

HEFNER, MARY KRISTEN., M.A. Negotiating Masculinity within Prison. (2009)
Directed by Dr. Sandra Westervelt. 219 pp.

The idea that prisons are particularly masculine environments is solidly grounded in current sociological literature. However, limited literature exists regarding the ways masculinity is negotiated within prison settings. Using James W. Messerschmidt's (1993) structured action theory, the current examination explores how male prison inmates situationally negotiate masculinity within these institutional milieus.

Three research questions are posed. First, how does masculinity negotiation differ in maximum vs. minimum-security institutions and by race within and across these institutional settings? In addition, is prison violence used as a resource to negotiate masculinity within the prison setting and, if so, to what extent? Lastly, how do male inmates in single sex, long-term correctional facilities negotiate masculinity in the absence of women?

Based on in-depth interviews conducted with fourteen male prison inmates in two North Carolina prisons, security level has a greater impact than race on the differential ways masculinity is negotiated in prison. However, when race does impact the ways masculinity is accomplished, it does so in significant and interesting ways.

NEGOTIATING MASCULINITY WITHIN PRISON

by

Mary Kristen Hefner

A Thesis Submitted to
the Faculty of The Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

Greensboro
2009

Approved by

Committee Chair

To those whose voices often go unheard.

APPROVAL PAGE

This thesis has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of The Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Committee Chair _____

Committee Members _____

Date of Acceptance by Committee

Date of Final Oral Examination

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would first like to acknowledge and thank Dr. Sandra Westervelt who believed in me from the beginning, whose support was unwavering, and without whom this never would have been possible. I would also like to thank Dr. Gwen Hunnicutt and Dr. Steven R. Cureton, my thesis committee members, for their guidance, expertise, and commitment throughout this project.

I would like to thank various North Carolina Department of Correction personnel including, but not limited to, Dr. Stephan A. Kiefer, Mr. James Pierce, Mr. David Edwards, Dr. Michael Conley, Mrs. Sarah Cobb, Superintendent George Solomon, and Superintendent Michael Davis for allowing me to conduct this research project and for providing me the support necessary to complete this examination.

I am also grateful to the members of UNCG's Institutional Review Board, particularly Mr. Eric Allen and Dr. Anne Fletcher, for being so accommodating and willing to help during this unusual, time-consuming, and sometimes difficult process.

I want to thank my family for providing continued support in my life. I would especially like to thank my nieces, Madeline and Kaylee, for reminding me to always take time to appreciate the little things in life.

Finally, I want to thank the incarcerated men who shared a part of their lives with me in order for others to better understand their plight.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THEORY	5
Gender and Masculinity	5
Gender	5
“Doing” Gender	10
Masculinity	14
“Accomplishing” Masculinity	19
Influence of Class on Masculinity Negotiation	26
Influence of Race on Masculinity Negotiation	26
Resources for “Doing” Masculinity	28
Material Resources	29
Interpersonal Power	30
Employment	31
Emotions	33
Language	35
Sports	36
Normative Heterosexuality	38
Knowledge and Rationality	40
Masculinity and Crime/Violence	41
Non-Sexual Violence	43
Sexual Violence	45
Summary	46
III. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE: DOING MASCULINITY	49
“Doing” Masculinity in Social Context	49
Masculinity and Prison	52
Summary	57
IV. METHODOLOGY	58
Method	58
Institutional Approval to Conduct Research	61
Research Procedure	61

Study Design.....	61
Sample.....	63
Sampling Criteria.....	66
Data Analysis.....	67
Study Limitations.....	69
Pilot Interviews.....	72
Preliminary Findings.....	76
Full-Scale Examination.....	82
Conclusion.....	85

V. RESULTS: MASCULINITY NEGOTIATION THROUGH FIRST-HAND ACCOUNTS.....86

Negotiation of Masculinity in Prison.....	86
Differential Negotiation of Masculinity by Prison	
Security Level and Race.....	87
Material Resources by Setting.....	87
Material Resources by Race.....	92
Interpersonal Power by Setting.....	93
Interpersonal Power by Race.....	97
Employment by Setting.....	100
Employment by Race.....	104
Emotions by Setting.....	106
Emotions by Race.....	109
Language by Setting.....	112
Language by Race.....	114
Sports and Fitness by Setting.....	115
Sports and Fitness by Race.....	118
Knowledge and Rationality by Setting.....	119
Knowledge and Rationality by Race.....	122
Respect by Setting.....	122
Respect by Race.....	125
Friendships and Doing Time Alone or	
Collectively by Setting.....	125
Friendships and Doing Time Alone or	
Collectively by Race.....	129
Inmate Accounts of Masculinity by Setting.....	131
Inmate Accounts of Masculinity by Race.....	133
Violence as a Resource for Negotiating Masculinity.....	134
Non-sexual Violence by Security Level.....	134
Non-sexual Violence by Race.....	138
Sexual Violence by Security Level.....	139
Sexual Violence by Race.....	142
Negotiation of Masculinity in the Absence of Women.....	143

