

The Effect of CCTV on Prisoner Misbehavior

Troy J Allard, Richard K Wortley, & Anna L Stewart*

Key Centre for Ethics Law Justice and Governance, Brisbane Qld 4111 Australia

* Corresponding Author Email: T.Allard@griffith.edu.au

Troy Allard is a Research Fellow at Justice Modelling @ Griffith, within the Key Centre for Ethics, Law, Justice and Governance, Griffith University, Brisbane Qld 4111 Australia. Tel: +61 (0)7 38755649. Richard Wortley and Anna Stewart are from the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Griffith University, Brisbane Qld 4111 Australia. The authors would like to acknowledge the assistance provided by the Queensland Department of Corrective Services in allowing this research to take place.

Abstract

Despite the widespread use of closed circuit television (CCTV) in prison, few studies have explored its effect on prisoner misbehavior. Research was conducted to explore two research questions: (i) does CCTV have a greater preventative effect on non-violent than violent prisoner misbehavior, and (ii) does CCTV have a greater preventative effect on planned than unplanned violent behavior. Data were obtained on the 1,116 incidents involving aberrant prisoner behavior that occurred at four prisons in Queensland (Australia) over a six year period. Findings indicated that violent and unplanned misbehavior were relatively more likely to occur in view of CCTV coverage than were non-violent and unplanned misbehavior. The implications for the prevention of aberrant inmate behavior and for our understanding of the impact of CCTV on violence are discussed.

Introduction

While most new correctional facilities are built with CCTV technology incorporated into design and many older facilities have retrospectively fitted camera surveillance at considerable expense (Travis, Latessa, & Oldendick, 1989), few empirical studies have explored the impact of CCTV on prisoner misbehavior. Results from studies conducted in public spaces indicate that the impact of CCTV on crime varies according to its location and the nature of the crime under surveillance (Welsh & Farrington, 2002). CCTV has been found to be most effective preventing crimes in car parks (41%) compared to city centers or public housing (2%). Research findings also suggest that while CCTV may reduce some non-violent crimes, its impact on violent crime is usually negligible (Armitage, Smyth, & Pease, 1999; Brown, 1995; Chatterton & Frenz, 1994; Mahalingham, 1996; Sarno, 1996; Skinns, 1998; Tilley, 1993; Welsh & Farrington, 2002). The inability of CCTV to affect violent crime is typically attributed to its spontaneous nature (Brown, 1995; Gill & Spriggs, 2005; Phillips, 1999). Violent crimes are therefore perceived as being less amendable to deterrence through the use of camera surveillance.

The finding that CCTV has a differential impact depending on the setting in which it was implemented highlights the need for research to be conducted in the prison environment. This study explored two research questions: (i) does CCTV have a greater preventative effect on non-violent than violent prisoner misbehavior, and (ii) does CCTV have a great preventative effect on planned than unplanned violent behavior. While the inability of CCTV to affect violent behavior in public spaces has been attributed to the spontaneous nature of much violent behavior, this contention has never been empirically tested. The findings of the research will therefore improve

our understanding of the effect that CCTV has on prisoner misbehavior, how misbehavior can best be prevented, and the relationship between CCTV surveillance and violent behavior.

Prisoner Misbehavior

Inmates engage in a range of misbehaviors that have been investigated through victimization surveys, self-report surveys and official misconduct records. These behaviors result in physical victimization (inmate-on-inmate assault, inmate-on-officer assault, sexual aggression, and murder), psychological victimization (inmate-on-inmate verbal abuse or threats and inmate-on-officer verbal abuse or threats), economic victimization (theft, extortion, and robbery), and also includes behaviors that do not result in the victimization of another identifiable individual (vandalism, riots, escape, self-harm/attempted suicide, suicide, and drug-use/possession). While victimization surveys have tended to focus on the extent of behaviors resulting in inmate victimization, studies based on administrative data have focused on inmate behavior that does not typically result in the victimization of another identifiable victim (Table 1). Additionally, while the extent of drug-use has been reported based on the proportion of inmates who test positive during voluntary, random, and targeted testing, self-report measures have been used to capture drug use that does not come to the attention of authorities.

Table 1 about here

It is evident that prisoner misbehavior resulting in psychological and economic victimization occurs frequently in prison and that a significant proportion of some

behaviors such as inmate-on-inmate assaults and drug-use are not recorded in administrative databases. These forms of behavior are a perennial problem facing prison administrators and make the environment more difficult to manage. The consequences of these behaviors are widespread and potentially have a negative impact on inmates, correctional staff, correctional organizations, and ultimately on public safety (Allard, 2005; Bowker, 1980; Cohen, Cole, & Bailey, 1976; Cooley, 1993; Cullen, Latessa, Burton, & Lombardo, 1993; Eichenenthal & Jacobs, 1991; Harris, 1993; Irwin, 1980; Porporino, 1986; Shewan, Gennell, & Davies, 1994; Wright, 1994).

Situational Crime Prevention

One approach that has been applied to the prison environment in an attempt to reduce prisoner misbehavior is situational crime prevention. This approach to prevention is based on opportunity theories such as the rational choice and routine activities perspectives. According to the rational choice perspective, behavior is the result of a subjective calculation that the perceived benefits outweigh the costs in a given situational context (Clarke & Felson, 1993). Individuals are viewed as attempting to fulfill their needs through decisions or choices to engage in particular activities, with decisions likely to be based on information that is most evident and immediate (Felson & Clarke, 1998). Decisions are viewed as being constrained by factors such as time, ability, the availability and quality of information relevant to such decisions, and individual-level deficits such as impulsivity and low IQ (Clarke & Felson, 1993; Cornish & Clarke, 1986; Felson & Clarke, 1998).

