

**Prison Research From the Inside: The Role of Convict Autoethnography**  
Greg Newbold, Jeffrey Ian Ross, Richard S. Jones, Stephen C. Richards and Michael Lenza  
*Qualitative Inquiry* 2014 20: 439  
DOI: 10.1177/1077800413516269

The online version of this article can be found at:  
<http://qix.sagepub.com/content/20/4/439>

---

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

**Additional services and information for *Qualitative Inquiry* can be found at:**

**Email Alerts:** <http://qix.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

**Subscriptions:** <http://qix.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

**Reprints:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

**Permissions:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

**Citations:** <http://qix.sagepub.com/content/20/4/439.refs.html>

>> [Version of Record](#) - Apr 2, 2014

[What is This?](#)

# Prison Research From the Inside: The Role of Convict Autoethnography

Qualitative Inquiry  
2014, Vol. 20(4) 439–448  
© The Author(s) 2014  
Reprints and permissions:  
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav  
DOI: 10.1177/1077800413516269  
qix.sagepub.com



Greg Newbold<sup>1</sup>, Jeffrey Ian Ross<sup>2</sup>, Richard S. Jones<sup>3</sup>,  
Stephen C. Richards<sup>4</sup>, and Michael Lenza<sup>4</sup>

## Abstract

A perspective that has often been absent in criminal justice research is that of former prisoners. This article discusses the establishment, in 1997, of “convict criminology,” a group of scholars producing research informed by their experiences of crime and the criminal justice process; that is, either those who have served time themselves or who have operated alongside prisoners as professionals in custodial settings. It is argued that such scholars face similar dilemmas to others in terms of emotionalism, but suggests that their emotions are of a different nature. While an “insider” perspective cannot lay claim to scientific “objectivity,” the article argues that the existence of emotion does not invalidate an “insider” criminologist’s views. Rather, the passion engendered by the experience of incarceration can add color, context, and contour to data collection, findings, and analysis and may therefore be regarded as an essential thread in the tapestry of criminological inquiry.

## Keywords

convict criminology, autoethnography, emotionalism, subjectivity, epistemology

## Introduction

In her article, “Autoethnography and Emotion as Intellectual Resources: Doing Prison Research Differently,” published in this journal in 2012, Yvonne Jewkes discusses the emotional dilemmas that many prison researchers face when gathering firsthand information about prisons and prisoners. Although, in our opinion, good research should endeavor to be fair and impartial—if not actually value-free—ethnographers inevitably encounter problems when faced with emotionally provocative contexts involving human suffering or injustice. How, for example, does one maintain objective neutrality when dealing with situations like genocide or concentration camps, which are repugnant to common human sensibility? (see, for example, Abel, 1951; Adler, 1958; Bettelheim, 1943; Bloch, 1947; Bondy, 1943; Jackman, 1958; Kogon, 1958). Is emotional neutrality in such situations even desirable?

Albeit to a somewhat lesser extent, modern prison ethnographers face similar situations. Here, the investigator is working in a stressful environment consisting of two antagonistic groups—inmates and correctional workers—both of which have perspectives that can be irreconcilable with one another. The self-concepts of prison officers as aggrieved and maligned may be as justifiable as those of prisoners as deprived and oppressed. Often underpaid and working in a routinely uninspiring but sometimes dangerous authoritarian environment, officers easily become embittered and

vindictive toward the men and women they supervise. Dealing day to day with prisoners who are sometimes rude, recalcitrant, exploitive, deceitful, abusive, or assaultive affects the culture and the working mentality of the prison officer (Goffman, 1961; Hawkins, 1976; McCorkle, 1970; McCorkle & Korn, 1970; Morris & Morris, 1963; Napier, 2007; Thomas, 1972; Weinberg, 1942). Prisoners, however, whose world is perhaps even less inspiring, and more frustrating, dangerous, and authoritarian than that of staff, develop a corresponding image of officers as petty, vindictive, autocratic, antipathetic, and unreasonable (Hawkins, 1976; McCorkle, 1970; Rasmussen, 1940; Ross & Richards, 2002; Sykes & Messinger, 1960; Weinberg, 1942). Like the perceptions of right and wrong among warring marriage partners, the perspectives of prison officers and inmates can be totally at odds.

In prison research, becoming emotionally attached to one side or the other is not unusual, but doing so affects the perceptions of the researcher. Jewkes (2012) herself

<sup>1</sup>University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand

<sup>2</sup>University of Baltimore, MD, USA

<sup>3</sup>Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, USA

<sup>4</sup>University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh, USA

## Corresponding Author:

Greg Newbold, School of Social and Political Science, University of Canterbury, Private Bag 4800, Christchurch 8140, New Zealand.  
Email: greg.newbold@canterbury.ac.nz

recounts the empathy she felt after getting to know a prisoner called Harry Roberts, then in the 33rd year of a life sentence for murdering three policemen in 1966. Her reaction here is understandable. Roberts was apparently personable and intelligent, and no doubt a much changed man from the angry youth he must have been on that fatal day in 1966. Had Jewkes been personally acquainted with any of the three policemen that Roberts shot, however, her emotional reaction may have been different. This interpretation is underscored by the antagonism Jewkes experienced from a group of lawyers at Oxford University. The lawyers thought she was focusing too much on criminals and ignoring the rights of victims. Thus, the impact of emotional empathy on the objectivity of an observer is highlighted.

This is not to denigrate the validity of her point. Roberts had a tale to tell and the story of his life was of personal tragedy. The pointlessness and injustice of keeping him locked up for the rest of his life is arguably as pointless and unjust as the crimes he committed. As in the Indian parable of the blind men and the elephant, criminal justice is a many-faceted beast that can be described differently depending on a person's position. One perspective that has often been absent in criminal justice research, though, is that of former prisoners. Numerous firsthand accounts of prison life have been written but until recently, accredited research from former prisoners equipped with higher degrees has been rare. After 1997, this began to change following the formation of a group of criminologists with experience of incarceration or of working with criminals in prisons. These scholars have begun producing research that is informed by their experiences of crime and the criminal justice process. The purpose of this article is briefly to review the emergence of this "convict criminology" group; to describe some of its work; and, using Jewkes as a springboard, to discuss matters such as subjectivity, emotionalism, and partiality, which are often a controversial component of this type of analysis.