Normative Heterosexuality by Security Level	144
Normative Heterosexuality by Race	152
Conclusion	154
VI. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	157
Theory of Structured Action in the Prison Environment	157
Interviewer Effects on and Nonverbal Signs of Masculinity Negotiation.....	168
Descriptions that are Consistent with and Contradict Current Ideology	175
Evidence of Prison Based Indicators of Social Class	178
Enhancements for Future Research	180
Future Research Directions.....	181
Conclusion	182
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	184
APPENDIX A. INTERVIEW SCHEDULE: MINIMUM-SECURITY PARTICIPANTS	194
APPENDIX B. INTERVIEW SCHEDULE: MAXIMUM-SECURITY PARTICIPANTS.....	200
APPENDIX C. INFORMED CONSENT.....	207
APPENDIX D. SAMPLING CRITERIA.....	211
APPENDIX E. PARTICIPANT RECRUITMENT LETTER.....	212
APPENDIX F. NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION APPROVAL	215
APPENDIX G. UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO IRB APPROVAL FOR PILOT STUDY	217
APPENDIX H. UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO IRB APPROVAL FOR FULL SCALE STUDY	218

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Gender is a socially constructed characteristic of our culture that plays an important role in the social interactions of men and women. Gender, as opposed to sex, is the way males and females carry out specific roles designated to the particular gender group they represent. Males and females engage in particular behaviors because those behaviors represent their “gender” effectively (Stohr and Hemmens 2004: 231). As Morgan (1992) suggests, masculinity, for example, “is a cultural source, which can be drawn upon in a ‘Goffmanesque’ presentation of the self, something which is negotiated (implicitly or explicitly) over a wide range of situations” (cited in Carrabine and Longhurst 1998: 162).

The primary purpose of this study is to examine how masculinity is negotiated in various prison settings. Four main research questions are posed. First, how do male inmates in single sex, long-term correctional facilities negotiate or manage masculinity in the absence of women? Historically, our society has viewed gender as being dichotomous and distinguishes masculinity and femininity as the only gender categories with which one can identify. However, more recent work has shown that a variety of masculinities and femininities exist. Differing types of masculinities exist only to the

extent that other types of masculinities and femininities exist within the same time and space.

The second research question asks how does masculinity negotiation differ in close (maximum) vs. minimum-security institutions? What elements and resources are present or absent in each that allow for the playing out of gender roles within these differentiated social settings?

According to the North Carolina Department of Correction, minimum-security prisons are comprised of non-secure dormitories which are regularly patrolled by correctional officers. Each inmate dormitory consists of a group toilet and shower area adjacent to the sleeping quarters that contain double bunks and lockers. The prison is commonly enclosed by a single perimeter, but has no armed or itinerant surveillance. Minimum custody inmates generally participate in community-based work assignments such as the Governor's Community Work Program, road maintenance with Department of Transportation employee supervision, or work release with civilian employers. Inmates also may participate in prerelease transition programs with community volunteers and family sponsors (<http://www.doc.state.nc.us/dop/custody.htm>).

In contrast, North Carolina's Department of Correction distinguishes maximum-security prisons as consisting of cells with sliding entrances that are remotely operated from a secure control station. Maximum custody inmates typically remain in their cells twenty-three hours a day. During the other hour, they may be allowed to shower and exercise in the cellblock or an exterior cage. All inmate movement is strictly controlled with the use of physical restraints and correctional officer escorts

(<http://www.doc.state.nc.us/dop/custody.htm>). The differences in minimum and maximum-security institutions permit and/or constrain the social action of the individuals who live in them, thus permitting and/or constraining the resources available for inmates to negotiate masculinity.

The third research question asks how does masculinity negotiation vary by race within and across these institutional settings? Masculinity is negotiated in a variety of ways given that men reproduce masculine ideals in specific, structured practices (Messerschmidt, 1993). Men use their access to power and resources to effectively express their gender to others. The type of masculinity negotiated by a particular individual depends on the resources available to do so. Moreover, masculinity negotiation also is dependent upon current societal ideologies that guide individuals' behaviors. For example, a black, upper-class man will construct masculinity differently than a white, lower class man based on the resources accessible to each, and the prevailing ideology. The former may be able to negotiate masculinity in a more traditional way, such as expressing oneself as a business man or the breadwinner of a family. The same resources used by the black, upper-class man for negotiating masculinity may not be available to the white, lower-class man, therefore positioning the latter to negotiate masculinity by utilizing different resources. In this way, gender interconnects with race and class creating multiple types of masculinities.

