offender need had not disappeared from the policy agenda. However its branding as multi agency working and the suggested action plans linked to each of these underscored that interventions as well as being more 'joined up' might be less dependent on the Probation Service for their delivery in the future.

In undertaking the next phase of field research and in the concluding chapter it will be important to explore the extent that hostel residents appear able to access assistance in these core areas. A macro layer of management is created by NOMs for probation and prisons in general that in effect sits in separate offices and has the power to commission services. It is not inconceivable that the eventual drilling down of this approach to hostels may eventually lead to them being seen as a 'National Estate' with a lead manager.

Space does not allow an exploration of what was happening in each of the seven pathways in this period however it is worth exploring the first of these as it has been so inextricably linked to hostels in the past and appears as a key to need of so many offenders in general and specific to hostel move on success in particular.

During 2005 HMIP also published an inspection report entitled:

'An Essential Element of Effective Practice' – An Inspection of National Probation Service Work on Offender Accommodation'.⁸¹

⁸⁰ ROM is the Regional Offender Manager, at the time of writing this role was located in NOMS but not within the local probation area.

⁸¹ Published on 21st of July 2005 by HMIP.

The focus was on exploring how well probation addresses offenders' accommodation needs. Enquiry took place in eight disparate probation areas in terms of their offender profiles and rural/urban mix. A summary of the findings of this report were presented in HMIP 3/05 .Page one of the summary reported:

'Good practice examples were noted in many of the areas we visited. In particular, we saw several examples of Approved Premises being used to good effect to address public protection and crime reduction concerns'

The main inspection report went on to note that:

'We saw many examples of innovative work in Approved Premises geared to enhancing public protection, reducing reoffending and successfully reintegrating offenders into their communities. Direct management of these resources by areas meant that the premises could be developed to specifically underpin their work.'

HMIP (2005: 13)

However there was an overall weakness in staff understanding across the wider service of what the service own local offender accommodation strategy was and in 51% of cases sampled (ibid: 19) attention to assessment of accommodation needs of offenders was unsatisfactory. The report implicitly highlights the potential for drift in two key areas:

- That grand policy initiatives such as 'supporting people' and the 'reducing re-offending action plan' require understanding at a policy, management and coal face level to ensure that offenders access the services they need.

- That management of accommodation and approved premises within a service may have different priorities in terms of risk and need but in either case if these become disjointed service provision and public protection is potentially compromised. HMIP (2005) suggests that a more joined up approach is required in this area.

More explicit is the finding in relation to how the implementation of NOMS was impacting on understandings of policy, clarity over priorities and resources;

'The Inspection found something of a disjointed approach to addressing accommodation issues at the national level. With the advent of NOMS, the approach to providing leadership on this agenda at the national level was further complicated. At the time of the inspection it was not clear how responsibility for this area of service delivery would be shared between NOMS and the NPD....'

HMIP (2005: 36)

Although this critique is specific to this inspection on accommodation, it is of concern that there appears to be potential for poor service delivery, due to a lack of clear structure, ownership and leadership in a key policy area. For NOMS as an emerging organisation there must be concern that service delivery has become disjointed due to a lack of clear leadership. Such lack of clarity could threaten similar problems across the other six pathfinder areas.

The implications for wider service delivery could be severe and may owe more to what appears to be a constant stream of management restructuring than any inherent inability or unwillingness to focus on key areas of practice with offenders. A real danger would be if, during such a rapid period of change, either no one owned needs related issues or if NOMS began to see these as separate from risk related issues and as a result offenders ceased accessing such services which the new systems were designed to secure in a consistent way.

The next section will explore more specific hostel policies and guidelines that flowed in to hostels alongside the wider tide of restructuring and re branding occurring at a macro level in the Probation / Offender Management Service.

Hostel Specific Policy and Developments

The rate of policy change, revised national standards (2001, 2005) and a period of Home Office sponsored hostel focussed research (2001-2005) with outcomes that have not resulted in the 'roadmap' managers and policy makers may have wished for, appears to have seen hostels go through a period of rapid change and both policy and media attention e.g. (Panorama 2006, News of The World 26.03.2006 Guardian 7.11.2006).

In September 2004 the National Probation Directorate Public Protection and Courts Unit carried out an Approved Premises Review. This review promised a final report on the hostel pathfinder by the autumn (2004: 3). The report links the review process to the Carter Report (2003) although Carter did not mention hostels:

'The recently published Carter Report and the government response , makes it clear that further radical reform is required if we are to realise the full potential of the correctional services...the resources review can make an early contribution by...drawing together codes and conditions and in helping to define a future staffing regime and supporting structures for approved premises.'

Home Office (2004: Section1.3)

The document goes on to explore the pay, running costs and salary scales of staff involved in approved premises. The staffing model addressed issues of double cover at nights and was linked to the pay review for hostel staff that was to follow. Its main focus was on staffing, bed spaces, costs, performance indicators, possible links with pathfinder and a future set of performance targets linked to specific outcomes. Given that it lists the staffing requirements

of every hostel in England and Wales and lists bed spaces, funding formulas and intended changes to staffing requirements one might wonder why such detail became public (this can be found by a standard google search) and yet the Home Office Pathfinder research has gone unpublished? Any potential private provider bidding under contestability would find this financial information invaluable. The lack of a business model for NOMS when it was launched alongside the easy access to financial information about hostels could suggest that there is not a concern to retain or secure their provision as internal to the National Probation Service.

It will be important to explore whether the staffing of hostels has changed as a result of the above review and whether proposed changes to pay and conditions impacts on who works in hostels.

Of note is the recommendation to remove the Female Supplement paid to mixed and female only hostels (sections 3.12.5 – 3.12.7). It states that:

'.. it could be argued that women in the criminal justice system do indeed have additional needs....Residents of approved premises are ordinary members of the community, and are entitled to healthcare in the same way as any other members of the community. At this stage we are not persuaded to continue with a female supplement'

Home Office (2004: 12-13)

The support for women in mixed hostels was reported as unsatisfactory in the previous chapter. This review pulled away finances from women in hostels. The NPD (2004) went on to recommend that regions reconfigure resources to end mixed gender provision and create an estate with single sex hostels only. In the next chapter I will explore whether these decisions impacted on the provision of a mixed hostel at Newhouse.

Hostels found their role being questioned amid a torrent of probation circulars, guidance and policy developments and omissions that are not easy to pull

together in a coherent fashion. PC 15/2005 brought in a new set of national standards and affirmed the primacy of a public protection focussed role for hostels:

'... the aim of protecting the public from offenders or bailees posing a high or very high risk of harm '

Given such clear policy statements about the role and purpose of hostels, it is surprising on reading The NOMS Offender Management Model (2006: 36) that Hostels / Approved premises are not mentioned in the table which presents an overview of how punitive interventions, constructive interventions, rehabilitative interventions and restrictive interventions relate to one another. The 'Punish, Help, Change, Control' mantra which rather oversimplifies the dynamic being addressed (2006: 48-51) fails to mention hostels. The 'Tiering Model' (ibid: 50-51) which appears integral to the case management model and core to managing high risk of harm cases, applies the model to custody but not to hostels. In terms of joined up policy and practice an opportunity appears to have been missed. Appendix 4 of the same document list 'evidence summaries' underpinning the offender management model, none of these draw on hostels research generally (Burnett and Eaton 2004) or on the hostel pathfinder which the Home Office had commissioned in 2001 and had the results of in 2005.

Hostel staff and managers may be anxious as to whether this omission was indicative of the perennial oversight that hostels can appear to face in probation planning and strategy or indicative of possible desires to separate off hostels from the rest of NOMS and manage it as an 'estate'. PC 37/2005 redefined the 'Role and Purpose of Approved Premises'

'The core purpose of approved premises is the provision of enhanced supervision as a contribution to the management of offenders who pose a significant risk of harm to the public. Admissions criteria and referral processes need to reflect this focus on public protection. The delivery of

enhanced supervision encompasses security, staffing arrangements, restrictive measures and rehabilitative components’.

Home Office (37/2005: 1)

It will be important to consider in the next and final chapter whether and how these multiple purposes are being put into practice and whether such purposes are theoretically or practically coherent. Does an increased emphasis on security and restrictive measures in statements of purpose shape or skew practice? The National Probation Service for England and Wales NPD Leaflet 007/2005 states that;

‘The Core purpose of an approved premise is to protect the public from offenders who pose a significant risk of harm to others, For this reason, the majority of bed spaces are occupied by offenders released from custody, some of whom have been convicted of very serious offences. The enhanced supervision typically includes measures such as CCTV and alarm systems, a standard curfew from 11pm – 6am and core regime which addresses offending behaviour.’

Aware of a growing media attention to hostels (e.g. News of the World 26th March 2006, 18th June 2006) PC26/2006 issued on the 19th of June 2006 brought in changes to the admissions criteria to hostels and ordered the transfer of offenders in ‘restricted categories’ and demanded that Chief Officers provide a list of such offenders within ‘restricted areas’ to submit details by ‘the close of business on 20.06.2006.’

The circular was aimed at those offenders who had committed sex offences against children under 16, including child related and internet offences. A list of ‘restricted hostels’ was listed that could no longer take such offenders.⁸²

⁸² In an unusual step the following 12 hostels were listed – Luton- Bedfordshire, Banbury- Cheshire, Hanworth House – Lancashire, Kirk Lodge – Leicester and Rutland, Wordsworth House- Lincolnshire, Camden House- London, Norfolk Park- South Yorkshire, Staitheford House – Staffordshire, Clerks House – Thames Valley, McIntyre House - Warwickshire, Elliot House – West Midlands, St John’s West Yorkshire.

One of the ironies of this decision was that only a few weeks earlier the Home Office appeared to be on the verge of a decision to use hostels as a strategic way of housing and managing high risk sex offenders. The News of the World gloated:

'Exclusive; Major U- Turn to Protect Our Children – 11 hostels shut to Paedos and 60 perverts shifted out.'

News of the World (18.06.2006)

Not shying away from penal populism and the very real risks associated with this the related blog spot (notwats.blogspot.com/2006/06sarahs-law-victory.html) still carries a link from this article to a site on;

'how to make your 'very own flaming torch'.

This was more than Nimbyism and pushed penal populism towards vigilantism through the national tabloid press. The next chapter will consider what impact this had on hostel staff.

Burnett and Eaton (2004: 22) writing for the Home Office only two years earlier had noted that:

'According to the snapshot survey conducted in March 2003, around four in ten of all male residents had a current or previous charge or conviction for a sexual offence, and the majority of these were also schedule 1 offenders.

The Approved Premises inspection in 1998 found that Approved Premises who accepted sex offenders often restricted the number in residence at any one time. Not all the 17 Approved Premises inspected were prepared to admit sex offenders, perhaps because of concerns about 'NIMBY' campaigns.'

Hostels appear particularly vulnerable targets for journalists as soon as their stated purpose becomes dealing with those who are high risk in the

community. Alongside this is this risk of knee jerk policy reactions to manage public perceptions.

HMIP 2007 demonstrated hostels continuing vulnerability to media attention and reinforced the potential for NIMBYist tendencies to lead public debate (Panorama 8th of November 2006). Policy makers appear too keen to issue knee jerk reaction to 'public concerns' about specific offenders mostly sex offenders and attempt to show that hostels are restrictive or punitive, ignoring public engagement with the numbers of sex offenders located in hostels;

'The majority of hostel residents had been released from prison on licence. They included lifers – people sentenced to life imprisonment. Most prisoners will be released at some stage; we acknowledge that here again it is individual assessment of Risk of Harm that is crucial in determining when and how long-term prisoners can be managed safely in the community. Lifers released on licence sometimes comment that they had fewer restrictions in open prison than on release due to the nature of the restrictive requirements in their licences.'

(HMIP March 2007: 7)

Policy documents particularly those aimed at the media have increasingly given a mixed message, on the one hand that hostels have always been there and always had dangerous offenders and on the other that this 'type of resident' although not new is now in the majority.

'Hostels have always housed among their residents some of the most dangerous offenders supervised in the community, particularly those who have become rootless by virtue of serving a long prison sentence. What has changed is their systematic use, primarily for the accommodation of those who pose a high risk of serious harm to the public. Some residents previously deemed too difficult or dangerous to house in a hostel, were in the past accommodated in whatever private provision there was available, often bed and breakfast accommodation or direct access hostels found by the offender themselves. This cannot be right.'

Hostel managers may find Denney's (2005: 88) reproduction of a Bedfordshire County Council's job advert in the Guardian (20.11.2002) both humorous and serious in the message it makes:

'Caution Risk Reduction at Work'

Such a strapline could become the new logo for hostels, hostel staff and perhaps for residents to wear on t-shirts. A serious point here is that the words are on something which would usually say 'caution wet floor'. Probation's management of risk and its relationship to the public has been constructed in a one sided fashion. As Denney (2005: 88) notes:


'While proactive risk management can protect, individuals must always be mindful of the danger'.

Probation and hostels in particular are at risk of being cajoled by the media and politicians into stopping rehabilitative work with particular categories of offender because some will re-offend. Risk reduction strategies are more complex than the health and safety approach of the 'yellow sign'. However the mutual contract implied in such an approach may be worthy of further exploration within a criminal justice and community setting. Circles of Support may be one model that stretches current understandings of risk management practice and their relationship to the wider community.

Hostels now appear to find themselves operating in contexts where oversimplified understandings of risk reduction are operating in the public domain and perhaps in a policy domain presenting falsely as risk elimination. Unless probation and policy makers begin to own taking some risks as an inevitable consequence of the task they are engaged in the NOMS and hostels in particular will forever be prone to perennial 'moral panics' (Cohen 1972) or a policy shift towards increased use of incarceration at any cost (both

human and financial) to rule out the actuarial possibility of whole swathes of the population ever re-offending. The graph below points to an almost doubling of the prison population between 1976 and 2006. Punitive policies could easily re-double this between 2006 and 2036. Home Office Circular 11/06 projected a possible prison population for 2013 as between 90,250 and 106,550. However if 'narrowing the justice gap' i.e. an increase in police arrests and prosecutions is achieved, alongside new legislation (e.g. full CJA 2003 implementation) and a continuation of current sentencing trends and an increased use of imprisonment as a response to enforcement/ breach then the projected figure could be much higher. Hostel and hostel resources appear as a diminishing resource within this context.

Figure 8
Annual average prison population (1900 to 2005)



Sources: Offender management caseload statistics, Home Office/NOMS

83

It will be important to map in the next chapter the extent to which the current hostel populations reflect particular risk concerns and to consider to what extent hostels may be seen as being used as a particular type of resource or intervention in probation's public protection arsenal.

⁸³ Table Reproduced from Home Office (2006) A Five Year Strategy for Protecting the Public and Reducing Re-offending

Hostels as a Risk to their Residents?

If community perceptions of offenders as 'risk entities' can be one sided so too can probation's preoccupation with their risk of re-offending and need to control their behaviour. The next chapter will outline some of the new methods of control and surveillance being used in hostels. What is less routinely considered is the possibility that hostel environments have the potential to be damaging and harmful to their residents (Wincup 1997, Wincup 2002, Barton 2005).

Despite an overwhelming focus on policies that constructed offenders as risks to others and staff as managers of these risk, some work acknowledges offender vulnerability in this period, specifically recognising the potential risk to offenders of suicide and self harm, i.e. their vulnerability and risk to self. The next and concluding chapter will consider to what extent the mix of residents in hostels as well as the day to day practices in them may make hostels more or less 'risky' for residents. It will also explore whether Auldhouse retained the presence of a CPN and whether this facility was extended to Newhouse.

The Prison and Probation Ombudsman, building on the work of the Public Protection Units '(PPU) Research into Deaths of Residents of Approved Premises, An Initial Summary Report (2002)', issued guidance on a new framework for resident and inmate complaints alongside new procedures for reporting deaths in custody and approved premises. In May 2003 the Ombudsman set out a framework for residents' complaints along with procedures and protocols for investigating deaths in approved premises. Despite this work, suicide and self harm continue to be identified as issues that hostels need to improve on. Home Office Circular 02/2004 is but one example of reports on offender deaths in hostels in this period.

Cowe in Caton and Hancock (2007: 304) draws attention to the instance of suicide in custodial and hostel settings highlighting that:

'Between 1998 and 2002 some 87 people died in approved premises in England and Wales'.

PC 02/2004 builds on the earlier research by the PPU making explicit recommendations to hostel staff. Cowe (ibid: 288) notes that:

'Institutional or organisational structures can validate self destructive behaviours and reinforce self harm...'

Hostility between staff and poor relations between staff and residents can be linked to instances of self harm. Cowe (2007: 288) lists a series of worker skills and staff needs that are required to reduce risk in this area. The concluding chapter will consider the possibility of a holistic set of worker skills which may meet the needs of risk management, public protection and a duty of care towards residents.

Undertaking a general duty of care to residents has the potential to diminish, when so much resource and rhetoric is focussed on seeing individuals as in need of 'management' for the risk they may pose to others. A constructive staff – resident dynamic identified by Sinclair (1971) and Hudson (1981) as core to hostel success is identified by Cowe (2007) as a factor which can reduce risk of self harm too.

The concluding chapter will suggest that the continued disentanglement of welfare from control is neither useful for good risk assessment nor pragmatic in actually working to resettle and monitor individuals in the community.

The Public Face of Risk Averse Policy Making

Tragic cases and real human loss and pain are, regrettably, a core part of the work of prison and probation staff. Their clientele are those that perhaps, most in society would choose not to work with or associate themselves with. Every generation or even decade has its' share of 'folk devils' and 'monsters' that can shape and inform public perspectives of criminal justice processes and

with each of these their victims, whose families pain and loss remains real and tangible.^{84 85} Debates about the treatment of such particular offender 'groups' and the punishments they should receive, invariably also focus attention on the systems and staff who work with and manage these individuals and the many other non dangerous and potentially dangerous but not re-offending offenders.

Policy makers have a choice whether to be informed by the facts and be seen as part of that system which both punishes and protects these 'monsters' from the vigilante mob, even upholding a duty to protect them from their own attempts to harm themselves, or they can sit with the mob and blame the system, standing outside of it, justifying more punitive or surveillance orientated approaches on the many, in case amidst their number we can detect those 'dangerous' few. Concerns over individual citizen's human rights can become silenced by demands for or promises of absolute safety.

Nash (2006: 145) suggests that:

'Media pressure and an increasingly vocal public demanding action, information and protection has driven what has undoubtedly been a relentless policy agenda'

The Roy Whiting case (see Nash 2006) commented on by Kemshall and Maguire (2003) exemplifies this process in action. Whiting was a known offender and subject to MAPPA. The media and public assumed that being under supervision and public protection arrangements guaranteed their safety. Tabloid press such as the News of the World led campaigns to have paedophiles 'outed' from a local estate in Portsmouth. Names of 'known offenders' were published on a daily basis, attacks resulted on actual offenders and innocent victims of mistaken identity and misinformation. Although occurring prior to the research in 2002 this case is important to flag

⁸⁴ Myra Hyndley, Ian Brady, Fred and Rose West, Ian Thompson and James Venables, Roy Whiting, Ian Huntley.

⁸⁵ 'Monsters on Our Streets' – News of the World 26.03.2006.

as it provides a context for understanding the 'Panorama Programme' (2006) and the News of the World and other tabloid media campaigns that hostels and hostel staff have experienced.

The relationship between the criminal justice system and the public appears, for the most part, to be mediated through the press (Roberts et al 2003). Staff may have been forced to pull up the barricades, withdraw from the community and retreat to a probation practice that occurs beyond the public gaze. The previous chapter identified one hostel where an awareness of the need for good public relations lead to a pro active stance in making links between the hostel and the community, It would appear that for the CJS as whole, a lack of planned engagement with the public may miss opportunities to gather information (see Williams and Thompson 2004) thus reinforcing stereotypes of paedophilia and 'dangerous offenders' being essentially a 'stranger danger' problem and not an issue for families and communities to address. Roberts et al (2003:76) suggest that the media promotes penal populism in three ways.

'...it supports the belief in the value of punishment as appropriate and necessary...influences politicians directly through their framing of the issues of crime and punishment...and...the media provides a communication platform that favours certain types of policy responses...'

At the same time that ongoing negative media attention to paedophiles was taking place Thames Valley Police, Probation ,including a probation hostel, the NPD and the Quaker Church were piloting and researching a restorative justice informed approach to working with sex offenders called 'Circles of Support and Accountability' (see Quaker Communications 2005). The contrast of this project with the Media Campaigns is starkly set out in the forward to this report by Wilson (2005: 3):

'The fear and hatred of sex offending and offenders can be best worked with by recognising the anxiety and demonstrating that by providing opportunities for growth and learning, the offender can enjoy the change to active

citizenship and the community can accept the person back with a greater awareness of the risks involved...'

Only four months after the above project had started, Holly Wells and Jessica Chapman were killed by their school caretaker Ian Huntley (August 2003). The case raised concern about risk to children, sex offenders and whether 'the system' had effective protocols and practices in place to prevent such incidents from happening again.

'The media's insatiable need to feed off such a terrible event resulted in the Circles office becoming a national media circus and our introduction to the wider public was informed through national headlines such as 'What a Waste of Our Cash' ..'

Wilson (Quaker Communications 2005: 5)

Although much of the attention from this case focussed on police practice and how communications were recorded and transmitted between forces the Bichard Inquiry (2004) made 31 recommendations and a number of observations that may be seen to have influenced the tenor of the public protection discourse in England and Wales.

The report calls for 'no loopholes' in structures and processes to protect children and echoes the belief that safety can be guaranteed. The Panorama (2006) criticism of Probation hostel practice in Bristol had similar undercurrents. HMIP gave a less knee jerk and more measured response than the Home Office to the Bristol Hostel story openly publishing a review of the cases shown.

The more general policy outcome and practice headache that has resulted from an apparent desire to be seen to be doing something (new!) about risk, has been a sustained period of 'new' policy initiatives and directives which suggest moves towards greater public safety but which may actually without

considerable extra resource have diminished the amount of time that criminal justice staff spend face to face with offenders.

Media attention can be more balanced (Radio 4, 18.02.04 – Map of Minds – John Waite) but may be less ‘public’ in drawing attention of successes to a large section of the population who at best remain to be convinced that some offenders should be worked with in ‘their community’. Public support, from government or opposition parties, may not be forthcoming as it is easier and less politically risky for policy makers and ministers to attach themselves to success stories than align themselves and their reputations with an at times beleaguered probation service which will always face a problem of serious further offences. Probation or at least those charged with its governance; appear generally unwilling to state the fact that it cannot guarantee public safety any more than the police can.

Overview of changes between 2002 and 2007

Probation practice began this period having increasingly sold itself as being linked to public protection work e.g. see the New Choreography by Wallis (Home Office 2001) and became less interested in associating itself with those offenders not deemed to be a danger to the public, arguably adding to a perception that all offenders should be treated as risks to the public. Risk management appears to have become a more appealing cloak than working with offender need. The unwillingness to engage publicly with the subtle differences and complex relationship between risks, needs and danger may have meant that probation practice now finds itself in a position where it boasts of its engagement with the dangerous (Nash 2006) but ignores need and sees need as unrelated or at least not so important to publicly focus its resources on.

Nash (2006: 198) notes that talk of dangerousness and pressure to assume that all risks can be managed may be having very real impacts on practice and practitioners;

'...practitioners are quite likely to become increasingly cautious and therefore more reluctant to take a chance with a their risk assessments, always erring on the side of caution...more people could be assessed as dangerous...'

The developments outlined in this chapter can be seen as evidence of the 'sea changes' in practice being influenced by trends in penal policy and a more risk orientated practice. Kemshall and Wood in Gelsthorpe and Morgan (2007: 384) note that the extent to which 'new penology' is theoretically coherent in its explanations of changes in the criminal justice system is contested .Cheliotis (2006) suggests that the role of human agency is downplayed in accounts which present criminal justice policy in a rationale way, charging 'new penology' with the status of 'hypothesis' as opposed to 'a realized penal rationale' Cheliotis (2006: 313).

Whitehead and Statham assert that changes that have taken place in probation need not have happened that way at all...:

'What has happened, been allowed to happen, can not be changed. But just as the course of our personal and professional lives within the context of the 20th Century history could have been different, so probation history could have taken a different course if different decisions had been made at critical points....We cannot change the past but we can shape the future...the next 25 years do not have to replicate the last quarter century..'

Whitehead and Statham (2007: 272)

The conclusion of this thesis will return to the application and relevance of the 'new penology' debate however it is worthy of note that whether, hypothesis or rationale, it is undeniable that in policy terms at least Probation/ NOMS and hostels per se have been aligned with purposes that give primacy to the ideals of public protection and engagement with high risk offenders. As Burnett notes:

'However it would be a pity if this stress on the public protection role of approved premises is allowed to overwhelm the agenda for promoting rehabilitation and community reintegration.'

Burnett (2005: 7) VISTA

Hostels had hitherto by and large escaped the gaze of criminal justice strategists. This is changing and as a result hostels may be changing. We may have choices in this, but change appears to be taking place and in order to exercise the choices Whitehead and Statham (2007) allude to, we need to understand where we are now and what the choices might be.

Throughout the period explored above risk and risk management have become enshrined in statements of purpose, admissions criteria and publicity relating to hostel's roles and contribution. A potential problem, with this grand standing or foregrounding of risk reduction activity as an organisational function in law (CJ A 2003, Sex Offenders Act 2003 and in policy PC 37/2005, PC15/2005), is that it has the potential to remove the offender's social agency and ownership of change from the process.⁸⁶ Understandings, devoid of active offender choice, of what risk reduction might look like in practice appear to be reducing practice to the use of formal processes, tools (OAsys, Matrix 2000, etc) and 'joint working' via MAPPA all of which have the potential to exclude and render passive the offender in question. That is, dependence on procedural approaches to risk management might remove worker's attention to offender agency in working to reduce risk and rehabilitate real individuals. Meetings and tools alone neither rehabilitate nor reduce risk. Kemshall and Wood (2007) highlight the possible operation of two different models of risk management:

⁸⁶ There may be some wider mirroring process between the demise of social agency of practitioners in the CJS and the apparent lack of attention to the social agency of offenders under probation's new 'offender management' – role passivity may have become more structural than Whitehead and Statham (2007) would admit.

COERCIVE MODELS
VS
INTEGRATIVE MODELS.

'The coercive relies upon the 'community protection model', conditions, restrictions, sanctions, enforcement and intrusive community measures...Integrative approaches on the other hand emphasise inclusionary approaches such as 'circles of support'....'

Kemshall and Wood in Gelsthorpe and Morgan (Eds) (2007: 391)

These models iterate well with Blakemore's (2003: 101) differentiation between 'directly coercive' and 'subtly oppressive' forms of social control highlighted in the introduction to this work. The extent to which policy is read, through a lens which preferences one of these over another may impact on social practices in the real world. In the next chapter and conclusion it will be important to consider whether such differentiations can be found in hostels practice and how staff and managers understand their role within a changing context.

In this period hostels would appear to have been seen as both potentially useful to policy makers (Halliday 2001, Home Office 2004, HMIP 2005, Home Office 2007) and remarkably easy to forget (Carter 2003, Home Office 2006, NOMS 2006). Hostels and the wider service found themselves undergoing significant review and scrutiny often with one set of changes following another before these had either been embedded or fully implemented. Important practice and policy resources such as the Hostels Handbook have not kept apace with change.⁸⁷ Streams of probation circulars (now published with expiry dates) flood into services on an ever increasing drive toward implementing the latest policy initiative. It will be important to consider in the next and concluding chapter what happens to hostel practice on a day to day basis within such a sea of change.

⁸⁷ At the time of writing NAPA were being tasked by NOMS with producing a new Hostels Handbook- this is due sometime in 2008.

Despite the existence of the Hostel Pathfinder in this period relatively little attention appears to have been given to hostel practice and the contribution it may have been able to make in forming models of offender management and service delivery models. The prison population grew in this period (table1 - appendix 1) whilst the hostel population appears to have at best stagnated.

It was against the backdrop of these significant but at times for hostels, indirect changes, that the second phase of research began. The next chapter will explore what hostels have become in practice since 2002 and consider whether changes suggested in this and detected in the previous chapter have continued to shape their purposes. Whithead and Statham (2006: 234) assert that:

'Prior to 2001 it could be argued that probation had developed a distinctive culture, created over many decades through a shared set of beliefs, norms, values and attitudes....Whilst probation culture could not be defined in an unqualified homogeneous manner, there was enough of a shared perspective for people working within the organisation to be linked by some sense of common purpose.'

The next chapter and the concluding chapter will explore whether hostels have a common culture or whether within and between hostels a sense of common purpose is being transformed or lost. It will also consider the extent to which an increased focus on risk and public protection has shaped day to day practices with residents, possibly altering hostels rehabilitative potential.

Returning to the Field:

The Post Modern Hostel / Approved Premise

Chapter Eight:

The ethnographic work in this chapter afforded the author a unique opportunity to revisit 'Auldhouse' and 'Newhouse' and explore whether major shifts in policy outlined in the previous chapter had been operationalised in practice. At the outset of this study, the range and nature of changes that were to take place were unforeseen; however the desire to see whether hostels were changing had been explicit from the start.

This chapter presents the findings from the second phase of the ethnographic study. This research took place between September 2006 and March 2007. Themes in the earlier research (2002) included; the role of keywork(er), the training of staff, the ability of the hostel to enable change, the hostel as a mechanism for transition from chaos to stability, the role of space and time in differentiating transformative efficacy, a re-integrative environment, gender and mixed hostels and the internal regime and its relationship to 'community'. This chapter will report back on the extent to which the above areas have remained pertinent to hostel practice as well as exploring emerging areas of interest that are outlined over. The author also gained the consent of the Assistant Chief Officer (ACO) with responsibility for hostels to be interviewed at the end of this research period. Some of the material from that interview is incorporated into this chapter.

The profile of offenders in both hostels had changed from previously being a mix of bailees, licensees, probation orders and home leaves to being almost exclusively licensees and home leaves (Appendices 5). Both hostels had previously taken serious sex offenders however such residents were now the majority of residents and non sex offenders were aware of this.

The key themes explored in the previous chapter were followed up in interviews and observation, utilising the same ethnographic approaches as before, including semi structured interviews and informal participant observation. Given the media attention noted in chapter seven the author also remained alert to potential impact such attention may be having on hostel policy, staff and residents.

In following up Auldhouse and Newhouse four years later it was important to consider whether the initial findings and differences noted between the hostels may have been more to do with one being new and one being established, rather than any deliberate policy to shift hostels role and purpose. Moreover if hostels are becoming redefined in line with the changes outlined in the previous chapter one would expect to see the development of staffing, policy and day to day practices reflecting these changes, now evident in both hostels.

This chapter will consider whether the initial differences between the hostels that were detected were still evident. The concluding chapter will pull together the historical analysis of hostel's purposes identified in chapter two and the literature review with the contemporary findings presented in this chapter and chapter six.

Chapter seven outlined significant shifts in probation policy and practice that occurred between the two studies. This chapter seeks to explore the initial themes identified in the first phase of research and then consider whether the changes explored in chapter seven have impacted on the role and purpose of Auldhouse and Newhouse hostels. Did they still have a rehabilitative and re-integrative purpose? Had the broader policy and practice changes in Probation begun to impact on hostel's role and purpose e.g. had their transformative potential changed and did they capture the same clientele as before? Key to this will be a consideration as to whether risk continues to be defining principle in organising practice. Kemshall and Wood in Gelsthorpe and Morgan (Eds) (2007: 381) suggest that:

'By the close of the twentieth century risk had come to preoccupy much of the Probation Services' agenda.'

The chapter will conclude with an exploration of the extent to which it is reasonable to assert that a rehabilitative and re-integrative focus remains core to hostel practices. The tentative suggestions from chapter six will be revisited and a brief overview will be provided of views from other hostel managers and deputies not involved in the in depth ethnographic research. Key themes that were of interest from the previous chapter included:

- The extent to which residents and staff interact and whether there were variations in keywork contact.
- The extent to which there was a balance in keywork between care and control and supervision and surveillance.
- Whether any changes in style or approach could be detected in either regime and whether the privatisation of the cleaning and cooking contracts had impacted on the hostel regime
- Whether the morning meeting still had the same role.
- The extent to which there was evidence of constructive activity with residents that engaged them with life outside the hostel
- Whether gender differences were detectable in the mixed hostel.
- Whether rehabilitation and reintegration was core to hostel practices.
- The creation of an internal regime versus engagement with the 'community'.
- Whether hostels now understood rehabilitation as core to their engagement with all residents or one of a range of reasons for residence (CJA 1991, CJA 2003).

Before commencing an analysis I will provide a brief outline of my first impressions of returning to the field and restate some of the differences that were apparent in this phase of research around gaining consent and accessing information.

First Impressions on Return to the Field

Regaining access to the hostels was more complex and time consuming than had originally been the case. This may have been a reflection of a more coherent national service with greater levels of scrutiny for research projects but may also have reflected some concern and possibly paranoia around recent media attention to hostels. Requests for information were passed up the organisational chain and clear written undertakings had to be provided as to the security, safety and confidentiality of information accessed. This was of itself indicative of the fact that hostels were now much more strongly associated with the probation service as a whole and that the management of the wider service were more involved in scrutinising policy decisions surrounding hostels. Individual hostel managers appeared less autonomous. Residents were aware of media concerns and in 2007 regularly joked that I was really working undercover for Panorama.

On returning to the hostels I kept a diary of first impressions and observations on what had happened and how I felt afterwards. This was both helpful at the time in re-orientating me to the hostels and as the research progressed allowed me to reflect on whether initial feelings and perceptions were representative of the wider reality that the ethnographic study would seek to explore. It also allowed me to check out impressions formed from these two particular hostels with managers and deputies of other hostels not involved in the ethnographic research. I managed to discuss findings with a group of managers and deputies from 26 other hostels whilst presenting some research findings to them as part of a national training programme in March 2007 and in November 2007. I used these as opportunities to ascertain their views as to the role and purposes of their hostels. A survey questionnaire was constructed from the semi structured interview schedule used with managers and deputies in the ethnographic work. Just over a third of the twenty six staff returned written responses with permission to use these responses in this research; all took part in a discussion forum allowing me to record views and check out my research findings with them, noting responses on a flipchart as we went along.

Auldhouse felt different on arrival as internally there was a visible presence of cameras in all the rooms apart from the toilets and bedrooms. The monitoring equipment was visibly stacked in the front office but was not always being watched. As one keyworker noted their presence had become established but that did not necessarily mean they had to become central to practice:

'If the quality of the picture was better they would be more helpful...it's a good deterrent and I don't think it changes the relationship between staff and residents now... when it was first put in it caused problems and suspicion but that was only with that group, people who come here now just accept it's there'

Keyworker Auldhouse (2007)

The presence of cameras does not necessarily mean that staff either watch them or that they are useful. They appeared to be used when staff interviewed an offender they may be concerned about as a risk to staff, on one occasion I was asked to keep an eye on the cameras of someone in interview whilst the other staff saw a resident.

Staff were regularly discussing 'high risk offenders' and 'sex offenders'. Staff told me that senior management had wanted to keep me out of this hostel in the previous month or so and in light of recent press attention to hostels (News of the World) were wary of my presence.⁸⁸ A vocal member of staff was also apparently about to leave and my return was delayed until he had gone. The basic layout of the hostel and general protocols appeared to have remained the same.

Newhouse was very clean and tidy, everywhere had just been repainted. The layout remained the same as four years previously however there were no female residents. The basic staffing structure appeared to have remained the same apart from the introduction of double 'waking' cover at night and the

⁸⁸ Initial attempts to regain entry included the experience of 'start' dates being changed and renegotiated.

ending of 'sleep in' (all hostels experienced this as a result of the 2004 Approved Premises Resources Review). Every room apart from the toilets and bedrooms had a camera in the ceiling.

Both hostels had a less varied range of residents and appeared to be much less focused on either bail assessments or in holding probation / community rehabilitation orders with conditions of residence (Appendix 5.1).

Staff in Newhouse appeared to spend considerable time in the office 'watching the residents'. It felt as if there was less talk of helping people than before and more of a focus on enforcing licence conditions. Staff in both hostels reported a much larger sex offender population and noted that their occupancy was now being driven by residents defined MAPPAs level as opposed to needs or what rehabilitative potential the hostel might have for particular individuals.⁸⁹

In both hostels the catering and cleaning contracts had been privatised and there was a sense of staff working around this e.g. most of the staff were the same but were theoretically now externally supervised. In reality they made a point of still making use of the Manager and Deputy Manager. Supervision from the private contractor was reported as being less frequent than required at times.

'You can't separate staff out in a place like this, you need to stay as one team and know what is going on, you depend on each other.'

Staff Newhouse (2006)

Female Residents were no longer accepted in Newhouse with a rationale that the four female beds were rarely filled (see Appendix 5.1) and that being a mixed hostel was impacting on their occupancy rate in terms of which offenders they could take. That said the NPD (2004) policy directive and cuts

⁸⁹ PC 37/2005 directed hostels to take MAPPAs 3 cases and above. PC 19b/2004 acted as a forerunner to this.

in funding women in hostels noted in the last chapter appear to have been 'hidden drivers' in these changes.

In both Hostels staff discussed the News of the World Campaign against hostels (www.newsoftheworld.co.uk/2006) and perceived their hostels as being relatively lucky to have escaped the media gaze. Staff in both hostels reported stories of press stopping staff in the street and coming knocking at the door, asking if they had paedophiles there.

As McCulloch and Kelly (2007: 8) suggest it would appear that:

'...not only are those who work with sex offenders susceptible to media bias at a personal level, but ...the public institutions and practices within which workers operate are also influenced by the media, as is evident in the social and legislative agendas being pursued currently in the UK.'