Hayano (1979), on the subject of autoethnography generally, and Jones (1995), on prisons in particular, have recognized the problem of maintaining objectivity in autoethnographic research, but both argue that the advantages of subjective observation outweigh the possible limitations. Yuen (2011) takes an even stronger view and argues that emotions can enrich and deepen researchers' understanding of what they are studying (see also the recent collection edited by Holman Jones, Adams, & Ellis, 2013). Likewise, Jewkes (2012) persuades us that emotionalism and subjective experience deserve a role in the formulation of knowledge because, she says, they "deepen our understanding of the people and contexts we study" (p. 72). Thus, she "discusses the work of a small minority of ethnographers who acknowledge the emotional content of prison studies," and urges that "a more frank acknowledgement of

the convergence of subject-object roles does not necessarily threaten the validity of social science" (Jewkes, 2012, p. 63). With this we fully agree. One of the weaknesses of outsider research is that it analyzes crime from the sterile viewpoint of the middle class academic. Ignoring the cultural and environmental contexts in which it occurs, criminal behavior is often equated with individual pathology. In the introduction to their edited book on doing fieldwork with deviant subcultures, Ferrell and Hamm (1998) observe,

As a wealth of fieldwork has demonstrated . . . research methods which stand outside the lived experience of deviance or criminality can perhaps sketch a faint outline of it, but they can never fill that outline with essential dimensions of meaningful understanding. (p. 10)

Jewkes's article is primarily about the predicaments of academics working in the unfamiliar and potentially hostile environment of the prison. Some, such as Hayner and Ash (1939, 1940), have actually entered prison briefly as voluntary inmates while others, like Marquart (1986), have been voluntary staff members. But the majority of ethnographers have conducted surveys of prisoners and/or staff from the outside (for a discussion of such work, see Jones, 1995; also Reiter, this issue). The problem inherent in this kind of research is that any specific role that is held, negotiated, or assumed by an investigator must affect his or her access to, and interpretation of, the data collected. In all such situations, therefore, the same questions arise. How does an outsider prevent emotional responses (e.g., empathy, embarrassment, fear, nervousness) from coloring his or her objectivity? How does someone from the academy gain the confidence of men and women who tend to look at representatives of the "establishment" with suspicion? How does an investigator assess the truth or validity of what is being said? How can researchers from relatively protected, middle class backgrounds be sure that they are accurately interpreting the world of people whose culture and biographies are dramatically different from their own?

Another cogent concern for academic ethnographers is the restrictions imposed by officialdom. Gaining access to prison is difficult and if granted is likely to be highly conditional. Although existing literature confirms that social scientists have managed to access prisons with some regularity, they have typically done so under closely negotiated circumstances (Farkas, 1992; Peak, 1985; Unnithan, 1986). Zwerman and Gardner (1986) consider the matter of possible state intrusion into the investigative process—What happens, for example, if the authorities attempt to define the nature of study or demand access to research data? Linked to this are ethical and practical considerations of confidentiality and the vulnerability of inmate subjects. Silberman (1995) considers a number of these, including prisoner concerns about the impact that any information given may have

on institutional policy or release chances. These matters may affect their responses and impugn the validity of the findings.

Some of the issues surrounding confidentiality can be overcome by using anonymous surveys, which have an advantage of allowing large amounts of information to be collected from inmates as well as staff (e.g., Garabedian, 1963; Wheeler, 1961). Although surveys have contributed valuable knowledge, they also have limitations, including a tendency to focus on matters of administrative concern (Fleisher, 1989). Moreover, the preconceptualized and pre-structured nature of survey instruments is not conducive to an understanding about everyday life in prisons, and sometimes profoundly distorts it (Irwin, 1987). Those without insider knowledge of prisoner culture, language, idiom, and nuance can easily misconstrue responses to surveys or interview questions (for an exception using inmate interpretation, see Winfree, Newbold, & Tubb, 2002).

An approach that to date has remained largely unexplored in the literature is that which involves academics originating from inside the correctional cordon. These researchers generally comprise men and women who either have served time themselves or who have operated alongside prisoners as professionals in custodial settings. Such scholars face similar dilemmas to outsiders in terms of emotionalism, although the emotions are of a somewhat different nature. For the ex-prisoner, the contaminating potential of hyper-emotionalism lies in passions such as frustration, resentment, and perceived injustice, which can be considerable and sometimes consuming, and which can compromise objectivity. Jewkes validly points out that the existence of emotion does not necessarily invalidate an “insider” criminologist’s views. Rather, the passion engendered by the experience of incarceration can add color, context, and contour both to objective and subjective findings. Provided it does not unrealistically skew the researcher’s perception or analysis, insider input may therefore be regarded as an essential thread in the tapestry of criminological inquiry.

Although still relatively new in the criminological field, there is a cadre of scholars emerging today who write from a background of imprisonment or of working with prisoners, and who employ their experiences as a part of their epistemology. Although not all have actually done time themselves, they refer to themselves loosely as “convict criminologists” (see, for example, Richards & Ross, 2001; Ross & Richards, 2003; Earle, this issue; Piché et al., this issue). The broad objective of the convict criminologists is to explore a new horizon in criminological understanding, particularly with regard to prisons. The approach is often reflexively autoethnographic, although it is not necessarily so. Sometimes a grounded theory approach, using surveys supplemented by ethnographic analysis, is used (see, for example, Winfree et al., 2002). Whether subjective or objective, however, the views and

interpretations of members are inevitably affected by the experiences, knowledge, and *verstehen* derived from years of living with, and among, criminals and inmates.