There are obviously fewer resources, choices and opportunities for men who are in prison. But compared to minimum security facilities, there are even greater restrictions in maximum security prisons. Therefore, due to the differential resources available in

various prison settings that are accessible for the negotiation of gender and existing beliefs, masculinity should be negotiated differently in close (maximum) and minimum-security institutions. Moreover, based on the same rationale, masculinity also should be negotiated differently by race within and between these institutional settings.

Lastly, violent behavior does exist in prison. I am interested in exploring whether violence is used as a resource to negotiate masculinity within the prison setting. To the extent that violence is used as a resource to negotiate masculinity, I am interested in exploring whether it varies by the type of prison setting in which inmates are situated.

Limited literature exists regarding the ways masculinity is negotiated in prison settings. The sociological literature does, however, point to gender and the ways in which gender is “done” in our society as a starting point for this discussion. In the following theoretical discussion, I start by situating gender generally in our society. Subsequently, I consider the phenomenon of “doing” gender, as examined by Candace West and Don H. Zimmerman (1987), as a way of viewing gendered behavior in our culture. The discussion then proceeds to masculinity more specifically in the context of our society. Next, Messerschmidt’s theory of structured action, which incorporates many of West and Zimmerman’s notions of “doing” gender, is discussed as the main theory on which this research is based. The discussion then examines gender and masculinity in terms of criminal and violent behavior and in terms of prison life in order to situate the questions: how is masculinity negotiated in prison, and how is masculinity negotiation structured by prison setting?

CHAPTER II

THEORY

Gender and Masculinity

Gender

In Western societies, gender is often viewed as a natural phenomenon, occurring based on one's identified or recognized sex category. According to this view of gender, individuals are the focus of gendered behavior and not the social interactions and institutions of which they are a part. Moreover, this perspective asserts that the sex of the individual and the sex category one is placed into puts restrictions or constraints on the gendered behaviors in which individuals engage. In Amy S. Wharton's book, The Sociology of Gender: An Introduction to Theory and Research (2005), she states that:

The constraints imposed by sex come primarily from the reproductive roles of men and women. Hence, those who view gender as an attribute of individuals tend to believe that there are some differences between the sexes that are relatively stable across situations (23).

Furthermore, this biological perspective of gender claims that the differences between men and women are greater than the differences within each group, neglecting to take into account the impact of social factors, such as race and class, on gender (Wharton, 2005: 23).

Elaine J. Hall presents an alternate, feminist view of gender and gender relations. In her article, “Developing the Gender Relations Perspective: The Emergence of a New Conceptualization of Gender in the 1990’s,” she (2000) discusses the reconceptualization of gender that occurred within the social sciences from a definition of gender founded in individual traits to what she refers to as the gender relations perspective.

According to Hall (2000), historically, the biological and individualistic views observe gender as being the result of personality characteristics or learned gender roles (97). “When cast as a personality characteristic, individuals ‘have’ gender because they develop feminine or masculine identities. When defined as ‘gender roles,’ individuals ‘have’ gender because they have learned and internalized role definitions of appropriate behavior for females and males” (97). Consequently, when taking a gender relations perspective, the biologically and individually based conceptualizations of gender are limited in several ways.

First, the individualistic view of gender involves the idea that certain types of individuals exist, namely those who are masculine or feminine. This way of thinking “not only locates gender as something within individuals, but also frames gender as a universal entity which can be measured by standardized scales for all people within a society” (Hall, 2000: 101). The fact that gender is not a constant, invariable phenomenon throughout time and space is evidence refuting the idea that gender is rooted within individuals. In other words, societies throughout the world do not necessarily share assumptions about gender that are understood to be true in Western societies. For example, in our society, we predominately identify “male” and “female” as being the

only two sex categories and, subsequently, “masculinity” and “femininity” as the only two gender options. However, recent research shows that multiple masculinities and femininities exist. Moreover, other societies have historically recognized the existence of more than two gender categories. William G. Roy (2001) states that various Native American societies have included a gender category known as *berdache* in their social order who hold a high status within their society. *Berdaches* are “people who are born with male genitalia but who live as neither men nor women, combining characteristics of both” (113). Not only do these individuals not identify with one gender or another, they also engage in sexual relations with other men in order to meet their sexual needs without “threatening the institution of marriage” (Roy, 2001: 114). Engaging in this type of behavior is very different from any recognized, gender appropriate behaviors in our culture today.

Even within cultures that identify dichotomized gender categories similar to the groupings distinguished in contemporary Western society, the activities and manners that are treated as masculine or feminine differ significantly from the behaviors for the same gender categories in our society. “The Tahitians, for example, are dimorphic in that they have two sex-gender statuses, men and women, but there are few social differences between them” (Roy, 2001: 115). In fact, gender differences are not expressed in the Tahitian language (Roy, 2001: 115). In our society, we use pronouns “he/him” or “she/her” to refer to the gender of a third party, but Tahitians do not use pronouns to designate the sex or sex category of individuals.

