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ABSTRACT

BACKGROUND: Research has continuously demonstrated the social disadvantage, racial inequality, and institutional racism within a broad range of domains including, socio-economic status, education, healthcare, and the Criminal Justice System, which has led to young Black men being the most over-represented within the UK prison population. Critical Race Theory (CRT) provided a useful framework to explore this inequality. This study aimed to explore young Black men’s stories and experiences of prison, and ideas for prison reform.

METHODOLOGY: A social constructionist epistemological stance underpinned the qualitative research, with consultation with a Research Consultant and participants to co-design elements of the research. Purposive sampling through third-sector organisations was used. Five young Black men shared their stories of prison, through one individual life story narrative interview. These were recorded, transcribed, and analysed using a multimethod approach of Narrative Inquiry, to examine the chronological plot, story dimensions, structural elements, meaning making, and collective storylines.

FINDINGS: There were four main collective storylines; stories of challenges, coping, power, and change. The experiences of the young Black men were rooted in social deprivation and racial inequality. They have been failed by services never designed to support them, blamed for their disadvantaged position, and socially constructed as ‘bad’ throughout their lives within multiple contexts. Through the CRT lens, power hierarchies and institutional power in the prison system further oppresses young Black men, with oppressive policies and practices, which restrict basic human rights. Despite these challenges, the young Black men showed considerable strength and resilience to pull themselves out of the prison system.
IMPLICATIONS: These stories demonstrate change is required within the prison system, to tackle and dismantle the root causes of social injustice, rather than labelling Black men as ‘bad’ and leaving them to navigate these challenges themselves. There are recommendations for much needed further research in this area.

Keywords: Young Black Men; Experiences; Stories; Prison; Narrative Inquiry
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Chapter Overview

In this chapter, I will firstly position myself within the research, by discussing the reasons for choosing this topic and my epistemological stance. I will discuss the key terminology, and through the lens of Critical Race Theory, I will highlight some of the main literature in the field, to help situate the research in the wider historical, cultural, and socio-political contexts. I will demonstrate how social disadvantage, inequality, and institutional racism, at all levels, has led to the disproportionate number of young Black men within the prison system. I will conclude with the discrepancy between the amount of evidence showing this racial inequality and seemingly the lack of research which involves gaining the experiences of these marginalised individuals.

1.2 Positionality

1.2.1 Personal Reflexivity

In qualitative research it is important to be transparent about one’s interests and stance (Emerson & Frosh, 2004), as the researchers’ lens will impact on all aspects of the research. ‘Reflexivity’ is the critical evaluation of one’s position as the researcher and examining one’s knowledge, experiences, beliefs, biases, and identity, and considering how these influence the research process (Finlay, 1998). It requires openness and acceptance that the researcher is part of the research (Finlay, 1998). Throughout this thesis, I have kept a reflective journal, and reflected on key areas, such as the ethical approval process, recruitment, data collection, and analysis. I fostered reflective relationships with the research team, to consider our joint lens, similarities and differences, and the blind spots of the research. Some reflections will be discussed throughout the thesis in italics and a first-person perspective will be
used. Other reflections will be provided in the appendices and signposted within the main text.

1.2.2 Factors Leading to the Research Area

I have always been an individual who is curious about understanding ‘why’. Growing up I remember questioning ‘why I live the life I do’, while others live a life which leads to crime and criminal conviction. I have always been passionate about hearing people’s stories. This led to a career working within clinical and forensic settings for the past 11-years. Whilst working as a Custody Officer, Assistant Psychologist, and a Trainee Forensic Psychologist, supporting people in prison, I noticed a clear disproportionate representation of young Black men in prison. The led me to think about the experiences of young Black men in prison, and the impact their identity has on their experience. I believe that as Clinical Psychologists we should promote social justice and ensure that services are appropriate for all clients (Patel et al., 2020). This motivation and passion to support services for young Black men has contributed to the research project.

I have reflected upon aspects of my identity and how these will impact on the research process (Finlay, 1998). I am a white British female and have resided in the United Kingdom (UK) since birth, which means that I have been part of the white dominant group and I have experienced ‘taken-for-granted’ white skin privileges (Di Angelo, 2011, p. 62) and the associated power that this provides (McIntosh, 2015). Being white and the intersectionality of my identity, as a middle-class, cisgendered, neurotypical woman has led to privileges meaning that I have worked in prisons, rather than being imprisoned. I recognise that I hold power due to my white identity and associated experiences. Much of my knowledge and experiences are informed by
white western (Eurocentric) knowledge. My experience working in prisons means I have some existing views of what prison is like for imprisoned young Black men. I have witnessed racism in prisons, from other people in prison, prison officers, and within the system, which meant that Black men were disadvantaged and unfairly treated in areas such as sentences, incentives, and the use of restraints. My white Eurocentric lens means I will struggle to understand the impact that different social identities have on an individual’s experiences. I have reflected on this throughout the research and made adaptations to incorporate different lenses (detailed below).

1.3 Epistemological and Ontological Position

Epistemology is ‘the study of the nature of knowledge and the methods of obtaining it’ (Burr, 2003, p.203). Epistemology is about what is possible to know, and the process (between knower and knower-to-be) in which knowledge is created, and communicated (Scotland, 2012). There are many epistemological positions, depending on how one views the world and knowledge. Ontology is about the nature of reality and what exists (Burr, 2004).

This research will take a social constructionist epistemological stance and a critical realist ontology; this is known as moderate social constructionist stance (Harper, 2011). Using a social constructionist epistemological stance, this research takes the position that reality does not exist outside of a social context, with language shaping reality and giving it meaning (Ekdawi et al., 2000). It is centred around the idea that there are separate realities, and language allows one to create some shared understandings of reality (P. L. Berger & Luckmann, 2011). This stance is appropriate as the research will focus on participants’ experiences of prison, which will be co-created through interactions and language, and influenced by interpersonal, social,
and cultural relations. The current research is examining the experiences of racially-
marginalised people, with the stance that race and racism are socially constructed
(discussed below).

The ontology means the data collected will be viewed as informing but not directly
mirroring reality, as stories told by an individual can only be understood in the context
of their own social upbringing, biases, and experiences. With this ontological position,
the current study assumes that racism is a real experience, although how it is
experienced, perceived, and storied varies between people. By adopting this
moderate social constructionist stance, I will question taken-for-granted knowledge
(Burr, 2004), and situate the individual narratives within a broader historical, social,
cultural, and socio-political context (Harper, 2011). This stance fits with my belief that
knowledge is connected to power and leads to social action (Baum et al., 2006), as
detailed below.

1.4 Language and Key Terminology

Language is a form of social practice, meaning it is part of society and not external
to it, and the language used can assign and maintain power (Fairclough, 1989). When
discussing relevant literature, it is important to discuss and define terms.

*This is a section that I have really grappled with, mostly due to my white identity, and the associated awkwardness, ‘whiteness’ (Di Angelo, 2011; Wong, 1994) and discomfort when discussing the position of difference. I have struggled to think about the ‘right’ language to use. It has taken a substantial amount of time researching and considering the language. I acknowledge that this section is written from my white Eurocentric lens, however I have tried to use definitions from organisations and people from racially-marginalised backgrounds.*
1.4.1 Ethnicity and Race

It is important to recognise that the terminology used to describe an individual’s heritage has changed frequently in the UK and differs within different countries and contexts. In the UK the words ‘ethnicity’ and ‘race’ are often used interchangeably. ‘Ethnicity’ is about group identity and belonging to a certain ethnic group (Fernando, 2004), encompassing common nationality, ancestry, religion, language, cultural origin, and/or physical appearance (ONS, 2021b). With ethnicity there appears to be a degree of choice and it is more changeable than race (Fernando, 2004). However, in the UK ethnicity is often only associated with marginalised groups.

The term ‘race’ has historically been used to categorise people by genetic ancestry (Fernando & Keating, 2008), which has had huge effects on marginalised communities. However, race does not exist as a genetic construct or biological reality (Phinney, 1990). Race is socially constructed and linked to power and positioning (Smedley & Smedley, 2005) and exists as an ideology or worldview, with components from social policy (i.e., physical characteristics, racial hierarchies, and behaviours viewed as innate) used to create and enforce differential opportunities, and racial inequality (Smedley & Smedley, 2005). The term race will be used in this thesis in italics to show that race is socially constructed and linked to power.

1.4.2 Racism and Anti-racism

Racism is a form of oppression based on race, where a person is treated worse, excluded, disadvantaged, or degraded because of their race (Tuntimo, 2022). Racism is a powerful system (Woods, 2014), and is a mentality that has three elements. Firstly, there is a belief that there are racial differences in characteristics, such as character...
or intelligence. Secondly, there is racial superiority of one race over another. Thirdly, the dominance is maintained through complex systems of beliefs, feelings, behaviours, language, and policies (Minnesota Education Equity Partnership, 2022).

While white people can experience oppression (i.e., homelessness), they will not experience racism. White supremacy and white privilege exist because of the existing ideology of race, and subsequent racial hierarchies. White supremacy is not about individual racism, but the entire powerful system (Woods, 2014), in which there is an ideology that white people constitute a superior race (Reid, 2021). ‘White supremacy is not the shark. It’s the water’ (Guante, 2016). White privilege is the societal advantages and benefits that an individual with white skin gains.

Racism can present in different forms, including personal, institutional, and structural (Dismantling Racism Works, 2021). Personal racism includes individual acts of overt racism, biases, and microaggressions. Microaggressions are defined as “Black-white racial interactions [that] are characterised by white put-downs, done in an automatic, preconscious, or unconscious fashion” (Pierce, 1974, p. 515). Institutional (or systemic) racism is the way in which systems, organisations and institutions are founded upon and then promote, reproduce, and perpetuate advantages and maintain power for white people and oppress racially-marginalised people (Dismantling Racism Works, 2021). Racial discrimination becomes established as ‘normal behaviour’ within a society or an organisation. Structural racism is the historical, cultural, and current reality of racism across multiple institutions and/or systems (Dismantling Racism Works, 2021). Racism leads to and perpetuates unearned white privilege (Reid, 2021).

Anti-racism is a term used frequently, but there is no clear definition. Anti-racism is about in-depth analysis, and dismantling the structural racism, racist attitudes, beliefs, systems, and practices (Minnesota Education Equity Partnership, 2022).
Moving towards anti-racist values and practices is a continuous direction to move in, and the process involves listening, unlearning, re-learning, and responsive action (Reid, 2021). It is supporting anti-racist policy (i.e., unwritten laws, rules, guidelines), which produce or sustain racial equality, through action or expressing an anti-racist idea (Kendi, 2019). Anti-racist work is hard, given the racist and powerful systems which remain in place.

1.4.3 Black, Asian, and Minority Ethnic (BAME)

The term ‘BAME’ has been used by the Ministry of Justice (MOJ), Office of National Statistics (ONS), in prison settings and within research. However, the term perpetuates racism, creates othering (Patel & Fatimilehin, 1999), and maintains ‘whiteness’ (Di Angelo, 2011). In 2021, it was recommended that the government discontinue the use of the ‘BAME’ acronym due to its controversy (Sewell et al., 2021), lack of specificity (Saeed et al., 2019), and emphasis on skin colour (Wilson, 2010). The term BAME will not be used in this thesis, unless directly quoting authors.

1.4.4 Racially-marginalised

Reid (2022) recognises that people will have their own individual preferences to describe their heritage. The term minoritised was created as a socially constructionist way to show that people are actively minoritised by others, rather than being the minority (Gunaratnam, 2003). The term marginalised is used to demonstrate that marginalisation is a social process shaped by power (Predelli et al., 2012), where people are intentionally removed, denied, and isolated from economic, socio-political, and cultural participation based on race, immigration status, income, or ability (Multicultural Affairs, 2016). The term ‘minoritised’ has been disputed as marginalised groups are not the minorities in all areas, i.e., the disproportionate representation of
Black people in prison (Multicultural Affairs, 2016). The term racially-marginalised will be used in this thesis, to show that people are actively marginalised, and not the minority in this research topic. Where the data allows, people’s specific heritage will be identified.

1.4.5 Black

The term ‘Black’ has a multitude of contested meanings. In the media and political outlets, the term ‘Black’ has been used to refer to all racially-marginalised people due to their skin colour, despite any social or cultural differences (S. Davidson & Patel, 2009). In recent anti-racist political movements, people have used the term ‘Black’ as an identity, as a member of, or in ally-ship support of, people who are oppressed due to the colour of their skin (Patel et al., 2000). In previous research the term ‘Black’ represents a ‘unity of experience’ in relation to racism, white privilege, and discrimination, among people whose skin is not white (Glynn, 2013, p. 9). The term Black is a cultural construct for people of African and/or Caribbean descent; this is the meaning of ‘Black’ used in this thesis and will therefore be capitalised.

1.4.6 Power

Power is the ability to exercise one’s will over others (Weber, 1978), and exists within all societies. Power structures exist within the ideology of race, and subsequent racial hierarchies (Dreher, 2016), and the ideology that white people constitute a superior race (Reid, 2021). Consequently, certain people, namely those who are white-skinned, educated, and wealthy (Henrich et al., 2010) hold power and privilege (Woods, 2014), while people who are marginalised are exploited and oppressed for their benefit (Reynolds, 2012). Power and privilege are rooted in global colonisation, capitalism, and neoliberal politics (Reynolds, 2012).
1.5 Critical Race Theory

Critical Race Theory (CRT) began as a movement in mid-1970s America, with activists examining the relationship between race, racism, and power (Crenshaw et al., 1996). CRT provides a lens of viewing and understanding knowledge. It helps focus attention on the social construction of race and racism and subsequently to challenge the ordinariness of racist actions and treatment, going beyond this to understand the underlying factors (Delgado & Stefancic, 2000). CRT focuses on the experiential knowledge of racially-marginalised people and their communities (Delgado & Stefancic, 2000) to attempt to make changes for social justice (Brown, 2003). Brown (2003) describes five main elements of CRT:

I) Racism is ordinary (the norm) and not the exception. This ordinariness makes it harder to recognise and address the racism.

II) Interest convergence: civil rights have resulted more from self-interest from white people, rather than helping racially-marginalised people.

III) Race and racism are socially constructed, there is no genetic or biological difference. Racial categories have been created and employed by society.

IV) The experiential knowledge of racially-marginalised people is genuine, and they can communicate it because they are oppressed.

V) Social justice is an important element. Racism should not only be named, but social justice should be promoted, to make changes.

In research, a CRT lens means that the researcher foregrounds race and racism in all elements of the research process and confronts conventional research texts and worldviews (Creswell, 2007). CRT is used in this research, due to its fit with the social constructionist epistemological stance, and the belief that race and racism are socially
constructed, and that racism is ordinal. CRT was led by Black scholars and foregrounds the knowledge and experiences of oppressed populations, which is key to the current research. CRT’s emphasis on social justice is important in the current research, given the use of lived experiences for prison reform.

1.6 Positionality on Racism

The term institutional racism became mainstream after the MacPherson Report in 1999, where the Police were labelled as institutionally racist, due to their failure to provide appropriate and professional services to people due to the ‘colour of their skin’. More recently, the Sewell (2021) report investigated the state of race relations in broad areas, such as education, health, employment and the CJS. Sewell reported that ‘we no longer see a Britain where the system is deliberately rigged against ethnic minorities’ (2021, p. 8). However, this is in direct contrast with extensive research (C. Alexander & Shankley, 2020; Bywaters et al., 2015; Hamed et al., 2022). Within this research, I am taking the position that race and racism are socially constructed and still very much exist in the UK as ideologies. I take the position that racism is a real experience and is not merely the product of individuals or prejudice, but it is embedded in legal systems and policies.

1.7 Being Racially-marginalised in the UK

Black communities have been present in the UK since at least 1500 (English Heritage, 2022). In the 17th and 18th centuries African communities were brought to the UK for the institution of slavery. The organisation of slavery strengthened the dichotomy of racial superiority and inferiority, to justify cheap labour (Fields, 1990). During this period, Black males were mostly portrayed as docile, justifying slavery as
the best position for them (Smiley & Fakunle, 2016), and saving them from a worse fate (Olusoga, 2015).

After the American Civil War, Black people gained some social, economic, and political rights, which challenged white supremacy, and created white fear (Smiley & Fakunle, 2016). The media began to portray the mythical Black ‘brute’ claiming that Black people were naturally more prone to violence and aggressive behaviours, and were ‘brutal and merciless’ (Smith, 1983, p. 181). In the UK, these narratives were perpetuated during the Windrush era (1948 to 1971), where people from Caribbean countries came to the UK to help the post-World War II rebuild. The Caribbean workers were subject to low-quality housing, and experienced social exclusion, hostile environments, and significant overt racism, including from the police.

In the UK the social construction of young Black male identity has been linked to narratives of violence and crime (Law, 2002). The stereotype of young Black men as ‘dangerous, violent and volatile’ is a longstanding narrative, still prominent within UK society today (Angiolini Report, 2017). This consequently impacts the understanding and attitudes towards Black males, which has led to negative consequences, and it is important to understand the context behind this.

1.7.1 Current UK Context

The UK is now more ‘ethically, racially, and religiously diverse than ever’, although patterns of settlement mean that it is more multi-cultural in urban areas (Byrne et al., 2020, p. 9). In the UK in 2021, 81.7% of residents identified themselves as white, compared to 7.5% who identified as Asian, 4.0% identified as Black and 2.9% as dual-heritage (ONS, 2021a). Overall, racially-marginalised people make up
approximately 18% of the UK population (ONS, 2021a), and therefore the dominant norm is, and has always been, informed by white western culture (Patel et al., 2000).

There has been long-standing racial inequality in the UK, however discussions of this within the media has come to the forefront in the past few years (Davis, 2020). This was partly due to the police brutality in the murder of George Floyd in America, which triggered global protests led by the Black Lives Matter movement for racial equality (Centre for Social Justice, 2020). The shooting of Chris Kaba by the Metropolitan Police, and the deaths of Oladeji Omishore and Godrick Osei, both of whom are Black men who died after police contact, highlight the racial inequality that still exists in the UK. A recent report has shown that in the UK, Black men are seven times more likely to die from police restraints than white men (Inquest, 2023).

Crime does not happen in a vacuum, and those who receive criminal convictions have mostly experienced multiple forms of disadvantage, exclusion, and racism (Wilson, 2004). To understand the racial inequalities that exist in the prison system, it is important to understand the UK context and take into consideration the history of oppression, including slavery, colonialism, and racism (Fryer, 1984). Research should be situated within broader historical, social, cultural, and socio-political contexts, as this demonstrates how racial disparities have been created, and maintained within UK society. Below, I demonstrate some of the historical and current oppressions, racial disparity, and institutional racism in the UK, through the lens of CRT.

1.7.2 Socio-economic Status

Racially-marginalised people in the UK have experienced generations of poverty and racial inequality (Centre for Social Justice, 2020), and are persistently more likely to experience low-income, homelessness, and deep poverty (Butler, 2022). Black
people are persistently more disadvantaged, with approximately 45% of Black children growing up in poverty (UK Government, 2020), 44% of Black African and 40% of Black Caribbean people lived in social housing, compared to 11% of white people (Ministry of Housing, 2020).

Through a CRT lens, historical events such as slavery have had last lasting effects on Black people, including significant economic disparities (Powell & Menendian, 2006). Additionally, structural racism means there are discriminatory policies in housing, immigration, financial resources, and crime, which create and perpetuate the socio-economic disadvantage and cycle of poverty for racially-marginalised people (Powell & Menendian, 2006). The Grenfell tower disaster in 2017 is a powerful example of how systemic racism and structural inequalities continue to affect racially-marginalised communities in the UK (Y. Williams, 2020). The disaster in Kensington, was caused by flammable cladding being installed on the social housing, because residents from higher socio-economic backgrounds elsewhere in the borough complained that the building was ugly and need cladding to improve their view (Y. Williams, 2020). Of the 72 people who died, only seven were white.

1.7.3 Social Care

Racial inequalities extend across social care, with racially-marginalised children over-represented in the looked-after children population, in particular Black children (Owen & Statham, 2009). In 2020, 26% of looked-after children were racially-marginalised (HM Government, 2021). In the UK looked-after children are more at risk of interacting with the Criminal Justice System (CJS) and receiving a criminal conviction (MOJ, 2012). Approximately 24% of the prison population (MOJ, 2012), and 54% of those in Young Offender Institutions (Prison Reform Trust, 2021) have been a
looked-after child. Black (19%) and dual-heritage (21%) looked-after children had higher rates of imprisonment than white (15%) looked-after children (ONS, 2022).

CRT provides a lens to view these statistics and examine this interaction with social care. The disproportionate involvement of social care with Black families is not due to genetics, or poor parenting abilities, but due to the racial biases and assumptions which are entrenched in society and by service providers about the parenting abilities of Black parents (Bywaters et al., 2015). These assumptions and biases are underpinned by psychological theories on attachment and childrearing, which are Eurocentric, and lack an understanding of cultural differences in parenting (Okpokiri, 2017), making them harmful to marginalised communities.

1.7.4 Education and Employment

Education is another area of great disparity and inequality for racially-marginalised people (C. Alexander & Shankley, 2020). ‘If we want to fix the racial and economic disparities in the criminal justice system… the work starts in the primary school, not in the prison’ (Akala, 2018, p. 88). Racially-marginalised students are over-represented in pupil referral units and permanent exclusions from schools (C. Alexander & Shankley, 2020; ONS, 2017), and underrepresented at Russell Group Universities (C. Alexander et al., 2015). Specifically, Black Caribbean students were over three times more likely to be suspended than other students, and their GCSE grades were significantly lower than white British, Chinese or Indian pupils (DfE, 2016). However, research has found that Black students entered school as the highest performing racial group, yet left school as the lowest performing group (Gillborn, 2008). Education and employment are directly linked, and in 2021, Bangladeshi and Pakistani (11%), mixed-heritage (10%) and Black (9%) people had the highest rates of unemployment (ONS,
Exclusion from education affixes blame to the child, instead of working to address their behaviour (No More Exclusions, 2022), which can then lead to feelings of abandonment, and consequently associating with gangs and engaging in criminal behaviour to earn income or gain identity (Lammy, 2017).

Through the lens of CRT, the following contribute to racial inequality within the UK education system, 1) a competitive system that is hierarchical and perpetuates differential treatment and racial inequality; 2) educational policies and practices that construct racial inequality and perpetuate whiteness; 3) a constructed narrative of inherent inferiority of racially-marginalised people; 4) links between educational inequality and historical patterns of racial oppression (Dixson & Anderson, 2018). Several factors are relevant in racial inequality in education including, poor leadership on matters of equality, the exclusionary nature of the curriculum, as well as socio-economic disadvantage, poverty, housing, and entrenched structural racial stereotyping and institutional racism (C. Alexander & Shankley, 2020; Demie, 2018).

Teachers and other professionals often assume that Black children are less intelligent and consequently underestimate their intelligence and treat them differently (Akala, 2018). These assumptions are underpinned and linked to psychological theories including social Darwinism and eugenics, which influence the construction of race and racial superiority (Kessi, 2017). Psychologists have drawn on these theories and have perpetuated and reinforced these intellectual racial hierarchies by using Eurocentric knowledge to assess, diagnose and treat intelligence, which has led to scientific racism (K. Cullen et al., 2020). This affects Black children’s intellectual ability, grades, self-esteem, and mental health (Akala, 2018). Meaningful outcomes are required to redress the racial inequality within the UK education system (Dixson & Anderson, 2018).
1.7.5 Healthcare and Mental Health Services

There are longstanding racial inequalities in healthcare in the UK, and the disproportionate effect of the Coronavirus pandemic on racially-marginalised people has brought this to the forefront (Ajayi, 2021). Racially-marginalised people are ‘devalued, disempowered and subject to differential treatment’ (Hamed et al., 2022, p.2) in accessing and receiving healthcare, including mental health services (Gabbidon et al., 2014). They are over-represented at every stage in mental health treatment, including involuntary mental health hospitalisation, length of inpatient admission, and readmissions (Barnett et al., 2019). In society, Black men are often constructed as violent, aggressive, and threatening (Law, 2002). These socially constructed racial narratives, and associated assumptions have led to Black men being diagnosed more often with severe mental health conditions, such as schizophrenia (Das-Munshi et al., 2018) and psychosis (Qassem et al., 2015). Black people are three times more likely to be prescribed medication, and more likely to be sectioned under the Mental Health Act than white people (R. Holmes et al., 2023; S. Khan, 2020; McKenzie & Bhui, 2007).

A CRT lens is helpful to understand the inequality in healthcare. Racially-marginalised people face multiple risk factors for poorer health outcomes (L. Khan et al., 2017), and racial stereotyping, biases, discrimination, and cultural incompetence have been identified in the delivery of care throughout the NHS (Chouhan & Nazroo, 2020). Healthcare policies, procedures and practices were created using white Eurocentric knowledge, which constructs racial inequality, and maintains colour-blindness, whiteness, and institutional and structural racism within its practices (Ford & Aihiihenbuwa, 2010). Longstanding racial inequalities and differential treatment is
not due to any biological difference between *racial* groups, but due to racism (Hamed et al., 2022), which leads to poorer health outcomes and increased mental health concerns for racially-marginalised people (Chouhan & Nazroo, 2020; L. Khan et al., 2017). Experiences of discrimination, racism and consequent social disadvantage are the main reasons for this disproportionate over-diagnosis (Qassem et al., 2015), and increased mental health admissions (Chakraborty et al., 2011).

Clinical psychologists work both individually and systemically with mental health concerns and offer psychological intervention. A vast majority of psychological interventions are based on evidence which disproportionately represents white, western, educated, and rich populations (Henrich et al., 2010), despite these only representing approximately 5% of the global population (Arnett, 2008). Racially-marginalised groups have been oppressed by psychology, due to psychological knowledge being underpinned by colonial and Eurocentric knowledge (Dudgeon et al., 2014). Psychology therefore creates and perpetuates systemic racism by continuing to use this Eurocentric knowledge, and currently mental health services are not adequately supporting the needs of racially-marginalised people, particularly Black men (L. Khan et al., 2017). Within the CRT framework, it is not enough to just highlight racism, there is a need to promote social justice and make changes, including questioning where knowledge comes from and how it perpetuates racism. Clinical psychologists should therefore consider more broadly the racism and harm that is caused by these systems and taking steps to dismantle them (Klukoff et al., 2021). ‘Social injustice is at the root of all distress’ (Reid, 2021, p. 116), and there are clear links between mental health and the CJS, with an estimated 39% of those detained in police custody, and up to 90% of the people in prisons having a mental health concern (NICE, 2014).
1.7.6 Criminal Justice System

The overrepresentation of racially-marginalised people in the CJS is a long-established concern (HMIP, 2022). It has long been recognised that there is institutional racism within the CJS (MacPherson, 1999). Stephen Lawrence was murdered in an unprovoked racist attack in 1993 in London. The Macpherson Report (1999) which followed was one of the first formal documents stating that the CJS, particularly the police, was institutionally racist, and failed to provide a professional service to people because of their 'colour, culture, or ethnic origin' (p. 41). There were over 70 recommendations for the CJS. However, 30 years later most of these recommendations are still relevant and there continues to be great inequality for racially-marginalised people within the CJS.

Young Black men are the most disproportionally represented in all areas of the CJS in England and Wales (Feilzer & Hood, 2004; MOJ, 2016), including stop and searches, arrests, prosecutions, convictions, custodial sentences, and the prison population (MOJ, 2021). In 2019 Black men were 9.7 times more likely to be stopped and searched by police (Race Disparity Unit, 2019), had the highest proportion of arrests following stop and searches (MOJ, 2021a), and were more likely to gain a criminal conviction, and receive a prison sentence (Lammy, 2017).

A CRT lens is helpful to understand the racial inequality in the CJS. Firstly, racism, racial stereotyping, and discrimination, are ordinal and embedded throughout the CJS (Clinks, 2021). Policies and laws are written by and in favour of white people, and therefore maintain racism (Kendi, 2019). In the UK, certain behaviours are defined as criminal, threatening and punishable by law. There are harsh sentences for drug offences, despite rehabilitation being much cheaper than punishment (Delgado &
Narratives of Prison: The Stories and Experiences of young Black men (Stefancic, 2007). There are socially constructed and longstanding narratives of racially-marginalised people, in particular young Black men, being involved in gangs, violence, and selling drugs (Lammy, 2017). This narrative is a significant factor in the overrepresentation within the CJS (Delgado & Stefancic, 2007), with 40% of all convictions for Black people being for drug offences, compared to 19% for white people (MOJ, 2022). Racially-marginalised people are more likely to receive a prison sentence for drug offences, even when factors such as previous convictions are taken into consideration (Lammy, 2017). It is therefore no surprise that this racial disparity continues into the prison population.

1.7.7 Prison System

Prisons in the UK are designed be a deterrent to crime, punish and rehabilitate the individual, and protect the public (Newburn, 2017). There is a longstanding debate regarding the effectiveness of prison in reducing reoffending, with proven reconviction rates of 31.8% within 12-months of release from prison for young offenders in 2021 (Prison Reform Trust, 2021). There is little evidence to suggest prisons provide value for money (F. T. Cullen et al., 2011), with reoffending costing the UK approximately £18.1bn per year (MOJ, 2016).

As of March 2022, there were 84,372 people in prison in England and Wales, of which 96% were male (MOJ, 2023). Racially-marginalised people make up approximately 11% of the population in England and Wales (ONS, 2021a), but 26% of the prison population (Prison Reform Trust, 2021). As of June 2022, approximately 3% of the general population identified as Black, compared to 13% of the overall prison population (MOJ, 2022), and over one third of the population in some prisons, i.e.,
Brixton (34.3%), Cookham Wood (41.3%) and Feltham (41.8%), demonstrating a significant over-representation of Black men in prisons in the UK (Lammy 2017).

In 2001, Martin Narey, the former Director of Prisons, acknowledged that ‘the Prison Service is an institutionally racist organisation, which reflects an institutionally racist white society’ (Narey, 2001, p. 7). Since 2002 there has been a significant reduction in the number of young people (aged between 18 and 30) in prison, however the proportion of young Black males has increased (Robertson & Wainwright, 2020). Black men are more likely to serve longer sentences (Rehavi & Starr, 2014), and spend approximately 70% longer on remand than white men (Wilding & Syal, 2023).

Whilst in prison, Black men receive unfair treatment (Cheliotis & Liebling, 2006), including excessive force and dangerous restraint techniques (Angiolini Report, 2017), and reported worse relationships with staff than white prisoners (Lammy, 2017). After release from prison, Black men are more likely to return to a disadvantaged social context (Krivo & Peterson, 1996) and less likely to gain employment (Lammy, 2017), which are both linked to higher levels of reoffending (Edmark, 2005).

Much of the literature available provides a quantitative approach in relation to the disproportionate number of racially-marginalised men, in particular young Black men, who are in prison. The existing literature has ‘provided little data about most areas of Black prisoner’s experience’ (HMIP, 2022, 64). Whilst statistics can show information regarding the overrepresentation, they are unable to provide rich information or an understanding of lived experiences (Lived Experience Voice, Revolving Door, 2023), and consequently how prison reform could reduce the overrepresentation or improve prisons for racially-marginalised people. Therefore, it is important to hear the experiences of men who have been in prison and make co-produced decisions about prison reform.
1.8 Conclusions

Overall, research has continuously demonstrated that social disadvantage, racial inequality, and racism exists within broad areas such housing, social care, education, employment, healthcare, the CJS, and in prisons, with Black people being the most disproportionately represented in most areas. Therefore, the literature presented conflicts with Sewell et al. (2021)’s report that ‘we no longer see a Britain where the system is deliberately rigged against ethnic minorities’ (p. 8). These systems (i.e., education, health, employment and the CJS) do not operate in a vacuum, and they reflect the social, cultural, and political structures found in wider society. The racial assumptions, biases and institutional racism within these systems has led to the racial disparity within the CJS and the prison system, and ultimately has led to the disproportionate number of young Black men in prison (Bromley, 2011). The above research has highlighted the statistics surrounding racially-inequality in prisons, and CRT provides a useful framework to explore this disparity and inequality. However, there appears to be a lack of research which gains the views and experiences of racially-marginalised men. If racial disparity and institutional racism within prisons is going to be dismantled, and prisons are to be redesigned, rebuilt, and reformed, there is a need to hear from the experts (the racially-marginalised men) about their experiences in prison. A qualitative Systematic Literature Review was conducted (chapter 2) to explore the available literature on racially-marginalised men’s experiences of prison, to gain a qualitative perspective on the statistics published on racial inequality in prisons.
CHAPTER TWO: SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Chapter Overview

In this chapter I will outline the Systematic Literature Review (SLR) that has been completed, including the aims, search strategy, methodology and quality appraisal. I will discuss the themes identified through the thematic synthesis of the literature and draw together conclusions and future recommendations. Finally, I will highlight the rationale, aims and questions of the current research.

2.2 Scope and Aims of the SLR

A SLR is a method of reviewing literature, to identify, appraise, synthesise, and critique the current literature (Shaw, 2012), to understand what is known about a particular topic and answer a specific question, to allow for future recommendations (Fink, 2019). SLRs follow a high quality and rigorous process, which should allow them to be replicated (Siddaway et al., 2019). The aim of this SLR was to consider the following question:

- What are racially-marginalised men’s experiences of prison in the UK?

The aim of the SLR is to integrate and synthesise the current literature to explore this question, assess the quality of the literature, and identify any gaps in knowledge on this topic. This SLR is reported in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) guidelines (Page et al., 2021) and is registered with the international prospective register of systematic reviews (PROSPERO; CRD42022384441).

2.3 SLR Methodology

2.3.1 Preliminary Scoping
Firstly, a preliminary scoping search on racially-marginalised men’s experiences of prison was conducted (including but not limited to: Cochrane Library, Google Scholar, and PROSPERO) to ensure that no other related systematic reviews had been conducted. The Sample Phenomenon of Interest Design Evaluation Research type (SPIDER; Cooke et al., 2012) tool was used to define the fundamental parts of the research question (Table 1). A mind-map was created to consider potentially relevant key terms and synonyms related to the question (Shaw, 2012). The American Psychological Association (APA) thesaurus and Index Terms were used to consider additional search terms. The language used to describe racially-marginalised people has changed vastly, as the language used can often maintain power (Fairclough, 1989). ‘A guide to race and ethnicity terminology and language’ was used to help consider a range of terms and ensure inclusivity (The Law Society, 2022). Several pilot searches were conducted to determine the most useful and necessary terms (appendix A).

Table 1

**SPIDER Tool**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Phenomenon of Interest</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Research Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Racially-marginalised males</td>
<td>Prisons in the UK</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Experiences Stories</td>
<td>Qualitative Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.2 Search Strategy

Qualitative synthesis aims to locate all relevant studies to provide an answer to a question (Thomas & Harden, 2008). A systematic search was conducted to review papers relevant to the research question. Due to there being no specific CJS database
available, the search for relevant published studies was completed in three electronic databases on the following dates: PsycARTICLES (13.02.2023), CINAHL Plus (13.02.2023), and Scopus (14.02.2023). These databases were chosen as they are multidisciplinary and include a variety of allied health, clinical and social psychology, and social care, and overlap with the CJS. Email alerts were set up for any new studies meeting the search terms. A final search was completed in August 2023, due to the length of time since the first search.