## Background

Use of the ethnographic method dates right back to the roots of American sociology (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Vidich & Lyman, 1994), but apart from the concentration camp literature (e.g., Bettelheim, 1943; Bondy, 1943; Kogon, 1958), scholarly observation from former prisoners has not featured highly in criminological literature. Although not widely known, Frank Tannenbaum (1938), author of the influential book *Crime and the Community* and a former labor organizer, served a year in prison and went on to become a successful journalist and subsequently a professor at Columbia University, New York. His concept of the “dramatization of evil” through the “tagging” of young delinquents was an important precursor to labeling theory and was partially inspired by his own reflections on life as a former inmate. A more recent ex-convict scholar is Richard McCleary who served time in both state and federal U.S. prisons and published his first book, *Dangerous Men*, in 1978 while on parole in Minnesota. McCleary went on to develop a distinguished career at the University of California (UC)–Irvine (see Newbold, Ross, & Richards, 2010).

One of the most celebrated and, from the point of view of convict criminology, most important convict-academic is John Irwin. Irwin, who died in January 2010, was a former heroin addict who in the mid-1950s served 5 years for armed robbery in Soledad Prison in California. Irwin commenced his college education while in prison and was assisted after release by Herbert Blumer, Erving Goffman, and David Matza at the University of California–Berkeley, and by Donald R. Cressey and Lewis Yablonsky at the University of California–Los Angeles. Irwin became a professor of sociology at San Francisco State in 1967 and remained there until his retirement in 1994. His first book, *The Felon*, was published in 1970, after which he wrote or co-wrote six more (American Friends Service Committee, 1971; Irwin, 1977, 1980, 1985, 2005, 2009; Irwin & Austin, 1994). He also produced a large number of influential articles. Throughout his life, Irwin devoted himself to using his prison experiences to challenge orthodox thinking about prison culture. For example, he disputed the functionalist view that prison culture is primarily a collective reaction to the “pains of imprisonment” (cf. Sykes, 1958). Instead, he argued that prisoners bring their culture into jail, and that prison culture is in fact an amalgamation of criminal culture beyond the walls combined with the values of the working classes from which most inmates come (Irwin, 1970; Irwin & Cressey, 1962).

Irwin used his knowledge of, and contacts within, the criminal community to glean information from select groups

of veteran convicts. In this way, he was able to provide a unique insight into inmate culture, prisoner typologies, and conditions of confinement. He also wrote about the political manipulation of public fears of crime and about the creation of an expanding felony underclass. Irwin reminds us that, despite their relative powerlessness, prisoners have social agency and do not simply comply with the dictates of the authorities. Instead, they struggle to reduce their state of deprivation, to ease their social condemnation, and to pursue their interests. Like people in other societies, inmates adapt to the extant environment. Convict codes and culture assist prisoners to survive relatively normally despite the rigors of incarceration. After release, some felons apply things they learned in prison to survival on the streets (see Richards, 2009).

Irwin used his ex-convict perspective to champion humanitarian correctional policies and to attack what he termed America's "imprisonment binge" (Austin & Irwin, 2001), which saw U.S. incarcerated populations burgeon from about half a million in 1980 to about 2.2 million by the time he died. In the late 1960s, he joined lawyers, reform activists, and ex-inmates to launch the United Prisoners' Union in California and then Project Rebound at San Francisco State University. Throughout his life, in fact, John Irwin combined academic learning with heuristic experience to champion the cause of prison reform.

One of the early foundations of the sociology of corrections was the prison ethnography. Clemmer (1940), Sykes (1958), Morris and Morris (1963), S. Cohen and Taylor (1972), and J. Jacobs (1977) all produced ground-breaking research about prison culture and the prison world. But apart from Irwin, and crime ethnographers like B. A. Jacobs (1998), Katz (1988), Shover (1996), and Weisheit (1998), inquiry of this type became scarce after the 1970s. In 2002, Wacquant lamented the demise of criminal ethnography, which coincided with the onset of mass incarceration in the 1980s. He wrote, "*The ethnography of the prison thus went into eclipse at the very moment it was most needed . . . the ethnography of the prison in the United States is not merely an endangered species but a virtually extinct one*" (p. 385). In 2003, Irwin also noted the dearth of recent published material on the effect of mass incarceration on prison conditions, changes in the social organization of prisoners, or the challenges facing ex-convicts after release. He criticized the false conclusions that some criminologists come to, derived from a fundamental misunderstanding about the meanings of what they see or are told.

## The Emergence of Convict Criminology

Irwin was the intellectual progenitor of convict criminology. In 1987, echoing Matza (1969), he argued for greater use of the qualitative approach to gain a more thoroughly

rounded view of prisons. Two years later, at the American Society of Criminology (ASC) meetings in Reno, Nevada, Irwin spoke to Greg Newbold, then a newly appointed sociology lecturer from the University of Canterbury, New Zealand. Newbold had served time in a juvenile detention center (a "boot camp") for growing cannabis in 1971, and then a 7.5-year prison term for selling heroin. Like Irwin, he had studied in prison, had read for his PhD after release in 1980, and had commenced publishing research based on objective analysis informed by ethnographic reflexivity. At Reno, Irwin had expressed concern about the exploding American prison population and about his hopes for the growing number of convicts who were using their time in prison to become educated. He voiced the need for an organization of educated convicts to produce internally informed research on prisons that could make a difference in sentencing practices and correctional policies. He spoke about the idea regularly from that time forth.

Coincidentally in Canada, a group of scholarly activists—Bob Gaucher, Howard Davidson and Liz Elliot—was thinking along similar lines. Disappointed about the dearth of ex-convict input to the International Conference on Penal Abolition III held in Montreal in 1987, in 1988 they had launched the *Journal of Prisoners on Prisons (JPP)*. *JPP* aimed to publish scholarly work by prisoners and ex-prisoners in an attempt to encourage inmate participation in policy debate (see Piché et al., this issue). The journal has generated more than 20 issues since that time, and some of the convict criminology groups currently serve on the editorial board.