The routine activity perspective places more emphasis on the social context of crime and proposes that three elements must converge in time and space for offending behavior to occur, which are a motivated offender, a suitable target, and the absence of a capable guardian (Felson & Clarke, 1998). According to the perspective, all individuals are capable of committing aberrant behavior given a salient reason or motivator (Clarke & Felson, 1993). A suitable target is any person or object that may potentially be taken or attacked, although the suitability of a target is viewed as being influenced by its position in time and space as it is affected by its perceived value, inertia, visibility and access. Targets are more likely to be attacked when they are valued highly, easy to transport (inertia), exposed to offenders (visibility), and when the offender has quick and easy access to the target (Felson & Clarke, 1998). A capable guardian keeps a “watchful eye” and may be police, security, or people going about their everyday lives such as neighborhood residents, friends, family, bystanders, or owners of property targeted.

Both the rational choice and routine activity perspectives advocate the implementation of strategies that aim to reduce opportunities for particular types of behavior by manipulating aspects of the immediate physical environment where behavior occurs (Cornish & Clarke, 2003). Findings of evaluations that have assessed the effectiveness of opportunity reducing techniques in community settings suggest that the adoption of a problem solving approach can result in meaningful reductions in offending (see for example, Eck, 2006). While the prison environment offers considerable potential for implementing situational strategies, few studies have explicitly assessed the prevention of prisoner misbehavior within a situational framework (see for example, Atlas, 1982, 1983; La Vigne, 1994; Wortley & Summers, 2005).

Most studies that have examined environmental influences on behavior in prison have focused on the spatial distribution of misbehavior and have attempted to explain the uneven distribution by referring to the nature of the location or behavior. For example, self-harm is most likely to occur in locations with little supervision (such as cells and dorm areas). Inmate-on-officer assaults have been found to occur most frequently in areas of prisoner movement where officers are in a supervisory role, including corridors, dining rooms, recreation areas, and showers (Steinke, 1991). Similarly, inmate-on-inmate assaults have been found predominately to occur in multi-purpose areas where inmates congregate and engage in unstructured activities (such as television areas, dining rooms, exercise yards, day yards, and corridors) rather than locations such as work and education where highly structured activity takes place (Dietz & Rada, 1983; Porporino, 1992; Steinke, 1991; Wener & Olsen, 1978). Cells and showers have also been found to be locations where a significant proportion of assaults occurred (Atlas, 1983; Porporino, 1992; Quinsey & Varney, 1977).

Given that assaults occur in both supervised and unsupervised locations, Atlas (1983) speculated that assaults occurring under direct supervision were usually unplanned because they tended to involve a single, unarmed assailant, while assaults occurring in less supervised locations were usually planned because they typically involved multiple, armed assailants. This is consistent with Wortley's (2002) argument that the environment may both precipitate and regulate behavior. He proposed that strategies aimed at controlling precipitators in the environment that give rise to misbehavior

may be more appropriate for preventing unplanned behavior while strategies aimed at regulating behavior may be more appropriate for preventing planned behavior.

CCTV Surveillance in Prison

CCTV surveillance has been incorporated into prison design to improve security, the level of control that officers have over the environment, and the level of supervision that officers have over inmates (Allard, Wortley, & Stewart, 2006). Purposes that have been attributed to CCTV in public spaces include detecting crime and disorder, gathering evidence, improving safety, and acting as a general site management tool (Barnard, 1988; Chatterton & Frenz, 1994; Dolahenty, 1999; Horne, 1996; Kruegle, 1997; Kyle & Aldridge, 1992; Phillips, 1999). In situational prevention terms, CCTV increases the perceived risk of misbehavior by permitting formal surveillance (Clarke, 1997; Clarke & Felson, 1993; Cornish & Clarke, 2003) or as Felson (1987) puts it, by providing a capable guardian. Where CCTV does increase the perceived risk of detection, it may prevent misbehavior or may displace misbehavior from locations under camera surveillance to locations that are not under camera surveillance (Short & Ditton, 1996, 1998; Skinns, 1998). Despite the considerable financial investments in CCTV technology, it has received little attention in the literature, and most of this attention has focused on technical aspects of CCTV installation (see for example, Atkinson, Pietrasiewicz, & Junker, 1999; Intersec, 1996, Nicholson & Vigil, 2000; U.S Department of Justice, 1995)

Only one study (Bradshaw, 2002) was located that explored the behavioral impacts of CCTV on misbehavior in the prison environment. Bradshaw's research was based on a survey of 220 inmates confined at HMYOI Glen Parva. The research assessed the

impact of CCTV by comparing self-reported victimization and offending in units with and without camera surveillance. Inmates from units with cameras in showers reported that they were threatened and assaulted less often and alternatively that they perpetrated such behavior less often. However, it should be noted that victimization and self-report data related to unit behavior rather than behavior occurring solely in shower areas.

Aims of the Current Research

The aims of the research were to explore the effect of CCTV on violent and non-violent prisoner misbehavior and to determine whether CCTV had a differential effect on planned and unplanned inmate-on-inmate assaults. Given the findings of studies conducted in public spaces, the research addressed two research questions: (i) does CCTV have a greater preventative effect on non-violent than violent prisoner misbehavior, and (ii) does CCTV have a greater preventative effect on planned than unplanned violent behavior. Findings will improve our understanding of the effect of CCTV on misbehavior in prison, and will provide insight into whether some strategies aimed at reducing prisoner misbehavior should target precipitators in the environment that give rise to behavior or reduce the opportunities in the environment that permit misbehavior.