The search was limited to studies published in English from 1999, as this was when the MacPherson Report (1999) formally documented that the CJS was institutionally racist, a pivotal point in this research area. Databases were searched for the terms shown in Table 2. Asterisks were used to capture possible derivatives, hyphenated words, and spelling errors (e.g., imprison* = imprisoned, imprisonment). Boolean operations ‘AND’ / ‘OR’ were used to help the searches terms to yield appropriate papers. The search strategy was adapted for databases parameters, where key terms were mapped onto subject headings. A snowballing process (Sayers, 2007) was used to further consolidate the search, by reviewing the reference lists and contacting authors of relevant articles. Independent CJS journals were searched individually, including the Howard Journal of Crime and Justice (26.03.2023) and Prison Service Journal (26.03.2023).
Table 2

Summary of Search Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Term</th>
<th>Search Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Racially-marginalised</td>
<td>BAME OR BME OR Black OR Asian OR ethnic* OR African* OR AFRO* OR Caribbean OR racial* OR Minorit* OR marginali* OR ‘Mixed-race’ OR ‘Mixed race’ OR ‘Mixed heritage’ OR ‘Dual heritage’ OR *racial OR *ethnic AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Men OR Man OR Male* OR Boy* OR Masculin* AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison</td>
<td>Prison OR Custody OR Incarcerat* OR Imprison* OR Jail OR ‘HMP’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.3 Grey Literature

Ensuring the SLR is capturing all relevant information for the research question is an essential but challenging part of the process (Shaw, 2021). After the pilot reviews of formally published literature, there were limited relevant studies located, and a discussion was held with supervisors and University librarians about grey literature. Grey literature is a field of information not controlled by commercial publishers (GreyNet, 2013), and includes reports produced by government departments, policy documents, theses and working papers (University of Leeds, 2023). Grey literature is not formally published in a journal and therefore not peer-reviewed, so the quality of information is considered more variable. However, grey literature can allow for a more diverse range of voices, by including research published from non-mainstream commercial publishers (University of Leeds, 2023). Peer-reviewed journals and databases favour journals from western educated authors (Henrich et al., 2010), and therefore knowledge is underpinned by colonial and Eurocentric knowledge (Dudgeon et al., 2014), which perpetuates institutional racism. Although searching for grey
literature can be a lengthy process, it can reduce publication bias, and provide a more comprehensive and balanced view of the evidence (Paez, 2017). Considering the above, along with knowledge of existing government reports available, it was decided that grey literature would be included.

Grey literature searches were conducted using Ethos (doctorate thesis), Wordcat and Social Care Institute for Excellence. Web-based searches were conducted using Google, ResearchGate and searching Government websites for reports from His Majesty’s Inspectorate of Prisons (HMIP). Due to the large number of results returned on Google, only the first 10 pages were searched, as after this point studies became less relevant. A final grey literature search was completed in August 2023.

*It is recognised that the current search strategy was completed from my lens, and therefore relevant studies may have been overlooked. I attempted to identify all available studies and minimise the influence of my lens by talking to the research supervisors and consultant, reviewing the reference lists of key authors, and locating sources authored by Black scholars.*

2.3.4 Screening and Eligibility Criteria

The initial search of the three databases yielded 903 papers. The Covidence Systematic Review online software tool was used to screen the papers. Covidence detected and removed 7 duplicate articles. Due to capacity, it was not feasible to have a second reviewer to double screen records. Titles were read to determine their relevance to the research question and their fit with the inclusion criteria (Table 3). Where titles alone were not enough to decide, the abstracts were read (Siddaway et al., 2019). There were 32 articles which were potentially relevant, although one full
text could not be located, and therefore 31 articles were read. Five studies were determined to fit the inclusion criteria. An additional five studies were sought for review from the snowball strategy, reference lists (n=1), specific CJS journals (n=2), and grey literature search (n=2). A final list of 10 studies were included in the review. A full breakdown of this process is shown in Figure 1.

**Table 3**

*Literature Search Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Exclusion Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Published in the English Language</td>
<td>Not published in the English Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary studies using qualitative design or mixed-method design gaining qualitative information i.e., individual interviews or focus groups</td>
<td>Quantitative design, or using survey information or questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published since 1999</td>
<td>Published before 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences of racially-marginalised men who had lived experiences of prison in the UK</td>
<td>Experiences of non-racially-marginalised or undefined males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prisons experiences outside the UK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1

PRISMA Flow Chart for SLR

Databases and registers

Identification
- Records identified from database searching:
  - PsycARTICLES (n = 194)
  - CINAHL Plus (n = 276)
  - Scopus (n = 433)
  (Total n = 903)

Records removed before screening:
- Duplicate records removed
  (n = 7)

Screening
- Records screened (n = 896)

Records excluded** (n = 864)
- Records excluded:
  - Not UK (n = 14)
  - Not racially marginalised (n = 4)
  - Not qualitative (n = 4)
  - Not in Prison (n = 3)
  - Not male (n = 1)
  (Total n = 26)

Included
- Studies included in review (n = 10)

Records identified from:
- Howard Journal of Crime & Justice (n = 25)
- Prison Service Journal (n = 24)
- Citation searching (n = 3)
- Government (n = 3)

Reports sought for retrieval
- Reference lists (n = 1)
- CJS journals (n = 2)
- Government website (n = 2)
  (n = 5)
2.4 Study Characteristics

Key information from the 10 eligible studies was extracted and input into a summary table (Table 4). Studies were published between 2004 and 2022, from eight different authors, including three studies from HMIP. All studies except one (HMIP, 2005) provided the exact number of participants, meaning the experiences of approximately 474 racially-marginalised men are represented across the 10 studies. Sample sizes range from four to approximately 210 participants. In terms of participant demographics, only six studies identified the race of the men. Only three studies (Hunter et al., 2019; Irwin-Rogers, 2018; Wilson, 2004) provided data on participants’ age, with a range from 16 to 52 years old. All studies were conducted in prisons in England.

The 10 studies used different sampling methodology, including purposive (n = 3), random (n = 2), snowball (n = 1), convenience (n = 1), and the sampling methodology was unclear in three studies (HMIP, 2005, 2020; Irwin-Rogers, 2018). For data collection, seven studies used interviews, two studies used focus groups (HMIP, 2005; Irwin-Rogers, 2018), and one study used both interviews and focus groups (HMIP, 2022). For data analysis, seven studies used thematic analysis, two studies used grounded theory (Brookes et al., 2012; Wilson, 2004), and the data analysis approach was unclear in one study (Chistyakova et al., 2018).
### Table 4

**Summary of Studies Included in SLR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s) &amp; Date of Publication</th>
<th>Aim(s) of study</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Race &amp; Age</th>
<th>Prison(s) &amp; Sampling</th>
<th>Data Collection &amp; Analysis</th>
<th>Summary of Findings</th>
<th>Strengths &amp; Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brookes et al. (2012)</td>
<td>Explore the experiences of Black prisoners</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>HMP Grendon Random</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews, Grounded Theory</td>
<td>Feelings of isolation, difference, invisibility, and powerlessness, which were barriers to engagement</td>
<td>+ In-depth, rich data, + Identified as Black researcher, + Recommendations based on findings - Does not offer limitations or areas of future research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chistyakova et al. (2018)</td>
<td>Explore the experiences of ‘BAME’ prisoners</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pakistani (3), Indian (1), African (2), Caribbean (2)</td>
<td>Category B prison Snowball</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews, Unclear analysis</td>
<td>Experiences of racism, in overt and subtle ways, Not being treated with respect and feeling vulnerable as a result of racial discrimination</td>
<td>+ Identified the heritage of the participants, + Stated topics in the interviews, + Identified the location and type of prison - Method of analysis not stated - Does not offer limitations or areas of future research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMIP (2005)</td>
<td>Explores prisoners’ direct experiences of racism, and victimisation</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>‘Visible minorities’</td>
<td>18 prisons</td>
<td>Focus groups</td>
<td>Thematic Analysis</td>
<td>Experiences of racism, which was in overt and subtle ways, and being treated differently because of racial bias and stereotypes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMIP (2020)</td>
<td>‘BME’ prisoners’ experience of rehabilitation</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>‘BME’</td>
<td>6 prisons</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews</td>
<td>Thematic Analysis</td>
<td>Experienced being judged and treated differently based on racial bias and stereotypes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMIP (2022)</td>
<td>Experiences of adult Black male prisoners</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>7 prisons</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews &amp; Focus groups</td>
<td>Thematic Analysis</td>
<td>Experiences of racial bias, stereotyping, and persistent racial discrimination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 265 prisoners, (30 of the 38 focus groups were with men), approximate 79%
2 Unclear what type of prisons included
3 2 x open prisons, 2 x category C prisons, 1 local prison, 1 Young Offenders Institution
4 4 x category C prison, 1 x open prison, 1 x local prison, 1 x high secure prison
5 Semi-structured (n=55), Focus Groups (n =45)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunter et al. (2019)</td>
<td>Explore experiences of ‘BAME’ offenders and barriers to engagement.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Caribbean (6) British (1) African (1) African (2) Mixed (1) Kurdish (1)</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews</td>
<td>Feelings of judgement, alienation, difference, and hopelessness which impacted on engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Age: 19-22</td>
<td>Thematic Analysis</td>
<td>The service being for white individuals and staff not understanding them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irwin-Rogers (2018)</td>
<td>Explore male prisoners experience of racism and racial discrimination</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>‘BAME’</td>
<td>Semi-structured Focus Groups</td>
<td>Racial discrimination in several areas (i.e., harsher sentences, incentives, visits, money, and access to personal items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Age: 21-52</td>
<td>Thematic Analysis</td>
<td>Feelings of being unfairly treated by officers and a level of dehumanising treatment by white staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones et al. (2013)</td>
<td>Explore ‘BME’ male prisoner experiences and cultural sensitivity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>‘BME’</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews</td>
<td>Feelings of marginalisation due to a ‘white middle-class’ prison system and a lack of cultural sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HMP Grendon Random</td>
<td>Thematic Analysis</td>
<td>Feelings of being unable to express their emotions and a lack of belonging overall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feelings of relatedness to those from similar cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan  (2007)</td>
<td>Explores experiences of applying to and being resident of HMP Grendon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>British Asian (1), African (1), Caribbean (1)</td>
<td>HMP Grendon Convenience</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson (2004)</td>
<td>Explores the experience of young Black men and coping with incarceration</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Black (34), Mixed-race (6), Pakistani (5)</td>
<td>YOI Purposive</td>
<td>Unstructured interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5 Quality Appraisal

Assessing the quality of studies included within a SLR is an essential part of the process (Shaw, 2021). The goal of quality appraisal in qualitative research is to assess whether the studies address their aim, determine whether the process and context are appropriate, and evaluate the trustworthiness and value of the findings (Hannes, 2011). There are several different appraisal tools which can be used for qualitative research (Hannes et al., 2010), including the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP, 2018). The CASP checklist was chosen for appraising the quality of the studies in this review, as it is recommended by the Joanna Briggs Institute for meta-synthesis and World Health Organisation (Feder et al., 2006), is user-friendly for novice researchers (Long et al., 2020), has an extensive evidence base, and allows for a standardised, consistent, and structured approach (Aveyard, 2014). The CASP checklist consists of 10 items; two for screening out inapplicable studies (aims and appropriateness of qualitative research) and eight items examining the study design, recruitment, data collection, relationships, ethics, analysis, findings, and value of the research. Scoring is determined by assigning ‘Yes’, ‘No’ or ‘Cannot tell’ to each item. It is recommended at least 10% of studies are screened independently by 2 reviewers (NICE, 2022). Two doctoral colleagues reviewed 50% of the 10 articles (n=5). There was a 94% concordance rate between the three reviewers. The combined scores for each of the CASP items for this SLR are shown in Table 5.

During the reviewing process, I reflected on my white British identity and how my familiarity with Eurocentric knowledge will have impacted on the way I review the quality of research. I am conscious of the power dynamics in the researcher-participant relationship and believe this is important to reflect and report on, which means I may have been more critical towards articles which did not report this (further reflections in...
To reduce this influence and widen the lens in which the literature is reviewed, I asked two colleagues who would potentially have a different lens to myself, one racially-marginalised female, and one Black male.

2.5.1 Quality of the Studies

There is limited validity to excluding relevant qualitative studies based on quality alone (Thomas & Harden, 2008). Instead, the CASP was used to examine and acknowledge the range of quality across studies. The studies mostly gained a moderate to high quality rating. All studies met the initial two screening questions, providing clear statements of aims, and being suited to qualitative research. All studies used an appropriate design and data collection methodology to meet the research aims and provided a clear statement of findings. However, some studies did not provide information on researcher-participant relationship, ethics, or data analysis.

Only two studies (Brookes et al., 2012; Sullivan, 2007) discussed reflexivity and the researcher-participant relationship. Within this research area of exploring racially-marginalised men’s experiences of prison, the potential bias and influence of the researcher’s lens is important to consider. It is possible that researchers did consider the researcher-participant relationship and their epistemological position, but it was practically applied rather than written in the article, potentially due to strict word limits of journals. Four studies (HMIP, 2005, 2020; Jones et al., 2013; Sullivan, 2007) did not discuss ethical issues. This appears concerning, especially given the topic which involved interviewing adults who are often vulnerable, and residing in an environment where there is a clear power imbalance. However, seven studies were peer-reviewed journal articles, and three articles were published by the Government, therefore they all would likely have gained ethical approval. Therefore, the absence of discussing
ethical issues is potentially just in the written report, rather than a complete absence of considering ethical issues. Three studies (Brookes et al., 2012; HMIP, 2020; Irwin-Rogers, 2018) did not present their recruitment or sampling strategy in detail. All studies were included due to moderate to high scoring, and the recognition that the quality is scored on the written format of the research, rather than the research itself, and the consideration that often processes such as ethics and reflexivity are considered but not written, especially given journal word limits.

This quality appraisal process led me to reflect on the current research and consider what peer-reviewed journal articles value. This will be helpful for the publication process, and what I choose to include in the written report, given the strict word counts and specific structure required (further reflections in appendix B).
Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Clear Aims</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Recruitment</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>Ethics</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brookes et al. (2012)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cannot tell</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Very valuable; focus on Black men, new research area and offers recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chistyakova et al. (2018)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Valuable; discussed racism and vulnerability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMIP (2005)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Somewhat valuable; large sample size from different prisons, direct questions regarding racism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMIP (2020)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Valuable; large sample size from different prisons, recommendations made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMIP (2022)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Very valuable; large sample size, identified pathways to improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Validity</td>
<td>Usefulness</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Implications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter et al. (2019)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cannot tell</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Very valuable; new research area, well defined themes, recommendations, and implications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irwin-Rogers (2018)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cannot tell</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cannot tell</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Valuable; explored micro-level lived experiences and privileges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones et al. (2013)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Very valuable; clear data analysis and themes, built on previous research, discussed implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan (2007)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Very valuable; new research area, co-created design, clear themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson (2004)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cannot tell</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Valuable; large sample size, implications for prison services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.6 Methodology for Synthesis

There are several methodologies for synthesising qualitative research, including thematic synthesis, narrative synthesis, and meta-ethnography (Pope et al., 2007). Whilst all these methods were considered, a thematic synthesis was chosen, as seven studies used thematic analysis to examine patterns across their data sets. A thematic synthesis allowed for combining the 10 studies, to explore the repeated patterns and reoccurring themes, and provide a general understanding of racially-marginalised men’s experiences of prison.

Thematic synthesis is a process using thematic analysis to analyse and synthesise qualitative studies (Thomas & Harden, 2008). A thematic analysis was conducted using the NVIVO (version 12) software for qualitative data analysis. Guidelines of using thematic analysis as a qualitative methodology were applied to the findings of each of the 10 articles to synthesise them (Siddaway et al., 2019). After review and familiarisation, Thomas and Harden (2008)’s techniques were used to synthesis the studies, i) coding the text line-by-line, ii) developing descriptive themes, iii) generating analytic themes. The themes were discussed with the research team, to support with credibility, ensuring alignment of the 10 studies and relevance to the SLR question.

2.7 Synthesis of Findings

From the synthesis there were three main themes: i) feeling powerless in a powerful system, ii) experiencing racism and iii) feeling disconnected from cultural identity. There are an additional seven sub-themes (Table 6). Further tabulation was implemented to depict the source of each theme (appendix C).
### Table 6

*Themes Identified Through Thematic Synthesis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major theme</th>
<th>Sub-theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feeling Powerless in a Powerful System</td>
<td>‘Us’ and ‘Them’; (Brookes et al., 2012, p. 19) Powerless to challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiencing Racism</td>
<td>‘You are judged straight away, for your colour’; (Brookes et al., 2012, participant C, p. 21) ‘I’ve been treated differently’; (HMIP, 2020, Caribbean prisoner, p. 30) ‘Blatant racism’; (HMIP, 2022, Black prisoner group, p 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling Disconnected from Cultural Identity</td>
<td>‘Have some insight into our culture’; (HMIP, 2022, Black prisoner, p. 55) Suppressing cultural identity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.7.1 Feeling Powerless in a Powerful System

In nine studies, participants discussed feeling powerless in a powerful prison system. The participants expressed experiences of an ‘us and them’ environment (Brookes et al., 2012, p. 19), where there was a power imbalance between the officers and prisoners, and the participants felt powerless to challenge, due to limited faith in complaint procedures.

**Us and Them.** In nine studies (Brookes et al., 2012; Chistyakova et al., 2018; HMIP, 2005, 2020, 2022; Hunter et al., 2019; Irwin-Rogers, 2018; Jones et al., 2013; Wilson, 2004) the participants discussed feeling a power imbalance within a binary opposition with the prison officers (Perea, 1997), which Brookes et al., (2012) described as ‘us’ and ‘them’ (p. 19). This was rooted in prison officers having power, authority, and control, such as keys and using physical restraints to exercise control. In contrast, the prisoner’s space, privacy, freedom, and ultimately their power, was
removed in the prison environment. The participants discussed how the power dynamic would be different in the community, stating, ‘they [prison officers] have power, and give you stress but only in here’ (Wilson, 2004, North [3] participant, p. 326). Participants felt powerless due to being a prisoner and further disempowered due to constructed racial hierarchies and associated biases and stereotypes. The participants spoke about the prison system having very few racially-marginalised prison officers, which ultimately impacted on the men’s trust and relationship with officers. They discussed underlying prejudice, lack of cultural sensitivity and racism, and how this led to a lack of trust and barriers to meaningful relationships with prison officers, which perpetuated the feeling of powerlessness.

**Powerless to Challenge.** In seven studies (Brookes et al., 2012; Chistyakova et al., 2018; HMIP, 2005, 2020, 2022; Jones et al., 2013; Wilson, 2004) participants discussed feeling like a single voice, which could easily be ‘drowned out’ (Jones et al., 2013, participant E, p. 152), and having no voice in the prison system. There was an embedded narrative that you do not make complaints as you would be seen as a ‘grass’ (Chistyakova et al., 2018, prisoner, p 14), and that you should deal with problems yourself. The participants generally had low expectations and little faith in the prison complaints system, which led participants to ‘keep quiet’ (Wilson, 2004, South [13] participant, p. 323) and not challenge wrongdoing or racism. The participants felt there was no benefit to making complaints about prison officers, as officers would think they were ‘playing the race card’ (HMIP, 2022, Black prisoner, p. 19), and it would perpetuate the differential treatment they received.
2.7.2 Experiencing Racism

The experience of racism permeated all 10 studies. Participants expressed experiences of being judged straight away, being treated differently in subtle and difficult to identify ways, including racial stereotypes, biases, and microaggressions, as well as overt racism from other prisoners and staff.

‘You are judged straight away, for your colour’ (Brookes et al., 2012, participant C, p. 21). In nine studies (Brookes et al., 2012; Chistyakova et al., 2018; HMIP, 2005, 2020, 2022; Hunter et al., 2018; Jones et al., 2013; Sullivan, 2007; Wilson, 2004) the men discussed feeling actively minoritised, often as soon as they entered the prison. The experiences of racism were heavily linked to feeling like the minority, both in the number of racially-marginalised prisoners and staff. In Brookes et al. (2012)’s study, participants discussed being ‘the only black person’ (participant S, p. 19), and the ‘only West Indian’ (participant D, p. 19). Brookes et al. (2012) highlighted that the experiences of racism were linked to the ethos of the prison system and regime itself, ‘ethos of the place was … middle class white people’ (participant S, p.19). Similarly, in other studies, participants felt like prison was ‘not a place for minorities’ (Jones et al., 2013, participant D, p. 151) and they felt like an ‘outcast’ (Hunter et al., 2019, participant 7, p. 19). The men felt actively minoritised and judged because of racial biases and stereotypes, and this led to feelings of isolation and loneliness.

In seven studies (HMIP, 2005, 2020, 2022; Hunter et al., 2019; Irwin-Rogers, 2018; Jones et al., 2013; Sullivan, 2007) participants discussed the racial assumptions, biases and stereotypes placed on them. They experienced staff and prisoners automatically labelling them as part of a gang, a drug dealer, or viewing them as ‘difficult’ (HMIP, 2022, Black prisoner, p. 39), ‘scary or unapproachable’
‘threatening’ (HMIP, 2005, focus group, p. 13) and ‘aggressive if we are animated or loud’ (HMIP, 2020, Black prisoner, p. 48). One participant in HMIP (2022)’s study discussed feeling that ‘the darker you are, you get treated more like a criminal’ (Black prisoner, p. 26).

‘I’ve been treated differently’ (HMIP, 2020, Caribbean prisoner, p. 30). Implicit racism, racial discrimination and microaggressions persisted in seven studies (Chistyakova et al., 2018; HMIP, 2005, 2020, 2022; Irwin-Rogers, 2018; Sullivan, 2007; Wilson, 2004). Participants reported racism often being in subtle, unconscious, and difficult to identify ways, which ‘you can feel’ (Chistyakova et al., 2018, prisoner, p. 235), and ‘in ways they [staff] can get away with’ (HMIP, 2005, focus group, p. 13). They discussed experiencing microaggressions and being treated differently in prison, identifying that there are ‘different rules for different people’ (Chistyakova et al., 2018, participant, p. 13), based on racial assumptions, biases, and stereotypes. This included being on lower Incentive and Earned Privileges (IEP) levels for longer and/or more often than white men, being subjected to a disproportionate use of force, and more heavily medicated. The participants reported they were treated with less respect, and not supported with visits, healthcare needs, education and job opportunities, and less likely to be released on temporary licence and move to less restrictive conditions. They identified that it was hard to prove that they were treated differently based on racial assumptions, which led them to feel sceptical about raising the racial discrimination, with one participant commenting ‘when a Black guy says something, there’s scepticism… when a white guy says something, there’s truth to it…’ (HMIP, 2022, Black prisoner, p. 11). This led the men to question themselves and the racial discrimination, ‘was that because I am black?… Am I being paranoid?’ (HMIP, 2022,
Black prisoner group, p. 11), and led to an overall narrative that they should just learn to ‘live with the systemic racism’ (HMIP, 2022, Black prisoner group, p. 27).

‘Blatant Racism’ (HMIP, 2022, Black prisoner group, p 12). In addition to the more indirect experiences, participants described overt racism in six studies (Brookes et al., 2012; Chistyakova et al., 2018; HMIP, 2005, 2022; Sullivan, 2007; Wilson, 2004). The men experienced ‘racial harassment, racist verbal abuse, and non-stop hustling’ from other prisoners (Chistyakova et al., 2018, prisoner, p. 235). In two studies (Chistyakova et al., 2018; Wilson, 2004) the men told stories of seeing racist graffiti on the prison wall, which included racially discriminative, derogative, and abusive names, and was not removed for weeks. This led them to feel uncared for, hated and discriminated against. In three studies (HMIP, 2005, 2022; Wilson, 2004) participants experienced overt racism from staff, including jokes about their skin tone, their name, and calling them racist and derogative names. This led to feeling distressed and frustrated, and there was a sense of powerlessness that they just had to accept it, try to ‘forget these people are racist’ (HMIP, 2022, Black prisoner group, p 12), and put up with the racism, as if they complained they would not be listened to, people would be defensive, and/or they would get in trouble.

2.7.3 Feeling Disconnected from Cultural Identity

Cultural identity was discussed by participants across studies, with them highlighting an importance of cultural relatedness, a lack of cultural awareness in the prison system, and consequently feeling they had to suppress their cultural identity.

Cultural Relatedness. The importance of cultural relatedness and seeking support from people from a culturally similar background was a theme which appeared in seven studies (Brookes et al., 2012; HMIP, 2020, 2022; Hunter et al., 2019; Jones
The racially-marginalised men expressed missing familial networks in the community, and an increased relatedness with prisoners and prison officers who were from a similar heritage and could understand their cultural identity. One participant discussed spending time with culturally similar people, ‘...the lads on my Hindu service on a Monday’, which led him to feel ‘relaxed’, and finding a sense of ‘belonging’ (Sullivan 2007, participant, p.13). This was important in the prison system, where they often felt like the minority. The culturally similar people ‘stick together’ (Wilson, 2004, South [8], p. 324), and comfort each other, and this led to shared understanding and experiences, and mutual trust. This is in contrast to their difficulty in relating to the mostly white prison officers, who lacked insight into the racially-marginalised men’s culture and identity, leading to a lack of trust within these relationships.

‘Have some insight in our culture’ (HMIP, 2022, Black prisoner, p. 55). In eight studies (Brookes et al., 2012; Chistyakova et al., 2018; HMIP, 2005, 2020, 2022; Jones et al., 2013; Sullivan, 2007; Wilson, 2004) participants talked about how white staff and prisoners lacked the understanding of how it feels to be a minority. There were narratives that staff and the system inadequately recognised participants’ cultural identity and subsequent needs. This included, a lack of cultural food, reading materials and black literature, ‘no Black hairdressers’ (HMIP, 2005, focus group, p. 7), poor religious facilities, and a lack of understanding of the importance and routines of praying. It was reported that prisons adopted a ‘colour-blind approach’ (Brookes et al., 2012), which led the men to feel a blatant disregard for their cultural identity. This led to mistrust and feeling invisible in many areas of the prison environment. Participants wanted a prison regime which recognises and respects ‘colour and culture’ (Brookes et al., 2012, p.23), where they would not feel invisible.
Suppressing cultural identity. The suppression of cultural identity appeared in six studies (Brookes et al., 2012; Chistyakova et al., 2018; HMIP, 2020, 2022; Jones et al., 2013; Sullivan, 2007; Wilson, 2004). The men talked about feeling like they had to change the way they talked, use a ‘softer’ voice, used ‘good English’, and change the words they used to ‘sound white’ (HMIP, 2022, Black prisoner, p. 28), biting their tongue, and keeping their head down. One participant in Brookes et al. (2012)’s study stated, ‘they are not letting me still be Black’ (participant C, p.21), whilst another participant felt stripped of their cultural identity while in prison. The participants felt they had to suppress their cultural identity to try and avoid feeling or appearing different. The participants were unable to develop a cultural identity and sense of self within prison, which led to isolation and loneliness, and perpetuated feelings of powerlessness.

2.8 Discussion

This SLR demonstrates how racially-marginalised men experienced powerlessness, racism, and a disconnect from their cultural identity in the prison system. The SLR provides insight into the racially-marginalised men's distinct feelings of powerlessness in a powerful prison system. Feeling powerless is a longstanding narrative identified by Scraton et al. (1991), which stated that ‘life in most British prisons is an unrelenting imposition of authority’ (p. 63), where prisoner’s autonomy is ‘reduced to the barest minimum’ (p. 48). There is a clear power imbalance in prisons, due to the lack of freedom of prisoners, and prison officers being in a position of authority. However, it was clear that the power imbalance was exacerbated for racially-marginalised men due to them feeling like the minority, experiencing racism, and a lack of cultural sensitivity.
The SLR showed that the men felt powerless due to the lack of racially-marginalised prison officers, and this led to barriers in creating meaningful and trusting relationships. Research has consistently shown the value of positive relationships between prisoners and prison staff for rehabilitation (Mann et al., 2018). Therefore, this SLR suggests racially-marginalised men are further disadvantaged due to poor relationships with prison staff. The men felt powerless to challenge or complain about wrongdoing or racism, due to their lack of faith in prison officers and the complaint procedure. People who are marginalised can often lack trust and confidence in complaint processes (IOPC, 2019), as procedures are written and implemented, and complaints resolved by white people in power (Edgar & Tsintsadze, 2017).

Racism was prevalent in the men’s stories, with experiences of overt racism from staff and prisoners, and more subtle and difficult to identify racism, including biases, stereotypes and microaggressions. These experiences were heavily linked to feeling like the minority, both in the number of racially-marginalised prisoners and staff, and the ethos of the prison system (Brookes et al., 2012), and consequently left them feeling alienated, isolated, and lacking a sense of belonging. Previous research has shown that in 2020, 93.3% of prison officers in England and Wales were white (MOJ, 2021b), whilst 26% of the prison population were racially-marginalised (Prison Reform Trust, 2021), demonstrating that prison officers do not represent the current prison population.

The participants discussed being treated differently due to racial assumptions, biases, and stereotypes, but these were difficult to prove. These racial stereotypes are deep-rooted and ingrained in the prisoners, officers and throughout the prison system (HMIP, 2022; Lammy, 2017), and this impacted on how the racially-marginalised men were treated. The literature shows a clear over-representation of Black prisoners in
critical areas such as the use of force, adjudications, assaults, and segregation (HMIP, 2022), and racially-marginalised men have been found to be on comparatively lower IEP levels (NOMS, 2016). This SLR shows that racial biases and stereotypes led to the racially-marginalised men being treated differently, impacting factors linked to rehabilitation, such as moving to open conditions and being released on licence, which can hinder reintegration into society (M. Alexander, 2010) and lead to mental health difficulties (Mental Health Foundation, 2021; Reid, 2021). This further perpetuate the disproportionate number of racially-marginalised men in prison.

The findings from this SLR suggest that the men felt disconnected from their cultural identity and that the prison system has adopted a ‘colour-blind’ approach in regimes and programmes (Brookes et al., 2012), where cultural differences and racial wellbeing were not supported. This conflicts with MOJ guidelines which suggest that treatment in prisons should be ‘culturally aware, sensitive and inclusive’ and ‘delivered by culturally aware and sensitive staff’ (Shingler & Pope, 2018, p. 2). The loss of cultural identity led to a build-up of resentment and tension, and increased the feelings of powerlessness, alienation, isolation, and a disconnect from their culture. The participants wanted a prison system which recognises and respects their cultural identity, so they do not feel invisible, as this can lead to feeling excluded, having low self-worth, and impact on their progress (Franklin, 2004). This SLR supports previous research which suggests that the prison system needs to fully recognise and respect cultural differences so that these are visible (Steele & Aronson, 1995). This would go some way towards allowing prisoners to connect with their cultural identity, rather than supressing it, and therefore reduce feelings of isolation and alienation (HMIP, 2022). This could lead to improved mental health and allow for connection with oneself and others (Mental Health Foundation, 2021), which are skills needed for rehabilitation.
As with other broad areas such as education, health and employment, CRT is a useful framework to explore this disparity and inequality in prison. The racial biases, stereotyping, discrimination, racism, cultural insensitivity, and differential treatment identified in these studies demonstrate that racism is ordinary. The prison system and policies were created using white Eurocentric knowledge, and most employees are white, which constructs racial inequality, and maintains colour-blindness, and institutional racism within its practices.

This SLR supports the notion that racism very much exists in the prison system, and therefore refutes Sewell’s (2021) report that systems (i.e., education, health, employment and the CJS) are not ‘rigged against’ racially-marginalised people (p. 8). These systems are all embedded with institutional racism and discrimination, which leads to a disproportionate impact on racially-marginalised people, particularly young Black men. This SLR reaffirms that the prison service needs to take meaningful action to reform prisons to become anti-racist, support cultural needs and dismantle the power dynamic for racially-marginalised men.

2.8.1 Robustness of the Synthesis and Future Research

This is the first SLR that brought together research which studied how racially-marginalised men experience prison in the UK. Another strength is the attention given to the search terms and strategy, with the inclusion of three clinically relevant databases, individual CJS journals, grey literature, snowballing from reference lists and contacting authors. This is further strengthened by the quality appraisal used for the studies and my reflexivity. However, the findings should be considered in relation to its limitations. The robustness of the synthesis has been influenced by my white-British lens, which impacted on the literature search, screening, and synthesis. This
review only included 10 studies after extensive searching. It is possible that some studies were missed due to the search strategy, and my knowledge of search avenues for grey literature. Studies were only included in the search if the prison was in the UK, and all the studies used data collected in England. Future research could address this limitation by considering data collected in other countries. Studies were only included if they were written in English, due to time constraints and restricted budget for translation. This limitation meant that the voices and experiences of racially-marginalised participants and authors who do not speak English were not included.

The characteristics of the studies included in the review limit the applicability of the findings. The SLR was overrepresented by experiences at HMP Grendon (Brookes et al., 2012; Jones et al., 2013; Sullivan, 2007), which is a therapeutic community with a focus on rehabilitation. Consequently, there is often prolonged periods of custodial stability and motivation is often higher (Brookes et al., 2012). HMP Grendon is known to have a higher proportion of white prisoners (Newberry, 2012; Newton, 2000). Research suggests that predominately ‘white’ prisons are likely to have more ‘social marginalisation and psychological invisibility difficulties for some Black men’ (Brookes et al., 2012, p. 23). It is possible that this impacted on the participant’s experiences of racism, powerlessness, and lack of cultural awareness, and this may differ to experiences in the wider prison system.

All 10 studies interviewed people who were still residing in prison. Whilst this allows for a current perspective, participants were still within a powerful and institutionally racist system, which may impact on the experiences they shared. Men who have been released from prison may be more willing and ready to reflect and provide a narrative of their whole prison experience. Additionally, whilst several studies suggested avenues to gain the voices of the racially-marginalised men, only
one study (Sullivan, 2007) used elements of co-production in the research design. This means that the research design, including the questions asked and recommendations, are not co-produced with the racially-marginalised men who have been in prison, and are instead based on the lens of the author.

This SLR has identified the lack of research within this area. Most of the studies (n = 8) focused on racially-marginalised males in general. There is very limited research on specific racial groups, with only two studies (Brookes et al., 2012; HMIP, 2022) focused on the experiences of Black men. Yet, the literature shows, young Black men are the most disproportionately represented in prison (Feilzer & Hood, 2004; MOJ, 2016). Further research needs to gain the individual stories and experiences of people from different racial identities and develop counter narratives through storytelling that draw on the real lived experiences of those people. Finally, many of the studies did not state the age of the men, and intersectionality of their identities.

### 2.8.2 Clinical Implications

Firstly, this SLR suggests that prison reform needs to occur to dismantle the systemic and institutional racism in prisons. Eliminating the overrepresentation of racially-marginalised people in prison should be the primary aim, and other clinical implications should be part of an interim solution, whilst the wider systemic racism and social disadvantage are addressed. In terms of clinical implications and recommendations, Brookes et al. (2012) suggested a need to abolish ‘Black invisibility’ (Ellison, 1947), embed anti-racist practices and fully recognise and respect colour and cultural differences so that these are visible, respected and supported (Burnham, 2012). In terms of practical recommendations to support cultural identity, the studies suggested that the racially-marginalised men should have access to items such as,
cultural food, hairdressers, clothes, and cultural or religious reading materials (HMIP, 2005).

Brookes et al. (2012) argued ‘a prison regime that does not see, acknowledge, or understand the impact of race and processes of racialisation on Black men will only serve to perpetuate the difficulties that some Black men experience’ (p. 24). Several studies argued that there is a need to raise cultural awareness, increase cultural understanding and sensitivity from staff (Brookes et al., 2012; HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, 2022; Hunter et al., 2019). Increasing cultural awareness may go some way in increasing staff knowledge and cultural sensitivity, helping the prisoners to talk about culturally sensitive topics (Hunter et al., 2019; Jones et al., 2013) and empowering them to challenge racism. However, individualised recommendations and changes should be based on each specific prison population and their needs.

