

Summary

Choosing for sharing?

Evaluation of the first stage of the introduction of the multi-person cell

On 3 July 2003, the Custodial Institutions Service (Dienst Justitiële Inrichtingen (DJI)) and the prison staff unions agreed that an independent study would be conducted to evaluate the first stage of the introduction of the multi-person (or multi-occupancy) cell (MPC) in a limited community regime.

Introduction

Two questions are central to the evaluation:

- What consequences does the introduction of MPC have for the working conditions, safety and well-being of the staff or the prisoners?
- Under what conditions could national, prison-wide MPC be introduced?

The study was conducted by IVA Beleidsonderzoek en Advies, affiliated with the University of Tilburg, in the period from January to May 2004. This report is the result of that study.

After placing the phenomenon of MPC in a historical context, the report describes the process by which the first stage of the introduction of MPC in a limited community regime originated. In order to answer the first question, the report deals with the effects and consequences of MPC, from the point of view of the staff as well as the prisoners. The relevant data were collected from studies of literature and documents, by telephone and face-to-face interviews with staff and prisoners in the seven Penal Institutions (PI) involved, and by using questionnaires distributed among penal institution workers (PIW) and prisoners.³⁸ With a view to answering the second question, the report closes with conclusions and recommendations based on the results of the study, which are relevant for developing the policy framework within which the conditions are to be formulated for the national introduction of MPC.

³⁸ These are the BASAM and DKS: questionnaires periodically administered by the DJI, which are part of the regular business operations in the prison system. For the purposes of the evaluation study – in consultation with the DJI and in keeping with the layout and processing of the questionnaires – additional questions (modules) were added with respect to MPC. The study was conducted in seven Penal Institutions (PI). The face-to-face interviews with staff and prisoners took place at the following locations: PI Achterhoek, Ooyerhoek site; PI Breda; PI Limburg-Zuid, Overmaze site; PI Rijnmond, De Schie site; PI Tilburg; PI Utrecht, Nieuwersluis site; and PI Nieuw Vossenveld (Vught). A detailed description of the organisation, approach and methods of the study is given in Annex 1.

Scope and limitations of the study

The evaluation study concerns the first stage of the introduction of MPC in a limited community regime, which took place under *special conditions*. This preparatory, 'experimental' stage only involved adult prisoners and was based on two prisoners in one cell. With the (possible) use of positive incentives, the prisoners were placed on a voluntary basis, whereby the standard regime served as a point of departure. The evaluation study thus related to a *special situation*. The current findings and conclusions cannot automatically be declared applicable to a future situation in which one or more of the aforementioned conditions would change.

Two persons in one cell: the run-up

In a letter of 16 October 2002, the Minister of Justice announced the modernisation of penalty application to the Lower House, including the capacity-increasing measure of the 'multi-person cell' (MPC). The ensuing decision to introduce MPC was challenged by the Group Staff Council (GOR) of the Prison Service. The GOR had not been asked for advice where this was required. On 3 July 2003, the Enterprise Section decided to dismiss the GOR's request to order the State to revoke its decision to introduce the measure. This made it possible to introduce the first stage of MPC at that time, and a special situation arose: *in anticipation* of the necessary amendment of the Custodial Institutions Act (*Penitentiare beginselenwet (Pbw)*), seven PIs were able to gain experience with several (for the time being two) persons in one cell. In 2004, this will involve 459 cells in prisons, remand centres and an institution primarily intended for the detention of aliens, which also has the status of a remand prison. The first prisoners were placed together in a single cell in the course of October 2003. December 2nd 2003, the Lower House approved the Minister of Justice's proposal to amend the *Pbw*. The discussion of the Bill in the Lower House is scheduled for early July 2004.³⁹

Historical context and research into MPC

In the debate over the intended introduction of MPC, in which the press had its own say, little or no attention was devoted to placing the phenomenon of the MPC in a historical context. The Netherlands has a long tradition when it comes to imposing prison sentences. From the beginning of the nineteenth century, the emphasis had come to lie increasingly on the 'educational potential' of the prison sentence: no revenge and retribution, but civilisation by working on the moral improvement of criminals by means of (solitary) confinement in a cell. The Netherlands maintained the cell system for a long time, whereas other West European countries had already abandoned it by the end of the nineteenth century. Although major adjustments had been

39 Parliamentary Papers 2002-2003 and 2003-2004, 28 979.

made to the Dutch cell system since then, the prison system continued to be based on the principle of one person per cell. The process of the emancipation of prisoners, the negotiation management between prison staff and prisoners and the opinions on what determines the quality of detention are embedded in that standard.⁴⁰ From this viewpoint, the intended introduction of MPC in a limited community regime – whereby existing cells are rebuilt for use by two persons – can be considered as a break with a long-lasting tradition.