As a result of media campaigns the Home Office issued Probation Circular 26 / 2006 ensuring the removal of sex offenders from some 12 hostels located within the vicinity of schools. The ACO felt that hostels received mixed messages about creating community links:

'Public perception of who we work with can create fear. We get mixed messages from the centre about local engagement. Our immediate neighbours are OK in Auldhouse, it's wider perceptions that can be a problem, New House is lower profile in the community.'

ACO Hostels (2007)

In my first return visit to Newhouse there appeared to be little informal interaction with residents. I decided that in both hostels I would pay attention to the nature and type of staff / resident contact that I would observe on my visits and consider whether the development of a surveillance culture was shaping staff / resident interactions. It may be that changes in hostel clientele and the discourses surrounding them are impacting on worker attitudes and approaches to their role and their relationships with residents.

In Auldhouse the 'friends' group were conspicuous by their absence and in both hostels it was apparent that the range of external 'constructive activities' e.g. walks, outward bounds, bike rides etc that staff involved residents in had all but ceased to take place. Therefore there was less opportunity to undertake informal observation and interaction with residents and staff outside of the formal hostel setting. As a result I increased the number of interviews conducted in both hostels and undertook to spend some more informal time in the hostel just being around staff and residents.

Staff related the loss of constructive activities to a range of factors but the most common explanation was 'risk management' and 'public protection' coupled with the make up of the resident group;

'The risk of the offenders is too dangerous to take them out...you can't take twenty sex offenders out and keep an eye on them all...'

Keyworker Auldhouse (2007)

In both hostels the managers and deputies had changed at least once, with more limited turnover amongst the other grades of staff. It may be that the influence of different 'wardens' would now also be working alongside wider policy changes (Sinclair 1971).

Mixed Hostels a Mechanism for Change?

Shortly before this phase of research commenced the last female resident left Newhouse. The manager there explained the change from a mixed to a single sex hostel:

'This changed as part of the resources review and was influenced by messages from NPD to move to single sex hostels. It was an ideal opportunity to get rid of them.'

Manager Newhouse (2007)

The ACO noted that there been a difference in the type of referral they were getting between male and female offenders:

'Women referrals were high need as opposed to high risk, we are not set up to deal with vulnerable women. I have misgivings about putting vulnerable women with serious male offenders, my instinct would be to provide protective accommodation ... the hostel couldn't provide for their needs, too few were high risk and isolation was an issue...mixed hostels are a nightmare.'

ACO Hostels (2007)

Given the findings of the last chapter, the decision to withdraw mixed sex hostels appears to make sense. Women offenders however appear to have shifted further to the margins of probation practice. Within the modern hostel story women's hostels have either been modelled on men's hostels or been created as adjuncts to them. The profile of the current male hostel population appears at sharp odds with that of the general female offending population.

If hostels can rehabilitate and reintegrate then a practical and moral question remains as to where and how women offenders who need halfway resources between custody and community get their needs met? Careless cited in Gorman et al (2006: 245) provides a useful exploration of what constructive work with women offenders may look like. Emphasising the fact that they are often women:

'... who have experienced abuse and domestic violence, who have turned to drug/ alcohol misuse and self harm and or crime as ways of 'blotting out' or 'coping' with their experience...'

Placing such women with predominantly male sex offenders and male violent offenders would appear at best counterproductive if not oppressive and potentially places such women at risk of further victimisation. The hostel estate appears to have narrowed the focus of its practice and to have moved

away from developing a woman friendly regime and a needs focussed approach. Worrall (1997) has argued against placing women in mixed hostels and HMIP inspections have likewise seen these as a less favourable option to women only hostels. However Barton (2005: 54) cautions against a rush to develop a series of women only hostels. She argues that:

'...many of the critical arguments made by feminist writers about the patriarchal feminising regimes and practice within custodial institutions can also be made of the supposedly 'empowering' probation hostel environment.'

Acknowledging the work of Wincup (1996), Barton (2005: 154) suggests that a more structural critique is required of current Home Office approaches to interventions with women offenders as these continue to focus for the most part on psychological 'programmes' which aim to correct women's faulty thinking. She suggests that there is a need to:

'question the popular notion that hostels are unproblematic institutions which have traditionally been accepted as positive environments simply because they are 'non custodial'

Barton (2005: 156)

This latter critique may be important to revisit in the conclusion with reference to male offenders too. One cannot presume that hostels are less damaging than custody. Worrall's (2002: 136) asserts that the probation service:

'has missed opportunities to remain a major player in the lives of women.'

However, the decreasing use of hostels for women offenders, could prove to be less of 'a missed opportunity for women if it excludes them from an increasingly risk driven regime that potentially ignores or misappropriates individual and gender differences. Moreover it remains to be seen whether the modern hostel can be defined as 'non custodial'.

Whether for the right or the wrong reasons, the HMIP (1998) recommendation that mixed hostels are not suitable for women appears to have now been recognised (Home Office, NPD 2004).

The Role and Focus of Keywork.

In both hostels keywork remained a key feature of hostel practice. Given the demise of constructive activities involving staff and residents co-working, keywork appeared as even more central to staff / resident interactions. Domains of offender engagement were becoming reduced to interactions within the hostel itself.

Staff saw keywork as a core part of hostel practice and getting to know and monitor the residents. All assistant managers (sometimes referred to as APSO's) were designated as keyworkers in both hostels. Neither Deputy Manager undertook keywork; both were involved in a monitoring of keywork role as had been the case in Newhouse in 2002. In both hostels there was a recognition that the frequency and quality of keywork could vary and some concern that the changed nature of residents meant that some staff were not equipped to do in depth work with residents.

'A lot of staff are set in their ways, are idle... will sleep at night. I need to develop new strategies and protocols to make things work. The regularity of keyworking needs monitoring...due to the nature of the offences the in depth work should be done by the case manager, the keyworker should look more at the social factors, employment and housing etc and link with the case manager. There is evidence of good work and handovers but lazy staff may not do the paperwork even when they are needed for suicide watch.'

Deputy Manager Newhouse (2006)

My role is not so hands on with offenders, my predecessor did a lot of hands on work with offenders... but that is not seen as my role.

Deputy Auldhouse (2007)

'I spend quite a lot of time with residents in an informal sense. I think it's crucial, we were under pressure to wear uniforms and I said no way. I encourage the staff to spend as much time out there as they can. All the staff are very approachable, but some spend more time with residents than others, I encourage them to do this. '

Manager Auldhouse (2007)

'I don't do any direct work with the residents. I don't go in there to the morning meetings, it's better not to go, if you are not seen you don't get asked questions. The keyworkers can deal with issues as well as I can. Because it's a community you are very much on display I would rather have time to consider and keep some mystique around the manager role for the residents.'

Manager Newhouse (2006)

If Sinclair (1971) and Fisher and Wilson (1982) were correct about the extent to which managers can influence and shape hostel practice then one might expect both hostels to have a different approach to engagement with residents as the former made a point of modelling this and the latter felt it important to remain removed from day to day interactions with residents. As a result the observation and just being in the hostel included a focus on how these stark differences between managers might be translated into staff practices.

'There is still keywork as before with each worker having a maximum of five residents each. The overarching responsibility is about level of risk and it worries me that keyworkers are not qualified PO's. Some have had training but we are working with high risk offenders. If PO's are on leave then Keyowrkers here can be left with the responsibility for the case. They end up

doing the National Standards contacts, but my staff are not qualified at PO level...its just taken for granted that they will do it. There should be a duty officer doing this.'

Manager Auldhouse (2007)

The ACO explained differences in approach between the two hostels too:

'The hostels have two ways of doing keywork; they are not structured in the same way. Newhouse work to headings, like Oasys (A Risk Focussed Tool) and check through things so there are differences in the depth of day to day recordings. Auldhouse works to themes. There is lots of evidence of good thought provoking work, making use of their knowledge of offender. In both it's scrutinised by the deputy.'

ACO Hostels (2007)

Some keyworkers had over 15 years experience in hostel roles and despite a lack of formal qualifications appeared to work well with residents and were honest and realistic about the extent to which personal differences had the potential to shape their practice.

'I'd like to think I treated everyone the same ...I wouldn't say I had favourites but someone who wants to work with you, you differentiate from someone who doesn't want to be here...My approach is PSM, run of the mill treat others as you would like to be treated yourself, communicate in a way people understand and empathise- it's about building up a therapeutic relationship and trust...showing empathy to good characteristics and moving away from them and us'⁹⁰

Keyworker Auldhouse (2006)

This keyworker supports the earlier suggestion that staff may well self select which residents they do which types of work with and re-iterates Hudson's (1981) suggestion that it may be useful to match staff to different needs.

⁹⁰ Pro Social Modelling – All staff had recently received training on this at this time.

'In keywork we work with the Probation Officer towards the supervision plan goals. We discuss what the PO expects and how best to achieve this. It's our job to support the officer and the resident. The work is time limited but the aim is to help them move on and change their behaviour and attitudes – you have your successes with some. You have to be aware though of residents trying to groom you, buying you little presents, giving you praise anything really , you get used to dealing with it you just make a point of sharing any gifts openly amongst everyone or putting them in a raffle for the residents.'

Keyworker Newhouse (2006)

Such staff were also aware of the potential shortcomings of differential and narrowly focused practice:

'We need to treat them fairly, we should have a consistency in our approach , that doesn't always happen though, when we move them on sometimes we set them up to fail as they don't get support afterwards from the agencies especially some of the sex offenders. If we don't do aftercare and follow up in the community this is poor risk management'.

Keyworker Newhouse (2006)

The extent to which keywork focused on move on, as well as actual residence in the hostel was an issue for some staff and all residents. Maguire (2007: 398-424) in Gelsthorpe and Morgan explores the concept of resettlement and throughcare in relation to the prison population, hostel residents would appear to require similar theoretical and practical attention and suffer from a similar lack of research into what works in this arena. What is of note is that hostel staff were now recognising a gap between the immediate purpose of the hostel and the more long term potential for re-integration. Such gaps were seen to equate with 'poor risk management' and not just poor support or aftercare.

Changes and Differences in Approach

'There are 5 APSO's here we all keywork residents, at the moment the numbers are low for me because we have had a lot of recalls. The Focus of key work is the same as before however the nature of the residents' means they are not so open to talk about issues, whether it's because the offences are sex offences...some feel they have done their time and don't want to listen. We drug test and breath test them now this is new. It depends on their offence history if we do this. The role of the hostel is still to rehabilitate though that has not changed so much but the hostel has in terms of the cameras and the feel of the place at times – there's an aura about some of them. But you still do the same work ...'

APSO Auldhouse (2006)

Long term staff such as the above, were able to hold rehabilitative and surveillance functions together, albeit they were experiencing some unease at the number and nature of the serious sex offenders they were now working with.

Residents were aware of differential approaches between staff and could readily identify which staff they saw as interested in them and which they saw as lazy or disinterested. It could be that more resident feedback forms or fora could help raise the standard of delivery to a more equal level for different residents.⁹¹

'I would change how some of the staff are with you. , make it a bit more forceful in terms of what they do for you. Some seem to want to do more than others but then don't make an argument for you or see it through – maybe they are told what to do and what not and are scared for their jobs..?'

Resident Auldhouse (2006)

⁹¹ PC 10/2007 appears to signal some recognition of the importance of such feedback in shaping services.

Some found spending time with some offenders more difficult than with others. The previous mix of residents may have made engagement with 'six or seven serious sex offenders doable' but it appeared more demanding for staff to maintain this within a hostel that was now predominantly high risk of harm cases. Residents regularly commented on whether or not they thought staff spent time with them and whether they were approachable.

'Since I have been here I have been off drink for 10 months...my keyworker has tried to help me find a house, only 28 but he has his head screwed on. I see him every week or two... I have been told off 4 times but not recalled, staff have been good to me – I can talk to any of the staff. '

Resident Auldhouse (2007)

The same resident suggested that receiving consistent keywork and clear and open messages about why he was being limited in his behaviour or rights could assist in enabling change and responsibility taking;

'Being here has helped me not re-offend, I used to look at girls...I don't look at them in a sexual way, I don't bother now...being denied access to my own children and having the controls have been good, I find it OK...I am not allowed on the computer or Internet, I'd like to talk to people more though, being here has made me think about what I did, it is boring though at the weekends – not much to do.'

Resident Auldhouse (2007)

Keywork alone was not seen as sufficient and many residents asked why there were not more constructive activities on offer particularly at the weekend. Housing mostly long term high risk residents could lead to hostels operating for relatively few people for a considerable period of time. Hostels could easily become blocked with such offenders if community resources are not in place to take them (see Appendix 5.1) For Auldhouse the average longest stay had moved up from 11.25 months in 2002 to nearly 17 months in 2007.

'We are looking to get more shorter stays and better move on...we mostly use the private rented sector but should get more from supporting people and local authorities....now that we are working with them more we would hope to see this improve.'

ACO Hostels (2007)

Residents could experience diminished external links as undermining their ability to re-integrate into the community;

'I see my keyworker once a week; she put me forward to an employment officer. I put myself on the level 3 maths course...my main concern is to find employment ...IT or anything really. I won't offend again – I did it whilst drunk (GBH) overall they are pretty good to me, they gave me a TV. It's quiet at night strictly no alcohol allowed. It would be good to have more of a scheme of activities, outdoor stuff and more to help you to get a job when you come out of prison. You should get more food and more help.'

Resident Auldhouse (2006)

Residents who had been in both hostels noted differences in approach and ethos.

'No one wants to be here – but it's a relaxed calm atmosphere, not on edge all the time, calm. I see my keyworker once a week without fail when he is on shift... Look at any problems, catch up, any concerns, worries or advice – I have had no referrals yet to outside agencies, I am awaiting a sex offence assessment, I need to see a clinical psychologist for counselling... the staff are fantastic no matter how busy they will come and talk to you or see you when finished more informal and different to Newhouse.'

Resident Auldhouse (2007)

Residents interpreted a surveillance focused approach that appeared to limit interaction to monitoring or instrumental intervention transactions as less

change focussed and as a result appeared to tell some staff less about themselves.

'When I was at Newhouse it was very different ,very much us and them, behind the screen, you had a keyworker but they were not interested...no time spent with us, if you mentioned issues they could come back to haunt you...so you said nothing...if you spoke out they accused you of being too rude or forthcoming in meetings...It does help you stop re-offending being here, you are reminded why you are here but the staff here notice if you are down or have problems and talk to you- they talk to each other. You get respect irrespective of your offences and past. I found that difficult after being at Newhouse... here they have been good enough to read my file and history and despite it all accept me. It would be in my best interests to stay here until I have completed SOTP.'

Resident Auldhouse (2007)

Enabling a caring role with serious offenders can be a challenge. A more surveillance and control focussed relationship that excludes human interest in the person appears to limit the individual's willingness to talk about their risk factors.

Auldhouse was by no means perfect and residents there noted differences too, often they wanted staff and researchers to acknowledge that developing relationships that disclose personal information is a risk for them.

'Some staff / keyworkers help you more than others; it's not fair some are really good you see them chasing things for others. Others just sit on their arses in the office drinking coffee. It has been good for me here, for the first time I haven't offended for 12 months, since being here it's made a difference. I don't generally talk to people apart form my keyworker – you are privileged! '

Resident Auldhouse (2006)

Staff and management may have been less aware that differential treatment might undermine change whilst consistent, fair and open practice whilst not resulting in immediate results does appear to make residents more receptive to feedback, willing to disclose personal information and potentially more reflective as to their own responsibility.

Don't get me wrong some of the staff here are really good, there are three here I would lay my life down for if anyone went for them, but there are others who...what can I say...I wouldn't do the same for. We should all be treated the same and get the same support...I had to sign during the day here when I first arrived but my keyworker and PO met after a few weeks and agreed I could go back to normal curfew – they showed me respect when I showed I could be trusted.'

Resident Auldhouse (2006)

Some staff had a very clear sense of how keywork should function and balanced care and control needs. This appeared to be mostly influenced by the messages they saw and heard from the manager and deputy and a mixture of their own length of experience under different managers and their own values and motivations.

'Keywork is about getting at the person behind the offence, find out how they got to be here- assist them with accommodation, employment, benefits, welfare , health / mental health – it needs to be a holistic approach at times some offence work – you need a sense of process and check out the regulation, attendance, conditions etc too...'

Keyworker Auldhouse (2006)

Other staff with less experience and who were more recently appointed appeared to have quite different views as to what keywork and their role with residents was for. This appeared to be influenced by what they thought the

manager expected and what wider messages they heard from the manager, deputy and other probation staff about their role;

'I think the keywork is good, its not in depth but about passing stuff on, they [residents] think they are getting friendly with you but they know the work really goes back to their PO. You get a feel for the residents you need to get a balance between watching them and seeing them informally... at the end of the day we are not their friends and we are here to do a job ... apart from keywork I have little other contact with the residents perhaps only 10 – 15 minutes twice a day...any more than that would blur the lines of the job...'

Keyworker Newhouse (2007)

There appeared to be a shift for some towards understanding their role as involving monitoring and surveillance but not intervention or spending time with residents. The extent to which there were differences between staff, in how important a belief in the ability of others to change was and the extent, to which they had a desire to be effective in enabling change, was stark!

'The balance between care and control varies from hostel to hostel, it should be more control in my eyes, that's why they are here for monitoring and managing the risk that's our job 'care' or 'assistance' is secondary and only once the risk has been addressed... I am not like some staff who see this as a kind of vocation thing, I won't get stressed out by the job or take stuff home, from where I come from it's a good wage for a job. I am not here to change the world...I don't spend much time with residents'

Keyworker Newhouse (2007)

As Hayles (2006: 67-68) notes the existence of a general 'fear culture' surrounding risk focussed practices may be undermining change focussed work;

'In this culture...optimism about the potential for offenders to change has been a major casualty. The trust that is required to give someone another chance is difficult to exercise in a climate in which the public's right to security is paramount....In such a context pessimism may seem a sensible precautionary principle.'

Cheliotis (2006) suggests that the impact of direct and indirect control mechanisms on new staff within the criminal justice system has the potential to alienate workers from colleagues, their labour and from themselves. Workers with experience of more constructive and change focussed interventions, in hostels or elsewhere, may be more able to resist a retreat to the extreme of purely control and surveillance focussed practice.

Practice approaches which fail to understand risk in its wider context may actually remove practice from those sites of engagement that would enable both more in depth risk management and a change focused practice. The human agency of worker and resident may be diminished in relationships which are driven by 'instrumentally rational' as opposed to 'value rational' approaches (Weber 1914). Hostel practice is experiencing the impact of 'new punitiveness' (Feeley and Simon 1994) and the fieldwork suggests that this is being mediated through the values, actions and beliefs of individual workers as well as the wider influence of legislation, practice guidance and the hostel manager. 'New Penology' appears not to account for the ability of staff, managers or others to shape their own practices.

Residents regularly reported whether they thought their keyworker and probation officer/ case manager believed in their ability to change or were supportive of them trying to change. Residents were both aware of and acutely interested in whether people thought they would change (this may be worthy of further study of its own),

'It's supposed to be the job of a probation officer to supervise and assist you, my PO has been telling people here I won't last a day, what sort of attitude or message is that? .. he is telling others I won't succeed , it feels like he is trying

to set me up ... I know he has told this to the staff here but do you know he has never bothered to come and see me here... I always have to go to his office in town.'

Resident Auldhouse (2007)

Links with the wider service and messages from that wider service have the power to influence resident's narratives and perhaps how hostel staff perceive residents. Residents within and between hostels could meet very different approaches.

'It's about working with the PO towards supervision plans, knowing what the PO expects and best to support the officer and resident, we work to move them on and change their attitudes and behaviour. Accommodation, move on, self harm are big issues for residents as well as basic skills – there are lots of people with 'special needs' too. It's busy but I enjoy it'

Keyworker Auldhouse (2007)

Messages of belief that one might change coupled with realistic boundaries appeared to be readily accepted if explained;

'Because of what I did... I have been locked up for 12 months. Being here will get me gradually into society... I don't think I really need it, it's a bit harsh my family know I won't offend again, they all know what I have done, gross indecency with a child...I understand why I am here and staff have explained it to me, they have to build up a trust in me, they say they want me to show that I won't reoffend ... it's not like being in prison here, they don't shout and force you, they call you by your proper name and ask you to do things, it puts you more at ease and makes you feel like a normal person again, not so nervous. I have to sign every two hours but they have explained that this will change slowly, they need to keep an eye on me until they know me and I show that I won't do what I did again..'

Resident Auldhouse (2007)

In both hostels there was evidence of staff who could work with offenders in a way which balanced care and control and who were keen to explore their approach. I was left feeling that many staff wanted and would have benefited from more frequent case discussions and reviews that explored their approaches.

'In keywork I look at their offending behaviour, accommodation, drugs, alcohol, lifestyle factors, their friendships etc. It changes the people who want to change, some need extra looking after and shouldn't be moved on until things are in place – you need to have good boundaries. We need to praise them more for what they are good at and play to their strengths, then work on their weaknesses- we can end up with more heads in computers and in the office than mingling with the residents – we need to do more with residents.'

Keyworker Newhouse (2007)

These insights came from an 'unqualified worker' who had worked in residential settings for 13 years and been in the care system as a child. A mixture of personal experience and an intuitive feel for 'what helps different people change' informed this reflexive and value rational approach.

The quality of keywork varied within and between hostels and the quality of links with the case managers influenced this too. Staff, residents and managers were implicitly aware of this. It would appear that unless a consistent approach or at least one that matches workers to residents (Hudson 1981) is developed regimes are less likely to be effective in engaging with their residents. Keywork could end up becoming disjointed from the wider supervision, support, challenge and resettlement of the offender and become a surveillance focussed activity that ignores the offender's social agency.

'The keywork system can be patchy. Some people are really good and would make great offender supervisors. Some of the offender managers in the field don't link with them enough...Some of our keyworkers are just not interested

and it's a job getting them to record stuff on CRAMS. When this place started it was allowed to develop as a hostel apart from the rest of the service. It is getting more integrated now with emails and CRAMS but officers need to come down here too.'

Manager Newhouse (2007)

Hostels provide an important domain for offenders to reconstruct desistance focussed narratives; core to this is relationship (Burnett and McNeil 2005). Some hostel staff evidenced much grounded expertise in creating relationships with complex offenders enabling domains for narratives that may promote alternative life scripts. Others either no longer see it as their role to engage in dialogue with offenders or appear to be receiving messages from the 'offender management model' that it is not their role to do 'the real work with offenders'. Further research may be required on how the offender management model is impacting on hostels.

Hostels may present what Goffman (1959) called 'front stage performances' through their literature, policies and Monday to Friday activities however some of the findings of this thesis suggest that there are not only 'back stage performances' but that the actors themselves may hear conflicting messages as to what the 'real' script is ! Governance of hostel policy and practice appears to involve a complex of differential staff approaches and values.

Buying in 'Care'?

In 2002 differences were noted between approaches that sought to bring services into the hostel and provide on site and those which came to the hostel but with a view to engaging residents in the wider community.

The CPN role was maintained at Auldhouse although the staff member had changed and Newhouse had not developed this type of resource. Although employed to meet the needs of the wider area the CPN identified a very specific hostel role;

'I act as a safety net for some here, providing informal counselling, advice, education about issues, support and monitoring. Some may not have people to talk to out of the hostel, its important for those who might self harm or consider suicide'

CPN Auldhouse (2007)

There was an explicit recognition that due to the nature of some of the residents' offences they may be less likely to have maintained familial ties or pro social friendships that could act as an external support.

'I work for the whole service see 170 – 180 people a year and am based here but usually have two to three people at a time in this hostel that I monitor and offer support to. It may mean an initial assessment and referral on to the Community Mental Health Team or Forensic Services. For the first time I have had to have a waiting list for referrals , currently three to four weeks.'

CPN Auldhouse (2007)

The CPN felt that she offered a service both internally to the residents, also making external links for them and more informally could act as a support to the hostel staff;

'Staff are very good and use the policy on self harm and do the proper checks at night and during the day. The challenge is getting people to ask for help and support. I help the resident to be more aware of their symptoms and stress and to take responsibility for checking themselves out and asking for help. Staff in the hostel will often ask for advice on someone they are working with.'

CPN Auldhouse (2007)

Staff and residents at Newhouse did not have the benefit of such a scheme and had to wait days or weeks for a community based CPN to visit the hostel.

Having staff in explicit 'caring roles' could have been helping to maintain an overall balance in the culture of the hostel and in staff and resident perspectives. That said such workers may experience isolation;

'I tend to have quite a bit of informal contact with residents, have a cigarette with them, spend some time with them, they always say who are you miss? I haven't gone to the morning meetings as I have been busy and never been asked....'

CPN Auldhouse (2007)

Both hostels also had staff from private companies who came in under contract from probation to provide literacy and numeracy 'classes'. These workers took an informal, semi structured approach, one 'encouraging' attendance with hot pasties proved very popular! All worked to engage the individuals and stated that unless the resident told them, they did not want to know what their offences were. If external referrals were being made they did link with and check out with keyworkers that these were appropriate. Opportunities appeared to be missed by some keyworkers to reinforce and promote residents interest in learning and development. Some staff would come into such sessions, ask residents how they were getting on or talk to them afterwards about what they had done. Other staff appeared to see such classes as separate from their role with the offender and never came into the informal classes. Surveillance and change focussed roles appeared separated for some.

Several of the 'non hostel staff' questioned why the service did not make greater use of volunteers;

'I only come here two days a week but at the weekends when there is nothing on, many of the lads would benefit from someone doing the literacy work or skills work with them. I don't know why they don't use volunteers here... it could be a way in for people who want to work in education or probation.'

Literacy Worker Auldhouse (2007)

External or skills based work now seemed to be the major source of 'caring' type interventions for some residents. It will be argued later that such splits may be counterproductive.

Domestic and Ancillary Staff

Chapter six identified the potential for housekeepers, administrative and ancillary staff to contribute to the overall rehabilitative and re-integrative potential of the hostel. The introduction of contracted out services for cooking, cleaning and repairs has impacted on hostels in unforeseen ways. The ACO noted:

'There have been issues...it's not been good for the local community as the hostel is no longer a place that provides this type of employment now. Due to the economies of scale and it being a national contract it's beyond our control, they bring in their staff and say where goods are bought.'

ACO Hostels (2007)

The retention of the previous staff group in these privatised roles has to date lessened the potential impact that such change have brought. However in terms of understanding the holistic nature of a regime and the need for a joined up, consistent and pro social approach with residents this is less assured than before and technically such staff should no longer be working with residents.

Breakfast was served buffet style with little or no interaction between staff and residents and resident and resident. A breakfast bar approach was evident in Newhouse. In Auldhouse the breakfast arrangements appeared to have more similarity to a roll top filing cabinet affording little opportunity for pro social modelling or staff / resident interactions.

Opportunities to teach basic life skills had been swept away with cooks and cleaners roles being officially separated from any notion of connection to wider regime purposes. Residents were banned from the kitchen and cleaners were limited in the cleaning materials they were allowed to give out.

All grades of staff were concerned to have clear support and management in their roles. However for ancillary staff training and support from manager and deputies (Worthington 1972) remained an issue, with evidence that such staff could feel unsupported and perhaps required more specialist supervision and support. Hostel managers too wanted supervision from those familiar with the territory on the ground.

'Initially I had supervision from an area manager; she was lovely but was an external appointment without a probation background. She didn't know about hostels and at first it was like the blind leading the blind...it was then changed and I am now supervised by an ACO with practice experience.'

Manager Auldhouse (2007)

Enabling Long Term Change

'In days gone by hostels were purely about successful reintegration with communities , that is still our aim and target, whether it's as implicit as enforcement or public protection I'm not sure. There is a massive public protection weight on us...there is a big burden of responsibility ...'

Manager Auldhouse (2007)

'Some you will never have an influence on, they are stuck in concrete but you have to have a belief that everyone can change, whilst knowing not all will – even if only 1 in 5 change it's good. Some come back with partners, wives, tell you they have jobs and let you know it worked...it's not the dumping ground some think it's a place to acclimatise from a secure rigid environment to a less

rigid one – like a bridge from prison to the community and a bridge from their old life to new...'

Keyworker Auldhouse (2006)

The balance between internal success for the hostel in terms of a successful completion and long term reintegration of residents and public protection was of interest to both staff and residents:

'When people leave I would like to see some kind of throughcare system ...if their keyworker kept in touch and reduced this gradually it may be better. We could be setting them up to fail if they go from 24 / 7 observation and support to zero contact with us and seeing their PO once a week or less...'

Keyworker (Auldhouse 2007)

Enabling long term change would appear to require hostels to become more connected to external resources and the wider service. Suggestions from hostel staff hint at an emerging frustration with narrow understandings of effectiveness, which equate success with the short term immediate protection of the public. Hostels are presented to the public (HMIP 1998 and HMIP 2007) as being effective with offenders whilst they are there. However the extent to which they enable long term resettlement and reintegration into non offending lives in the community remains unexplored. HMIP (2007: 44) identifies move on accommodation as problematic and earlier (ibid: 36) in relation to resettlement states that:

'One of the most constructive outcomes to a period of residence in a probation hostel is moving on to independent living or suitable accommodation'.

The remainder of this chapter will review what current hostel purposes are in practice. The previous chapter outlined, policy, legislative and contextual changes that impacted both directly and indirectly on hostels stated purposes since the last period of field work. This review will take account of the views

and experiences of staff, residents and managers as well as the author's observations of practice in action.

The Hostel as a Mechanism for enabling transition from Chaotic and Problematic Life Circumstances

A key issue for the modern hostel is the extent to which work to 'contain' residents whilst they are there impacts on the quality, content and scope of practice focused on enabling long term change and reintegration into society.

The first period of curfew was a bit strict, the staff are here to protect the public, you get some freedom here but you are not allowed to cook for yourself, they take a bit too much responsibility away from you. I just go out every day and am never here...I would like to talk to other addicts and help them, I'm a recovering addict and could help them see the mess it makes of you...I see my keyworker but he's not really useful. I find all the staff ok...you could do with more help filling in forms...'

Resident Newhouse (2006)

Residents can feel that the hostel takes away normal choices and responsibility in a way that potentially undermines resettlement afterwards. Those who had served long custodial sentences recognised benefits a hostel environment could provide but also had concrete suggestions as to how less directly risk focussed practice might enable rehabilitation too.

'This place does give you stepping stones back into society it's a safe haven from the mad lifestyle I had, I'd like to see things done as a unit... go out for a long walk or do stuff together going out – it would be good for orientating you back into society. We could do with more activities, walking, weights, a library, constructive things – help to learn how to do forms we need more stepping stones back into society'

Resident Auldhouse (2006)

Many more residents were 'post release' and had experience of a range of custodial settings and prison categories, with segregation between different types of offenders. These residents could be disappointed by the lack of opportunity for employment and constructive activities that enabled a shift from custody to community. The depletion in external constructive activities from the agenda of both hostels was stark and the lack of provision of such inputs was a regular feature of informal discussions between residents.

One worker noted;

'I have been here 9 months now and I don't think I have seen anyone get a job yet.'

Staff Newhouse (2007)

Some residents regarded the hostel as potentially more controlling than a category D prison and felt that the number of sex offenders made staff less focussed on finding people work in the community:

'I want to go to work, to have a move on plan. There is no incentive to work whilst you're here... I'd rather do another 5 months in prison. Like for like there is more freedom there, I am signing every 2 hours – how can I do anything...staff are Ok / polite. This breeds politeness, some make a point of coming and saying hello, others haven't spoken to me at all. I think it's taking the piss putting sex offenders and violent offenders together... it could be stigmatising'

Resident Newhouse (2006)

Serious offenders who had served long sentences and been in the public gaze could experience the hostel as a protective environment for them and were less concerned about controls and a lack of external links;

'I have been released from prison after serving ten years and in that time was allowed no visits out. The hostel has been good to me. It's let me acclimatise;

it's been a safe haven. You need to get used to the cost of living, how things have moved on in society , how you get a house... most people wont want to house me. There needs to be a balance though between what you did... and allowing you to move forward.'

Resident Newhouse (2007)

Such residents were also acute observers of staff dynamics and knew who they could manipulate and who they couldn't:

'The staff are reasonably approachable here... however there is infighting between the staff, lots of back bighting in front of residents – it undermines a united front. I get confused with the purpose of the hostel – the staff here are very much in the office, if you say anything they use it, I just don't trust some of them because of their position. Some of them will use their power just to make you wait for two minutes before you sign... however others will look into things for you ...'

Resident Newhouse (2007)

Staff were aware of differences in approach and ethos between themselves but did not appear to openly discuss these outside of the semi structured interviews. Differences in quality of supervision and support for residents from some staff were a source of irritation to both staff and residents:

'There is a lot of difference depending on which staff are on duty. Some residents have staff they won't talk to... some staff fob off resident's requests whilst other will do things and follow them up. It is really important that we explain things and give feedback to residents as to why we do or don't do stuff.'

Sessional Worker Newhouse (2007)

Interested by staff and residents comments about follow up I spent time in both hostel offices where residents would come with requests. Mostly residents were responded to and staff treated them with respect but on some

occasions they could be ignored or blatantly treated in an unprofessional manner.

One resident requested assistance in getting a letter from his file for someone to read to him as he needed to know what his position was with his housing application. He was told three times to come back later or see someone else and eventually gave up and never had the letter read to him that day. On other occasions I observed staff that would respond quickly and politely or arrange a time when they could see the resident. From Monday to Friday hostel offices and receptions could be very busy places however residents appeared to receive a differential service depending on who was on duty. It was difficult at times to remain in a researcher role and not offer to intervene.

The change in resident profile (Appendix 5.1) appears worthy of further exploration in terms of how it impacts on the nature of the regime and other residents. Younger non sex offenders in hostels could differentially experience a regime that now focussed mostly on older and serious sex offenders. Individual resident's responses to this could be surprising and some observations were concerning:

'I don't mind being here, glad that it's not mostly dickheads like in the YOI. Time in prison was very easy though, nine months went quickly ... coming out was like a big dream, there were cars shooting past all night, noise in the street and things happening... I don't care about the mix... that there aren't that many young people for me it means there is less bullying. Being here will be good for me it will mean I am in for 11.00pm and won't drink so much , all my troubles were at 2.00am coming home from pubs and clubs and fighting people.

Resident Auldhouse (2007, under 21)

However some sex offenders appeared to only use the communal area when younger residents were there playing pool. Although all the residents were adults over 18 years of age it felt uneasy knowing that an 18 or 19 year old

was in the hostel surrounded by sophisticated child sex offenders who were skilled at manipulating and befriending younger people.

Residents could target other residents younger or less sophisticated than them for friendships and encourage them to spend time with them. At times, having worked as a probation officer 10 years previously and having most of the offenders disclose their offences to me in interview, made for uncomfortable feelings as older or more devious offenders befriended other younger offenders. Current constructions of public protection appear to exclude risk to fellow residents (PC26/2006) as worthy of consideration.

Hostels appear to have rightfully questioned the prudence of mixing female offenders with sexual offenders, policy as yet has not recognised the vulnerability that age or intellect might mean for some male residents. Staff who did not want their details and possible hostel identified in this research implied that there had been at least one case of a male offender raping or abusing other younger male offenders. They assured me that the particular case had been reported to management but were not comfortable in revealing details of when this occurred as they felt that initial responses to their concerns had been poorly received.

If hostel populations continue to skew towards serious sex offenders, notions of risk in hostels should be more rigorously informed by a duty of care to assess the potential vulnerability of residents from one another. A major focus on managing high risk of harm cases now predominates in hostel purposes (PC 20/2004) with resettlement as a policy aim (HMIP 03/2005). A critical understanding of how different individuals e.g. young offenders, sex offenders, violent offenders etc may both, pose and simultaneously be at, high risk of harm is not sufficiently acknowledged in current policy. An oversimplification of risk of harm and offender categorisation may mean that hostels have a differential impact on residents as they engage with more control focussed mechanisms that keep residents separate from the wider community. Identification as high risk of harm has the potential to mean very different things and an exclusive focus on an oversimplified attempt to reduce

'risk to the public' may undermine resettlement and place some in vulnerable positions. Risk of harm does not preclude individual vulnerability.

Room for Differences and Splits

Chapter six suggested that a rehabilitative ethos was differentially present during the day, across the week and between the hostels. In considering the role of hostels today it is important to consider the extent to which such differentiation was now present for the hostels and whether the constructive activities, linking to the external world, that were evident in Auldhouse continued and were taken up by Newhouse.

The hostel managers seemed to have quite different levels of engagement with what happened in the hostels outside of the normal Monday to Friday hours:

'One of my biggest concerns, and it is now being resolved, is about having inexperienced staff on duty. It can still happen. I have argued with senior management that given the media spotlight we could not defend it if there was an issue here on the weekend with untrained staff on duty. On a Friday you can have an intake of new residents unknown to us and then have staff on who are untrained, If I'm on call I pop in and respond to any calls to come in quickly...'

Manager Auldhouse (2007)

This concern was evidenced in practice when I carried out some weekend visits to the hostels. Discussion with the relief staff revealed that she was a recently graduated student and knew relatively little about the hostel. She disclosed that as a relief worker she received no formal supervision and that being paired with a keyworker was seen as sufficient training and support.

'I had no real training for the role. I undertook two shadow shifts watching what staff do and then started work when they had shifts for me. I had a training session later when there was a big intake of relief staff – it gave me a

background on what hostels are, what the rules are and covered safety issues. ..It would be good to get feedback in this role as there is no real job description and it is hard to know if you are doing things right. I just see what the other staff do and follow them. I have no contact with the case managers or other agencies...I need more full time experience with probation, it's good working here it's interesting and keeps me going.'