Method

Selection of Four Prisons

This study was based on analysis of archival administrative data relating to 1,116 incidents that involved prisoner misbehavior occurring in four prisons in Queensland (Australia) over a six year period (22/10/1997 to 6/11/2003). Four prisons with

distinct prison populations (size and composition) were selected from the 12 that were operational in Queensland during 2002, as it was conceivable that each prison would have different levels of camera surveillance. These prisons included: male reception and remand (prison 1, n=683), female reception, remand, secure and residential (prison 2, n=203), male mainstream and protection (prison 3, n=332), and male secure and residential (prison 4, n=641). These four prisons were secure prisons housing maximum, high, and medium risk inmates and were all constructed with camera surveillance built into prison design.

Incident Data

The data supplied by the Queensland Department of Corrective Services (QDCS) were archival incident data. An incident is any significant event that occurs in prison, including breaches of laws or rules that may result in criminal prosecution or breach hearings and emergencies. When an incident occurs in prison, witnessing and responding officers complete an incident report by entering information relating to the incident into an electronic database called Correctional Information System (CIS). This database requires officers to provide specific information in free-text fields about the incident including date, type, location, description, cause, and action. Incident reports are usually entered into CIS immediately after an incident has occurred and provision is made for officers to update their reports as new information surfaces. Each incident is given a unique incident number that enables several reports about the same incident to be completed and linked. Information that is entered into CIS is stored in the QDCS mainframe and is accessible by other officers.

Data Coding/Recoding

Incident data provided by the department included 41 administrative categories that were recoded into twelve distinct types of misbehavior. Nineteen administrative categories were removed because they did not involve prisoner misbehavior (e.g.: officer-on-inmate assault, death due to natural causes), did not have an accurate location recorded (e.g.: fail drug test was reported as occurring in the medical/health unit where tests were performed), or because they did not take place in prison (e.g.: inmate escape from another place). The remaining incident categories were recoded into 12 distinct types of misbehavior (Table 2). These forms of misbehavior were then further recoded into violent behavior (inmate-on-inmate and inmate-on-officer assault) and non-violent behavior (remaining types of behavior).

Table 2 about here

The free-text descriptions of the locations where the misbehavior occurred were coded as either 'under camera surveillance' (30%), 'not under camera surveillance' (54%), or 'unknown' (16%) based on physical audits of the four prisons. During these audits, building names, purposes, and the status of CCTV surveillance were recorded and remarkable consistency was found in the locations that were and were not under camera surveillance (Table 3). Reliability coding was then performed by providing the General Managers of the prisons with information relating to the date and location of misbehavior and asking them to indicate the status of camera surveillance in that location at that time. While few differences emerged between coding based on physical audits and by General Managers, any differences were confirmed by contacting General Managers to confirm the status of camera surveillance.

Table 3 about here

Inmate-on-inmate assaults that took place in locations that were ‘under camera surveillance’ or ‘not under camera surveillance’ (82% of all assaults) were coded as ‘planned’ or ‘unplanned’ based on information contained in the free-text fields of incident reports. Following Atlas (1983), assaults were coded based on whether there was ‘more than one assailant’ (10%) or ‘one assailant’ (90%) and based on whether the assault involved the use of a ‘weapon’ (4%) or ‘no weapon’ (96%). Seven of these cases (1%) involved ‘more than one assailant’ and the use of a ‘weapon’. As the majority of assaults involved a single assailant and did not involve the use of a weapon, it was assumed that these atypical features would be mentioned in free-text fields if applicable.

Results

Given that the four prisons had similar locations that were and were not under camera surveillance and the low number of assaults that involved a weapon when considered across the four prisons separately, data analyses were undertaken for the four prisons on an aggregated basis. The first research question addressed by this study sought to determine whether CCTV surveillance had greater preventative effect on non-violent than violent prisoner misbehavior. Chi-square analysis indicated that there was a significant difference between non-violent and violent behavior based on the CCTV status of locations where behavior took place ($\chi^2(1, n=931) = 23.21, p < .001$). Three quarters (75%) of non-violent offences occurred in locations that were not under camera surveillance while violent offences were more evenly distributed in locations

that were (41%) and were not (59%) under camera surveillance. An examination of the specific types of misbehavior indicated that in addition to violent behavior (inmate-on-inmate assault and inmate-on-officer assault), escape and inmate-on-officer threats or verbal abuse were more randomly distributed in locations that were and were not under camera surveillance than other forms of behavior (Table 4).

Table 4 about here

The second research question sought to explore whether CCTV had a greater preventative effect on planned than unplanned violent behavior. This research question was addressed by examining whether planned (involving a weapon or more than one assailant) inmate-on-inmate assaults tended to take place in locations that were not under camera surveillance while unplanned (not involving a weapon or only involving one assailant) assaults were more randomly distributed in locations that were and were not under camera surveillance. A relationship was found between weapon status and whether assaults took place in locations that were or were not under camera surveillance ($\chi^2 (1, N=597) = 7.20, p<.01$). Similarly, the number of assailants involved in assaults was found to be related to whether they took place in locations with or without camera surveillance ($\chi^2 (1, N=596) = 11.13, p<.001$).

Over three-quarters (86%) of assaults that involved the use of a weapon took place in locations that were not under camera surveillance while assaults that did not involve the use of a weapon took place in locations that were (42%) and were not (58%) under camera surveillance. Three-quarters (78%) of assaults that involved more than one

assailant took place in locations that were not under camera surveillance while about half (44%) of assaults involving a single assailant were found to take place in locations under camera surveillance.