Whilst there is still a huge over-representation of racially-marginalised men in prison, some studies suggested a need to diversify prison officers (Hunter et al., 2019; Irwin-Rogers, 2018; Sullivan, 2007), so they more closely represent the current prison population. This echoes Lammy’s (2017) report that states the prison staff need to reflect the community they serve. This could lead to the racially-marginalised men feeling more connected to, listened to, and trusting of prison officers, which could reduce the ‘us and them’ culture (Brookes et al., 2012, p. 19), and in turn support their rehabilitation into the community (Mann et al., 2018). However, it would not be enough to just increase the number of racially-marginalised officers, there is a need to embed cultural sensitivity and anti-racist practices. This would include listening, believing, and trying to understand the experiences of racially-marginalised men, acknowledging, and apologising for racism and wrongdoings, offering support, and building and keeping trust (Reid, 2021). Furthermore, policies, procedures, and programmes
should be reviewed (Reid, 2021) to ensure they are suitable for racially-marginalised men. The racially-marginalised staff would need to be supported and empowered to make changes in prisons. Research has shown that Black prison officers often feel undermined, lack support from white colleagues, and experience racism in the workplace, which impacts on their mental health (HMIP, 2022). Additionally, there needs to be more progression for racially-marginalised officers into leadership positions, as currently racially-marginalised officers report a lack of encouragement, guidance and mentoring, and racial discrimination when applying for promotions (HMIP, 2022).

Finally, this SLR has highlighted that at the heart of prison reform is a need to understand what is failing and therefore what needs to change. Several studies suggest avenues to gain the voices of the racially-marginalised men (Brookes et al., 2012; HMIP, 2020, 2022; Jones et al., 2013). This supports the notion that, ‘those closest to the problem are closest to the solution, but often the furthest from resources, influence and power’ (Reed, 2019). For changes to prison which support racially-marginalised men, the changes need to be co-produced with them as experts (Harriott, 2021). Therefore research, policy, regime, and programme changes need to be led by the racially-marginalised men. ‘Involving people with lived experiences is cost-effective, as a service, it avoids you wasting money on solutions that don’t work’ (Lived Experienced Representative, 2023).

2.9 Conclusions

The aim of this SLR was to understand what is currently known about racially-marginalised men’s experiences of prison in the UK, by synthesising existing qualitative research. This SLR has started to go beyond the statistics and explore the current qualitative literature available to gain an insight into how racially-marginalised
men experience prison in the UK. It has brought together the findings of 10 studies and used thematic synthesis to tell the current experiences of racially-marginalised men. Overall, the SLR highlighted the complex and multifaceted experiences, and showed that racially-marginalised men experienced powerlessness, racism, and a disconnect from their cultural identity. Their experiences led to isolation and alienation, and impacted on the treatment and support they received in prison, with this directly linked to rehabilitation and desistance from offending. All these factors perpetuate the disproportionate number of racially-marginalised people in prison.

For the prison service to change and support the needs of racially-marginalised men and address the disproportionality, they need to dismantle racist policies, embed anti-racist practices, and build a system which is culturally aware, understanding, and sensitive. More research is needed to gain racially-marginalised men’s experiences and ideas on prison reform, as they are the experts. Finally, to understand the different stories and experiences, people should not be grouped across racial identities. Given that young Black men are the most over-represented within the CJS and prisons, there is a need to understand their individual lived experiences and stories of prison.

2.10 Rationale for Current Research

The literature so far has demonstrated racial inequality in the UK in housing, social care, education and employment, healthcare, the CJS and prisons. The social inequality and the institutional racism throughout the CJS (MacPherson, 1999), are both significant contributing factors for the over-representation of racially-marginalised men, particularly young Black men in prison (Bromley, 2011). Over the past 20 years, numerous studies have sought to understand and address the racial inequality in prisons (Chistyakova et al., 2018; HMIP, 2005; MOJ, 2016). Whilst this literature has
provided an understanding of the overrepresentation, with some statistical evidence, it does not provide an understanding of the lived experiences. More research is needed to gain an understanding of the lived experience of people who have resided in prison, in order to redesign, rebuild, and reform the prison system for marginalised populations (Harriott, 2021; Robertson & Wainwright, 2020). Much of the qualitative research available grouped different racialised identities together, with little focus specifically on Black men’s experiences of prison (HMIP, 2022), despite them being the most disproportionately represented with the CJS and prisons.

2.11 Aims and Research Questions

In recognition of the limited research and a systemic and urgent need for prison reform for young Black men, the aim of the research is to gain a better understanding of young Black men’s experiences of prison, to push for social change and prison reform. The research questions are:

- What are the stories and lived experiences of prison in the UK for young Black men?
- What do these stories and experiences suggest about the changes needed for prison reform for young Black men?
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

3.1 Chapter Overview

In this chapter, I will firstly orientate the research within the principles of community psychology and participatory action research. I will outline the research design, and detail why Narrative Inquiry was chosen, including its fit with the research question and epistemological stance. The ethical considerations, procedure, sampling strategy, recruitment process, and data collection will be presented. Finally, I will outline the specific narrative restorying framework used for data analysis and examine the quality of the current study.

3.2 Collaborative Design

3.2.1 Outsider Researcher

I am a white-British female who has not resided in prison, and therefore I use the term ‘outsider researcher’, to acknowledge and show the difference in my position to the participants (Braun & Clarke, 2013). This position meant I considered the roles of power, identity, and privilege in the design and recruitment process. Given the socio-political challenges and inequalities within this research area, the study incorporated consultation with participants, and social action approaches, as detailed below.

3.2.2 Community Psychology

Community psychology is an approach that is underpinned by values of social justice, liberation, empowerment, and social action (Kagan et al., 2011). It draws on theories to consider the impact different systems have on an individual. The focus on marginalised communities is a key principle (Kagan et al., 2011), and its aim is to move
towards an understanding of the impact that oppressive political and social environments have on people and their communities (Byrne, 2020). It shifts the perspective to seeing people as experts of themselves and their experiences. Working alongside communities to develop knowledge and implement change is key (Patel, 2003). This study used principles of community psychology and participatory action research (detailed below) to understand the experiences of marginalised young Black men, within an oppressive prison environment, and shift power by making collaborative decisions from the outset.

3.2.3 Participatory Action Research

Participatory action research (PAR) is an approach focusing on power and equity, both in relation to processes and outcomes of research (Ozer et al., 2013). PAR is a collaborative process of research, education, and action (Hall, 1993), where researchers and participants work collaboratively to challenge injustice (Cammarota & Fine, 2008), and try to change situations for the better (Kindon et al., 2007). PAR strategies aim to locate power and knowledge in those who have experienced the oppression and inequality, and actively involves participants in designing and developing the research (Byrne, 2020). Arnstein (1969)’s Ladder of Participation (figure 2), represents the increasing levels of participation in PAR, moving from nonparticipation (no power) to citizen control (actual power). In this research, I used Arnstein (1969)’s ladder to gage the level of participation and initially aimed to embed citizen control wherever possible.

PAR fits with my values for social justice, empowerment, equity, and centring participants’ voices within prison reform, and the epistemology of the research. Due to my outsider researcher position, I was not best placed to make every decision about
the research. For research on the changes needed in prisons for young Black men to be meaningful, it should be co-produced with them. Using a methodology that enables direct interaction with young Black men, who have been marginalised and silenced, was important. This would allow them to use their knowledge and experience in the decision-making process, whilst acknowledging my lens, influence and power as a white researcher, and the wider institutions in which the research has been conducted within.

**Figure 2**

*Ladder of Citizen Participation* (Arnstein, 1969)

![Ladder of Citizen Participation](image)

3.2.4 **Challenges with PAR**

The initial intention was to incorporate PAR principles in most of the decisions within this research. Whilst PAR has been used within Doctorate of Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy) research, it can be difficult due to constraints of time, funding, and ethical considerations (Templer, 2017), and it must be carried out predominantly by the primary researcher to gain a doctoral level qualification, which leads to a power
imbalance from the onset. Additionally, the ethical approval process for this project took three months, as the original application was rejected on the grounds of risk. The new submission required extensive consideration, reflection, and liaison with the Ethics Committee, captured in my reflective diary (appendix D). This impacted on the PAR elements of the project, including building relationships with third-sector organisations and participants, and consequently there was significantly less time for data collection. Whilst a full PAR project was not achieved, I applied principles of community psychology and PAR for parts of the research (detailed below).

3.2.5 Research Decision Making

There are parts of the research which were defined as ‘top-down’ as they were non-negotiable requirements of me qualifying from the DClinPsy programme set by the University (i.e., the deadline and publication requirement). I decided on the broad topic and a qualitative design, before submitting a research proposal and being assigned a supervisor.

A young Black man with lived experience within the research area, was involved from the initial stages, as a Research Consultant (RC). They were involved as part of their paid employment with a third-sector organisation and have a passion for prison reform. Together we co-designed the research, and considered the broad research questions, selection criteria and method of data collection. The RC supported with producing the recruitment materials, to ensure suitability, and was fundamental in identifying avenues and bridging relationships for recruitment with third-sector organisations. The RC supported with considering the language used by participants and the contexts behind collective stories.
Working alongside the RC helped the research to be grounded in real experiences. However, it was important that the participants were involved in decision-making. We decided to run research workshops with participants so that specific decisions about the research design could be determined by them (see sections 3.7.1 to 3.7.4 for details).

3.3 Qualitative Methodology

This research aimed to explore the stories of young Black men and their experiences of prison, to push for social change and prison reform. As the introduction and SLR demonstrated, much of the existing literature provides a quantitative approach in relation to the disproportionate number of young Black men in prison, and there is ‘…little data about most areas of Black prisoner’s experience’ (HMIP, 2022, p. 64). It was therefore a priority to use a qualitative methodology that allowed for in-depth descriptions of experiences to be explored (Harper & Thompson, 2012). Qualitative researchers study participants’ life events, experiences, and stories (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011).

3.3.1 Qualitative Methodologies Considered

There are several qualitative methodologies which are suitable for gaining an in-depth understanding of an individual’s experience. It is important to select a methodology that fits with the epistemological stance, position of the researcher and aims of the research (Harper, 2011). In the initial stages of the research design, the following three methodologies were considered for data analysis:

I) Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis

II) Discourse Analysis
3.3.2 Interprettive Phenomenological Analysis

Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) allows for an in-depth understanding of a subjective experience and explores how people make sense of their experiences (Larkin & Thompson, 2012). IPA would amplify the participant’s voices and experiences, and be helpful to explore a shared understanding, for example, how participants made sense of their experience of living in prison. However, IPA has a strong interpretative (hermeneutic) phenomenological epistemology, and the stance that the researcher will try to remain neutral, bracket out assumptions, and analyse experiences in isolation (Yardley, 2000). Therefore, IPA does not fit with the epistemological stance of the research, that knowledge is co-constructed with the researcher and stories do not directly mirror experiences.

3.3.3 Discourse Analysis

Discourse Analysis (DA) is an approach which examines the language used by participants, in terms of construction and function (Wetherell et al., 2001). DA fitted with the social constructionist epistemological stance of the research and considers how discourses are captivated by power (Harper, 2011). However, with DA it can be difficult to involve participants, because of its interpretative nature. DA focuses on the use of language and ‘how’ stories are constructed, rather than ‘what’ the story is about, and the wider context (Burr, 2004). DA would be helpful to consider how the young Black men construct their own experiences of prison. However, for the current research, it was important to explore their stories and experiences, and consider both ‘what’ stories are told and ‘how’ they are told.
3.3.4 Narrative Inquiry

Narrative research is an umbrella term for a range of qualitative methodologies that share a focus on written or spoken accounts of events, which are connected chronologically (Czarniawska, 2004; Riessman, 2008). There are a range of different types of narrative analysis, to suit the research question and aims (Frost, 2009). Narrative inquiry (NI) is one type of narrative analysis, which focuses on studying people’s lived experiences which have been storied, as a source of knowledge itself (Andrews, 2008; Caine et al., 2018; Clandinin & Huber, 2010). It is a methodological approach with the assumption that human beings lead storied lives (Clandinin, 2006), and make their lives meaningful by sharing stories (Polkinghorne, 1995). A story is a specific type of narrative about an individual’s experiences (Czarniawska, 2004). When one tells a story about themselves, they describe actions, choices, and beliefs and include interactions, continuity of experiences, and specific situations and places (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000).

NI was chosen for the current research for several reasons. Firstly, NI is underpinned by ontological relativism and epistemological constructionism (Smith, 2013), in that participant’s individual stories are personal, and do not pristinely reflect their experiences (B. Smith, 2016). People construct meaning from within their social and cultural contexts and experiences, to share life stories (Trahar, 2013). NI emphasises relational engagement between the researcher and participant (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000), and acknowledges that stories are co-constructed, and influenced by both the participant and researcher’s historical, social, cultural, and socio-political experiences and beliefs, the wider context, and the environment in which the stories are shared (Riessman, 2008). This fits the stance of the current research (section 1.3).
NI allows participants to speak in their own way, which can shift power and amplify the voices of marginalised communities (Ganzevoort, 2011). This was particularly important, due to my outsider researcher position, and exploring the stories of young Black men and their experiences of prison. NI analyses both what the story is and how the story is structured (Wells, 2011). NI allows the stories told to stay intact, rather than ‘over-coding’ (B. Smith, 2016, p. 210). Finally, NI can be used to analyse stories in several forms, such as interviews, storytelling in groups, letters, and journal records (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). This allowed flexibility, as the form of experience-sharing was determined by participants during the research workshops (section 3.7.2).

3.4 Ethical Considerations

Ethical approval was granted from the University of Hertfordshire Health and Human Sciences Ethics Committee on 2nd May 2023 (protocol number: LMS/PGT/UH/05308; appendix E). The Code of Human Research Ethics (BPS, 2021a), and Code of Ethics and Conduct (BPS, 2021b), namely principles of integrity, consent, confidentiality, and minimisation of harm were used to ensure the study adhered to ethical guidelines.

3.4.1 Informed Consent

Third-sector organisations supporting people who met the selection criteria, were contacted via telephone or email, and asked to support with recruitment of participants. Men who were suitable and interested in taking part in the study, were asked to contact the researcher via telephone (researcher number) or email as per the recruitment poster (appendix F).
An initial conversation was arranged with all potential participants, prior to them engaging in the study, to start to build trust and rapport (Flanagan & Hancock, 2010). They were provided with an information sheet which explained the aims, requirements, benefits, costs, confidentiality, anonymity, and withdrawal process (appendix G). Potential participants were provided with time to consider whether they would like to participate or ask any questions. Those who decided to participate were asked to sign a consent form (appendix H) to be included in the research and for the experience-sharing to be audio-recorded.

3.4.2 Confidentiality

Confidentiality and anonymity principles were maintained throughout the research and explained to participants in the information sheet, consent form, and after recruitment to confirm understanding. The participants were informed that all identifying information (i.e., names, locations) would be anonymised. They chose a pseudonym to match all their data and to protect anonymity. They were informed that their data would be kept confidential unless there were any safeguarding concerns. Safeguarding steps and researcher duty of care were outlined on the information sheet. As experience-sharing was online, we discussed the confidentiality of their space. No concerns were highlighted.

3.4.3 Data Protection

Data was collected in line with the Data Protection Act (UK Government Legislation, 2018), and kept securely, in line with university guidelines. Interviews were recorded via online conferencing software (MS Teams). Within 24-hours of completion of the interview, the recording was stored on my university OneDrive, which only I had
access to. It required two factor authentication and password protection and was stored using a participant identification number. The audio-recording was then deleted from the computer and software. Audio-recordings were transcribed and anonymised, and stored on the university OneDrive, with the same protection.

3.4.4 Risk of Distress

Whilst sharing experiences can be therapeutic (Murray & Sargeant, 2012), there was potential for participants to share experiences which could cause distress to themselves and/or the researcher. This was considered carefully throughout to safeguard participants and the researcher. Participants were recruited through third-sector organisations, as they could bridge existing relationships and ensure participants were suitable (Flanagan & Hancock, 2010). Participants were informed of the potential for distress in initial conversations, the information sheet, and reminded prior to data collection. Participants were invited to attend research workshops to build a relationship with me, and make specific decisions about the research, including the format, location/premise, and questions of the experience-sharing, to reduce the potential risk of distress.

Prior to data collection, the participants and I determined how they would communicate distress. During data collection, participants did not have to answer any questions they did not feel comfortable with, and I monitored participants for signs of distress, asked about potential distress, and provided support where necessary. Participants were provided with a debrief sheet, which contained information of local resources and support, including complaints processes for prison services. Participants were offered a check-in telephone call 24-hours after experience-sharing
from myself, and the third-sector organisations were able to provide after-care, if necessary.

3.4.5 Risk of Harm

There is a nuanced understanding of Black men and the risk of harm. Whilst this research was with a population that had been in prison, and there was a potential risk of harm, there are also underpinning stereotypes that society positions Black men as violent individuals rather than understanding the systemic problems within the CJS linked to offending. The ethical committee highlighted concerns that the ‘…investigator is in a very vulnerable position. The participants may have been convicted of highly violent crimes’ (Ethics Committee, personal communication, March 7, 2023). Whilst the concern of risk of harm was understood, it was important to ensure the more nuanced understanding and acknowledge participants may not have committed ‘highly violent crimes’, they have served their prison sentence and are deemed safe to live in the community.

Extensive risk assessments were conducted prior to data collection (appendix I). Disclosure protocols were created, in case participants disclosed any involvement in illegal activity, maltreatment or abuse (appendix J). Recruitment was conducted solely through third-sector organisations, to ensure suitable and willing participants. The location/venue was supported by the third-sector organisation, and a staff member was present to support. During data collection, risk management knowledge and skills were used, including positioning of myself, and paying close attention to body language and tone. The primary supervisor was informed of the meeting time and location, and contacted following the meeting to communicate safety, and debrief if necessary. No harm occurred.
3.4.6 Remuneration

Remuneration for participants for their expertise and time participating in the research is grounded in community psychology principles, and wider arguments about inclusion (Cornish et al., 2023). I applied for additional funding, and as stipulated by University Ethics, each participant was provided a £20 voucher for each hour of participation, with a maximum of £100 per participant.

3.5 Procedure

The research procedure is outlined in figure 3 and discussed below.

Figure 3

*Procedure Flowchart*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruitment of two third-sector organisations: to support with recruitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment of five suitable and willing participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Meetings: Relationship building, overview of project, demographics, consent form and questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with Participants: 4 Research Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Data Collection: Consent revisited, individual interview via MS Teams and audio-recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debrief: Debrief and support provided, 24-hour check offered, questions and vouchers provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storing Data: Storing on OneDrive, anonymising, password protecting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up Interviews: Follow-up individual interviews to check and comment on accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Story Sharing Workshop: Shared individual stories, and discussed emerging collective stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis Process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6 Recruitment

3.6.1 Selection Criteria

To meet the research aims, selection criteria were determined (Table 7). Individuals were able to participate in the study if they identified as Black, male, and aged 18 to 30, as this is considered 'young' in criminology literature (Ritschel, 2018). Participants were required to have resided in a UK prison, as experiences outside the UK may be vastly different (Mjåland et al., 2021). A minimum sentence of three months was stipulated to ensure participants could reflect on a significant period in prison, and not just the most turbulent settling period (Toman et al., 2015). Anyone unable to provide consent, or undergoing criminal investigation were unable to participate, due to the potential risks, vulnerability, and impact on any ongoing investigation.

Table 7

*Participant Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Exclusion Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifies as Black (i.e., Black British, African, Caribbean, African-Caribbean, or Dual Heritage)</td>
<td>Anyone deemed unable to provide informed consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies as male</td>
<td>Anyone currently in prison, remanded for a sentence or undergoing criminal investigations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 18 to 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resided in a UK prison for at least three months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6.2 Sampling Strategy

The current study aimed to recruit up to 10 participants. NI research commonly has four to six participants (Haydon et al., 2017), and just one participant is deemed adequate, given the rich amount of data (Wells, 2011). Given the population, sensitivity of the topic, outsider researcher position, and suggestions from the Ethics Committee, the study used purposive sampling to select individuals with the experience linked to the research question (Oppong, 2013). Third-sector organisations were approached and helped identify suitable and willing participants.

3.6.3 Recruitment Process

The recruitment process took place from May to September 2023, after ethical approval was provided. A recruitment poster (appendix F) and a video (appendix K) were created with the research team. These were shared with relevant third-sector organisations, to help them and potential participants to understand the aims and requirements of the study. Overall, 36 third-sector organisations were approached, and meetings were held with 16. The two third-sector organisations who were willing to support with the research, were asked to provide a letter/email detailing their ability to support with recruitment and the location/premises of participant's experience-sharing and show the poster and video to potentially suitable participants. Interested participants were asked to contact the researcher by telephone or email.

3.6.4 Challenges with Recruitment

Challenges with recruitment were pre-empted due to the nature and sensitivity of the topic connected to race and racism, and my identity as a white woman, who represents the white systems built by and for white people that oppress Black men.
As anticipated, there were some challenges, including questions from a third-sector organisation about my identity as a white woman, and if the men would feel comfortable sharing their experiences, and whether I would get an authentic account.

As a white woman working in psychology, I am often privileged with being trusted, and therefore it felt strange not to be, and it led to anxiety about the project. I considered that I might cause harm as a white individual who has not experienced racism, but also that psychology does not currently represent this population. This feedback led to seeking guidance from the RC, and the creation of the recruitment video to show my white identity and explain my passion for the research, my outsider prospective and that the research would be co-constructed. The recruitment process was exhausting, with lots of time spent emailing, calling, and holding meetings. It felt like a rollercoaster of emotion, making progress one day, and hitting barriers the next. A reflective journal was kept throughout the process (appendix L).

3.7 Participants

Five individuals were recruited for the study, from two third-sector organisations. All participants met the selection criteria. Participants were invited to choose their own pseudonym to maintain confidentiality, allow for choice and control, reduce researcher power, and avoid an insensitive pseudonym (Allen & Wiles, 2016). Participants’ information and demographics are shown in Table 8.
### Table 8

*Information and Demographics of Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Racial identity</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Age first in Prison</th>
<th>Time in Prison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy</td>
<td>Dual heritage (Kenyan and Filipino)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17 years old</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16 years old</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome</td>
<td>Black British</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18 years old</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorge</td>
<td>Black British</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21 years old</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJ</td>
<td>Black British</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18 years old</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.7.1 Consultation with Participants

While all qualitative methodologies emphasise relationships between the researcher and participants (Frith & Gleeson, 2012), NI lends itself to a collaborative and participant-led approach (Nasheeda et al., 2019). Given this NI approach, and the underpinning principles of PAR/community psychology, which all value co-production, research consultation with participants took place prior to formal data collection. This included an initial meeting and four research design workshops, to build relationships, trust, and make co-constructed decisions about the research design. The participants’ involvement in the research consultation is shown in Table 9.

#### 3.7.2 Initial Meeting

An initial meeting was held with all potential participants to start building a trusting relationship. These were completed individually or in a group, and on the telephone or in-person at a location supported by the third-sector organisation, depending on their preference and whether they knew each other (participation shown in Table 9). I introduced myself, reflected on my outsider researcher position and explained the
aims and project rationale. We discussed the research workshops, and the elements of the research design that we would decide on together. Participants were invited to the workshops, and asked for their preferences for times, dates, format, and geographic location, in-person, online (via MS Teams) or on the telephone. The information sheet was discussed with participants, and they had the opportunity to ask questions. Written consent was obtained, either in-person or via email. Demographic information was collected (appendix M).

Table 9

Participants’ Involvement in the Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Initial meeting</th>
<th>Workshop 1: Introduction to Research</th>
<th>Workshop 2: Changes to Prison</th>
<th>Workshop 3: Research Design</th>
<th>Workshop 4: Sharing the research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy</td>
<td>Phone call Individual</td>
<td>Online Individual</td>
<td>Online Individual</td>
<td>Online Individual</td>
<td>Online Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>Phone call Individual</td>
<td>DNA</td>
<td>Phone call Individual</td>
<td>Phone call Individual</td>
<td>Online Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome</td>
<td>In-person Group 1</td>
<td>In-person Group 1</td>
<td>In-person Group 1</td>
<td>In-person Group 1</td>
<td>In-person Group 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorge</td>
<td>In-person Group 1</td>
<td>In-person Group 1</td>
<td>In-person Group 1</td>
<td>In-person Group 1</td>
<td>In-person Group 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJ</td>
<td>In-person Group 1</td>
<td>In-person Group 1</td>
<td>DNA</td>
<td>In-person Group 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7.3 Research Workshops

Participants were invited to take part in four research workshops (see table 10 and appendix N). Originally, group research workshops were planned to run once enough participants had been recruited. However, due to time constraints and concerns from third-sector organisations regarding potential association issues between participants, research workshops were offered both individually and in
groups, depending on association concerns, availability, and preference (participation is shown in Table 9). A decision was made with participants not to record the workshops, to build trust and allow more authentic and informal conversations (Rutakumwa et al., 2020). After research workshop 1, participants were provided with a debrief sheet outlining some options for support in their local area (appendix O). After each workshop, participants were offered a check-in within 24-hours, to check how they were feeling and whether they needed any additional support. No participants took up this offer. The research workshops helped towards building a trusting relationship and co-constructing parts of the research. Participants were experts in their experiences, and I brought an expertise in research. Ideas from the research workshops were collated onto mind-maps (appendix P), and some of the main decisions are discussed below.

**Method of Experience-sharing.** We discussed the different methods of experience-sharing, including individually (i.e., interview), storytelling in groups, letter writing, journal records (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000), and/or through photos. We discussed the benefits and limitations, and how the participants would like to share their experiences. Some participants wanted to share their experiences individually, stating ‘more people, more problems’, and describing themselves as a ‘lone wolf’. Other participants reported they were happy to share in a group, but acknowledged they all had very different experiences, and sharing in a group may impact on what was shared. We agreed to have the experience-sharing individually but have further group discussions on collective storylines, changes to prison and dissemination.

**Developing the Interview Schedule.** We discussed different types of questions, style of questionings, the number of questions, and what types of experiences participants felt comfortable to share. Overall, participants wanted broad open
questions, which they could answer ‘in their own way’. This approach is known as an ‘open invitation’ within NI (Jovchelovitch & Bauer, 2000), and aligns with conducting qualitative interviews on sensitive topics (Dempsey et al., 2016).

Participants discussed prison being part of their life and wanting to share stories about before prison, so their experiences of prison could be understood in the context of their whole life. Based on this epistemological stance that stories are co-constructed and that discourse shapes reality, participants would be invited to discuss pre-prison, during, and post-prison stories.

We briefly discussed narrative approaches and created the interview schedule together (appendix Q). From their suggestions this fitted with a life stories approach (Peacock & Holland, 1993). The schedule had a brief question situating themselves before prison, one main question about their experiences of prison, and a question considering changes to prison. Participants considered how others may struggle with the openness of the main question and suggested including prompt questions to ask if participants wanted more direction. The schedule aimed to allow participants space to narrate their stories with a degree of flexibility.

**Sharing the research.** We discussed who the research should be shared with, and participants talked about sharing it with friends, family, third-sector organisations, prison, and prison officers. We discussed how to share this research in creative ways, such as poems, podcasts, and social media. Participants were asked if they wanted to be contacted post-submission, to continue discussing potential ideas and/or be involved in the disseminated. Four participants agreed.
Table 10
Main Discussion Points for the Workshops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop</th>
<th>Main Discussion Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Introduction to Research</td>
<td>- What is research? Differences of quantitative and qualitative research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Research of interest about young Black men’s experiences of Prison?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What experiences would like/be willing to share?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What parts of prison feel more relevant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What would be the aims of research and question?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Changes to Prison</td>
<td>- What worked well and did not work well in prisons?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What was the hardest part of prison?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Changes to prison? Changes for young Black men?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Research Design</td>
<td>- Define aims and questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- How to share experiences? Other elements for sharing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Format &amp; location of the experience-sharing? (face-to-face, online, telephone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The role of the researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Sharing the Research</td>
<td>- How and where should the research be shared?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What impact do you want this research to have?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Who is it important for this research to be shared with / heard by?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7.4 Reflections on Consultation with Participants

The consultation with participants on the research design was helpful and allowed for us to build a relationship involving mutual trust. However, a power dynamic was present, and I still had power to influence what the participants knew or understood, with the knowledge I shared (Willig, 2012). During the research workshops, I was mindful of the approach I took, and whilst I did not want to come across as an educator, I had to provide enough information to participants for them to make informed decisions about the research design. They made decisions in that they would share their stories individually, and the interview would include prompts. However, I think my novice researcher knowledge impacted on the research design. For example, some methodologies, i.e., photovoice, I do not know enough about to
provide a rationale for choosing it, or how it would be implemented. I think this is possibly why it still took on a more traditional NI approach (i.e., individual interview and life-story approach). Although I tried to provide knowledge and ask open-ended questions, I was often met by participants saying they do not mind, and happy to follow my lead, possibly demonstrating the power imbalance (further reflections in appendix R).

3.8 Data Collection

As determined in the research workshops, participants shared their stories and experiences of prison in an individual interview. Formal interviews allow stories to emerge in collaborative conversation between the researcher and participants (Muylaert et al., 2014). All participants were aware of the questions prior to their individual interview. Participants chose the length of time, format and location of the interview, and social elements, i.e., food and drinks while we talked. Participants agreed for the interview to be audio-recorded, and verbal consent was gained. Participants were provided with the debrief sheet outlining some options for support and offered a check-in call 24-hours after. One participant took up the offer and raised no concerns. Follow-up interviews were conducted for the participants to review their summary story (detailed in section 3.9.3).

3.9 Data Analysis

There are many different approaches used to analyse narrative data (Haydon et al., 2017), and there is no single best way for analysing narratives (Mishler, 1995; Nasheeda et al., 2019). The current study examined the stories of young Black men and their experiences of prison. It was therefore important to centralise their voices
(Ganzvoort, 2011), keep the core story and extract the meaning of their lived experiences, while not over coding (Iyengar, 2014). The current study used a multimethod approach, with a goal of restoring and transferring the transcripts into a story (Nasheeda et al., 2019). This approach was chosen as it values extensive collaboration with participants through establishing rapport, building mutual trust, and conducting follow-up interviews to ensure the accounts are accurate (Nasheeda et al., 2019). This approach has four phases, see figure 4. Table 11 was created to provide questions to consider at each phase to help the research team with the analysis process.

Figure 4.

Phases in a Multimethod Restorying Framework (Nasheeda et al., 2019)

3.9.1 Phase 1: From Interview to Transcript

Transcribing. The primary source of information was the individual interviews, which were audio-recorded and transcribed. Transcribing is a time-consuming process, but allows for detailed analysis (Davidson, 2017). It is an interpretive process
and transcripts do not pristinely represent what happened in an interview (Riessman, 2008). Therefore, the role of the transcriber is important in interpreting the oral version into a written format, and thus giving meaning. I transcribed all data to allow further familiarisation (Nasheeda et al., 2019), and avoid an external transcriber being involved in the co-construction of the narratives.

Decisions about transcribing and how to display the speech informs how the narrative is co-constructed and interpreted. Jefferson (2004)’s transcribing guide was used (appendix S), and the interviews were transcribed verbatim, for pauses, utterances, repetitions, emphasis of speech, non-audible speech, and expressive sounds. Notes were made following each interview on details which might not have been evident in the interview (i.e., facial expression, emotions, overall tone). Audio-recordings were listened to again while reading the transcript, to support accuracy. A section of Jorge’s transcript with the analytic process is shown in appendix T.

**Familiarisation.** Elements of holistic content reading (Lieblich et al., 1998) were used for familiarisation, including reading the transcript and listening to the audio-recording several times to immerse and familiarise myself in the narrative, understand the sequence of events and allow for an overall impression of the story (Lieblich et al., 1998).

### 3.9.2 Phase 2: Storying

Stories are narratives which have been emplotted and made into a coherent story (Czarniawska, 2004). Emplotment is making sense of the narratives, by understanding the order of events and how they are connected, to develop a structure (Czarniawska, 2004). Each transcript was analysed using structural analysis, which explores how a story is told, the language used and how it is organised (Riessman,
The data from each transcript was organised into a chronological plot of events. Questions were considered (Table 11) to understand the main characters, time, and order of events, and how the participants positioned themselves in their story (Nasheeda et al., 2019). Subtitles were added to help section the story, and interact with the data, to allow for a description alongside the analytical foci. The chronological plotting led to a draft story being created for each participant. These were read multiple times, to highlight missing links and any unclear information.

**Table 11**

*Questions to Consider for Data Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis Approach</th>
<th>Focus and questions to consider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Chronological plot**    | • Who are the main characters in this story?  
• What are the main events?  
• When and where did these events take place?  
• How has the participant positioned themselves in their story? |
| **Story dimensions**       | • Form: ‘Selection of events… composed into a strategic sequence to arouse specific emotions’  
• Function: ‘Call prior experiences to mind helping us understand a current situation’  
• Phenomenon: Stories around for many years. Stories within stories |
| (Kurtz, 2014)              |                                                                                                                                                               |
| **Structural Analysis**    | • How is the story put together, ordered, and organised?  
• How does the story begin, develop, and end?  
• How is the story told? |
| (Riessman, 2008)           |                                                                                                                                                               |
| **Meaning Making**         | • Silences, repeated words, phases, utterances  
• Person shift: indicates important narratives  
• Narrative peaks: critical incidents  
• Narrative evaluations: personal touches to story  
• Glimpses into participant’s own biases and judgements |
| (Czarniawska, 2004; Kurtz, 2014; Margetts, 2015) |                                                                                                       |
3.9.3 Phase 3: Co-creating

Collaboration between the researcher and participant is crucial for co-creating the story (Haydon et al., 2017), and important for mutual trust and respect (DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006). Working collaboratively allows the participant and researcher to view the transcripts from multiple lenses (Nasheeda et al., 2019). After the transcript was chronologically plotted, online follow-up interviews were conducted with each participant to ask questions to help with the accuracy of the sequence and reflect the participant’s voice (DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006).

3.9.4 Phase 4: Meaning

To move from transcript to story, it is essential to understand how the sections of narratives fit into broader context, and the meaning of the narratives that the participant wants to convey (McCormack, 2000). In the transcripts, language has been used to express one’s beliefs, values, and construct reality (Riessman, 2008). Participants have their own style of communication and version of shared cultural communication. Hence language is an essential unit of analysis to understand meaning (Sirbu, 2015).

Structural analysis of the transcripts was conducted to consider the language in the development of a story plot (Riessman, 2008). Elements such as dichotomies, utterances, repeated words, expressions of emotions, and silences were considered in the meaning making (Czarniawska, 2004). Some words were clarified for their meaning during follow-up interviews. Transcripts were analysed for shifts in pronouns while telling stories, as this can indicate importance (Kurtz, 2014). Narrative events (parts of the story which the participants want to reveal), narrative peaks (conversations which evoked interest in the story as critical incidents), and narrative
evaluations (personal touches to stories, which offer a unique experience) were considered (Margetts, 2015).

Once the analysis was completed, and the summary stories were finalised, participants had the opportunity to read and comment on the accuracy, which is an important procedure in NI (Nasheeda et al., 2019). They also reflected on how they found the overall process. An example of a summary story is shown in appendix U.

3.9.5 Collective Stories

NI recognises individual stories but is also interested in the shared stories of individuals (Murray & Sargeant, 2012). Upon completion of the individual analysis and the summary stories, I continued to familiarise myself with the transcripts, audio-recordings, and summaries. I read across the five individual accounts for points of connection and divergence, in the core elements (i.e., main characters, events, positioning of themselves, form, story phenomenon, and structural elements). Tables were created for the core elements of the five individual stories to support with considering the collective stories (appendix V).

Following this, all participants were invited to one group story sharing meeting. This was attended by four participants: three participants in-person (Jerome, Jorge, and AJ), and one participant online (Jimmy). Participants shared the main elements of their stories, and we considered the accounts collectively, discussing similarities and differences in the emerging collective stories, and the way participants constructed their stories (Weatherhead, 2011).