The convict criminology concept itself actually came into being some time later. In 1997, Chuck Terry, a former burglar and drug addict who had clocked up over 12 years in various U.S. penitentiaries, contacted John Irwin and asked to meet him. Terry had commenced his college education at Oregon State Penitentiary in the 1980s and when he contacted Irwin he was halfway through a PhD program at UC-Irvine. Terry introduced Irwin to Alan Mobley who, having served 10 years in federal prisons for cocaine trafficking, was also finishing a doctorate at Irvine. Terry told Irwin that he knew of several other ex-prisoners who had advanced degrees, such as former "pot" dealers Rick Jones and Steve Richards, and Ed Tromhauser, who had served several sentences for robbery. This was the kind of possibility Irwin had been dreaming of: a team of academically trained ex-felons capable of producing experience-based research on prisons and law enforcement. Terry had already spoken to his program chair, Joan Petersilia, about the dearth of recent research on the internal realities of prison life. Petersilia, a senior criminological academic, encouraged Terry to organize a special "Convict Criminology" session at the forthcoming annual meeting of the ASC, scheduled for that November in San Diego. Irwin had no hesitation in giving Terry his support.

Titled “Convicts Critique Criminology: The Last Seminar” and chaired by Irwin, the session at the 1997 ASC conference featured presentations by Mobley, Richards, and Tromhauser. This was the first time a collection of ex-convicts had appeared together at a national academic forum. That evening Richards, Terry, Irwin, and Irwin’s co-author Jim Austin discussed the potential for a collaborative work. From there, things moved quickly. In the spring of 1998, Richards and Jeffrey Ian Ross began preparing an edited book written by ex-convict academics. Ross, who had worked for almost 4 years in the psychiatric unit of a Canadian correctional facility (see Ross, 2011), combined with Richards to collect and edit papers from 19 invited contributors—not all of them former prisoners—in the United States and New Zealand. With a foreword by Todd Clear and a preface by John Irwin, the book was launched under the title *Convict Criminology* in 2003.

It was Richards and Ross who coined the term *convict criminology* and who have been its principal promoters. Since 1997, the group has held sessions at every ASC meeting as well as at other conference venues. The first session titled “Convict Criminology” was at ASC Toronto in 1999, by which time the team had been joined by former prisoners Rick Jones, Dan Murphy and Greg Newbold. By 2012, the group had been involved in more than 30 sessions at major criminology and sociology conferences. It has also published widely. Numerous books and refereed articles and scholarly book chapters have been written by members of the convict criminology group (see Jones, Ross, Richards, & Murphy, 2009; Richards & Lenza, 2012).

## The Work of Convict Criminology

Like the criminal community itself, the group that calls itself “convict criminology” is more eclectic than uniform in its character. Its members hail from a variety of backgrounds. Some, like Terry and Tromhauser, have extensive criminal histories and have lived under a range of correctional regimes. Others, like Mobley and Richards, have only been incarcerated once but received lengthy sentences. Members have done time in a variety of institutions and have been exposed to different types of programs. They have experienced federal as well as state institutions and have served in adult as well as juvenile facilities at all levels of security. As noted, a number of members of the group do not have criminal records but have worked in prisons or alongside prisoners and through that have gained personal understanding of the way correctional systems work and how they have changed over time.

Their life histories and associated contacts permit convict criminologists an interesting probative insight into the contemporary prison world. Members maintain currency with prison life by corresponding with inmates and their families and by visiting prisons either as individuals or through

educational programs. Such contact helps them maintain an understanding of how prisons differ by region and security level, and how these things have altered. This is especially important in the United States, with a prison population that has more than doubled since 1990 and which operates 50 different state jurisdictions alongside the federal system. However, the convict criminology group also has input from ex-convict academics in countries such as Finland, France, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom (see Richards, Austin, Owen, & Ross, 2010; Richards et al., 2011).

Because the direct experiences that members have had with criminal justice systems are so diverse, their perspectives inevitably vary. Opinions are not uniform and there are many debates within the group, concerning matters such as correctional policy, research orientation, use of terminology, and subjective methodology (see, for example, Newbold & Ross, 2013). The work of the group is not confined to corrections. Some have published ethnographic material not only on prisons but also on crime itself and on aspects of law enforcement. What unifies the group is a shared belief that to be a well-rounded discipline, criminology, and by extension criminal justice requires input and commentary from people who have lived and/or worked around criminals and/or correctional facilities. Members do not claim to have the last word on criminology or to have unassailable opinions. They do not deny that prison officials and other researchers also have valid perspectives that may challenge their own. Indeed, some of the great classics of criminology came from the ethnographic observations of people such as Becker (1966), Clemmer (1940), A. K. Cohen (1955), S. Cohen and Taylor (1972), Goffman (1961), J. Jacobs (1977), Miller (1958), Morris and Morris (1963), Shaw (1938), Sutherland (1937), Sykes (1958), Thrasher (1927), Whyte (1943), and Yablonsky (1963). What the convict criminology group do insist, however, is that prisoner viewpoints are an essential part of the correctional picture and are necessary building blocks to a science of criminology and criminal justice.

An advantage that former convict status affords an investigator is in the conduct of research itself. One of the rewards of having a prison record is that it opens doors to avenues of investigation that might otherwise remain closed. The fact that a researcher has been in prison and understands criminal culture and idiom puts him or her on a different footing to other researchers. We argue that criminals are more likely to be open and candid with an investigator they can identify with, and who will recognize misleading information. Greg Newbold’s early graduate work, for example, sprung directly from his former status as a maximum-security prisoner. During his years in prison, he studied inmate politics and culture, interviewed numerous inmates, and produced one of the only insider ethnologies of maximum-security social organization (Newbold, 1977). After release, Newbold began investigating the institution’s history. This was only possible

because his prison connections gave him access, not only to criminals but also to retired officers who would normally have been suspicious of an outsider. Most of the interview information collected was candid and verifiable. The result was a colorful, sometimes sensational history, containing material never before published which otherwise would have died with the passage of time (see Newbold, 1989).

