
As part of the Cambridge Studies in Criminology series, this book is a sophisticated, and well substantiated sociological study of women’s imprisonment in California from the 1960’s to 1990’s. The authors investigate whether and how shifts in penalty have affected the daily lives of female prisoners.

The authors contextualise their study by noting that the conclusion of World War II marked an era of renewed optimism and economic prosperity. California’s penal system, nicknamed “America’s laboratory for social change” (p. 8), was on the forefront of innovative social and rehabilitation programmes in the United States, at least on paper. However, economic downturn and disillusionment with rehabilitation in the face of increasing crime rates and right wing politics marked the transition from discourses of social inclusion to social exclusion and anxiety. In response, the justice system generally expanded its technologies of punishment. Its focus shifted from rehabilitation to risk management, which not only changed the public’s view of those kept but changed prisoner relations -- among those kept, and between the keepers and the kept. What was once more rehabilitative in emphasis and more supportive changed to distrust and emphasis on individual responsibility.

Set in this changing socio-political climate, the authors draw their conclusions from three primary sources of data and substantiate them with reference to a plethora of academic and governmental research. Multiple methods are used including content analysis, surveys, focus groups and interviews. The first major source of data, more historical, is the primary raw interview data, including interviewer notes with those kept, and reports gathered in the 1960’s by Ward and Kassenbaum at the then only women’s correctional facility, the California Institute for Women (CIW). Ward and Kassenbaum’s research questions are the basis for the authors’ own primary research (by way of content analysis of reports, surveys, focus groups, and interviews) gathered from both the keepers and the kept at two women’s correctional facilities in the 1990’s. The CIW was again chosen and is described as still embracing openness and rehabilitation in the 1990’s, relatively speaking; and Valley State Prison for Women (VSPW), one of four new facilities built to accommodate California’s growing
women’s prison population -- described as more austere and much more repressive and custody oriented both physically and psychologically than the CIW. Thus not only did the authors investigate (1) the effects of shifts in penal ideology and practice on institutional dynamics over time in one place, namely the CIW, (2) they also investigated how current penal ideologies and practice played out in two prisons with very different histories and institutional milieux but with similar types of prisoners.

Despite the sometimes unnecessary thick description and convoluted writing style, the authors demonstrate that penal institutions are indeed public and political institutions, although they are not entirely subject to the will and the whims of politics, shifting penal ideologies and the larger cultural milieu. What must also be figured into the equation when considering how prisoners experience prison and more importantly what they take out of their prison experience is how individual institutional histories and practices affect what Garland refers to as the “pragmatic rules and habits of doing time” (Kruttschnitt and Gartner, p. 11).

Meant for readers with more than just a rudimentary knowledge of penology and corrections, this volume represents a significant contribution to both the fields of sociology and penology and corrections. It should be recommended reading for penal policy makers, implementers and administrators as this book offers a more in-depth comprehension of the dynamics of doing time which, in turn, has definite implications for future penal policy.

Nancy Poon, University of Saskatchewan.
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