Discussion

The findings of this study indicated that CCTV had a greater effect on non-violent than violent prisoner misbehavior and that camera surveillance affected planned violence to a greater extent than unplanned violence. Non-violent prisoner misbehavior was found to take place relatively more frequently in locations that were not under camera surveillance while violent behavior was more randomly distributed. Examination of particular types of prisoner misbehavior indicated that escape and inmate-on-officer threats or verbal abuse were also more randomly distributed in locations with and without camera surveillance. However, there were few escapes which by their very nature would involve CCTV surveillance and inmate-on-officer threats or verbal abuse may have occurred spontaneously or in the heat of the moment. Overall, these findings lend support to the transferability of findings from studies that have been conducted in public spaces where CCTV has been found to have more effect on non-violent than violent offending.

Additionally, planned inmate-on-inmate assaults were found to predominately take place in locations that were not under camera surveillance while unplanned assaults were more randomly distributed. This finding provides support for the proposition that the inability of CCTV to affect violent behavior is due to the spontaneous nature of much violence. It highlights the importance of time for the rational choice perspective, as more organized offences were deterred by the presence of camera

surveillance. Additionally, the finding suggests that the presence of a capable guardian (i.e.: CCTV) is most effective when behavior is motivated. Perhaps strategies should be adopted that address precipitators in the environment that give rise to unplanned misbehavior (e.g., see Wortley, 2002). However, such strategies should be used in conjunction with measures aimed at reducing the opportunities for misbehavior as the findings clearly indicate the deterrent value of CCTV for planned assaults.

While findings from this study indicated that CCTV had more effect on non-violent than violent behavior and on planned than unplanned assaults, these findings should be considered in light of three main limitations of the study. Firstly, the study was based on analysis of archival administrative data that underestimates the occurrence of prisoner misbehavior, may have been distorted by disproportionate security practices, and is not subject to any external controls or checks to assess the validity of the data (Davies, 1982; Eichenhal & Blatchford, 1997; Eichenhal & Jacobs, 1991; King, 1992; O'Donnell & Edgar, 1996, 1998).

Secondly, while the method adopted in the study involved exploring the distribution of misbehavior based on whether it occurred in locations that were or were not under surveillance, this approach is far from ideal as it does not take into account the differing purposes of locations, the length of time officers or inmates spend in locations, and the features of particular locations that may contribute to misbehavior. However, alternative approaches such as pre- post- CCTV installation comparisons (ARIMA time-series) and cross-sectional comparisons of prisons with and without camera surveillance could not be adopted because all prisons in Queensland were

built with CCTV and had similar locations that were and were not under camera surveillance.

Thirdly, the distinction between planned and unplanned inmate-on-inmate assaults was made based on the criteria developed by Atlas (1993). While this criteria is theoretically plausible and provides an objective measure, it is possible that some planned assaults were coded as unplanned as officers either did not know or indicate that the assault involved the use of a weapon or more than one assailant.

Given the considerable financial investments in CCTV surveillance in prison and the lack of research exploring this technology in this environment, future research should consider adopting methodologies from studies that have been conducted in public spaces. This research could involve observation from the control room to explore how CCTV is used and the extent that it is used for detection of misbehavior (Brown, 1995; Gill, Allen, Jessiman, Kilworth, Swain, Spriggs, Hemming, Kara, & Little, 2005; Norris & Armstrong, 1999), attitudinal based surveys to explore the impact of CCTV on feelings of safety (Brown, 1995; Chatterton & Frenz, 1994; Mahalingham, 1996; Musheno, Levine, & Palumbo, 1978; Sarno, 1996; Spriggs, Argomaniz, Gill, & Bryan, 2005), and interviews with officers to explore the evidence gathering capabilities of CCTV (Wilson & Sutton, 2003).

Further research exploring the effect of CCTV on prisoner misbehavior is also required and consideration should be given to adopting pre- post- CCTV installation comparisons or cross-sectional comparisons of prisons with and without camera surveillance if possible (Phillips, 1999; Welsh & Farrington, 2002; Gill & Spriggs,

2005). Given the findings of this study, future exploration of planned and unplanned behavior is warranted and these approaches would provide additional insights such as being able to assess whether planned misbehavior is displaced from locations with camera surveillance to locations without camera surveillance.

Conclusions

To conclude, the findings of this study indicated that CCTV had a greater effect on non-violent than violent prisoner misbehavior, although CCTV did have an effect on planned violent assaults. Findings from studies conducted in public spaces therefore appear transferable to the prison environment and support was found for the contention that CCTV fails to reduce violent crime because of the spontaneous nature of much violence. While more research is needed to disentangle the effect of CCTV on planned and unplanned behaviors, the findings provide support for the need to implement strategies that address precipitators in the environment that give rise to unplanned behavior and strategies aimed at minimizing opportunities for planned misbehavior.