Relief Staff Auldhouse (2007)

A Saturday morning in Auldhouse revealed a more laid back approach than that present during the week, with no morning meeting and fewer staff on duty. The same number of residents – up to 28 – could still be around but only one keyworker, a relief worker and the cook were present. It was quite easy for residents to sideline the most qualified member of staff for an interview or keywork session so that only a relief staff was left on duty on her own in the main hostel area whilst the cook was in the kitchen. Hostels remain potentially dangerous places to work and 'qualified' staff / resident ratios were low at weekends and evenings.

Newhouse had similar relief staff too but had also made use of qualified probation officers, trainees or PSO's as relief staff at the weekend. One relief staff, now a qualified PO, had commenced her career in Probation as hostel relief and continued with this at weekends as a way of making extra money. Staff were aware of a differential spread of knowledge and skills:

'It's mostly casual staff on the weekend; they lack experience and don't know how to respond. If you are on as a keyworker you need to be on the ball and make all the decisions. The person on call isn't always contactable.'

Keyworker Newhouse (2007)

The extent to which relief staff understood their role was very dependent on the explanation and induction they received, basic access to fob's (pass keys) and how they worked could shape practice:

'A while ago I didn't have a fob of my own here. It could be quite disempowering if you just sit in the office and sign people in and out. I wouldn't leave the office and other staff and residents probably thought I didn't want to talk to them or mix with them but if I went out I didn't know how to get back in without another member of staff being with me as I didn't have a fob. In the old hostel there was no office like this or fobs so you had no choice but to mingle, it was so small you needed to get up and move about. Since I have started sitting with the residents more they say I have changed... it's amazing how you just sitting in the office creates the impression that you want nothing to do with them. When I went in the residents' room they were amazed, I think they thought I was either scared of them or not interested...'⁹²

Relief Staff Newhouse (2007)

Residents noticed and commented to each other which staff 'mixed with them' and which didn't:

'X only ever comes into this room to smoke and then he's gone, you watch... unless he wants a fag break he doesn't talk to us or mix with us. He is only in here for himself not because he wants to talk to us.'

Resident Newhouse (2007)

Residents tended to see the weekend as 'their time' and could either enjoy the relaxed atmosphere or be bored by the lack of activities on offer.

It's very quiet here at night and at the weekends apart from the odd breach which is the only excitement....if people come in drunk or are abusive or come

⁹² Both hostels had areas that could only be accessed by staff; Auldhouse relied on sets of keys. Newhouse had electronic passes 'fobs' which allowed staff to move in and out of designated areas such as the office, interview rooms, kitchens and the manager's office. Without keys or a fob one could become stuck outside the office or unable to get back from one area to another.

in late they get breached, I had more to do in prison , the kitchens there kept me busy but you can't do that here...'

Resident Auldhouse (2006)

The hostels continued then to be very different places at different times of the day and week. Auldhouse had stopped its 'constructive activities programme' and Newhouse did the occasional trip depending on the motivation of one or two staff. Staff in Auldhouse informed me that prior to the current manager and deputy there had been a change of hostel staff since my last visit. Long serving staff were critical but anxious in exploring what happened in this period. It would appear that as Sinclair (1971) found the manager and deputy shape and influence a whole regime:

'The previous manager and deputy stopped the constructive activities, each of us used to have responsibility for an area; pool, quiz, garden, bike project etc...it helped model good behaviour. We used to arrange talks of different topics, health, diversity, race etc. They phased these out during that period. The hostel went through a bad period, we became enforcers in the office against the residents and they even stopped them having daily papers or pictures on their walls... they (manager and deputy) only lasted about 14 months though..'

Keyworker Auldhouse (2006)

Staff suggested that some managers understanding of how to work with risk had ignored the need to get alongside and understand residents as individuals. They suggested that it was still possible to balance care and control agenda:

'Hostels have had to be more high risk focused and have more restrictions, but you can do this in such a way that the resident doesn't know that the supervision or surveillance is being done to them... you need to do it but in a way that's not intrusive in their daily life...getting to know the person is vital.'

Morning Meetings

In both hostels the practice of having morning meetings on a weekday was in evidence. I attended several in both hostels and was either a passive observer or introduced to the resident group as a researcher who was interested in talking to them about their experiences in the hostel. The meetings had the same stated purposes of ensuring that all the residents were up, allocating domestic chores, and taking feedback on any issues that may have arisen as well as using it as an opportunity to remind residents of any meetings, appointments or court appearances that they might have.

In Newhouse the meeting took place in a room where the majority of people could not sit and see each other. The staff tended to run the meeting with very factual inputs and quite closed questions as to whether there were any problems or issues. The hostel manager delegated these meetings to the deputy and keyworkers and was absent from them. Staff and residents were visibly separate at different ends of the room and staff tended to remain standing throughout the meeting. This may have been due to a lack of chairs however the impression created was one of separation and instrumental engagement. The meeting was one of the few times that staff and residents were together as a group. The domestic staff though worked with residents to ensure cleaning tasks were completed. Residents were asked to make their meal choices for the day.

The meetings rarely lasted more than five minutes in Newhouse and there was little exchange between staff and residents. In both hostels I alternated spending time with the residents or the staff prior to the morning meeting. In both cases there was a sense of either staff being interested in what you were talking to the residents about or residents being interested in what you did with the staff before the meeting. Surveillance appeared to have become a two way dynamic that even a researcher could not escape being part of.

In Auldhouse the morning meetings followed a similar format but there was more likely to be the presence of the manager and or deputy as well as the keyworkers and domestic staff. There was an informal structure of staff taking it in turns to lead the meetings. There was more regular banter between staff and residents and basic problems around noise, cleanliness, food etc were raised by the residents and explored. Meetings could at times be brief as in Newhouse but crucially staff tended to mix with residents during the meetings and afterwards when they completed their chores.

There was a different atmosphere in both hostels in the morning and a sense of most staff retreating back to their domain in Newhouse once the formal meeting was complete. A key change that may have influenced interaction levels in the morning was that breakfast had in both hostels become a 'self service' breakfast bar affair with few residents sitting together in the dining room to eat. Staff no longer ate with residents at all. Moreover in delegating the morning meeting role out in Newhouse, the manager may have unwittingly given out the message that such meetings were unimportant and that time with all the residents wasn't important.

As Wincup (1997: 153) notes:

'...constructive relationships between staff and residents are essential to allow residents to discuss issues affecting their lives with staff.'

Individualised meal arrangements removed an important daily opportunity for staff and residents to interact and model basic skills and manners. More vulnerable residents with mental health problems or low IQ were less likely to be noticed if they were not eating or displaying paranoid type behaviour. Privatisation would appear to have unintended consequences on the interaction of staff and residents. A daily opportunity to influence socialisation on how to live with others, share a meal, talk, wash up appears to have been lost. Prior to the facilities contract some residents were routinely allowed to

help in the kitchens and assist with shopping. Albeit informal or a previously hidden element of the regime, once changed the differences were stark.

For staff morning meetings could mean facing tensions between staff and residents or tensions between residents. In both I observed complaints and arguments and in Auldhouse I observed one resident verbally and physically intimidating another at the end of the meeting in a way that suggested he was trying to position himself as 'not to be messed with'. Body language and seating arrangements were revealing of underlying discourse. In Newhouse there was one table around which only convicted child sex offenders sat. Staff never commented on this but residents did – there were at times awkward moments when residents shared their observations with me amongst other residents:

'It's not right having all these sex offenders here, people outside must think we are all like that.'

Resident Newshouse (2007)

In Newhouse a core group of 'sex offenders' appeared to 'own' a space in one room. Residents commented on this away from staff. In Auldhouse, a TV room appeared to form a similar function at different times of the day. Residents could group around very similar offence profiles and had the potential to spend long periods in these groups with little or no interaction from the staff. In the absence of regular interaction from staff the development of a self identity could be mediated through other similar offenders. As Wincup (1997: 157) notes:

'...being a resident leads to new issues in assigning self-identity.'

If staff routinely remove themselves from the sites of construction, the regime may be sanctioning a segregated identification between different offence categories reinforcing not challenging personal justifications and normalising sub group norms and values. Hostels have the capacity to reinforce particular types of offender identities as well as enable change.

Factors in Developing a Re-integrative Environment

Chapter six suggested that creating a broad context for change in the hostel related to three key dynamics:

- The belief by staff that offenders could change
- The development of a pro social context that supported integration in society.
- The provision of support in developing and transiting to a pro social lifestyle.

It would appear that some shifts in these dynamics can now be detected. New surveillance focused practices driven by an increased focus on sex offenders and risk averse practice may be overshadowing re-integrative focussed styles and skills.

Mc Culloch and Kelly (2007: 10) argue that changes to the legislative context for practice e.g. the Crime and Disorder Act (1998) and the Management of Offenders and Sentencing Bill (2005) exemplify real shifts providing for extended sentences, increased surveillance, electronic monitoring and polygraph tests:

'These introductions mark a clear shift in emphasis from treatment towards 'surveillance through contact', with any notion of therapeutic intervention being lost in the rush to produce defensive risk assessments and ever-new controls'

Enhanced 'curfews', i.e. periods of restriction of movements during the day coupled with repeated signing requirements, in some cases hourly, may mean that for some residents the hostel is becoming more of a semi penal institution, keeping them out of the community as opposed to resettling them in the community.

What may be of influence in how the wider service understands its role and purpose and in how hostels in particular engage with 'offenders' is the fact that the shift towards 'high risk' offenders and 'public protection' particularly surrounding 'sex offenders' is somewhat asynchronous to the dominant themes and paradigms that are associated with the history of probation in general (see Whithead and Statham (2006)) and the practices and purposes of hostels. Hostels have previously housed serious sexual and violent offenders (the research in 2002 evidenced this). However it is only recently (HO 37/2005) that their stated purposes align such work as its main focus.

McCulloch and Kelly (2007:17) deconstruct purely punitive and public protection focussed paradigms that restrict themselves to 'management' and 'monitoring' of convicted sex offenders. Hostels may be generally good at protecting the public during residence but there appears to be no evaluation of the impact of an increasingly surveillance focused practice on either recidivism or social integration.

Staff and keywork competencies need to reflect the clientele that hostels take and align themselves with the purpose(s) of hostels. The ascendancy of risk focussed practice, an increased focus on 'sex offenders' and Probation's wider desire to be seen to be 'effective' at such 'risk management' may be overly dominant in shaping practice and purpose :

'We get really serious cases here, sometimes we get sent people I have said no to. There is no acceptance from senior management, that there are some people hostels just can't deal with. They are some who are just too risky for staff and other residents'

Manager Auldhouse (2006)

Tensions were evident between practice which focussed on resettlement and reintegration and practice which was public protection focussed. These tensions could often ignore the wider reality that the control element of a licence was due to end relatively shortly.

For example one resident was stopped from playing in his band in case he drank alcohol. His offences were alcohol related but his licence had only seven months left:

'Ok they think I might drink when playing in a band but what's to stop me going around the corner and buying a drink now? I am more likely to drink because of boredom and I could end up losing my place in the band and money...they are only interested in getting me through the licence and out of the door. There's no thought about being tested or balanced over time. '

Resident Newhouse (2007)

Such approaches to practice differ markedly from work observed in 2002 when some staff and 'friends' supported a resident by going to events he played at and encouraging him to remain dry. Staff would no longer appear to see such practice as appropriate to their role. Some considered the need for less risk averse practice, suggesting that giving individuals measured responsibility could facilitate change:

'We need more of an overview of a plan towards change or freedom, If they are constantly tied down by conditions you are not really monitoring to see if they are changing their behaviour. The Hostel is not 'testing out' if change has occurred; it's more focussed on control and public safety. We pay attention to the triggers and lead up but we never sit down, have a really good team meeting and review the cases, we have the daily handover but not in depth. Things aren't always fully logged; we need to build up more of an overview.'

Sessional Staff Newhouse (2006)

Such sentiments iterate with Kemshall and Wood's (2007: 393) reflections on probation's work with high risk offenders suggesting practice:

'...requires a move from a 'zero risk' position to a position of acceptable risk, acknowledging that nothing is risk free and that the role of the Probation

Service is to work with manageable risks in the community, not to manage risks away.'

The concluding chapter will explore the extent to which apparently competing agenda's of care and control, surveillance and assistance, re-integration and public protection are necessarily juxtaposed against one another in theory or practice.

Bored men doing nothing?

An observable outcome of an increasingly risk focused practice is the extent to which it may in fact undermine possibilities for resident's rehabilitation and resettlement. The conclusion of this thesis will consider to what extent hostels can act as places of containment and still claim to be non custodial. One resident reported that he had to sign in seven times a day in addition to the normal curfew conditions. He understood that the nature of his offences may warrant a period of testing out but was unsure as to what his purpose was in the hostel if he could neither seek work nor undertake a course:

'You end up with a lot of time on your hands. There is nothing to do and nowhere to go – you can't really go out because you have got to be back in to sign every hour. They do some education but not much else – hostels should be about rehabilitation too, ok it's a form of punishment but a bit more trust could go hand in hand with the boundaries, they seem to want to punish you more...I've proved myself for 3 months now and stuck to the conditions, some people end up breaching because there is nothing to do... there is more in prison. If they just do punish, punish, punish it makes you angry and more likely to offen.'

Resident Newhouse (2007)

Staff were aware of the false environment that can be created by practice that focussed mostly on restricting people to the hostel and wondered about the long term resettlement of serious sex offenders:

'It's not a proper life getting your breakfast , sitting in front of the TV, playing pool being surrounded by other sex offenders...residents are still on a sentence here and should be more accountable for their time. We should have more staff to do things with them. Some of the offenders will never be accepted by the community , some probably need something like this long term... we need to do more with the residents....'

Keyworker Newhouse (2007)

Staff felt that having lots of sex offenders watching TV, smoking and chatting was not a constructive regime , however there appeared to be few ideas from staff as to what they should do with such residents and some tension that holding residents for a licence period may not be productive in the long term if external links are not made. If hostels are holding such residents for longer periods, indeed some voluntarily after their licence has expired, there is real potential for hostels to cease being mechanisms for integration into society and start to act as semi penal warehouses, allowing some offenders a restricted citizenship. Some staff felt strongly that more should be done on resettlement.

'We should concentrate on those who are more likely to reoffend , we should really look after them, make sure they get resettled , move them into a place gradually , get them sorted and give them a chance to settle in.'

Staff Newhouse (2007)

Staff recognised high risk and the need for public protection but implicitly suggested that the regimes focus was shifting to risk management of cases whilst they are there. Rehabilitative optimism amongst staff appeared to be becoming tempered by the type of recidivist sex offenders that they were sometimes required to work with:

'In some cases what we do here works, but there is a certain type of predatory sex offender that we won't stop. We can't change that mindset. I firmly believe that it's an illness and you'll never change it. ..We can monitor them but you'll never change them.'

Sessional Worker Newhouse (2007)

Staff tried to balance optimism and realism in their work, perhaps as much to hold on to valuing their own roles as residents' potential for change:

'The purpose of this place is to protect the public and rehabilitate the offenders, it acts as a buffer for these guys , a dual role, If what I say makes a resident think in one instance and holds him back from doing something then my time here is worthwhile...'

Sessional Staff Newhouse (2006)

It may become more difficult for staff to maintain such a balance in their outlook if hostels become exclusively populated by high risk recidivist offenders. A less polarised resident group could be important in enabling change focused approaches. A move towards a more long term 'holding' facility would signal a further shift of purpose and may attract different staff and lead to changed resident perspectives.

Residents appeared to hear mixed messages about the extent to which the hostel aims to reintegrate them into society or act as a cordon sanitaire between them and society:

'I have to sign every two hours seven times a day, it means I cannot work or go to my bible study group... I have a curfew from 12.00 – 4.00pm as well as the night curfew and am not allowed near Schools or Swimming Pools. My PO comes down once a week and tells me what I can and cannot do. I have no named keyworker here... I would rather get a job somewhere even around my curfew times. I worked before. I need help to get a flat and stay off the drink. This is like a jail but there you get given chances and can associate with people, get things sorted out, you have to be careful what you say to staff here, do what they say and don't argue , whilst you are here they are the ones in control of you. I am due back in society in four to six months time , my family support me and visit me...I suppose they do help you here and they don't, if you put a foot out of line they come down on you, they give with the one hand but take away with the other, there is no trust. '

Resident Newhouse (2006)

The 'due back in society' suggests that this resident saw himself as more half way out than half way in. The pervasive use of signing on a regular basis throughout the day as a control and monitoring mechanism was questioned by some staff.

'They can't get out of the building anyway without you letting them out, so if we sign them all in and out why do we need the signing, you can still have curfews and just say sorry you are not allowed out at this time....either we put sex offenders on an island and leave them there or we give them some way back into the community or else what can they do? They can't be watched for ever – we probably need more honesty and community awareness about how many sex offenders there are,,, if they can't go out is it a good thing to keep them in talking with all other sex offenders?'

Staff Newhouse (2007)

The practice of signing could be reconstructed by some staff as being in the offender's own interests. Practice which is surveillance orientated need not necessarily be de-humanising or disabling of the individual's social agency:

'Activity is good for their mental health and confidence, it develops their awareness of the local area and helps them feel useful until they can get a job or go on a programme... I know there have been a lot of problems for hostels recently in the media...but It would be nice if there was more staff on, some of the residents need more attention to take them places and get them more involved in recreational and practical activities otherwise you have a lot of bored men sitting about doing nothing which is not good!'

CPN Auldhouse (2007)

'They used to do more cycling and other activities , it feels like the bare minimum of staff are here when we are full...you could do with someone to take people out to appointments and focus more on the social and recreational side with residents... we have some vulnerable people here for whom volunteers would be really useful'

Staff Auldhouse (2007)

Hostels retreat from the public gaze and fear of adverse media attention may be limiting the scope for developing practice which combines surveillance and public protection with reintegrative work. The hostel manager in Auldhouse felt that the hostel performed a crucial role for the community and was unsure why the 'friends' had stopped meeting:

'The friends have not met for many months, the message on the grapevine was that people were concerned about the media attention and publicity and were trying to distance themselves from us. I am not sure what the group was/ It wasn't a community group in a real sense more magistrates and solicitors who didn't live in this area. The reality of what we are is removed from the

community. However being where we are makes a difference for the community. I cannot imagine that those in the immediate vicinity have any idea of the nature of the offenders here. But if we weren't here the residents would be out there unsupported and not supervised to the same extent.'

Manager Auldhouse (2007)

Hostels functions may be changing and becoming realigned with residents and practices that 'community' may not be inclined to engage with from a value rational standpoint.

Summary

The next chapter will discuss the overall conclusions of this thesis. Three key factors stand out from this immediate period of fieldwork:

- The ethnographic research and analysis of hard data on numbers and types of residents demonstrates that both hostels had and were changing. They had shifted in terms of the type of resident they took and at least in part in terms of how they understood their role and purpose. It could be argued that had this study taken place at any period in history change would have been detectable. Haxby (1978: 15) was cited in the introduction to this thesis as evidencing probation's almost perennial claim that it has never faced such dramatic change. The conclusion will consider whether the change detected may be seen as significantly different from previous changes that hostels have undergone.
- There is evidence that the policy and practice context summarised in the last chapter is now impacting directly on hostels. Hostels are part of probation's strategy for managing high risk of harm cases. Such a shift may indicate that their purpose is becoming redefined and remoulded into a form of 'new punitiveness' (Feeley and Simon 1994). The conclusion will consider whether a shift from transformation and rehabilitation to public protection and surveillance is either necessary or mutually exclusive.

- It is important to acknowledge that differences between the regimes may have been influenced by the existence of prior 'wavelengths' of practice and 'tradition' within the hostels. Newhouse was a purpose built hostel that commenced in 2002 and although some of the staff there had previously worked in hostels the Hostel itself was new and had no 'practice baggage' or preconceptions as to how the regime should be run. In contrast Auldhouse had been in existence since the late 1960s early 1970s and had more or less lived through all the various probation changes outlined in the literature review covering the accepted hostel story, i.e. from children homes, to bail hostel, to approved premises etc. Some staff had worked in Auldhouse for over 20 years and may have acted as links with a period of practice that was more rehabilitative and optimistic in its outlook.

The conclusion will also consider whether it make sense to see the post modern hostel as sharing a continuity of role and purpose with its predecessors. Are hostels now on the cusp of serving some new function or role in society?

There is some suggestion in this work that a commitment to enabling people to transfer to a restored or full citizenship status is at best contingent for some. The final chapter will also consider the extent to which it appears timely to:

'question the popular notion that hostels are unproblematic institutions which have traditionally been accepted as positive environments simply because they are 'non custodial'

Barton (2005: 156)

That is, for some residents might hostels present as a modified form of custody as opposed to a step towards community?

Greenhouses or Warehouses?

Chapter 9:

This thesis has explored the varying streams of influence and changing climatic factors (Sellin 1972) which have contributed to the shaping of mainstream contemporary hostel practice. Gertz (2000: 5) has argued that if one wants to understand something:

'...you should look in the first instance not at its theories or findings, and certainly not at what its apologists say about it; you should look at what the practitioners of it do.'

In seeking to develop a greater understanding of hostels, their practices and purposes, the author has looked not only at what its practitioners do but also at how their clientele experience this. Theory, policy and practice have been explored mapping out a broader hinterland from which to explore current practice and purposes.

Social policy, rehabilitative theory, research findings, exploration of new or 'discovered' practices and interventions hitherto ignored in the wider hostel story have been weaved together to provide a broad context from which to assess hostels current purpose(s). Together these have been located against 'thick description' (Gertz 1973) gained from ethnographic study. This concluding chapter will now pull together the findings from the thesis as a whole and consider:

- What have hostels been?
- What do they do today and how does this fit with their past?
- How they position themselves today in relation to rehabilitation and containment.
- What might their future(s) be?

The author will also suggest some theoretical and practice frameworks which may be of assistance to practitioners and policy makers in engaging with hostels' changed context.

What have hostels been?

This thesis has argued that the hostel story is much longer than has hitherto been argued. This history has always been there to be read but has been ignored or forgotten.⁹³ It has been argued that this history is both revealing of hostels' longer rehabilitative and re-integrative origins but also predates the more general probation history which has traditionally been located against the 1897 Probation of First Offenders Act or the 1907 Probation of Offenders Act. This thesis demonstrates that the location of hostels' origins against the backdrop of the 1969 Children and Young Person's Act is but one convenient point (Burnett and Eaton 2004) from which the hostel story can be told. Ignoring a much longer rehabilitative history risks losing a theoretical hinterland from which to understand and explore the contemporary hostel story and as will be argued later, may narrow debate as to what hostels future(s) may be.

Hostels may be seen to have two histories; the conventional story beginning in 1970, sitting for the most part to the side of mainstream probation but running alongside it and a longer history that initially predates the 'official' probation story which has the potential to inform and shape our notions of rehabilitation and resettlement.

By 'looking backwards to look forwards' (Barton 2005: 61) this thesis has established a broader theoretical and historical hinterland from which to understand and engage with hostels. Their roles and purposes developed over a longer timeframe than is usually argued (Burnett and Eaton 2004). This work demonstrates that until relatively recently core to hostel purposes has

⁹³ Much of this history is signposted in Social Work histories e.g Bosanquet 1914, Le Mesurier 1935, Young and Ashton 1967 it may be that probation's shift away from its social work roots and training has discouraged attention being paid to such roots and added to a potential shift towards punitive or 'corrective' discourses.

been a commitment to the rehabilitation and reintegration of the individual within society, the belief that individuals can change and the interplay of four key dimensions of practice:

- Provision of accommodation
- Training with a view to developing a constructive use of time
- Engagement in employment / labour as a means of re-engaging individuals in society.
- The gradual emergence of a 'science of change' i.e. that of bringing the individual:

'...under the right influences, and subjected to judicious control and training'

Carpenter (1968: 347-348)

In effect the articulation of this last area draws attention to the possible role and influence of individuals and regimes per se and the centrality of the influence of the individual in shaping and developing how the first three more established practices are variously implemented. Attention to this fourth dimension of practice has, over time, further developed a relational as opposed to an institutional approach to rehabilitating individuals i.e. it established the importance of interpersonal relationships as a mechanism for enabling offenders to develop new ways of behaving and relating. As Vanstone (2004: 157) notes of probation more generally, interest in enabling change in offenders as opposed to only imposing punishment on offenders:

'...developed as a result of reformist concerns about the impact of a harsh criminal justice system on the poor'

Like probation more generally the hostel story has been moulded by a minority of influential individuals, often but not exclusively from the upper echelons of society, convinced of both the practical and moral worth of their

endeavours to provide opportunities for change, growth and re-integration.⁹⁴ Common to the various approaches they have taken -; sailing ships, training schools, apprenticeships, ragged and industrial schools, homes and hostels - was the belief in the value and ability of their interventions and relationships with offenders to transform individuals and offer them a pathway of restoration and (re) integration into society as useful and productive citizens. This thesis encourages a critical remembering of that past (Ferguson 2007). Interventions were fallible and could be damaging. However ignoring the past risks narrowing the theoretical lens through which we understand the present and dimming the light that may be cast on hostels' future(s).

A key driver identified in the development of hostels has then been a general reaction against separation, transportation or punishment as an end in itself irrespective of its impact on the individual. Hostel or hostel like interventions emerged in the late 18th and early 19th century offering a new paradigm of treatment alongside punishment, locating the individual half way in society via their engagement in employment, apprenticed labour and or some kind of treatment or intervention. Re-integration emerged as a possibility against a discourse that had hitherto essentially seen offenders as other or a threat. At first individual employers and then the state began to own offenders rehabilitation and reintegration, albeit often as a source of profit. The approaches explored in hostels' history are united in their emerging shift towards seeing offenders as one of us, or at least as having the potential to be one of us. Hill (1883) and Carpenter's (1864) work exemplify the ability to work towards inclusion whilst offering boundaries and censure where appropriate.

As much as interest in rehabilitation and restoration informed hostels' early development, their purposes in the later half of the 20th and early 21st century have been surrounded by debates about the extent to which they should exercise care and or control (Hinton 1975, Fisher and Wilson 1982, Hudson 1981, Worrall and Hoy 2005, Wincup 1997, Barton 2005). More recently these

⁹⁴ Some of the key individuals in this story have been explored in this thesis; Hanaway, Hill and Carpenter,

debates have become articulated around discourses of enabling change and recognising the social agency of the individual (Maruna 2000) versus punishment and public protection (Nash 2006). This work suggests that a valuing of the practical and moral worth of hostels' caring and re-integrative role is diminishing.

This work has set the potential for apparently competing purposes for hostels (and probation more generally) against the backdrop of changing social policy and criminal justice contexts. Such contextual change is likely to be a constant in the hostel story, changes of purpose and core practices it will be argued are a matter of choice for policy makers and practitioners.

Exploration of more recent changes has witnessed shifts in policy and discourse from welfare orientated approaches towards more punitive and market driven practices. Movements away from segregation of offenders towards their normalisation (Worrall and Hoy 2005) into the community underpinned the early development of probation more generally and hostels in particular. The author has argued that a polarised understanding of concepts of care and control which mirror older debates around segregation, contamination and welfare orientated integration is both misleading and unhelpful to practice (Fisher and Wilson 1982). However these debates appear to be reappearing in policy and practice today.

It will be suggested later in this chapter that recent articulations of this bimodal debate of care versus control ignore the potential for a more complex and interdependent state of affairs, in part suggested by hostels' history and in part emerging from the ethnographic work in this thesis. A coincidentia oppositorum i.e. a unification of irreconcilables (Cheliotis 2006: 330) may be possible which recognises and values the apparently competing policy and practice aims of care versus control, welfare versus punishment, segregation versus integration and the needs of victims versus the needs of offenders. This research suggests that a juxtaposition of such policy and practice aims may be both unhelpful and undermining of each other.

In terms of what hostels have been table 3.1 outlined key features of hostel practice prior to the mid 1980's. 'Old Penology' with its individual welfare orientated approach predominated. Until relatively recently one could discern some key features of hostels' clientele, they were variously;

- a) at risk of criminality
- b) already offending or ex convicts
- c) related to offenders or ex convicts
- d) in need of moral guidance unless they offend

And relatively more recently;

- e) on bail

All of the above categories were seen as benefiting from their connection to the community in a hostel and in the latter case the wider criminal justice system benefited too by easing pressure on remand places in prisons.

Changes and Missed Opportunities?

This thesis argues that until the 1980s when an interest in their use for bailees developed, public policy thinking and policy making for hostels was mostly ad hoc and unconnected to probation and criminal justice's wider purposes and policy development. Their use for bailees signalled both a possible strategic use of hostels by policy makers, i.e. to assist in reducing pressure on the prison system, and a possible shift away from prior rehabilitative purposes. Until this juncture the re-socialisation of the individual was core to their purposes with the ultimate goal of resettling residents in society as useful and productive citizens. Hostels have for over two centuries been places of transition and resettlement. That is they have represented a foothold into society for the offender, they have allowed residents to experience being halfway in as opposed to halfway out of society. Hostels have to varying degrees recognised the social agency (Maruna 2000) of individual residents and sustained their selfhood 'as sacred rather than profane' (Braithwaite and Mugford 1994: 146). Offenders have been constructed as essentially

redeemable and the hostel has acted as a mechanism for facilitating the adaptation or re-scripting of previously corrupted narratives.

The social and political contexts that surrounded offenders may have changed but hostels intended purposes have centred on equipping individuals for a normal life in the community. Hostels, their managers and staff (Sinclair 1970, Hudson 1981, Wincup 2002) have been relatively invisible in wider probation policy. Their practices and critical exploration of their purpose(s) have also been relatively hidden or ignored (Home Office 1998) with the exception of HMIP (1993, 1998, 2007). Little was known about what staff did in hostels and the wider service appears to have had limited research, policy or practice interest in their use. Hostels have for the most part sat to one side of the wider probation story and their ethos has been largely guided by the staff who run and manage them.

This work has shown hostel development in the late 20th century to be haphazard and piecemeal. Exploration of this has revealed both missed opportunities and isolation, in policy and practice. A danger for this research has been to construct a more coherent narrative than the evidence permits. However core identifiable themes, patterns and purposes have emerged whilst noting the gaps, fragmentation and ambivalence surrounding them. These themes and patterns now appear to be changing.

In the last quarter of the 20th century policy and context shifts in the wider probation and public policy domain began to threaten hostels' rehabilitative purposes and challenge their isolation from the wider probation system. Some missed opportunities (Criminal Justice Bill 1938, 1948 Criminal Justice Act and the Morison Committee 1962) pre date this threatening of their purposes and could have resulted in their wider use. These missed opportunities may have seen hostels expanded and used alongside and as an alternative to custody. However initial attention and suggestions of expansion became lost in the events of the day or were overtaken by wider shifts in public and penal policy outlined in chapters three and seven that increasingly saw the welfare orientated role of hostels being sidelined within the criminal justice system.

Hostels have until recently for the most part been remarkably isolated from wider policy making, penal thinking and practice.

Renewed Policy Attention

More general shifts in probation policy that signalled a move away from a welfare orientated service noted in chapter four, signalled a move from a probation politic rooted in rehabilitative optimism towards a more managerial and bureaucratic approach (James and Raine 1998). Hostels did not begin to feel the impact of this on their rehabilitative purposes until the 1990's. The 1991 CJA may be seen as having sounded a warning bell to hostels prior welfare orientated purpose. However as Nellis (2002: 2) has argued surrounding more recent developments and changes in probation:

'... there is a bigger story going on here than just the demise of probation, than just political disillusionment with one agency.'

Hostels use for bail from the 1980s, although now diminishing is significant as this development marked their first use in the modern era as a strategic asset within the criminal justice system, paving the way for their use for purposes other than rehabilitation.⁹⁵ The 1991 CJA was to open up the possibility of their purposes becoming more punitive than integrative. Looking in to the system needs as opposed to out to the individual offender needs. The wider policy and legislative changes which made probation 'a punishment in the community' opened the legislative doorway to new punitive, surveillance orientated and restrictive purposes (CJA 2003) for probation more generally and hostels in particular.

The 1991 Act and the changes which followed saw probation becoming part of a more centrally controlled and managed service in which the influence of individual workers and thinkers was diminishing.

⁹⁵ See PC 33/2007 which signals a relocation of bail provision for those not at high risk outside the probation domain, in the private sector.

Factors which had shaped their relatively recent (post 1960) policy have been identified as:

- a) A rise in the adult prison population
- b) Concerns about specific social problems including homelessness and alcohol abuse
- c) Concerns about reintegrating those who have been in custody and may either be institutionalised and or pose a risk or re-offending.
- d) A growing realisation that casework alone could not deal with offenders' accommodation and support needs.

However with changes in probation's wider policy purpose (1991 CJA, CJA 2003, PC 37/2005, HMIP 2007) hostels had both begun to attract the attention of policy makers and the media. Chapter seven highlighted key shifts that had taken place in wider probation policy (Halliday 2001 and Carter 2003), legislation (CJA 2003) and its emerging re-definition of practices coming from NOMS and offender management (Grapes 2005). Specific shifts in stated policy purpose for hostels followed (PC 37/2005:1) and began to impact on hostels' role and purpose. This final chapter will now consider how these shifts are impacting in practice, from both staff and residents perspectives, and how this is impacting on what hostels do today. This will include consideration of their possible wider policy purpose(s) in the postmodern era, including managers and policy makers' perspectives. Hostels at the start of the 21st century appear to be moving away from their long re-integrative tradition.

What do hostels do today and how does this fit with their past?

The ethnographic work summarised in this thesis has been a core source of information as to what hostels do today. Gertz (2000: 20) notes three core dimensions to an ethnographer's work:

'He observes...he records...he analyzes...'

However from these three practices, he notes that a fourth dimension emerges and that is attention to the microscopic or generally hidden side of practice. This thesis offers a unique perspective on the current state of hostels policy, practice, staffing and residents from the inside. This section draws attention to that detail from the inside, the 'thick description' (Gertz 1973) looking at the attitudes, beliefs and behaviours of staff and residents. Consideration will now be given to how hostels may be changing and how the wider policy and discourse changes noted in this work may be impacting on relationships between staff and residents and residents and the 'outside world'. It will be important to reflect on evidence that the attitudes and beliefs of staff may be changing and consider whether this is impacting on staff / resident relationships and residents' perspectives and experiences of what a hostel is for.

Appendices (5.1) show that between 2002 and 2007 who hostels captured was changing. The ethnographic work evidenced a shift away from an old penology and welfare orientated approach (table 3.1) towards a more risk focussed practice approach (table 4.1). Hostels in 21st century are becoming more focussed on surveillance and public protection. This work argues that this new punitive approach is now being reflected in the policy and practice of the postmodern hostel. Such changes are impacting on staff and resident relationships.

Revised Policy, Purposes and Practices

The focus of hostel policy, having been pulled in from the margins of wider probation policy is now overtly risk and public protection focussed. The core purposes of hostels have been redefined (PC 15/2005). Such shifts have begun to impact on hostel staffing. As Nellis (2007: 3) notes of probation more generally:

'The political assault on probation is not unimportant, it has been real enough; government treated probation, like it treated doctors and teachers as a bastion of middle class professional self interest, too autonomous in its

judgements, too understandardised, too amenable to central control, too questioning of official policy...what was needed was a more diverse, segmented knowledge base... fewer of which needed to be 'professional' (university –educated) in the traditional sense'

One could argue that apart from the manager and deputy hostels never had a 'professionalised' workforce. The facilities contract, in policy and practice has however added to the potential fragmentation of the workforce of hostels and as reported in chapter eight has had unforeseen consequences on the rehabilitative potential of the hostel and diminished the opportunity of the hostel being seen as a source of local employment and trade. Opportunities for pro social modelling and life skills training are being lost:

'I used to have them in the kitchen with me or get them to help cleaning up. It was a chance to get to know them and see if they could cook for themselves before they left here. We can't do that now it's not our job. The facilities contract means that we are not supposed to do any direct work with the residents. The food is ordered in and you have no choice over the provider so you can't send the residents out to shop for food or stuff anymore...you still try and get to know them but it's not the same...'

Ancillary Worker (2007)

In theory at least, such staff are separate from the other hostel staff and not line managed as part of the hostel team. Privatisation has lead to fragmentation of hostel staffing and deconstructed the rehabilitative potential such staff and roles have to offer. By closing relationships with local suppliers this change has also removed one area of staffing and supply within hostels from the local community towards centralised provision. This work suggests that hostels can ill afford this shift and that if they are to maintain a re-integrative role they require as many positive relationships with their communities as possible.

Hostels' focus on offenders in the highest risk category of risk is likely to lead to more not less media and policy attention for hostels and hostel staff. More centralisation or privatisation may be on the horizon but more not less training would seem to be required for staff if hostels are adequately to perform a 'public protection' and resettlement role. Policy makers may wish to consider the impact of staffing and structural changes on the rehabilitative potency of the regime as a whole and on the hostel's relationship to the local community.

Shifts in both hostel specific policy and wider probation contexts outlined in this thesis do now appear to be impacting on what hostels are today. A risk averse approach evidenced in practice, demonstrates the very real possibility of the focus of policy, practice and discourse being drawn away from community integration and social inclusion. PC 15/2005 pulls hostels into the influence of wider punitive shifts making hostels places for 'those at high risk of harm'. Hostels are being redefined in terms of the risks they manage (new penology) as opposed to the changes and transformations they can enable (old penology). HMIP (2007) and the media frenzy which preceded this evidences hostel policy, purposes and clientele as now being very much in the public eye. Probation's response to this scrutiny (e.g. PC 26/2006) can be both knee jerk and at the mercy of national tabloid press attention. Hostels appropriation of high risk sex offenders may be pushing a shift towards new penology in un-intended ways.⁹⁶ As Worrall and Hoy (2005: 173) note of this group of offenders:

'...policies towards sex offenders are not based only on actuarial assessment but are overlaid with an accommodation of populist punitiveness that discredits and disregards any 'objective' risk assessment that does not accord with 'common sense' perceptions of danger.'