The summary stories were read by the research team, and I discussed emerging collective stories with them individually to consider multiple lenses of the stories. I held in mind these perspectives, and this allowed for the weaving of individual stories into
the creation of the most dominant collective stories, which were relevant to the research aims. These were then considered and interwoven within broader social narratives, particularly those around race, racism, power, prisons, and crime. Finally, transcripts were revisited to check their fit with the collective stories and interpretations made. Reflections throughout data analysis are shown in appendix W.

3.10 Quality of the Current Research

The approach to examining the quality of research depends upon the researcher’s epistemological position (Riessman, 2008). In constructionist research paradigms there is no definitive truth, and therefore the quality of research can be determined by attending to its trustworthiness (Loh, 2015), based upon credibility, rigour, and pragmatic usefulness (Riessman, 2008; Yardley, 2014). Quality criteria have been suggested by many authors, including Tracy’s (2010) eight criteria for excellent quality framework which has been used in NI research (Grewal, 2022), to assess trustworthiness and quality. This framework has been applied to this research, with steps taken throughout to ensure it met the criteria, as illustrated in Table 12. Some of the main elements are discussed below.

Reflexivity is essential in developing trustworthiness (Finlay, 1998). An essential element of reflexivity is examining our identity in relation to the participant’s identity (Jacobson & Mustafa, 2019). To support reflexivity and transparency, I positioned myself within the research and reflected on my outsider researcher position, particularly my white identity and associated power. I fostered a supervisory relationship which challenged me, and kept a central and critical eye on race, racism, and power. This approach led to a deeper understanding and acknowledgment of the power I hold, the impact it had and led to practices to reduce power dynamics.
wherever possible, such as creating research design workshops. Detailed reflexivity, personal reflections, emotional responses, reflections on privileges, and stories which were silenced, were reflected upon throughout the process with the research team. Regular meetings with the RC helped to consider my white identity, and discuss issues on power, biases, and assumptions.

### Table 12

**Assessment of Quality of the Current Research (Tracy, 2010)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria for quality</th>
<th>Evidence in present study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worthy topic?</strong> (i.e., relevant, timely, significant, and interesting)</td>
<td>Previous research grouped different racialised identities together, with little focus specifically on Black men’s experiences of prison, regardless of them being identified as the most disproportionately represented in prison. The research is a worthy topic due to the literature gap. This project was relevant, timely and significant, and provided important contributions given the need for prison reform and social change. It provided significant contribution, which bridges the gaps in research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rich rigor?</strong> (i.e., theoretical constructs, data, sample, context, data collection and analysis processes)</td>
<td>Theoretical constructs, epistemological and ontological positions were outlined, and underpinned decisions. Recruitment and sampling processes were clearly outlined. The sample of participants, context and demographics were provided. Data collection and data analysis followed theoretical guidelines and were outlined with figures to orientate the reader. Significant time was given to build relationships and gather data. Appropriate procedures, interviewing practices and analysis procedures were used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sincerity?</strong> (i.e., self-reflexivity and transparency)</td>
<td>Self-reflexivity and transparency were embedded throughout. My identity as a white British female who has not resided in prison, and the associated power and privileges, was reflected upon in the introduction, methodology and discussion. Power dynamics and biases were carefully considered throughout. Transparency has been shown by including the mind maps from the research workshops, extracts from one participant’s transcript and one summary story.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Credibility?</strong> (i.e., thick description, triangulation, member reflections, crystallisation)</td>
<td>Thick description was used with direct quotes from participants, to show the stories and experiences. There were follow-up interviews with participants to check language and plot, and participants were invited to check the accuracy of their finalised summary story. They were invited to a collective story sharing workshop. My supervisor and I analysed part of a transcript separately and compared results. The summary stories were read by the research team to gain multiple lenses on the stories. A research diary was used to maintain a reflexive position throughout. Reflective comments added to the transcripts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Resonance?**  
| (i.e., aesthetic merit, transferability, and naturalistic generalisation) | Findings were presented and intertwined with wider context and narratives. Naturalistic generalisation was gained through the findings being generalised within and embedded within wider narratives. There was clinical significance and relevance within systems, including prisons, probation, the wider CJS, and psychology. |
| **Significant contribution**  
| (i.e., theoretical, and practical significance) | The research extends upon previous research, with a focus on Black men’s experiences of prison, which bridges the gaps in research. The findings aim to improve practice in prisons, for social change and prison reform for young Black men. It helped to amplify the voices of young Black men, leading to empowerment, and generated suggestions for ongoing research. |
| **Ethical?**  
| (i.e., procedural, situational, culturally, relationship and exiting ethics) | Ethical approval was gained from the University. Ethical standards and considerations were adhered to and reflected upon throughout the research. Situational ethics were considered with risk assessments, and disclosure protocols. Relational ethics were considered in relationship building, consultation workshops, and reflexivity in relation to power. |
| **Meaningful coherence?**  
| (i.e., achieved purpose and aims, and interconnected literature) | The research achieved its aims of gaining the stories of young Black men and their experiences of prison. The method and procedure fitted the aims of the research. It was interweaved and connected with relevant literature and broader narratives. It made suggestions for clinical and research application, and future research. |
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Chapter Overview

In this chapter, I will present the collective storylines from the five young Black men, who told their stories and experiences of prison. I will firstly orientate CRT (Crenshaw et al., 1996) as the theoretical lens of viewing the findings. I will present the collective stories, connecting similar narratives and highlighting points of divergence. I will present the findings and discussion together to allow them to be interwoven within broader social narratives, particularly those around racism, power, and crime. The participants’ own words are included to centre their voices amongst my observations and how I made sense of their experiences (Squire, 2008). Additional quotations are shown in appendix X to further illustrate the collective stories.

4.2 Theoretical Lens

CRT was chosen as the lens in which to view the young Black men’s racialised experiences of prison. CRT is a lens of viewing and understanding knowledge through an intersectional perspective, in that there is not a singular truth (Parker & Lynn, 2002). CRT lens focuses attention on the social construction of race and racism and helps to understand the underlying factors of their experiences (Delgado & Stefancic, 2000). CRT helps to reframe the Black men’s experiences from a critical perspective (Pelzer, 2016), challenge dominant beliefs, introduce counter-narratives (Yosso et al., 2009), and situate the experiences within the broader historical, social, cultural, and socio-political context (Harper, 2011).
4.3 Collective Storylines

The findings have four main collective storylines; stories of challenges, coping, power, and change. There are an additional nine sub-stories (Table 13).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story</th>
<th>Sub-stories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Life [before prison]... wasn’t a fairy tale’ (AJ); Stories of challenges</td>
<td>‘Riding the waves’ (Jorge); Navigating through childhood challenges ‘I was a bad guy’ (Jimmy); constructed as ‘bad’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘It’s home now’ (Jerome); Stories of coping</td>
<td>‘Learning the ropes’ (Jimmy); stories of learning and adapting ‘Pass the time’ (Jerome); stories of getting through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘People got too much power’ (AJ); Stories of power</td>
<td>‘Lowest of the low’ (AJ); stories of losing agency ‘They are policing the wing’ (Jerome); nuances of power ‘That’s the rules’ (Jorge); panoptic power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I’m out the game now’ (Jimmy); Stories of change</td>
<td>‘I made myself change’ (Jimmy); Stories of self-change ‘Now this is the list’ (Jerome); Changes to prison</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 ‘Life [before prison]... wasn’t a Fairy Tale’ (AJ); stories of challenges

All five participants were born and spent most of their childhood within different areas of London. Participants shared descriptive experiences showing that ‘Life [before prison]... wasn’t a fairy tale’ (AJ), having to navigate through childhood challenges, ‘riding the waves’ (Jorge), and how they were constructed as ‘a bad guy’ (Jimmy).
4.4.1 ‘Riding the waves’ (Jorge); navigating through childhood challenges

All participants started by storying a general description of their childhood (Labov, 1972) and used language such as ‘good’ (Jimmy and Ashley), ‘it was alright’ (Jorge), and constructed that their childhood ‘was ok’ (AJ). However, as their stories continued, the dominant narrative was that ‘life [before prison]… wasn’t a fairy tale’ (AJ). Stories of challenges, disruption, and loss permeated the participant’s experiences, including, growing up in a ‘strict household’ (Jorge), ‘never had a father in the household’ (Ashley), ‘getting kicked out [of home]’ (Jimmy), ‘moved out when I was 16’ (Jerome), ‘getting the cane’ (AJ) in a school in Africa, bereavements including ‘dad passed away… when I was like seven’ (AJ), friends being killed, and financial hardship, ‘We weren’t rich or anything… Our parents always made sure we ate. But like, you’d always want more’ (Jorge).

Through the CRT lens, the young Black men disproportionally experienced these challenges due to structural inequalities, institutionally racist systems, and patterns of racial oppression in a broad range of domains including, socio-economic status, health, housing, and education (C. Alexander & Shankley, 2020; Centre for Social Justice, 2020; Ministry of Housing, 2020). Growing up in a low socio-economic background is common for Black children in the UK, with almost half growing up in poverty (UK Government, 2020), which impacts on their health, local amenities, schools, opportunities, and level of crime in the area (No More Exclusions, 2022).

In telling their childhood stories, participants discussed the area of London they grew up in and challenges they experienced, including, racism: ‘I moved to (area of London), which was predominantly a white area then. Erm. So, like I had to deal with a lot of like, erm, skinheads and hostility’ (Ashley), conflict in their neighbourhood:
‘problems with where I lived’ (Jerome), being a victim of crime: ‘Walking down the high street, and then you see those guys that are gonna try and rob us’ (Jorge), and how crime was normalised: ‘You can get robbed any amount of times. And at the same time, when you’re young, you might rob someone as well, it’s strange… Because it’s just the done thing in the area’ (Jorge).

When the men discussed these experiences, they did not used the words ‘trauma’, ‘disadvantage’, or ‘victim’ but candidly discussed them, and narrated that their upbringing was an ordinal experience for a young Black man in London, constructing it as ‘character building’ (Jorge), ‘riding the waves’ (Jorge) and took the mentality ‘it is what it is’ (Jerome). Within a CRT framework and wider societal discourses of neoliberalism, this normalisation of adverse experiences for young Black men leads to society affixing blame and punishing Black people for their own disadvantaged position and life circumstances (Goff et al., 2014), rather than acknowledging and addressing the racial and socio-economic disparities and systemic inequalities (McGee et al., 2021). This can be internalised, with Black people blaming themselves for structural disadvantages and childhood challenges (Dickson et al., 2008), demonstrated by participants constructing a sense of agency as a child and storying making ‘choices’ (Jimmy) and that they chose the ‘wrong path’ (Jimmy).

All five participants storied challenges in their childhood which they constructed as turning points linked to their offending, such as ‘football career messed up’ (Jimmy), ‘dropped out [of university]’ (Jorge), being victim to an offence, and their friend being killed. Childhood challenges can lead to criminality, violence, and gang involvement (Ward, 2013), including associating with ‘…the wrong crowd’ (Jimmy), ‘…less positive people’ (Jimmy), and ultimately their offending, ‘Well, that’s when. Yeah, it all happened… we committed our offences’ (Jorge). People can become involved in
crime to meet their needs, or to redress the social exclusion felt through not having material goods (Ward, 2013), which was storied by participants, ‘I’m thinking when my mum can’t give [me] certain things. So, let me go get it myself’ (Ashley).

Through a CRT lens, Black people experience poverty, disadvantage, and oppression due to structural inequalities, racism, and discrimination in society (Delgado & Stefancic, 2007), which impacts on their socioeconomic status, housing, and schooling, meaning a ‘fairy tale’ (AJ) upbringing is less likely (J. Williams et al., 2020). These stories reflect a neo-liberalised society, where behaviour is conceptualised as individualistic, with society affixing blame to Black men for adverse circumstance (J. Williams et al., 2020). Consequently, root causes of disadvantage and racial disparity are not examined, meaning societal changes are not made, oppressive structures of power remain (Reynolds, 2012), and Black people have to continue ‘riding the waves’ (Jorge) of childhood challenges.

4.4.2 ‘I was a bad guy’ (Jimmy); constructed as ‘bad’

Participants storied their school experiences, describing that they ‘loved’ (AJ) and ‘enjoyed school’ (Jerome, Jorge, Ashley) and continued on to college, with one participant starting university. However, their stories were permeated by the dichotomy of the ‘good’ and ‘bad’ child narrative in the school system, and participants were labelled as, ‘bad’ (Ashley), ‘naughty’ (Jimmy and Ashley) and ‘misbehaving’ (AJ). These labels demonstrate the societal discourse which categorise people as ‘good’ or ‘bad’, and children can be constructed as a ‘problem’ by the narratives which are told and retold by others, including parents, teachers, and psychologists (MacLure et al., 2012).
In telling their stories of school, participants shared how their grades deteriorated, ‘I started secondary school in the top classes and then started spiralling... my grades just started to slip’ (Jorge), and how they existed in a punitive school system where they were punished for ‘bad’ behaviour, rather than provided with care and support (No More Exclusions, 2022), with consequences of being isolated from others, ‘sent to the headmasters… locked up in some room… copying 1000 words’ (Jimmy). The school system often underestimates Black children’s intelligence and under-monitors their academic ability (Akala, 2018), but over-monitors their behaviour (Warren, 2005), labelling them as troublemakers (Law, 2002; Okonofua & Eberhardt, 2015), and expecting that they will break the rules (Boyd, 2019). This differential and more punitive treatment for Black boys means they are more likely to be excluded than white students, especially for behaviour deemed as violent (DfE, 2016; Gaffney et al., 2021), as was the case with four participants who were ‘kicked out’ (Jimmy, Ashley, AJ, Jerome) of school and college, for having ‘an altercation’ (Jerome), ‘fighting’ (Jimmy and Ashley), and for ‘trying to bring a knife to school’ (AJ). Through a CRT lens, structural racism within educational policies and practices, racial stereotypes and biases, lead to Black boys being constructed as ‘bad’, over-monitored for their behaviour, and consequently are more likely to be excluded (No More Exclusions, 2022).

The societal dichotomy of ‘good’ and ‘bad’ was reiterated within the family home, as participants storied how parents were ‘hard-working…Law abiding citizens’ (Jimmy) and wanted them to be ‘smart’ (Jorge). Black parents in the UK are often subject to additional layers of scrutiny (Gatwiri & Anderson, 2021), and consequently Black children are frequently taught to work harder to be successful and have a chance of the good life (Okpokiri, 2017). The language ‘law-abiding’ (Jimmy) suggests the men
wanted to ensure their parents were not affixed blame, as the social construction of Black boys being ‘bad’ means society often affixes blame to the parents for their behaviour (Sakamoto, 2007).

The social construction of Black boys being considered ‘problematic’ (Law, 2002), is shown within wider society, and the CJS:

‘When I was younger, it was ridiculous. [I’d get stopped and searched] Like two or three times a day… The first thing they’ll say is ‘you smell of marijuana’. But I wouldn’t. I’ve never even tried it in my entire life’ (Jerome)

Jerome’s story shows the stereotypes of Black people using and selling drugs has filtered into police structures, which alongside narratives of Black men being ‘bad’ and criminal, leads to institutionally racist stop and search practices in the UK (Lammy, 2017). CRT would view this racism, racial stereotyping, and discrimination, as ordinal within the CJS, with laws and policies that disadvantage Black people (Burris-Kitchen & Burris, 2011) and cause the racial disparity in prisons. People can internalise these wider social narratives, especially during times when identity is less stable (Dickson et al., 2008), as demonstrated by participants labelling themselves as, ‘a bad guy’, ‘naughty’ (Jimmy), ‘that type of person’ (Ashley), and ‘born a monster’ (Ashley). This internalised societal discourse can stay with them throughout their life (MacLure et al., 2010), and impact on behaviour (J. Williams et al., 2020), with participants storytelling how they were involved in ‘badness’ (Jimmy), ‘wild shit’ (Ashley), ‘mischief’ (Jorge) and ‘we got up to some stuff’ (Jerome). These abstract terms (Squire, 2008) used by participants possibly illustrate not wanting to share details of offending behaviour, for several reasons, including the nature of the research, telling their story to a white-British female who has not been in prison, and/or due to masculinity narratives around not admitting guilt or vulnerability (Gibbs & Merighi, 1994).
Participants narrated how despite these labels of ‘bad’ in multiple contexts, they tried to conform to the dominant ‘good guy’ (AJ) narrative, but this led to challenges, including, ‘it was difficult [to] get jobs’ (Jerome), and ‘...it [being good] doesn’t get you nowhere’ (AJ), and consequently, they ‘snapped back into my old habits’ (AJ) in order to get their needs met, for example ‘...trying to look for money’ (Jorge). This led to a negative cycle where criminality felt both inevitable and essential, including ‘carry a knife...just to protect myself’ (AJ). Consequently, going to prison was a ‘potential’ (Jerome), or inevitable, ‘I always knew I was gonna come [to jail] innit, which is sad isn’t it’ (Jimmy). Through a CRT lens, racism is inherent and embedded through systems with young Black men being oppressed, disadvantaged, and subjugated, meaning crime is often necessary to meet their needs (Clinks, 2021). Laws are written by and in favour of white people, and therefore maintain racism (Kendi, 2019), meaning going to prison is an ordinal experience for Black men in London.

4.5 ‘This is Home Now’ (Jerome); stories of coping

All participants entered prison for the first time between the ages of 16 and 21, where they spent between two and seven years. The next collective storyline centres around entering the prison system, ‘This is home now’ (Jerome), and how they learnt ‘the ropes’ (Jimmy) to adapt and cope in prison, and ‘pass the time’ (Jerome).

4.5.1 ‘Learning the ropes’ (Jimmy); stories of learning and adapting

All participants storied how they learnt ‘the ropes’ (Jimmy) to adapt and cope in prison. Learning about the prison system started before the participants entered, and was derived from peers, ‘I had a good friend. He went to prison, early’ (Jorge), ‘one of my mates... was already there’ (Jimmy), and from television programmes and media.
representations. In the British media there are two contrasting dominant narratives surrounding prison (Coyle, 2005). One narrative is that prison is easy, like a ‘holiday camp’ (e.g., Drury, 2018) and people in prison lie in bed, eat well, play videogames, and watch Sky TV (Marsh, 2009). The opposing narrative is that prisons are dangerous and violent places (Coyle, 2005).

Participants narrated their experiences of entering prison initially fitting their preconceptions, ‘Oh, old arse prison. It’s Victorian. It’s like you see on the TV’ (Jimmy), and how wider narratives influenced their expectations, ‘You see things on TV and that. Like little things, like showering, what’s the showering situation?’ (AJ). Despite some preconceived ideas, participants storied how nothing could prepare them for prison, they ‘…didn’t really know what to expect’ (Jerome), and had to adjust their expectations, ‘It was just like learning things like that. It’s not everything that you see on the TV’ (AJ). The dominant narrative was that entering prison for the first time was ‘Scary’ (AJ), with participants describing it as, ‘…a Lion’s den… It’s like big three floors of cells… everyone’s now looking at the new fish’ (Jorge). The language ‘Lion’s den’ constructs prison as a place of extreme disadvantage and hostility (Power-Hays et al., 2020). These stories challenge the dominant media narrative that portrays prisons as a ‘holiday camp’ (Drury, 2018), and portrays it as a scary place, which media representations and peers did not prepare them for. These stories challenge the wider societal discourse where Black men in the UK are positioned as mentally strong (Thompson et al., 2004), and suggests an alternative and more subjugated story that Black men entering prison for the first time were ‘anxious’ (Jerome), ‘scared’ (AJ), and vulnerable to institutional power. The ‘Strong’ Black man narrative of showing strength in the face of adversity, rather than acknowledging fear or vulnerability (Meechan et al., 2021), is normalised in society and internalised by Black men (King et al., 2020):
‘It just felt like home... cause, I’m surrounded by people who’s like me. Yeah, everyone here has done bad to get here. So, like, we’re in the same boat. It’s like yeah cool. No-one’s better than no-one. It felt like home. I wasn’t scared.’ (Jimmy)

Through a CRT lens, this alternative narrative of vulnerable Black men is not widely portrayed within the media, as it suggests that young Black men require care and support for their disadvantages. Whereas the strong Black man narrative leads to less empathy and contributes to the justification of oppressive and punitive measures (J. Williams et al., 2020), and consequently structures of racial injustice and power continue.

The ‘strong’ Black man narrative is present within the prison induction process, which was constructed by participants to be a place which prioritises determining potential ‘problems’ (Jerome), with officers asking, ‘Have you got any problems?’ (AJ), to manage conflict between ‘certain areas [postcodes outside prison]’ (AJ). This contrasts with its intended purpose to provide practical and emotional support to the people in prison to adapt to their new environment (Doing Time, 2023). This perpetuates narratives that if Black men are feeling vulnerable, they need to conform to traditional expectations of strength, and not show weakness or ask for support. Consequently, they had to learn from their own experiences, and readjust their expectations:

‘… I’m showering, and I’ve got these guys standing at the door, trying to conversate with me (laughs) … I turned around, and I’m like ‘Bro, I’m naked’ (laughs). Why am I going to talk to you when I’m naked, this is weird. This was my whole perception. But it was like instantly I had to learn that it’s doesn’t matter if you are naked or clothed, you have to handle whatever situation this is right now’ (Ashley)
Ashley’s story demonstrates how the men had to learn that power hierarchies operate in all situations. Participants storied how they learnt to adapt to their environment by, ‘…just observing. So, just trying to take as much information in as I could’ (Jorge), and how others helped them to learn, ‘Couple of the brothers … they was good to man. Showed me the ropes’ (Jimmy). They learnt from other people in prison about ‘the best times to go gym’ (Jerome), and how they gained additional benefits, ‘I started talking to people that was on the servery, so I ended up getting more food’ (Jerome). Jerome’s story shows how power operates within the learning process of prisons, and receiving benefits was linked to associating with people in privileged positions. This replicates wider society, which is dominated by capitalist and neoliberal politics, that emphasise individualism (Reynolds, 2012), and privileges are gained based on individual connections linked to power (Reynolds, 2012), rather than the amount of support an individual requires.

4.5.2 ‘Pass the time’ (Jerome); stories of getting through

After initially settling into prison, all participants narrated how they had to ‘just try and cope with it’ (Jerome) and ‘pass the time’ (Jerome). All participants storied struggling to cope in prison at times, stating, ‘I was having basically a shit time, innit. I had enough’ (Jimmy), and ‘I was dealing with things I didn't even know I had to deal with’ (Ashley). A dominant narrative was how the men learnt to cope with these feelings, and lots of idle time due to being locked in their cell each day for up to ‘23 and a half hours’ (AJ). Participants storied that in prison ‘[time] goes slow’ (Jerome) and constructed that coping in the prison system was linked to their ability to distract themselves and ‘take your mind off of where you are’ (Jerome). They storied engaging in any activity to ‘keep busy’ (Jimmy), including, ‘football’ (AJ and Jerome), ‘table
tennis’ (Jorge), ‘cell workouts’ (Jimmy), ‘writing poems, playing guitar, writing bars’ (Jimmy), and going to the ‘library’ (Ashley). Participants storied gaining employment in prison, as a ‘cleaner’ (Jimmy), ‘on the servery’ (Jimmy), and ‘in a call centre’ (AJ), and engaging in rehabilitation courses, ‘Any course I could do in there, I was doing innit. I saw it as I’m not doing anything else. I’m here for two years... If I’m not gonna do this, I’m gonna be sitting in the cell all day’ (AJ).

The dominant narrative was the men had limited purposeful activities, and they tried to keep busy. This constructed a sense of agency to cope in prison, rather than a system set up to support them. This fits with wider neoliberalism where there are limited resources for rehabilitation in prisons, due to a lack of funding, a focus on punitive measures, and an emphasis on individual responsibility (J. Williams et al., 2020). The strong Black man narrative contributes to the justification that Black men are positioned to be strong and support themselves (J. Williams et al., 2019).

Communicating with friends and family through visits, letters and phone calls was an important part of coping in prison and is key in reducing reoffending (Bales & Mears, 2008). However, phone calls themselves are complex and had a story about power and conflict. For example, access to phone calls is not guaranteed and equitable for all in prison, “There was no phones in cell’ (AJ) and phones were located on prison landings, for which people must line up for, which could lead to violence between people in prison. Also, the cost being ‘1p a second’ (AJ) made it inequitable depending on individual’s financial circumstances. This replicates structures of injustice which are rooted in capitalism (Reynolds, 2012), meaning that people with more money can communicate with their families more regularly, which perpetuates socio-economic hierarchies in the prison system. Consequently, some participants talked of illegal use
of mobile phones in prison to keep in contact with friends and family. This mirrors offending in the community to meet their needs, which would otherwise not be met.

Coping in prison is complex, and participants tried to cope by keeping their ‘head down’ (Jimmy), being ‘a good boy’ (Ashley), and having some ‘sit downtime… [to] work on myself’ (Jorge). These stories echo the participant’s experiences in school and wider society, where they try to conform to the ‘good child’ narrative (MacLure et al., 2012). However, a dominant narrative was that participants often ‘run into situations’ (Ashley), because of people they have ‘got problems with’ (Jerome) from different postcodes outside prison, or due to power hierarchies in prisons linked to money, crime, and violence:

‘I did my shop. I did that because, like, there’s always an opportunity for you to sell drugs, whatever, and make a buck. But the shop was alright, man, because if somebody takes cans of drink and crisps and runs off, I’ll be alright with that.’ (Jorge)

Jorge’s story shows how the prison system is in many ways a microcosm of the community and replicates societal disadvantages for Black men. Prison is an environment where it is necessary to make money to cope, and the use of violence is normalised to manage conflict. It perpetuates the reality that people with more money gain more privileges and maintains power hierarchies based on financial status. These narratives fit with wider neoliberalism which attributes blame to individuals (Goff et al., 2014), rather than examining and addressing systemic factors. This contributes to the construction of racist ideologies by implying Black men need to be strong, work hard, and take responsibility for how they cope in prison.
4.6 ‘People got too much power’ (AJ); stories of power

Within the prison system, prison officers hold power and authority. Additionally, as the majority of prison staff in the UK are white (MOJ, 2021b), they also hold power due to their white-skin (Reid, 2021). The focus of the next collective storyline centres around power, ‘people got too much power’ (AJ), and how the Black men were constructed as the ‘lowest of the low’ (AJ), the nuances of power, ‘They are policing the wing’ (Jerome) and panoptic power in prison, ‘That’s the rules’ (Jorge).

4.6.1 ‘Lowest of the low’ (AJ); stories of losing agency

Stories of institutional power permeated throughout all five participants’ narratives. Power operates through the labelling in prison as ‘a prison number’ (Jorge and Jimmy) or ‘by your surname’ (Jorge), and within the ways people in prison are required to refer to those in positions of power, as ‘Sir or Miss’ (Jorge), indicating a clear hierarchy within the prison system. Furthermore, power operates within racial hierarchies in prison, with Black men being labelled:

‘A lot people have this perspective of us being aggressive and problematic... So, people sometimes have that opinion of us before they even know us, innit? ... it’s like, it’s a proven, you have to try to prove that you’re not like that. Like you don’t even give me a chance to even to show that I’m not ... Not everyone’s a gang member. Not everyone’s aggressive... I just feel like, in the prison system especially. I feel like, people of other ethnicities, they kinda get a chance to prove how they are.’ (AJ)

AJ’s story shows how the racial stereotyping of Black men as ‘problematic’, ‘aggressive’ and ‘gang members’ is ordinal within the prison system. Through the CRT lens, Black men are oppressed in wider society due to racial hierarchies and
structures, and further oppressed in the prison system through institutional power and labelling. The men storied they felt ‘targeted’ (Jimmy), ‘always on the defence’ (Jerome) and constructed the labelling as de-humanising, ‘We’re people too, alright’ (Jimmy). A CRT lens would view the labelling of young Black men as a social control that maintains racial hierarchies and oppressive structures of power (Connell, 1995; Gibbs & Merighi, 1994). These labels maintain the punitive prison approach, influence policies and practices, and perpetuate structural barriers for young Black men (J. Williams et al., 2019).

Power also operated through the violation of basic human rights within the prison environment, for example the living conditions: ‘It was a shithole innit. Poor living conditions. It was dirty’ (AJ); ‘the cells … with the bunk beds in … they were made for one person’ (AJ); isolation ‘[being locked up for] 23 and a half hours’ (AJ) and lack of privacy, ‘the toilet is right next to the foot of the bed. It's just there when someone is taking a shit.’ (Jorge), ‘… [the toilet had] a fake like wooden half door, not even a full door’ (Jerome), ‘It's literally like a curtain. So you are in a cell, with a person, having to use the toilet with a curtain’ (AJ). These stories show the young Black men’s basic human rights were violated. These stories are situated in wider socio-political influences of power and human rights for Black people, with historical contexts of slavery, colonialism, and racism (Fryer, 1984), and ideologies that Black people constitute an inferior race (Reid, 2021), and are less deserving of human rights (Burris-Kitchen & Burris, 2011).

Power operates in the prison system with other basic human rights being compromised in relation to unresponsive healthcare, ‘[my cellmate] tried to kill himself... they [healthcare] took like two hours to come’ (Jerome). The dominant narrative was that there was lack of recognition that these experiences could be
traumatic and a lack of mental health support following these events (Boxer et al., 2009). Participants shared stories of inadequate prison food, ‘The food was terrible… On the menu there would be two things, but it would look like the food they cooked yesterday, and they have just reheated it’ (Jerome). The dominant narrative was that the men did not have access to enough food in prison, ‘that's why you have to have money, you have to have canteen [prison shop], because that [prison food] isn’t going nowhere. Oh, you’d be starving’ (Jimmy). The men used their own money to buy additional food including, ‘cereal and noodles’ (AJ). Participants explained that their available spend depends on ‘your [incentive] level’, ‘who’s been sending you money’ (Jerome), and wages from employment in prison, where they can gain up to ‘20 pounds a week’ (AJ).

These stories demonstrate power narratives and a prison system of inequality, which is unable to meet the basic human rights of individuals (Penal Reform International, 2023), and where responsive healthcare and food are considered privileges, and the men are constructed as the ‘lowest of the low’ (AJ). This deprivation demonstrates a punitive prison system which mirrors societal structures, and further oppresses people who are already oppressed in society. Through a CRT lens, racial hierarchies, structural inequalities, and racism (Reid, 2021), and wider socio-political influences, situated in historical context of slavery, power and human rights for Black people, position Black men as less deserving of basic human rights (Burris-Kitchen & Burris, 2011), but deserving of a punitive prison system (Burris-Kitchen & Burris, 2011).
4.6.2 ‘They are policing the wing’ (Jerome); nuances of power

Power manifested in nuanced ways in the prison system, with a dominant narrative of officers abusing their institutional and personal power, both in punitive and neglectful ways. This manifested with officer’s abusing their use of force within physical restraints, and using disproportionate and excessive force, ‘I've seen them [officers] bend people up unnecessarily, un- un- unnecessarily, like for nothing’ (Jimmy), and physically assaulting the men, ‘They [officers] literally beat me up, carried me back to, back to the same wing’ (AJ), with an implication of racism:

‘Yeah and one time, there was these guys having a fight, one I remember them [officers] coming in. … yeah mad things like knees in the back. But I don't know if that's racism or just how you know. But it doesn't take 10 [officers] to, to bend up one man (laughs). Not like that anyway.’ (Jimmy)

Jimmy’s story of 10 officers restraining one Black man demonstrates the power structures within the prison system, where prison officers are enabled to engage in violent behaviour, which would be considered abuse outside of the prison context. CRT would link this to racism and stereotyping of Black men as ‘strong’, ‘aggressive’ and ‘violent’, indicating how this has filtered down into the prison system, impacting officer’s biases, and subsequently their behaviour. Through the CRT lens, Jimmy’s laugh suggests discomfort with raising this as racist, demonstrating racism as ordinal, and how power operates in institutions, with Black people feeling powerless to complain about racism (HMIP, 2022).

Power operates in the officer’s abusing their personal power, and breaking prison rules and the law by ‘bringing in drugs and phones’ (AJ), and ‘charging people £1000 a time’ (AJ). AJ goes on to story the connection between money and power:
‘If they [officers] are getting crap money, and then some of the people who are in prison, have got access to serious money, like millions sometimes. Then, obviously they are going to, some people will get swayed to do certain things.’ (AJ)

This demonstrates the complexity of power within the prison system, and how power is connected to money and violence (Naqvi, 2022). This was further illustrated by participants constructing that ‘Govs have nothing under control’ (Jerome) and how officers relied on the ‘inmates to police the wing’ (Jerome):

‘There was a lot of people that work for the Govs. So, let’s just say somebody’s annoying one of the Govs. They would tell the all the people who work for them, and they will go in there [in the cell] and beat them up or do whatever… they are policing the wing’ (Jerome)

Jerome’s story shows the link between power and violence (Naqvi, 2022), and how the Black men were harmed by officer’s abuse of power. Power also operates through officer’s abusing their authority in more nuanced ways, with participants being asked ‘where you got problems with?’ (Jerome), and then ending up on the same wing as opposing ‘gang members’ (AJ) with this constructed as either a deliberate choice by the authorities to endanger them or encourage violence as a punishment, or indirectly by neglecting to listen to their concerns.

In addition to overt abuse of power, it also operated through neglection of officers to step in to support people in prison:

‘There were two members of staff in there at the time. And they had their little office just there, while all of this commotion [fight between two men] was going on… And they just closed their room and stayed there. They wanted no part of it.’ (Jorge)

Jorge’s story demonstrated the neglection of officers stepping in to protect the men from violence. Nuances of power were embedded within the prison system, with
officers abusing their power in punitive ways, and neglecting their power by not intervening to support the men. Both of which are connected to violence and led to the Black men being harmed. This links to wider socio-political contexts of silence, where people with less power are ignored (McLaren, 2016), and therefore turn to each other to feel heard, and consequently to monitor behaviour (Foucault, 1977).

Furthermore, participants storied officers neglecting their power within the complaints process, ‘Complaints do not work at all. It’s pointless. No-one’s gonna read it … Nothing ever happens’ (Jerome), indicating a breakdown of trust and exacerbating the power hierarchies in the prison system, where young Black men are positioned to accept the abuse and not challenge or complain. This feeds into masculinity narratives of Black men not complaining or asking for help (Meechan et al., 2021), which further increases the silence, meaning abuse in prison is not known about or investigated. The violence combined with the Black men’s silence consequently leads to the status quo being maintained.

4.6.3 ‘That’s the rules’ (Jorge); panoptic power

The dominant narrative was that people in prison have little agency, and the participants storied how this led to clear power hierarchies being constructed between themselves. This manifested with ‘silly little things’ (Jerome), including implementing unwritten rules, ‘who’s next on the pool table’ (Jerome), who ‘could go on the TV’ (Jerome), or who uses the prison phone, microwave or washing machine first:

‘So, when, if there’s someone’s washing on top of the washing machine already, you put yours next to it. So, when that one’s finished, the next person’s goes inside. If that next person isn’t there when that laundry finishes, you put your stuff inside, that’s the rules.’ (Jorge)
These stories demonstrate how panoptic power operates in the prison system, by encouraging self-surveillance whereby people in prison continuously monitor their own and each other’s behaviour (Foucault, 1977). Participants storied feeling in control of their own actions, ‘It’s almost like the inmates ran the jail’ (Jorge), and that they are implementing and following the ‘rules’ (Jorge). However, through panoptic power the people in prison are being subjected to various psychological and institutional powers, that force them to cooperate with the prison system (Connor, 2016).

Participants storied how the power hierarchies and self-surveillance that operate in prison, lead to conflict and violence, ‘Things like escalate, where it wouldn’t on the outside’ (Jerome), and storied violence occurring because ‘People just push in [phone queues], ‘Oh I'm behind this person’” (Jerome), and how ‘things start over, a microwave, a washing machine’ (Jorge). Participants constructed the loss of agency, ‘In prison those things are big, that’s all you have got’ (Jerome), and how ‘that place gets the better of people’ (Jerome). The prison system is a microcosm of the wider society in the UK and replicates the societal disadvantage and further oppresses young Black men. The panoptic power within the prison system serves the function of encouraging self-surveillance, therefore reducing the number of officers needed to maintain order, rules, and discipline, and the associated cost of this (Connor, 2016).