Table 1: Extent of prisoner misbehavior occurring in prison

Type of Misbehavior	Official Records	Victimization Surveys	References
<i>Physical Victimization</i>			
Inmate-on-inmate assault	0.24 - 0.45%	17 - 32%	Bowker, 1980; Cooley, 1993; McCorkle, Miethe, & Drass, 1995; O'Donnell & Edgar, 1996, 1998; QDCS, 2000
Inmate-on-officer assault	<1%		Bowker, 1980; Ekland-Olson, 1986
<i>Sexual aggression</i>			
Attempted sexual assault		2 - 28%	Davies, 1968; Lockwood, 1978, 1980; Nacci & Kane, 1983, 1984; Tewksbury, 1989
Sexual assault		1 - 14%	Cooley, 1993; Davies, 1968; Heilpern, 1994; Maitland & Sluder, 1998; Nacci & Kane, 1983, 1984; Wooden & Parker, 1982
Rape		<1%	Moss, Hosford, & Anderson, 1979; Nacci & Kane, 1983, 1984
Murder	<.01%		Ekland-Olson, 1986; Fleisher, 1994; Jayewardene & Doherty, 1985; Porporino, Doherty, & Sawatsky, 1987
<i>Psychological Victimization</i>			
Verbal abuse		26 - 59%	Maitland & Sluder, 1998; O'Donnell & Edgar, 1996, 1998
Threats		18 - 46%	Cooley, 1993; O'Donnell & Edgar, 1996, 1998
<i>Economic Victimization</i>			
Theft		18 - 49%	Cooley, 1993; Maitland & Sluder, 1998; O'Donnell & Edgar, 1996, 1998
Extortion		2 - 10%	Cooley, 1993; Maitland & Sluder, 1998
Robbery		2 - 11%	Cooley, 1993; O'Donnell & Edgar, 1996, 1998
<i>Other Misbehavior</i>			
Vandalism	Infrequent		Cooley, 1993
Riots	Infrequent		Martin & Zimmerman, 1990
Escape	0 – 8.4%		Herrick, 1989; Michael, B., 1992; Ministry of Justice, 1996
Self-harm/Attempted Suicide	4 - 40%		Eyland, Corben, & Barton, 1997; Franklin, 1988; Home Office, 1984; Pattison & Kahan, 1983; Weekes & Morrison, 1992
Suicide	0.02 - 0.47%		Backett, 1987; Camilleri, McArthur & Webb, 1999; Flaherty, 1983; Liebling, 1992; Liebling & Krarup, 1993; McClure, 1987; Ministry of Justice, 1996; Office of Corrections Victoria, 1985; Porporino, 1992; Ramsay, Tanney, & Searle, 1987; Tatarelli,; Topp, 1979
Drug-use	1 - 31%	22 - 76%	Edgar & O'Donnell, 1988; Grant, 1995; Home Affairs, 1999; Inciardi, Lockwood, & Quinlan, 1993; Korte, Pykalainen, & Seppala, 1988; Thomas & Cage, 1977

NA – Not Available

Table 2: Prisoner misbehavior based on QDCS categories

Prisoner Misbehavior	QDCS Incident Category	Prison 1	Prison 2	Prison 3	Prison 4	Total
Inmate-on-inmate assault	Assault (major) - offender on offender	18	2	7	9	36
	Assault (minor) - offender on offender	438	72	98	89	697
	Total	456	74	105	98	733
Inmate-on-officer assault	Assault (major) - offender on staff	1			4	5
	Assault (minor) - offender on staff	23	4	4	10	41
	Total	24	4	4	14	46
Sexual aggression	Assault - sexual	5		7	2	14
Inmate-on-inmate threats or verbal abuse	Threats against offender		3	2	4	9
Inmate-on-officer threats or verbal abuse r	Threats against staff	20	3	1	8	32
Theft	Property loss/theft - offender	4			1	5
	Property loss/theft - other	1	1	2	2	6
	Total	5	1	2	3	11
Vandalism	Damage - offender accommodation/cell	18	5	7	9	39
	Damage - office/building	1			1	2
	Damage - property	12	8	5	11	36
	Total	31	13	12	21	77
Riot	Major disturbances - violent demonstrations/riot			1		1
Escape	Escape - attempted	1				1
	Escape - preparation	1			1	2
	Escape					0
	Total	2			1	3
Self-harm/Attempted suicide	Attempted suicide	6	1	4	2	13
	Self mutilation	47	9	3	6	65
	Total	53	10	7	8	78
Suicide	Death - suicide	3				3
Drug possession	Prohibited article - drug or related implement	36	8	4	24	72
	Substance - offender possession	24	3	1	10	38
	Substance - offender supply					0
	Total	60	11	5	33	109
Total		659	119	146	192	1116

Key: Prison 1 - Male Reception and Remand (n=683/year)

Prison 2 - Female Reception, Remand, Secure and Residential (n=203/year)

Prison 3 - Male Mainstream and Protection (n=332/year)

Prison 4 - Male Secure and Residential (n=641/year)

Table 3: CCTV status of locations at the four prisons

Location	Prison 1	Prison 2	Prison 3	Prison 4
Oval	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Detention unit (cells)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Secure unit common areas	Yes	Yes	Some	Yes
Medical / Health / Observation unit	Yes	Yes	Yes	Some
Secure units	Some	Some	Some	Some
Walkways / Other outer locations	Some	Some	Some	Some
Secure unit cell landing/stairs	No	Yes	Some	Yes
Residential compound	N/A	Some	N/A	Some
Cell	No	Some	No	Some
Secure unit laundry	No	No	No	No
Exercise yards	No	No	No	No
Education/Programs	No	No	No	No
Gym/Hall	No	No	No	No
Industries/Workshop	No	No	No	No
Residential units	N/A	No	N/A	No
Other	Some	Some	Some	Some

Table 4: Prisoner misbehavior occurring under and not under camera surveillance

Location	CCTV Surveillance?			
	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Inmate-on-inmate assault	246	41.2	351	58.8
Drug possession	15	15.3	83	84.7
Self-harm/Attempted suicide	17	23.0	57	77.0
Vandalism	19	26.8	52	73.2
Inmate-on-officer assault	15	42.9	20	57.1
Inmate-on-officer threats or verbal abuse	15	60.0	10	40.0
Sexual aggression			12	100
Theft	1	10.0	9	90.0
Inmate-on-inmate threats or verbal abuse	1	33.3	2	66.7
Escape	2	100		
Suicide			3	100
Riot			1	100
Total	331	35.6	600	64.4