MPC is the rule, not the exception almost everywhere outside the Netherlands. Many countries have already had more than a hundred years' experience with MPC, whereby in actual practice at the moment, there are often more than two persons in one cell, or 'dormitories' are used. Therefore, foreign research specifically aimed at two-person cell occupancy is hardly or not at all available. In addition, unlike the situation in many other countries, Dutch prisons are not overpopulated. The Dutch variation of negotiation management is also a relatively unique phenomenon. The introduction of MPC in the Netherlands is thus taking place in a context which is difficult to compare with experiences gained with MPC in other countries. For this reason, literature about and data relating to MPC practice abroad can be applied to the Dutch situation only to a limited extent. Moreover, much foreign research is based on information from one or more penal institutions with specific structural, demographic and regime characteristics which cannot be extrapolated to the Dutch situation without problems.

However, research in other countries underlines several points of interest which are relevant for the introduction of MPC in the Netherlands. This is true for the international and European standards for the treatment of prisoners. A second point of interest is the relationship between the nature of the crime, gender and degree of interpersonal distance: violent persons seem to have more of a need for this than non-violent persons. There also appears to be a negative correlation between the severity of the sentence and the suitability of prisoners for sharing a cell. Much research has been done into the experience of privacy and overpopulation (crowding). The findings

40 The term 'negotiation management' refers to a development described by the sociologist Abram de Swaan, 'in which people impose on themselves and each other a stricter control of violence, compel more carefulness' and further restrain their self-exaltation'; in this process, 'the variation in permissible manners of interaction is expanded' under 'the conditions of mutual consultation and reciprocal permission' (De Swaan, 1979). This development has also taken place within the penal institutions. In his dissertation, Zwezerijnen shows that 'striving for total limitation of the initiatives of prisoners has been replaced by striving to stimulate and give direction to initiatives of prisoners'. 'Authority that used to be based on position is now based on expertise.' 'Social control is based on trust, rather than coercion. The main means of control are (...) persuasion and encouragement.' 'One-sided communication has made room for bilateral communication: from top to bottom as well as from bottom to top' (Zwezerijnen, 1972). The term 'negotiation management' or 'negotiation culture' is used in this evaluation study to describe these shifts in the treatment of prisoners – whereby, for the rest, the prison staff remain the boss and, where necessary, impose disciplinary measures or internal rules on prisoners.

are not very unambiguous, but point in the direction of an increase in aggression, stress and physical and mental disorders with the use of MPC. The same can be ascertained for PIWs as well: their experience of safety and well-being is under pressure, and the risk of stress and physical and mental disorders increases when they are confronted by prisoners in situations which are difficult to control. Furthermore, research shows that ethnic and cultural differences between prisoners are significant for the feeling of well-being in and the experience of MPC only in relation to socio-economic background variables. Moreover, ethnic and cultural differences are not often problematised, and are sometimes even ignored in practice. However, with MPC, these factors are important in avoiding conflict situations. Lastly, the physical environment in which MPC is introduced (the organisation of multi-person cells in a ward), and with that the changes in the population density of a ward, appears to have a direct influence on the perception of crowding. The effect of this on prisoners' behaviour and experience of stress is clearly demonstrable, even in the event of minor changes.

Description of the process

After the run-up to the first stage of the introduction of MPC, as outlined above, on 3 July 2003, the DJI and the trade unions for prison staff concluded the *Overeenkomst invoering meerpersoonscelgebruik in het kader van het georganiseerd overleg Dienst Justitiële Inrichtingen* (Agreement on the introduction of multi-person cell occupancy in the context of organised consultation with the Custodial Institutions Service). Conditions are formulated in this Agreement to guarantee the safety and well-being of both staff and prisoners. Contra-indications for placement in a multi-person cell have been set out as well. On the basis of this agreement, several PIs made Plans of Action (PoA). In these, they set out in detail the procedure for the introduction and implementation of MPC. This involves matters such as organisation of the cells, contents of the day programme for prisoners, the deployment and training of staff, selection of prisoners and how contra-indications are applied, putting safety rules into operation, for example in locking up and excluding prisoners, as well as adjustment of the administrative information system.