4.7 ‘I'm out the game now’ (Jimmy); stories of change

The final collective storyline centres around change, and how participants are ‘out the game’ (Jimmy) due to a process of self-change, as well as their ideas for prison reform, ‘Now this is the list’ (Jerome).
4.7.1 ‘I made myself change’ (Jimmy); stories of self-change

All participants storied self-change, and they identified that before prison they were, ‘...young, and I just thought it was a bit of fun’ (Jimmy), and ‘When you’re 15, you think you are all that’ (Ashley). They constructed that now they were ‘wiser’ (Jimmy and Ashley), their ‘...anger has been channelled into other things. Like, I'm a very good musician’ (Ashley), and that they are ‘out the game now. I’m writing books and stuff’ (Jimmy).

This change was constructed as an autonomous process, ‘It weren't anyone made me change. I made myself change’ (Jimmy), ‘I've rebuilt myself’ (Ashley), and ‘became my own best friend’ (Jorge). The participants storied some of their motivations to change, including finding faith and having children: ‘Now I've got my kids and that ... nothing is going to make me risk my freedom, freedom is everything’ (Jimmy), ‘I think me being there while she [daughter] was born, kinda, made me promise myself, like yeah, like this jail lifestyle is not for me’ (AJ). These stories link to wider socio-political messages and neoliberalism, where the young Black men are blamed for their own disadvantaged situation (Goff et al., 2014), and are expected to pull themselves out of criminality.

The process of change was not linked to prison rehabilitation programmes, ‘...the majority of them [courses] for me weren’t helpful’ (Jorge), and they struggled to recall the names and content of the courses, ‘I can’t even remember. That’s how useless it is’ (AJ). They storied that prison did not support, rehabilitate, or provide them with opportunities so they could live a life without criminality: ‘I’ve learnt that its [prison] is not for me. But I haven’t learnt how to manoeuvre through life.’ (Ashley). Ashley’s story questions the purpose of prison and shows a system which is failing to rehabilitate (Criminal Justice Alliance, 2012). Through a CRT lens, the prison courses were likely
not rehabilitative or useful, as most courses are written by and for white people and therefore not tailored to meet the needs and experiences of Black men (Patel et al., 2000). Furthermore, the courses often do not tackle the root causes of criminal behaviour, such as poverty and lack of resources, finances, and employment (HMIP, 2020).

Central to stories of change was participants’ experiences of being released into the community. The participants narrated that although it was ‘good being out’ (AJ), it also ‘felt weird. It didn’t feel normal’ (Jerome). The dominant narrative was that it was difficult being released, and they experienced challenges including, ‘trying to adjust was quite difficult’ (Jerome), and it was ‘long, trying to get a job’ (Jerome). Though, one participant storied probation being helpful when they were released:

‘They got me my apprenticeship, for where I work now. They are actually good. They are actually helping people... they were getting me interviews upon interviews upon interviews. And the positions they are getting me interviews for are like careers. Like they are not dead-end jobs’ (Jerome)

The dominant narrative was that support was not in place when they were released, and they experienced further adversity, including losing their jobs, apprenticeships, college courses and housing. From a CRT lens, these men experienced racism, racial stereotyping, and discrimination, in multiple systems, including employment (Lammy, 2017), education (Demie, 2018), housing (Ministry of Housing, 2020) and the CJS (Clinks, 2021), and were positioned at the bottom of the hierarchy to be supported with these. They experienced further social exclusion due to the ‘ex-offender’ label and stigmatisation (Quillian & Pager, 2005; Uggen, 2000), which impacted on their opportunities to reintegrate back into society: ‘I got back to
having a life with no routine and no structure, just moments. And then, that lead me into more problems’ (Ashley).

Through a CRT lens, the prison system further exacerbates the oppression that young Black men have experienced, which leads to further disadvantage in the community and often reconviction (Prison Reform Trust, 2021). Despite all these challenges, the young Black men storied how they pulled themselves out of the prison system, finding employment, having families, coaching football teams, ‘writing poems’ (Jimmy) and ‘self-help books’ (Jimmy), and talked about wanting to support friends, family, and others in their community to avoid their ‘path’ (Jimmy).

4.7.2 ‘Now this is the list’ (Jerome); stories of prison reform

All participants shared changes to the prison system, with some participants finding this difficult at first, ‘it’s a tricky one’ (Jorge), reflecting the complexity of prison reform, and that a solution is not easy: ‘…I’m thinking what is a quick fix? or what is it that over time is going to make a real difference?’ (Jorge). Jimmy illustrated the dichotomy of punishment and rehabilitation:

‘The hard way, you know like back in the day… make everyone go for jogs… like the army… cut off all their hair… Should just make it hell (laughs)... Or you could do, you could do the nice approach. Where you could be like give everyone everything… Make them feel at home. Make them feel cause you know what I mean? it's, it's already a bad situation’ (Jimmy)

Jimmy’s dilemma reflects the different aims of prison in relation to punishment and rehabilitation, which are rooted in wider discourses and societal beliefs about whether people should be punished for wrongdoing (Klukoff et al., 2021). Participants discussed the problems with the punitive UK prison system, ‘The whole punishment,
punishment, punishment thing. It’s just it just builds rebels’ (Jorge), which reflects current literature that a punitive prison system does not work and leads to further oppression and reconviction (Prison Reform Trust, 2021).

Whilst participants did not provide ideas for prison abolition, they provided some basic changes, including to the officer’s approach, as they constructed that many officers were inexperienced, unskilled, and unmotivated. The officers were constructed as not caring or supportive to the individuals’ needs: ‘Sometimes they’ll literally say, ‘I don’t wanna speak to you’ or ‘I don’t know’. You say I need answers. They don’t even try to find you answers’ (Jerome). The participants constructed that ‘The approach [of officers] is something that needs to change’ (Jerome), and they suggested officers should be ‘more responsive’ (Jerome), ‘kinder and more human’ (Jimmy), and how their ‘sense of listening’ (Jerome) needs to improve. Participants discussed how small changes such as if officers ‘call you by your name’ (Jorge), could lead to the men feeling more respected, and ‘make them feel at home’ (Jimmy). Overall, the men suggested a need to create a supportive and rehabilitative environment: ‘Treating people with dignity and respect’ (Jorge), to allow for a more humane system, ‘We’re people too, alright’ (Jorge) and prevent them from feeling like the ‘lowest of the low’ (AJ). Through the lens of CRT, these recommendations for change show a de-humanising, racist and punitive prison system which mirrors societal structures, where Black men are positioned to be less deserving of human rights (Burris-Kitchen & Burris, 2011). This suggests societal changes are required to dismantle stigmatisation and labelling and build a humane system which focuses on rehabilitation.

Officers’ skills, knowledge, and communication are key for rehabilitation (Schaufeli & Peeters, 2000). However, it is currently an unskilled and low paid profession
The participants discussed how it should be a skilled profession, ‘…they [officers] should even be like, do a social worker course. So, they got that social workers skill vibe. So, they can actually support’, and how they should be paid more, ‘I think they should pay them more, funny enough’ (AJ).

A dominant narrative for prison reform, was more support to occupy one’s time, including, ‘more interactive stuff like sports…gym competition…football matches’ (Jerome), and more rehabilitation options, ‘more courses, better courses’ (Jerome), and better workshops and training which are linked to careers, such as ‘railway construction, [as] they don’t really care about convicts’ (AJ). These recommendations demonstrate the impact of neoliberalism in prisons, which emphasises individualism, personal responsibility (Goff et al., 2014), and punishment, rather than a humane and rehabilitative approach. Whereas participants’ suggestions highlight a need for care and support for the men, in order to counteract their societal disadvantage.

Another key narrative for prison changes was maintaining relationships, with participants suggesting the needs for ‘phones in cell’ (Jerome) and ‘conjugal visits (laughs) and family days’ (Jimmy). These ideas show how communicating with friends and family is important for coping in prison. The suggestions showed the men wanted guaranteed and equitable access to phones, and other means to contact their friends and family, which are not dependent on power structures or financial position. These recommendations highlight that Black men know exactly what is needed for prison reform, and these recommendations reflect extensive previous literature (Brookes et al., 2012; HMIP, 2022; Hunter et al., 2019). These suggestions challenge the current punitive prison system, and narratives that prison is a holiday camp (Drury, 2018), and provides a subjugated narrative that young Black men need connection and access to
supportive care and relationships, and for the root causes of criminality to be addressed.
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS

5.1 Chapter Overview

In this chapter, I will firstly revisit the aims of the research and summarise the findings of the study, situating them within wider societal discourse. I will consider the strengths and limitations of the research, as well as clinical relevance, implications, and recommendations. I will discuss how this research will be disseminated and provide final reflections and a conclusion.

5.2 Revisiting the Research Aims

The main aim of the research was to gain a better understanding of young Black men’s experiences of prison, to push for social change and prison reform, and therefore to address the following questions:

- What are the stories and lived experiences of prison in the UK for young Black men?
- What do these stories and experiences suggest about the changes needed for prison reform for young Black men?

5.3 Summary of Findings

The findings revealed four main collective storylines; stories of challenges, coping, power, and change. Overall, the stories and experiences of the young Black men are rooted in poverty, social deprivation, power structures, racial hierarchies, racial inequality, and injustices. It shows how the young Black men have been failed by services never designed to support them (Imafidon, 2023). Their stories link to wider socio-political messages and neoliberalism, where young Black men are blamed for their own disadvantaged position (Goff et al., 2014), and socially constructed as ‘bad’
throughout their lives within multiple contexts. Power hierarchies in the prison system perpetuate this oppression, and young Black men are constructed as the ‘lowest of the low’ (AJ). This was in the context of concerningly oppressive policies and practices within the prison system, which restrict basic human rights, replicating wider societal disadvantage and further oppressing young Black men. These stores are situated in the historical context of slavery, colonialism, and power, which position Black men as less deserving of basic human rights (Burris-Kitchen & Burris, 2011), but deserving of a punitive prison system.

Despite all these challenges, the young Black men showed admiral strength and resilience, by pulling themselves out of the prison system, finding employment, having families, coaching football teams, writing poems and self-help books, and talked about wanting to support friends, family, and others in their community to avoid their ‘path’ (Jimmy). These stories demonstrate that change is required within the prison system, to tackle and dismantle the root causes of the social injustice from the bottom up, rather than labelling Black men as ‘bad’ and leaving them to navigate these challenges themselves.

5.4 Strengths and Limitations of the Research

5.4.1 Strengths

Much of the previous research in this field grouped different racialised identities together, with little focus specifically on young Black men’s experiences, despite them being identified as the most over-represented within prisons. Thus, by focusing on Black men’s experiences, this study offers a new and meaningful contribution to the research field. Furthermore, the use of a CRT lens helped to focus attention and locate the stories in systems of racism and power.
The use of NI enabled rich stories from participants and contributed to a better understanding of their collective experiences of prison, and ideas for prison reform. The research used a combination of consultation with a RC and participants throughout the project, and a multimethod approach of NI (Nasheeda et al., 2019). This allowed for extensive collaboration, helped to ground the research in lived experiences, reduce the power imbalance, and amplified the voices of the young Black men. My reflexivity was a strength, with power and identity considered and reflected upon throughout.

The project showed the value of bridging relationships with third-sector organisations, where there was already mutual respect and trust with potential participants. It showed that building relationships and trust takes time, but it can be done with honesty, passion, and co-construction. This project provided in-depth stories of people, whose opinions are rarely sought, and often labelled as ‘hard-to-reach’ (L. M. Berger & Langton, 2011; R. Berger, 2016); Black men have ‘never been hard to reach, just easy to ignore’ (Dodzro, 2023). This research contributes to shifting long-standing narratives and shows that these voices should not be ignored but amplified, as they are the experts and closest to the solutions to prison reform.

5.4.2 Limitations

This study recruited five individuals through two third-sector organisations. Although this is a relatively small sample, it is appropriate for NI (Haydon et al., 2017; Wells, 2011). Whilst NI does not seek generalisations (B. Smith, 2016), the recruitment strategy did lead to some recruitment bias. This research only gained the stories of individuals who were supported by third-sector organisations and put forward to engage in the project. It relied on participants that could read and converse in English.
This excluded young Black men, who could not converse in English and were not involved with a third-sector organisation. Therefore, it is possible that the participants recruited were more interested in prison reform, which will have impacted on the dominant narratives. It is likely, and understandable, that many young Black men who have been in prison will be untrusting of professionals and therefore may not be involved with third-sector organisations. Consequently, the voices of these men are not heard in this research. Additionally, the participants were recruited from two third-sector organisations in London, and therefore this may have impacted on the dominant narratives shared due to discourses specific to London.

My outsider researcher position as a white-British female, who has not resided in prison, and gaining a Doctorate level qualification for research, was an important consideration in relation to the power that I held. Whereas the participants had experienced oppression due to their racial identity and criminality, which led to a power imbalance. Whilst participant consultation helped to reduce the power imbalance, it would not have prevented it entirely. This was important in relation to the impact it had on what stories were shared and how they were told. This was apparent when the participants used more abstract words to describe criminality and checked my understanding of certain words associated with prison experiences.

The length of the research and time set aside for recruitment and relationship building was a limitation. Whilst I attempted to use some principles of Community Psychology and PAR in areas of this research, this was not as much as originally planned. These restrictions led to consultation with participants, rather than allowing ‘citizen control’ (Arnstein, 1969), meaning it was possibly tokenistic in parts. Additionally, although I completed follow-up interviews to clarify information, and participants were given the opportunity to comment on the accuracy of their own story
and consider the collective stories, their individual stories were shared in one single interview. The NI approach can use several interviews, and this may have provided more in-depth stories of prison.

5.5 Clinical Relevance and Implications

The findings of the current study are clinically relevant on multiple levels, as prisons are just one system in a complex web of interconnected systems, which reflect the social, cultural, and political structures found in wider society. The findings link to the wider societal debates on whether prisons can be reformed or whether they need to be abolished. The findings are presented in terms of their implications for short-term and long-term prison reform and prison abolition. The recommendations are based on the direct suggestions from the participants, which are captured in the collective stories of change. These will be outlined alongside my interpretation of the wider systemic issues and institutional racism which exists within society, which are translated into clinical implications. These are some initial implications, but to find solutions to the prison system, there is a need to fully understand the problems by meaningfully gaining young Black men’s experiences, and their ideas should be at the centre of all decisions on redesigning, rebuilding, reforming, and/or prison abolition.

5.5.1 A Different Approach

The Norwegian approach focuses primarily on rehabilitation and reintegration as the purpose of prison and uses money and attention to create a humane prison system (R. Berger, 2016). People in Norwegian prisons have almost all the same rights and services as citizens in the community, including access to their own phone with unlimited calls, internet access, and several visits each week, including conjugal
visits (R. Berger, 2016). The focus is on education by providing opportunities to gain skills and degrees, while also supporting people to find employment after prison and reintegrate back into society. Consequently, Norway has one of the lowest recidivism rates among Western nations, at approximately 20% (Deady, 2014). The Norwegian approach shows a rehabilitative and humane approach is possible. Many of these strategies could be used in the UK, however the focus would need to shift to viewing prison as a place for rehabilitation, rather than for punishment.

5.5.2 Prison Reform

The current findings support arguments that while prison abolition might be achieved in the long-term, the current prison system is ineffective and inhumane (Penal Reform International, 2023). Therefore, short-term changes can be made to allow for a more effective and humane prison system, that prioritises human rights, rehabilitation, reintegration and reducing recidivism.

5.5.3 Improving Relationships

The participants’ relationships with officers, friends, and family were key in their collective stories, and have been consistently shown as essential in reducing recidivism (Bales & Mears, 2008). Prison staff have an important role in supporting people whilst in prison and forming trusting relationships to support them. These relationships have been damaged, and the participants storied being defensive and not trusting prison officers, due to their similarities to the police and other authorities. This mistrust is justified (Dodzro, 2023), due to years of institutional racism, neglect, and brutality. The power structures within these relationships need to be dismantled, with people in prison treated humanely, shown respect, given agency, and called by
their first name. The collective stories reflect the need for roles within the CJS (i.e., prison officers) to be recognised as skilled professions, to ensure they can provide the necessary support for people in prison. Participants suggested that officers should receive social work training, and anti-racist practices should be embedded throughout the prison system. This should include listening, believing, and trying to understand the experiences of Black men, acknowledging and apologising for racism, whilst also building communication and trust (Reid, 2021). This should be alongside reviewing policies, procedures, and laws to ensure they are anti-racist (Reid, 2021). People in prison need to be supported to maintain relationships with family, friends, partners, and the wider community, using regular and uncostly phone/video calls, visits, and more innovative uses of technology. This should be a fundamental right for all people in prison, and not dependent on their financial circumstances, which is shown to lower recidivism rates in Norway (R. Berger, 2016).

5.5.4 Improving Rehabilitation and Reintegration

The participants discussed having lots of idle time, and minimal rehabilitation within the prison system. Rehabilitation needs to be given urgent and serious consideration, and there is a need for prisons to focus on education, employment and courses which provide some of the fundamental tools to sustain employment and reintegrate into the community. The findings showed fragmented communication between different interconnected systems around the young Black men. The participants received minimal support from services prior to and after prison, often leaving with no secure housing or employment and limited support from probation. There is a need to improve the communication and interactions between multiple organisations, with the young Black men at the centre of this. The participants
suggested that courses and employment in prisons should be linked to careers in the community, that do not discriminate against people with a criminal record. At the systemic level, policies, processes, and barriers which discriminate against people with a criminal record need to be dismantled (Atherton & Buck, 2021), and associated biases challenged. Timpson retailers is one organisation known for their innovative approach to recruiting people with a criminal record and creating an environment that supports and empowers them (Pandeli & O’Regan, 2019). Atherton and Buck (2021) demonstrated how many companies have proactively employed people with criminal records and recommend that more employers consider the example of these proactive organisations. They also suggested that probation officers are pivotal in connecting with local charities who can act as ‘brokers’ (p. 201), to connect people with a criminal record to inclusive employers.

5.5.5 Laws, Policies and Funding

The participants’ stories demonstrated some of the failing laws and government policies, lack of funding, and a dehumanising system which focuses on punishment rather than rehabilitation. This research shows the need to acknowledge the impact that oppressive political and social environments have on criminality, rather than affixing blame to young Black men. The results of this study can be used to support the review of practices in the prison system which are dehumanising, punitive or restrict basic human rights such as privacy, food, and healthcare. Young Black men must be part of this review process. Clinical psychologists have an important role to use their power combined with clinical and research skills for policy-level work (Browne et al., 2020), to dismantle those which are rooted in racism or affix blame to individuals and embed policies which support the needs of young Black men.
The results suggest an urgent review of policies and funding is required for systems including schools, housing, social care, education and the CJS. Funding within the CJS is heavily focused on reactive and punitive practices, with limited funding for proactive, community-based ways of managing offending. Funding should support evidence-based rehabilitation rather than punitive approaches, which are then continuously reviewed with young Black men to ensure they do not become stagnant. This should lead to reduced recidivism and more cost-effective outcomes in the long-term, as demonstrated in Norway (R. Berger, 2016).

5.5.6 Dismantling Harm

Prison is a microcosm of society and therefore changes within the prison system require changes within wider society. I would argue the root cause of much criminality lies within the capitalist society and neoliberal politics of the UK, where money is made from people’s labour, and society is set up to exploit people who are marginalised and oppressed, for the benefit of privileged others (Reynolds, 2012). There needs to be a shift to a more proactive system, with a focus on dismantling sources of harm. Clinical psychologists, alongside other professionals, need to firstly examine and dismantle their own entrenched institutional racism, and colonial practices. There is need to work alongside marginalised communities to operate within the macrosystem, to expose the oppression, social disadvantage, and systemic racism experienced by young Black men throughout their lives and within the prison system. Clinical psychologists need to acknowledge and embrace their responsibility to address racism (Grzanka et al., 2019), and challenge the racial biases, stereotypes, and broader cultural societal values, as these perpetuate the cycle of offending. Black men need to be supported with finances, housing, employment, education and
provided with opportunities to reverse the intergenerational and engrained disadvantages within society.

5.5.7 Prison Abolition

Some critics of prison reform claim it will only perpetuate the current injustice (Scott, 2009). Prison abolition is based on the belief that the law and its application is rooted in inequality (Ryan & Sim, 2007), and the UK's CJS is irrelevant in tackling crime. People involved in the CJS are overwhelmingly poor, powerless, and oppressed in society, yet they are not those who cause the greatest social harm (Hillyard & Tombs, 2007). Prison abolition empathises the material, political and ideological realities that underpin imprisonment (Ryan & Ward, 2014). Prisons are just one system in a complex web of interconnected systems, and therefore, abolition is a broad strategy linked to abolishing imprisonment, policing, surveillance, the courts, and associated systems as a means of maintaining social, economic, and political inequalities (Schenwar & Law, 2020).

The findings of the current study endorse prison abolition as there is a need to tackle the social and ideological roots of offending and dismantle societal structures that continue to maintain the oppression of people through punishment, violence, and control. This research suggests that anything other than abolition would be putting a plaster on a system, which was never meant for rehabilitation. Prison abolition seeks to dismantle the current punitive systems of policing and imprisonment and create new structures which are fundamentally care and support people's needs. It seeks to resolve disputes in alternative ways, such as in the community, rather than punish or blame individuals.
If prison abolition was effective, prisons would no longer be required in their current form, because other practices would replace state punishment and confinement (Ryan & Ward, 2014). Through an abolitionist lens, clinical psychologists are fundamental in supporting structures of accountability, reconsidering the way systems operate, and dismantling systems of oppression from the ground up, helping to ‘create the world we want to live in, not the world we feel resigned to settle for’ (Klukoff et al., 2021).

5.6 Dissemination

This research is underpinned by a desire for social change and prison changes and abolition. Therefore, social action and dissemination is key. This research will be written up for publication (i.e., Race and Justice; Social Justice), and will be presented at the University of Hertfordshire, Life of Medical Science’s 2024 research conference. Following the participants suggestions, they have started to share their stories with friends and family, and plan to share the collective stories going forward. The research is going to be shared with the two third-sector organisations, which helped with recruitment, and we are in discussions on how to share the research with more young people involved in the services.

Following the participants suggestions, I have been in contact with a prison podcast, who are interested in the research, and we are in discussions regarding how the participants could be involved. I have recontacted several third-sector organisations which I contacted for recruitment, and it is hoped to be shared with them after publication. I intend to contact police, prison, and probation services, to disseminate within these systems. Delivery to these organisations is likely to be with oral presentations, and I am considering how to include the participants, whilst
balancing ethical considerations, including confidentiality and anonymity, as well as remuneration.

Participants were asked if they wanted to be contacted post-submission, to continue discussing potential ideas and/or be involved in the dissemination. Four participants agreed, and these conversations are ongoing. We will consider a creative way to demonstrate the findings to help illustrate the key points to allow audiences to easily see and understand the stories and findings, to promote social change. I am considering fundraising options, grants and/or additional funding opportunities, to ensure that participants are reimbursed for their time spent on the dissemination.

5.7 Invitations for Future Research

As discussed, a full PAR methodology was not achieved in this project, however this research has demonstrated the value of gaining the voices of young Black men and the avenues to do this. More thorough PAR methodology would be helpful for future research, to allow researchers and participants to work collaboratively to challenge inequalities, unfair policies, and justice issues (Cammarota & Fine, 2008). It would be beneficial to give the participants control from the beginning to choose the aims, research question, methodology, and length of project. This would be helpful to address multiple power imbalances within a group who are oppressed by society, yet their stories and opinions are often not sought or listened to despite being ‘closest to the solution’ (Reed, 2019).

Further research could consider more creative ways to explore young Black men’s stories. For example, photovoice would be a creative way to capture experiences of the resettlement period after prison. Additionally, if a NI approach was used again with young Black men to record their experiences of prison, it may be beneficial to offer
several interviews to allow for more in-depth stories of specific elements of prison life, or to consider more specific areas of reform.

This research opened up a space to start discussing changes to prison with young Black men. Further research would benefit from having these conversations over a longer period of time and consider prison reform and abolition. Participants spoke frequently about relationships with prison officers and highlighted challenges within these relationships. Further research could explore these relationships and how they could co-construct changes to prison.

Finally, if there is to be future research with oppressed and marginalised populations, especially those labelled as ‘risky’ or ‘hard to reach’, then the stereotypes, biases and systemic racism within ethical approval processes need to be exposed, understood, and dismantled. Ethical approval committees need to consider the nuanced understanding of Black men and the CJS. Ethical approval committees alongside psychologists need to think more broadly about the harm done by systemic practices and take steps to dismantle systems which perpetuate this. I will share the barriers I experienced within the ethical approval process, to help dismantle harmful systemic practices and promote safe research with marginalised communities. I will continue to complete further research, co-produced with the men, to understand further alternatives to prison and I hope to focus more on stories of reform from communities outside of a Eurocentric and colonial lens.

5.8 Final Reflections

This is a project which I am extremely passionate about and proud of. I am proud of the relationships that I was able to build, including with the research team, third-sector organisations, and especially the five participants. I feel privileged and thankful
that they trusted me with some of their stories. However, there was several times in the project where I was concerned I would not do these stories justice, especially given my white identity. My relationships with the participants were bridged through the RC and two third-sector organisations, which I am thankful for, and it showed the power of pre-existing relationships. Building relationships with the participants took time, and understandably I had to prove I was trustworthy. I believe the initial meetings, research workshops and co-designing parts of the research, as well as owning my identity, passion, and blind spots were fundamental to building these relationships. In future projects, I would like to give more time and flexibility to the relationship phase and use collaboration for all decisions.

Throughout this project I felt frustrated, disappointed, and hopeless with the level of injustice within the prison system for young Black men. Working in a prison, meant I struggled with being part of a system, which I felt so critical and in despair with. I started this project with frustrations about how young Black men are viewed by society, and within the prison system, and this has not changed. In fact, when the ethical application was not approved, I felt further frustration at the barriers within research, which prevent changes and further exacerbate oppression. I have now reached the end of the project, and I am left thinking of Steven Lawrence, and the recommendations from over 30 years ago which are still relevant today. Throughout the project I have started to move from a view of prison reform towards a view of abolition, as the stories from the men suggest that anything other than abolition would be putting a plaster on a system, which was never meant for rehabilitation. I am still in the process of considering what this means, especially in terms of my work going forward within the prison system.
I have learnt so much from this project about myself and my future as a clinical psychologist. I have considered my identity and power in this project more than ever before. I will continue to consider how I have power, and how I can use this for social change, but in ways where I step aside, and empower those with the lived experiences to be heard. I have considered even more about system mapping and how I want to be a psychologist who does not just pull people out of the river but goes upstream and finds out why they are falling in (Tutu, 2007) and use this knowledge to fight for social change.

5.9 Final Conclusions

This research used PAR/community psychology principles and NI to analyse the stories of five young Black men and their experiences of prison. These approaches helped to amplify the voices, stories, and experiences of the young Black men, who are often marginalised, oppressed, and silenced in society. Listening to their stories and experience is essential as these are the voices which are closest to the solution for changes to prisons (Reed, 2019).

Central to the participants’ narratives was the social disadvantage, racial biases, and stereotypes they have experienced throughout their lives and in the prison system, with society viewing them as bad, which leads to the offending cycle. This research provides a narrative of prisons in the UK that consists of deprivation and dehumanising experiences, showing how power operates throughout the system, with limited focus on rehabilitation. These stories challenge the dominant narratives within media, society, and research, namely that prison is ‘easy’ and young Black men are ‘strong’. This research has shown that young Black men are more than just statistics and how they have been failed by systems never designed to support them (Imafidon, 2023). This challenges the blame affixed to young Black men for their life circumstances, and
the mentality ‘it is what is’ (Jerome). If the prison system is to change, the UK needs to acknowledge and address the racial and socio-economic disparities and dismantle the root causes of harm. Finally, this research provides clinical recommendations for prison, CJS and wider systems, and recommendations for much needed further research in this area.
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APPENDICES

Appendix A: SLR search terms for racially-marginalised

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racially-marginalised Terms</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAME OR BME</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAME OR BME OR Black OR Asian OR Ethnic Minoritm*</td>
<td>12347</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAME OR BME OR Black OR Asian OR ethnic*</td>
<td>16402</td>
<td>Don’t need ethnic and Ethnic Minoritm*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAME OR BME OR Black OR Asian or ethnic* OR African</td>
<td>17,688</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAME OR BME OR Black OR Asian or ethnic* OR African* OR African* OR Afro*</td>
<td>17729</td>
<td>Afro* adds 34 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAME OR BME OR Black OR Asian or ethnic* OR African* OR Afro* OR Caribbean</td>
<td>17767</td>
<td>Caribbean adds 38 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAME OR BME OR Black OR Asian or ethnic* OR African* OR Afro* OR Caribbean OR racial*</td>
<td>18,279</td>
<td>Racial adds 512 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAME OR BME OR Black OR Asian or ethnic* OR African* OR Afro* OR Caribbean OR racial* OR racially-minoritised</td>
<td>18,279</td>
<td>Don’t need the racially-minoritised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAME OR BME OR Black OR Asian or ethnic* OR African* OR Afro* OR Caribbean OR racial* OR racially-marginalised</td>
<td>18,279</td>
<td>Don’t need the racially-marginalised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAME OR BME OR Black OR Asian or ethnic* OR African* OR Afro* OR Caribbean OR racial* OR Minorit*</td>
<td>20,197</td>
<td>Need minorit*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAME OR BME OR Black OR Asian or ethnic* OR African* OR Afro* OR Caribbean OR racial* OR Minorit* OR marginali*</td>
<td>205273</td>
<td>Need marginali*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAME OR BME OR Black OR Asian or ethnic* OR African* OR Afro* OR Caribbean OR racial* OR Minorit* OR marginali* OR POGM</td>
<td>20573</td>
<td>No attention for POGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAME OR BME OR Black OR Asian or ethnic* OR African* OR Afro* OR Caribbean OR racial* OR Minorit* OR marginali* OR POGM OR “People of Global Majority”</td>
<td>20573</td>
<td>No attention for POGM or People of Global Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAME OR BME OR Black OR Asian or ethnic* OR African* OR Afro* OR Caribbean OR racial* OR Minorit* OR marginali* OR “people of colour”</td>
<td>20573</td>
<td>No attention for POGM or People of Global Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAME OR BME OR Black OR Asian or ethnic* OR African* OR Afro* OR Caribbean OR racial* OR Minorit* OR marginali* OR “Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic”</td>
<td>20573</td>
<td>Don’t need Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAME OR BME OR Black OR Asian or ethnic* OR African* OR Afro* OR Caribbean OR racial* OR Minorit* OR marginali* OR ‘Mixed Race’</td>
<td>20615</td>
<td>Need Mixed Race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAME OR BME OR Black OR Asian or ethnic* OR African* OR Afro* OR Caribbean OR racial* OR Minorit* OR marginali* OR ‘Mixed Race’ OR mixed heritage</td>
<td>20619</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAME OR BME OR Black OR Asian or ethnic* OR African* OR Afro* OR Caribbean OR racial* OR Minorit* OR marginali* OR ‘Mixed Race’ OR mixed heritage OR dual heritage</td>
<td>20620</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAME OR BME OR Black OR Asian or ethnic* OR African* OR Afro* OR Caribbean OR racial* OR Minorit* OR marginali* OR ‘Mixed Race’ OR mixed heritage OR dual heritage OR <em>racial OR Multiethic</em> OR *Ethic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Reflective diary entries for SLR

Reflections

12.04.2023 - Critical Appraisal and information which is privileged
As I am completing the quality review process for the SLR, I have noticed a lot of the articles did not voice or reflect on the participant-researcher relationship. They did not talk about their own demographics, and some authors did not discuss the demographics of the participants. I think this is so important, especially given the sensitive topic and the focus on individuals who have been in prison. In addition, the authors were potentially in an outsider researcher position, and therefore it would be important to consider the different lens and the impact this would have. It is interesting to consider what to peer-reviewed journal articles value, and what is not being published due to articles strict guidelines on word count and specific structure. The word limit of articles is usually 6000-8000 words, and therefore, I was wondering whether the lens had been considered, but just not formally included in the written report.

This made me consider where we get our information from, and what information is privileged, for example the databases which the university subscribes to. A lot of the journal articles in psychology are from white authors in the UK and they are published in English, and therefore they are from a Eurocentric view. They are likely entrenched in white supremacy, racist assumptions and normalised the dominant white narrative. This would impact on the findings and discussions of the SLR. I had tried to include other literature, by doing a grey literature search, however, as a white author and new to SLRs I am unaware of avenues to search for other information.

I reflected on my own research, what I voice or not voice, and how this links to the quality of the research. I thought about my lens, and how I feel it important to constantly reflect and consider my position as an outsider-researcher. However, when it comes to reducing my thesis from 30,000 down to 6,000-8,000 words, I will have to lose lots of the information. It will be important for me to keep information about the researcher position. However, I will also need to fit the stringent article format, and word count. I will need to carefully consider where I publish the article, and ensure it fits with my ethos, and is the right fit for the participants. I will also co-construct dissemination decisions with the young people.

16.03.2023 - Type of synthesis for SLR
The literature review feels like such a slog. It has taken me so long to determine the terms, review all the literature and decide on the relevant articles. I am really undecided on the type of synthesis to do. I am considering both narrative synthesis and thematic synthesis. I think narrative would be good as I intend to do narrative analysis for the primary research method, and therefore it feels like it would flow. However, I also think a thematic analysis would be really helpful as most of the studies used thematic analysis and have drawn out themes. The thematic synthesis would then help provide broad themes across all the studies. In addition, I think thematic synthesis would be really helpful as at the moment there is limited literature out there, and no SLRs. The aim of the SLR is to show the current literature on this topic, to consider the research, which is needed going forwards, and to make clinical recommendations. The information on how to complete a narrative synthesis is sparse. It feels very confusing. I have looked at lots of past thesis, and they appear to say a specific type of synthesis but then complete a thematic analysis. I have found guidelines from Popay (2008) which appears to suggest using thematic analysis to complete a narrative synthesis.

02.06.2023 – My training as a prison officer
As I am writing the discussion for the SLR and the clinical implications, I reflect on my experiences as a prison officer. I had 7 weeks of training, and half a day of ‘inclusion and diversity training’. I do not remember any training on racism or cultural awareness. It makes me wonder how we can expect a system to be culturally sensitive and anti-racist, when we do not provide the support, education, and scaffolding needed. Also, I worked in a prison with several young Black men, but I can only remember three Black officers. Mostly there were white men and women. I wonder the impact this had, and how this must feel to this population, who likely have a lot of anger, frustration, and mistrust with white officers.
## Appendix C: SLR The source of each theme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s) &amp; Date of Publication</th>
<th>Feeling powerlessness in a powerful system</th>
<th>Experiencing racism</th>
<th>Feeling disconnected from cultural identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Us and Them</td>
<td>Powerless to challenge</td>
<td>You are judged straight away, for your colour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookes et al. (2012)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chistyakova et al. (2018)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMIP (2005)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMIP (2020)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMIP (2022)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter et al., (2019)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irwin-Rogers (2018)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones et al., (2013)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan (2007)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Reflective diary entries on the ethical approval process

Reflections
01.03.2023 - Ethics DENIED
I have just received the email detailing that my ethics application has been DENIED. I read it 3 times. At first, I felt like it must be a mistake. Then I thought I must have done something wrong, maybe I submitted a wrong version, or not all the information I needed. It has been deemed as HIGH RISK. I have so many questions. What is high risk? Does that mean it is too high risk to do? Are there stereotypes and racial biases playing out? Is it because its young Black men? Would this be the case if it were investigating white men? Is it because they have been in prison? Is it because I am white and deemed as vulnerable?