⁹⁶ It is important to note that not all residents were child sex offenders, however many more were than before and of those who were not most were now licencees on release from custody for serious offences of violence. There were very few bailees and the age profile of residents was increasing.

Although not all hostel residents are sex offenders, policy and media attention coupled with a 'dangerisation' (Douglas and Lianos 2002) of the professional dynamic surrounding this group appears to be impacting on how hostels construct their regimes today. This appears to be increasing the likelihood that hostels function as the type of institutions Worrall and Hoy (2005) predicate of such a dynamic, institutions which;

'...exercise ever greater control over social organisation and render it increasingly predictable and 'safe'... they demand social environments that are controlled but non judgemental...in short as many criminologists have pointed out, the search for causes and remedies has given way to the identification of risk and mechanisms for reducing or avoiding it.'

Worrall and Hoy (2005: 174)

If seen to its conclusion, such an approach would see a withdrawal of investment in the social capital of the individual and weakening of and shift away from rehabilitative and re-integrative practices with such 'risk groups'. Withdrawal from and an ignoring of hostels' prior re-integrative history and current potential is now a very real risk. Clear examples of withdrawal from re-integrative practice evidenced in this thesis include:

- a reduction in access to external activities for residents and the exclusion of community involvement
- the shift towards 'containing' residents in the hostel
- changes in some staff relationships with residents
- pressure on managers to avoid risk and their forced taking of residents on behalf of the wider risk management system.

Maguire and Kemshall (2004: 223) note the potential for variation in practice amongst those with a focus on public protection. Hostels now operate within a risk focussed context. This research demonstrates hostels' potential to engage with risk management in exclusionary and differential ways.

Reduced access to external activities for residents and the exclusion of community.

Probation now appears to have a more cautious and exclusionary relationship with its public. This does not bode well for residents' ability to settle in the community or for hostels and their staff to be seen as providing a resettlement function for citizens who have offended. Staff at all levels are unsure how to respond to a revised and more risk averse context and appear more likely to avoid community contact than engage with new challenges:

'We get very mixed messages about relations with the community from the centre...I am not too sure that the local community would want us to be involved with them if they knew the type of residents we have... it would only take one mistake to close a place like this...'

ACO Hostels (2007)

'The media attention meant that some of the solicitors, magistrates and others didn't want to risk having themselves associated with this place... It may be they thought it would reflect badly on them'

Manager Auldhouse (2007)

The media or rather fear of possible media attention was routinely cited as a reason for reducing contact with the external world:

*'The hostel has been relatively lucky with the News of the World, some of us got stopped by them in the street back in 2006, can you imagine if we were out with six or seven sex offenders and got stopped by the press...what we have to do hasn't changed so much, I still think we have to rehabilitate them but we don't do the things we did before... the bike project was stopped because of fear of bad publicity, sex offenders making bikes for kids...the managers don't want the press getting hold of that.'*⁹⁷

Staff Auldhouse (2007)

⁹⁷ This project involved no contact between offenders and children. The bikes were being sent abroad to both children and adults in Bosnia. A climate of fear can limit and shape practice.

Offender reports suggest an experience of a more internal and isolated dynamic as a hostel resident:

'This place should be a bit more based on trust...I have been here three months now and ok it's a form of punishment but where is the rehabilitation if you are stuck in all the time. It's not so much the staff it's the system ...staff seem to focus a lot on what will happen in the long term but not about what you need to do now. Because I have been in prison before I know about what a deterrent is but it feels like I'm stuck here for now I had more freedom in open prison.'

Resident Newhouse(2007)

Staff who had worked in hostels for a number of years expressed concern about the impact that *holding* residents within the hostel could have if this was not balanced with more happening in the hostel and some movement towards resettlement:

'We have four or five signing. I can see why ...but I am not sure it's effective long term. It can help with short term things, if it's a means to stop them travelling to certain places or being out at certain times but it's not always rational who gets it... we should be doing more with them to reduce re-offending, more offence focused work general things on drugs, alcohol and mental health... we don't do much it's terrible that just now all there is Fred the literacy worker once a week and the CPN, we can't keep them here forever !'

Staff Auldhouse (2007)

The strategic use of hostels to house and hold specific categories of offenders in relation to their risk is removing the discretion of hostel managers to accept or reject residents being placed with them. Conditions on offenders are now pre-imposed before arrival, by courts, prisons, supervising officers or MAPPA

allowing managers less flexibility in how they engage with individuals and how they shape and construct the hostel regime:

'Hostels can end up holding people while probation areas and officers argue over whose responsibility they are. The Police have too much of a say in these meetings and Probation Officers agree with them too much now in MAPPA. Case managers agree to signing conditions, sometimes hourly that means they are always in with us. There is a need for a more balanced approach that allows some testing out... for a lot of offenders the local area is not the community they will be returning to, we are holding them for other areas. If the PO there is making links and visiting that is fine, some do and are better than some local PO's ...to me though community is only important to the field PO in terms of protecting the public and not reintegration. Sometimes there is not a lot of thought about how they will eventually resettle in a new other community without the support they have had here...'

Manager Auldhouse (2006)

Hostels now appear to mirror an, at best, ambivalent relationship between policy makers, managers, practitioners and communities as to their role and relationship to 'offenders' and their resettlement in the community. The more residents are constructed as other and essentially different the easier it may become to create policies and practice which exclude them and move them out of the community. If hostels primarily become places of exclusion and separation then Feeley and Simon's (1994) warnings about the impact of new penology will indeed be further evidenced in this domain. Hostels appear to be operating more as places for temporary exclusion rather than phased inclusion. The potential for 'bedblocking' looms large if hostels continue to hold offenders for longer periods (Appendix 5.1) including some beyond the period of their licence or order.

The wider criminal justice system now appears to be using the hostel as a new form of control for those residents, mostly released from custody, perceived as being too risky to supervise in the community. The ethnographic work evidenced both changes in clientele (Table 5.1) and the potential for wholesale shifts in practice. Media attention and the fear of a 'serious further offence' featured high on managers' and deputies' concerns;

'We want to avoid press and publicity here. We don't want to draw attention to the place. Here we are out of the way and not too visible...we run a strict regime here far stricter than Auldhouse... It feels as if there is a media driven swing towards public protection and away from rehabilitation. The regime is a lot tighter than it was... it's easy though to talk up condition and control ...but long term what does it do. Though we need to be about defensible decisions now.'

Staff Newhouse (2006)

The 'holding' of residents was perceived as problematic and some residents now experienced the hostel as more restrictive than custody:

'There is hardly anything to do here unless you play pool or darts or like computers. We could do a lot more. No one seems to take responsibility for arranging stuff, we could do IT work or more skills stuff, help you get a job and prepare for living on your own. I worked for the post office before, some of us worked before we came here, I have no complaints about the food or the staff but it is a bit boring here, I want to do more to prepare for the future and get a flat. We seem to be stuck in a lot ...I am not sure how it's different from custody apart from the respect the staff give you.'

Resident Auldhouse(2007)

As well as being restrictive the emerging containment focus of the regime appeared to make more visible the differences between individual residents offence profiles, potentially and for some a cause for concern. The

mechanism of regular signing marked out residents from one another and made visible, within the hostel, concerns about the risks they presented:

'I find it quite stressful sharing with sex offenders. In prison you are segregated but here it's quite shocking you have to eat with them and live side by side with each other, you have to associate together...I'd rather do an extra five months in prison than be here, they are in your face all the time. You get to know who they are... it can't be easy for the staff.'

Resident Auldhouse (2006)

The development of constructive activities now appears limited to the individual risks that staff are willing to take or can justify. When these do occur some residents are now excluded from such activities on the basis of their risk status, or concerns about the press getting hold of such 'soft' work taking place with 'high risk' offenders. The creation of external links is further limited if the resident is due to be resettled out of area and is restricted in their ability to travel:

'Constructive activities are still encouraged but more on an individual level, for lots of them this is not the community they will re-settle in. A lot depends on who their officer is and whether they come and see them.'

Manager Auldhouse (2007)

Hostels are now less engaged in communities than before. The hostels explored in this work do not appear to have considered whether and how the re-integrative capital that such changes have lost can be replaced in meaningful ways. Hostels it would appear may end up holding lots of bored and 'risky' men doing nothing. What or who they are holding them for beyond their period of licence / residence is unclear. Presumably risk does not dissipate with the end of residence? Hostels could end up holding more residents for longer and longer periods, blocking their ability to provide either a rehabilitative or protective service for the system as a whole.

Changes in Staff – Resident Relationships

Differences in approach between staff evidenced in this work, demonstrate shifts in practice for some and differences between staff in their ability to negotiate and interpret hostels revised purposes in varying ways;

“Even if you are not a keyworker it’s your job to listen, assist and help as well as monitor and sit in the office. Some staff here are not willing to do that, whether it’s complacency or ability I don’t know... but I’m paid to be here and part of that means doing it to the best of your ability...some staff fob off residents requests...”

Staff Newhouse (2007)

Given that more residents are in the hostel more of the time it appears even more crucial that the staff – resident dynamic is a constructive one. This work suggests that this is not always the case:

‘What happens here depends on who is on duty and the balance of staff...it should be more about control in my eyes. That’s why we are here, monitoring and managing the risk is our job, care or assistance is secondary once the risk has been assessed as lower’

Staff Newhouse (2007)

This member of staff seemed to assume that by providing control and tight boundaries, being ready to breach and ensure compliance, somehow risk would reduce and then care or assistance could follow. Risk orientated practice has been juxtaposed by some staff with care and assistance. Surveillance and monitoring now appear as core to how they perceive their roles and relationships with residents.

'...leaving the hatch open like they do at Auldhouse ties up staff, if it is important it's ok having it open, but just to encourage them to stand there and talk about general stuff wastes time. It's a good job I'm not the manager there I would change that ! '

Deputy Manager Auldhouse (2006)

The 'hatch' was a closeable window that acted as a reception and access point to the office for residents in both hostels. Unless an interview was taking place or there was a case discussion this was nearly always open in Auldhouse. Managers and deputies who had spent time in either hostel were critical of each others approaches. Spending time in both hostel offices revealed a very different staff culture, although some staff in Newhouse readily opened the window when on duty if the manager or deputy were not about, likewise some staff in Auldhouse would close the hatch when managers were not about 'to get some peace'.

The fact that a growing proportion of hostel residents were child sex offenders appeared to be further shaping how staff understood and developed their relationships with residents. Variations and ambiguity in individual approaches were highlighted when staff talked about the mix of residents in the hostel and how this had changed:

'Ok there is a big change in the number of sex offenders...it's still just people to deal with. I think you need to take an approach that says it's just another offender...apart from when you come to managing the risk'.

Staff Newhouse (2007)

How managers were seen to respond to residents appeared to shape and influence staff responses. Actual modelling of desired behaviour with residents as well as clear messages appeared to work best:

'You need to build a rapport with the residents, if you don't do the bit in between drawing boundaries and offering planned support, it doesn't work. If we interact with the residents they pick it up...'

Manager Auldhouse (2007)

This manager was regularly present in staff and resident areas and interacted both informally and formally with them. The manager of Newhouse was supportive to staff and spent time with them and articulated what she wanted from staff:

'Some of the staff would work better as arts and crafts tutors and should do more with the residents, we should talk more about integration into the community and take people to see what's out there in the community...some staff are just not interested.'

Manager Newhouse (2007)

However this manager spent little time with residents in any informal sense and some staff mirrored this approach believing they too could *manage from a distance* and via formal interactions with residents. Individual staff would quietly question the nature of the regime and noted a shift towards a more surveillance focussed practice.⁹⁸

'Some residents say this is like a Cat D prison. The dynamics of the hostel change depending on the number of signings we have... if we had these before it never used to be so obvious. Now there are loads of these and it's very visible... it creates a message of surveillance... we never used to have so much of this... I think it's because of the media attention and they (management) are scared of missing something. If it feels intrusive for me in my work, you are always stopping on shift to do these, then how does it feel for the resident?'

Staff Newhouse (2007)

⁹⁸ 'Offender Management' as a distinct activity core to probation's new NOMS identity, appears as a risky concept if management excludes contact and interaction with offenders as human beings and social agents, focussing solely on 'risk management' The Offender Manager role may be a defining shift away from a relational approach to work with offenders. This is emerging area of discourse, policy and practice worthy of enquiry of its own.

The increased 'risk' profile of both hostels appears to have made staff and service managers more reluctant to offer support for activities that involve staff either taking offenders out into the community (as had still been the practice in Auldhouse in 2002) and to have discouraged managers from engaging local communities or community representatives in hostels.

On the surface it would appear that manager's anxiety about the social and perhaps moral unacceptability of some hostel residents to the wider community (and media) is having an impact. The ethnographic work revealed a very real fear by managers to neither be seen to be putting the community at risk nor to be seen as on the 'side of' such offenders. Such media driven fear, coupled with a distancing from the local community, mitigates against creating possible positive narratives of community re-integration and community involvement with these hostel residents.

The disbandment of the 'friends' of Auldhouse demonstrated a reciprocated uncertainty and anxiety about how to deal with media attention and how to negotiate being associated with a hostel that had large numbers of child sex offenders.

The demise of practices that took residents out into the community and the community, albeit symbolically via the 'friends', into the hostel reduces access to practices and relationships which may be constructed as enabling a gradual movement from restriction to freedom. Work or activity in the community has been core to hostel's history and to wider notions of re-integration. The bike rides, visits to leisure centres and encouragement to residents to integrate into the local community and make use of local facilities had all but disappeared in Auldhouse. Containment within the hostel as opposed to integration with the community has surfaced as a new dimension of practice. Development of practices linking residents to the local community in Newhouse is almost non-existent and limited to one or two activities arranged by individual staff on a rare and ad hoc basis. Such losses signal a reduction in the opportunity for 'managed re-entry' (Raynor and Robinson

2005: 152) and suggest that hostels may be becoming a form of 'waste management' as opposed to human recycling:

'...if they don't offend whilst they are here and we get them through their order the service is happy. Some end up staying longer now and beyond when their licence ends. It's not easy getting accommodation for some of these people, but they have got to live somewhere...'

Staff Auldhouse (2006)

Staff anxiety about developing resident links to the community appears fuelled by both their negative experience of the media campaigns and hearing that managers don't want them to take risks;

'We used to take them out on walks or to go shopping or even just to the local leisure centre. But with all the media attention we are not supposed to do that now. I am not sure it makes sense...when they leave they will be able to go where they want unless the police stop them but even then they can't be watched all the time. They need a more gradual move to being on their own...'

Staff Auldhouse (2006)

Shifts in practice are impacting on residents. Indicative of this change of approach is the use of the mechanism of regular signing. This was employed by staff with some residents and deliberately limited access to the outside world beyond normal curfew hours. Such management of offenders primarily in relation to their risk was perceived by some staff as of questionable long term value. Wincup (1997) stressed the importance of residents being able to build relationships with one another and staff which become sources of support. The mechanism of signing at the office hatch at regular periods makes some residents visible in ways that may be neither constructive in developing staff - resident or resident - resident relationships:

'...being a resident leads to new issues in assigning self identity...for some residents, the choice to keep themselves to themselves was a strategy to avoid tension and conflict.'

Wincup (1997: 157)

Signing makes some residents very visible and can encourage other residents to see them in particular ways:

'X has to sign at nine, lunchtime and three o'clock. I think, he is not allowed out either side of this for an hour... it doesn't take a genius to work out what he has done and what they (the staff) are worried about. But he gets out on the weekend anyway and there are loads of kids in the city centre then...'

Resident Newhouse (2006)

How staff responded to residents and shaped their interactions with them was very visible within the regime. As Sinclair (1970) found deputies and managers shape day to day practice with residents by modelling interactions with residents. Risk orientated practice and managers' concerns are now shaping the regime as a whole and not just the experience of those individual residents (predominantly child sex offenders) subjected to additional surveillance orientated approaches.⁹⁹ Some staff treated residents more as fellow human beings others were more instrumental and task(risk) focussed in their relationships.

X was made to stand and wait until exactly three o'clock before he signed. The staff wouldn't open the hatch until it was three o'clock by their clock. X stood about in front of the hatch with three staff in the office, no one saying anything to him and all the other residents in the main room watching him...

⁹⁹ At the time of writing a new circular has been released to hostels requiring them to demonstrate the provision of 21 hours of constructive activity a week for residents. PC ??/2007. This research suggests that hostels may find this a challenge and in the absence of clear policy messages as to what 'constructive' now means could easily end up seeing signing, enhanced curfews and other controlling mechanism as part of a constructive regime.

just waiting to sign his sheet. He was in the hostel and in full view on the cameras and couldn't leave anyway ...

Notes from the field Newhouse (January 2007)

Differences noted in this work between hostels appear to reflect the different approaches the two hostels managers modelled to staff. The Auldhouse manager spent much time being visible to residents and doing what Goffman (1968) would recognise as front stage performances. These seemed to encourage staff to move beyond purely surveillance orientated relationships. The manager of Newhouse whilst wanting staff to mix with the residents did not model this and wondered why some staff stayed stuck in the office:

'Some of them just sit there and don't mix, whilst others go out and talk to the residents...we need better staff in some cases who will work with the residents more.'

Manager Newhouse(2006)

It would appear that an active modelling is required by managers and deputies of the type of hostel dynamic they wish if this it to be heard and put into action by staff. Uncertainty or role confusion about how to work with an increasingly sex offender dominated hostel population as opposed to unwillingness to engage with residents per se may be a concern for staff. It also appears to shape residents' experiences of the hostel and can lead to segregated spaces between staff and residents and between difference categories of resident:

'They all sit there on the one table... you can tell who they are ...making there matchstick boxes and talking to each other. They don't come in here much and seem to sit by the tea and coffee all f.....g day some aren't allowed out...if I go in there they go quiet.'

Resident Newhouse(2006)

The profile of hostel populations was previously less polarised and more generic. Auldhouse had previously had a rule of thumb to have no more than one third of the resident population as child sex offenders. Due to its prior status as a mixed gender hostel Newhouse had previously limited the number of child sex offenders it took. For both hostels such residents now appeared to be in the majority. The balance of residents in a hostel appears to shape how staff and residents interact with one another and how the more general regime relates to the wider community. HMIP (2007) demonstrates the power the media can exercise in drawing attention to hostels and their changed resident profile. The growing focus on practices designed to 'hold' or 'contain' residents can mean that re-integrative approaches are not focussed on. Attention to residents' employment needs or their constructive use of time outside of the hostel now appears less central to some keyworker practice. Enabling transition to the community is becoming subverted by probation's promises to 'protect the public' (Nash 2006). It is now open to question how residents' experience of such restrictive and predominantly risk averse practice differs for some residents from being in an open prison. Moreover if externality i.e. links to and engagement with the wider community, is being deliberately blocked for some residents this signals an underlying shift in the mechanisms available to hostels and signals a core shift in ethos and purpose.

Hostel policy and practice now occupy a space which has the potential to see a shift away from core rehabilitative practices and almost exclusively focussed on short term risk management. As much as 'homicidal mania' legitimised the power of psychiatry and acclimatised its discourses of protective detention within mental health spheres (Foucault 2000: 185) risk and public protection now appear to be developing new controlling techniques for managing 'high risk' (sex) offenders in hostels. The cultural schemes and codes (Barthes in Cuff et al 1998: 224) of risk, public protection and containment appear poised to usurp the rehabilitative and welfare orientated content of hostels' earlier practice and purposes. What is actually done with some residents, apart from holding them in the hostel, is not apparent. Some staff no longer appear to see it as their job to develop meaningful relationships with offenders:

'...at the end of the day we are not their friends and we are here to do a job ... apart from keywork I have little other contact with the residents perhaps only 10 – 15 minutes twice a day...any more than that would blur the lines of the job...'

Keyworker Newhouse (2007)

A shift away from relational focussed practice may be undermining of effective risk assessment. This work has found that residents tend to readily identify those staff they believe are genuinely interested in them and communicate less with those they see as instrumental in their relationships with them. Moreover it may remove the opportunity for a change focussed practice which is narrative based if the room for discourse is further narrowed to risk and control focussed interactions.

If such a shift is to be avoided alternative approaches to practice now need to be developed in hostels that can challenge an emerging exclusionary ethos which places hostels as a mechanism between offenders and communities as a new form of cordon sanitaire. A range of personal, cultural and structural approaches to working with hostels' new resident populations is required if hostels are to be effective at realising an integration of risk and needs based approaches. For some it would appear that day to day communication with residents as fellow human beings, with an active social agency is becoming more problematic. In reality holding more residents in the hostel for longer periods shifts the staff – resident dynamic and ties staff up with more administrative processing of risk focussed practices as opposed to actual engagement with residents.

This signals a dramatic shift and may have unintended consequences for practice. An alternative approach would seek to maintain appropriate surveillance but balance this with a valuing of the individual's needs and social agency. A challenge to retaining hostels' rehabilitative potential is the

need for well trained and supported staff who are actively encouraged to spend time with residents and demonstrate a willingness to offer support as well as provide appropriate surveillance and sanction. There are real risks that the old that old dualisms of care vs control (Fisher and Wilson 1982) are being systematically being pushed towards control under the guise of a concern for public protection and risk reduction. At the time of this research some individual staff appeared able to influence or shape the extent to which this dominated their staff - resident relations. For others the discourse of public protection was shaping a more controlling practice.

How containment practices reduce risk beyond the period of residence is open to question. Keeping people in the hostels and monitoring their entry / egress in visible and ritualistic ways (signing) that mark out some residents from others suggests that for some residents, hostels are performing more of a containment than (re)integration function. Staff in Newhouse had from the start adopted 'uniforms' (standard issue coloured tops) that marked them out from the residents. Auldhouse has to date resisted this and staff continue to wear their own clothes. The manager and deputy of Newhouse did not wear these tops, signalling differentiation between staff and further marking out traditional institutional tendencies towards demarcation between staff grades and functions and between staff and 'inmates'.

'When I arrived here the service wanted me to get the staff to wear the same as in Newhouse. I resisted this and the staff were clear they didn't want it. People have come out of prison and when they arrive here as a resident and come through the door the last thing they want to see is another uniform... It's not good for the staff either if you do this, and can set them up to be seen as prison officers or glorified security guards...'

Manager Auldhouse (2006)

The separate provision of meals for staff and residents, a feature that emerged as a result of the facilities contract, marks out residents as people to be fed, as opposed to people to share a meal with.¹⁰⁰ Subtle and creeping signals of institutional differentiation between staff and residents and between emerging resident categories seem to be appearing. Hostels and policy makers have a choice over how far these shifts go.

The approach of the hostel manager and deputy has been shown to be key in shaping and communicating to staff how public protection and surveillance requirements are read in practice. The deputy at Auldhouse felt that hostels were at risk of losing their re-integrative focus:

'We need to be more balanced in showing a care element too via constructive activities. There is a danger that we will be seen as an open prison as opposed to a place of residence that offers enhanced supervision... the way 'public protection' is understood has done us no favours...it's understood too much by physical controls and measures. We need more of a balance...the threat of a serious further offence shapes everything...hostels could do with an independent monitoring board like in prisons... this would be good for residents and staff. It would be good to get an external view.'

Deputy Manager Auldhouse (2007)

The possibility of an independent monitoring body, separate from the service and hostel management may be worthy of further consideration and could offer staff reflection upon and a balance to internal drivers and concerns which lead to risk lead policy developments. Concern about the potential for risk based approaches to shape a more control orientated regime were apparent in both hostels. Some staff were concerned about the long term

¹⁰⁰ It was made clear to staff in both hostels by service management that the facilities' contract fee included meals for residents and that staff should not expect to have free meals at work. Staff are expected to bring in their own food or go out for their lunch break etc... this signals a shift away from the traditional hostel model.

impact of an increasingly restrictive and coercive reading of practice for both offenders and communities:

'It is easy for staff to talk up conditions and control... in the long term does this help the public...If the hostel removes people from society does it long term protect or rehabilitate? It's down to defensible decisions here a lot. There is a fear of lifting conditions, particularly on predatory paedophiles – we have to supervise this piece of their time on the inside... the shift from being supervised here to being relatively unsupervised or monitored when they leave is too much....only one resident has been employed since I worked here, I can't think of a sex offender whom we have helped get a job, we should be encouraging employment for them '

Staff Newhouse (2007)

This work evidences that some staff now interpret policy and practice through a coercive model (Kemshall and Wood 2007), if not believing it, at least feeling that the service or hostel managers now favour or require such an approach to demonstrate commitment to public protection. However as Vanstone (2004: 156) suggests:

'...the capacity of each individual practitioner to subvert the expectation of the organisation within which they work should not be underestimated.'

The differences between staff approaches uncovered shows that workers still hold considerable power as 'street level bureaucrats' (Lipsky 1980) to interpret, modify and subvert policy makers intentions. This subversion may act as a source of resistance to more punitive or exclusive practices or can disclose some hostel staff's ability to read surveillance and risk orientated policies as a reason to ignore or disengage from residents' social agency:

'We are not here to help or support them for it's own sake, we are here to protect the public and look at risk factors. We provide the police with lots of information in terms of containment and management. The hostel falls

somewhere between prison and release...it is difficult to get help in the community for some of them, because of their offences. The profile of hostels had changed completely we now do a different thing. They are given far too much freedom there should be a more robust schedule of activities'

Staff Newhouse (2006)

Residents' experience of the hostel as a place of containment, as opposed to a place for change was evidenced too;

'My friends and family have been a lifeline to me here. The signing and curfews stop you working and socialising. I thought I would come here from prison and get a job and start to get settled back into a life... I know I can't go back to my wife and kids but I thought I would have more contacts and support. You don't even get to make phone calls if you don't have the money...I don't really want to use this as a place to start a life from, I don't want to be just a number or paperwork for someone... If I get into a rut of feeling down and cut off it might change my opinion towards life and moving on, I don't want to end up being angry towards life again...I have come from a middle class life to this place and it feels like I am in limbo.'

Resident Auldhouse (2007)

External links with field probation officers appeared to be changing too with hostel staff suggesting that a small minority of officers now failed to see the hostel as place for reintegrating their offenders back into the community and more of a holding facility until their licences expired:

'Most of them are proactive still, you do get some now though we have to put pressure on. We have put eviction notices on residents before to get the probation officer to take note. It's like having to put a time-bomb under some of them to them to sort out accommodation.'

Keyworker Newhouse (2007)

'We need more of a two way balance with the service. When I arrived here I had to deal with six people who were still NFA (no fixed abode/ homeless) at their licence expiry date (LED). I had to keep five of them beyond their LED. Liaison between the wider service and the hostel is generally not good. It's down to individual officers. Some are great others we just don't see...'

Manager Newhouse (2007)

Hostels can be experienced as places where the wider service sends those 'high risk' offenders it is otherwise unsure how to manage in the community. Hostels appear to be functioning as a holding station for some offenders.

Holding Risks?

Hostels have shifted from a generic offender focus to in many cases housing or rather warehousing the 'excluded' offender as a result of their risk categorisation. That is hostels are shifting from a transformative focus towards a managerial processing of risks that individuals may present on release from custody. It is now emerging that policy makers and hostel managers will reduce residents access to resettlement and re-integrative focussed practices located in the community on the basis of their projected status as 'moral dirt' (Hughes 1974 and Ferguson 2007). That is re-integration is declining for those constructed as a potential source of contamination to an otherwise 'healthy community'.

As well as the implications this has for residents, a retreat from rehabilitation may now see a transfer of resources from activities that co-constructed rehabilitative opportunities in the community to more segregated and potentially 'private' spaces. If communities and policy makers believe that such 'protection' is in their long term interests voices of dissent may be few

and far between. Hostels today mirror well a wider emerging precautionary approach suggested by Nash (2006: 69):

'Criminal Justice Legislation ...appears to single out and isolate certain groups of offenders for special treatment, with common themes of restricted or non-release and intermediate detention...'

Hostel managers appear to be shaping their practices around the wider structural concerns of the service to act as a warehousing facility for groups of predominantly adult male child sex offenders and high risk of harm cases whom the wider system feels unease/ fear at reintegrating into the community. How hostel managers carry out this new protective role appears to continue to be shaped by their own values and beliefs, which have a determining effect on the overall ethos of the hostel regime (Sinclair 1971). What staff see and hear managers do does appear to impact on how they understand and interpret their practice roles.

If hostel practice fails to critically engage with their longer rehabilitative history, changed populations and the policy and media anxiety now surrounding them they may see both their purposes being transformed and their rehabilitative potential being lost. Whether hostels can resolve tensions between rehabilitation and containment for their resident population and the potential for moral panics (Cohen 1972) to shape policy, may be the deciding factor in whether they continue their history of rehabilitation and resettlement or become a new modified form of custody as a 21st century semi-penal institution (Barton 2005). Cheliotis (2006) suggests that to date new penology presents more as a useful lens through which changes in the criminal justice sphere may be explored;

'...its usefulness for now, is limited to that of mere hypothesis, or, at best, of a warning for the future.'

Cheliotis (2006: 314)

An exploration of hostels suggests new penology is poised to become more reality than rhetoric. The warnings about where such policy and practice may take hostels should be heard. Hostel purposes are in the process of being reframed in ways that are arguably neither useful to residents nor in the long term interests of society. This work suggests an alternative positioning of hostel policy and practice that can build on their rehabilitative tradition and recognise and engage with their new clientele. Hostels have and could continue to offer unique opportunities for desistance and change focussed practice. These aims need not be set against the interests of public protection or victims. To achieve this policy makers and hostel staff may need to negotiate more honest and skilful relationships with 'the public' (and media) and avoid hostels becoming limited to the status of a very blunt and short term public protection tool.

The current status of public policy in relation to hostels appears to be driven by a dual concern to manage their new population of predominantly high risk offenders and to avoid adverse media attention (e.g. Panorama 08.11.2006). One of the potential problems with such policy making is that it risks ignoring the rehabilitative and protective role that hostels have had and risks ignoring the potential for a practice which is both care and control focussed. Control it would appear can end up meaning containment without constructive activities and lots of offenders being around similar profile offenders just passing time. Control risks becoming an end in itself. Ethnographic work reveals the potential for current policy messages to be read in ways that meet stated surface policy purposes of control or public protection or to be operated by street level bureaucrats in ways that align with their own preferences or individual managers' interpretations. Policy which ignores the social agency of individual residents and ceases to value their potential to change may in fact undermine public protection and effective risk assessment.

As Nash (2006: 71) observes current rhetoric and legislation now appear to reflect a view that ;

'...gaps will be closed offering a notion that safety can be achieved. Treatment is also blamed for previous mistakes, being a 'flawed concept'. As a concept it will be redrafted to become a public protection intervention.'

New punitiveness appears as a real and substantial threat to the continued rehabilitative potential of the hostel. Surveillance focused practices, indicative of a risk averse policy making climate are further removing hostel's clientele from the community by overemphasising public protection as a one way process. Hostels are already being defined (PC 37/2005) in terms of their public protection role. This may now move to exclude a re-integrative focus.

This both risks constructing offenders as non citizens and as separate from community and posits hostels as warehouses for a new class of disowned and excluded residents. The development of a 'social apartheid' (Murray 2005) is emerging that not only reduces the possibility of re-integration but may undermine change focussed practices. Were this policy approach to continue unchecked, hostels may find themselves as part of a new hidden penalty, holding residents in semi penal institutions with little or no emphasis on re-integrative or rehabilitative aims.

How could Hostels Position Themselves In Relation to Rehabilitation and Containment?

Both in terms of policy (PC20/2004), stated purposes (PC37/2005) and practice, hostels' rehabilitative purposes and potential are now seen to be at best underplayed and at worst, at risk of becoming displaced by an exclusive and potentially skewed attention to risk as a stand alone dynamic. This thesis argues that it is unhelpful, in theory and practice, to conceive of risk or risk management as a dimension of hostel practice in isolation from rehabilitation. Hostels (and their residents) location in or link to real communities, affords opportunities for risk reduction and re-integrative practice. Any further separation in hostel's policy and practice of risk management from re-integration risks their becoming, temporary places of containment, holding 'risks' rather than working with residents. The role of hostels is now much

more aligned with probation's public protection role. However an exclusively surveillance and risk focussed practice may in the long term undermine public protection by holding individuals in relative isolation from the external world, allowing observation / surveillance in a false environment, thus disengaging residents from testing out or learning to engage with freedom and responsibility in reality.

'National Standards frameworks and structures can make it difficult to work with the chaotic and difficult ones. There is a real danger of creating a revolving door for residents. I think this group of resident are more likely to be recalled now because of their risk and links to MAPPA. Everyone is watching them closely...if they cough they are straight back in ...'

Staff Newhouse (2006)

Despite hostels stated central role in public protection (PC 37/2005) their real number and potential as a resource against an ever increasing prison population (table 1), is in fact shrinking. Government commitment to bail orientated hostels has for the most part been quietly but dramatically shifted away from the hostel domain (PC 33/2007), apart from public protection cases where there is a high risk of harm.

Raynor and Robinson (2005:28) have re-visited Garland's (2001) suggestion that a focus on public safety and public protection has shifted the rationale of rehabilitation from being for the benefit or restoration of the offender towards the benefit of the victim/ potential victim and or the wider community. The work reported here suggests that for hostels this shift in focus risks losing rehabilitation as an aim completely. This research evidences a shift towards a 'new penology' approach driven by a focus on public protection and a fear of adverse media attention. Hostels in the 21st century are reflecting the wider shifts that have impacted on probation more generally. Policy and practice risk juxtaposing rehabilitative and re-integrative practices against their public protection and offender monitoring credentials.

However this research suggests that where risks and needs are acknowledged as co-located in practice even for the high risk offender with restrictions being placed on them, hostels can offer rehabilitative potential:

'Some of the restrictions are bad...but you have to live with them anyway. Being here is the beginning... to change me. I am learning to be a bit more pragmatic and gregarious, more relaxed with myself and others...Being here is in part about stopping you offending and keeping you occupied, it gives you the opportunity to talk about your feelings and know how to respond and react to them... a big part for me is learning self control. If you don't or can't talk to these people (the staff) then you are going to re-offend.'

Resident Auldhouse (2007)

This resident reported a keyworker approach that was experienced as interested in him and not just his risk:

'X sees me once a week formally, more if I need to. He takes a holistic approach and covers a whole range of things from relationships to accommodation. He asks me what things I need help with. I want to get back to work but because of my health problems and offences this will be difficult. I need to sort out my life as it is now... get my accommodation sorted. I need to do CSOP (community sex offender programme) improve my English and Maths but my keyworker is sorting this for me with the literacy worker here...I have problems with communication but keywork is helping me with this. '

Resident Auldhouse (2007)

Although the resident was being made 'to sign' and having his movements restricted, he was having this explained to him and being informed why he could not go to certain places at set times. These restrictions were not enjoyed but they were understood and made part of a wider range of interactions between this resident, the hostel staff and accommodation and literacy workers. That is he was being treated as a whole and not just as a risk.

As he saw it *'despite what I have done they treat me as a person... that has surprised me...'* Respecting his social agency, despite of and explicitly acknowledging his offending history and real risks were seen by him to enable him to make choices about his future.

How staff interpret and engage with rehabilitation and containment was experienced by residents as an explicit message about how they were valued and whether there was hope that they may change:

'Being here supports you. I can talk to any member of staff. I see my keyworker a lot . If I need to ask him something I can. We play pool together and chat. Although I have to sign three times a day and can't go out much yet, it makes life smoother, he (keyworker) shows me my progress reports and tells me if he thinks there is a problem. At least I can go out sometimes and if I show I can be trusted they will reduce the curfew eventually. I was never a predator. I did it to my daughter and it was wrong I want to settle here way from my daughter and know that my risk is in relationships... I need help getting work now but my keyworker is going to help me with this and talk to my PO about what I could do'.

Resident Auldhouse (2007)

Maintaining hope for offenders appears core to desistance (Maruna 2000). However this hope needs to be both realistic of their potential risks and acknowledging of the very real harms they may have caused. The demise of such hope and moral commitment to enabling the possibility of change / transition would see a very real shift in hostel values.

This work demonstrates that some workers are able to balance surveillance, control and an interest in enabling the resident to make a new life, in spite of a hostile practice context. The overall balance and visibility of surveillance and welfare orientated practices in hostels shapes the regime as a whole and this work suggests it shapes individual resident's ability and willingness to explore their behaviour:

'I did five years inside for manslaughter and am on licence now, I was in the army before that. I have been here for three months now since I came out. I see my keyworker nearly every day if she is on shift. She makes sure I don't stay in my room and encourages me to talk to people and get out. I can't do much in two hours because of the signing restrictions, but she makes me go to the shop and do stuff. I feel supported here, they helped me get a GP, you can talk to any of the staff. They are a bit too keen though checking you for drugs and knives when you come in, smelling outside my room for drugs... I would rather have my own place and a job but they are straight with you here. I think the conditions and reports on me are fair...it's their job to supervise and assist you If they talk to you, you talk to them ... I have been in places where they ignore you or treat you like s—t it's not like that here.'

Resident Auldhouse (2007)

Chapters six and eight noted the importance of three core dynamics in rehabilitative regime:

- The belief by staff that offenders could change
- The development of a pro social context that supported integration in society.
- The provision of support in developing and transiting to a pro social lifestyle.

This work suggests that each of these dynamics is now under threat and requires the explicit attention of hostel managers, policy makers and practitioners if hostels re-integrative potential is to be maintained.