The seven PIs proceeded with introduction on the basis of these plans. Despite the long introductory period, the implementation nevertheless took many PIWs by surprise. Daily routines were put under pressure. There was little or no disagreement between the working and steering groups supervising the implementation, the management and the staff (Staff Council). The conflict rules contained in the Agreement between the DJI and trade unions were used only once. The working and steering groups have

meanwhile been disbanded practically everywhere. The subject of MPC has become an item on the agenda during regular consultation situations.

The institutions are experiencing heavy pressure in getting and keeping the multi-person cells filled. This pressure causes unwanted side effects. Partly through the expansion of TULP (automated registration system of the prison service), the administrative workload on the staff of the PIs (including PIWs) has increased. PIWs regularly feel that they are being held responsible for keeping the cells filled, while that is not part of their task and responsibility. Furthermore, agreements in the PoAs on the selection procedure for prisoners are sometimes not observed. In practice, the applicable contra-indications are 'broadly interpreted'. The determination of what degree of psychological disorder, addiction or aggressive behaviour constitutes an exclusion criterion has led to confusion.

The same is true of the way in which shape has been given to the voluntary cooperation of prisoners. Virtually all PoAs provided for special rewards and positive incentives to convince prisoners to cooperate voluntarily. This 'temptation method' – based on the starting point of MPC placement unless the prisoner explicitly objects to this – proved to work, although at least twenty and probably more cases have occurred in which prisoners patently refused to share a cell and were placed apart. Separation in this context is allowed as an internal rule, but not as a disciplinary measure. The total number of separations of MPC prisoners is at least 51, according to statements of the PIs (until the end of April 2004). Half of the prisoners state that they were put under pressure by such an internal rule or otherwise. This is in line with the observations of the PIWs.

In a number of PIs, MPC proves to conflict with the accelerated release (IVO) scheme: for pragmatic reasons, prisoners in multi-person cells are not eligible for the accelerated release scheme. In general, the prisoners in question in MPC wards are not informed of these reasons. The unequal informing of prisoners is an undesirable situation, which could lead to legal uncertainty and legal inequality.

Staff

Deployment and training

Additional support staff and guards are deployed in all PIs. Problems continue to occur in practice, partly owing to a lack of available staff (quantitative) and partly to inadequate capability of the staff to deal with the increased complexity of the work in MPC wards (qualitative). Eighty per cent of the PIWs state that they did not make their own choice to work in MPC wards. They experience the introduction of MPC as a *fait accompli* which has

been imposed on them. More than twenty per cent of all PIWs say that their supervisor exerted pressure on them. If, theoretically, they did indeed have a choice, failure to cooperate would in real terms mean transfer to another ward, and this was an unattractive prospect for most of them. As set out in the Agreement, an additional training course in 'conflict management and self-defence' has been developed which the PIWs on an MPC ward are required to take. Most PIWs have done so, and almost half of them felt that the training was not very meaningful for actual practice. Contrary to the preconditions in the Agreement, not all PIWs in MPC wards have completed the required BBO (special vocational training) course (in time).

Safety

During the study period, no serious MPC-related incidents occurred with PIWs or other staff. One out of three PIWs feels safe working in a ward with multi-person cells. One fourth do not feel safe. The rest state that they feel neither safe nor unsafe. When asked to compare, 63% of the PIWs felt that working on an MPC ward was less safe than working in wards with only single person cells. The procedure set out in the Agreement, always to open a multi-person cell with two PIWs, is frequently not followed in practice. Sometimes two PIWs are not available (quickly enough). In other cases, the PIWs state that they cannot see why it would be unsafe to open the door of a multi-person cell alone, while situations occur in day-to-day practice in which PIWs are not anywhere near each other in the presence of two or more prisoners. Deviation from the procedure in the Agreement does not seem to have an effect on the experience of safety. For the PIWs, perception of the risks of MPC is much more related to aggression on the ward, a heavy workload and the degree to which they feel they have room and are encouraged to take their own decisions in organising their relationship with prisoners.