It says, 'I would strongly recommend seeking support from your supervisor(s) to formulate an alternative project.' I don't want to have to change my whole project. I have spent the last year formulating the project, speaking to supervisors and the research consultant. I have worked in forensic settings, and I think I understand some of the risks and risk managements. I am passionate about the project, and don't want to change it. I don't even know what to do now?!?

02.03.2023 - Reflections with Principal Supervisor on Ethics DENIED
I spoke with my supervisor and vented my frustrations and my thoughts. I felt frustrated that I had only received 3 sentences back saying it was high risk and to choose another project, when I had sent a 40-page ethics application. I felt really supported and validated. We spoke about what I wanted to do, and how I wanted more information and clarity from the ethics committee. I wanted to know what high risk was, what was too high risk, if I could adapt the project rather than choose a new project. My supervisor and I formulated a response, which felt containing, but there was still a lot of anxiety and frustration there. It is really frustrating that the DClinPsy encourages the ‘decolonising of research’, however it feels like a lot of barriers in this research. I feel like the narrative is, just do something easy, with little risk. But I just keep coming back to the fact that this is the opportunity to complete meaningful research, and we should take this opportunity and do that.

07.03.2023 - Email received from ethics
I received an email from the ethics committee saying the risk ‘could be managed by the involvement of an organisation’. I found this email helpful in some respects as it was helpful that they clarified their points. However, I also feel like most of these are recommendations for adaptations or changes, rather than starting a whole new project. It just feels really unfair that I have had this week of worrying that I would have to choose a new project. I am really happy to have the support of a third-sector organisation, as they will have pre-existing relationships and will be able to bridge the relationships and trust and will help in terms of risk and support. However, I think it will limit who engages, i.e., they will be supported by a third-sector organisation. I believe that many young Black men will be untrusting of professionals, and therefore may not be involved in services in the community. Also, I think snowball recruitment can be really helpful with these studies as it can lead to authentic relationships for a group. However, on the other hand I just want this to be approved, so I can do the project. Therefore, I feel like I just want to go as safe as possible, so it is approved.

16.03.2023 - Reflections with Principal Supervisor on Response to the ethics application
It has now been 15 days since the ethical application was rejected, and it just feels like limbo. I really want to fight the decision. I really believe I should be able to do this research, and it feels unfair that it was rejected. I felt really supported in this meeting with my primary supervisor, and we went through each point methodically and formulated a response. We tried to be fair, realistic, and understanding, whilst also standing up for the research. I think we were being really mindful not to
‘call out the racism’. It felt that a big part of the reason the project was rejected was due to unconscious and potential conscious racial bias and stereotyping. The response from the ethics committee stated that the participants may be convicted of ‘highly violent crimes’. In the proposal I did not say they were committing violent crimes, they could have been in for theft, fraud, or white-collar crimes. It felt like there was racial stereotyping of Black men committing violent offences. However, I felt like I could not say this in the response, as I did not want to upset the chair/panel, for fear this would impact on the project’s approval. For the first time in my life, I felt like I needed to tread carefully, as to how I approached the topic of racism. I can only imagine the stereotyping and bias my potential participants would experience and have to navigate without getting into trouble.

I felt really happy that we had formulate a response to all the points, however, it now just feels like limbo again. I am not sure how long they will take to respond. I don’t feel like getting on with my project because I might have to change it all. I would like to start contacting third-sector organisations which might help with recruitment, but it feels difficult as it might not be approved, and I am not sure what they input will have to be. I am going to try to have some down time to re-balance, self-care and support myself.

29.03.2023 - Reflections on email received from ethics
After another 12 days I have received an email which states that ‘The research team have given some thoughtful consideration to potential changes and therefore the committee will allow the applicant to re-submit. Please note that this will be treated as a new submission and therefore subject to a new review process’.

I feel happy that I can re-submit, and it will be considered, and I might not have to do a new project. However, I also feel that it has been a month now, and I am no further forward. I also feel that this could have been amendments and recommendations, so I am questioning why I am having to re-submit with some changes. I have gone through the changes, and added them in red, and there are hardly any changes. It does not feel like a new application. Also, I am wondering – how long will this take. My research is including PAR principles, and I feel like this is going to be impacted because of this lengthy ethics process.

27.04.2023 - STILL Waiting for ethics
I still have not got a response. It’s coming up to 3 months since I first sent my ethics application. I’m just in limbo!! I’m struggling to concentrate. I’m struggling to get on with my thesis and not just feel upset about this process. Sometimes I just wish I was doing an easy option. If our ethics application process is entrenched with racism, what hope do we have at prison reform? But then I think of the social injustice for young Black men, who are probably one of the most oppressed groups in society. This is a small fight to change prison reform.

02.05.2023 - Ethical Application APPROVED
I receive the email I have been waiting for. IT’S BEEN APPROVED. With no comments. I’m happy, excited! But no comments – seriously? It’s gone from rejected to no comments!! Can’t believe it has taken 3 months!!! I’m happy. On to the next challenge – recruitment!!!
Appendix E: Ethics Approval Notification

Health, Science, Engineering and Technology ECDA

Ethics Approval Notification

To: Rachael Floyd
CC: Rachel McKail
From: Dr Rebecca Knight, Health, Science, Engineering & Technology ECDA Vice Chair
Date: 02/05/2023

Protocol number: LMS/PGT/UH/05308
Title of study: Narratives of Prison: The Experiences of young Black men.

Your application for ethics approval has been accepted and approved with the following conditions by the ECDA for your School and includes work undertaken for this study by the named additional workers below:

No additional workers named

General conditions of approval:

Ethics approval has been granted subject to the standard conditions below:

Permissions: Any necessary permissions for the use of premises/location and accessing participants for your study must be obtained in writing prior to any data collection commencing. Failure to obtain adequate permissions may be considered a breach of this protocol.

External communications: Ensure you quote the UH protocol number and the name of the approving Committee on all paperwork, including recruitment advertisements/online requests for this study.

Invasive procedures: If your research involves invasive procedures you are required to complete and submit an EC7 Protocol Monitoring Form, and copies of your completed consent paperwork to this ECDA once your study is complete.

Submission: Students must include this Approval Notification with their submission.

Validity:

This approval is valid:

From: 02/05/2023
To: 31/01/2024
Appendix F: Recruitment Poster

Looking for Research Participants

Are you a Black male aged 18-30, who has been in Prison?

What is it like to be a young Black man in prison?

Working together to change the prison system

I am Rachael, a trainee Clinical Psychologist. I have no idea what it is like to be in Prison as a young Black man. BUT I have worked in Prisons and seen racial inequality and racism in Prisons, and I am passionate to try and change this.

I am part of a team looking for young Black men to help us to co-create research which helps understand your experience of prison and hear your ideas for prison reform.

Contact me to find out more
r.a.floyd@herts.ac.uk
07926 695396

for more info
Appendix G: Participant Information Sheet

Narratives of Prison: The Experiences young Black Men
Participant Information Sheet

Invitation
We would like to invite you to take part in some research. Before you decide if you would like to take part, it is really important that you understand what the research is about, and what you would be asked to do if you choose to take part. Please take some time to read the sheet carefully, as it should help you to decide if you would like to be a participant. Please contact me via the email below if you have any questions or for any more information that would help you to make your decision.

What is the research about?
The aim of research is to understand young Black men’s experiences of prison. In the UK Black men are more likely to receive a prison sentence, serve longer sentences and receive less support in Prison, compared to white men. Currently, there is very little research which has focused on young Black men’s own experiences, therefore more research is needed to understand these experiences and make changes to prison services and beyond.

Who am I?
I am Rachael Floyd, a Trainee Clinical Psychologist at the University of Hertfordshire. The research consultant is Adonis Akra (who has some lived experience in this area). The research is supervised by Dr Rachel McKail (Senior Lecturer, University of Hertfordshire) and Dr Tessa Saunders (Clinical and Community Psychologist, MAC-UK).

Why am I doing this?
I have worked in Prisons, rather than being imprisoned myself. I have no idea what it is like to be in Prison as a young Black man. I do know that Black individuals make up 3.3% of the population in the UK, but over 40% of some prison populations. I believe this racial disparity needs to change. I believe as Clinical Psychologists, we should promote social justice and ensure that services are appropriate for all clients. This motivation and passion to support services for young Black men has contributed to the research aims.

Because of this I do not feel I am best placed to make the decisions about exactly what the research is. For research on the changes needed in Prisons for young Black men to be meaningful, it needs to be co-produced research led by the experts (the young Black men who have been in prison). I want to co-produce this research. This means that together we will decide on the research question, what experiences you want to share, and how, where and when you will share the experiences. We will conduct the research together and decide together where and how we want to share the research.

Who can take part in this study?
To take part in this study, you must:
- Identify as a Black (Black British, African, Caribbean, or Mixed Heritage)
- Identify as male
- Be aged 18 – 30
- Have been in a Prison for at least 3 months (in England or Wales)
- Be fluent in English

You cannot take part in this study if:
- You are currently in prison, on remand for a sentence or undergoing criminal investigations
What will I have to do if I take part?
You will be asked to fill in a consent form. You will be asked to complete a short questionnaire about yourself (age, ethnicity/heritage, age you were first in prison and length of time in prison). There are then four phases of the project which you will be invited to:

**Phase 1: Initial Discussions:** I will have a chat with you about your availability (times and dates), and if you would like to join the workshops, and how these would work best for you. I would also love to hear why you would like to participate in the research.

**Phase 2: Research Design Workshops** There will be up to 4 workshops where we will get to know each other. You will be invited to help decide what questions the research should be asking and how. We will discuss how and where you would like to share your experience. We will discuss what should happen to the information collected, including where the findings need to go and who needs to hear them to support changes to prison services. You don't need to have specific knowledge about research to take part.

**Phase 3: Main research phase.** This will be where you share your experiences of prison and ideas for changes to prison. Your experience will be listened to respectfully and be audio recorded. You don’t have to answer any questions you don’t want to.

**Phase 4: Sharing the research** and stories of young Black men and their experience of Prison for social change and prison reform. You will be invited to be involved in sharing the research.

**How long will it take?**
The demographic questions should take less than 5 minutes. The length of time for the participation will be decided by you. You will have the option of what you can commit to. You can either take part in everything or different parts of the process.

**Are there any benefits in taking part?**
If you choose to take part, the benefits are that you will contribute to the current lack of research in this area to inform prison services in the future. Some people also find sharing their experiences personally beneficial. It is hoped that through your contributions, prisons, probations, and other support agency will have a better understanding of young Black men’s experiences of Prison and will make changes to address the issues that exist. Though, changes to prisons services are likely to take a long time, so you may not see immediate changes/effects after the research. Participant will receive a £20 voucher for each hour they are involved.

**Are there any risks involved?**
The question is about your experience, and so you can share as much or as little as you feel comfortable with sharing. It has not been designed to cause distress or significant risk. However, you may find what you are sharing upsetting or frustrating. This may also be the first time you are sharing your experiences. I will ensure to support you, if you feel upset, frustrated, unsafe or uncomfortable. If it becomes too much, you can stop the story sharing at any time. You will not be asked any specific questions about offenses. However, if you do disclose illegal activity, the process will be stopped, and I have a duty of care to report this to the police. You will be provided with a debrief sheet after the story sharing, containing information of resources and support which you may find helpful.

**Will my information be kept confidential?**
Your name will not be written on the questionnaire or the interview. Instead, you will be asked to choose a pseudonym (Alias), or one can be chosen for you if you would rather. Your participation and the information provided will be kept confidential. Only I will be aware of your identity; data shared with other research members will be using the pseudonym. If you attend a group format, you can choose what you share, i.e., if you share your name or pseudonym and other details.
Our discussions will be audio-recorded. The audio-recordings and demographic information will be uploaded to a password protected folder on my secure University of Hertfordshire OneDrive with 24 hours (immediately if the participation is online, and ASAP if face-to-face). They will be labelled with a participant number, not with any identifiable information. After the audio file has been uploaded to the UH drive, it will be deleted from the audio-recorder. The laptop is password protected and the file will also require a password as an extra level of protection. Only my internal supervisor (Rachel McKail) and I will have access to them.

The audio-recordings will be typed up word-for-word afterwards. This will be completed by myself or a transcription service. A transcription service is not allowed to share the conversations. Any personal information about you (such as names, specific places, and ages) will be changed so that the information is not identifiable. For both, ethical procedures and practices will be followed, and all information will be handled in confidence. The transcription service will be asked to sign a confidentiality contract.

What will happen to the results of the research?
The audio-recordings will be typed up word-for-word afterwards and I will analyse (explore) them. A summary of the story will be written for you (in a way that you would find helpful) and sent to you for you to check if its right, you would anything to be added or deleted.

The results will be written up as part of a piece of work (known as a thesis), for the Doctorate of Clinical Psychology at the University of Hertfordshire. Any research findings will not include any personal identification. It will be submitted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal (which journal can be determined with participants). We can decide together where you would like the findings to go to and what way they should be presented. The hope to share the information with services to improve services for young Black men in Prison.

What happens if I change my mind?
You can change your mind about taking part at any point from now, whilst the demographic questionnaire or interview are being completed, and up until the narratives have been typed up (date to be provided at the end of phase 3). If you change your mind about taking part, just let me know. From that point onwards, no more questions will be asked and information you have provided will be destroyed and will not be used in the research. If you change your mind after you have taken part please contact me on the details below. Again, no questions will be asked, and your information will be destroyed.

Who can I contact if I have any questions? Where can I get more information?
If you have any questions or would like more information, please get in touch with the researchers on the details below:

- Rachael Floyd, Trainee Clinical Psychologist (r.a.floyd@herts.ac.uk)
- Research Supervisor: Dr Rachel McKail (r.mckail@herts.ac.uk)
- Research Consultant: Adonis Akra (adonis.akra@mac.uk.org)

PLEASE CONTACT ME IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO BE INVOLVED IN THE STUDY

What if I have a complaint?
It is hope that you will not want to or need to make a complaint. However, if you do have a complaint or concern about any aspect of the way you have been treated during this study, please write to the follow address:

Secretary and Registrar, University of Hertfordshire, College Lane, Hatfield, Herts, AL10 9AB

Ethical Approval
This project has been reviewed by the Health, Science, Engineering, and Technology Ethics Committee at the University of Hertfordshire with Delegated Authority (Protocol Number: LMS/PGT/UH/05308)

Thank you for reading this information and considering taking part in this study.

Student ID: 19004278

UH Protocol Number: LMS/PGT/UH/05308 (Health, Science, Engineering & Technology ECDA)
Appendix H: Participant Consent Form

Consent Form

Study Title: Narratives of Prison: The Stories and Experiences of Young Black Men

Please read the following statements before you agree to take part in this study. Please tick or initial each statement to show you agree. If you have any questions, please contact the primary researcher, Rachael Floyd.

1. I have read and understood the information sheet

2. I have been given a copy of the information sheet to keep which includes contact details for if I have any questions, compliant or want to withdraw my data

3. I understand what the study involves and what I will be asked to do

4. I have had the opportunity to ask any questions, and have the answers to those questions

5. I understand I will not be asked specific questions about offenses, or what lead me to enter Prison. However, I understand that if I do disclose illegal activity, the experience-sharing research will be stopped. I understand that if I mention any illegal activity, the researcher has a duty of care to report this to the police.

6. I understand that my story will be recorded and written up word-for-word, and this may involve a third-party organisation transcribing some of the recordings

7. I understand that the story recordings will be kept until the research project has been examined

8. I understand my participation is voluntary and I can withdraw my results until (XX/XX/2023)

9. I understand my data will be anonymised, all identifying information (names, locations, age etc.) will be removed and I will choose a pseudonym (alias) for all my data.

10. I understand that parts of my story will be pooled together with other people’s, anonymised, and may be published

11. I consent to information from my story and quotations etc., may be used in the thesis, reports, journal articles, conferences, training event, book chapters and/or other avenues for social change

12. I understand that any information I give will remain confidence, unless there is a safeguarding risk, i.e., there is a risk of harm to yourself, myself, or others, in which case I may need to share this information. You will be informed if this happens.

13. I consent to take part in the study

Participant Signature: ........................................Date: ........................................

Researcher Signature: ........................................Date: ........................................

Researcher name: RACHAEL FLOYD

UH Protocol Number: LMS/PGT/UH/05308 (Health, Science, Engineering & Technology ECDA)
Appendix I: Life and Medical Sciences Risk Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rachael Floyd</th>
<th>Email address</th>
<th>Contact number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor’s name</td>
<td>Rachel McKail</td>
<td>Supervisor’s e-mail address</td>
<td>Supervisor’s contact number</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Information**

**Title of activity**
Narratives of Prison: The Experiences of young Black men.

**Brief description of activity**
Up to 5 workshops (online, face-to-face or a combination of both) and data collection (e.g., interviews or focus groups depending on what the participants choose through the co-produced workshops)

**Location of activity**
Participants will be recruited through a variety of third sector organisations, such as MAC-UK, Art Against Knives, Project 1010, Project Future, Prison Reform Trust, Spark4Life, as well as Probation Trusts. They will be asked to provide it to eligible and suitable individuals, and for the participants to contact the primary research via email should they wish to participate in the study. Organisations will also be asked if they can provide a premise/location for the research to take place. This will be confirmed in write before any data collection commences.

Workshops and data collection (e.g., interviews or focus groups) will be located face-to-face in the third sector organisations/ probation premises or online via the Zoom virtual platform. All venues will have trained staff within them and will comply with health and safety regulations.

**Who will be taking part in this activity**
The researcher. The research consultant might be present for the interviews if available and deemed helpful by participants

The participants will be young (18-30) identify as Black (Black British, African, Caribbean, African-Caribbean, Mixed Heritage or other [self-descriptions]) males, who have resided in prison in the UK, and now live in the community

**Types of Hazards likely to be encountered**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazard</th>
<th>☐ Computers and other display screen</th>
<th>☐ Falling objects</th>
<th>☐ Farm machinery</th>
<th>☐ Fire</th>
<th>☐ Cuts</th>
<th>☐ Falls from heights</th>
<th>☐ Manual handling</th>
<th>☐ Hot or cold extremes</th>
<th>☐ Repetitive handling</th>
<th>☐ Severe weather</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slips/trips/falls</td>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>Workshop machinery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological distress (to interviewer or interviewee)</td>
<td>Aggressive response, physical or verbal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other hazards not listed above
- Participants possibly disclosing information about illegal activity or historic maltreatment or abuse
- Food being served
- Participants potentially using drug and/or alcohol

---

**Risk Control Measures**

List the activities in the order in which they occur, indicating your perception of the risks associated with each one and the probability of occurrence, together with the relevant safety measures.

Describe the activities involved.

Consider the risks to participants, research team, security, maintenance, members of the public – is there anyone else who could be harmed?

In respect of any equipment to be used read manufacturer’s instructions and note any hazards that arise, particularly from incorrect use.

Identify hazards | Who could be harmed? | How could they be harmed? | Control Measures – what precautions are currently in place? | What is the residual level of risk after the control measures have been put into place? | Are there any risks that are not controlled or not adequately controlled? | Is more action needed to reduce/manage the risk? |
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
E.g., questionnaires | E.g., participants | E.g., Aggressive response - physical or verbal | E.g., LMS Health and Safety Policy, interviewer being accompanied, following local rules, advice, or training in dealing with difficult situations. | Low Medium or High | E.g., the risk to participants | E.g., additional support following interview. |
Psychological distress - Content of the interview | Participants | Emotional Distress from answering questions and discussing their experiences. | o The discussions will be set up to ensure participants know they do not need to share information about their offences, backgrounds or what led them to enter Prison  
  o Participants will be encouraged to only discuss things they feel comfortable sharing during the research process  
  o Participants may be directly involved | Low | Yes – the risk to participants emotional state | o I will be carefully looking out for discomfort, distress, trauma responses and the different forms this may take - silence, anger, sweating, shaking, hot flushes or crying etc.  
  o Participants will be offered the option of choosing not to answer questions.  
  o If I notice heightened distress I will check in with the participants about whether they are happy to continue with the |
| Psychological distress - Content of the interview | Researcher | Emotional Distress | Low | Yes – the risk to researcher’s emotional state | Should the plans already stated not be enough, I will ask for an additional meeting with my Principal supervisor, or secondary supervisor and together make an appropriate plan. I will discuss my reflections of the project with my supervisors and the emotional response which may have been evoked in me. |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------|-------------------|-----|---------------------------------------------|
| Routine check-in and outs will be arranged with the primary supervisor to allow debriefs for all interviews/meetings | ○        | ○                 |     |                                             |
| I have a lot of experience in clinical/forensic settings and am aware of the content that may arise | ○        | ○                 |     |                                             |
| I will space out the sessions to minimise emotional exhaustion | ○        | ○                 |     |                                             |
| I will not do back to back meetings so          | ○        | ○                 |     |                                             |

If a participant does become upset or distressed: I will offer to pause the meeting, or to terminate and/or rearrange it if participant feels this is the best course of action. Participant will be given a follow-up call (24-hours after the experience sharing). If the meeting is terminated, I will support the participant to reduce their distress before ending our time together and offer a debrief sheet and follow up call. Aftercare support will be provided in the format of giving local services to that participant regarding formal psychological support if needed. I will offer to call the participants for a check-in with 24 hours of the experience-sharing session. If appropriate I will signpost the participant to existing support organisations, their GP, or A&E for further support as appropriate. If risk to self-and/or others is disclosure I will inform the participant of the need to break confidentially. I will then need to contact support services, and supervisors.

Emotional Distress

- I will be open and non-judgemental throughout the process and let know the aim is to keep them and others safe.
- Participants will be informed prior to participating in each meeting they can stop or pause the meetings at any point.
- Routine breaks will be offered.

If a participant were not involved in the initial workshops and did not co-produce the questions, they will be sent the questions in advance to the data collection to ensure there are no surprises with the questioning.

I will be open and non-judgemental throughout the process and let know the aim is to keep them and others safe.
| Disclosure of illegal activity | Participants & Researchers | Emotional Distress | Low | Yes – the risk to participants and researcher emotional state, and concerns about how the disclosure is managed | o In the event of a disclosure of illegal activity I will follow the disclosure of illegal activity protocol in **appendix 10**

o I will be open and non-judgemental, and let know the aim is to keep them and others safe and remind of my duty of care.

o If participants disclose any offence in whatever context that may have been in, this will be reported to the police. The meeting will be stopped, and the police notified

o Should the plans already stated not be enough, I will ask for a meeting with my Principal supervisor, or secondary supervisor and together make an appropriate plan.

| Disclosure of historical maltreatment or abuse which identifies a person and/or risk of ongoing harm to participant or others | Participants & Researchers | Emotional Distress | Low | Yes – the risk to participants and researcher emotional state, and thinking about the maltreatment or abuse | o Ensuring participants are aware of the line and what my duty of care is if they do cross the line and discuss criminal activity.

o I will be open and non-judgemental, and let know the aim is to keep them and others safe.

o Ensuring questions do not require the disclosure of maltreatment or abuse

o Should the plans already stated not be enough, I will ask for a meeting with my Principal supervisor, or secondary supervisor and together make an appropriate plan.

| Participants under the influence of | Researcher | Distress - This could result in over disclosure, threats made to | Low | Yes – the risk to participants and researcher | o Should the plans already stated not be enough, I will notify and discuss with the organisation in which I am using their premise and discuss the risk with staff
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drugs or Alcohol</th>
<th>Investigator, lack of informed consent.</th>
<th>Emotional and physical state if participants under the influence of drugs or alcohol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aggressive response, physical or verbal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I will be open and non-judgemental, and let know the aim is to keep them and others safe.</td>
<td>If I believe participants are under the influence of drugs or alcohol, workshops/narrative-sharing will be stopped and rescheduled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If it becomes clear that the participant has used drugs and/or alcohol the investigator explicitly asking if participants are under the influence of drugs or alcohol. Using rapport to ensure they know that the research cannot go ahead when they are intoxicated.</td>
<td>I will use the safety measures in place at the organisation, i.e., call out, alarms, use work mobile to call premise staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If there are medical concerns, I will call for medical assistance, i.e., call 999.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I would provide support information for drug and alcohol service and emergency care should they need it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I would also offer a follow up call in 24-hours.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggressive response, physical or verbal</th>
<th>Researcher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants could display an aggressive physical or verbal response in the research meetings towards the researcher or other participants</td>
<td>All participants will be living in the community and deemed safe for release by a hear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The location will be in a third sector or probation venue with trained staff present in the building at all times. and any room used will be on the same floor and not isolated from others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I will have access to a mobile phone to call for assistance if needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The questioning style will be one that is not too intrusive. Active listening and respect will also be portrayed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The workshops will hopefully lead to participants feeling that they can trust me. I will use my rapport to show there is no judgement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am working with a consultant who will also be able to support with relationship building and who has supported the design the workshops, questions, and interview styles most suitable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants will be known to organisations sharing the research advertisements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For in person meetings, I will ensure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes -- the risk to researcher emotional and physical state if participants engage in physical/verbal aggression</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Low |
| In the event of verbal aggression, I will deescalate the situation by remaining calm and suggesting the meeting can be paused/people can take a break/listening to the persons concerns. |
| I will ensure that all exit routes remain open I will call via my research mobile if I require assistance and it is safe to remain in the room. If this escalates further, I will inform the person that I will be leaving the room and ask others to leave the room if they are present I will call for support from other trained professionals in the building. |
| In the unlikely events of physical aggression, I will contact the police |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The location of research meetings</th>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Danger associated with meeting individual in-person</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o The location will be in a third sector or probation venue to minimise this. It will be supported by trained staff and have specialist experience in the field.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o I will follow the premises’ guideline in terms of health and safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o I will tell supervisors where and when will be completing the research meetings, adhering to lone working policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o I will tell the staff at the premise where and when will be completing the research meetings, these will take place on the same floor as the professionals and will not be isolated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Ensure staff at premise and/or supervisor is available to receive the information, and they know who is responsible if departure details are not provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Lone working procedure will be in place, if supervisor has not heard from researcher within 30 minutes, they will contact the researcher. With no answer, they will contact the venue / next of kin and if no response within a further 30 minutes will report to the police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of computer / screen time</th>
<th>Participants &amp; Researchers</th>
<th>‘Zoom fatigue’</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At the beginning of the research meetings, I will discuss breaks with the participant. We will discuss ‘zoom fatigue’ whether it would be helpful to pause and have time away from the screen. I will also use my clinical judgement if the participant or I appear to have ‘zoom fatigue’. I will then provide a break. Meetings will be spaced out so they allow for breaks between days that participants may take part</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If participants experience difficulties as a result of being on zoom, I will offer to terminate the meeting and reschedule Participants can be offered a face to face meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>Participants &amp; Researchers</td>
<td>Risks traveling</td>
<td>Participants and the researcher will be encouraged to take relevant precautions when travelling, to include a safe route, and attend to safety on the road or public transport. If the rules around COVID-19 change, the research meetings will be changed to meet all government guidance, i.e., pausing or moving online.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Participants &amp; Researchers</td>
<td>Symptoms of food poisoning could occur and issues with allergies as participants will be provided with food and drinks to feed into it being a relaxed environment.</td>
<td>Cold food and snacks to be offered Dietary requirements/Allergies would be asked for prior to any meeting where food will be provided and adhered to throughout Only approved food venders will be used when providing food for the research meetings</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Include Standard Operating Procedures, local rules, COSHH Assessment, and so on.

| Signatures |
|---|---|---|---|
| Assessor name | Rachael Floyd | Assessor signature | RA.floyd | Date | 03.04.2023 |
| Supervisor, if Assessor is a student | Rachel McKail | Supervisor signature | RACHEL MCKAIL | Date | 03.04.2023 |
| Local Health and Safety Advisor/ Lab Manager | (Deleted for confidentiality) | Local Health and Safety Advisor/ Lab Manager signature | (Deleted for confidentiality) | Date | 04/04/2023 |
Appendix J: Disclosure Protocols

Protocol for responding to the disclosure of criminal activity

1) Participants will be reminded of the aims and scope of the research at the beginning of the workshops and data collection, including that they will not be asked specific questions about offenses, or what led them to enter Prison.

2) It will be made clear to participants that they will not be able to participate if they have ongoing criminal investigations.

3) It will be made clear to participants that if they share information suggestive of illegal or criminal activity it may mean that information needs to be reported to authorities (e.g., HMPPS, Social Care, Police).

4) If participants do begin to disclose information about suggestive information of illegal or criminal activity, the researcher will interrupt the conversation and gently remind them that sharing this information linked to illegal or criminal activity is not within the scope of the research and it may be necessary to pass this information onto a third party or the authorities.

5) If the participant continues to disclose the information regarding illegal or criminal activity, despite the reminded from the researcher, the data collection will be stopped.

6) If there is enough identifiable information about the criminal or illegal activity, the participant will be informed that any information that is held by the researcher will need to be passed onto the authorities (e.g., HMPPS, Social Care, Police), i.e., name, phone number, email address.

7) In all cases, should the researcher believe that (based on the disclosure), the participants or others are in immediate risk of harm, the researcher has a duty of care to report this to a relevant body (e.g., HMPPS, Social Care, Police), who would take appropriate action on the information.

8) In all cases, in all potential disclosures regarding the risk of harm, the researcher will contact the Principal Supervisor (a qualified Clinical Psychologist) to discuss the participant, the disclosure, the risk and discuss and review the appropriate action.

9) In all cases, the individual will be asked about if they would like to inform the organisation, trusted worker or professional within the third sector organisation about the disclosure and if so, how this could be done, i.e., call a three-way meeting to discuss the disclosure with their trusted worker.

10) Data management will ensure that full anonymity following data collection where no problematic disclosures are made, unless to appropriate authorities in the case of risk. Any identifying details participants do share with the researcher, including the names and locations, will be deled from the transcripts.

11) Participants will be provided with a debrief sheet after data collection, containing information of resources and support which they may find helpful, including complaints processes for prison services.

12) Participants will be offered a check-in phone call 24 hours after data collection.
Protocol for responding to disclosures of maltreatment or abuse

1) Participants will be reminded of the aims and scope of the research at the beginning of the workshops and data collection, including that they will not be asked specific questions about maltreatment or abuse.

2) It will be made clear to participants that if they share information discussing previous maltreatment and/or abuse, and if there could be a continued risk to others (i.e., they name a specific prison or prison officer, and there is a potential for continued abuse to others), then the researcher may deem there is a duty of care to report this to the relevant bodies (e.g., HMPPS, Social Care, Police).

3) If participants do begin to disclose information about any maltreatment or abuse, the researcher will interrupt the conversation and gently remind them that sharing this information linked to specific incidents of maltreatment and abuse is not within the scope of the research and it may be necessary to pass this information onto a third party or the authorities if there is a continued safeguarding risk.

4) If the participant continues to disclose information regarding specific historical maltreatment or abuse that identifies a perpetrator, despite the reminded from the researcher, data collection will be stopped. Remind the individual that the research team has clinical, professional, person and research experience in this area and can support with this.

5) If there is not specific identifiable information about the historical maltreatment or abuse, the researcher will ask if the participant wishes to continue, provide information for support to complaint and/or raise a grievance within a particular service, and/or provide support for emotional support services.

6) If there is enough identifiable information about the historical maltreatment and/or abuse, and where there is known ongoing risk to others the participant will be informed that this information will be passed onto a third party or the authorities to

7) If the researcher believes that (based on the disclosure), that the participants or others are in immediate risk of harm, the researcher has a duty of care to report this to a relevant body (e.g., HMPPS, Social Care, Police), who will take appropriate action on the information.

8) In all cases, in all potential disclosures regarding historical maltreatment or abuse, the researcher will contact the Principal Supervisor (a qualified Clinical Psychologist) to discuss the participant, the disclosure, the risk and discuss and review the appropriate action.

9) In all cases, the individual will be asked about if they would like to inform the organisation, trusted worker or professional within the third sector organisation about the disclosure and if so, how this could be done, i.e., call a three-way meeting to discuss the disclosure with their trusted worker.

10) Data management will ensure that full anonymity following data collection where no disclosures of risk are made. Any identifying details participants do share with the researcher, including the names and locations, will be deleted from the transcripts.

11) Participants will be provided with a debrief sheet after data collection containing information of resources and support which you may find helpful, including information for support to complain and/or raise a grievance within a particular service.

12) Participants will be offered a check-in phone call 24 hours after the data collection.
Appendix K: Recruitment Video

https://vimeo.com/832581809
Appendix L: Reflective diary entries for recruitment process

Reflection

12.05.2023 - Response from third-sector organisation
I received a response today from an individual from a third-sector organisation. They had some apprehensions about whether the guys would feel comfortable speaking to me as a white woman about their experiences of prison. He queried if I would get an authentic account or a watered-down version. This was pre-empted and something I had grappled with throughout the whole project. Whilst the honesty and transparency were appreciated, and fully understood, it felt strange for me to be mistrusted. I suppose I am not used to it. I value trust. I feel like I am good at being trusted. However, here I was being untrust due to my identity, namely skin colour, and gender. I almost felt a bit defensive. I wanted to prove I could be trusted. But how?

It did make me reconsider the project. I started to think about whether I was being insensitive doing this project, and whether anyone would trust me? How do I build that trust? I also considered that psychology does not currently represent this population. I continued to consider how to approach this outsider researcher position, within the research design. This feedback led to the creation of the recruitment video to show my face and explicitly state that ‘I am not Black or male and have no idea what it is like to be in Prison as a young Black man’. I also explained why I am doing the research. I acknowledged that I will be part of the stories shared, and they will be co-constructed. This is something that I will continue to consider, especially in the recruitment and the analysis.

02.06.2023 - Exciting responses from third-sector organisations
I have had some good meetings with third-sector organisations this week, and I have had some really exciting news. Three organisations have stated that the project sounds like a very good, and needed project, and that they would be happy to support with recruitment. They support individuals who fit the selection criteria, and that they would be able to support with recruitment. One organisation discussed the location of the interviews and felt they might not be able to provide a location/premise for the interviews, and therefore suggested that the experience-sharing might have to be online. They talked about providing a lot of their support online, and that the young men are used to it. This was fine, although, I felt like I did not want it to be online, because of the barrier of not having a location. But it has been a month since ethical approval and I have not recruited anyone yet. Another organisation felt happy and able to support with recruitment and the location/premise of the experience-sharing.

05.06.2023 - Disappointing responses from third-sector organisations
I have had some really good meetings and really exciting emails last week and there were a few third-sector organisations interested. However, today I received the email from one organisation stating that they had spoken to their team, and I would need to go through HRA (HMPPS) ethics. Another organisation said that they are now too busy to support. This feels so disappointing.

This process is exhausting!!! Some organisations are not responding, now others are asking for additional ethical approval, and other organisations have said that circumstances have changed, meaning they could no longer support with recruitment. I have already spent so long doing the ethical approval process. I just feel I may never recruit the required participants.

30.06.2023 - Contact with participants
YAYYYY! Two participants contacted me today to participate in the study. I am SO happy. Finally, it feels like my hard work has paid off. I had an initial meeting with them both, which went really well. They are both 30 and both pretty keen on helping others and changing prisons so they run better.
suppose this is probably the individuals which I will recruit, as I am going through third-sector organisations. I spoke to them both and gave them some time to consider whether they wanted to participate. I arranged to contact them next week to check… but it looks really promising!!! However, it is a bit annoying that I don't have snowball recruitment as it would be great to see if these two had other peers they knew and they could form a group.
Appendix M: Participant Demographic Form

Demographic Questionnaire

Please note that all personal information will be kept completely confidential and none of the responses you provide will be connected to your name or other identifying information.

Pseudonym/Alias: ..................................................................................................................

1. How old are you? .............................................................................................................