In the United States, Jones and Schmid (2000) have made a similar contribution. These authors were able to gain a unique insight into American prisoners' lives by conducting research while Jones was serving a year-and-a-day sentence in a maximum-security prison in Minnesota. With the cooperation of prison officials and assisted by Schmid on the outside, Jones conducted research in situ, which was supplemented after Jones' release by returning to the prison for focused interviews. Jones' dual role as inmate and sociologist provided a strong vantage point for analysis, although it also raised questions about his ability to evaluate impartially and independently. In this study, possible imbalance was controlled by combining Jones' "insider" perspective with that of Schmid.

Denzin and Giardina (2009) argue that qualitative research is an essential component of good policy making and the achievement of social justice. This is an area where convict criminologists have also been active. In the 1990s, former prisoners Steve Richards and Richard Jones published research looking at the structural obstacles prisoners encountered upon release from prison in Iowa. These included having no money, no job, or a place to live (Richards, 1995; Richards & Jones, 1997). In the early 2000s, when the Commonwealth of Kentucky sought to lower its prison and community corrections costs, state authorities asked Richards and Jones to investigate ways to reduce the prison intake and the number of paroles failures. To develop an understanding of the problems of re-entry, Richards and Jones interviewed a number of parolees, successful and unsuccessful, past and present. What they found was something they called a "perpetual incarceration machine" whereby prisoners lacking adequate support, resources, and coping skills are recycled from prison to parole and back again, without ever achieving full liberty (Austin, Richards, & Jones, 2003a, 2003b; Richards, Austin, & Jones, 2004).

In New Zealand, similar official use of ex-convict knowledge has been made. In 1995, when the Department of Corrections wanted information about the motivations for prison escapes, the research contractor (CRESA) hired Greg Newbold to travel around the country's prisons and interview all inmates with escape records. Newbold also contributed to the writing of the final report, which found that internal and external pressures, rather than a desire for freedom per se, were the most common drivers of prison escapes (see McLellan, Saville-Smith, & Newbold, 1996). The following year, during the course of New Zealand's

ministerial *Review of Firearms Control* in 1996-1997, the Commission hired Newbold to survey all of the country's prisoners with criminal histories involving firearms and to write up his findings (see Newbold, 1998, 1999). These were incorporated into the final report (Thorp, 1997). Because of his research profile and the unique perspective provided by his criminal background and contacts, Newbold has been an invited member or consultant to 17 government-appointed special committees including the Minister of Justice's penal advisory group (1991), and committees to set up a prison ombudsman (1993-1994), to report on criminal legal aid (1993-1994), to award New Zealand's first private prison contract (1995-1996), and to advise on the revision of the country's *Police Act* (2006-2008). He is regularly cited in the media and is recognized by the courts as an authority on crime and criminal justice, having given expert evidence in 18 judicial hearings in New Zealand and Australia.

One of the dilemmas facing convicts attending universities or applying for jobs is whether, or at what stage, a person's convict status should be revealed. This is particularly problematic in the United States, where the stigma of a criminal conviction is high. In 2007, a group of convict criminologists conducted an open-ended survey, asking former prisoners currently employed in universities, about attempts to get academic work and their experiences of being hired. The resulting article gave useful advice to convict candidates about disclosure, meeting administrators, handling difficult questions, giving presentations, and dealing with rejection (Ross et al., 2010). The article was able to provide research-based advice valuable not only to prospective employees but also to hiring committees considering job applicants with criminal records.

### The Problem of Excessive Subjectivity

Similar to Jewkes and Yuen, we recognize that emotionalism and subjective experience can play an important part in criminological experience. The passions aroused by perceptions of unjust incarceration, excessively long incarceration, or mistreatment can be compelling and valid components of criminological analysis. As her example of the inmate Harry Roberts shows, and as was demonstrated so poignantly in Truman Capote's (1965) novel *In Cold Blood*, tragic circumstances and outcomes characterize victims as well as perpetrators in many criminal events.

But we believe that this can be taken too far. To let emotionalism or even subjective interpretation monopolize a scholarly discipline is to endanger its credibility. There must be balance, and as far as possible, subjective observation needs to be grounded in facts that are objective and verifiable. Just as bald data can be bland and meaningless without qualitative analysis, so can the value of ethnographic observation be empty without objective backing. In

common with qualitative inquiry generally (see, for example, Denzin & Giardina, 2009), one of the criticisms that convict criminology has faced is that it relies too heavily on the unsupported observations of autoethnographers, who have sometimes assumed that the experience of imprisonment to be a validation in itself. On conference panels and in other forums, some appear to believe that people acquire uniquely inspired thinking through being in prison, and that this alone is enough to discredit people with whom they disagree. At professional meetings, particularly in convict criminology's early stages, John Irwin himself regularly chastised the group for over-reliance on personal anecdote and for failing to engage in much-needed empirical work. Convict criminology has encountered verbal and written critiques from other well-regarded scholars as well, who have challenged the group for lacking in objectivity, for over-generalizing about the work of non-convict scholars, and for parading their ex-convict status as if it gives them a premium on insight (see, for example, Bosworth, 2004; Lilly, 2009; Maghan, 2004).

It is easy to see how these views are formed and there is some validity to them. Newbold and Ross (2013) have commented that on convict criminology conference panels in particular, there has been a tendency for participants to claim superior understanding based on prison insight. This is manifested in an "old soldier" mentality among some, whereby proprietorship over prison scholarship is claimed, based on personal knowledge. In addition, many are embittered by their prison experiences and by what they see as academic stigmatization, giving them a tendency to emote, proselytize and play the victim when things don't go their way. Another issue is that of balance, discussed above. We concur with Irwin that there has been a tendency in published research for convict criminologists to rely heavily on the autoethnographic component and sometimes to ignore the hard work and robust scientific requirements necessary for acceptance by high impact journals. If the valuable ethnographic contributions members can offer are to be taken seriously, Newbold and Ross argue that members need to produce more rigorous, superior-quality, work that can withstand editorial scrutiny from the best journals in the social science profession. Emotion may form part of a rounded understanding of a situation, but not emotionalism. Jewkes (2012) observes, "There is . . . no place for hot-headedness in academic writing" (p. 71). Work must be presented in a studious, measured and considered way. These are some of the challenges that convict criminology faces if it is to advance its academic standing.