A way of doing this could be to extract what has been learned from hostels and probation's longer rehabilitative history and to explore this alongside its relatively more recent positioning as focussing on 'high risk offenders'. In deed setting side by side old and new penology approaches and exploring these in light of the evidence of this thesis and wider rehabilitative theory

suggests an alternative penology may be open to policy makers, practitioners and managers that sees hostels become more than just warehouses and perhaps more dynamic and creative than greenhouses. Table 9.1 over outlines a suggested 'alternative penology' approach.

Core to this would be a discernible set of worker skills, worker-resident relationships and regimes that would both recognise the need to offer public protection and engage with and support the resident's hope of re-integration and transformation. Drawing on the work in this thesis and Porporino and Fabiano's (2007) 'blend of styles and skills' an alternative approach would require:

- A Regime and staffing that showed sensitivity and understanding of resident's perspectives
- An ability to negotiate participation with residents
- An understanding of how and why residents may engage with interventions
- Staff training in specific sex offender and serious violent offender issues.
- A regime which encouraged residents to think through and articulate their reasons for action
- Regular consistent advice via keywork and offender management that works with where residents are at and draws and explains appropriate boundaries and sanctions
- Trained and committed staff who are able to talk about, explore and assist transition to non-offending identities making use of appropriate community and personal resources
- Staff who come across as genuinely interested and committed to residents' change
- A regime which promotes appropriate individual responsibility, encouraging residents to become active social agents in their lives, developing non offending activities and interests

- Staff recognition of risk factors, support in this and explicit discussion of these with residents and where appropriate MAPPA
- Re-introducing pro social work for residents that allows them to experience being active social agents benefiting others
- Pro social use of monitoring, surveillance and appropriate restriction of liberty

By revisiting the focus, themes and practices previously associated with hostels and outlined in this thesis and by considering how these might relate to a new revised role for hostels one can map a new set of desired relationships between staff and residents and hostels and the community, suggesting a role for hostel that both recognises care and control functions but neither subverts one to the other.

Table 9.1 offers a suggested 'new penology' approach that could inform an alternative future for hostels.

| Model | Old Penology | New Penology | Alternative Penology |
|-----------------------|---|--|---|
| Focus | Individuals Guilt / Responsibility Diagnosis Treatment | Managing Groups Risk Identification Risk Classification Risk Reduction | Individual and Community Risk and Needs Analysis Intervention and Integration Risk Reduction / Harm Reduction |
| Themes | Transformation of the Individual Change | Managing Risk Protecting the Public | Risk of Harm / Reintegration Change Focused / Public Accountability |
| Practices | Rehabilitative Programmes Needs Based Work Preparation for Freedom Welfare Therapy | Actuarial Profiling Preventative / Pre-emptive Incapacitation Programmes Case Management | Planned Re-integration Skills Focused Rehabilitation Risk Aware Multi Agency Offender Supervision / Keywork After Care Focused Risk Management including 'offender'. |
| Workers | Relative Independence Professional Discretion Welfare / Change Orientated Positivist Outlook To the Side of Mainstream Practice | Monitoring / Managing Prescribed Practice Administration/ Classification Monitored Centrally Defined Purposes | Co working with others Change Focussed Practice Case Supervision / Management Keywork Defined and Regulated Community Links Critical Realist Outlook Trained and Supported. |
| Role of Institution | Rehabilitation Care / Control Assistance Reintegration / Resettlement | Punishment Change/ Control Public Protection Safeguarding The Community | Assist, Change, Instrumental Control , Monitor, Responsibility and Reintegrate Protect the Public, Protective Regime. |
| Status of Individuals | Client Rehabilitated / Recidivist In Need of Help, Support and Direction Possibly Homeless or Alcohol Problems Released from Prison or... On Probation | Offender Possible Risk / Danger In need of Monitoring Subject to Punishment and Control | Active Social Agent Responsible for Future Identity Social Capital To be monitored and worked with. |
| Community | As Capital (Spencer and Deakin 2004) | As Public Voice (James and Raine 1998) | Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft. Resource and Customer. Victim and Locale / Domain Protected within limits and 'responsibilised'. |

Hostels – Back to the Future?

This work outlines key themes and practices that suggest the possibility of an alternative future for hostels. Core to this needs to be a greater level of honesty with the public about what hostels do and what they cannot promise. For probation to achieve this policy makers and politicians need to stop boasting of custodial growth and punitiveness as if something great has been achieved:

' A Home Office spokesman said that the department had delivered 20,000 more prison places'

BBC News (16.02.2007)

Reconsideration is required of the moral and practical worth of hostels' longer rehabilitative roots. This may be difficult in a context in which government appears poised to embark on a further process of prison building, expanding HMP Belmarsh and building on the old Ashworth Hospital site (John Reid BBC News 16.02.2007). A further eight thousand places are planned by 2012. By comparison hostels are a diminishing resource and may be becoming constructed as an adjunct to a community prison estate (Halliday 2001) for certain 'risk categories'.

This work shows that hostels are on the cusp of being swept along by an exclusively risk and surveillance orientated approach premised on an apparently morally laudable concern to protect the public and vulnerable victims in particular. Their current clientele, with easy reference points to vulnerable victims, a hostile media and offenders conveniently constructed as other, potentially undermines probation energy to make public calls for a need for solidarity with offenders' basic humanity. Stranger danger has always facilitated a more comfortable critique than attention to the general prevalence of sex offending as a familial or community problem. Hostels' inclusion in wider probation policy has witnessed a shift in their status and function. That is, from apparently being 'on the side of the offender' i.e. working to enable

their rehabilitation and transformation to being 'on the side of the community' i.e. working to protect them from the potential risk their residents pose.

This work suggests that an exclusive focus on hostels' necessary protective and surveillance orientated aims, given hostels' new resident profile, risks eroding attention to issues of social justice, the welfare of the individual resident and re-integrative focussed practice. It also conveniently and comfortably constructs such offenders as essentially other. Such a shift appears both theoretically and practically, to risk closing down resident's openness and transparency with staff and undermines realistic monitoring of their behaviour in the community. As Barton (2005: 157) warned of hostels for women, we can no longer assume that hostels are a 'moral good' or better than custody... *'these institutions must not be uncritically accepted as salutary, unproblematic environments.'* Indeed hostels today risk providing both a false promise to their would be residents, who expect resettlement and to a public which expect guarantees of safety. As Burnett (2005: 7) notes of the role of rehabilitation and reintegration in modern hostel policy:

'These aspects have a very low profile. This is likely to be demoralising for staff working closely with offenders, and may ultimately detract from efforts to build up public confidence in the value of approved premises.'

This work suggests the possibility of an alternative and arguably more hopeful future for hostels. A possible future, suggested by the ethnographic work in this thesis and the theorising that has come from engaging with this. Such theorising on wider rehabilitative possibilities and historical perspectives has in part been suggested by residents and staff themselves. Hostels and policy makers have a choice to either recognise hostels' longer rehabilitative roots and engage with the new challenges of humane treatment and re-integration, or to abandon messages of change, hope and transition and become yet another part of a seemingly ever expanding surveillance and containment system.

Hostels in their current formations present as potentially problematic institutions enforcing levels of segregation and restriction, hitherto unseen in the community justice approach. Their status as non custodial environments where transition and change are enabled is now threatened. A new social apartheid (Murray 2005) between offenders and wider society may beckon. Clinton (1996) stated that *'it takes a village to raise a child'* what appears to be becoming increasingly less palatable as a notion is that serious violent and or sexual offenders are in anyway part of the wider community's responsibility or making. Offenders are not us or ours, seems to be the underlying policy message. Probation, policy makers and sections of the media appear to have facilitated the disassociation between communities and their offenders. Hostels have traditionally worked to reinforce and reconstruct this bond in positive and mutually beneficial ways. 'High risk' and 'sex' offenders can make for uncomfortable association and identification. The role of identification with residents and the traditional solidarity hostels have created between staff and residents appears to be being cast aside. It remains to be seen what the wider implications of this will be for society and the criminal justice system. Hostels practices and policy now risk treating their offenders:

*'as the moral dirt of a social order determined to prove its purity'*¹⁰¹

Ferguson (2007: 1)

This work suggest that hostels need not end up being yet another penal cul de sac, however it cautions against the assumption the hostel story will of itself end with a happy ending worked out on the back of:

¹⁰¹ Although Ferguson (2007) uses the term to highlight how children of industrial and reformatory schools were treated by the Irish care system, the concept transfers as well to those working with abusers as it did those working with the abused. The origins of this concept appear to relate to Hughes (1974) post war visits to German WWII concentration camps and interviews with those who worked in them, their families and those living in their vicinity.

'Our belief that reason, justice, sciences and human nature will ultimately prevail, we assure ourselves'

Pratt (2002: 192)

Pratt cautions against ignoring the 'dark side' of our ability to treat people in harmful ways. By drawing attention to hostels' risk of now swinging away from their rehabilitative and re-integrative past, this work hopes to draw policy makers and practitioner's attention to what is happening and what could be possible and suggests constructive ways of engaging with hostels' current context. This work argues that an alternative penology (table 9.1) is possible. A practice which both retains hostels' longer rehabilitative and re-integrative past neither excludes nor undermines hostels' potential to engage with public protection and risk reduction roles. Indeed they may prove to be theoretically and practically of mutual benefit. Hostels are changing but we have a choice as to whether they become greenhouses or warehouses. These choices may say as much as about the kind of society 'we' are as the kind of residents 'they' now are in hostels.

Summary

This thesis has demonstrated that the hostel story is more complex than has been traditionally suggested (Burnett and Eaton 2004). A credible history has been constructed to offer the reader a theoretical hinterland from which to explore current and future possible hostel developments. This history has been shaped by the wavelengths of social policy, social reformers, theoretical frameworks, individual practitioners, legislative developments and more recently changes in probations more general direction. Hostels can no longer be seen as peripheral to the wider probation story. However an exploration of their precursors may be beneficial in understanding what they can and could do. Ignoring the influence of these earlier wavelengths risks losing the values, culture and learning that have emerged from and shaped staff – resident relations for well over a century.

The hostels explored in this thesis, if representative of the wider hostel story, evidenced clear and significant shifts in hostel practice and purpose. Their more exclusive focus on high risk of harm cases and more particularly 'public protection work' with 'sex offenders' is shaping both what hostels are and do and how staff and residents perceive their relationships with one another. Managers and staff were being more centrally directed in both the type of residents they could take and in the kinds of relationships they should pursue with these residents and the wider community.

A shift towards an exclusively 'public protection' orientated function risks losing hostels potential to act as a mechanism which enables rehabilitation and resettlement in the community. An exclusive focus on a 'new penology' approach now risks over-simplifying and underselling the potential for hostels and their staff to respond to both the immediate public protection expectation on hostels and their longer term potential to re-settle and develop pro-social relationships with some difficult, disadvantaged and potentially risky individuals. This thesis argues that an alternative penology is possible (Table 9.1) which constructs risk assessment and public protection as core to and informed by constructive change focussed engagement with offenders and communities. A *coincidentia oppositorum* (Cheliotis 2006: 330) offers hostels a 'new' way forward and could prevent them from becoming yet another part of a wider and growing custodial arsenal.

The impact of the facilities contract, a good example of an attempt to separate out basic 'care', 'control' and 'intervention' functions, had 'unforeseen' impacts on the rehabilitative and protective potential of the regime as a whole. All staff had previously had the potential to contribute to the regime and could impact on both its rehabilitative and public protection capacity.¹⁰² A separation of staff functions, purposes and management has signalled a reduction in opportunities to model pro-social behaviours and get alongside residents. Such separation now risks losing the holistic and potentially powerful 24 hour,

¹⁰² The ethnographic work also highlighted the ability of long serving catering and ancillary staff to spot signs of risk of suicide and self harm.

seven day a week influence of the regime on its residents. It also signals a reduction in the potential efficacy of the regime in gathering and making sense of diverse information from and about residents from a holistic team of staff with a common sense of purpose. The hostels and staff engaged with in this research demonstrated the potential to work together in collaborative and imaginative ways with difficult and at times potentially dangerous individuals. Such staff appeared to need more training, cohesion and support not fragmentation and separation. Hostels can provide both an enhanced level of supervision and public protection. Ignoring the role that all staff have to play in this risks compromising what hostels can do.

If hostels act as warehouses temporarily holding 'risks' for a period of residence with no focus on future resettlement and re-integration they will miss the opportunity to integrate a public protection and resettlement role. Furthermore the wider service risks losing a unique mode of intervention that is halfway between custody and community, to date this has been halfway in as opposed to halfway out! The ethnographic work in this thesis suggests that managers and policy makers may need to question how restrictive regimes prepare residents for their eventual release and whether in the long term they make offenders less likely to tell staff what they are doing and what their concerns are thus undermining the quality of their risk assessments. As much as practices which focus on resettlement or care (Fisher and Wilson 1982) without attention to potential risks may be both naive and counterproductive so too this work suggests are practices which discourage engaging with the social agency and potential for change of individual offenders.

This work has found that policies and practices which are exclusively risk focussed appear to undermine the basis of both sound risk assessments and decrease individual responsibility taking and potential for managed transition to non-offending identities. Were hostels to exclusively focus on one type of offender this could in the long term lead to both changes in the attitudes, values and practices of staff and undermine the potential for peer challenge and constructive modelling between residents. Current hostel staff receive insufficient specialist training and support to run regimes exclusively focussed

on 'managing' high risk sex offenders. Understanding how staff and residents may need to be matched (Hudson 1981) at an individual or regime level appears to have diminished as a consideration the more regimes and policy makers have understood 'public protection' as a separate and specific task apart from changed focussed practice.

This work found that in practice the NOMS Punish, Help, Change and Control mantra (Grapes 2005) risks being misunderstood for high risk offenders as being exclusively containment and restrictive in its orientation. Contact with managers, staff and residents suggested that fears of adverse media attention may be further skewing this tendency. A greater focus is required on the hostel as a mechanism that enables managed transition as opposed to a further bolstering of their public protection and carceral potential. The relational nature of change and risk management now appears understated in policy and practice. Staff and hostels which no longer engage with their residents' potential for change in constructive ways risk becoming a 'modified form of custody' (Barton 2005) as opposed to places of transition and resettlement.

At the start of the 21st century hostels have behind them a much longer history of managing care and control functions than has hitherto been argued and ahead of them the potential to build on this history in new and constructive ways.¹⁰³ Ignoring their rehabilitative past for the sake of being seen to be 'new' and 'punitive / public protection' orientated may present risks for both the residents they capture and the public they are eventually released to. Now that hostels have become more aligned with probation's more general purposes it may be useful for probation more generally to pay attention to the alternative penology and creative practice that hostels can offer.

¹⁰³ This work also reveals a wealth of re-settlement orientated practice and research that appear to have been mostly ignored, sidelined or brushed over by the wider service in its recent attempts to engage with a 'what works' approach.

Glossary

AC0 – Assistant Chief Officer

APSO – Assistant Probation Service Officer formerly Assistant Manager in a Hostel or Keyworker.

CETS's – Church of England Temperance Society

CJ – Criminal Justice

CJA- Criminal Justice Act

CJS – Criminal Justice System

CSOP – Community Sex Offender Programme

CYPA – Children and Young Persons Act

HMIP – Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation

NIMBYISM – 'Not in my back yardism'

MDO's – Mentally Disordered Offenders

NOMS - National Offender Management Service

NOMM – National Offender Management Model

PO – Probation Officer / Offender Manager (OM)

PSO – Probation Service Officer

YOT's – Youth Offending Teams

Overview of Hostels as Resource Relative to the Prison Population

Table 1 -Appendix 1

| Year | Number of Hostels | Average Bed Capacity | Capacity of Hostels | Average Prison Population | Hostels as % of Average Prison Population | |
|------|-------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---|------------------|
| 1974 | 1 | Not Known | Not Known | | Not Known | |
| 1976 | 54 | 17.43 | 941 | 41,443 | 2.27 | |
| 1977 | 73 | 15.42 | 1,126 | 41,619 | 2.70 | |
| 1978 | 79 | 15.75 | 1245 | 41,796 | 2.97 | |
| 1979 | 90 | 16.96 | 1527 | 42,220 | 3.61 | |
| 1980 | 101 | 17.14 | 1732 | 43,346 | 4.01 | |
| 1981 | 104 | 16.72 | 1739 | 43,346 | 4.01 | |
| 1982 | 105 | 16.89 | 1757 | 43,754 | 4.01 | |
| 1983 | 109 | 17.94 | 1956 | 43,773 | 4.45 | |
| 1984 | 110 | 16.95 | 1865 | 43,349 | 4.30 | |
| 1985 | 118 | 17.11 | 2019 | 46,278 | 4.36 | |
| 1986 | 120 | 17.00 | 2040 | 48,889 | 4.17 | |
| 1987 | 102 | 18.79 | 1917 | 48,963 | 3.91 | |
| 1988 | 104 | 18.17 | 1890 | 49,949 | 3.78 | |
| 1989 | 97 | 18.72 | 1816 | 48,610 | 3.73 | |
| 1990 | 103 | 19.42 | 2001 | 45,636 | 4.38 | |
| 1991 | 111 | 20.80 | 2309 | 44,897 | 5.14 | |
| 1992 | 112 | 21.75 | 2,436 | 45,817 | 5.32 | |
| 1993 | 116 | 22.87 | 2,655 | 45,565 | 5.95 | Peak Year |
| 1994 | 116 | 21.37 | 2,480 | 48,795 | 5.08 | |
| 1995 | 106 | 22.83 | 2,420 | 51,047 | 4.74 | |
| 1996 | 103 | 22.48 | 2,316 | 55,281 | 4.18 | |
| 1997 | 101 | 22.21 | 2,244 | 61,114 | 3.67 | |
| 1998 | 99 | 22.85 | 2,263 | 65,298 | 3.46 | |
| 1999 | 95 | 22.74 | 2,161 | 64,776 | 3.33 | |
| 2000 | 99 | 22.69 | 2,247 | 64,602 | 3.47 | |
| 2001 | 100 | 22.56 | 2,258 | 66,301 | 3.40 | |
| 2002 | 100 | 20.99 | 2,099 | 70,778 | 2.96 | |
| 2003 | 100 | 22.42 | 2,242 | 73,180 | 3.06 | |
| 2004 | 100 | 22.35 | 2,235 | 74,657 | 2.99 | |
| 2005 | 98 | 22.35 | 2,190 | 76,081 | 2.87 | |
| 2006 | 98 | 22.35 | 2,190 | 78,189 | 2.80 | |
| 2007 | 101 | 22.35 | 2,257 | 80,176 | 2.81 | |

NB figures in this table are approximate, there was no 'official source' for hostel figures and these had to be gleaned by reading each years Probation Directory from 1974 - 2007 and individually extracting the hostels details and numbers. Where double entries existed these were counted as one and it is hoped that these figures provide some context to understanding how the role of the modern hostel may be changing as a resource in relation to the growing custodial estate against which hostels sit. The list only records hostels that were actually open and not those under temporary closure or refurbishment. Recording of women only or mixed hostels proved too inconsistent to present a clear table with an annual total. It is worth noting that clearly defined women only hostels averaged around 6 per year and mixed hostels fluctuated between 6 and 41 a year peaking in the 1990's. There appears to have only ever been one female only-bail only hostel ,whilst for men there were up to 22 of these in 1991, Mixed Bail only hostels peaked in 1986 at 15. After 1992 hostels cease to be recorded as bail only and are classified as Probation and Bail. From the mid 1970's to 1992 there are records of both single sex and mixed hostels providing sheltered work for men and women. These may be seen as having links to the early probation and pre probation practices alluded to in Chapter two that linked probation with the undertaking of work, long before the days of community service/ punishment. From 2005 onwards the Probation Directory ceased to record the actual number of bed spaces in each hostel and the Home Office would not provide these. The bed spaces for these four years is projected on the basis of a static average bed space since 2004 . In comparison with Prisons

access to reliable statistics about hostel populations is problematic and not readily available to the public.

Appendix 2.1

Example of 19th Century Warrant for Arrest on Breach of Bonded Labour

'State of Pennsylvania, _____ county, ss.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to the sheriff or any constable of _____ county, greeting: Whereas, it appears by the oath, or solemn affirmation, of _____, that _____, was held to labor or service to _____, of _____ county, in the state of _____, and the said _____ hath escaped from the labor and service of the said _____:

You are therefore commanded, to arrest and seize the body of the said _____, if he be found in your county, and bring him forthwith before the person issuing the warrant, if a judge (or if a justice of the peace or alderman) before a judge of the court of common pleas, or of the district court, as the case may be, of your proper county, or recorder of a city, so that the truth of the matter may be inquired into, and the said _____ be dealt with as the constitution of the United States, and the laws of this commonwealth direct. Witness our said judge (or alderman, or justice, as the case may be), at this ___ day of _____, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and _____.

By virtue of such warrant the person named therein may be arrested by the proper sheriff or constable to whom the same shall be delivered, within the proper city or county.

<http://www.toptags.com/aama/docs/prigg.htm> created 10.02.02

RESEARCH APPROVAL FORM

Name: Francis Cowe

Organisation: Cardiff University, Student

Address: XXXXXXXXXXXX

Tel: XXX X XXXXXX

Commissioners of the Research: Research being supervised by
Professor Mark Drakeford and
Dr Lesley Noaks at University of Wales ,
Cardiff.

Initial Submission Date: Due to Complete Fieldwork Nov 2006

**Note access to the hostels was delayed
and put back until October 2006** Write up of fieldwork March 2007
Complete Project Write up Early 2008.

Title of Research: Probation Hostels(approved premises) , an exploration
of their rehabilitative and re-integrative potential.

Purpose of the Research:

(Please explain why you want to undertake the research and who will be the main
beneficiaries)

The research aims to benefit those interested in understanding how hostels
developed- what their role and function is today and what rehabilitative
potential they have; this may be of interest to policy makers, managers and
practitioners

Study Aims:

(Please explain what key questions the research is intended to answer)

This research commenced in 2002 and aims to complete in 2007 early 2008. The fieldwork being re-negotiated for the final phase is to be undertaken between now and November by agreement.

It aims to interview the staff in each hostel and 10-15 residents in each hostel. .

This is part of a larger piece of work as part of submission for PhD exploring the rehabilitative potential of hostels and their history.

The aims are twofold;

To ascertain whether hostels (approved premises) have a longer pre history than has been traditionally accepted , from which practitioners, policy makers and academics can learn.

And to ascertain whether the modern hostel / approved premise has the potential to rehabilitate / reintegrate and to what extent changes in the wider probation service have now begun to impact on approved premises.

Methods to be Used:

(For example, do you intend to use interviews, questionnaires, etc)

In order to answer the above question the author suggests that two approaches are required; an ethnographic study of 'current practice' and critical historical analysis of their origins and role(s). However the dichotomy implied by such a distinction of methods of enquiry may be misleading as the field research is both a source of data for critical theorising and place to critically explore, the extent to which, theoretical and policy approaches represented in texts had application in reality. Together the fieldwork and the historical analysis will be used to provide the foundations required for an exploration of both the concept and practice of the hostel as a transformative mechanism.

This fieldwork will involve – semi structured interviews with residents and staff and spending periods of observation / shadowing in each hostel.

Expected Outcomes:

(Please explain what you hope to achieve from the research and how you will use your research findings)

As requested I attach a summary of some initial suggested findings;

Initial Findings from Phase one of the research tentatively suggest the following as core to the rehabilitative enterprise in hostels:

Committed and pro-social staff , who clearly understand and undertake their role and are able to develop links with the 'community' and the wider criminal and social justice systems. The Keywork system at Auldhouse was a positive example of this.

The ability to give offenders the opportunity to engage in constructive activity outside of the hostel , whether work, volunteering, treatment , sport or socialising. The employment links at Auldhouse , the Voluntary work facilitated by a key worker at Newhouse and a range of 'constructive activities' arranged outside of the hostels allowed staff to facilitate and monitor progress.

A holding of the care and control, risk management and helping, authority and freedom , enabling social agency and monitoring behaviour in equal and explicit balance appears core to residents being facilitated and at times pushed to develop new narratives about themselves which are realistic and achievable.

The first phase of the field research found that hostels in 2002 still held out transformative potential for offenders and the probation service. Newhouse appeared to be more aligned with a discourse of public protection, it felt as if staff in interview wanted to show they were on message with probations concern to manage risk and protect the public, however this may have been symptomatic of staff desire to show they were a 'good hostel' within contemporary discourses of risk management and public protection. Auldhouse was less verbal about this agenda but appeared to have more well developed risk management links with the local CID, Forensic Psychiatric Services, Accommodation Services and Drug and Alcohol Services.

The fieldwork suggested that creating a broad context for change in the hostel seemed to relate to three key dynamics:

- The belief by staff that offenders could change
- The development of a pro social context that supported integration in society.
- The provision of support in developing and transiting to a pro social lifestyle.

These three dynamics fit well with findings of other ethnographic studies of probation practice (Bailey and Ward, 1992, Ditton and Ford, 1994. Rex , 1999). Porporino and Fabiano (2007) summarise a 'blend of style and skills' that emerge as core in effective correctional interventions. This thesis tentatively suggests that these could be adapted to Hostel work. Below is a suggested adaptation for hostel workers of Porporino and

Fabiano's (2007) 'blend of style and skills' based on the first stage of field research and current desistance research;

- An approach that shows sensitivity and understanding of a residents perspective
- Ability to negotiate participation with residents
- An understanding of how and why residents may react to or reject suggested interventions/ goals
- Encouraging residents to think through and articulate their reasons for action
- Regular consistent advice being available that works with where the resident is at and draws appropriate boundaries/ censures.
- Staff who are able to talk about, explore and assist transition to non offending behaviour, linking residents to community resources
- Staff who come across to residents as having a genuine interest in enabling them to change
- Promoting residents taking responsibility, becoming active social agents in their lives and developing a non offender identity.

The above could form the starting place for keywork competencies .However the field work in the mixed hostel threw up particular issues that suggest that such anodine 'lists' need a gendered awareness of their context and impact. Moreover depending on risk and offence type community engagement may mean quite different things are possible for different residents.

It is hoped that the next phase will add to this and explore specific themes that arose in further detail:

Question for 2nd Phase of Fieldwork

- To what extent can hostels today may be seen as part of an ongoing story of transformation and rehabilitation, or conversely at a point of departure from this re-integrative discourse.

Qualitative Differences in the Regime at different times

Are managers, residents and workers aware of the differential experience of being in the hostel at different times of the day – and week? Is there a continuity of a context for change ? (space and time) .

What are the night cover arrangements?
What happens at the weekends?

The Role and Focus of Key work

Does key work still have the prominence and meaning it had ?

Has the focus of keywork changed – i.e. is it less change focused and more controlling? E.g. auditing and monitoring how do staff and managers understand the role and function of keywork?

How do residents understand and experience this?

Who does it - how do they understand it?

Managers view of the role of the hostel / Home Office view

How do managers and staff understand the purpose of the hostel (i.e. will they still include / stress rehabilitation and reintegration – containment?)

How do workers see the balance of care and control?

Has any more surveillance technology been used?

Has the publicity material or info for residents / sentencers seen any shift in tone or emphasis.

Training / Staffing

Have there been any changes in training - what training or inputs have staff had since 2002? What have these focused on?

Has the staffing or nature of staffing changed.

Is there any evidence of functions being privatised.

Do staff feel part of the wider service?

Have they noticed any changes in their role and or their relationship to the wider service since 2002?

Connection with Community?

Has 'Auldhouse' maintained its 'Friends' group - to what extent has Newhouse adopted strategies to link with community?

Has Newhouse remained geographically isolated from community?
Are there any community links now?

Reintegration / Rehabilitation

Has 'follow on support' been considered in either hostel? How do staff and residents understand the end of a residence - how does this fit with notions of

'end to end offender management' / NOMS ?

Does voluntary work or 'active citizenship' play a role in offender interventions.

What is the stated purpose of the hostel?

Has the regime/ daily routine changed?

What do staff understand by effective practice?

Is there more or less of an emphasis on provision of services within the hostel or looking out?

Differences

Is there still a perception that both hostels are quite different?

Gender

Is Newhouse still a mixed hostel?

If it has changed why? If not why not ?

Policy and practice implications for female offenders ?

Privatisation / Contestability

Is there a change in the discourse or practice?

How do staff and managers understand this?

Has it impacted on policy or practice?

(food, facilities, staffing , activities, partnerships?)

Change

Is there evidence of rehabilitative/ re-integrative continuity / coherence over the last four years?

How are the hostels understood in relation to the wider service?

Has the role of the hostel changed?

Care - Control Continuum - Where do hostels sit on this and to what extent may they be understood to have been influenced by contemporary changes in probation ?

Are there plans to increase the size of the hostel estate?

Are hostels understood as having a common function?

What do staff and managers see as the future for hostels?

Metric:

(Please explain how you will report your research findings e.g. written report)

The final product will be a PhD thesis but as discussed I am happy to produce a shorter report/ summary of findings and undertake a presentation on this.

Timescale:

(For example, commencement/completion dates, number of hours)

Due to Complete Fieldwork Nov 2006

Write up of fieldwork March 2007

Complete Project Write up Early 2008.

An interim report may be possible in January 2007.

Appendix 5.1

Summary of Average Monthly Occupancy Profile for Hostels

During Phase 1 and 2 of Ethnographic Work.

| Hostel and Year | Average Age | Average Period of Residence | Average Longest Stay | Average Monthly Through put by Gender | Average No of Probation Cases | Average No of Bail Cases | Average No of Licence Cases | Average No off HDC Cases | Average No of Home Leave/ ROTL |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Auldhouse 2002 | 35.01 | 2.65 | 11.25 | 37.16Male | 5.83 | 11.67 | 17.00 | 0.00 | 2.83 |
| Newhouse 2002 | 37.71 | 1.67 | 7.00 | 35.8 Male 2.6Female | 4.00 | 22.6 | 11.40 | 0.20 | 0.00 |
| Auldhouse 2006-7 | 41.06 | 3.63 | 16.83 | 28 Male | 0.33 | 2.00 | 23.33 | 0.00 | 2.33 |
| Newhouse 2006- 7 | 38.97 | 2.11 | 6.34 | 32.67Male | 0.00 | 6.17 | 26.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |

Auldhouse Profile – March 2002

Appendix 5.2a

| Type of Residence | Gender | Age | How Long in Hostel – Months | Recall , Breach, Transfer Move On HMP |
|---------------------------|---------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| Probation | Male | 20 | 12.00 | Move On |
| Probation | Male | 19 | 6.0 | Transfer |
| | | | | |
| Licensee | Male | 30 | 1.0 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 54 | 11.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 29 | 8.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 39 | 7.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 29 | 7.00 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 37 | 5.00 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 43 | 5.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 47 | 4.00 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 22 | 2.00 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 41 | 2.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 38 | 2.00 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 41 | 2.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 32 | 1.50 | Withdrawn |
| Licensee | Male | 48 | 1.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 39 | 1.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 19 | 0.25 | Absconded |
| Licensee | Male | 53 | 0.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | 32 | 0.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | 25 | 0.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | 58 | 0.25 | |
| | | | | |
| Bailee | Male | 31 | 5.00 | |
| Bailee | Male | 29 | 1.00 | Breached |
| Bailee | Male | 36 | 1.00 | |
| Bailee | Male | 41 | 1.00 | |
| Bailee | Male | 48 | 1.00 | Court CD |
| Bailee | Male | 30 | 1.00 | |
| Bailee | Male | 33 | 1.00 | |
| Bailee | Male | 26 | 0.50 | Breach FTR |
| Bailee | Male | 18 | 0.50 | |
| Bailee | Male | 22 | 0.25 | Breach FTR |
| Bailee | Male | 32 | 0.50 | Bail Variation |
| Bailee | Male | 38 | 0.50 | FTR |
| Bailee | Male | 42 | 0.25 | |
| Bailee | Male | 50 | 0.25 | |
| | | | | |
| Home Leave | Male | 38 | 0.25 | HMP |
| Totals | Gender | Average Age | Average Stay | Outcomes |
| | | 35.37 | 2.52 | |
| 20 L 14 B 1HL 2P | All Male | Youngest-19 Oldest - 53 | Longest Stay 12 months | Move On 7 Withdraw 1 FTRB 3 Variation 1 Abscond 1 |

Newhouse Profile - April 2002

Appendix 5.2b

| Type of Residence | Gender | Age | How Long in Hostel - Months | Recall , Breach, Transfer Move On HMP |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|---|
| Probation | Male | 31 | 7.25 | |
| Probation | Male | 65 | 4.25 | |
| Probation | Male | 19 | 3.00 | |
| Probation | Male | 37 | 1.50 | |
| Probation | Male | 38 | 0.5 | |
| Probation | Male | 24 | 0.35 | Breach |
| Probation | Female | 35 | 0.50 | |
| | | | | |
| Licensee | Male | 25 | 5.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 38 | 2.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 41 | 1.50 | |
| Licensee | Female | 25 | 1.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 52 | 1.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 44 | 0.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | 67 | 0.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | No Age | 0.25 | Breach FTR |
| Licensee | Male | 58 | 0.06 | |
| Licensee | Male | 43 | 0.03 | Recall |
| | | | | |
| Bailee | Male | 59 | 0.75 | Custody |
| Bailee | Male | 19 | 0.75 | Move to Auldhouse |
| Bailee | Male | 31 | 0.60 | Custody |
| Bailee | Male | 40 | 3.50 | |
| Bailee | Male | 57 | 1.00 | |
| Bailee | Male | 34 | 0.50 | |
| Bailee | Male | 34 | 0.35 | Breach |
| Bailee | Male | 44 | 1.00 | |
| Bailee | Male | 43 | 1.00 | |
| Bailee | Male | 29 | 0.75 | |
| Bailee | Male | 21 | 0.25 | |
| Bailee | Male | 32 | 0.35 | Moved On |
| Bailee | Male | 48 | 0.25 | Breach FTR |
| Bailee | Male | 24 | 0.25 | Breached |
| Bailee | Male | 32 | 0.12 | |
| Bailee | Male | 38 | 0.12 | Move On |
| Totals | Gender | Average Age | Average Stay | Outcomes |
| 7Probation 10Licensee 16 Bailee | 31 Male 2Female | 38.34 Youngest - 19 Oldest - 67 | 1.26 Longest Stay 7.25 Months | Move On Withdraw FTR Breach Court |

Auldhouse Profile – April 2002

Appendix 5.2c

| Type of Residence | Gender | Age | How Long in Hostel - Months | Recall , Breach, Transfer Move On HMP |
|---------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|
| Probation | Male | 31 | 6.00 | |
| Probation | Male | 19 | 6.50 | Move On |
| Probation | Male | 33 | 2.00 | |
| Probation | Male | 31 | 6.00 | |
| Probation | Male | 24 | 2.00 | |
| Probation | Male | 20 | 0.25 | |
| | | | | |
| Licensee | Male | 54 | 11.50 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 29 | 9.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 39 | 8.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 43 | 6.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 41 | 3.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 41 | 3.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 48 | 2.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 39 | 2.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 53 | 1.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | 32 | 0.75 | Breach FTR |
| Licensee | Male | 25 | 0.75 | Breach FTR |
| Licensee | Male | 58 | 1.25 | Transfer |
| Licensee | Male | 38 | 0.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 37 | 0.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 22 | 0.50 | |
| | | | | |
| Bailee | Male | 36 | 2.00 | |
| Bailee | Male | 41 | 2.00 | Withdrawn |
| Bailee | Male | 18 | 1.50 | |
| Bailee | Male | 42 | 1.25 | |
| Bailee | Male | 50 | 1.25 | |
| Bailee | Male | 46 | 0.75 | Breach |
| Bailee | Male | 44 | 0.50 | CD Court |
| Bailee | Male | 43 | 0.50 | Breach |
| Bailee | Male | 20 | 0.50 | |
| Bailee | Male | 30 | 0.25 | |
| Bailee | Male | 25 | 0.25 | |
| Bailee | Male | 23 | 0.25 | |
| Bailee | Male | 36 | 0.25 | |
| | | | | |
| Home Leave | Male | 69 | 0.25 | HMP |
| Home Leave | Male | 56 | 0.25 | HMP |
| Totals | Gender | Average Age 37.11 | Average Stay 2.37 | Outcomes |
| 15 L 13 B 2HL 6P | All Male | Youngest-19 Oldest -69 | Longest Stay 11.5 months | Move On 2 Withdraw 1 FTR 2 Breach 2 Court 1 |

Newhouse Profile- May 2002

Appendix 5.2 d

| Type of Residence | Gender | Age | How Long in Hostel - Months | Recall , Breach, Transfer Move On HMP |
|---|---------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|
| Probation | Male | 31 | 8.25 | Move On |
| Probation | Male | 65 | 5.25 | Move On |
| Probation | Male | 19 | 4.00 | Move On |
| Probation | Male | 37 | 2.50 | |
| Probation | Male | 38 | 1.50 | |
| Probation | Female | 35 | 0.75 | Breach |
| | | | | |
| Licensee | Male | 25 | 6.00 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 38 | 3.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 41 | 2.50 | |
| Licensee | Female | 25 | 2.75 | Recall |
| Licensee | Male | 52 | 2.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 44 | 1.50 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 67 | 1.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | 58 | 1.06 | |
| Licensee | Male | ? | 0.25 | Arrested |
| Licensee | Male | 55 | 0.12 | |
| | | | | |
| Bailee | Male | 40 | 4.50 | |
| Bailee | Male | 57 | 2.00 | |
| Bailee | Male | 34 | 1.50 | Breach |
| Bailee | Male | 43 | 1.00 | |
| Bailee | Male | 44 | 2.00 | |
| Bailee | Male | 29 | 1.75 | |
| Bailee | Male | 21 | 1.25 | Breach |
| Bailee | Male | 32 | 0.45 | Bail Variation |
| Bailee | Male | 22 | 0.87 | Custody |
| Bailee | Male | ? | 0.75 | |
| Bail A | Male | 27 | 0.50 | FTR Breach |
| Bailee | Male | 38 | 0.75 | |
| Bailee | Male | 25 | 0.25 | Breach |
| Bailee | Male | 28 | 0.25 | Breach |
| Bailee | Male | 30 | 0.56 | |
| Bailee | Male | 30 | 0.50 | |
| Bailee | Male | 32 | 0.50 | |
| Bailee | Female | 26 | 0.50 | |
| Bailee | Male | 25 | 0.25 | |
| Bailee | Male | 60 | 0.06 | |
| Bailee | Male | 30 | 0 | FTA |
| Bailee | Male | 29 | 0 | FTA |
| ROTL | Male | ?? | 0.25 | HMP |
| Totals | Gender | Average Age 37 | Average Stay 1.62 | Outcomes |
| Probation 6 Licensee 10 Bailee 22 ROTL 1 | 36 Male 3 Female | Youngest -19 Oldest - 67 | Longest Stay 8.25 Months | Move On Withdraw FTR Breach Court |