References

- Allard, T. (2005). *CCTV in Prison*. Unpublished Dissertation. Brisbane: School of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Griffith University.
- Allard, T., Wortley, K., & Stewart, A. (2006). The purposes of CCTV in prison. *Security Journal*, 19, 57-80.
- Atkinson, D.J., Pietrasiewicz, V.J., & Junker, K.E. (1999). *Video Surveillance Equipment Selection and Application Guide*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.
- Atlas, R. (1982). *Violence in Prison: Architectural Determinism*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, School of Criminology, Florida State University.
- Atlas, R. (1983). Crime site selection for assaults in four Florida prisons. *Prison Journal*, 63, 59-72.
- Armitage, R., Smyth, G., & Pease, K. (1999). Burnley CCTV evaluation. In: K. Painter and N. Tilley (Eds.). *Surveillance of public space: CCTV, street lighting and crime prevention*. New York: Criminal Justice Press.
- Backett, S. (1987). Suicides in Scottish prisons. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 151, 218-221.
- Barnard, R.L. (1988). *Intrusion detection systems (2nd ed.)*. Boston: Butterworths.
- Bennett, T., and Gelsthorpe, L. (1996). Public attitudes to CCTV in public places. *Studies in Crime and Crime Prevention*, 5, 72-90.
- Bowker, L.H. (1980). *Prison Victimization*. New York: Elsevier.
- Bradshaw, S. (2002). *Anti-Bullying Strategy Survey for HMYOI Glen Parva*. Internal Document.
- Brown, B. (1995). *CCTV in town centres: Three case studies*. (Police Research Group Crime Detection and Prevention Series Paper No. 68). London: Home Office.
- Camilleri, P., McArthur, & Webb, H. (1999). *Suicidal Behaviour in Prisons: A Review of the Literature*. Canberra: Australian Catholic University.
- Chatterton, M.R., & Frenz, S.J. (1994). Closed circuit television: Its role in reducing burglaries and the fear of crime in sheltered accommodation for the elderly. *Security Journal*, 5, 133-139.
- Clarke, R.V. (1997). Introduction. In R.V. Clarke (Ed.). *Situational Crime Prevention: Successful Case Studies (2nd ed.)*. Albany NY, Harrow and Heston.

- Clarke, R.V. and Felson, M. (1993). Introduction: Criminology, routine activity, and rational choice. In R,V. Clarke and M. Felson (Eds.). *Routine Activity and Rational Choice*. London: Transaction Publishers.
- Cohen, A., Cole, G., & Bailey, R. (1976). *Prison Violence*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Health.
- Cooley, D. (1993). Criminal victimization in male federal prisons. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, October, 479-495.
- Cornish, D., & Clarke, R. V. (1986). Introduction. In D. Cornish & R. V. Clarke (Eds.), *The Reasoning Criminal: Rational Choice Perspectives on Offending*. (pp. 1-16). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Cornish, D.B., & Clarke, R.V. (2003). Opportunities, previpitators and criminal decisions: A reply to Wortley's critique of situational crime prevention. In M.A. Smith and D.B. Cornish (Eds.). *Theory for Practice in Situational Crime Prevention. Crime Prevention Studies, Volume 16*. Monsey, NY: Willan Publishing.
- Cullen, F., Latessa, E., Burton, V., & Lombardo, L. (1993). The correctional orientation of prison wardens: Is the rehabilitation ideal supported? *Criminology*, 31, 69-92.
- Davies, W. (1982). Violence in prisons. In P. Feldman (Ed.). *Developments in the Study of Criminal Behaviour (vol. 2.)*. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons.
- Davis, A.J. (1968). Sexual assault in the Philadelphia prison system and Sheriff's vans. *Trans-Action*, 8-16.
- Dietz, P.E. & Rada, R.T. (1983). Interpersonal violence in forensic facilities. In J.R. Lion and W.H. Reid (Eds.). *Assaults within Psychiatric Facilities*. New York: Grune and Stratton.
- Dolahenty, A. (1999). CCTV. *Security Australia*, April, 16-17.
- Eck, J. E. (2006). Preventing Crime at Places. In L. W. Sherman, D. P. Farrington, B. C. Welsh & D. L. MacKenzie (Eds.), *Evidence-Based Crime Prevention*. (Revised ed., pp. 241-294). London: Routledge.
- Eichenthal, D.R., & Blatchford, L. (1997). Prison crime in New York State. *The Prison Journal*, 77, 456-466.
- Eichenthal, D.R., & Jacobs, J.B. (1991). Enforcing the criminal law in State prisons. *Justice Quarterly*, 8, 283-303.