## Summary and Conclusion

From the point of view of the current authors, Jewkes's (2012) defense of the autoethnographic method is an

important contribution to criminological epistemology. In advocating the value of subjective inquiry, she illuminates a problem that has been growing within the discipline as ethnographic studies of prison and criminal culture became unfashionable in the 1980s. The result, over the last three decades, has been a proliferation of studies informed primarily by official data and managerial sources, exacerbating the impression that criminology is a rather narrow and parochial field, especially when compared with other social sciences (see Holman Jones et al., 2013). Without the benefit of insider interpretations, conclusions have often been dry and passionless, and frequently slanted in one direction. The imbalance is derived from researchers writing about crime and prisons without any real knowledge of the grassroots realities of criminal or convict life. We agree with Jewkes that "lived experience" and associated emotions are an important complement to research derived from empirical positivism. Both are required if a rounded perspective of criminological issues is to be attained.

Jewkes notes some of the difficulties facing ethnographers doing work inside prisons. The problems she identifies relate mostly to outsider ethnographers: people from the academy who enter the prison environment to gather firsthand data about institutions and their inhabitants. To the current authors, the fears and uncertainties she notes are familiar—we, too, were once "cleanskin" civilians entering prison for the first time. But unlike outside academics, whose contact is fleeting and who go home at night, we either lived or worked in prisons for many years. During those years, we were digested inside what Abbott (1982) called "the belly of the beast." This, in truth, is where our "rehabilitation" really began as we studied for higher degrees. Now, armed with the knowledge and understanding that immersion in a foreign culture brings, we are able to research the institutions that once consumed us.

When, in 1997, a small number of academic felons formed what is now loosely termed *convict criminology*, one of the group's central aims was to revive the ethnographic perspective that has become rare in contemporary criminological research. Since 1997, members have produced dozens of books and hundreds of book chapters and articles. Most—but not all—have had to do with aspects of crime and incarceration, and have been informed by the autoethnographic method. The dilemmas facing outsider fieldworkers—embarrassment, anxiety, nervousness, uncertainty over interpreting convict argot and innuendo—are seldom a problem for those familiar with the culture and language of the prison. Most members feel quite comfortable in the company of the kinds of people they lived alongside for years. But this does not make their arguments impregnable. As we have observed, convict criminologists have their own ontological problems. They have to learn to put aside any prejudices, bitterness, or resentment that may



contaminate the objectivity of their work. And some convict criminologists need yet to recognize that the fact of having been in prison does not confer proprietorship over prison knowledge and understanding. Other views may be equally valid. Just as there is no place in academic writing for hot-headedness, so is there no place for arrogance.

Nonetheless, we have argued that the observations of former convicts who are now academics deserve an important role in debates over crime, corrections, and law enforcement policy. The views of insiders break the complacency that hegemony of official interpretations brings. They disrupt familiar thought patterns and challenge what is often taken for granted. They question established and commonly held assumptions. The subjective experience of ex-convicts, together with their collective knowledge of prisoners, criminals, and the world they live in, provides color to critical analysis and contour understandings of the people and contexts that criminologists study.

### Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### References

- Abbott, J. H. (1982). *In the belly of the beast*. New York, NY: Vintage.
- Abel, T. (1951). The sociology of concentration camps. *Social Forces*, 30, 150-155.
- Adler, H. G. (1958). Ideas towards a sociology of the concentration camp. *American Journal of Sociology*, 63, 513-522.
- American Friends Service Committee (with Irwin, J.). (1971). *Struggle for justice: A report on crime and punishment in America*. New York, NY: Hill & Wang.
- Austin, J., & Irwin, J. (2001). *It's about time: America's incarceration binge*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Austin, J., Richards, S. C., & Jones, R. S. (2003a). New ideas for reforming parole in Kentucky. *Offender Programs Report*, 7(2), 19-20, 22, 24.
- Austin, J., Richards, S. C., & Jones, R. S. (2003b). Prison release in Kentucky: Convict perspective on policy recommendations. *Offender Programs Report*, 7(1), 1, 13-16.
- Becker, H. (1966). *Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bettelheim, B. (1943). Individual and mass behavior in extreme situations. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 38, 417-452.
- Bloch, H. A. (1947). The personality of inmates of concentration camps. *American Journal of Sociology*, 53, 335-341.
- Bondy, C. (1943). Problems of internment camps. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 38, 453-457.
- Bosworth, M. (2004). Convict criminology [Book Review]. *British Journal of Criminology*, 44, 988-990.
- Capote, T. (1965). *In cold blood: A true account of a multiple murder and its consequences*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Clemmer, D. (1940). *The prison community*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Cohen, A. K. (1955). *Delinquent boys*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Cohen, S., & Taylor, L. (1972). *Psychological survival: The experience of long-term imprisonment*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.
- Denzin, N. K., & Giardina, M. D. (2009). Introduction: Qualitative inquiry and social justice: Toward a politics of hope. In N. K. Denzin & M. D. Giardina (Eds.), *Qualitative inquiry and social justice* (pp. 11-50). Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Introduction: Entering the field of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 1-17). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Farkas, M. A. (1992). The impact of the correctional field setting on the research setting: A research chronicle. *Journal of Crime & Justice*, 15, 177-184.
- Ferrell, J., & Hamm, M. S. (1998). *Ethnography at the edge: Crime, deviance, and field research*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.
- Fleisher, M. S. (1989). *Warehousing violence*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.
- Garabedian, P. S. (1963). Social roles and processes of socialization in the prison community. *Social Problems*, 11, 140-152.
- Goffman, E. (1961). *Asylums: Essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates*. New York, NY: Anchor Books.
- Hawkins, G. (1976). *The prison: Policy and practice*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Hayano, D. M. (1979). Auto-ethnography: Paradigms, problems and prospects. *Human Organization*, 38, 99-104.
- Hayner, N. S., & Ash, E. (1939). The prisoner community as a social group. *American Sociological Review*, 4, 362-369.
- Hayner, N. S., & Ash, E. (1940). The prison as a community. *American Sociological Review*, 5, 577-583.
- Holman Jones, S., Adams, T. E., & Ellis, C. (Eds.). (2013). *Handbook of autoethnography*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Irwin, J. (1970). *The felon*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Irwin, J. (1977). *Scenes*. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE.
- Irwin, J. (1980). *Prisons in turmoil*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.
- Irwin, J. (1985). *The jail: Managing the underclass in America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Irwin, J. (1987). Reflections on ethnography. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 16, 41-48.
- Irwin, J. (2003). Preface. In J. I. Ross & S. C. Richards (Eds.), *Convict criminology* (pp. xvii-xxii). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Irwin, J. (2005). *The warehouse prison: Disposal of the dangerous class*. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury.
- Irwin, J. (2009). *Lifers: Seeking redemption in prison*. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
- Irwin, J., & Austin, J. (1994). *It's about time: America's imprisonment binge*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Irwin, J., & Cressey, D. R. (1962). Thieves, convicts and the inmate culture. *Social Problems*, 10, 142-155.