Auldhouse Profile – May 2002

Appendix 5.2 e

| Type of Residence | Gender | Age | How Long in Hostel - Months | Recall , Breach, Transfer Move On HMP |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| Probation | Male | 31 | 7.00 | |
| Probation | Male | 33 | 3.00 | |
| Probation | Male | 20 | 1.25 | |
| Probation | Male | 27 | 0.50 | |
| Probation | Male | 26 | 0.50 | |
| | | | | |
| B.Assessment | Male | 20 | 0.50 | |
| B.Assessment | Male | 24 | 0.50 | Remanded |
| B.Assessment | Male | 20 | 0.75 | |
| B.Assessment | Male | 37 | 0.50 | |
| B.Assessment | Male | 21 | 0.50 | Breach FTR |
| | | | | |
| Licensee | Male | 29 | 10.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 39 | 9.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 43 | 7.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 41 | 4.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 41 | 4.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 48 | 3.00 | Recall |
| Licensee | Male | 39 | 3.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 53 | 2.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | 38 | 1.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 37 | 1.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 22 | 1.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | 28 | 0.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 21 | 0.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 46 | 0.25 | |
| | | | | |
| Bailee | Male | 36 | 3.00 | |
| Bailee | Male | 18 | 2.50 | Sentence |
| Bailee | Male | 42 | 2.25 | |
| Bailee | Male | 50 | 2.25 | |
| Bailee | Male | 30 | 0.75 | Breach FTR |
| Bailee | Male | 25 | 0.75 | Breach |
| Bailee | Male | 23 | 0.50 | Breach |
| Bailee | Male | 36 | 0.50 | Breach |
| Bailee | Male | 46 | 0.25 | |
| Bailee | Male | 21 | 0.25 | |
| | | | | |
| Home Leave | Male | 48 | 0.25 | HMP |
| Home Leave | Male | 22 | 0.25 | HMP |
| Home Leave | Male | 38 | 0.25 | HMP |
| Totals | Gender | Average Age 32.95 | Average Stay 2.09 | Number of Breach, Move On Recall |
| 14 L 10 B 5 BA 3HL 5P | All Male | Youngest-18 Oldest-53 | Longest Stay 10 Months | FTR 2 Breach 3 Sentence 1 Recall 1 Remand 1 |

Newhouse Profile - June 2002

Appendix 5.2 f

| Type of Residence | Gender | Age | How Long in Hostel - Months | Recall , Breach, Transfer Move On HMP |
|---|---------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|
| Probation | Male | 37 | 3.50 | |
| Probation | Male | 38 | 2.50 | |
| Probation | Female | 35 | 0.75 | Breach |
| | | | | |
| Licensee | Male | 38 | 3.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 41 | 3.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | 52 | 3.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 23 | 2.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 67 | 2.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | 58 | 2.06 | |
| Licensee | Male | 54 | 1.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 29 | 1.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 55 | 1.00 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 56 | 0.75 | |
| | | | | |
| Bailee | Male | 40 | 5.50 | |
| Bailee | Male | 57 | 3.00 | |
| Bailee | Male | 43 | 2.00 | |
| Bailee | Male | 44 | 3.00 | |
| Bailee | Male | 29 | 2.75 | |
| Bailee | Male | 21 | 1.25 | Breach |
| Bailee | Male | 32 | 0.95 | Bail Variation |
| | | | | |
| Bailee | Male | ? | 1.75 | |
| Bailee | Male | 30 | 1.56 | |
| Bailee | Male | 30 | 1.25 | Bail Home |
| Bailee | Female | 26 | 1.50 | |
| Bailee | Male | 25 | 0.50 | Breach FTR |
| Bailee | Male | 60 | 0.31 | Breach |
| Bailee | Male | 42 | 0.80 | Move On |
| Bailee | Male | 27 | 0.12 | Breach FTR |
| Bailee | Male | 34 | 0.80 | |
| Bailee | Male | 29 | 0.00 | FTA |
| Bailee | Male | 68 | 0.25 | Bail Variation |
| | | | | |
| Bailee | Male | 39 | 0.25 | Breach |
| Bailee | Male | 24 | 0.33 | |
| Bailee | Male | | 0.25 | |
| Bailee | Male | | 0.25 | |
| Bailee | Male | | 0.20 | |
| Totals | Gender | Average Age 40.93 | Average Stay 1.54 | Outcomes |
| 3 Probation 10 Licensee 23 Bailee | 34 Male 2 Female | Youngest -21 Oldest - 68 | Longest Stay 5.5 Months | Move On 2 FTR 2 Breach 4 BV 2 FTA 1 |

Auldhouse Profile – June 2002

Appendix 5.2 g

| Type of Residence | Gender | Age | How Long in Hostel - Months | Recall , Breach, Transfer Move On HMP |
|----------------------------------|---------------|--|-----------------------------|---|
| Probation | Male | 31 | 8.00 | |
| Probation | Male | 33 | 4.00 | |
| Probation | Male | 20 | 2.25 | |
| Probation | Male | 27 | 1.50 | |
| Probation | Male | 26 | 1.50 | Move On |
| Probation | Male | 20 | 1.50 | |
| Probation | Male | 20 | 1.75 | |
| Probation | Male | 24 | 0.25 | Absconded |
| | | | | |
| B.Assessment | Male | 20 | 0.25 | |
| B.Assessment | Male | 20 | 1.00 | |
| B.Assessment | Male | 37 | 0.75 | Bailed |
| | | | | |
| Licensee | Male | 29 | 11.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 39 | 10.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 43 | 8.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 41 | 5.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 41 | 5.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 39 | 4.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 53 | 3.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | 38 | 2.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 37 | 2.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 22 | 2.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | 28 | 1.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 21 | 0.50 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 46 | 1.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 24 | 0.25 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 33 | 0.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 32 | 0.25 | |
| | | | | |
| Bailee | Male | 36 | 4.00 | |
| Bailee | Male | 42 | 3.25 | |
| Bailee | Male | 50 | 3.25 | |
| Bailee | Male | 46 | 1.25 | |
| Bailee | Male | 21 | 0.50 | Remanded |
| Bailee | Male | 36 | 0.50 | Bailed |
| | | | | |
| Home Leave | Male | 48 | 0.25 | HMP |
| Home Leave | Male | 36 | 0.25 | HMP |
| Home Leave . | Male | 56 | 0.25 | HMP |
| Totals | Gender | Average Age 33.75 yrs | Average Stay 2.65 | Outcomes |
| 16 L 6 B 3 BA 3HL 8P | All Male | Youngest-21 Oldest - 56 | Longest Stay = 11 months | Move On3 Abscond 1 Bailed 2 Remand 1 |

Newhouse Profile - July 2002

Appendix 5.2 h

| Type of Residence | Gender | Age | How Long in Hostel - Months | Recall , Breach, Transfer Move On HMP |
|---|--------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| Probation | Male | 37 | 4.50 | Move On |
| Probation | Male | 38 | 3.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | 22 | 0.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 56 | 1.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 41 | 4.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | 52 | 3.25 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 23 | 3.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 67 | 3.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | 58 | 3.06 | |
| Licensee | Male | 54 | 2.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 29 | 2.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | ? | 0.40 | |
| Bailee | Male | 40 | 6.5 | |
| Bailee | Male | 43 | 4.00 | |
| Bailee | Male | 44 | 3.25 | Custody |
| Bailee | Male | 29 | 3.00 | Move On |
| Bailee | Male | 24 | 1.25 | Breach |
| Bailee | Male | 49 | 0.00 | FTA |
| Bailee | Male | ? | 2.75 | |
| Bailee | Male | 30 | 1.68 | Move On |
| Bailee | Male | 35 | 0.75 | Breach |
| Bailee | Male | 19 | 3.00 | Move On |
| Bailee | Male | 35 | 1.25 | Breach |
| Bailee | Male | 29 | 1.25 | |
| Bailee | Male | 35 | 1.00 | |
| Bailee | Male | 30 | 0.06 | Breach |
| Bailee | Male | 34 | 1.05 | Breach |
| Bailee | Male | 24 | 1.00 | |
| Bailee | Male | 34 | 1.00 | |
| Bailee | Male | 32 | 0.75 | |
| Bailee | Male | 44 | 0.75 | |
| Bailee | Male | 47 | 0.25 | Move On |
| Bailee | Male | 31 | 0.25 | Breach FTR |
| Bailee | Male | 25 | 0.03 | FTR Beach |
| Bailee | Male | 28 | 0.25 | |
| Bailee | Male | 21 | 0.20 | |
| Bailee | Male | 21 | 0.20 | |
| Bailee | Female | 20 | 0.75 | |
| Bailee | Female | 26 | 2.50 | |
| HDC | Female | 23 | 1.00 | |
| Totals | Gender | Average Age 34.97 | Average Stay 1.81 | Outcomes |
| 2 Probation 10 Licensee 27Bailee 1 HDC | 37Male 3 Female | Youngest 19 Oldest 67 | Longest Stay 6.5 Months | Move On 6 FTR 2 Breach 5 Custody 1 FTA 1 |

Auldhouse Profile – July 2002

Appendix 5.2 i

| Type of Residence | Gender | Age | How Long in Hostel - Months | Recall , Breach, Transfer Move On HMP |
|--------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| Probation | Male | 31 | 9.00 | |
| Probation | Male | 33 | 5.00 | |
| Probation | Male | 20 | 3.25 | |
| Probation | Male | 27 | 2.50 | |
| Probation | Male | 20 | 2.50 | |
| Probation | Male | 20 | 2.00 | Breach |
| | | | | |
| Licensee | Male | | 0.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 29 | 12.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 39 | 11.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 43 | 9.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 41 | 5.50 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 41 | 6.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 39 | 5.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 53 | 4.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | 38 | 3.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 37 | 3.00 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 22 | 2.75 | Breach |
| Licensee | Male | 28 | 2.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 46 | 2.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 33 | 1.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 32 | 1.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 19 | 0.50 | Breach |
| Licensee | Male | 36 | 0.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 44 | 0.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 57 | 0.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 36 | 0.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | 20 | 0.50 | |
| | | | | |
| Bailee | Male | 36 | 5.00 | |
| Bailee | Male | 42 | 4.25 | |
| Bailee | Male | 50 | 4.25 | |
| Bailee | Male | 46 | 1.50 | Bailed |
| Bailee | Male | 31 | 0.75 | |
| Bailee | Male | 28 | 0.25 | Bailed |
| Bailee | Male | 32 | 0.50 | |
| | | | | |
| Home Leave | Male | 48 | 0.25 | HMP |
| Home Leave | Male | 38 | 0.25 | HMP |
| Home Leave | Male | 56 | 0.25 | HMP |
| Home Leave | Male | 69 | 0.25 | HMP |
| Totals | Gender | Average Age 36.76 | Average Stay 3.6 | Number of Breach, Move On Recall |
| 21 L 7 B 4HL 6P | All Male | Youngest-19 Oldest- 69 | Longest Stay 12 Months | Move On2 Breach 3 Bailed 2 Resolved 1 |

Auldhouse Profile – August 2002

Appendix 5.2 j

| Type of Residence | Gender | Age | How Long in Hostel - Months | Recall , Breach, Transfer Move On HMP |
|--------------------------|---------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Probation | Male | 31 | 10.00 | |
| Probation | Male | 33 | 6.00 | |
| Probation | Male | 20 | 3.50 | Move On |
| Probation | Male | 27 | 2.75 | Move On |
| Probation | Male | 20 | 3.50 | |
| Probation | Male | 23 | 0.25 | Move On |
| | | | | |
| Licensee | Male | 29 | 13.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 39 | 11.25 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 43 | 9.75 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 41 | 7.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 39 | 6.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 53 | 5.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | 38 | 4.75 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 28 | 3.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 33 | 2.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 32 | 2.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 36 | 1.50 | Recall |
| Licensee | Male | 44 | 1.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 57 | 1.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 36 | 1.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | 20 | 1.00 | Breach |
| Licensee | Male | 41 | 1.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 46 | 0.25 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 21 | 1.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 40 | 1.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 62 | 0.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | 31 | 0.25 | Withdrawn |
| Licensee | Male | 69 | 0.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 28 | 0.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 28 | 0.25 | |
| | | | | |
| Bailee | Male | 36 | 6.00 | |
| Bailee | Male | 42 | 5.25 | |
| Bailee | Male | 31 | 1.00 | Breached |
| Bailee | Male | 33 | 0.50 | |
| Bailee | Male | 32 | 1.50 | |
| Bailee | Male | 21 | 0.50 | |
| Bailee DTTO | Male | 28 | 0.50 | |
| | | | | |
| Home Leave | Male | 48 | 0.25 | HMP |
| Home Leave | Male | 56 | 0.25 | HMP |
| Totals | Gender | Average Age 36.28 | Average Stay 3.08 | Outcomes |
| 24 L 7 B 2HL 6P | All Male | Youngest-20 Oldest-62 | Longest Stay 13 Months | Move On7 Breach 3 Withdrawn1 |

Newhouse Profile August 2002

Appendix 5.2k

| Type of Residence | Gender | Age | How Long in Hostel - Months | Recall , Breach, Transfer Move On HMP |
|--|---------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Probation | Male | 23 | 0.50 | Move On |
| Probation | Male | 38 | 4.50 | |
| | | | | |
| Licensee | Male | 42 | 1.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 56 | 2.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 41 | 5.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | 23 | 4.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 67 | 4.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | 58 | 3.26 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 54 | 3.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 29 | 3.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 32 | 1.40 | |
| Licensee | Male | 22 | 1.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 61 | 1.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 42 | 0.84 | |
| Licensee | Male | ? | 0.03 | |
| Licensee | Male | 48 | 0.80 | |
| Licensee | Male | 32 | 0.77 | |
| Licensee | Male | 52 | 0.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 58 | 0.12 | |
| | | | | |
| Bailee | Male | 40 | 7.50 | |
| Bailee | Male | 43 | 4.20 | Move On |
| Bailee | Male | 30 | 3.75 | |
| Bailee | Male | 29 | 1.50 | Move On |
| Bailee | Male | 35 | 2.00 | |
| Bailee | Male | 24 | 1.20 | Move On |
| Bailee | Male | 34 | 2.00 | |
| Bailee | Male | 32 | 1.75 | |
| Bailee | Male | 44 | 1.75 | |
| Bailee | Male | 21 | 1.20 | |
| Bailee | Male | 21 | 1.20 | |
| Bailee | Male | 32 | 0.30 | |
| Bailee | Female | 20 | 1.75 | |
| Bailee | Female | 26 | 2.75 | Breach |
| Bailee | Female | | 0.25 | Breach |
| HDC | Female | 23 | 1.25 | Recall |
| Totals | Gender | Average Age | Average Stay | Outcomes |
| 2 Probation 17 Licensee 15 Bailee 1 HDC | 31 Male 4 Female | Youngest-20 Oldest - 67 | Longest Stay 7.5 Months | Move On 5 Breach 2 Recall 1 |

Auldhouse Profile – September 2002

Appendix 5.2 L

| Type of Residence | Gender | Age | How Long in Hostel - Months | Recall , Breach, Transfer Move On HMP |
|--------------------------|----------|-------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Probation | Male | 31 | 11 | |
| Probation | Male | 33 | 6 | |
| Probation | Male | 20 | 3.5 | Move On |
| Probation | Male | 27 | 2.75 | Move On |
| Probation | Male | 20 | 3.5 | |
| Probation | Male | 23 | 0.25 | Move On |
| | | | | |
| Licensee | Male | 29 | 13 | |
| Licensee | Male | 39 | 11.25 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 43 | 9.75 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 41 | 7 | |
| Licensee | Male | 39 | 6 | |
| Licensee | Male | 53 | 5.5 | |
| Licensee | Male | 38 | 4.75 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 28 | 3.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 33 | 2.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 32 | 2.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 36 | 1.5 | Recall |
| Licensee | Male | 44 | 1.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 57 | 1.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 36 | 1.5 | |
| Licensee | Male | 20 | 1 | Breach |
| Licensee | Male | 41 | 1 | |
| Licensee | Male | 46 | 0.25 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 21 | 1 | |
| Licensee | Male | 40 | 1 | |
| Licensee | Male | 62 | 0.5 | |
| Licensee | Male | 31 | 0.25 | Withdrawn |
| Licensee | Male | 69 | 0.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 28 | 0.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 28 | 0.25 | |
| | | | | |
| Bailee | Male | 36 | 6 | |
| Bailee | Male | 42 | 5.25 | |
| Bailee | Male | 31 | 1 | Breached |
| Bailee | Male | 33 | 0.5 | |
| Bailee | Male | 32 | 1.5 | |
| Bailee | Male | 21 | 0.5 | |
| Bailee DTTO | Male | 28 | 0.5 | |
| | | | | |
| Home Leave | Male | 48 | 0.25 | HMP |
| Home Leave | Male | 56 | 0.25 | HMP |
| Totals | Gender | Average Age | | Number of Breach, Move On Recall |
| 24 L 7 B 2HL 6P | All Male | | | Move On7 Breach 3 Withdrawn1 |

Auldhouse Profile – October 2006

Appendix 5.2 m

| Type of Residence | Gender | Age | How Long in Hostel - Months | Recall , Breach, Transfer Move On HMP |
|--------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Licensee | Male | 39 | 16.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 36 | 11.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 40 | 10 00 | Transfer NH |
| Licensee | Male | 50 | 10 .00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 51 | 9.00 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 46 | 8.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 28 | 7.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 59 | 7.00 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 60 | 6.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 56 | 5.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 57 | 4.00 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 26 | 4.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 46 | 4.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 54 | 4.00 | Recall |
| Licensee | Male | 49 | 3.00 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 59 | 2.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 33 | 2.00 | Recall |
| Licensee | Male | 28 | 2.00 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 21 | 1.00. | Recall |
| Licensee | Male | 42 | 1.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 41 | 1.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 32 | 1.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | | 0.00 | Recall |
| Licensee | Male | | 0.00 | Recall |
| Licensee | Male | 32 | 0.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | 19 | 0.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | | 0.00 | Recall |
| Bailee | Male | 42 | 5.00 | |
| Home Leave | Male | 40 | 0.25 | HMP |
| Home Leave | Male | 47 | 0.25 | HMP |
| Home Leave | Male | 46 | 0.25 | HMP |
| Home Leave | Male | 24 | 0.25 | HMP |
| Totals | Gender | Average Age 37.60 | Average Stay 3.91 | Outcomes |
| 27 L 1 B 4HL | All Male | Youngest-19 Oldest -60 | Longest Stay 16 Months | Recall 6 Move On 5 Transfer 1 |

Newhouse Profile – October 2006

Appendix 5.2n

| Type of Residence | Gender | Age | How Long in Hostel – Months | Recall , Breach, Transfer Move On HMP |
|--------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| Licensee | Male | 43 | 7.00 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 61 | 6.00 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 56 | 3.75 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 52 | 5.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 65 | 4.00 | Licence Expiry |
| Licensee | Male | 44 | 4.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 39 | 3.00 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 32 | 3.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 56 | 3.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 27 | 2.00 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 31 | 1.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 31 | 1.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 31 | 1.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 40 | 1.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 34 | 0.33 | |
| Licensee | Male | 34 | 0.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 20 | 1.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 37 | 0.16 | |
| Licensee | Male | 68 | 0.19 | |
| Licensee | Male | 38 | 0.16 | |
| | | | | |
| Bailee | Male | 54 | 5.00 | |
| Bailee | Male | 52 | 2.5 | |
| Bailee | Male | 52 | 2.00 | Breach |
| Bailee | Male | 38 | 2.50 | |
| Bailee | Male | 66 | 1.16 | |
| Bailee | Male | 23 | 1.16 | |
| Bailee | Male | 41 | 0.87 | |
| Bailee | Male | 31 | 0.06 | Breach |
| Bailee | Male | 25 | 0.5 | Breach |
| Bailee | Male | 36 | 0.00 | FTA |
| Bailee | Male | 21 | 0.20 | |
| Bailee | Male | 45 | 0.00 | FTA |
| Totals | Gender | Average Age 41.34 | Average Stay 2.00 | Outcomes |
| 27 L 1 B 4HL | All Male | Youngest -21 Oldest-68 | Longest Stay 7 Months | Recall 6 Move On 5 Lic Expiry 1 Breach 3 FTA 2 |

Auldhouse Profile– November 2006

Appendix 5.2 O

| Type of Residence | Gender | Age | How Long in Hostel - Months | Recall , Breach, Transfer Move On HMP |
|---------------------------|---------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Licensee | Male | 39 | 17.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 36 | 12.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 50 | 11.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 50 | 11.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 46 | 10.00 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 60 | 7.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 56 | 6.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 26 | 5.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 46 | 5.00 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 59 | 3.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 42 | 2.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 41 | 2.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 32 | 2.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 40 | 0.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | 24 | 0.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | 32 | 1.50 | Recall |
| Licensee | Male | 19 | 1.50 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 42 | 0.50 | Recall |
| Licensee | Male | 42 | 0.50 | |
| Bailee | Male | 42 | 6.00 | |
| Bailee | Male | 35 | 0.50 | Recall |
| Bailee | Male | 35 | 0.50 | |
| Home Leave | Male | 40 | 0.25 | HMP |
| Home Leave | Male | 47 | 0.25 | HMP |
| Home Leave | Male | 46 | 0.25 | HMP |
| Totals | Gender | Average Age 41.08 | Average Stay 4.39 | Outcomes |
| L = 19 B = 3 HL = 3 | All Male | Youngest-19 Oldest - 60 | Longest Stay 17 Months | Recall 3 Move On 3 |

Newhouse Profile - November 2006

Appendix 5.2 p

| Type of Residence | Gender | Age | How Long in Hostel - Months | Recall , Breach, Transfer Move On HMP |
|--------------------|---------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Licensee | Male | 52 | 6.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 44 | 5.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 32 | 4.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 56 | 4.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 31 | 2.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 31 | 1.75 | Recall |
| Licensee | Male | 31 | 2.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 40 | 2.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 34 | 1.33 | |
| Licensee | Male | 34 | 1.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 20 | 2.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 37 | 1.16 | |
| Licensee | Male | 68 | 1.19 | |
| Licensee | Male | 34 | 1.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 66 | 0.88 | |
| Licensee | Male | 30 | 0.25 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 64 | 1.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 34 | 0.16 | Recall |
| Licensee | Male | 46 | 0.60 | |
| Licensee | Male | 43 | 0.36 | |
| Licensee | Male | 35 | 0.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 22 | 0.30 | |
| Licensee | Male | 23 | 0.13 | |
| | | | | |
| Bailee | Male | 54 | 6.00 | |
| Bailee | Male | 52 | 3.50 | |
| Bailee | Male | 42 | 0.03 | FTA |
| Bailee | Male | 38 | 3.50 | |
| Bailee | Male | 66 | 2.16 | |
| Bailee | Male | 25 | 1.50 | |
| Bailee | Male | 41 | 1.87 | |
| Bailee | Male | 31 | 0.75 | Breach |
| Bailee | Male | 35 | 0.03 | |
| Totals | Gender | Average Age 40.34 | Average Stay 1.83 | Outcomes |
| 27 L 1 B 4HL | All Male | Youngest- 20 Oldest- 66 | Longest Stay 6.25 | Recall 2 Breach 1 FTA 1 Move On 1 |

Auldhouse Profile– December 2006

Appendix 5.2 q

| Type of Residence | Gender | Age | How Long in Hostel - Months | Recall , Breach, Transfer Move On HMP |
|---------------------------|---------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| Licensee | Male | 39 | 18.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 36 | 13.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 50 | 12.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 50 | 12.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 60 | 8.00 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 56 | 7.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 26 | 6.00 | Recall |
| Licensee | Male | 59 | 4.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 42 | 3.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 41 | 3.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 32 | 3.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 40 | 1.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | 42 | 1.00 | Recall |
| Licensee | Male | 47 | 1.00 | Recall |
| Licensee | Male | 31 | 1.00 | Transfer |
| Licensee | Male | | 1.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 27 | 1.00 | Recall |
| Licensee | Male | 24 | 1.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 48 | 1.00 | Recall |
| Licensee | Male | 24 | 1.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 43 | 1.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | | 0.50 | Recall |
| Licensee | Male | 30 | 0.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 31 | 0.25 | |
| Bailee | Male | 40 | 0.50 | Move On |
| Bailee | Male | 39 | 0.25 | Move On |
| Bailee | Male | 29 | 0.25 | Breach |
| Bailee | Male | 38 | 0.25 | |
| Bailee | Male | 35 | 0.50 | |
| Home Leave | Male | 40 | 0.25 | HMP |
| Home Leave | Male | 47 | 0.25 | HMP |
| Home Leave | Male | 46 | 0.25 | Arrested |
| Totals | Gender | Average Age 39.73 | Average Stay 3.22 | Outcomes |
| L = 24 B = 5 HL = 3 | All Male | Youngest-24 Oldest - 60 | Longest Stay 18 Months | Recall 6 Move On 3 Breach 1 Arrest 1 |

Newhouse Profile- December 2006

Appendix 5.2 r

| Type of Residence | Gender | Age | How Long in Hostel - Months | Recall , Breach, Transfer Move On HMP |
|-------------------|---------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|
| Licensee | Male | 52 | 6.75 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 44 | 5.50 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 32 | 5.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 56 | 5.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 31 | 2.25 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 31 | 3.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 40 | 3.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 34 | 2.33 | |
| Licensee | Male | 34 | 2.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 20 | 3.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 37 | 1.66 | Recall |
| Licensee | Male | 66 | 1.88 | |
| Licensee | Male | 64 | 2.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 46 | 1.60 | |
| Licensee | Male | 43 | 1.36 | |
| Licensee | Male | 35 | 1.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 22 | 0.80 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 23 | 1.13 | |
| Licensee | Male | 18 | 0.24 | Recall |
| Licensee | Male | 28 | 0.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 48 | 0.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 31 | 0.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 35 | 0.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | 50 | 0.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 27 | 0.12 | |
| Bailee | Male | 52 | 4.00 | Sentenced |
| Bailee | Male | 54 | 7.00 | |
| Bailee | Male | 38 | 4.00 | Bail V |
| Bailee | Male | 66 | 2.66 | Breach |
| Bailee | Male | 25 | 2.5 | |
| Bailee | Male | 41 | 2.27 | |
| Bailee | Male | 18 | 0.60 | |
| Bailee | Male | 33 | 0.40 | |
| Bailee | Male | 35 | 0.53 | Transfer to Auldhouse |
| Totals | Gender | Average Age 38.50 | Average Stay 2.33 | Outcomes |
| 25 L 9 B | All Male | Youngest- 18 Oldest - 66 | Longest Stay 7.00 Months | Recall 1 Breach 1 Move On 4 BV 1 Transfer 1 |

Auldhouse Profile - January 2007

Appendix 5.2 s

| Type of Residence | Gender | Age | How Long in Hostel - Months | Recall , Breach, Transfer Move On HMP |
|---------------------------|---------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Licensee | Male | 39 | 19 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 36 | 14 | |
| Licensee | Male | 50 | 13 | |
| Licensee | Male | 50 | 14 | |
| Licensee | Male | 56 | 8 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 59 | 5 | |
| Licensee | Male | 42 | 4 | |
| Licensee | Male | 41 | 4 | |
| Licensee | Male | 32 | 4 | |
| Licensee | Male | 40 | 2.5 | Transfer |
| Licensee | Male | 48 | 0.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 28 | 1 | |
| Licensee | Male | 49 | 1 | |
| Licensee | Male | 43 | 2 | |
| Licensee | Male | 31 | 1 | |
| Licensee | Male | 30 | 1.25 | Recall |
| Licensee | Male | 31 | 1 | Recall |
| Licensee | Male | 29 | 0.5 | Recall |
| Licensee | Male | 41 | 1 | |
| Licensee | Male | 65 | 1 | |
| Licensee | Male | 41 | 0.25 | Recall |
| Licensee | Male | 36 | 0.25 | Transfer |
| Licensee | Male | 35 | 0.5 | |
| Licensee | Male | 48 | 0.5 | |
| Licensee | Male | 58 | 0.25 | |
| | | | | |
| Bailee | Male | 40 | 0.75 | Move On |
| Bailee | Male | 34 | 1 | |
| | | | | |
| Home Leave | Male | 47 | 0.25 | HMP |
| Totals | Gender | Average Age 42.11 | Average Stay 3.62 | Outcomes |
| L = 25 B = 2 HL = 1 | All Male | Youngest -28 Oldest- 65 | Longest Stay 19 Months | Recall 4 Move On 3 Transfer 2 |

Newhouse Profile - January 2007

Appendix 5.2 t

| Type of Residence | Gender | Age | How Long in Hostel - Months | Recall , Breach, Transfer Move On HMP |
|-------------------|---------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| Licensee | Male | 32 | 6.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 56 | 5.75 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 31 | 4.00 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 40 | 4.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 34 | 3.33 | |
| Licensee | Male | 34 | 3.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 20 | 3.00 | Custody |
| Licensee | Male | 66 | 2.88 | |
| Licensee | Male | 64 | 2.75 | Recall |
| Licensee | Male | 46 | 2.60 | |
| Licensee | Male | 43 | 1.86 | Transfer to Auldhouse |
| Licensee | Male | 35 | 1.75 | Recall |
| Licensee | Male | 23 | 2.13 | |
| Licensee | Male | 28 | 1.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 48 | 1.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 31 | 0.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 35 | 1.50 | Recall |
| Licensee | Male | 50 | 1.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 27 | 0.12 | Recall |
| Licensee | Male | No Age | 0.12 | Recall |
| Licensee | Male | 49 | 0.85 | |
| Licensee | Male | 35 | 0.66 | |
| Licensee | Male | 29 | 0.25 | Recall |
| Licensee | Male | 38 | 0.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | 37 | 0.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | 60 | 0.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | 27 | 0.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 41 | 0.12 | |
| Licensee | Male | 38 | 1.00 | |
| Bailee | Male | 54 | 7.12 | Sentenced |
| Bailee | Male | 25 | 3.50 | |
| Bailee | Male | 41 | 3.27 | |
| Bailee | Male | 19 | 0.25 | |
| Bailee | Male | 33 | 1.40 | |
| Bailee | Male | 36 | 0.38 | Bail V |
| Bailee | Male | 25 | 0.64 | |
| Totals | Gender | Average Age 38.00 | Average Stay 2.69 | Outcomes |
| 29 L 7 B | All Male | Youngest - 19 Oldest - 66 | Longest Stay 7.12 Months | Move On 2 Custody 1 Recall 6 Sentenced 1 Bail V 1 |

Auldhouse Profile – February 2007

Appendix 5.2 u

| Type of Residence | Gender | Age | How Long in Hostel - Months | Recall , Breach, Transfer Move On HMP etc |
|------------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| Probation | Male | 48 | 0.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 36 | 15.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 50 | 14.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 50 | 14.25 | Recall |
| Licensee | Male | 59 | 6.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 33 | 5.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 42 | 4.50 | Place Withdrawn |
| Licensee | Male | 48 | 0.50 | Recall |
| Licensee | Male | 28 | 2.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 49 | 2.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 43 | 3.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 31 | 2.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 41 | 2.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 65 | 2.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 44 | 1.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 35 | 1.00 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 48 | 1.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | 58 | 1.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 41 | 0.75 | Recall |
| Licensee | Male | 51 | 0.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 32 | FTR | FTR |
| Licensee | Male | 33 | 0.12 | Recall |
| Licensee | Male | 31 | 0.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 23 | 0.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 28 | 0.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | | FTR | FTR |
| Baillee | Male | 34 | 2.00 | Move On |
| Home Leave | Male | 47 | 0.25 | HMP |
| Home Leave | Male | 47 | 0.25 | HMP |
| Totals | Gender | Average Age 41.96 | Average Stay 3.08 | Outcomes |
| L = 25 B = 1 HL = 2 P = 1 | All Male | Youngest-23 Oldest- 65 | Longest Stay 15 Months | Recall 4 Move On 2 Withdrawn 1 FTR 2 |

Newhouse Profile - February 2007

Appendix 5.2 v

| Type of Residence | Gender | Age | How Long in Hostel - Months | Recall , Breach, Transfer Move On HMP |
|-------------------|---------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| Licensee | Male | 40 | 5.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 34 | 4.15 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 34 | 2.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 66 | 3.88 | |
| Licensee | Male | 23 | 3.13 | |
| Licensee | Male | 46 | 3.50 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 66 | 3.30 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 28 | 2.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 48 | 2.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | No Age | 1.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 50 | 1.75 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 49 | 1.85 | |
| Licensee | Male | 35 | 1.06 | Recalled |
| Licensee | Male | 38 | 0.62 | |
| Licensee | Male | 37 | 1.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | 60 | 1.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | 27 | 1.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | No Age | 1.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 41 | 1.12 | |
| Licensee | Male | 46 | 0.78 | Recalled |
| Licensee | Male | 38 | 2.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 51 | 0.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | 44 | 0.04 | Breached |
| Bailee | Male | 25 | 4.50 | |
| Bailee | Male | 41 | 4.27 | |
| Bailee | Male | 33 | 1.90 | Bail V |
| Bailee | Male | 25 | 2.00 | |
| Bailee | Male | 30 | 0.25 | Bail V |
| Bailee | Male | 23 | 0.35 | |
| Bailee | Male | 18 | 0.03 | FTA |
| Bailee | Male | 23 | 0.25 | Bail V |
| Totals | Gender | Average Age 38.57 | Average Stay 1.94 | Outcomes |
| 23L 8 B | All Male | Youngest- 18 Oldest -66 | Longest Stay 5 Months | Move On 4 Recalled 2 Breached 1 Bail V 3 FTA 1 |

Auldhouse Profile – March 2007

Appendix 5.2 w

| Type of Residence | Gender | Age | How Long in Hostel - Months | Recall , Breach, Transfer Move On HMP etc |
|---------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| Probation | Male | 48 | 1.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 36 | 16.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 50 | 15.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 59 | 7.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 28 | 1.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 33 | 7.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 28 | 3.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 49 | 2.50 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 43 | 4.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 31 | 3.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 41 | 3.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 65 | 3.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 44 | 2.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 48 | 2.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | 58 | 2.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 51 | 1.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 31 | 1.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 23 | 0.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 28 | 1.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 61 | 0.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 63 | 0.25 | |
| Home Leave | Male | 47 | 0.25 | HMP |
| Totals | Gender | Average Age 43.86 | Average Stay 3.53 | Outcomes |
| L = 20 HL = 1 P = 1 | All Male | Youngest- 23 Oldest – 65 | Longest Stay 16 Months | Move On 1 |

Newhouse Profile March 2007

Appendix 5.2 y

| Type of Residence | Gender | Age | How Long in Hostel - Months | Recall , Breach, Transfer Move On HMP |
|------------------------|---------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| Licensee | Male | 40 | 6.00 | |
| Licensee | Male | 34 | 2.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 66 | 4.88 | |
| Licensee | Male | 23 | 4.13 | |
| Licensee | Male | 28 | 3.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 48 | 3.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | No Age | 2.00 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 50 | 2.75 | Move On |
| Licensee | Male | 49 | 2.85 | |
| Licensee | Male | 38 | 1.62 | Recalled |
| Licensee | Male | 37 | 1.75 | Recalled |
| Licensee | Male | 60 | 2.50 | |
| Licensee | Male | 27 | 2.25 | |
| Licensee | Male | 41 | 2.12 | |
| Licensee | Male | 38 | 3.0 | |
| Licensee | Male | 51 | 1.5 | |
| Licensee | Male | 30 | 0.75 | |
| Licensee | Male | 23 | 0.16 | Recalled |
| Licensee | Male | 56 | 0.25 | Recalled |
| Licensee | Male | No Age | 0.06 | Recalled |
| Licensee | Male | 27 | 0.80 | |
| Licensee | Male | 50 | 0.29 | |
| Licensee | Male | 47 | 0.06 | Recalled |
| Licensee | Male | 35 | 0.03 | Recalled |
| Bailee | Male | 44 | 0.29 | Breached |
| Bailee | Male | 25 | 5.50 | |
| Bailee | Male | 41 | 5.27 | |
| Bailee | Male | 25 | 2.00 | Breached |
| Bailee | Male | 23 | 0.75 | Sentenced |
| Bailee | Male | 21 | 0.60 | Bail V |
| Bailee | Male | 22 | 0.25 | Sentenced |
| Bailee | Male | 37 | 0.75 | |
| Bailee | Male | 43 | 0.60 | |
| Bailee | Male | 40 | 0.60 | |
| Bailee | Male | 22 | 0.30 | Breach FTR |
| ROTL | Male | 23 | 0.16 | ROTL |
| Totals | Gender | Average Age 37.17 | Average Stay 1.85 | Outcomes |
| 25 L 11 B 1 ROTL | All Male | Youngest- 21 Oldest- 66 | Longest Stay 6 Months | Move On 2 Recall 8 Breach 2 Breach FTR 1 Sentenced 1 |

Sample of Letters Sent

Appendix 5.4

New House

16th of May 2002

Dear (Hostel Manager),

Thank you for your time on my recent visit. It was good to see the hostel and begin to meet a few people. I would like to introduce myself to the staff and residents. My name is Francis Cowe. I am a member of staff at University of Wales College Newport. Between 1991 and 1999 I worked as a Probation Officer in Wales and am aware of some of the issues facing staff and residents in a hostel environment. I am interested in exploring with staff and residents their views and experiences of Probation and Bail Hostels. I am also visiting other hostels around the country and am keen to look at the role and purpose of hostels.