- Ekland-Olson, S. (1986). Crowding, social control, and prison violence: Evidence from the post-ruiz years in Texas. *Law & Society Review*, 20, 389-421.
- Eyland, S., Corben, S., & Barton, J. (1997). Suicide Prevention in New South Wales Correctional Centres. *Crisis: The Journal of Crisis Intervention and Suicide Prevention*, 18, 163-169.
- Felson, M. (1987). Routine activities and crime prevention in the developing metropolis. *American Sociological Review*, 44, 588-608.
- Felson, M., & Clarke, R. V. (1998). *Opportunity Makes the Thief: Practical Theory for Crime Prevention* (Police Research Series No. 98). London: Home Office: Policing and Reducing Crime Unit - Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.
- Flaherty, M.G. (1983). *The National Incidence of Juvenile Suicide in Adult Jails and Juvenile Detention Centres*. Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois.
- Fleisher, M. (1994). Scenes of violence. In: M. Braswell, S. Dillingham, and R. Montgomery (Eds.). *Prison Violence in America*. Cincinnati: Anderson.
- Franklin, R. (1988). Deliberate Self-harm: Self-injurious behaviour within a correctional mental health population. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 15, 210-218.
- Gill, M., Allen, J., Jessiman, P., Kilworth, J., Swain, D., Spriggs, A., Hemming, M., Kara, D., and Little, R. (2005). *Control Room Operation: Findings From Control Room Observations*. London: Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.
- Gill, M., and Spriggs, A. (2005). *Assessing the Impact of CCTV*. *Home Office Research Study 292*. London: Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.
- Grant, A.A. (1995). *Investigation into Drugs in Prisons in South Australia. Report Prepared for the Minister for Correctional Services*.
- Harris, J.W. (1993). Comparison of stressors among female vs. male inmates. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 19, 43-56.
- Heilpern, D. (1994). *Sexual Assault of New South Wales Prisoners*. Paper presented at the 10th Annual Conference of the Australian and New Zealand Society of Criminology at University of New South Wales, 28th September 1994.
- Herrick, E. (1989). Escape rates remain steady. *Corrections Compendium*, 14, 9-20.

- Home Affairs. (1999). *Home Affairs – Fifth Report*. Report available on line from House of Commons, Home Affairs Committee Publications.
- Home Office. (1984). *Suicides in Prison*. Report by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons. London: HMSO.
- Honess, T. and Charman, E. (1992). Closed circuit television in public places: Its acceptability and perceived effectiveness. (Crime Prevention Unit Series Paper No. 35). London: Home Office.
- Horne, C.J. (1996). The case for: CCTV should be introduced. *International Journal of Risk, Security and Crime Prevention*, 1, 317-326.
- Inciardi, J.A., Lockwood, D., & Quinlan, J.A. (1993). Drug use in prison: Patterns, processes, and implications for treatment. *The Journal of Drug Issues*, 23(1), 119-129.
- Intersec. (1996). Securing the modern prison. *INTERSEC: The Journal of International Security*, 6, 121-124.
- Irwin, J. (1980). *Prisons in Turmoil*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Jayewardene, C. H. S., & Doherty, P. (1985). Individual violence in Canadian penitentiaries. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 27, 429–439.
- King, M.B. (1992). Male rape in institutional settings. In: G.C. Mezey and M.B. King (Eds.). *Male Victims of Sexual Assault*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Korte, T., Pykalainen, J., & Seppala, T. (1998). Drug abuse of Finnish male prisoners in 1995. *Forensic Science International*, 97, 171-183
- Kruegle, H. (1997). CCTV surveillance. In L.J Fennelly (Ed.). *Effective physical security (2nd ed.)*. Boston: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Kyle, T.G., & Aldridge, J. (1992). *Security close circuit television handbook: Applications and technical*. Springfield: Charles C Thomas Publisher.
- La Vigne, N.G. (1994). Rational choice and inmate disputes over phone use on Rivers Island. In R.V. Clarke (Ed.). *Crime Prevention Studies (vol. 3)*. Monsey NY: Criminal Justice Press.
- Liebling, A. (1992). *Suicides in Prison*. London: Routledge.
- Liebling, A., & Krarup, H. (1993). *Suicide Attempts and Self-Injury in Male Prisons*. London: Home Office.
- Lockwood, D. (1978). *Sexual Aggression among Male Prisoners*. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International.

- Lockwood, D. (1980). *Prison Sexual Violence*. New York: Elsevier.
- Mahalingham, V. (1996). Sutton town centre public perception survey. In: M. Bulos and D. Grant (Eds.). *Towards a safer Sutton? CCTV one year on*. London: London Borough of Sutton
- Maitland, A.S. & Sluder, R.D. (1998). Victimization and youthful prison inmates: An empirical analysis. *Prison Journal*, 78, 55-74.
- Martin, R., & Zimmerman, S. (1990). A typology of the causes of prison riots and an analytical extension to the 1986 West Virginia riot. *Justice Quarterly*, 7, 711-737.
- McClure, G.M.G. (1987). Suicide in England and Wales, 1975-1984. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 150, 309-314.
- McCorkle, R.C., Miethe, T.D., & Drass, K.A. (1995). The roots of prison violence: A test of the deprivation, management, and “not-so-total” institutional models. *Crime and Delinquency*, 41, 317-331.
- Michael, B. (1992). *An Analysis of Escapes from Prison Custody in Queensland for the period 1 July 1991 to 30 June 1992*. Queensland: Queensland Corrective Services Commission.
- Ministry of Justice. (1996). *Escape Pressures: Inside Views of the Reasons for Prison Escapes*. Wellington: Department of Corrections.
- Moss, C.S., Hosford, R.E., & Anderson, W.R. (1979). Sexual assault in a prison. *Psychological Reports*, 44, 823-828.
- Musheno, M.C., Levine, J.P., and Palumbo, D.J. (1978). Television Surveillance and Crime Prevention: Evaluating an Attempt to Create Defensible Space in Public Housing. *Social Science Quarterly*, 58, 647-656.
- Nacci, P.L., & Kane, T.R. (1983). The incidence of sex and sexual aggression in federal prisons. *Federal Probation*, 47 (4), 31-36.
- Nacci, P.L., & Kane, T.R. (1984). Inmate sexual aggression: Some evolving propositions, empirical findings, and mitigating counter-forces. *Journal of Offender Counselling, Services, and Rehabilitation*, 9, 1-20.
- Nicholson, N., & Vigil, J.T. (2000). Using video in a correctional environment. *Corrections Today*, 62, 150-151.
- Norris, C. and Armstrong, G. (1999). CCTV and the social structuring of surveillance. In: K. Painter and N. Tilley (Eds.). *Surveillance of public*