Workload and work experience

The PIWs experience the workload as heavy and presume that it will only increase in future. Over eighty per cent consider working on an MPC ward more difficult than on a ward with only single person cells. PIWs emphasise that the increased workload and the announced reduction of working hours limits their possibilities to maintain adequate contact with prisoners. They consider this as a hollowing out of an essential part of their duties. PIWs on an MPC ward more often experience role conflicts, more aggression and less favourable work rosters. In the first quarter of 2004, the absenteeism rate in virtually all PIs was lower than in the same period in 2003. The interviews showed that PIWs are afraid to lose their jobs in an unfavourable labour market and in a period of continuous cutbacks in the prison system.

Opinions on MPC

PIWs' opinions on MPC vary strongly among the PIs. In total, 66% have a

positive or neutral opinion about working on an MPC ward. One third have a negative opinion. Three PIs stand out. In the Limburg Zuid PI, PIWs are clearly more negative than average, and in the Tilburg PI and Breda PI considerably more positive. Positive opinions are expressed mainly by PIWs who feel safe in their work with MPC and, in addition, do not consider working with MPC less safe than working on a ward with only single-person cells. Other factors that influence a positive opinion of MPC are: feeling supported by supervisors, feeling responsible for one's work, making one's own choice to work with MPC and not being put under pressure by supervisors. PIWs who considered the additional training meaningful for practice are usually more positive about MPC as well. In all PIs, the different sections of staff consider the application of the contra-indications and conflicts between cellmates as the main sources of tension in placing prisoners in multi-person cells. There are differences of opinion within and among the different job groups and among the PIs on the possible nationwide introduction of MPC, whereby the placement of prisoners in a limited community regime would become obligatory in nature. Members of staff who are not negative regarding nationwide introduction of MPC also emphasize that clear conditions are necessary if this is to be done successfully, and in this light question the combining of the introduction of MPC with cutbacks and the reduction in working hours.

Prisoners

Placement and its voluntary nature

One fourth of the prisoners who share a cell are of the opinion that they were well informed in advance. This information was usually provided by or on behalf of the management. About 40% of the prisoners state that they themselves had applied. Almost half of the prisoners were able to choose their cellmate themselves. That is the case particularly in the Limburg Zuid PI, Tilburg, the Breda PI and the PI in Vught. Over half of the prisoners in a multi-person cell say they were put under 'a bit' of pressure (21%) or 'strongly' (34%) put under pressure, but this does not mean that the majority of them ultimately experience the sharing of a cell as problematic. Approximately 40% of the prisoners do not have any problem in sharing the cell with another. The same percentage do have difficulty with this, and the remaining 20% cannot or do not want to make any statement about it. In interpreting these percentages, one must take account of the fact that over 40% of the (MPC) prisoners state that sharing a cell gave them a material advantage. A great majority of the MPC prisoners say that they 'certainly would not' want to share a cell with more than two persons. A quarter 'might' want to do so, at least if they were able to choose the cellmates. Of the prisoners, 4% say that they 'certainly would' want to share a cell with more than two persons.

In total, 324 complaints have been lodged (no data have been received from the Breda PI). These complaints relate especially to the (intended) placement and putting 'voluntary placement' into operation upon introducing MPC. Within these, two variations can be roughly distinguished. The largest number of complaint cases concern the placement of prisoners in a multi-person cell, whereby pressure or coercion was allegedly applied, or whereby a prisoner was placed in a multi-person cell for the second time within the same detention period. In addition, a substantial number of complaint cases are aimed against placement in solitary confinement after the prisoner had refused placement in a multi-person cell. Another group of complaint cases relate to the way in which contra-indications are applied in the selection procedure. Lastly, there is another group of cases concerning material, psychosocial and behaviour-related complaints, such as a too small cell area, restrictions in spending the day, lack of space, inadequate facilities, inadequate ventilation, or disturbance of privacy, not feeling safe, or a smoking cellmate, discrimination, threats of violence and theft. About 40% of all prisoners questioned (in both single and a multi-person cells) are of the opinion that it helps to lodge a complaint; 35% believe that the complaints committee took the complaint seriously. Most of the prisoners complain about the long time it takes for the complaint to be handled.

Regarding the extent of voluntariness applied, there are clear differences between the sites studied. At the Tilburg PI, the Breda PI and the Limburg Zuid PI, placement in a multi-person cell was more voluntary in nature than at the other sites.