2. What is your ethnicity/heritage? ....................................................................................

3. How old were you when you were in prison? ............................................................... 

4. Approximately how long you have spent in Prison? (in total): ................................. 

Thank you for completing the questionnaire.
Appendix N: Research Workshops Outline

RESEARCH WORKSHOPS

INTRO: Thank you for agreeing to meet with me today. As you know, I am completing some research on young Black men’s experience of Prison. The plan is to share the information with services to improve experiences for young Black males in Prison. However, changes to prisons services are likely to take a long time, so you may not see immediate effects.

CONTEXT: Before we start I wanted to let you know my context and reasons for doing the research. I want to acknowledge that I am not a young Black male, I have not had any experience of living in Prison and I have no idea what it is like to be in Prison as a young Black man. However, I have worked in Prisons, Probation, STCs and YOIs for the last 10 years.

I have seen the over-representation of young Black men in prison, and I know that Black individuals make up 3% of the population in the UK, but over 40% of some prison populations. In the UK, Black men are more likely to receive a prison sentence, serve longer sentences and receive less support in Prison, compared to white men. Research to date has not asked young Black men about their own experiences by listening to the m. Therefore, more research is needed to understand these experiences and make changes to prison services and beyond. This motivation and passion to support services for young Black men has contributed to the research aims.

CO-PRODUCTION: Because of this I do not feel I am best placed to make the decisions about exactly what the research is. For research on the changes needed in Prisons for young Black men to be meaningful, it needs to be co-produced research led by the experts (the young Black men who have been in prison). Some decisions have already been made:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top-down</th>
<th>Consultation with RC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deadline for the research</td>
<td>Inclusion and exclusion Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Recruitment strategy (purposive sampling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The broad topic and research question</td>
<td>Approximate number of participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative Research</td>
<td>Data collection: format using words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical considerations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method of analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Areas which we will decide together:
- The specific research question(s)
- Specific aim(s)
- The exact data collection (i.e., focus groups, interviews, or other written forms of sharing experiences and ideas, or structured, unstructured questions)
- The format of the experience-sharing (e.g., face-to-face, or online, telephone, podcast style etc)
- The geographical location of the research meetings (e.g., at third-sector organisation)
- The role of the researcher in the sharing of experiences
- Routes of dissemination and sharing the research (who with and when).

Initial discussion: Introduction to each other and to research
o Introduction to each other, contexts, reasons for doing the research.
o Relationship building, general discussions, now and then.
o Involvement in workshops? If so, availability and preference for time/date and location?

**Workshop 1: Introduction to Research**
o What is research? Difference between Quantitative and Qualitative Research?
o The focus of Qualitative Research
o What research is of interest about young Black men’s experiences of Prison?
o What experiences would they like/be willing to share?
o What parts of reflecting on prison feel more relevant
o What would be the aims of research, and question?

**Workshop 2: Changes to Prison.**
o What worked in prisons? (i.e., regime, support, relationships, food, jobs, therapy)
o What did not work in prison? (i.e., regime, support, relationships, food, jobs, therapy)
o What was the hardest part of prison? (i.e., away from family, restraints, staff, sentence, others)
o Changes to prison for young Black men? (Prompt, magic wand what would you change)

**Workshop 3: Research Design**
o Define aims, question.
o What questions/topics/stories would you like to share about your experiences of prison?
o How they would like to share experiences (i.e., individuals or in a group)
o Any other elements for sharing (i.e., questions, prompts etc)
o Format of the experience-sharing? (face-to-face, online, telephone)
o The geographical location if face-to-face (i.e., at third sector organisation near them)
o The role of the researchers (i.e., to facilitate discussions, to ask informal or formal conversations, written down)

**Workshop 4: Sharing the research?**
o How should the research be shared?
o Where can we share the research?
o What impact do you want this research to have?
o Who is it important for this research to be shared with and heard by?
o Other suggestions?
Appendix O: Debrief Sheet

Debrief and Support Services Sheet

Thank you

Narratives of Prison: the experiences of young Black men.

Thank you for co-designing and taking part in this research and sharing your experiences of prison. There is no denying there is a racial disparity in prison which needs to change. Unfortunately, there is very little known or researched about young Black men’s experiences of prison. It is hoped that the research will allow this to change and will be able to your experiences and expertise to make changes to prison reform.

The results will be shared with probation trusts, prisons, and other supporting organisations (which participants have suggested), in the hope of improving prison services for young Black men. It is hoped that when these services are better informed about young Black men’s experience of prison, the services, staff members and system as a whole can change and adapt to better suit the needs of young Black men in Prison. It will be submitted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal, and it may be presented at conferences, board meetings at relevant agencies and other creative ways which the participants have suggested.

We understand that discussing your experiences of prison may have been hard for you. If taking part in this study has left you feeling upset, frustrated, confused, or distressed or anything else, please let me know before you leave if you want to. I understand that you might not want to share it with me, but might want to talk to someone else so I am sharing some information about

What happens next?
The results will then be written up as part of a piece of work (known as a thesis), for the Doctorate of Clinical Psychology at the University of Hertfordshire.

You have the right to withdraw your data until [___/___/___].

I would / would not like a call tomorrow [___/___/___], to check on how I am feeling?

UH Protocol Number: LMS/PGT/UH/05308 (Health, Science, Engineering & Technology ECDA)
Sources of support

Talking with me today might have caused you to feel upset, frustrated, annoyed, or impacted on your mood. This is completely understandable, given what we have talked about. If you continue to feel this way and/or it becomes a problem, you may wish to talk with someone about how you are feeling. Here are some (less urgent) support services:

- **Campaign Against Miserable Living (CALM)**
  - Call: 0800 58 58 58
  - www.thecalmzone.net

- **Mind (Mental Health Support)**
  - Call: 0300 123 3393
  - www.mind.org.uk

- **Samaritans**
  - Call: 116 123 (free)
  - www.samaritans.org

- **Prison Fellowship**
  - Call: 020 7789 2500
  - https://www.prisonfellowship.org.uk/

- **Prison complaints**
  - 'IMPS/Prison Experiences' website
  - www.imps.org.uk
  - www.royal.gov.uk

- **Sanelie**
  - Mental Health Support (for you or your family)
  - Call: 0300 304 7000
  - www.sane.org.uk

- **100 Black Men of London**
  - Call: 0207 704 3950
  - https://100blm.org.uk/

- **Black Minds Matter**
  - www.blackmindsmatter.uk.com/

- **The Black, African and Asian Therapy Network**
  - Find a therapist in your area
  - www.btaan.org.uk

**GP**
If you become worried about yourself, and how you are feeling. Please contact your GP and arrange an appointment.

**If you need urgent help:**
If you are worried about your immediate safety, go to your nearest Accident and Emergency (A&E) Department and ask for a Mental Health Liaison Nurse (24 hours a day) or contact 999 if you can’t get yourself there.

Thank you so much for taking part in this study. Please do contact me if you have any questions.

Rachael Floyd; r.a.floyd@herts.ac.uk

UH Protocol Number: LMS/PGT/UH/05308 (Health, Science, Engineering & Technology ECDA)
Appendix P: Mind-maps of Research Workshops

- First night
  - Being on remand
  - Jobs
  - Transfers
  - Visits
  - Guards
  - Football/sport
  - Being away from family
  - Probation
  - Violence
  - Change as a person
  - Cell mates
  - Medication
  - Courses
  - Football
  - Block
  - Relationship with guards
    - 'Crucial Camp'

- Before prison (Chapter 1)
- After prison (Chapter 2)

- Sharing huge story
  - Sharing poems/letters in prison
  - Sharing chapter of huge
    - Changes to prison
    - What didn't work
    - CSS/court/Remand
    - Help which change their life
    - Relationship with offices
    - Changes

- Intro to research
  - Willing/want to share
    - Build relationship first
      - Feel energy
        - Trust

- Football
  - Probation
  - Experiences in prison
    - Experience/violence
    - Changes as a person
    - Relationships
    - Cell mates stories
Narratives of Prison: The Stories and Experiences of young Black men

**What Worked**
- Job
- Some courses
- If get on with cellmates
- Losing freedom
- Music courses
- Gym / Football
- Probation - jobs
- CSCS card

**Hardest Part**
- Being away from people
- Transfers
- Being on remand
- Guvs + attitude
- Boredom
- Away from family
- Lack of sports
- Going on trial
- Food
- Cellmates
- Association rules

**Changes to Prison**
- Visits - physical (not business)
- Closer to home
- Incentives / make people not want to come back
- Guvs attitude - social worker skill
- Food
- More sport
- Cell - less bang up
- Support from P's
- Workshop / jobs
- Regime

**Changes**
- Having to ask for everything
- Medication / Healthcare
- Pay offices more
- More skilled officers
- Course - actually useful for leaving prison
- CSCS | trade
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Appendix Q: Interview Schedule

Introduction:
- Opportunity for participant to ask any questions
- Only share experiences that you feel able and comfortable to share (do not have to answer)
- Reminders about confidentiality, consent, breaks, withdrawal, and recordings

Thank you for agreeing to meet with me today. The main focus of today is to hear about your experiences of living in prison, in particular as a young Black man in prison. I am also interested to hear about how you think prisons should change, given your experiences.

Before we start to talk about your experiences in prison, I was wondering if you could tell me a bit about what life was like for you before you went in to prison (without going into specific details about the crimes or the offence that led to prison)?

Key questions:

1. **Can you tell me about your stories and experiences of prison?** Start from wherever you would like, this could be from the first time you went inside, until the last time you left. You can include any stories, events or experiences that stick out for you? Please take your time. When you have finished I may have some more questions about.

   *(Additional follow up questions)*

2. **Given your experiences of prison, can you share with me how you think prisons should change?** How could they be more supportive for young Black men?

Additional prompts/follow up questions:

**Experiences**
- Tell me about how you experienced the first and/or last time you went into prison?
- Tell me about how did your experience of prison change over time?
  a. How have you made sense of these changes?

**Adjusting**
- Tell me about how you adjusted to life in prison?
- If at all, how would you say you have changed as a person since being in prison?

**Self**
- Tell me about how you think being a young Black man affected your time in prison? In other words, how do you think your experience of prison might differ to someone different to you, like an older white male?

**Others**
- How were others (i.e., friends and family at home, other inmates, staff) part of your experience of prison?

**Rehabilitation / Change**
- Tell me about your experience of rehabilitation in prison?
- Tell me about anything that worked well / not well in prison?
- Tell me about the hardest part of prison?

**Ending**
- Thank you for sharing your story with me today.
- Check-in how they are feeling / How have you found talking today?
- Would you like to me to give you a call tomorrow to check in on how you are after our talk today? (if yes, arrange time)
- Explain about what happens next, and withdrawal etc.
General prompts
Prompt questions will be used to make sure that participants stay close to their narratives:
- Content: Tell me about X?
- Detail: ‘Tell me more about that’
- Detail: You mentioned ….. you tell me more about what happened’
- Context: And what happened after that?
- You mentioned…. I’m just wondering if you could discuss how you were feeling at that time’
- Ask for reflections.
Appendix R: Reflective diary entries for consultation and data collection

Reflection

06.07.2023 – First individual research workshop
I ran my first research workshop today online with one [Participant 1]. I actually felt really nervous beforehand. Although I have worked with this population a lot, this project was really personal and important to me. I did not want to mess it up and then them not engage. I felt a lot of pressure to build a rapport with the participant and to provide a detailed explanation of what research is. We talked a lot about areas of research which are of interest to them, but I feel I skipped over some of the more educational parts. I wonder how this will impact on their knowledge, and if I can add more of this in the next workshop. It felt really hard to balance rapport and providing education. I wish I had more time with them to build the relationship, 1 hour went so fast. Online was actually better than I expected. I created a mind map and shared screen at the end.

13.07.2023 - Initial meeting with 4 potential participants
Today, I met with 4 potential participants in-person as a group to discuss the research. I felt apprehensive. I was in-person and got there early, so had a lot of time waiting around. It was really good to meet the third-sector organisation staff member, and he was so supportive. When I met the guys, I really tried to discuss my position and the passion behind the project and why I am doing it. However, I was also conscious that I did not overshadow, or take up all the space, especially as the white individual. The purpose of the project is to amplify the voices of the young Black men and I was really conscious to try and do this from the beginning. I tried to remind myself to focus on building rapport. I was really excited about a group project. I was considering about seeing if the other two participants could join this group. I discussed this with the staff member, as to whether I should approach this with the men. He said he felt it was better not to as there were a lot of gang issues, and he felt that the men preferred to only meet with people they know. He also talked about the fact that the men may have met in prison, and they may be issues if meeting in a group.

31.07.23 - Participant not turned up
I had an interview booked in today and they didn't turn up. They have probably got so much more going on in their life and either completely forgot or have something come up. I tried to ring but no answer. I was a little bit worried and hope no harm has come to them. I actually feel really happy that the third-sector organisation is involved, as I have been able to call them and let them know, which means I don’t feel as responsible. I also feel disappointed it did not go ahead and hope I can get it booked in again.

16.08.2023 - Interview with Participant 3
Today I had my interview with [Participant 3]. I prepared for the interview beforehand, by going back over the questions, setting everything up and reminding myself of the NI approach. I felt ok as I know [participant 3] pretty well. However, I was still a little nervous as I was not sure what would come up. He had already mentioned a story of a cell-mate self-harming in prison, and I was wondering whether this would be triggering for him or for me.

As we were about to start I went through the confidentiality information and let him know he does not have to say the names of places or people if he would rather not. I then let him know that I was going to record the interview. We had already agreed on this. However, on reflection I am wondering if this impacted on what he shared and how he shared it. Throughout the interview, I felt like [Participant 3] answered quite briefly, and I kept asking him to ‘tell me more’. At times it felt like the questions were too broad. I felt like I was leaving huge gaps before I asked the follow-up question. The interview was the shortest interview so far, and I used a lot more prompt questions. I also
noticed that he did not name any prisons, and I wondered if this was due to how I started the interview, power in the room or not trusting me. The interview appeared to change, when we started to talk about changes to prison. [Participant 3] talked at length about the changes to prison. He also commented that he is more reserved since prison and does not ‘let people in’. I wondered if he found it difficult to talk about himself, but his passion was changes to prison, and found this a lot easier to talk about. On reflection, I need to be mindful how I set up the interview, and maybe make it less formal. It also made me question about recording, and whether this mimics a police interview, and if this is a limitation of the research.

27.08.2023 – Interview with Participant 4

Today I had my interview with [Participant 4]. Before [Participant 4] turned up I was nervous. Even though this was my fourth interview, and I had met [Participant 4] 5 times already, so I feel like our rapport is pretty good, I still felt nervous. So far, we had talked about research and experiences to share, but we had not spent time talking in-depth about [Participant 4]'s past. I prepared myself of the emotional depth which could arise in the interview, and reminded myself of my therapeutic skills of compassion, empathy and being non-judgemental. I also wanted to really centre his story and leave more time before I jump in with a follow up question, to ensure I am not jumping in too early.

As [Participant 4] joined we spent a few minutes catching up, which felt like it calmed my nerves. I discussed the consent and confidentially elements again. I tried to make this more informal. We also had food, and [Participant 4] had ordered food before the interview. I tried to create a warm and relaxed environment, by learning from the previous interviews.

At the beginning of the interview, [Participant 4] said ‘we are live’ I think this really symbolised our rapport and we both laughed. Throughout the interview, I felt so absorbed in [Participant 4]'s story. I noticed that I was relaxed, I was allowing him to speak, and I was quite present. This interview felt a lot more authentic. It appeared that [Participant 4] felt happy and able to share his story. Interestingly at times, [Participant 4] would check my understanding, i.e., if I knew what a sweatbox was. This really reminded me that I am an outsider, and this is a really important consideration as to the stories he shared and how they were told. At the end he reflected that he felt the interview was mildly therapeutic and had no concerns and did not need a check-in.
### Appendix S: Transcription symbols (Jefferson, 2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| [Square brackets] | Overlapping talk | I: Yeah, [I was]  
P: [Yeah] |
| = (equals sign) | No gap between speaker change | I: Yeah, I was=  
P: =Yeah |
| (.) | Brief interval (less than 1 second) | Yeah, I (. ) |
| (2) | Time in brackets represents the number seconds there was a pause | P: I, um (3) |
| Hyph- | Utterance or stutter or broken off word | P: I was ju-ju-, just |
| Underlining | Emphasis put on a word | P: I just don’t get it |
| : | Prolongation of word. The longer the colon row, the longer the prolongation | P: It so:::long |
| ↑↓ | Shift in pitch | R: I can’t image what that is like↓ |
| CAPITAL LETTERS | Words spoken louder than then other surrounding words | P: What do you MEAN? |
| oo | Words spoken are softer than other surrounding words. | R: Yeah it was «hard» |
| “ ” | Speaker imitated another person | He said ‘Yeah, ok’ |
| (xxx) | Inaudible speech. Number of x represents number of words missed. | I was (xxx), then |
| (brackets with italics) | Non-speech elements, i.e., (laughs) | (laughs) |
| () | Removal of text deliberately, i.e., location | P: I was in (name of prison) |
| [square brackets in italics] | Added text to convey who/want the individual is referring too | P: Like I said, it [prison] was tough |
Appendix T: Example of transcript

Interview 4: Anonymised Transcript – Jorge
Conducted on 27th August 2023, online, length: 1 hour, 22 minutes

Narratives of Prison: The Stories and Experiences of young Black men

Jorge: We are live, were’ livel (laughs)

Jorge: Before I went to prison. Before I went to prison. First time. So, I’d gone to secondary school. Finished secondary school and I’d gone to college. Completed college. College was alright. I don’t think I did too
years. Did I do four years in college? Three? No. No. Hold on. I think four. I think three. I think I did three
years in college. Yeah. And then went to university. Did one year. And then dropped out. Just thinking to
look for money, for some reason. Thinking that you are grown and need money a lot. Doing what you
don’t need money. But yeah. And I was working. Started working part-time in like a like a computer
store. And was working the weekends. So then, when that job now I kept and after I dropped out
of uni I was working. I was working full-time now in a restaurant. Started to do Monday to Friday thing, and then I had one on the weekends. So, I was trying. Was trying about the weekend, trying to make it make
sense. Well, that’s when Yeah, it all happened. Yeah, and then yeah, erm, committed our offence and then went inside around that time. Last after I’d dropped out of uni, yeah around that time.

Jorge: Hmm, was living in part of London. Nigerian parents. You know. So, we’re first generation here. Nigerian parents and it was, my upbringing was. It wasn’t hard, like, I dunno. It wasn’t, everything’s
relative and all. But, we weren’t rich or anything. You know? They always made sure our parents always
made sure we ate. You know? It was, it was cool. But like, you’d always want more. You know? You
always want more. You always want more. It was alright though. I had sisters, little brothers. It was just.
Just the four of us. You know. With our parents in London. London. London. It wasn’t like it was quite. You know. Nigerian parents can be quite strict. Erm.

Jorge: So, it was a strict household. But like it was managable man. There wasn’t anything that was like too
bad you know? Yeah. And it was cool. We used to. We used to basically. We used to go to Saturday
school and stuff like. We were.

My parents were onto us about our books from early. So, (laughs) they wanted to make sure that we
were smart. But then it school. I just started to spiral with friends and stuff. I started to, you know, I didn’t mean. I didn’t do anything extreme in school or anything but then my grades just started to slip. man. And then I started secondary school in the states and then started spiraling. So, yeah. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah.

Jorge: So, how was your childhood was alright man. You know. Yeah, yeah. I don’t know. Maybe yeah. I was. Yeah, I don’t know. I don’t know. Yeah. I suppose you can’t really regret too much man. But, I think I was
right.

Narratives of Prison: The Stories and Experiences of young Black men

Rachel Floyd
Laugh- demonstrates rapport
Rachel Floyd
Main event: went to secondary school
Rachel Floyd
Main event: went to college
Rachel Floyd
Positioning of self: completing school college
Rachel Floyd
Repeated words – feels important
Rachel Floyd
Position of self: Dropped out (autonomy)
Rachel Floyd
Main event: working & social constrcut of money
Rachel Floyd
Phenomenon of money: capitalist society
Rachel Floyd
Main event: working
Rachel Floyd
Position of self with working hard and needing money (capitalist society, social disadvantage)
Rachel Floyd
Structure – orientating the listener
Rachel Floyd
Broad term offence – potentially due to outsider research
Rachel Floyd
Position of self: a turning point
Rachel Floyd
Main character: Nigerian parents
Rachel Floyd
Position of self: first generation
Rachel Floyd
Position of family as always trying their best -lower socio-economic background
Rachel Floyd
Story phenomenon: strict parents
Rachel Floyd
Position of self: not victim or traumatic form: does not want to sympathy or seen as victim
Appendix U: Example Summary Stories

Jorge's Prison Story Summary

My upbringing wasn't hard.. but we weren't rich
   My childhood was alright. I was living in (area of) London. I had sisters, little brothers. The 4 of us. We're first generation here. Nigerian parents can be quite strict. But like it was manageable. My upbringing wasn't hard. But we weren't rich or anything. Our parents always made sure we ate. But like, you'd always want more.
   We used to go to Saturday school. My parents were onto us about our books from early. They wanted to make sure that we were smart. I started secondary school in the top classes and then. My grades just started to slip. I wasn’t applying myself as much to the lessons and the learning. I just started to spiral with friends and stuff. I didn’t do anything extreme. I was still relatively intelligent. I used to play table tennis at secondary school. Play like competitions, national level. I think I was like top 1000 or something in England at one stage.

   I went to Nigeria one time. Going back to .. where my parents come from. Opened my eyes to how much we had, even here. I felt like we didn't have much. We were driving one time, in a coach. Our driver wanted to buy petrol, and the other guy's saying there is a queue. They ended up fighting over the petrol. The driver had petrol poured all over him. He got back on the coach, started driving like nothing had happened. You would think that you would come back and then change your life. What opportunities I've got. But it didn't. I just came back and continued to ride the waves.

Get caught up in the waves.
   I had a good friend. He went to prison, when we were in secondary school. I'd finish secondary school. I did three years in college. College was alright. There was some good times, I can't even lie. Getting up to some mischief sometimes. It was funny. The streets of (area of) London is a bit crazy at times. Walking down the high street, and then you see those guys that [are] gonna try and rob us. It was extremely normal. It was to be expected. It was only promoted for you to be like that. When you're grown now, it's like roles reversed. You just know where you step, how to move. Then you start living the life. You're young, you're not as critical. You get caught up in the waves.

   I went to uni. for one year, and then dropped out. Just trying to look for money. I was working. Part-time in like a like a computer store. I was working full-time now in a call centre. I was trying, … to make it make sense. That's when...it all happened. We committed our offences. I can't think of anything that was very monumental. I think it's definitely a combination of all my experience. Environmental, societal stuff.

Being the 'new fish' in the 'Lion's Den'
   In court, I knew I was going to prison. [I was] in the court cell doing press-ups. Trying to get my mind right and trying to psych myself up. I was in a sweatbox. We are at (name of) prison. Induction wing. I am hearing one guy just mouthing off, like 'yeah, man's there before, yeah, its calm'. I'm thinking this guy, is definitely going to be some loudmouth troublemaker. I was just quiet. Just observing. Just trying to take as much information in as I could. So, he [officer] says, 'I'm going B-wing'. That's where the Mandem are. My co-ds are there already.

   So, we go to B-wing now. I've put my bags down. It's like big three floors of cells. It's like a Lion's den. Everyone's now looking at the new fish. Some guys come down, because he's recognised me from the area. I think he was probably, a somebody on the wing. I've noticed the [loudmouth] guys become sheepish now. I couldn't believe it. He turned into a reclusive person. That was just one of the first experiences that I thought. Oh, what is this place? Not everything is what it looks like initially. You have to be aware and look into people more deeply sometimes.
‘I’m in the thick of it’ … ‘I just hope I can make it through’

I’ve been on B-wing. I’ve seen my Co-Ds, and one of them works on servery. So, he’s giving me food and stuff. It’s almost like the inmates run the jail. Smoking weed on the landings. The first time I saw [violence]. They tore up one guy. He faces was just bleeding, like a horror movie, his whole face is bleeding, and he ran down the stairs. I was thinking Whooa, I’m in the thick of it now. But at the same time, you’re thinking, I just hope I can make it through this. I know that someone could possibly try and test you. It still don’t take a lot. A bit tricky.

I’ve got a cell mate now, seventy years old man. This guy, farts crazy, and they stink. I’m thinking BRO. I dunno how I’m gonna do this. The toilet is right next to the foot of the bed. It’s just there, when someone is taking a shit.

‘Super secure’ … ‘All I wished for now was freedom’

When we got sentenced. We were looking at maybe eight years or 10 years and ended up getting 14 years. Then we went to (name of prison). I’d heard stories about (name of prison). ‘Oh Bruv, yeah, there’s some batty boys there … will fuck you in your arse, don’t wanna go there’. Can you imagine, I was thinking ‘WHAT?’. But when I’ve got there. Obviously, again, its bullshit.

So, then that first lock up, after I got sentenced and he closed the door. I said, I have to do this for seven years. I was like shit, man. Fuck. I just had to have hope and continue. I’ve got that grounding, spirituality. (Name of prison) is super secure. I was like, Oh man, this is real jail. All I wished for now was freedom, to be outside. Everything was inside. You walk inside tunnels. You feel enclosed, man.

‘B-Cat threshold’ - ‘That’s the rule’

I got shipped out. Cause I got a long sentence, it was B-Cat, threshold. I ended up going to (name of prison). It was pretty relaxed prison. But when things happen. It happens on a heavier scale. In the laundry room. [When] you see something in the washing machine, you put your stuff on top. If there’s someone’s washing on top of the washing machine already, you put yours [washing] next to it. If that next person isn’t there when that laundry finishes. You wait there for 5 minutes, to make sure. (Then) you put your stuff inside, that’s the rules.

So [one day], I’ve waited for like 5 minutes. No-ones there, so I put my stuff inside. This guy, I play chess with all the time. He come in, saying ‘no, no ... I’m next’. I’ve been standing here for the like the last 10 minutes. So now it’s a problem. There is another guy in there folding clothes, his friend. They are Islamic Brotherhood. So, it’s like, if you see a Muslim fighting, you have to fight as well. I said, ‘Listen, you weren’t here, you know how the ting goes’. He said, ‘nah bro, nah I’m not having that’. I said, ‘What are you saying, you saying you want to fight me [over a washing machine]?’ He’s saying ‘Bro, you are gonna have to take your stuff out’. And I’m thinking, two men, they will probably defeat me. I might lose. I’ve got a visit tomorrow ...my mum and my sisters. If they come see me, and I’ve got a ...black eye. They are going to think I’m under pressure. I can’t have that. They need to tell that I’m alright here. And all this thinking I’m doing, is in the space of like 10 seconds. I said, ‘Alright then bro’. I’ve taken my stuff, walked back to my cell. My heart is pounding, and my mind is raging. I’ve put my stuff down, and I’ve started praying to God. Thinking, we don’t need to fight over laundry. I felt violated. But I had to take that, because it wasn’t worth it.

A couple days down the line, this guys said, ‘Sorry about that last time’. In my head, I’m thinking, Bro we could have changed each other’s lives in there. And now he’s just apologised. I thought to myself, I really can’t get myself into nothing, for no reason like that. It’s pointless. Especially, when you got family out here that are looking out for you. You got too many things that you aspire to be now.
Another crazy moment

There was another crazy moment. People from different wing in the same workshop, but we’ve all really clicked, we’re all London boys. Two people amongst us that don’t really get on though. Everyone sensed the tension. This day it came to a head. John (pseudonym) was asking to borrow something from Jay (pseudonym). Jay said, ‘No’. John then said, ‘Fuck off then don’t come back downstairs again’. Jay’s saying ‘Fuck that man, this guy’s always chatting shit. Let’s do it. Let’s go’. John’s there saying, ‘Come on, fucking do something’. Then, they both ran downstairs for a fight. We give them like 30 seconds. We ran downstairs now, we’ve opened the door, and we have seen John’s face. It’s got like three lumps on his forehead. Jay’s face is actually clean.

John has gone downstairs and is preparing a blade. Like a Stanley blade. I said ‘Bro, you don’t need to do this now’. In my head I’m saying this blade I’m looking at, it could do damage. I didn’t know what to do. I can’t take no sides. I couldn’t go to Jay and tell him. So, I’ve just gone back upstairs. Two minutes later John comes back upstairs, where all the guys are and asked Jay for a rematch. In my head again I’m thinking you cannot have a rematch with this guy, you have just beat him up. He’s obviously not gonna come again for a fair fight. But I’m hoping Jay realises this. But Jay’s said, ‘Alright then, pat him down innit, to make sure he ain't got a knife or nothing’. I’m thinking how can you ask guys to pat him down? We are not police, bro.

Then they have gone downstairs, to fight again. All you can hear is trainers on the ground. Until you hear, ‘BRO YOU CUT ME’. They have continued fighting for another 30 seconds. Then John has ran out the room with his face dripping in blood. Then we’ve come downstairs now, to assess what’s happening. Jay’s got like, maybe six .. like, 20 cm cuts, in the back of his head. The floor is flooded. Some of the other fellas quickly started mopping up the blood. There were two members of staff in the workshop at the time. They had their little office just there, while all of this commotion was going on. They just closed their room and stayed there. They wanted no part of it. I found it hard to sleep that night.

This is what things start over, a microwave

After Rye Hill, I moved again, I moved to the (name of prison), C cat. That was alright, that was less security. [Another thing happened]. This is what things start over, a microwave, a washing machine. Its ballocks. My friend put his stuff inside the microwave. But there was another guy waiting for the microwave. This guys, he’s not right upstairs, right. He walks funny. Everyone stays out his way. The guy opened the microwave and takes my friend’s food and threw it on the floor. So, my friends taken his food, which is on the top, and thrown it on the floor. The crazy guy has punched my friend in the face. The officers have come now and jumped in. My friend is fuming.

I had a shop … selling like biscuits and crisps

I had a shop, that I used to run. Just selling like biscuits and crisps, drinks, tobacco, and stuff. You could buy it and then you pay me back when canteen comes. With, a bit of interest. There was a guy called Fred (pseudonym). He used to use hard drugs. Fred used to come and get tobacco off me. Fred is a prolific late payer. He was like small and timid, but he would never run. He would always come back and tell you that. ‘Ohhh, I ain’t got it today… but I’m gonna get it for you though’. He always pays, eventually.

It wasn’t like illegal. I did my shop because, like, there’s always an opportunity for you to sell drugs, to make a buck. The shop was alright, man, because if somebody takes cans of drink and crisps and runs off, I’ll be alright with that. Instead of selling drugs and that, like, you are selling like, a hundred, £200 packs, 300, 400 pound packs and stuff and then someone’s running off. And you’re gonna be forced to have to do something.

‘I progressed’ … then ‘They kicked me out’

Then I went to, (name of prison) D cat. I suppose I progressed. They kicked me out the jail. They came for me early in the morning. They said, ‘We saw you on the phone last
night ... when they opened the flap’. That was a complete LIE. I never, in my whole time in jail, had a phone because I was just scared. Anytime I want to use a phone, I could go to my friend... and use that. I was thinking, why didn’t the officer open the door then? Why didn’t you search my cell, for the phone? You haven’t seen a phone. I was thinking, what is really going on here? So, they kicked me out. They took half of my property, and I never got it back. I was pissed off.

I went back to a Cat C, (name of prison). Back in closed conditions it was very annoying. They locked me straight up with some guy, who was in for statutory rape. I had to figure out how to get a single cell. [Another] guy, we were banged up together for a little while. He was actually, like, a relatively stable guy. Like we could have a decent conversation. He used to bring in spice. He used to go visit his MUM. And his mum would bring it in. In her vagina. He would take it and put it up his arse, in the visit. He would be selling it on the wing. I was just looking, I was thinking like, your Mum.. bring that in though. His DAD gave him HEROIN, when he was like six years old. Some people, the hand they are dealt, it’s just bad hand. I try my best not to judge. You know what I’m saying. This life is a funny game

I actually appealed that. I got my D cat back within a month. Cause it was ballock. So, when they gave me my D cat back, it took a good like, four months still. By that time, I had been in jail for five and a bit years. I ended up going to (name of prison). That's what I saw out my time.

I was doing every, every and any course

I didn’t have any courses that I HAD to do. I just started doing every and any course that they throw at me. I've got a bunch of certificates. Cause .. they weren’t really difficult. I just wanted to, just get as many certificates as I could man, to make it look good. Just to let people know that I am willing to progress and do things that are productive. It definitely helped. Whenever I showed anyone all my certificates, they would always be like ‘Ohh wow’

Some were ok. But the majority of them for me weren’t. I think I did one critical thinking course. The psychological stuff. That was good. But then other courses I can’t remember them, that’s how crazy is. I think they just tick boxes for the prison the majority of the time.

I tried to get into the gym, to try and better myself. Try and read. Cause I never really read on the outside. I tried to do a bunch of stuff, played games. I played a lot of chess. We played video games. Played a lot of table tennis. I was number one in prison. Something I could do then to get a buck.

Reflecting back

Prison can either be a help or hindrance to your life and it all depends on what it is that you're trying to get out of prison. Nobody wants to go to prison, but when you're there, how is it that you want this to affect you? Some people look at it like, Oh yeah, I’m in Jail man, I can meet all these guys that are gonna be able to like, sell me drugs for a good price or I could meet a good guy that’s good at fraud. It was to do with my mentality. [I] became my own best friend. You don't need anybody. To be strong. I tried to like, fortify, my mind. Mature a bit and see wow like. What were we up to man?

My younger ones, like my nephew I try to .., make them have a good understanding of things, like world, politics, and everything. If they can train you to think well, then you'll be able to reduce what makes sense to do directly. Having knowledge of different areas always helps, man. No knowledge is bad knowledge.

Changes to Prison

Treating people with dignity and respect and allowing them to know that. Just calling them by their first names. You bring them to prison; it is supposed to try and improve their mind. But ... it's just, builds badness. The whole punishment, punishment, punishment thing. It just builds rebels, man
Appendix V: Tabulated Summary Stories

Jimmy's prison Story. I chose the wrong path. Gained a crime family. I continued to level up. I never gave up and I made myself change.