- Jackman, N. R. (1958). Survival in the concentration camp. *Human Organization, 17*, 23-26.
- Jacobs, B. A. (1998). Researching crack dealers: Dilemmas and contradictions. In J. Ferrell & M. S. Hamm (Eds.), *Ethnography at the edge: Crime, deviance and field research* (pp. 160-177). Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.
- Jacobs, J. (1977). *Stateville*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Jewkes, Y. (2012). Autoethnography and emotion as intellectual resources: Doing prison research differently. *Qualitative Inquiry, 18*, 63-75.
- Jones, R. S. (1995). Uncovering the hidden social world: Insider research in prison. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 11*, 106-118.
- Jones, R. S., Ross, J. I., Richards, S. C., & Murphy, D. S. (2009). The first dime: A decade of convict criminology. *The Prison Journal, 89*, 151-171.
- Jones, R. S., & Schmid, T. J. (2000). *Doing time: Prison experience and identity*. Stamford, CT: JAI Press.
- Katz, J. (1988). *Seductions of crime*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Kogon, E. (1958). *The theory and practice of hell: The German concentration camps and the system behind them*. New York, NY: Berkley Publishing.
- Lilly, R. J. (2009). Book review of Prison, Inc: A convict exposes life inside a private prison. *Criminal Justice Review, 34*, 460-463.
- Maghan, J. (2004). *Ex-con professors: Book review of convict criminology*. Available from www.amazon.com
- Marquart, J. (1986). Doing research in prison: The strengths and weaknesses of full participation as a guard. *Justice Quarterly, 3*, 15-32.
- Matza, D. (1969). *Becoming deviant*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- McCleary, R. (1978). *Dangerous men: The sociology of parole*. New York, NY: Harrow and Heston.
- McCorkle, L. W. (1970). Guard-inmate relationships. In N. Johnston, L. Savitz, & M. E. Wolfgang (Eds.), *The sociology of punishment and correction* (pp. 419-422). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- McCorkle, L. W., & Korn, R. (1970). Resocialization within walls. In N. Johnston, L. Savitz, & M. E. Wolfgang (Eds.), *The sociology of punishment and correction* (pp. 409-418). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- McLellan, V., Saville-Smith, K., & Newbold, G. (1996). *Escape pressures*. Wellington, New Zealand: Department of Corrections.
- Miller, W. B. (1958). Lower class culture as a generating milieu of gang delinquency. *Journal of Social Issues, 14*, 5-19.
- Morris, T., & Morris, P. (1963). *Pentonville: A sociological study of an English prison*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Napier, A. (2007). *Each day is different: Prison officers and their work* (Unfinished PhD thesis). Victoria University, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Newbold, G. (1977). *The social organization of prisons* (Unpublished MA thesis). University of Auckland, New Zealand.
- Newbold, G. (1989). *Punishment and politics: The maximum security prison in New Zealand*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Newbold, G. (1998, December). The 1997 firearms review: An appraisal. *Social Policy Journal, 11*, 115-130.
- Newbold, G. (1999). The criminal use of firearms in New Zealand. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology, 32*, 61-78.
- Newbold, G., & Ross, J. I. (2013). Convict criminology at the crossroads. *The Prison Journal, 93*, 3-10.
- Newbold, G., Ross, J. I., & Richards, S. C. (2010). Convict criminology. In F. Cullen & P. Wilcox (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of criminological theory* (pp. 207-212). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Peak, K. (1985). Correctional research in theory and praxis: Political and operational hindrances. *Criminal Justice Review, 10*, 21-31.
- Rasmussen, D. (1940). Prisoner opinions about parole. *American Sociological Review, 5*, 584-595.
- Richards, S. C. (1995). *The Structure of prison release: An extended case study of prison release, work release, and parole*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Richards, S. C. (2009). John Irwin. In K. Hayward, S. Maruna, & J. Mooney (Eds.), *Fifty key thinkers in criminology* (pp. 173-178). London, England: Routledge.
- Richards, S. C., Austin, J., & Jones, R. S. (2004). Kentucky's perpetual prisoner machine: It's about money. *Policy Studies Journal, 21*, 93-106.
- Richards, S. C., Austin, J., Owen, B., & Ross, J. I. (2010). In memory of John Irwin. *Justice Policy Journal, 7*(2), 1-5.
- Richards, S. C., & Jones, R. S. (1997). Perpetual incarceration machine: Structural impediments to post-prison success. *The Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 13*, 4-22.
- Richards, S. C., & Lenza, M. (2012). Editors' introduction: The first nickel and dime of convict criminology (Special Issue on the 15th Anniversary of Convict Criminology). *The Journal of Prisoners on Prisons, 21*, 3-15.
- Richards, S. C., & Ross, J. I. (2001). The new school of convict criminology. *Social Justice, 28*, 177-190.
- Richards, S. C., Ross, J. I., Newbold, G., Lenza, M., Jones, R. S., Murphy, D. S., & Grigsby, R. S. (2011). Convict criminology: Prisoner re-entry policy recommendations. In I. O. Ekunwe & R. S. Jones (Eds.), *Global perspectives on re-entry* (pp. 198-222). Tampere, Finland: University of Tampere Press.
- Ross, J. I. (2011). Patient evaluations R us: The dynamics of power relations inside a forensic psychiatric facility from the bottom up. In L. M. Johnson (Ed.), *Experiencing corrections* (pp. 55-72). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Ross, J. I., & Richards, S. C. (2002). *Behind bars: Surviving prison*. Indianapolis, IN: Pearson.
- Ross, J. I., & Richards, S. C. (Eds.). (2003). *Convict criminology*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Ross, J. I., Richards, S. C., Newbold, G., Jones, R. S., Lenza, M., Murphy, D. S., & Curry, G. D. (2010). Knocking on the ivory tower's door: The experience of ex-convicts applying for tenure-track university positions. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 22*, 267-285.
- Shaw, C. R. (1938). *Brothers in crime*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Shover, N. (1996). *Great pretenders: Pursuits and careers of persistent thieves*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