I would like to spend time with staff and residents at New House and interview people ,over the coming months to listen to their views and experiences. The interviews would be for about 45minutes to an hour and information provided would be treated with respect. If you do not want to be identified in my written work I will leave out names , personal details and specific locations.

I hope to start meeting people on Thursday next week. I respect that for the residents this is their home and for the staff their place of work. So please be assured that I will try and respect your privacy and general routines.

I hope that my work will be of some benefit to the hostel and its residents.
Thank you for your cooperation and assistance in my work.

Best Wishes

Francis Cowe

Probation and Bail Hostels
Semi Structured Interview Schedule for Residents

Date:

Hostel:

Interviewee:

Name

Age

Gender

Why are you here?

Order/ licence/ bail / offence

- **How long have you been here?**
- **How were you received at the hostel? Did you receive an induction?**
- **Have you ever been at a hostel/ care home / institution before?**
- **Did this effect attitudes/ emotions to hostel on your arrival?**
- **How did you feel on arrival to the hostel?**

Purpose of being at the hostel (their Understanding)

What is it like to be a resident at this hostel?

Describe a typical day at the hostel?

What is offered to you at the hostel?

What issues do you need help with?

Is this being achieved/ how?

Do you have a key worker?

How often do you meet?

What happens in a typical session?

How useful do you find these sessions/ /Why?

Approach of key worker – (is this similar to the rest of the staff group)

Have you been involved in any programmes/ probation input outside of the hostel?

Has this been supported within the hostel? How?

Have you been referred to another agency for support whilst at the hostel?

Who?

Who else has been involved with you since you arrived?

Feel supported in initiatives, e.g offending behaviour/ Drug/ alcohol
(Criminogenic needs?)

Are there any issues you have not received support with?

Staff Relationships

Who is important to you in the hostel and why?

How do staff respond to you?

Overall experience and impact of the hostel

What do you see as being good about being a resident here?

What do you see as being bad about being a resident here?

How has being at the hostel affected you?

Has it helped you to stop offending?

Could anything else have helped you stop offending?

Close, Thanks etc – Happy to be involved in further discussions?

Willing for follow up contact?

Probation and Bail Hostels
Semi Structured Interview Schedule for Ancillary Staff

Date:

Hostel:

Interviewee:

- Job Title
- What do you see as your main duties and responsibilities?
- How long have you worked here?
- Age?
- Gender?
- Have you had a similar position elsewhere/ Previous residential experience?
- Duties/ Responsibilities in those positions?

Describe a typical day for you in the hostel?

Have you had any training specific to working in a hostel?

What is your role within the hostel?

What contact do you have with residents?

What do you think your responsibilities are to residents?

Do you have any supervision or support in your role?

What impact do you have on the residents?

What do you see as the purpose of this hostel?

What has your experience been of working in the hostel / satisfaction / plans etc?

Close, Thanks etc – Happy to be involved in further discussions – follow up questionnaire?

General Observations or Remarks :

Summary of Semi Structured Interviews

March 2002 – August 2002

February 2002 Pre Research Meeting with ACO

Note Newhouse opened early in 2002 and semi structured interviews did not start until a resident population had built up for a few months. Staff experience prior to this relates to work in other hostels. In 2002 Assistant Manager was the title used in 2007 to apply to APSO's.

| When | Staff | Resident | Hostel |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| March 2002 | | Probation (CRO) Male 20 | Auldhouse 1 year |
| March 2002 | | Probation (CRO) Male 19 | Auldhouse 6 months |
| March 2002 | | Licencee Male 58 | Auldhouse 1 week |
| March 2002 | Manager Auldhouse Male | | Auldhouse |
| March 2002 | Deputy Manager Female 37 | | Auldhouse |
| April 2002 | | Licencee Female 25 | Newhouse 1 ½ months |
| April 2002 | | Probation (CR0) Male 31 | Auldhouse 6 months |
| April 2002 | Relief Staff Male 55 | | Auldhouse 1 year |
| April 2002 | Relief Staff Male 53 | | Auldhouse 4 years |
| April 2002 | | Licencee Male 54 | Auldhouse 11 months |
| April 2002 | | Licencee Male 29 | Auldhouse 9 months |
| April 2002 | | Licencee Male 67 | Newhouse 2 weeks |
| April 2002 | Assistant Manager Male | | Newhouse 3 months |
| April 2002 | Relief Staff Female | | Newhouse 3 months |
| May 2002 | | Licencee Male 41 | Newhouse 2 ½ months |
| May 2002 | Assistant Manager Female 46 | | Newhouse 4 Months |

| | | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| May 2002 | Assistant Manager Male 38 | | Newhouse 4 months |
| May 2002 | Assistant Manager Male 38 | | Newhouse 6 Years |
| When May 2002 | Staff | Resident Licencee Male 54 | Hostel Newhouse 1 ¼ months |
| May 2002 | | Bailee Male 20 | Auldhouse 2 weeks |
| May 2002 | | Bailee Male 22 | Auldhouse 1 week |
| May 2002 | | Licencee Male 29 | Auldhouse 10 months |
| May 2002 | Waking Night Male 37 | | Auldhouse 2 years |
| May 2002 | Relief Staff Female | | Auldhouse 1 year |
| June 2002 | Manager Male 53 | | Newhouse 4 years |
| June 2002 | | Probation (CRO) Male 38 | Newhouse 3 months |
| June 2002 | | Bailee Male 30 | Newhouse 1 month |
| June 2002 | | Licencee Male 28 | Newhouse 1 month |
| June 2002 | | Bailee Male 42 | Newhouse 3 weeks |
| July 2002 | Deputy Manager Male 31 | | Auldhouse 3 weeks |
| July 2002 | Deputy Manager Female 57 | | Newhouse 4 months |
| July 2002 | Assistant Manager 54 | | Auldhouse 4 years |
| July 2002 | Assistant Manager Male 35 | | Auldhouse 8 ½ Years |
| July 2002 | House Keeper Female 43 | | Auldhouse 8 years |
| July 2002 | CPN Male 43 | | Auldhouse 4 weeks |
| July 2002 | | Probation (CRO) Male 33 | Auldhouse 5 months |
| July 2002 | Assistant Manager Female 53 | | Auldhouse 8 months |
| July 2002 | | Probation (CRO) Male 37 | Newhouse 4 months |
| July 2002 | Waking Night Male 54 | | Newhouse |
| July | Waking Night | | Newhouse |

| | | | |
|--------|----------------|---------------|-----------|
| 2002 | Male 60 | | 11years |
| July | Relief Staff | | Newhouse |
| 2002 | Male | | 5 years |
| July | Domestic Staff | | Newhouse |
| 2002 | Female 40ish | | 5 months |
| When | Staff | Resident | Hostel |
| August | | Bailee Female | Newhouse |
| 2002 | | 20 | 6 weeks |
| August | Housekeeper | | Newhouse |
| 2002 | Female 41 | | 7 ½ years |
| August | Administrator | | Newhouse |
| 2002 | Female 31 | | 6 ½ Years |
| August | | Bailee Male | Newhouse |
| 2002 | | 21 | 1 week |
| August | | Bailee Male | Newhouse |
| 2002 | | 40 | 3 weeks |
| August | Relief Staff | | Newhouse |
| 2002 | Female 24 | | 2 years |
| August | | Home Leave | Auldhouse |
| 2002 | | Male 48 | 1 week |
| August | | Bailee Male | Auldhouse |
| 2002 | | 36 | 6 months |

Summary of Semi Structured Interviews

October 2006 – March 2007

31st of August 2006 – Pre meeting with ACO and 2 Hostel Managers.

April 2007 – Research Exit Interview with ACO.

| When | Staff | Resident | Hostel and Length of Stay to Date |
|---------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|--|
| October 2006 | | Licencee Male 43 | Auldhouse 6 Months |
| October 2006 | | Licencee Male 46 | Auldhouse 5 Months |
| October 2006 | APSO Male 58 | | Auldhouse 10 Years |
| October 2006 | | Licencee Male 46 | Auldhouse 8 months |
| October 2006 | | Licencee Male 39 | Auldhouse 16 months |
| October 2006 | | Licencee Male 19 | Auldhouse 2 weeks |
| October 2006 | Manager Male 62 | | Auldhouse |
| October 2006 | Basic Skills Tutor Male 58 | Visits each week | Auldhouse 12 months |
| October 2006 | APSO Female 30 | | Auldhouse 10 months |
| November 2006 | | Licencee Male 35 | Auldhouse 2 weeks |
| November 2006 | | Licencee Male 19 | Auldhouse 5 weeks |
| November 2006 | | Licencee Male 26 | Auldhouse 5 months |
| November 2006 | | Licencee Male 50 | Auldhouse 11 months |
| November 2006 | | Licencee Male 59 | Auldhouse 3 Months |
| November 2006 | | Licencee Male 27 | Auldhouse 6 weeks |
| December 2006 | APSO Male 30 | | Auldhouse 14 months |

| When | Staff | Resident | Hostel and Length of Stay to Date |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| December 2006 | | Home Leave Male 47 | Auldhouse 1 week |
| December 2006 | Deputy Manager Male 47 | | Auldhouse |
| December 2006 | APSO Female | | Auldhouse 18 years* |
| December 2006 | | Licencee Male 36 | Auldhouse 13 months |
| January 2007 | Relief Staff Female 23 | | Auldhouse 18 months |
| January 2007 | CPN Female 47 | | Auldhouse 2 ½ Years |
| January 2007 | APSO Female 30 | | Auldhouse 2 ½ Years |
| January 2007 | | Licencee Male 31 | Auldhouse 4 weeks |
| January 2007 | | Licencee Male 64 | Auldhouse 2 weeks |
| January 2007 | | Licencee Male 40 | Auldhouse 1 week |
| January 2007 | | Licencee Male 42 | Auldhouse New Arrival |
| February 2007 | Cook Female | | Auldhouse |
| February 2007 | Administrator Female | | Auldhouse |
| February 2007 | Housekeeper Female | | Auldhouse 10 years? |
| March 2007 | | Licencee Male 27 | Auldhouse 1 week |
| March 2007 | | Licencee Male 59 | Auldhouse 7 months |
| March 2007 | | Licencee Male 30 | Auldhouse 1 month |
| September 2006 | | Licencee Male 30 | Newhouse |
| September 2006 | | Licencee Male 39 | Newhouse 3 months |
| October 2006 | Cook Female | | Newhouse 4 years |
| October 2006 | | Licencee Male 61 | Newhouse 5 months |
| October 2006 | | Licencee Male 39 | Newhouse 3 months |
| October 2006 | APSO Female | | Newhouse |

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| 2006 October 2006 | 51 | Licencee Male 31 | 4 years Newhouse 1 month |
| When | Staff | Resident | Hostel and Length of Stay to Date |
| October 2006 | | Bailee 66 | Newhouse 1 month |
| November 2006 | Sessional Worker Female 43 | | Newhouse 4 years |
| November 2006 | Deputy Manager Male 47 | | Newhouse 5 months |
| November 2006 | Sessional Staff Male 45 | | Newhouse |
| December 2006 | | Licencee Male 34 | Newhouse 1 month |
| December 2006 | | Licencee Male 34 | Newhouse 1 week |
| December 2006 | APSO Male 64 | | Newhouse 15 years* |
| December 2006 | | Licencee Male 52 | Newhouse 6 months |
| December 2006 | APSO Male | | Newhouse 3 months |
| December 2006 | | Licencee Male 28 | Newhouse 3 weeks |
| December 2006 | Manager Female | | Newhouse 2 years |
| January 2007 | | Licencee Male 20 | Newhouse 3 months |
| January 2007 | | Licencee Male 31 | Newhouse 4 months |
| January 2007 | | Licencee Male 23 | Newhouse 2 months |
| January 2007 | | Licencee Male 64 | Newhouse 2 ½ months |
| January 2007 | Relief Staff Male 33 | | Newhouse |
| January 2007 | Basic Skills Tutor Male | Visits Each Week | Newhouse Over a year |
| February 2007 | | Licencee Male 25 | Newhouse 4 months |
| February 2007 | Relief Staff Female 28 | | Newhouse |
| March 2007 | APSO Male | | Newhouse |
| March 2007 | | Bailee Male 37 | Newhouse |

| | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| March 2007 | | Bailee Male 40 | Newhouse |
| March 07 | Domestic Female | | Newhouse 4 Years |
| March 07 | Administrator Female | | Newhouse 4 Years |

¹ Newhouse also had a second male cook whom the author spoke with but did not interview formally. This was the one exception noted to an otherwise core team of all female ancillary staffing. The facilities contract did mean that relief cooks sent in on an agency basis were male or female.

Hostel Regime 2006-7
Auldhouse and Newhouse;

Monday to Fridays

0600- End of Curfew and Breakfast Bar Opens

0800- Residents Called

0845- Breakfast Bar Closed

0900-9.15- Residents Morning Meetings (Weekdays Only)

10.00- 11.00am – Group Activities (Tuesday to Friday)

12.00 – Visitors Welcome

16.45- 17.30 – Evening Meal

22.00 Visitors Leave

23.00 Hostel Secured All Residents to be in Unless given Leave of
Absence(not available to bailees or those on home leave).

00.30 All Residents Must be in their Own Rooms.

Weekends and Bank Holidays

0830 Residents Called

0900- 1200 Breakfast Available

12.00 Visitors Allowed In

12.30 – 1.00 Lunch

5.00 – 5.30 pm Evening Meal

10.00pm Visitors to Leave

11.00pm Hostel Secured All Residents to be in Unless given Leave of
Absence(not available to bailees or those on home leave).

00.30 All Residents Must be in their Own Rooms.

Hostel Regime 2002

Newhouse:

Monday to Fridays

| | |
|---------------|---|
| 0800 | Residents Called |
| 0810 -9.00 | Showers and Breakfast |
| 0900-9.15 | House Meetings- Allocation of Daily Chores/ Appointments (Weekdays Only) |
| 0915 -10.00 | Domestic Chores Completed. |
| 0900 -12.00 | Bedroom Vacated to allow domestic staff to do their duties |
| 10.00 -12.00 | Constructive Activities |
| 12.00 -1300 | Lunch |
| 14.00 -16.00 | Constructive Activities |
| 18.45 | Cooked Evening Meal |
| 19.00 - 21.00 | Leisure Groups and Activities |
| 22.00 | Tea and Toast |
| 23.45 | All Residents to their own rooms. |

Visitors by Appointment Only. Visitors are expected to abide by hostel rules.

Approved Premises Rules

- Stay within the hostel between 2300 and 0600 or for such longer periods as a court or Parole Board may determine
- Behave reasonably and, specifically, avoid all abusive, racist, threatening and violent actions and/ or language at all times
- Refrain from any such action or language on or in the near vicinity of the hostel premises which might cause annoyance, disturbance or serious offence to local residents
- Pay rent as set by the Home Office and comply with all other requirements to collect due payments
- Abide by the complete prohibition on all alcohol, un-prescribed drugs, gas, solvents and offensive weapons on the hostel premises
- Comply with health and safety and fire regulations
- Register with the Hostel's GP
- Accept staff responsibility to safeguard and hand out prescribed medication
- Assist with the designated domestic tasks on a daily basis
- Attend the weekly resident's meeting
- Participate in any group programmes which may be provided from time to time
- Accept responsibility for the reasonable behaviour of guests who must be signed in and who must remain downstairs unless specific authorisation is given by staff
- Remain in own rooms between 0030 and 0600 unless specific authorisation is given by staff.

Considerations for 2nd Phase of Fieldwork

Qualitative Differences in the Regime at different times

Are managers, residents and workers aware of the differential experience of being in the hostel at different times of the day – and week? Is there a continuity of a context for change ? (space and time) .

What are the night cover arrangements?

What happens at the weekends?

The Role and Focus of Key work

Does key work still have the prominence and meaning it had ?

Has the focus of keywork changed – i.e. is it less change focused and more controlling? E.g. auditing and monitoring how do staff and managers understand the role and function of keywork?

How do residents understand and experience this?

Who does it - how do they understand it?

Managers view of the role of the hostel / Home Office view

How do managers and staff understand the purpose of the hostel (i.e. will they still include / stress rehabilitation and reintegration – containment?)

How do workers see the balance of care and control?

Has any more surveillance technology been used?

Has the publicity material or info for residents / sentencers seen any shift in tone or emphasis.

Training / Staffing

Have there been an changes in training - what training or inputs have staff had since 2002? What have these focused on?

Has the staffing or nature of staffing changed.

Is there any evidence of functions being privatised.

Do staff feel part of the wider service?

Have they noticed any changes in their role and or their relationship to the wider service since 2002?

Connection with Community?

Has 'Auldhouse' maintained its 'Friends' group - to what extent has Newhouse adopted strategies to link with community?

Has Newhouse remained geographically isolated from community?
Are there any community links now?

Reintegration / Rehabilitation

Has 'follow on support' been considered in either hostel? How do staff and residents understand the end of a residence - how does this fit with notions of 'end to end offender management' / NOMS ?

Does voluntary work or 'active citizenship' play a role in offender interventions.

What is the stated purpose of the hostel?

Has the regime/ daily routine changed?

What do staff understand by effective practice?

Is there more or less of an emphasis on provision of services within the hostel or looking out?

Differences

Is there still a perception that both hostels are quite different?

Gender

Is newhouse still a mixed hostel?

If it has changed why? If not why not ?

Policy and practice implications for female offenders ?

Privatisation / Contestability

Is there a change in the discourse or practice?

How do staff and managers understand this?

Has it impacted on policy or practice?
(food, facilities, staffing , activities, partnerships?)

Change

Is there evidence of rehabilitative/ reintegrative continuity / coherence over the last four years?

How are the hostels understood in relation to the wider service?

Has the role of the hostel changed?

Care - Control Continuum - Where do hostels sit on this and to what extent may they be understood to have been influenced by contemporary changes in probation ?

Are there plans to increase the size of the hostel estate?

Are hostels understood as having a common function?

What do staff and managers see as the future for hostels?

References

Abbot, P & Sapsford, R (1999) Research Methods for Nurses and the Caring Professions, (2nd edition), Buckingham, Open University Press.

Allen, F (1964) The Borderland of Criminal Justice, USA, University of Chicago Press.

Allen, F (1981) The Decline of the Rehabilitative Ideal, Penal Policy and Purpose, London, Yale University Press.

Allen, R and Hough, M (2007) Community Penalties, Sentencers, The Media and Public Opinion, in Gelsthorpe, L and Morgans, R, Handbook of Probation, Devon, Willan:565-590.

Andersen, M (1993) Studying Across Difference, Race, Class and Gender in Qualitative Research, in Stanfield, J and Dennis, R (eds) Race and Ethnicity in Research Methods, London, Sage:39-53.

Andrews et al (1990) Does Correctional Treatment Work? A clinically relevant and psychologically informed meta-analysis, Criminology 28.3:369 – 388.

Andrews, D, A and Bonta, J (2003) (3rd edition) The Psychology of Criminal Conduct, Cincinnati, Anderson Publishing Company.

Anon (1993) My Life as a Woman in a Bail Hostel, Probation Journal, Vol 40: No 3:149-151.

Atkinson, P (1990) Ethnographic Imagination: Textual Construction of Reality, London, Routledge.

Bailey, C, A (1996) A Guide to Fieldwork Research, Thousand Oaks, CA, Pine Forge Press.

Barry, M and Hallet, C (1998) Social Exclusion and Social Work , Issues of Theory, Policy and Practice, Dorset, Russell House Publishing.

Barry , K (1991) Probation Hostels and Their Regimes A Comparative Study, Cambridge, Institute of Criminology.

Barnes, M & Prior, D (2000) Private Lives as Public Policy, Birmingham, Venture Press.

Barton, A (2005) Fragile Moralities and Dangerous Sexualities, Two Centuries of Semi-Penal Institutionalisation for Women, Aldershot, Ashgate.

Barton, A (2004) Women and Community Punishment: The Probation Hostel as a Semi- Penal Institution for Female Offenders in The Howard Journal Vol 43.No2:149-163.

Bean, P (1981) Punishment, Oxford, Martin Robertson.

Bean, P (1976) Rehabilitation and Deviance, Radical Social Policy, London, Routledge Kegan and Paul.

Becker, H, A (1963) Outsiders : Studies in the Sociology of Deviance, New York, Free Press.

Benyon, J and Edwards, A (1997) Crime and Public Order in Dunleavy, P et al (Eds) Developments in British Politics, 5, London Macmillan

Berger, P and Luckmann, T (1985) The Social Construction of Reality, A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge, Harmondsworth, Penguin.

Berkley, D and Collett, S (2000) Back to the Future; Housing and Support for the Offender, in Probation Journal 47 No 4:235 –242.

Bevan, A (1961) *In Place of Fear*, London, MacGibbon and Kee.

Beveridge, W, H (1944) *Full Employment in a Free Society, A Report*. London, Allen and Unwin.

Bhui, H, S (2002) *Probation in England and Wales ; from Rehabilitation to Risk* in The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry, Vol 13, No 2 :231-239, Taylor and Francis Ltd.

Biesteck, F (1961) *The Case Work Relationship*, London, Allen & Unwin.

Bingham, L (2001) *Diversion from Custody in Advances in Psychiatric Treatment No 7:198-2007*,The Royal College of Psychiatrists.

Blakemore, K (2003) *Social Policy An Introduction*, Buckingham, Open University Press.

Blumstein, A and Cohen, J (1973) *A Theory of the Stability of Punishment* in Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 64(2):198-207.

Bourdieu, P (1990) *In Other Words; Essays Towards a Reflexive Sociology*, Translated by Adamson, Cambridge, Polity Press.

Bosanquet, H (1914) *Social Work in London 1869 –1912*, London, John Murray (Reprinted by Harvester Press (1973)).

Boswell, G, Davies, M and Wright, A (1993) *Contemporary Probation Practice*, Aldershot, Avebury.

Bowlby, J (1971) *Attachment*, Harmondsworth, Penguin.

Braithwaite, J and Mugford, S (1994) Conditions of Successful Re-integration Ceremonies in British Journal of Criminal Justice, 34,2:139-171.

Brandon, D (N.D) *Women Without Home*, Christian Action.

Brewer, J.D (Ed)(2000) *Ethnography*, Buckinghamshire, OUP.

Bricker-Jenkins, M (1997) Hidden Treasures; Unlocking Strengths in the Public Social Services in D. Saleeby (ed) The Strengths Perspective in Social Work Practice, (2nd Edition) New York, Longmann.

Briggs, J et al (1996) Crime and Punishment in England, An Introductory History, London, UCL Press.

Brody, S, R (1976) The Effectiveness of Sentencing, Home Office Research Study No 35, London, HMSO.

Brookman, F, Noaks, L and Wincup, E (Eds) (1999) Qualitative Research in Criminology, Aldershot, Ashgate.

Brooke, H(1963) 'Homes and Hostels' Greetings from the Home Secretary in Probation Journal, Vol 10, No8:116-117.

Brown, G and Geelan, S (1998) Elliot House; Working with Mentally Disordered Offenders in Probation Journal Vol 45, No1:10 – 14.

Brownlee, I (1998) Community Punishment, A Critical Introduction, London, Longman.

Bryan, A (1967) St Leonard's Housing Association An Experiment in Prison Aftercare in Probation Journal, Vol 13, No1:14-18.

Bryman, A (2001) Ethnography, Volumes I - IV, Sage Benchmarks in Research Methods, London ,Sage.

Buchanan, J and Millar ,M (1995) Probation: A Crisis of Identity in Probation Journal Vol 42:195-198.

Burnett, R (2005) More than Accommodation, Less than Prison: Raising the Profile of Approved Premises in Vista, Vol 10,1:2-8.

Burnett, R and McNeil, F (2005) The Place of the Office-Offender Relationship in Assisting Offenders to Desist from Crime in Probation Journal Vol 52, No3: 221-242.

Burnett, R and Eaton, G (2004) Factors Associated with Effective Practice in Approved Premises, Home Office Online Report 65/04.

Burnett, R and Maruna, S (2004) So Prison Works, Does it? The Criminal Careers of 130 Men Released from Prison under Home Secretary, Michael Howard in The Howard Journal, Vol 43 No 4:390 - 404.

Burnett, R (1994) Recidivism and Imprisonment, Home Office Research Bulletin, 36:19-22, London, Home Office.

Burr, V (1995) An Introduction to Social Constructionism, London, Routledge.

Calder, C, Hampson, A and Skinner, J (1999) Assessing Risk in Adult Males Who Sexually Abuse Children, Dorset, Russell House Publishing.

Calhoun, C (1996) Contemporary Sociological Theory, Oxford, Blackwell.

Cameron, J (1989) Bail Schemes The Failure of Reformism in Probation Journal, Vol 36, No 2:78-81.

Canton, R and Hancock, D (Eds)(2007) Dictionary of Probation and Offender Management, Devon, Willan.

Carlen, P and Worrall, A (2004) Analysing Women's Imprisonment, Cullumpton, Willan.

Carpenter, M. (1851) Reformatory Schools for the Children of the Perishing and Dangerous Classes, and for Juvenile Offenders, London : C. Gilpin.

Carpenter, M. (1853) Juvenile Delinquents, their Condition and Treatment, London: W. & F.G. Cash.

Carpenter, M. (1864) Our Convicts, London : Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts and Green.

Carpenter, J. E. (1879, 2d ed. 1881, repr.1973) Life and Work of Mary Carpenter, London: Macmillan

Carpenter, Mary (1968 edition - first published 1851) Reformatory Schools For the Children of the Perishing and Dangerous Classes, London, Woborn Press

Carter, P (2003) Managing Offenders, Reducing Crime, London, Home Office

Cavadino, M and Dignan, J (2002) The Penal System - An Introduction, Third Edition, London, Sage.

Cheliotis, L.K (2006) How Iron is the Iron Cage of new Penology? The role of human agency in the implementation of criminal justice policy in Punishment and Society, Vol 8, (3):313 – 340, London, Sage.

Christie, N (1993) Crime Control as Industry, London, Routledge.

Chui, W, H and Nellis, M (2003) Moving Probation Forward, Evidence, Arguments and Practice, Essex, Pearson - Longmann.

Church of England Temperance Society (1889) Minutes of the Council of the Church of England Temperance Society. (British Library)

Clancy, A , Hudson, K, Maguire, M , Peake, R, Raynor, P , Vanstone, M & Kynch J (2006) Getting Out and Staying Out , Results of the Prisoner Resettlement Pathfinder, Bristol, Policy Press.

Clegg, F (1990) 'Simple Statistics, A Course Book for the Social Sciences (15th edition) Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Cohen, N (2002) Privatisation is Easy: You Just Pay More and Get Less in The Observer, Sunday 20th of October 2002. Comment (<http://observer.guardian.co.uk/comment/story/0,,815423,00.html>)

Cohen, S (1985) Visions of Social Control, Cambridge, Polity Press.

Cohen, S (1979) The Punitive City; Notes on the Dispersal of Social Control in Contemporary Crisis, Vol 3 : 339-363.

Cohen, S (1972) Folk Devils and Moral Panics;The Creation of the Mods and Rockers, London, McGibbon and Kee

Coker, J, B (1970) The Homeless Offender in The Probation Journal, Vol 16 No 2 :46-52.

Colton, M and Vanstone, M (1996) Betrayal of Trust – Sexual Abuse By Men Who Work with Children...In Their Own Words, London, Free Association Press.

Conrad,J (1984) The Redefinition of Probation: Drastic Proposals to Solve an Urgent Problem in McAnnay, P ,Thomson, D, Fogel D (eds) Probation and Justice, Cambridge, Mass : Oelgeschlager, Gunn & Hain.

Cook, T, Morgan, H, G and Pollok, B (1968) The Rathcoole Experiment, The First Year at a Hostel for Vagrant Alcoholics in Probation Journal , Vol 14 No 2:40-44.

Correctional Services Accreditation Panel (14.04.2003) Letter to Martin Copsey signed by Duncan Nichol.

Cowe, F, Deering, J and Vanstone M (2007) From Eclecticism to Orthodoxy in Practice: Can Theory and Practice Merge in Probation in Smith, S (Ed) Applying Theory to Policy and Practice – Issues For Critical Reflection, Hampshire, Ashgate.

Cowe, F (2007) Suicide and Self Harm in Canton, R and Hancock, D (Eds) Dictionary of Probation and Offender Management, Devon, Willan.

Cowe, F (2007) From Probation Hostels to Approved Premises, A Rehabilitative Thermometer. Where Next? In A Century of Probation, Moments in Probation– web entry (03.02.2007) www.centuryofprobation.com/moments/034.pdf

Cox, E (1887) The Principles of Punishment as Applied in the Administration of Criminal Law by Judges and Magistrates, London , Law Times Office.

Croall, H (1998) Crime and Society in Britain, London, Longmann.

Croft, J (1978) Research in Criminal Justice, Home Office Research Study 44, London , HMSO.

Croker-King, E (1915) Juvenile Probation in The National Association of Probation Officers,5;66-67.

Crow, I (2001) The Treatment and Rehabilitation of Offenders, London, Sage.

Crow, I (1980) Working with Discharged Prisoners in Probation Journal, Vol 27, No2:39-43.

Cuff, E, C , Sharrock, W. W and Francis, D, W (1998) Perspectives in Sociology, London, Routledge.

Darlington, Y and Scott, D (2002) Qualitative Research in Practice: Stories From the Field, Buckingham, Open University Press.

Dazell, Lord Hamilton of (1966) A Year of Change in Probation Journal, Vol 12, No2:40-44.

Denney, D (2005) Risk and Society, London, Sage.

Denney, D (1992) Racism And Anti-Racism In Probation, Routledge, London.

'Dews and Watts Report', Home Office (1995) Review of Probation Officer Recruitment and Quality Training; Discussion Paper, London , Home Office.

Ditton, J and Ford, R (1994) The Reality of Probation. A Formal Ethnography of Process and Practice, Aldershot. Ashgate.

Dodsworth, F (2007) Police and the Prevention of Crime , Commerce, Temptation and the Corruption of the Body Politic from Fielding to Colquhoun in *The British Journal of Criminology* 47:439-454.

Douglas, M and Lianos, M (2002) Dangerization and The End of Deviance: The Institutional Environment in Garland, D and Sparks, S (Eds) *Criminology and Social Theory*, Oxford: Clarendon Studies in Criminology.

Drakeford, M, Haines, K, Cotton, B and Octigan, M (2001) Pre Trial Services and the Future of Probation, Cardiff, University of Wales Press.

Drakeford, M (2000) Privatisation and Social Policy, Harlow, Longman.

Drakeford, M (1988) Privatisation, Punishment and the Future for Probation in Probation Journal Vol 35 no2:43-47.

Drakeford, M and Vanstone, M (Eds)(1996) Beyond Offending Behaviour, Aldershot, Ashgate/Arena.

Dunkley, E (2002) NAPBH, Hostels Past and Present, Hostels for Offenders Developing the Role, Conference Paper, 21.02.02, CCJS, London.

Duff, R and Garland, D (1994) A Reader On Punishment, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Ellison, N (1994) Egalitarian Thought and Labour Politics; Retreating Visions, London, Routledge.

Ellison, N and Pierson, C (Eds) (1998) Developments in British Social Policy, Basingstoke Macmillan.

Ellison, N, Bauld, L and Powell, M (Eds) (2004) Social Policy Review 16, Analysis and Debate in Social Policy, Bristol, Policy Press.

Emsley, C (1987) Crime and Society in England 1750 – 1900, London, Longman.

Estlea, B (1973) Periodic Detention an Alternative to Imprisonment in Probation Journal Vol 19, No2 :41-43.

Eyseneck, H, J (1960) Behaviour Therapy and the Neuroses; Readings in Modern Methods of Treatment Derived from Learning Theory, Oxford, Pergamon Press.

Fabiano, E and Porporino, F (2002) Focus on Resettlement – A Change, Canada, T3 Associates.

Fail, P (1996) Practice Note; Positive Group-work in an Approved Hostel
in Probation Journal Vol 35, No 3:165-167.

Farrall, S (2002) Rethinking What Works with Offenders, Cullompton, Devon, Willan.

Farooq, M (2003) Evolution of Managerialism in Probation in Justice of the Peace,
Volume 167:207- 209.

Feeley, M and Simon, J (1994) Actuarial Justice : The Emerging New Criminal Law
in Nelken, D, The Futures of Criminology, London, Sage.

Ferguson, H (2007) Abused and Looked After Children as 'Moral Dirt' ;Child Abuse
and Institutional Care in Historical Perspective in Journal of Social Policy,36,1:123-
139, Cambridge, CUP.

Fiddes, C (1989) Bail Information Schemes in Probation Journal, Vol 36, No2:74-78.

Fielding H (1751) An Enquiry into the Cause of the Late Increase of Robberies in
Zirker, M, R, (Ed) (1988) An Enquiry Into the Cause of the Late Increase of
Robberies and Other Writings, Oxford, Clarendon.

Fisher, R and Wilson, C (1982) Authority or Freedom, Aldershot, Gower.

Fisher, R, Wilson, C and Germann, O (1980) Adult Probation Hostels ; a view from
the field in Probation Journal, Vol 27, No 1:18-21.

Fitzgerald, M, McLennan, G and Pawson, J (Eds) (1981) Crime and Society,
Readings in History and Theory, London. Routledge.

Fitzgibbon, D, W, (2004) Pre Emptive Criminalisation Risk Control and Alternative
Futures. ICCJ , Monograph 4. NAPO.

Folkard, M. S et al (1976) IMPACT: Intensive Matched Probation and After-Care
Treatment. Home Office Research Studies , No.36, London , Home Office.

Forrester, S, A and Stanyer, J (1989) Bail Mail in Probation Journal Vol 36;44.

Forsythe, W, J, Howard, J, Clay, W, L, Griffiths, A, Maybrick, F, E, C (2000) *The State of the Prisons in Britain, 1775-1905*, London, Routledge.

Foucault (2000 edition) *'Power – The Essential Works of Foucault 1954- 1984: Volume 3*, Bath, Allen Lane Penguin Press edited by James. D. Fabion and translated by Hurley et al.

Fowles, A, J (Ed) (1984) *Ideas on Institutions : Analysing the Literature on Long-Term Care and Custody*, London, Routledge, Kegan and Paul

Fowler, D, A (1975) *Can Control be Justified?* in 'Control Without Custody' Papers Presented to the Cropwood Round-Table Conference 1975, Cambridge, Institute of Criminology (1976) King, J and Young, W (Eds):158-177.

Freud, S (1986) *The Essentials of Psychoanalysis, Sigmund Freud, Selected with an introduction and commentaries by Anne Freud*. Harmondsworth, Penguin.

Fullwood, C (2001) *Youth Justice- A Board Perspective* in Probation Journal, Vol 48, No2:135-138.

Gamble, A and Wells, C (1989) *Thatcher's Law*, Cardiff, University of Wales Press.

Garland, D (1991) *Punishment and Modern Society, A Study in Social Theory*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Garland, D (1997) *Probation and the Reconfiguration of Crime Control* in Burnett (Ed) Proceedings of the Probation Studies First Colloquium ; Probation Studies Unit Report Number 3, Oxford, Oxford Centre for Criminological Research.

Garland, D (2001) *The Culture of Crime Control; Crime and Social Order in Contemporary Society*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Garret C, J (1985) *Effects of Residential Treatment on Adjudicated Delinquents: A Meta Analysis* in Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency Vol 22,4:287-308.

Gelsthorpe, L and Morgan, R (Eds) (2007) *Handbook of Probation*, Devon, Willan.

Genderau, P, Coggin, C and Smith, P (2001) Implementation Guidelines for Correctional Programmes in the 'Real World', in Bernfield, G. A , Farrington D. P and Leschied A. W (Eds) *Offender Rehabilitation in Practice; Implementing and Evaluating Effective Programmes*, Chichester; Wiley.

Genderau et al (2002) The Common Sense Revolution and Correctional Policy in Mc Guire, J (Ed) *Offender Rehabilitation and Treatment: Effective Programmes to Reduce Re-Offending: 358-379*, Chichester, Wiley and Sons.

Gertz, C (2000) The Interpretation of Cultures, (revised 1973 edition) New York, Basic Books.

Gertz, C (1988) Works and Lives; The Anthropologist as Author, Bristol, Polity Press.

Gilliband, P (1994) Coherent Harm Reduction in *Probation Journal*, Vol 41, No 1:29.

Glennerster, H (1995) British Social Policy Since 1945, Oxford, Blackwell.

Glennerster, H (2004). 'Mrs Thatcher's Legacy: Getting it in Perspective.' In *Social Policy Review 16: Analysis and Debate in Social Policy*. Edited by Ellison, N, Baud, L, Powell, M. Policy Press, 2004.