- space: CCTV, street lighting and crime prevention*. New York: Criminal Justice Press.
- O'Donnell, I., & Edgar, K. (1996). *The Extent and Dynamics of Victimization in Prisons*. HMSO: Home Office Research and Statistics Directorate.
- O'Donnell, I., & Edgar, K. (1998). Routine victimisation in prisons. *The Howard Journal*, 37 (3), 266-279.
- Office of Corrections Victoria. (1985). *Suicide and Other Deaths in Prison –Including Victorian Results from the National Deaths in Custody Survey*. Information Series No.1. Victoria: Office of Corrections.
- Pattison, M., & Kahan, J. (1983). The deliberate self-harm syndrome. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 140, 867-872.
- Phillips, C. (1999). A review of CCTV evaluations: Crime reduction effects and attitudes towards its use. In K. Painter and N. Tilley (Eds.). *Surveillance of Public Space: CCTV, Street Lighting and Crime Prevention*. New York: Criminal Justice Press.
- Porporino, F.J. (1986). Managing violent individuals in correctional settings. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 1 (2), 213-237.
- Porporino, F.J. (1992). Violence and suicide in Canadian institutions. *Forum on Corrections Research*. Ottawa: Correctional Service, Canada.
- Porporino, F.J., Doherty, P.D., Sawatsky, T. (1987). Characteristics of homicide victims and victimizations in prisons: A Canadian historical perspective. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 32 (2), 125-135.
- QDCS (Queensland Department of Corrective Services). (2000). *Annual Report 1999-2000*. Queensland: Department of Corrective Services.
- Quincy, V.L., & Varney, G.W. (1977). Characteristics of assaults and assaulters in a maximum security psychiatric unit. *Crime and Justice*, November, 212-220.
- Ramsay, R., Tanney, B., & Searle, C. (1987). Suicide Prevention in High-Risk Prison Populations. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 29, 295-307.
- Sarno, C. (1996). The impact of closed circuit television on crime in Sutton town centre. In: M. Bulos and D. Grant (Eds.). *Towards a Safer Sutton? CCTV one year on*. London: Borough of Sutton.
- Shewan, D., Gemmell, M., & Davies, J.B. (1994). Prison as a modifier of drug using behaviour. *Addiction Research*, 2, 203-215.

- Short, E., & Ditton, J. (1996). *Does closed circuit television prevent crime? An evaluation of the use of CCTV surveillance in Airdrie town centre*. Edinburgh, SCOT: Scottish Office Central Research Unit.
- Short, E., & Ditton, J. (1998). Seen and now heard: Talking to the targets of open street CCTV". *British Journal of Criminology*, 38, 404-429.
- Skinns, D. (1998). Crime reduction, diffusion and displacement: Evaluating the effectiveness of CCTV. In C. Norris, J. Moran, and G. Armstrong (Eds.). *Surveillance, closed circuit television and social control*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
- Spriggs, A., Argomaniz, J., Gill, M., and Bryan, J. (2005). Public Attitudes Towards CCTV: Results from the Pre-Intervention Public Attitude Survey Carried Out in Areas Implementing CCTV. London: Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.
- Steinke, P. (1991). Using situational factors to predict types of prison violence. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 17, 119-132.
- Tewksbury, R. (1989). Measures of sexual behaviour in an Ohio prison. *Sociology and Social Research*, 74, 34-39.
- Thomas, C.W., & Cage, R.J. (1977). Correlates of prison drug use. *Criminology*, 15, 193-210.
- Tilley, N. (1993). *Understanding car parks, crime and CCTV: Evaluation lessons from safer cities*. (Crime Prevention Unit Series Paper No. 42). London: Home Office.
- Topp, D. (1979). Suicide in Prison. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 134, 24-27.
- Travis, L.F., Latessa, E.J. & Oldendick, R.W. (1989). The utilization of technology in correctional institutions. *Federal Probation*, 53, 35-40.
- U.S Department of Justice. (1995) Technology Issues in Corrections Agencies: Results of a 1995 Survey. Longmont, CO: National Institute of Corrections.
- Weekes, J., & Morrison, S. (1992). Self-directed violence: Differentiating between suicidal, malingering, and self-mutilating behaviours. *Forum on Corrections Research*, 4 (3).
- Welsh, B., & Farrington, D. (2002). *Crime Prevention Effects of Closed Circuit Television: A Systematic Review*. Home Office Research Study 252. London: Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.

- Wener, R., & Olsen, R. (1978). *User Based Assessment of the Federal Metropolitan Correctional Centers Final Report*. U.S. Bureau of Prisons.
- Wilson, D., & Sutton, A. (2003). *Open-Street CCTV in Australia: A comparative study of establishment and operation*. Report to the Criminology Research Council, Canberra. (CRC Grant 26/01-02).
- Wooden, W.S., & Parker, J. (1982). *Men Behind Bars – Sexual Exploitation in Prison*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Wortley, R. (2002). *Situational Prison Control: Crime Prevention in Correctional Institutions*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wortley, R., & Summers, L. (2005). Reducing prison disorder through situational prevention: The Glen Parva experience. In M. Smith and N. Tilley (Eds.). *Crime Science: New Approaches to Preventing and Detecting Crime*. United Kingdom: Willan Publishing.
- Wright, K. (1994). *Effective Prison Leadership*. Binghamton, NY: William Neil Publishing.