Safety

During the study period, hardly any serious or exceptional incidents took place between prisoners in a multi-person cell. One of six MPC prisoners felt safer with a cellmate than alone in a cell. Almost 20% stated that the cellmate was 'sometimes' or 'often' aggressive. Of the MPC prisoners, 5% state that they are 'sometimes' or 'often' sexually harassed by their cellmate. In addition, another 3% of the MPC prisoners say that they are now and then sexually harassed by others than the cellmate (3% of the single-person cell (SPC) prisoners also say this).

These figures should be used with due care, because the answers on both aspects are not always given consistently.⁴¹ Prisoners who share a cell do not feel safe more often with respect to PIWs than prisoners alone in a cell.

41 The answer to the statement 'I am being sexually harassed' is sometimes 'no', whereas later the answer is 'often' when prisoners are asked if they are being sexually harassed by their cellmate. In addition, a (small) number did not fill in these questions.

Well-being

The consequences for and adjustments to the day programme of MPC prisoners have remained limited. Half of the MPC prisoners feel that their privacy has been curtailed. This group state that they are always locked in with the cellmate and are thus never alone. This is especially the case at the sites where work is not done in shifts. In all PIs, MPC and SPC prisoners have the same day programme. Besides shift-work, there is another important factor in relation to the day programme for MPC. The intended economising: reducing working hours from 78 to 63 hours a week, could have consequences for the time those prisoners would have to spend in the (multi-occupancy) cell. This could create a new situation with unknown effects and consequences. The prisoners are concerned about the possible coincidence of the introduction of MPC and the intended reduction in working hours. Concerning the assessment of the day programme activities, there are no differences between MPC prisoners and prisoners alone in a cell. Despite the day programme activities, two thirds of the MPC prisoners feel that they spend too much time together in the cell. Prisoners who share a cell do not assess the different aspects of the detention climate differently from prisoners who are alone in a cell. However, there are differences in this respect among the PIs and PI sites.

Cells have been adjusted for multi-person occupancy, but their surface area has not been increased. In adjusting single-person cells for two-person occupancy, the international and European standards for a minimum number of m² have not been followed. Most multi-person cells have a surface area of approximately 10 m². Most prisoners consider the cell too small for two persons. Two thirds consider the ventilation in the cell inadequate. Prisoners feel uncomfortable about using the toilet or shower in the presence of a cellmate. Irritation often occurs regarding matters such as choosing TV programmes, personal hygiene, snoring or smoking. Prisoners, whether or not they share a cell, have the same opinions about the hygienic situation on their own wards and in other spaces. Half of both the MPC prisoners and those who are alone in a cell feel that their health and condition have deteriorated during the present detention. Prisoners in multi-person cells have more health complaints than prisoners staying alone in a cell. However, there appears to be no difference between the two groups when it comes to the extent to which they rely on and are satisfied with the care provided. Nor do there appear to be differences between the two groups of prisoners in the extent to which they rely on the services of other officers and how they assess their work. Prisoners who are alone in a cell have the same opinion as MPC prisoners on the opportunities to maintain contact with friends and family and receive things from outside.

During the present detention period, about 45% of the prisoners had lodged a complaint 'now and again'.

Opinions on MPC

Somewhat more than 40% of the prisoners consider it 'pleasant' to share a cell. They say that they are less likely to sit and brood in such a situation and experience the company as positive. Most prisoners can get along well with the cellmate. Almost half say that they 'never' or 'almost never' have problems with the cellmate. On the other hand, 23% of the prisoners state that they 'sometimes' and 17% that they 'always' have problems with their cellmate. Other advantages of MPC which are mentioned are the additional facilities, such as more visiting hours and recreation time, or the financial allowance. Half of the prisoners do not see any advantages. The limited room and lack of privacy are the most frequently mentioned disadvantages. In addition, the greater chance of aggression, too little rest and too much stress are viewed as major disadvantages. About 3% of the prisoners do not see any disadvantages in sharing a cell.