Core Elements of Story

'I chose the wrong path'
- Good law abiding parents
- Stopped football; passion, good at and belonging
- Turning point; kicked out of home and school
- I choose the wrong path
- Turned to the streets
- Too much time on hands
- Hanging around on the block
- Gained a crime family
- Respected for badness and being good at it

Learning the ropes & Levelling up
- The first time. I had nothing. I don't know nothing.
- I'd questioned this, what's this?
- I'm asking the people that's in it.
- Just figure things out.
- Brothers showed me the ropes.
- Turned Muslim. It's a lifestyle and being part of something.
- You start meeting other criminals
- Got myself onto Enhanced wing
- Levelling up: cleaner to serving officers
- Cell workouts

It's hitting me harder; I'm trying to change my path
- Loved ones in community, feeling disappointment
- Inmate hung himself
- Smoked spice (didn't know it was spice)
- In Block: racist officers
- Friend murdered in prison
- Go library. I've wrote poems.
- Record music: a good release
- A lot of courses (gas course)

'I'm out the game now'
- When I was young, I just thought it was a bit of fun
- I became a career criminal
- I've lost a lot of time in prison
- Nobody made me change
- I made myself change.
- I'm out the game now
- I've got my kids
- Nothing is going to make me risk my freedom
- Freedom is everything

Main Characters
- Parents (Law abiding & hard-working)
- Football family
- Teachers; not patient
- Crime family
- Co-d in prison together
- Other criminals; in the same boat
- Brothers at Mosque
- Officers
- Cell-mate; Westwood workout
- Pal got murdered in prison
- Own family

Main events
- Aged 10/11 turning point - stopped football
- Kicked out of home & school
- Turned to the street & crime family - respected for badness
- Learnt the rope from inmates
- Levelling up on jobs
- Friend got shot up in a cab
- Pal got murdered in prison
- Cell mate cutting self
- Writing music and poems
- Out the game

Position of Self
- I chose the wrong path.
- I blame myself
- I had a lot of anger
- I learnt the ropes
- I kept levelling up
- I got myself on Enhanced
- Nobody made me change
- I made myself change

Future Scripts
- I'm out the game now. I've got my kids. I'm happy
- I want to help people in the community with mental health

Changes to prison
- Hard or kind approach
- Officers to be kinder
- Conjugal visits
- Family days
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**Ashley's prison story:** Didn’t want to be bullied, so had to handle any situation. Became hostile and violent. Convicted of something I didn’t do. Rebuilt self

**Core Elements of Story**

**Being Black; Transition from Primary to Secondary School**
- Born here; Mother and Grandfather came here
- Great grandmother was a slave
- My home life was good
- Mother: nurture & discipline
- No father in the household
- Hostility for being Black
- Yr 7: Saw incident, realised did not want to be bullied
- Fighting in school and excluded
- Lack of routine and structure

**First time in prison; have to handle whatever situation… now**
- 16yr: went to prison
- Tried to chill and be good
- Shower situation; realised have to handle whatever situation
- Issues in education because of where from
  - I'm not such a good boy, because I'm already in the system
  - First shank in jail
  - I've learnt that Jail is not for me

**I couldn't do the course; I educated myself**
- Back in community no routine, caught up in wild shit
- Accused of something I did not do
- ‘Where you from?’ powerful question caused trouble
- Internal war locked in cell
- Could not do the course; they kept saying no
- Proof I hadn't lied
- Feeling really sad

**Building myself back up; recalls**
- Prison made me hostile and violent
- I've re-build myself back
- I dived in every religion
- I educated myself
- I started doing surveys in jail
- Two friends died (going in front of train and overdose)
- I keep ending up in court for breeches

**Main Characters**
- Mother: nurture & discipline
- Grandmother (was a slave)
- Hostile community members
- Yr 11 boy bullying others
- People in community asking to handle situations
- Co-d in prison together
- Women who accused him of crime
- Spiritual friend; died of overdose
- Friend; jumped in front of train

**Main events**
- Lived in predominantly white area
- Yr 7: incident - realised did not want to be bullied
- Kicked out of school – lack of structure and routine
- 16: in prison tried to chill
- Shower situation; had to handle whatever situation
- Arrested and sentence for something I did not do
- Could not do rehabilitation programme in prison
- Internal war
- Proof I had not done it
- Could not do course; educated myself
- Kept getting recalled

**Position of Self**
- I was born a monster
- I cared about my reputation
- I started being aggressive
- I landed myself in prison
- I tried to be good
- I was accused of something I didn’t do
- I had an internal war
- My faith and friend pulled me out
- Perception changed
- Educated myself

**Future Scripts**
- I am not going back in
- I want to do servery
- I've seen this car crash happened; I want to help others I

**Changes to prison**
- The regime does not work
- Courses need to be better
- Officer’s attitude
- They need people like me to help make the change, not people that wear suits and ties.
Jerome’s prison story: Home was good, friends fell out. I had to learnt to cope, others made it easier, football helped. I’m more reserved now.

Core Elements of Story

Home life was always really good; Different groups fell out
- Home life was always really good
- Got on well with parents
- Loved school
- Year 10/11 groups fell out
- Altercations with people in the area: choose best friend
- 16: had to moved out
- Football scheme & ICT at college
- Looking for a job was difficult
- Group of friends, running around, got up to some stuff
- 17yrs - Friend killed
- Stopped and searched by police

‘Learn how to cope; It’s all the little things’
- Missed birth of son
- First time: feeling anxious
- On the defence with officers
- Running in to people got problems with
- Having Co-D helped
- Met people that told me the best things to do etc.
- Spent most the time going to the gym or playing football
- Fights over phones
- Having fights: that place gets the better of people

On the lifer’s wing; The inmate run the wing
- Out for two years: lost apprenticeship and housing
- Back to lifer’s wing
- Some terrible cell mates: One cut himself, one drugged
- Cells are tiny: no door on toilet
- Split my tongue in two – healthcare came after 2 days
- People that work for the Govs
- Compliant do not work at all
- Inmates policing the wing: Govs bring in outside food

Keeping head down, football helped; Life after prison
- Football helped.
- Massive tournament, two games every week.
- Two cell mates, got on well with.
- Got out: probation went above and beyond to help get interviews and job.
- Did my CSCS card.
- I’m more reserved now.
- I don’t like lock doors.
- Anger is gone down a lot
- Best friend passed in car crash

Main Characters
- Parents: got on well with
- Older brother and older sister
- Group of friends
- Best friend from other area
- Other people in the area
- The council
- Police officers
- The Govs
- Co-d & Cells mates
- Misses & Kids

Main events
- Home life was good
- Different groups falling out
- Choosing best friend
- 16yrs: had to moved out
- 17yrs: Friend killed
- Football in prison was helpful
- Cell mate self-harmed
- Closest friend passed away in car crash
- Probation helped
- Decent job and family

Position of Self
- My family were good
- I loved school
- Just a group of friends
- I had to move out due to issues
- Prison gets the better of you
- I was calmer second time
- Football helped me keep busy
- I made myself change, but probation did help

Future Scripts
- I’m more reserved
- I’m more reserved now
- My anger has gone down

Changes to prison
- Food wasn’t good
- You have to order from the canteen - It depends on how much money you have
- Officer’s approach needs to change
- The workshops were useless.
- Healthcare to be more responsive
- More interactive stuff like sports, gym competition, football
- Better courses. ICT, trade
- Phones in cell is really needed
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Jorge’s prison story: Riding the waves, lion’s den - hoping I can make it through, avoiding trouble, progressing, doing courses, and getting on with time

Main Elements

‘Childhood was alright’; ‘Riding the waves’
- Childhood was alright
- Werent’ rich
- Parents strict & wanted us to be smart
- Living in London: promoted to be like that (rob or be robbed)
- School Spiralling: started in top classed
- Went to Nigeria: ‘should have’ opened eyes
- Friend going to prison
- College & University
- Dropped out of University
- Working to make ends meet

‘New fish’; ‘Hope I can make it through’; Wish for freedom
- Hearing about prison from friends
- Mentally preparing for prison
- The new fish in Lion’s den
- Knowing Co-Ds
- Thinking can I make it through?
- Feeling enclosed
- Wishing for freedom
- Feeling in the thick of it
- Avoiding fights – did not want family to think under pressure
- Small cells & difficult cell-mate

That’s the rules; This is what things start over
- Rules in the laundry: who puts washing in first
- Laundry could have caused a fight
- Rules on microwave: who puts food in first
- Friends fighting - not knowing how to navigate the situation
- Officers shutting the door and not helping

‘I progressed’; Reflecting Back
- Progressing and moving forward
- Had a shop - selling like biscuits and crisps (to avoid selling drugs)
- Doing every and any course that they throw at me.
- Got a bunch of certificates - to make it look good
- Tried to better self
- Keeping busy: gym, reading, chess, video games, table tennis

Main Characters
- Nigerian parents
- Sisters, little brothers (4 siblings)
- Friends: up to mischief
- Friend: prison in secondary school
- Mandem & Co-d: in same prison
- Friends in Workshop
- Cell-mates
- Officers (stepping in or not)

Main Events
- Crime promoted in London
- School spiralling (start in top classed, then spiralled)
- Dropped out of University
- New fish in prison; felt enclosed
- 14 year sentence
- Learning the rules and weighing up what to do
- Crazy moments about little things
- Avoiding trouble
- Doing every course, and keeping busy

Position of Self
- My upbringing wasn’t too hard
- You learn how to move
- I spiralled in school
- I got caught in the waves
- I went to prison due to a combination of experience
- I kept my head up
- I tried to better my self
- I became my own best friend

Future Scripts
- Educating others i.e., nephews
- No knowledge is bad knowledge

Changes to prison
- Treating people with dignity and respect
- Calling them by their first names
- Should improve their mind
- It builds badness
- Shouldn’t be punishment on punishment: that builds rebels
**AJ prison story.** Life wasn’t fairy tale. I tried to be good, but it didn’t get me anyway. Banged up in a shithole. Jail lifestyle is not for me.

### Main Elements

#### Life wasn’t a fairy tale; This good guy thing isn’t working
- Life wasn’t a fairy tale
- My mum had seven kids
- 7yrs: Dad passed away
- School; did not do any work
- Excluded from school
- Moved to Ghana & Caned
- Came back more reserved
- Went in with the year below
- Robbed on the bus
- Best friend killed
- Good guy thing isn’t working

#### It was a shithole; When you don’t care you don’t care
- Prison; poor living conditions
- Induction wing; ‘where you from?’
- Worked in call centre (prison); act like a normal person
- Got bail; so happy threw bags
- Back in for 15 months
- Hectic inside
- Banged up 23 hours a day

#### Jail Relationship with officers
- Got run over; broken bones; knew who did it
- Son born
- Mum died of cancer
- Carrying a knife
- Anxious & felt like shit parent
- Officer bought phones in
- Enhanced prisoner
- Sent to block for 2 months
- Bent up by officers
- Put on wing where there was person who had issue with

#### Jail lifestyle is not for me
- Brawl in prison
- Jail lifestyle is not for me
- Played a lot of football
- Doing any course so not sitting in cell all day
- Can’t remember any of course
- Started open university
- Fight with inmate
- Did a radio course & show

### Main Characters
- Mother
- Father
- Step-father
- 6 siblings
- Best friend
- Friend who was killed
- Govs
- Missus and children
- Gang and gang issues

### Main events
- Father passed away
- Kicked out of school
- Moved to Ghana for 3 years
- Bus incident - Phone robbed
- Friend killed
- London Riots
- Run over
- Son born
- Mother passed away
- Put on wing with issues on
- Sent to Block for 2 months
- Beaten up and moved back
- Doing any course and playing football

### Position self
- My life wasn’t a fairy tale
- School was pointless
- I tried to be good
- Being a good guy doesn’t get you anywhere
- I felt anxious
- I felt like a shit parent
- I was set up by officers, when they put me a wing with issues on
- I just wanted to keep busy and pass the time
- I let prison lifestyle isn’t for me

### Future scripts
- Jail lifestyle is not for me
- The railway helped as it gave me a job – they don’t get about convictions

### Changes to prison
- Officer’s sense of listening and caring
- Pay officer’s more money
- Healthcare – be more responsive
- Medication – they over prescribe
Appendix W: Reflective diary entries for Data Analysis

Reflection

16.09.2023 – Follow up interview with Participant 1
Today I went through the final summary story with [Participant 1]. He said ‘You done a good job. Yeah that’s my story’. I felt so proud and that I had really done a good job. This is what this project is about. I felt quite overwhelmed after this meeting, and that the research had actually been achieved. We had actually done it. This is why I did the project. Interesting he also said that it was a shame he can’t use his real name as it’s his story, not the pseudonym. This led me to reflect on the ethical guidelines of pseudonyms, and why we have them, and the consideration if he really did want to use his own name.

22.09.2023 - Familiarising and immersing myself in the stories
Over the last two weeks, I have been familiarising and immersing myself with the five stories. I have been listening to the audio-recordings and reading the transcripts. This familiarisation has really given me a sense of each of the five individual stories, the core elements, and the structural elements, including the pauses and language used. In terms of structure, all participants started with stories from before prison and their childhood. They storied their first experiences of prison, learning and settling into the prison environment, and then changes to self and to prisons. In terms of language, I noticed all of the participants used the language ‘do you know what I mean?’. I wondered whether this was a saying they used, but also whether it was used more due to my outsider researcher position. I was conscious when listening to these stories that they were co-constructed with me and the impact this has had on the stories which were shared and how they were shared. I wondered whether some of the words such as, ‘badness’ were abstract terms used to protect me from the details of offending, or whether it was linked to them not wanting to talk about this part of their life. I thought about my emotional responses when listening/reading to the stories, and how this impacted upon my lens. For example, which stories I was most drawn to. I felt like I was drawn to stories of disadvantage, power, and further oppression due to their race and racism. I wondered whether others would be drawn to these stories and whether the participants would also feel these are the most dominant narratives.

The quotes that stuck out for me include, ‘life wasn’t a fairy tale’, ‘it is what it is’. It had me thinking about the end of that sentence. It is what it is… [for someone like me]. This appeared to be an ordinal story for young Black men in London. I was also drawn to the stories about who polices the wing, and stories of power, and the little things such as fighting over microwaves. I was also surprised by some of the findings. There were not many stories of specific racism in prison. I wondered whether this was a normalised experience and something that was just ordinal, and also there was a real sense that the participants did not want me to feel sorry for them. Also, although there were stories of disadvantage, it was not structured in this way, and all the participant talked about choices they made which led to prison. There was a real sense of taking responsibility and not blaming others. I think it has been helpful to reflect on my initial thoughts, prior to talking to these others, including the participants.

22.09.2023 – Discussion with Principal Supervisor about collective Stories
Today I met with my principal supervisor, and I talked through the five individual stories, the dominative narratives which appeared to come up for the young Black men. I talked about the collective stories of the basics, and how the participants told stories of losing privacy, freedom, and autonomy, and how there was fights over the ‘little things’, like microwaves and washing machines. It was interesting to think how different this was to the narrative of the ‘holiday camp’, which is often
portrayed in media. I talked about all the childhood challenges they faced, and how they did not frame it as traumatic, but normalised it. I also talked a lot about power, and how it was complex within the prison system. My principal supervisor commented on story phenomenon including the showering in prison, and how a dominant narrative in prison is that prisoners get TV and other rewards. We talked a lot about the flawed prison system, and how it is not that different to the oppressive community for these men. We discussed how more money in prison made the prison experience easier, and this depended on others sending money in. We also discussed there was a real lack of stories on rehabilitation. This meeting felt really helpful as it helped to channel my thoughts, see a different lens of my interpretation, and consider these stories in broad narratives.

05.10.2023 – Discussion with Research Consultant about collective stories
Prior to today’s meeting, the RC had read all five individual stories. I then asked him to talk through the collective stories which he felt were the most dominant. He discussed the similarities and differences between the participants and focused on the language used to tell the stories. The RC discussed that the stories felt like ordinal experiences for young Black men in London, and how the mentality was ‘it is what it is’, and how they had to navigate through the challenges, often on their own. He felt that a dominant narrative was the relationship between the participants and officers, and how this affected their prison time. He also talked about a sense of just getting through and passing the time. There was a real sense that the purpose of prison was just to get through and keep busy. Although there was limited rehabilitation. This conversation was really helpful, as it allowed me to see a different lens and perspective of the stories. In this meeting I really tried to listen and not interrupt when the RC was talking as I really wanted to get their overall impression, without my influence. I was also mindful that I had written the summary stories, so I had still prioritised the information included, and therefore I did not want to jump in and impact his lens. I wanted to amplify his voice and interpretation of these stories.

05.10.2023 - Group collective story sharing with 4 participants
Today I met with 3 participants in-person and 1 participant online to discuss the collective stories. Each participant talked about some of the core elements in their story, including core characters, core events, and stories which stuck out. We discussed the individual stories, and then talked about the collective stories which stuck out. The participant talked about the little things in prison, they felt like the big things, including the phones and microwaves. They stated that relationships with officers were key. While there was a couple of helpful officers, they also talked about officers abusing power, and not being helpful. They also talked about having to keep themselves busy in prison in order to ‘get through’. Interestingly, they did not talk directly about power, but they talked about a system where they did not get any freedom, or autonomy, and that at times it was dehumanising. Again, they did not talk directly about overt racism, but they talked about having more trouble in prison due to community issues and officers not supporting this. This meeting was really helpful. It was really nice to hear the individuals tell their story in a group and consider the similarities and differences between the stories. It made me consider how the project would have been different if we had shared stories in a group. The individual who was online was really quiet, and I also wondered how this would have impacted his story if he shared in a group. It felt like a community of individuals who wanted to make changes to prison. I could really feel the passion from the participants, and I wondered if this project had helped to spark that. Finally at the end I asked the participants about how they found this process, and they discuss finding it ‘alright’ and ‘mildly therapeutic’ and it was good to talk about changes to prison. However, it was also clear that prison reform is complex prison and there is no easy option. I felt quite emotional after this meeting, due to seeing what I had helped to create and see the passion from the men, and how I have help to amplify their experiences.
### Appendix X: Additional quotations

#### STORY: ‘Life [before prison] wasn’t a fairy tale’ (AJ; Stories of challenges)

##### Sub-story: ‘Riding the waves’ (Jorge): Navigating through childhood challenges

- **AJ**: ‘Erm. (.) life was ok, I suppose. It wasn’t a fairy tale, I suppose. But. (2) from my opinion, wasn’t the worst’
- **Jorge**: ‘My upbringing was. It wasn’t hard, like, I dunno, it wasn’t, everything’s relative innit?’
- **Ashley**: ‘I moved to (name of place in London), which was predominantly a white area then. Erm. So, like I had to deal with a lot of like um skinhead and hostility… So, yeah being Black in (name of place) is a headache… Like people will kill you, just because you are Black. (laughs)’
- **Jerome**: So, my best friend was from a different area than, what, where I lived. … then along the years where I lived, they, they caught tension with that area. So. (3). It was a thing where they were like, your friends from there, you live here. (2). You gotta choose kind of thing. Yeah, so obviously I choose my friend (2). And then it caused problems with where I lived, yeah.’
- **Jimmy**: ‘I think everything started going bad, when I was about 10 or 11. And erm, so that’s when the football, football, career messed up for me and after that, that’s when I kind of turned to know the streets. But hanging out with erm. (.) erm., less positive people… too much time on my hands’
- **Jorge**: ‘Did Uni for one year, and then dropped out. Just trying to look for money… trying to make it make sense… That’s when. Yeah, it all happened. Yeah. And then, yeah, erm, we committed our offences’.
- **AJ**: ‘My step-dad had a stroke’
- **AJ**: ‘My dad passed away when I was younger. So, death wasn’t really. That was my real. Cause he died when I was like seven’
- **AJ**: ‘I think it was (date). And then. My friend got killed’
- **Jorge**: ‘Walking down the high street, and then you see those guys that, you know, yeah, those guys gonna try and rob us…When you’re grown now, you know, it’s like roles reversed… It was only promoted for you to be, erm, like that’
- **Jimmy**: ‘Everyone kind of like respected me for that. For getting kicked out and being the naughty person. And it made me feel like yeah, you get me? I felt like something for once’
- **AJ**: ‘Obviously, I had a lot of gang issues, but, especially my mum dying, it made me feel like I had to carry a knife init. Not to say, to look for people but just to protect myself’
- **Jimmy**: ‘I always knew I was gonna come [to jail] innit, which is sad isn’t it’.

##### Sub-story: ‘I was a bad guy’ (Jimmy): constructed as ‘bad’

- **Jorge**: ‘My parents were on to us about our books from early. So, (coughs), they wanted to make sure that we were smart’
- **Jimmy**: ‘My parents, there were actually good, erm, hard working. You know what I mean? Law abiding citi-. Law abiding citizens’
- **Jerome**: ‘I loved school. It was great’
- **AJ**: ‘Erm. I got kicked out of secondary school’.
- **Ashley**: ‘I got kicked out of school for fighting. I got excluded in. (2) year 10’
- **Jimmy**: ‘I got kicked out of school’
- **Jimmy**: ‘They didn’t have a real patience for me and every time something I didn’t do what they wanted or anytime I didn’t conform, they’ll just try and put me down or just send me out’
- **Jorge**: ‘I started secondary school in the top classes and then started spiralling’
- **Jorge**: ‘… at school, I just started to spiral with friends and stuff. I started to, you know? I didn’t, I mean, I didn’t do anything extreme in school or anything, but then my grades just started to slip, man’
- **Ashley**: ‘My family have this little saying, ‘He was born a monster, but raised a gentleman’.
- **Jimmy**: ‘Yeah, it was all crazy. I was a bad guy man’.
- **Jimmy**: ‘We were doing so much badness’
- **Jorge**: ‘Getting up to some mischief sometimes, you know’
- **Ashley**: ‘I’m caught up in wild shit’
- **Jerome**: ‘I dunno how to put it ( .) It was weird. So, um we got up to some stuff, that we got up to’
- **Jerome**: ‘When I was younger, it was ridiculous. [I’d get stopped and searched] Like two or three times a day … The funny thing is because they don’t know, cause I do a lot of sport. I’ve never smoked in my life. The first thing they’ll say is ‘you smell of marijuana’. But I wouldn’t. I’ve never ever even tried it in my entire life’
- **AJ**: ‘That for me, made me realise like, this good guy thing, I been trying to do. It doesn’t get you nowhere…I kinda just snapped back into my old habits’
- **Jorge**: ‘Walking down the high street, and then you see those guys that, you know, yeah, those guys gonna try and rob us…When you’re grown now, you know, it’s like roles reversed… It was only promoted for you to be, erm, like that’
- **Jimmy**: ‘Obviously, I had a lot of gang issues, but, especially my mum dying, it made me feel like I had to carry a knife init. Not to say, to look for people but just to protect myself’
- **Jimmy**: ‘I always knew I was gonna come [to jail] innit, which is sad isn’t it’.

---
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**STORY: 'It's home now' (Jerome): Stories of coping**

**Sub-story: ‘Learning the ropes’ (Jimmy): stories of learning and adapting**

- **Jimmy:** ‘First time I went there I was like. Ohh. Oh, oh, old arse prison. It's Victorian. It's like you see on the TV’
- **AJ:** ‘You see things on TV and that. Like little things, like showering, what's the showering situation. Like, it was just like learning things like that. It's not everything that you see on the TV’.
- **Ashley:** ‘So, when you shower in prison, I remember at first I would see people showering with their boxers on in the shower, and stuff (laughs). I've always found that weird (laughs). … Anyway, now I'm showering, and I've got these guys standing at the door, trying to converse with me (laughs) … I turned around, and I'm like ‘Bro, I'm naked’ (laughs). And it shows you how innocent I was (laughs), cause I'm literally just thinking like, Bro I'm naked, why am I going to talk to you when I'm naked, this is weird. This was my whole perception. But it was like instantly I had to learn that it’s doesn't matter if you are naked or clothed, you have to handle whatever situation this is right now’.
- **Jimmy:** ‘I just felt like home, I'll be honest, it just felt like home, which is weird. It felt like cause, I'm surrounded by people who's like me. Yeah, everyone here has done bad to get here. So, like, we're in the same boat. It's like yeah cool. No one's better than no one. It felt like home. I wasn’t scared. I wasn't nervous.’
- **AJ:** ‘Scary. I'm not gonna lie. Fear of the unknown’
- **Jerome:** ‘Cause it was my first time, I didn't really know what to expect, to be fair. Yeah I was feeling a bit anxious’
- **Jorge:** ‘It’s like a Lion's den. It’s like big three floors of cells, you know what I’m saying. Now everyone’s now looking at the new fish’.
- **AJ:** Induction was alright. They literally said, ‘Have you got any problems? Certain areas?’, that kinda thing.
- **Jorge:** ‘I was just quiet. I was just observing. So, just trying to take as much information in as I could’
- **Jimmy:** ‘Couple of the brothers … they was good to man. Showed me the ropes’
- **Jerome:** ‘So, I met a few people, that had problems with the same people as me… They told me what times was the best times to go gym. … I started talking to people that was on the servery, so I ended up getting more food’

**Sub-story: ‘Pass the time’ (Jerome); stories of getting through**

- **Jerome:** ‘It does get frustrating but, you just learn how to cope with it after a while. You have your bad days, but. Literally just try and cope with it, yeah’
- **Jerome:** ‘I think everyone was trying to get on with their time’
- **Jorge:** ‘make the time pass easier’
- **Jerome:** ‘I was by myself. Yeah. So that made yeah, then time goes slow’.
- **Jerome:** ‘It gives you time to take your mind off of it. Where you are really. Yeah and getting on with your sentence’
- **Ashley:** ‘I remember thinking …You're gonna just chill. You're gonna be a good boy… So, then I got to prison. And I was still chilled. That chilled lasted for like, I think (4) I think like two weeks … within in those two weeks, there was a lot of violence.’
- **Jimmy:** ‘So I was having basically a shit time, init. I had enough. Nah I didn't have enough, but I was having a shit time’
- **Ashley:** ‘I've been in jail for some bullshit, dealing with my own shit, because when I was in jail. I I. It was, It was a very internal war, when I was jail for that’
- **Ashley:** ‘I’m having a crazy internal war. Like, I’m dealing with things I didn’t even know I had to deal with’
- **AJ:** ‘Yeah, compared to (name of prison) where its 23 and half hours bang up’
- **Jimmy:** ‘I like to keep busy. I like to do something with my time’
- **Jimmy:** ‘They just don’t care. See that one that put us on 23 hour bang up’
- **Jimmy:** ‘So, then we were just going gym. Ohh yeah. And then recording. This one is where I started recording music for Chapel. Yeah, so this time I didn't care about no job. Ohh, I've got music dreams now. Writing poems, music dreams (laughs).. I used to go library’
- **Jerome:** ‘I spent most the time going to the gym or playing football’
- **Jimmy:** ‘Yeah, I mean. me and him used to do cell workouts to Westwood’
- **Jorge:** ‘Yeah, table tennis table, played a lot of table tennis’
- **Jimmy:** ‘I worked as a cleaner, servery, Kitchens’
- **AJ:** ‘Any course I could do in there, I was doing innit. I saw it as I’m not doing anything else. I’m here for two years, like, you know what I mean. If I’m not gonna do this, I'm gonna be sitting in the cell all day’.
- **Jorge:** ‘I did my shop. I did that because, like, there's always an opportunity for you to sell drugs, whatever, and make a buck, buck. But the shop was alright, man, because if somebody takes cans of drink and crisps and runs off, I'll be alright with that.’
**STORY:** ‘People got too much power’ (AJ); Stories of power

**Sub-story: ‘Lowest of the low’ (AJ); stories of losing agency**

- **Jorge:** ‘Well, I may as well start from the beginning. I was in the. You know what the sweatboxes are innit (name of researcher)?’
- **Jorge:** ‘The toilet is right next to … the foot of the bed. It's just there when someone is taking a shit.’
- **Jerome:** ‘No shower, just a small toilet with a fake like wooden half door, not even a full door’
- **AJ:** ‘The cells that they had, with the bunk beds in … they were made for one person…there is no door for the toilet. Its literally like a curtain. So you are in a cell, with a person, having to use the toilet with a curtain’.
- **AJ:** ‘It was bad. It was a shithole innit. Poor living conditions. It was dirty’
- **AJ:** ‘They put me in a block, for like two months…23 and half hours … Like, my senses of the day, and the time and that, they all went. Like, the food was shit. I'm in the prison clothes. … No TV … I've had some shitty little wind-up radio.’
- **Jimmy:** ‘…being a young black guy. Yeah. Like you, you get targeted innit. See everyone just thinks gangs innit’.
- **AJ:** ‘A lot people have this perspective of us being aggressive and problematic… So, people sometimes have that opinion of us before they even know us, innit? … it's like, it’s a proven, you have to try to prove that you're not like that. Like you don't even give me a chance to even to show that I'm not … Not everyone's a gang member. Not everyone's aggressive… I just feel like, in the prison system especially. I feel like, people of other ethnicities, they kinda get a chance to prove how they are’
- **Jerome:** ‘I've had some terrible cell mates. One tried to kill himself. I was on my bunk. I was on my bunk, I was on the bottom bunk, and I've just seen blood dripping down. I've looked up and he slit his wrists. And when I've rang the cell bell to call the Gov to say, 'yo get this guy out my cell'. And they took like two hours to come. Between an hour and a half and two hours to come. They are just terrible, and that’s just standard’
- **Jorge:** ‘You know, everyone has a prison number. They call you by your name, by your surname or your prison number… you have to call them sir or miss’
- **Jimmy:** ‘They just don't care. See that one that put us on 23hour bang up, the one that had come from the women’s jail. She. Um. Basically, what she did was. Some guy was. It was Sunday morning, and so the officers were upstairs. The guy was saying 'say goodbye to tell my son I love him’. Um. You know, Yeah what I mean? She didn't help, and he hanged himself straight away’
- **Jerome:** ‘The food was terrible… On the menu there would be two things, but it would look like the food they cooked yesterday, and they have just reheated it.’
- **Jerome:** ‘Complaints do not work at all. It’s pointless. No-one’s gonna read it. They say they do, but no-one’s gonna read it. Nothing ever happens’
- **Jimmy:** ‘Ohh that's why you have to have money, you have to have canteen, because that isn't going nowhere. Oh you’d be starving’
- **Jerome:** ‘I had to do canteen food. It depends on how much money you have. It depends on your level, if you are enhanced. If you are standards, you got your standard spend. But it just depends on who’s been sending you money, and if you have got enough money’

**Sub-story: ‘They are policing the wing’ (Jerome); nuances of power**

- **AJ:** ‘They literally beat me up, carried me back to, back to the same wing’
- **Jimmy:** ‘I’ve seen them [officers] bend people up unnecessarily, un- un- unnecessarily, like for nothing. Yeah and one time, there was these guys having a fight, one I remember them coming in. … yeah mad things like knees in the back. But I don’t know if that’s racism or just how you know. But it doesn't take 10 to, to bend up one man (laughs). Not like that anyway.’
- **AJ:** ‘One of the officers got arrested in there, for bringing in drugs and phones… She was charging people £1000 in time, and she would bring in four phones and a bit of drugs… she brought a lot of phones in innit, like the whole jail was flooded innit’.
- **AJ:** ‘If they are getting crap money, and then some of the people who are in prison, have got access to serious money, like millions sometimes. Then, obviously they are going to, some people will get swayed to do certain things’
- **Jorge:** ‘There were two members of staff in there at the time. And they had their little office just there, while all of this commotion was going on. … And they just closed their room and stayed there. They wanted no part of it, you know’
- **Jerome:** ‘My cell mate had an altercation with somebody cause I got involved in the fight. So once they broke it up, instead of the Gov putting it, like me back into my cell, she's put me back into one of the people that work for her's cell. And then she's waited until everyone is banged up and she’s opened the door and five of them have run in. But they realise they’re my friend, so they are like. ‘Nah, he’s alright, so it’s a misunderstanding’. So now I’ve looked at the Gov, like ‘Is this what you guys are doing?’ So, if I wasn’t one of them. Yeah, we've gone right. And then nothing would have happened to them. They would have got no nickings [punishments], nothing, cause they're doing it for her… Yeah so they are policing the wing… They could get away with murder’
STORY: ‘I’m out the game now’ (Jimmy); Stories of change

Sub-story: ‘I made myself change’ (Jimmy); Stories of self-change

- **Jimmy**: ‘I’m just wiser now. Obviously, at first, when I was young, and I just thought it was a bit of fun… I’m out the game now (laughs). I’m out the game. I’m writing books and stuff’.
- **Ashley**: ‘When you’re 15, you think you are all that… Now I’m more (2). I’m wiser now. My anger is not there no more. My anger has been channelled into other things. Like, I’m a very good musician’.
- **Jimmy**: ‘I don’t stay out for too long do I? (laughs). I’ve got a whole new mentality now, I’ve just come out. Finally, home’.
- **All participants** storied the realisation that they did not want to be in prison.
- **Jimmy**: ‘You start meeting other criminals… Yeah, so, he started teaching me with that…. I’ve got a whole new way of life’.
- **Jerome**: ‘I’ve been having basically a shit time, innit. I had enough’.
- **Ashley**: ‘I’m in the 23 hour lock up. I’ve got, I’m having a crazy internal war. Like, I’m dealing with things I didn’t even know I had to deal with’. 
- **Ashley**: ‘I’ve learnt that its [Jail] is not for me. But I haven’t learnt how to manoeuvre through life’.
- **Jimmy**: ‘It weren’t anyone made me change. I made myself change’.
- **Ashley**: ‘I’ve rebuilt myself’.
- **Jimmy**: ‘Now I’ve got my kids and that. Nah, there’s nothing really. For me personally, nothing is going to make me risk my freedom, freedom is everything’.
- **AJ**: ‘I think me being there while she was born, kinda, made me promise myself, like yeah, like this jail lifestyle is not for me’.
- **AJ**: ‘I can’t even remember man, I can’t even remember. That’s how useless it is, I can’t even remember.’
- **Jorge**: ‘I just started doing courses. I’ve got a bunch of certificates and started doing any and every course, man, you know what I’m saying? Cause really, really and truly, (2), they weren’t really difficult, at all… I just wanted to just get as many certificates as I could man, to make it look good, you know? … Some were ok. (3). A lot of them, erm. They could be helpful (3), but erm (2), the majority of them for me weren’t’.
- **Ashley**: ‘So, not only have I been taken out of the system and put in jail, now, and coming back to the community, I’m not even coming back to my community. I’m not allowed in my community’.
- **Jerome**: ‘They got me my apprenticeship, for where I work now. They are actually good. They are actually helping people… they were getting me interviews upon interviews upon interviews. And the positions they are getting me interviews for are like careers. Like they are not dead end jobs’.
Sub-story: ‘Now this is the list’ (Jerome); Changes to prison

- **Jerome:** ‘Now this is the list now. The food wasn’t good. Um a lot of the support from the POs was terrible. The regime was terrible. The workshops were useless. Um (3). Um Um Um. Even like the separation of the prison was useless as well’.

- **Jimmy:** ‘The hard way, you know like back in the day… make everyone go for jogs… like the army… cut off all their hair… Should just make it hell (laughs)… Or you could do, you could do the nice approach. Where you could be like give everyone everything… Make them feel at home. Make them feel cause you know what I mean? it’s, it’s already a bad situation’.

- **Jimmy:** ‘Or you could do, you could do the nice approach. Where you could be like give everyone everything. You know what I mean? (.) It was enhanced. Give them all luxury. Make them feel at home. Make them feel cause you know what I mean? it’s it’s already a bad situation, but at least it’s. Because if people are struggling, it’s just mean they cut up and take drugs and. If you got nice. If you just feel like, but then it just. They just want to stay there. Put fridges in their cells and get them keys to their doors’.

- **Jimmy:** ‘The officers need to be more kinder and more human. And they should even be like, do a social worker course. So, they got that social workers skill vibe. So, they can actually support. You know what I mean like slamming cells shut. We’re people too, alright’.

- **Jerome:** ‘The approach is something that needs to change. They need to be more responsive. So, if I’ve got a question, you respond to me. Sometimes they’ll literally say, ‘I don’t wanna speak to you’ or ‘I don’t know’. You say I need answers. They don’t even try to find you answers.’

- **AJ:** ‘I think they should pay them more, funny enough’

- **Jorge:** ‘What would I change? Erm, that’s a tricky one, you know, (name of researcher), man. Because I’m thinking, what is it that’s a quick fix or what is it that over time is going to make men know, that this aint it. It must go back to what we were speaking about, like in Norway and stuff. You know? Treating people with dignity and respect and allowing them to know that.

- **Jorge:** ‘The whole punishment, punishment, punishment thing. It's just it just builds rebels, man’.

- **Jorge:** ‘Treat people with more respect’

- **Jorge:** ‘They has to be a lot of research done, man’

- **Jorge:** ‘Just calling them by their first names’.

- **Jerome:** ‘I’d be putting on more interactive stuff like sports, stuff like do gym competition and do you football match football cause that football competition made like it was the talk of the town and everyone talking about it. Like everyone was excited. Cause people have got time on their hands, aren’t they? Like, actually a bit of fitness in there’

- **Jerome:** ‘The regime just doesn’t work. The way you gotta go to to your workshops. Like, like, there is always something’.

- **Jerome:** ‘If they can do more courses, better courses. Yeah, I can help you. Yeah. Like, ICT courses’

- **Jerome:** ‘The approach is something that needs to change. They need to be more responsive. So, if I’ve got a question, you respond to me. Sometimes they’ll literally say, ‘I don’t wanna speak to you’ or ‘I don’t know’. You say I need answers. They don’t even try to find you answers’.