Godson, D and Mitchell, C (1991) Bail Information Schemes in English Magistrates' Courts – A Review of the Data, Inner London Probation Service, London, HMSO.

Goffman, E (1968) Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates, Harmondsworth , Penguin.

Gomm, R (2004) Social Research Methodology a Critical Introduction, Hampshire, Palgrave Macmillan.

Gorman, K Gregory, M, Hayles, M , Parton, N (2006) Constructive Work with Offenders, London, Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Graham, J and Bowling, B (1995) Young People and Crime, HORS No 145, London, Home Office.

Grapes, T (2005) The NOMS Offender Management Model, Version 1, London, Home Office, NPD.

Grimsby, B (1963) Probation Hostels Some Observations on the Morison Report in Probation Journal, Vol 10, No 7:101-103.

Hamilton, Lord (1966) A Year of Change Probation Journal, Vol 12 , No 2:40-44.

Hanaway, J (1776) Solitude in Imprisonment, with profitable labour and a spare diet... the most effectual means of brining malefactor to a right sense of their condition. British Library 288.c.28

Hanaway, J (1784) The Neglect of the Effectual Separation of Prisoners and the Want of Good Order and Religious Economy in Our Prisons. British Library.

Hardy, S (1997) A Study of Bail Hostels in the West Midlands 1993-1996. Birmingham , West Midlands Probation Service.

Harris, R and Webb, D (1987) Welfare, Power and Juvenile Justice, Cambridge, University Press,

Haxby, D (1978) Probation: A Changing Service, London, Constable.

Hedderman, C (2003) Enforcing Supervision and Encouraging Compliance :181-193. in Chui, W, H and Nellis, M (2003) Moving Probation Forward, Evidence, Arguments and Practice, Essex, Pearson - Longmann

Hill, O (1883) Homes of the London Poor, London, Macmillan.

Hinton, N (1975) Should Hostels Control? ;93-103 in 'Control Without Custody' Papers Presented to the Cropwood Round-Table Conference 1975, Cambridge, Institute of Criminology(1976) King, J and Young, W (Eds).

Hobouse, S and Brockway, A. F (1923) English Prisons Today, London, Longmans Green and Co.

Home Office, NPD, HMSO Publications and Government Reports;

Home Office and NPD:

Home Office (1934) Home Office Directory 1934. London, Home Office

Home Office (1949) Approved Probation Hostel and Home Rules, London, Home Office

Home Office (1975) Research Study 30, Fielding Bail Hostel; The First Nine Months, Simon and Wilson

Home Office (1976) Statutory Instrument 1976/626 : Approved Probation Hostel and Home and Bail Hostel Rules 1976

Home Office (1993) Partnership in Dealing with Offenders in the Community, London, Home Office.

Home Office (1995) Review of Probation Officer Recruitment and Quality Training; Discussion Paper, London , Home Office.

Home Office (1995) Department of Health and Welsh Office, National Standards for the Supervision of Offenders in the Community 1995, London, Home Office.

Home Office (1995) Hostels Handbook; Approved Probation and Bail Hostels, London, Home Office.

Home Office and the Department of Health (1995) Mentally Disordered Offenders – Interagency Working, London, Home Office

Home Office (1988) Hough, M & Chapman, T Guide to Effective Practice, Evidence Based Practice, London., Home Office.

Home Office (1988) Lewis, H and Mair, G Bail and Probation Work II: The Use of London probation / bail hostels for bailees, Research and Planning Unit Paper 50, London, Home Office.

Home Office, Underdown, A (1998) Report of the HMIP What Works Project, Strategies for Effective Offender Supervision, London, Home Office.

Home Office, Wallis, E (2001) *A New Choreography – An Intended Strategy for the National Probation Service for England and Wales , Strategic Framework 2001-2004*, London, Home Office.

Home Office (2001b) *Making Punishment Work, The Report of a Review of the Sentencing Framework for England and Wales* (Halliday Report) Home Office Communications Directorate, London.

Home Office (2001) *Approved Premises Regulations – Statutory Instrument no 850 .2001*.

Home Office (2000) *National Standards 2000*, London, Home Office.

Home Office (2004) *Reducing Re-offending, National Action Plan*, London, Home Office.

National Probation Directorate (2004) *Approved Premises and Offender Housing Strategy for Higher Risk Offenders. Online Publication*. London: Home Office.

National Probation Directorate (2004) *Public Protection and Courts Unit, Approved Premises- Resources Review*.

Home Office (2004) *Review of the Protection of Children from Sex Offender* London, Home Office.

National Probation Service (2005) *NPS Business Plan, 2005 – 2006*, London, Home Office.

Home Office (2006) *The NOMS Offender Management Model*, COI. Ref 275240. London, Home Office

National Probation Directorate (2007) *A Century of Cutting Crime 1907-2007*, London, Home Office.

Home Office Circulars :

Circular of 20th of July, 1928, Issued to Justices – Young Offenders, reproduced in Le Mesurier (1935:319-328).

Home Office Circular 155/1975 Circular to the Courts on Bail Proceedings.

Probation Circular 35/1998, Effective Practice Initiative; National Implementation Project.

Probation Circular 54/1998, Effective Practice Initiative; Pathfinder Projects.

Probation Circular 17/1999, Crime Reduction Programme – Applications to Help Develop New Pathfinders.

Probation Circular 35/1999, Crime Reduction Programme – Pathfinder Selection.

Probation Circular 64/1999 What Works /Effective Practice Initiative: The Core Curriculum.

Probation Circular 110/2001 Invitation to Develop Hostel Pathfinders.

Probation Circular 02/2004 Death of an Approved Premises Resident.

Probation Circular 15/2005 National Standards 2005.

Probation Circular 37/2005 The Role and Purpose of Approved Premises.

Probation Circular 15/2006 Guidance on Implementation of Practice Recommendations.

Probation Circular 65/2005 National Standards 2005 and National Offender Management Model; Application of Tiering.

Probation Circular 19/2006 Implementation of Approved Premises Performance Improvement Standards.

Home Office (May 2006) Approved Premises Performance Improvement Standards. (appendix A of PC 19/2006).

Probation Circular 20/2007 Approved Premises Performance Improvement Standards: Guidance on Second Round Audits.

Probation Circular 33/ 2007 New Accommodation and Support Services for Bail and HDC.

Probation Circular 37/2007 Revised Procedures for Monitoring Deaths under Supervision.

Probation Circular 40/2007 Deaths of Approved Premises Residents – Investigation by Prisons and Probation Obudsman (PP0)

HMIP Reports:

HMIP (1993) Delivering an Enhanced Level of Community Supervision, Report of a Thematic Inspection on the work of Approved Probation and Bail Hostels, London, Home Office.

HMIP (1998) Approved Probation and Bail Hostels : Delivering and Enhanced Level of Community Supervision, Report of a Thematic Inspection, London, Home Office.

HMIP (1999) Suicide is Everyone's Concern, London, Home Office.

HMIP (2000) The Victim Perspective; Ensuring the Victim Matters, London; Home Office.

HMIP (2001) Shelter and Protection, An Inspection of the Langley House Trust Fresh Start Project, London, Home Office.

HMIP (2003) Valuing the Victim, London , Home Office.

HMIP (2005) An Essential Element of Effective Practice – An Inspection of National Probation Service Work on Offender Accommodation,HMIP (2005) Inspectorate Findings 03/05,London, Home Office.

HMIP (2007) Not Locked up but Subject to Rules – An Inquiry into managing offenders in approved premises (hostels) following the Panorama programme broadcast on 8th of November 2006, London , Home Office

HMSO Publications:

HMSO (1938) Catalogue 38, Item 14:498, 1938 Criminal Justice Bill. London, HMSO.

HMSO (1948) The Public Acts and the Church Assembly Measures of 1948, Vol II, London, HMSO, Norman Gibb Scorgie.

HMSO (1972) The Public General Acts and General Synod Measures of 1972, Part I, London, HMSO, Council of Law Reporting.

HMSO (1991) The Public and General Acts And General Synod Measures of 1991, Part II, London, HMSO.

Croft, J (1978) Research in Criminal Justice, London, HMSO.

HMSO (1966) Residential Provision for Homeless Discharged Prisoners; Report of the Working Party on the Place of Voluntary Services in After-Care, London, HMSO.

HMSO (1969) Children and Young Persons Act 1969, London, HMSO.

Reports from Parliament:

(1913) Report of the Departmental Committee on Reformatory and Industrial Schools – BOPCRIS (Abstract of Report).

(1927) Report of the Departmental Committee on the Treatment of Young Offenders, Cmnd (2831).

The 1928 Report of the Care of Children Committee. BOPCRIS.

Parliamentary, All Party Penal Affairs Group (1980) Too Many Prisoners, An examination of ways of reducing the prison population, Barry Rose, Chichester.

Home Office (1962) Report of the Departmental Committee on the Work of the Probation Service Cmnd (1650), London, HMSO (Morison Report)

Home Office (1962) Scottish Home and Health Departmental Committee on the Probation Service. Home Office. Cmnd(1800) London, HMSO.

Home Office (1976) Report of the Work of the Probation and After-Care Department, 1972-75, Cmnd (1976) London, HMSO

- End of Home Office Publications and Government Reports -

Hough, M, Allen, R and Padel , U (Eds) (2006) Reshaping Probation and Prisons – the New Offender Management Framework, Bristol, Policy Press

Hudson, J, R (1981) Probation Hostels; Wardens, Regimes and Residents in The Probation Journal, Vol 28 , No 1:12- 16.

Hughes, E, C (1974) Good People and Dirty Work in Rainwater, L (Ed) Social Problems and Public Policy, Deviance and Liberty :335-342,Chicago, Aldine Publishing.

Ignatieff, M (1978) A Just Measure of Pain, The Penitentiary in the Industrial Revolution 1750-1850, New York, Pantheon.

Ignatieff, M (1981) The Ideological Origins of the Penitentiary:37-59 in Fitzgerald, M ,McLennan, G , Pawson, J (Eds) Crime and Society Readings in History and Theory, Routledge, Oxford, OUP.

Jackson, C (1971) The Client Speaks in Probation Journal Vol 17, No 2:49-51.

James, A and Raine, J (1998) The New Politics of Criminal Justice, London, Longman.

Jenkins, D, T (1969) Periodic Detention Centres in New Zealand in Probation Journal Vol 15, No 3:94-96.

Jeffrey, S (1985) *Those Residential Blues* in Probation Journal Vol 32, No2 :82-83.

Johnston, N, Savitz, L and Wolfgang, M (1970) *The Sociology of Punishment and Correction*, London, John Wiley and Sons.

Jones, K and Fowles, A (1984) *Ideas on Institutions, Analysing the Literature on Long Term Care and Custody*, London, Routledge, Kegan and Paul.

Jones, T and Newburn, T (2007) *Policy Transfer and Criminal Justice , Exploring US Influence over British Criminal Justice Policy*, Berkshire, OUP.

Jordan, B (2003) *Criminal Justice, Social Exclusion and the Social Contract* in Probation Journal 50 (3):198- 210.

Jordan, B (1983) *Criminal Justice and Probation in the 1980's* in Probation Journal Vol 30:83-88.

Jupp, V, Davies, P. M, Francis, P (Eds) (2000) *Doing Criminological Research*, London, Sage.

Keith-Lucas, A (1972) *Giving and Taking Help*, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press.

Keller, O, J and Benedict, S, A (1870) *Halfway Houses : Community Centred Correction and Treatment*, Massachusetts, Heath Lexington Books.

Kelly, W, B (1857) *The Irish Quarterly Review* , London, Simpkin Marshall and Co.

Kemshall, H and Wood, J (2007) Beyond Public Protection in Criminology and Criminal Justice, Vol 7, No.3:203-222.

Kemshall, H and Mc Ivor, G (Eds) (2004) *Managing Sex Offender Risk*, London, Jessica Kingsley.

Kemshall, H and Maguire, M (2003) *Sex Offenders, Risk Penalty and The Problem of Disclosure to the Community* in Matravers, A (Ed) *Managing Sex Offenders in the Community: Contexts, Challenges and Responses*, Devon, Willan.

Kemshall, H (2002) Risk, Public Protection and Justice :95-111 in Ward et al (Eds) Probation Working for Justice, Oxford, OUP.

Kemshall, H & Pritchard, J (1997) Good Practice in Risk Assessment and Risk Management, London, Jessica Kingsley.

Kimmel, A, J (1998) Ethics and Values in Applied Social Research. London. Sage.

King, F, S (Eds) (1976) Control Without Custody – papers presented to the Cropwood round-table conference December 1975, Cambridge, Institute of Criminology.

King, J (1969) The Probation and After-Care Service, Third Edition, London, Butterworth.

King, R, D and Elliot, K, W (1977) Albany: Birth of a Prison – End of an Era, London, Routledge, Kegan and Paul.

Kohlberg, L (1976) Moral Stages and Moralisation in Lickona, T (Ed) Moral Development and Moral Behaviour. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Wilson.

Koven, S (1992) From Rough Lads to Hooligans: Boy Life, National Culture and Social Reform :365-401 in Parker, A (ed) (1992) Nationalisms and Sexualities, London, Routledge.

La Folette, H (Ed) (2002) Ethics in Practice. An Anthology, Oxford, Blackwell.

Land, H (2004) 'Privatisation, privatisation, privatisation - The British welfare state since 1979' in N Ellison, L Bauld and M Powell (Eds) Social Policy Review 16 (2004).

Lareau, A and Shultz, J (1996) Journeys Through Ethnography, Realistic Accounts of Fieldwork, Oxford, Westview Press.

Lart, R (1997) Crossing Boundaries, Accessing Community Mental Health Services For Prisoners On Release, Bristol, Policy Press .

LeCompte , M, D (2002) *The Transformation of Ethnographic Practice: Past and Current Challenges*, Qualitative Research Vol 2 No 3:283-299.

Le Mesurier, L (1935) *A Handbook of Probation and Social Work for the Courts*, London, NAPO.

Levitas, R and Guy, W (Eds) (1996) *Interpreting Official Statistics*, London, Routledge.

Levitas, R (Ed) (1986) *The Ideology of the New Right*, Bristol, Polity Press.

Levitas, R (1998) *The Inclusive Society? Social Exclusion and New Labour*, (Second edition 2005) London, Palgrave - MacMillan.

Lewis, S (2005) *Rehabilitation: Headline or Footnote in the New Penal Policy*, Probation Journal, Vol 52(2):119-135, London, Sage.

Lipsky, M (1980) *Street-Level Bureaucracy; Dilemmas of Individuals in Public Services*, New York, Russell Sage Foundation.

Lipsey, M, W and Wilson, D, B (2001) *Practical Meta-Analysis*, Thousand Island, London, Sage.

Lock, J (1982) *Some Idle Thoughts of a Fledgling Warden* in Probation Journal, Vol 29, No 3:100.

Lockett, P (2002) *Hostels for Offenders , The Developing Role* – CCJS Conference 2002, London, Kings College.

Lowenkamp, C and Latessa, E (2002) *Evaluation of Ohio's Community Based Correctional Facilities and Halfway House Programmes*. University of Cincinnati, Division of Criminal Justice, Centre for Criminal Justice Research.

Lueder, A, F (1800) *Uber Nationalindustrie Und StaatWirtschaft*. Berlin.

Madoc-Jones, I (2006) *Effective Practice in Hostels* in Probation Journal Vol 53, No1:77-78.

Maguire, M (2007) *The Resettlement of Ex-Prisoners* in Gelsthorpe, L and Morgan, R (Eds) Handbook of Probation, Devon, Willan.

Maguire, M and Kemshall, H (2004) *Multi – Agency Public Protection Arrangements: Key Issues* in Kemshall, H and Mc Ivor, G (Eds) Managing Sex Offender Risk, London, Jessica Kingsley.

Maguire, M, Kemshall, H, Noaks, L, Sharpe, K and Wincup, E (2001) *Risk Management of Sexual and Violent Offenders: The Work of Public Protection Panels*. Police Research Series Paper No.139, London, Home Office.

Mair, G (1996) *Development in Probation in England and Wales 1984-1993*, in Mc Ivor, G (Ed) Working with Offenders , Research Highlights in Social Work, 26, London, Jessica Kingsley.

Mair, G (2000) *Credible Accreditation?* in Probation Journal Vol 47 No 4;268-271,London.NAPO.

Manton, J (1976) *Mary Carpenter and the Children of the Streets*, London, Heinemann Educational.

Marsland, D (2004) *Welfare or Welfare State? Contradictions and Dilemmas in Social Policy*. New York, St Martin's Press.

Marsland, D (2004) *Social Policy Since 1979: A View From The Right* in Ellison, N, Bauld, L and Powell, M (Eds), *Social Policy Review 16, Analysis and Debate in Social Policy*, Bristol, Policy Press.

Martinson, R. (1974), *What Works? Questions and Answers About Prison Reform* in The Public Interest, Volume 35: 22-54.

Martyn, H (2000) *Developing Reflective Practice, Making Sense of Social Work in a World of Change*, Bristol, Policy Press.

Maruna, S (2000) *Making Good, How Ex Convicts Reform and Rebuild Their Lives*. Washington, American Psychological Society.

Marx, K (1976) Das Capital ; A Critique of Political Economy, Harmondsworth, Penguin.

McAnany P. D and Carey, J,T (1984) Introduction to Juvenile Delinquency: Youth and the Law, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice Hall.

McCall, G and Simmons, J (1969) Issues in Participant Observation , A Text and Reader, London , Addison-Wesley.

McConville, S (1981) A History of English Prison Administration, Volume 1: 1750-1857, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

McCorkle, L, W and Korn, R (1954) Resocialization within Walls in Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 293, Prisons in Transformation:88-98.

McCulloch, T and Kelly, L (2007) Working with Sex Offenders in Context: Which Way Forward? in Probation Journal Vol 54, No1:7 – 21.

McCullogh, M, K (1962) The Practice of Group-work in a Probation Hostel in Probation Journal Vol 10, No3:36-37.

McGuire, J & Priestley, P (1985) Offending Behaviour Skills and Strategies For Going Straight, New York, St Martin's Press.

McGuire, J (Ed) (1993) What Works: Reducing Offending Behaviour, Chichester, Wiley.

McLaughlin, E and Muncie, J (1994) Managing Criminal Justice in Clarke, J, Cochrane, A, and McLaughlin, E (Eds) Managing Social Policy, London, Sage.

McMurrin (Ed)(2004) Motivating Offenders to Change A Guide to Enhancing Change in Therapy, Chichester, Wiley.

McMurrin, M and Ward, T (2004) Motivating Offenders to Change in Therapy : An Organising Framework, Legal and Criminological Psychology, 9:295-311.

McNeillie, F, M (1974) Margaret Fry 1874 – 1958 in Probation Journal Vol 21 , No 2: 77-79.

McWilliams, B (1990) Probation Practice and the Management Ideal in Probation Journal Vol 37(2):60-67.

Mendelsohn, E (1984) East Anglia and East Midlands Probation Hostels, A Descriptive Study, Cambridge, Institute of Criminology.

Mertz, E (1994) A New Social Constructionism for Socio-legal Studies in Law and Society Review 28;5 :1243-1265.

Melossi, D and Pavarini, M (1981) The Prison and The Factory – Origins of the Penitentiary System, Basingstoke, MacMillan.

Milner, J & O'Byrne, P (1998) Assessment in Social Work, Hampshire. Macmillan.

Montgomery. D (1991) Citizenship and Justice in the Lives and Thoughts of Nineteenth-Century American Workers in The Tanner Lecture Series on Human Values delivered at Brasenose College, Oxford University April 29, May 3, and May 6, 1991.

Moore, A, H, K (1921) Robin House Croydon, NAPO. No 15 July :277-281.

Morgan, R (1975) Liaising with Voluntary Hostels in Probation Journal, Vol 22, No 4:110-113.

Morris, N and Rothman, D,J (1988)(Eds) The Oxford History of Prisons, The Practice of Punishment in Western Society, Oxford, OUP.

Murray, C (2005) The Advantages of Social Apartheid, in Sunday Times, News Review, 3rd of April 2005 – Times Online (www.thetimes.co.uk).

Nadkarni, R, Chipchase, B and Fraser, K (2000) Partnership With Probation Hostels – A step forward in forensic psychiatry, Psychiatric Bulletin (2000) 24:222-224.

Nash, M (1999) Police Probation and Protecting The Public, London, Blackstone Press.

Nash, M (2006) Public Protection and the Criminal Justice Process, Oxford, OUP.

NAPBH Eunice Dunkley (2002) NAPBH, Hostels past and present, hostels for offenders the developing role, Conference paper 21.02.02 London, CCJS.

NAPO DIRECTORIES (1974 - 1997), West Yorkshire, Published by Owen Wells - excluding 1975 which was not published.

NAPO DIRECTORIES, 1998 – 2007, Kent: Published by Shaw and Sons

Nellis, M. (2007). Humanising Justice: The English Probation Service up to 1972:22-58 in L. Gelsthorpe & R. Morgan (Eds) The Handbook of Probation, Cullompton: Willan.

Nellis, M (2007) Overarching Knowledge and Professional Identities: The Future of Training in Probation and / or Offender Management, London Probation Consortia Conference, Unpublished Conference Paper.

Nellis, M (2000) Creating Community Justice in S Ballintyne et al (Eds) Secure Foundations: Key Issues in Crime Prevention, Crime Reduction and Community Safety, London, IPPR.

Newburn, T (2003) 2nd Edition, Crime and Criminal Justice Policy, London, Longman.

Noaks, L and Wincup, E (2004) Criminological Research , London, Sage.

Norrie, A and Adelman, S (1989) 'Consensual Authoritarianism' and Criminal Justice in Thatcher's Britain, in Gamble, A and Wells , C , Thatcher's Law, Cardiff, University of Wales Press.

Ostler, A (1995) An Introduction to the Probation Service, Winchester, Waterside Press.

Other, A (1999) *Above infection ; status and hygiene behaviour in a hospital setting.*
Unpublished paper cited in Gomm (2004) *Social Research Methodology – a critical introduction*, Hampshire, Palgrave.

Palmer, E, J (2003) *Offending Behaviour- Moral Reasoning, Criminal Conduct and the Rehabilitation of Offenders*, Cullompton, Willan.

Palmer, T (1992) *The Re- Emergence of Correctional Intervention*, London , Sage.

Parker, A. (Ed) (1992) *Nationalisms and Sexualities*. London, Routledge.

Parker, H (1996) *Young Adult Offenders, Alcohol and Criminological Cul-de-Sacs*,
British Journal of Criminology, 36 : 282- 298.

Pavlov, I, P (1994) *Psychopathology and Psychiatry*, NewYork, Transaction Publishers.

Payne, A, Addyman, I, Brown, R, and West, D (2001) *The Provision of Addiction Services in Probation Hostels ; A New Approach* in *Journal of Substance Misuse* 2001 Vol 6:183-188.

Payne, G (1989) *Bail Hostels Between Bail and Jail* in *Probation Journal* Vol 36, No 1:37-41.

Pawson, R & Tilley, N (1997) *Realistic Evaluation*, Thousand Oaks, Sage.

Pitts, J (1991) *The New Politics of Youth Crime*, London, Palgrave.

Pitts, J (1991b) *The New Correctionalism, Young People, Youth Justice and New Labour* in Mathews, R and Pitts, J (Eds) *Crime Disorder and Community Safety*, London , Routledge.

Perlstein, G, R and Phelps, T, R (Eds) (1975) *Alternatives to Prison - Community Based Corrections, A Reader*, California, Goodyear.

Piaget, J. (1932) *The Moral Judgement of the Child*. New York: Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich.

Polgar, S & Thomas S (1999) 3rd Edition, *Introduction to Research In The Health Sciences*, Australia, Churchill Livingstone.

Porporino, F and Fabiano, E (2007) *Case Managing Offenders Within a Motivational Framework* in Raynor, P and McIvor, G (2007) *Developments in Social Work with Offenders*, Research Highlights 48, London, Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Pratt, J (2002) *Punishment and Civilisation*, London, Sage.

Pratt, J, Brown, D , Brown, M ,Hallsworth, S and Morrison, W (Eds)(2005) *The New Punitiveness. Trends, Theories , Perspectives*, Devon, Willan.

Pratt, B (1985) *Bail Hostels – Alternatives to Custody?* in *British Journal of Criminology*, Vol 25, No2:160-171.

Priestley, P (1999) *Victorian Prison Lives*, London, Pimlico.

Prison Reform Trust (2000) *Justice for Women: The Need for Reform (Report of the Committee on Women's Imprisonment)*, London, Prison Reform Trust.

Probation Journal (1934) *Retirement of Miss E. Croker-King: (Juvenile Courts Probation Officer)* Probation Journal.1934; 1: 284

Prochaska, J and DiClemente, C (1984) *The Transtheoretical Approach: Crossing Traditional Boundaries of Therapy*, Homewood, IL : Dow-Jones Irwin.

Pugh, R.B (1970) *Imprisonment in Medieval England*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Quaker Communications (2005) *Circles of Support and Accountability in the Thames Valley – First three years April 2002 – March 2005*. London, Quaker Peace and Social Witness.

Rachael, J (2002) *Punishment and Desert : 466-474* in La Folette (Ed) *Ethics in Practice An Anthology*, Oxford, Blackwell.

Rainwater, L (Ed) (1974) *Social Problems and Public Policy; Deviance and Liberty*, Chicago, Aldine Press.

Raynor, P and Vanstone, M (2007) *Towards a Correctional Service* in Gelsthorpe, L and Morgan, R (Eds) *Handbook of Probation*, Devon, Willan.

Raynor, P and Robinson, G (2005) *Rehabilitation, Crime and Justice*, Hampshire, Palgrave MacMillan.

Raynor, P and Vanstone, M (2002) *Understanding Community Penalties, Probation, Policy and Social Change*, Buckingham , OUP.

Raynor, P (2002) *Evidence Based Practice and its Critics* in *Probation Journal* Vol 50(4):334-345.

Reeves, R (1972) *New Form of Intensive Supervision* in *Probation Journal*, Vol 18, No 2:48-51.

Rex, S (1999) *Desistance From Offending: Experiences of Probation*, In *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38,4:366-383.

Roberts, J, V, Stalans, L, J, Indermaur, D and Hough, M (2003) *Penal Populism and Public Opinion, Lessons from Five Countries*, Oxford, OUP Press.

Robinson, C (2001) *Working Out Of Homelessness - The development of an innovative education and employment programme for single homeless men and women in inner Sydney*, St Vincent De Paul Society, State Council of New South Wales / ACT - National Homelessness Strategy.

Rolph, C, H (1971) *Homeless From Prison – A Report on Five Hostels set up by the Special Aftercare Trust*, London, Riverside Press.

Ross, R & Fabiano, E (1985) *Time to Think; A Cognitive Model of Delinquency Prevention and Offender Rehabilitation*, Johnson City, TN; Institute of Social Sciences and Arts.

Rothman, D. J. (1971) *The Discovery of the Asylum: Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic*. Boston: Little, Brown.

Rotman, E (1990) *Beyond Punishment: A New View of the Rehabilitation of Criminal Offenders*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Rusche, G & Kirchheimer, O (1939) *Punishment and Social Structure*, New York, Russell and Russell.

Sacks, J (1997) *The Politics of Hope*, London, Jonathan Cape.

Salisbury, J (1994) Ph.D Thesis, *Becoming Qualified: An Ethnography of a Post-Experience Teacher Training Course*, Cardiff, Cardiff University.

Scharfstein, B (1989) *The Dilemma of Context*, London, New York University Press.

Schlossman, S (1998) *Delinquent Children, The Juvenile Reform School* in Morris, N and Rothman, D, J (Eds) *The Oxford History of Prisons, The Practice of Punishment in Western Society*, Oxford, OUP. Pp325 -349.

Scull, A. (1977) *Decarceration: Community Treatment and The Deviant: A Radical View*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J : Prentice-Hall.

Searle, J, D (1973) *The Prisoner Free. The Story of John Dodd and Langley House*, Edinburgh. St Andrew Press.

Selleck, R. J. W. (1985) *'Mary Carpenter : a confident and contradictory reformer'* in *History of Education*. Vol. 14, no. 2 :101-115.

Senior, P (2004) *Editorial, NOMS – The National Community Justice Service?* in *The British Journal of Criminal and Community Justice* Vol 2, No3:3.

Sinclair, I (1970) Ph.D Thesis, Approved Probation and Bail Hostels, A Qualitative and Statistical Study, London, London School of Economics.

Sinclair, I (1971) Hostels for Probationers – A Home Office Research Unit Report, London, HMSO.

Sinclair, I (1988) The Research Reviewed, NISW, London, Home Office.

Skinner, B, F (1971) Beyond Freedom and Dignity, New York, Knopf.

Smith, D (1996) Reforming the Probation Service in May et al (Eds) Social Policy Review 8, Social Policy Association, London.

Smith, M, K. (2006) 'David Brandon: homelessness, advocacy and Zen in the art of helping', the encyclopaedia of informal education, www.infed.org/thinkers/david_brandon_zen_helping.htm .

Smith, S (Ed) (2007) Applying Theory to Policy and Practice – Issues For Critical Reflection, Hampshire, Ashgate

Spencer, J and Deakin, J (2004) Community Reintegration for whom? : 210-228 in Mair, G (ed), What Matters in Probation, Devon, Willan.

Stevenson, O (1972) Strengths and Weaknesses in Residential Care – The First Quetta Rabley Memorial Lecture, Oxford, Alden and Mowbrey.

Sugerman, B (1974) Daytop Village A Therapeutic Community, London, Marathon House, Case Studies in Cultural Anthropology.

Sutherland, E. H and Cressey, D. R (1960) Principles of Criminology, Chicago, Lippincott.

Taylor, S (Ed) (2002) Ethnographic Research, A Reader, London , OUP , Sage.

Thurston, P (2002) Just Practice in Probation Hostels:207-219 in Ward, D, Scott, J and Lacey, M (Eds) 'Probation Working for Justice', Oxford, OUP.

Todd, M (1997) Reports Briefing, Cultural Sensitivity in Hostels in Probation Journal, Vol 44 , No1:56-57.

Tonnies, F (1955) Community and Association - Gemeinschaft and Gessellschaft, translated by Loomis, C. P, London, Routledge, Kegan and Paul.

Tonry, M (2001) Symbol Substance and Severity in Western Penal Policies in Punishment and Society, 3(4):517-536.

Trotter, C (1999) Working With Involuntary Clients, London. Sage.

Trotter, S (1969) No Easy Road, A Study of the Theories and Problems involved in the Rehabilitation of the Offender, London., Allen and Unwin

Tullet J (1990) The Changing Role of Probation in South Australia in Keeping People out of Prisons, proceedings of a conference held 27th – 29th of March 1990, Canberra Institute of Criminology, AIC Proceedings; No 11 – [www.aic.gov.au publications/proceedings/11/tullet.html](http://www.aic.gov.au/publications/proceedings/11/tullet.html)

Tuke, S (1813) Description of The Retreat- An Instituion near York for the insane persons of the society of friends. Containing an account of its origins and progress, the modes of treatment and a statement of cases - Reprinted by Process Press with an introduction by Richard Hunter and Ida McApline , 1964 , London. Process Press

Turner, B, S (1996) Medical Power and Social Knowledge, London, Sage

Vanstone, M (2004) Supervising Offenders in the Community, A History of Probation Theory and Practice, Hampshire, Ashgate.

Vanstone, M (2003) A History of the Use of Groups in Probation Work: Part One- from 'Clubbing the Unclubbables to Therapeutic Intervention in Howard Journal of Criminal Justice 42(1):69-86.

Vanstone, M (2001) 'Making Sense of Probation: A History of Professional Discourse', Phd Thesis, University of Wales Swansea.

Vass, A and May, T (1996) Working with Offenders, Issues, Contexts and Outcomes, London, Sage.

Wax, R (1971) Doing Fieldwork Warnings and Advice, Chicago, CUP.

Wallich, C (1976) Caring on Sid Row, Dublin, Veritas.

Watkins, M, Gordon, W & Jeffries, A (1998) Magistrates Bench Handbook. The Sentence of the Court, Winchester, Waterside Press.

Watson, J (1896) Reformatory and Industrial Schools in Journal of Royal Statistical Society, Vol 59, no 2: 255 -317.

Webb, B and Webb, S (1922) English Prisons Under Local Government, London, Longmann Green and Co.

Weber, M (1914) Economy and Society; An Outline of Interpretive Sociology, New York, Bedminster Press.

Whelan, R (Ed) (1998) Octavia Hill and the social housing debate / essays and letters by Octavia Hill, London: IEA Health and Welfare Unit.

White, K and Brody, S (1980) The Use of Bail Hostels, in Criminal Law Review, 1980:420-425.

Whittaker, S and Domican, P (1993) Injecting Drug Users in Probation Hostels in Probation Journal Vol 40, No 4:229-230.

Whitlegg, E et al (Eds) (1982) The Changing Experience of Women, Oxford ,OUP, Basil Blackwell .

Whiteley, S (2004) The Evolution of the Therapeutic Community in Psychiatric Quarterly, Vol 75, No 3, Fall 2004:233-248.

Whitfield, D (1998) Introduction to the Probation Service, Winchester, Waterside.

Whitehead, P and Statham, R (2006) *The History of Probation. Politics, Power and Cultural Change, 1876-2005.* Kent , Shaw and Sons.

Wilcox, P and Morely, I (1970) *The Future of After-Care Hostels* in The Probation Journal ,Vol 16, No 1:36-39.

Williams, A (1990) *Reflections on the Making of an Ethnographic Text, Studies in Sexual Politics : No.29,* London, Routledge.

Wincup, E (2002) *Residential Work with Offenders, Reflexive Accounts of Practice,* Hampshire, Ashgate.

Wincup, E (1997) *Waiting for Trial, Living and Working in a Bail Hostel!* Phd Thesis, Cardiff, Cardiff University.

Wincup, E (1996) *Mixed Hostels: Staffing and Residents Perspectives* in The Probation Journal. Vol 43 no 3:147-152.

Wolcot, H, F (2005) *The Art of Fieldwork,* Oxford, Rowman and Littlefield.

Wolfgang, M , Figlio, R, Sellin, T (1972) *Delinquency in a Birth Cohort,* Chicago, CUP.

Wollins, M (1969) *Group- Care Friend or Foe?* in Social Work,14.1:25-35.

Wollstonecraft, M (1992) *A Vindication of The Rights of Woman,* London, Penguin Classics(first published 1792).

Worrall, A and Hoy ,C (2005) *Punishment in the Community, Managing Offenders, Making Choices,* Devon, Willan.

Worrall,. A (2002) *Missed Opportunities? The Probation Service and Women Offenders* in Ward, D, Scott, J and Lacey, M (Eds) Probation Working for Justice (2nd edition) Oxford , OUP:134-149.

Worrall, A (1999) *Offending Women,* London, Routledge.

Worrall, A (1997) *Punishment in the Community; The Future of Criminal Justice*, London, Longmann.

Worrall, A (1997) *Offending Women Female Law Breakers and the Criminal Justice System*, London, Routledge.

Worthington, M, J (1972) *The Probation Officer as Hostel Warden* in The Probation Journal , Vol 18 No 3:83-84.

Young, A, F and Ashton E, T (1967) *British Social Work in the Nineteenth Century*, London, Routledge, Kegan and Paul.

Young, J (1971) *The Drug Takers; The Social Meanings of Drugs Use*, London, Paladin.

Young, J (1999) *The Exclusive Society*, London, Sage.

Younghusband, E (1978) *Social Work in Britain:1950 – 1975 A Follow up Study, Volume 1*, London, Allen and Unwin .

Probation Services Reports:

Staffordshire Probation Service (1998) Approved Hostels – Focus on Keywork Practice, A Six Month Residents Evaluation, October 1996- March 1997, Staffordshire, Information Services Unit (Johnson, N, Jones, B, Massey, P and Butler, C)

World Wide Web:

www.marine-society.org.uk/history - accessed 21.06.2002

<http://www.aic.gov.au/publications/proceedings/11/tullett.pdf> (2000) Jonathan Tullet – accessed 22.06.2002.

<http://www.toptags.com/aama/docs/prigg.htm> - accessed 10.02.02

www.newsoftheworld.co.uk/campaigns/forsarah/sarah_history.shhtml - accessed 23.11.2007

Press Digital Archives;

The Observer – observer.guardian.co.uk

Cohen, N (2002) Privatisation is Easy: You Just Pay More and Get Less in The Observer, Sunday 20th of October 2002. Comment
(<http://observer.guardian.co.uk/comment/story/0,,815423,00.html>)

Don't Betray Sarah now – 6th of August 2000 – Leader.

Setback for Paedophile Campaign – Observer 6th of August 2000 – Kamal Ahmed and Martin Bright

The News of the World – http://www.the_sun.newsint-archive.co.uk

Sunday 13th of August 2000: 'Sarah's Law; Now Campaign: Campaign against Paedophiles

Sunday 23rd of July 2000: 'For Sarah Campaign Against Paedophiles'

Sunday 23rd of December 2001: 'Dig Out Beasts' – Letter.

Sunday 23rd of March 2006: The Hidden Evil Revealed- Secret Hostels where Paedophiles Lurk in our Midst – Monsters on Our Streets.

Sunday 2nd of April 2006 'Keep Evil Monsters in Prison; the Whistleblower'

Times on Line Digital Archive - 1785 – 1985:

<http://infotrac.galegroup.com.itw/infomark>

A New Penal System, The Times Thursday November 17th, 1938; 14

The New Penal System, The Times Saturday July 31st 1948: 5 .

Beginnings of Alternative to Prisons, The Times Wednesday Feb 8th 1967; 14.

Changes Urged in Prisoners' Aftercare: The Times Monday October 14th, 1963; 5