What makes prisoners have a positive opinion on MPC? In MPC prisoners, numerous personal characteristics do not show any connection. However in the case of obvious factors such as having a say in the choice of a cellmate, having a good relationship with the cellmate, not being put under pressure to go to a multi-person cell, the lack of a great desire for privacy (in particular not feeling uncomfortable about using the toilet in the presence of a cellmate), that connection is demonstrable. Among the prisoners staying in single-person cells, especially female prisoners, prisoners who were not born in the Netherlands and prisoners who only see advantages seem to be more inclined to share a cell. They also tend to be more willing to share a cell the more they feel that work will be done on social reintegration as well during the detention. Prisoners who have only been in detention for a short time have more of a tendency to share a cell. Prisoners with an open nature are more positive towards sharing a cell than closed types.

Recommendations

Under what conditions could national, prison-wide MPC be introduced?

- 1 On the basis of the study results relating to the working conditions of the staff, as well as the safety and well-being of the staff and prisoners, the evaluation of the first stage of the introduction of MPC *does not give sufficient cause* to abandon the intended national introduction of MPC in a limited community regime.

In a historical perspective, the introduction of MPC means a break with the policy pursued to date in imposing custodial sentences. Although various changes have been made to the regime since the introduction of the cell system in the mid-nineteenth century, single-person cell occupancy has remained the standard. That long tradition of detention in cells puts the Netherlands in a unique position with respect to many other West European countries, where different forms of MPC have been used since the end of the nineteenth century.

The intention to amend the Custodial Institutions Act, with an increase in the possibilities for MPC, is based on reasons of capacity and budget. The need to expand the capacity for sanctions is manifest. On the basis of the evaluation of the first stage of the introduction of MPC, however, a number of damaging observations have been made with respect to the workload of the institution staff, the well-being and safety of prisoners, as well as the practical execution of MPC.

- 2 Should the decision be taken, despite these damaging observations, to introduce MPC nationwide, for the purposes of a responsible introduction, proper account should be taken of the following *points of attention or conditions*:
 - The introduction of MPC under the constellation of continual cutbacks, the intended reduction in working hours in the standard regime and the experienced austerity resulting from this, leads to *feelings of unrest* among the staff and the prisoners. This gives rise to doubts about or resistance to MPC, which are actually not inspired by a rejection of MPC in principle. The staff, in particular the PIWs, are afraid of having less opportunity to maintain contact with prisoners, to observe their behaviour and thus maintain a grip on a larger number of prisoners who spend more time 'behind the closed door' of a multi-person cell. The prisoners fear a deterioration of the detention climate and hardening of the relationship with the PIWs. This 'experienced reality' should continue to receive the necessary attention, at national level as well as in the PIs.
 - The first stage of the introduction of MPC took place under the condition of voluntary participation. The evaluation of how the voluntary participation of prisoners was put into practice during the first stage of the introduction of MPC has brought differences to light among the PI sites. The variations range from 'massaging' through 'directing' to 'ignoring' voluntariness. More than half of the prisoners state that they were put under pressure. Different policy lines were also applied regarding the use of positive incentives to encourage prisoners to share a cell. The fact that compulsory placement was used at some PI sites and not positive incentives has seen to it that the first stage of the introduction of MPC in particular cases was more similar to the

situation that could possibly arise after amendment of the Custodial Institutions Act and the intended introduction of total MPC than could be expected beforehand. It is important to observe in this light that the evaluation study has produced indications emphasising that voluntary placement, possibly combined with the use of positive incentives, has a positive effect on the participation of prisoners and their experience of MPC. The PIWs also experience MPC more negatively to the extent that coercion is used more or more frequently, and 75% of the PIWs expect problems to increase if placement in multi-person cells becomes compulsory in nature. On the basis of these observations, it is advisable in case of national introduction of MPC to formulate policy lines stipulating that prisoners should be encouraged also through the *use of positive incentives* to share a cell, as well as to be involved in *and* feel that they have influence on the *choice of a cellmate* – and to see to it that this policy line is observed in a uniform manner.