- Silberman, M. (1995). *A world of violence: Corrections in America*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Sutherland, E. H. (1937). *The professional thief*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Sykes, G. M. (1958). *Society of captives*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sykes, G. M., & Messinger, S. L. (1960). The inmate social system. In R. A. Cloward et al. (Eds.), *Theoretical studies in social organization of the prison* (pp. 5-48). New York, NY: Social Science Research Council.
- Tannenbaum, F. (1938). *Crime and the community*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Thomas, J. E. (1972). *The English prison officer since 1850: A study in conflict*. London, England: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Thorp, T. (1997). *Review of firearms control in New Zealand*. Wellington, New Zealand: GP Print.
- Thrasher, F. (1927). *The gang: A study of 1313 gangs in Chicago*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Unnithan, P. (1986). Research in a correctional setting: Constraints and biases. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 14, 401-412.
- Vidich, A. J., & Lyman, S. M. (1994). Qualitative methods: Their history in sociology and anthropology. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 23-59). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Wacquant, L. (2002). The curious eclipse of prison ethnography in the age of mass incarceration. *Ethnography*, 3, 371-397.
- Weinberg, S. K. (1942). Aspects of the prison's social structure. *American Journal of Sociology*, 47, 717-726.
- Weisheit, R. A. (1998). Marijuana subcultures: Studying crime in rural America. In J. Ferrell & M. S. Hamm (Eds.), *Ethnography at the edge: Crime, deviance and field research* (pp. 178-203). Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.
- Wheeler, S. (1961). Socialization in correctional communities. *American Sociological Review*, 26, 697-712.
- Whyte, W. F. (1943). *Street corner society: The social structure of an Italian slum*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Winfree, L. T., Newbold, T., & Tubb, H. S. (2002). Prisoner perspectives on inmate culture in New Mexico and New Zealand. *The Prison Journal*, 82, 213-233.
- Yablonsky, L. (1963). *The violent gang*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Yuen, F. (2011). Embracing emotionality: Clothing my "naked truths." *Critical Criminology*, 19, 75-88.
- Zwerman, G., & Gardner, G. (1986). Obstacles to research in a state prison. *Qualitative Sociology*, 9, 293-300.

### Author Biographies

**Greg Newbold** is a professor of sociology at the University of Canterbury, New Zealand. In 1977, while serving a 7.5-year

sentence for selling heroin, he completed an MA thesis on the social organization of a maximum-security prison. He studied for his PhD after release and received tenure at Canterbury University in 1988. He has written seven books and 80 scholarly articles and book chapters and has served for 25 years on the board of trustees of a government-funded halfway house for prison parolees. Currently regarded as New Zealand's leading correctional authority, he is frequently consulted by government agencies on matters of criminal justice policy.

**Jeffrey Ian Ross** is a professor in the School of Criminal Justice, College of Public Affairs, at the University of Baltimore. He has researched, written, and lectured primarily on corrections, policing, political crime, violence, global crime and criminal justice, and crime and justice in American Indian communities, for over two decades. Ross is the author, co-author, editor, or co-editor of several books including most recently *The Globalization of Supermax Prisons* (Rutgers University Press, 2013). During the early 1980s, he worked in a correctional institution.

**Richard S. Jones** is professor of sociology at Marquette University. He is author of the books *Doing Time: Prison Experience and Identity in a Maximum Security Prison* (with Tom Schmid) and *Global Perspectives on Re-Entry* (with Ikponwose Ekwunwe). He has published in the areas of prison experience, social identity, and the problems of re-entry faced by incarcerated individuals.

**Stephen C. Richards** is an ex-convict and now professor of criminal justice at the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh. He served a 9-year sentence in federal prison for conspiracy to distribute marijuana. A Soros Senior Justice Fellow, his work includes nearly 100 publications.

**Michael Lenza** received his PhD in sociology from the University of Missouri in 2005 and is currently an associate professor of criminal justice at the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh. He completed a life sentence in Missouri for second-degree homicide (15 years' incarceration; 15 years on parole). While on parole, he received numerous honors in graduate school at the University of Missouri, successfully negotiating health care coverage for graduate student research and teaching assistants, creating institutional programs and representation for international graduate students, and was elected President of the Graduate Student Association. Since completing his PhD, he has implemented restorative justice/offender conferencing programs for juveniles and has published widely in criminal justice and criminology.