- The introduction of MPC will change the working climate. The staff, the PIWs in particular, feel on the one hand that through the pressure to fill multi-person cells and keep them filled, their duties and responsibilities are being stretched. On the other hand, the PIWs emphasise that involvement in the selection and ‘matching’ of prisoners is a very important aspect of their work and is part of the negotiation management between staff and prisoners. A certain degree of *participation and involvement of staff* in placing prisoners together is necessary to guarantee a safe climate on the MPC wards. This paradoxical situation demands – with a view to national introduction of MPC – a careful assessment of the effects of MPC on the negotiation culture between PIWs and prisoners, further investment in the leadership on MPC wards and a careful and well-argued apportionment of responsibilities. It can be concluded from the study results that stimulating leadership is considered important. In line with this, the PIWs emphasise that the ‘experienced support’ from managers is limited at the moment. In order to arrive at a functionally workable form of negotiation management, aspects of co-responsibility, co-decision-making authority and a stimulating working climate must be involved. An important observation is, moreover, that the aforementioned aspects are also directly related to the degree of subjective and objective feelings of safety which PIWs experience.
- The introduction of MPC will increase the *workload of the prison staff*, particularly that of the PIWs. The additional fulltime positions made available for MPC wards do not always appear to be filled adequately, and are not sufficient in all cases in the light of the increased complexity of the work on MPC wards. Therefore, it is advisable in increasing the fulltime positions in connection with the intended national introduction of MPC not only to use quantitative, but also and especially qualitative criteria for staff selection, specifically oriented to

- multi-person detention. Additional training could also play a part.
- The evaluation of the first stage of the introduction of MPC did not produce any indications that the current work instructions of PIWs need fundamental adjustments other than practical adjustments to the business operations, which ensue logically from the fact that two prisoners share a cell. Although many PIWs are of the opinion that working on an MPC ward is less safe than working on a ward with only single-person cells, most of them do not consider work on an MPC ward as unsafe. Nevertheless, based on the finding that, for example PIWs feel safer on an MPC ward to the extent that they experience less of a workload, it is advisable to pay attention to the *functionality and flexibility of the work instructions* in the light of the heavier workload and increased complexity of the work on MPC wards.
 - The present contra-indications and the policy lines which the PIs have based on them often stand in the way of the occupancy and continued occupancy of the multi-person cells. The experienced pressure accompanying this has negative effects and consequences. The intended increase in the capacity of multi-person cells requires reconsideration of the *workability of the current contra-indications* and a review of the procedure for applying contra-indications.
 - In introducing MPC, a site and ward-specific *proportion of the number of multi-person cells to the total number of cells* should be taken into consideration, so that the possibility continues to exist to spread prisoners who in the second instance prove too ‘weak’ for MPC. Concentration of ‘weak’ prisoners on wards within the existing structure has a negative effect on the PIWs’ experience of safety.
 - In the *selection and ‘matching’* of prisoners for MPC, with a view to the entry procedure and transfer of prisoners, more attention should be paid to the severity of the sentence and nature of the offence. Given the total number of short-term prisoners, detainees in preventive and alternative detention and detainees committed under the Traffic Regulations (Administrative Enforcement) Act (*Wet Mulder*), in view of the relatively short time this group spend in detention, and given the observation that in the case of short-term detention, the application of an extra austere regime is being considered, it is advisable to study whether, in practice, MPC would be a more suitable form of detention for this group than for relatively more severely sentenced prisoners or detainees (in remand prisons) with the prospect of a potentially severe sentence.
 - A positive factor in the privacy experience of MPC prisoners is *working in shifts* in the day programming. If work is not done in shifts, MPC prisoners spend practically the whole day in each other’s proximity. In combination with the intended reduction in working hours, through which prisoners in a full community and, in practice, usually prisoners in a limited community as well, would spend more time ‘behind closed

doors', not using shifts in the activities of the day programme would be a stress-increasing factor which heightens the safety risk for prisoners and staff.

- The introduction of MPC – carried out in practice by rebuilding single-person cells for two-person occupancy – creates the circumstance that MPC prisoners will have fewer m² available individually than indicated as desirable in *international and European standards*. Partly on the basis of this situation, it would be wise to consider using MPC as far as possible for short-term sentences, so that prisoners are not housed for too long in a cell which is in itself too small.
- The *management capacity* within the PIs, the communication of managers with one another, the communication between managers and workers and the coaching of workers should be better developed so that workers can be coached in dealing with the effects of the introduction of MPC. Given the intended centralisation of the Human Resources services, which will increase the distance between specialised human resources officers and the workplace, it is advisable to take measures to accentuate the importance of the Human Resources position within the PIs and create opportunities to respond to specific human resource development issues of PIs.
- It is advisable to monitor the introduction of MPC adequately and systematically and *evaluate* both the process of introduction and the efficiency and effectiveness of the MPC measure. A suitable and practically feasible manner to do this is to utilise the existing format of the annual report of the PIs. This format could include parameters relating to MPC.