Furthermore, within our own culture, individuals of both sexes often exhibit hegemonic masculine behaviors within one context and stereotypically feminine behaviors within another. Previous research has documented this fact. According to Hall (2000), one examination found that one's "social role influences whether or not gender stereotypes are applied; judges attributed feminine traits to women and men performing homemaking tasks in television commercials, and masculine traits to men and women portraying business executives" (Eagly and Steffen, 1984 and Geis et al., 1984 as cited in Hall, 2000: 101).

A second limitation of the individualistic view of gender as described by Hall (2000) is its dependence on justifications of gender based on socialization. This belief encompasses the idea that individuals adopt conventional ideas of gender during childhood and that these ideas are ultimately internalized and held constant throughout the life course. But, this is not the case. Studies show that ideas about gender and the way individuals "do" gender change throughout the life course. Catherine B. Silver (2003) states that, "men and women spend a significant period of their lives – on average nineteen years for women and fourteen years for men – in the third and fourth ages, in a 'habitus' (Bourdieu, 1984) characterized by a weakening of social expectations about mobility and a lessening of traditional gender norms" (387). Thus, ideas individuals have about gender throughout the life course change according to parallel changes in social context.

To this end, neither the biological nor individualistic views of gender can “adequately incorporate the structural aspects of gender” across differing contexts (Hall, 2000: 102).

Hall (2000) puts forth the gender relations perspective as an alternative theory for analyzing gender in our society. Hall discusses four principles of this perspective: 1) individuals have gendered identities; however, they also ‘do’ gender; 2) presentations of masculinity and femininity are “contextualized behaviors occurring in and deriving meaning from particular social settings;” 3) social actors within society are gendered, but so are the behaviors individuals engage in and the social institutions of which they are a part; and 4) “structural factors strongly influence the shape of gender patterns whether they occur at the micro, meso, or macro levels of social life” (Hall, 2000: 104). The gender relations perspective gives insight into the analysis of gender explored in this thesis.

Consistent with the gender relations perspective, Judith M. Gerson and Kathy Peiss (1985) define gender as “socially constructed relationships between women and men, among women, and among men in social groups. Gender is not a rigid or reified analytic category imposed on human experience, but a fluid one whose meaning emerges in specific social contexts as it is created and recreated through human actions ” (114). This definition emphasizes the social actions and interactions that individuals engage in as mechanisms for producing and reproducing gender as socially created relationships.

Furthermore, in their article, “Unpacking the Gender System: A Theoretical Perspective on Gender Beliefs and Social Relations,” Cecilia L. Ridgeway and Shelley J.

Correll (2004) view gender as an “institutionalized system of social practices for constituting people as two significantly different categories, men and women, and organizing social relations of inequality on the basis of that difference” (510). Gender is viewed as a multi-phased organization of differentiation and inequality much in the same way as race and class, which involves the distribution of societal resources, “patterns of behavior and organizational practices at the interactional level, and selves and identities at the individual level” (Ridgeway and Correll, 2004: 511).

The latter views and definitions of gender are consistent with the theoretical framework utilized in this examination. The current study incorporates the gender relations perspective by examining how male prison inmates “do” gender within the particular social setting in which they find themselves and how various structural factors aid in the negotiation of masculinity. Next, I discuss how individuals in our culture “do” gender in an attempt to lay the foundation for examining how men in single sex, long-term correctional facilities negotiate masculinity.

“Doing” Gender

Candace West and Don H. Zimmerman (1987) argue that gender is something that is routinely and continually “done” in individual’s everyday social exchanges and relationships and not a set of traits or biological characteristics existing within individuals. Gender is an “emergent feature of social situations: both as an outcome of and a rationale for various social arrangements and as a means of legitimating one of the most fundamental divisions of society” (West and Zimmerman, 1987: 126). Therefore, gender is essentially about the social interactions and relationships in which individuals

engage on a daily basis. Gender is embedded in every social interaction in which individuals engage, and the “doing” of gender by individuals simultaneously creates, reproduces, maintains, and justifies the social order and meaning of gender in our culture.

According to West and Zimmerman (1987), three systematically separate concepts must be differentiated in order to understand what is involved in “doing” gender in our society: sex, sex category, and gender. Sex is the categorization of individuals as male or female based on biological criteria, such as differing genitalia or genetic material. Once one’s sex is determined, an individual is placed into a sex category. However, in our society, individuals are placed into a sex category based on gender displays such as how they dress or their demeanor, when the genetic or physical factors defining sex are not explicitly identified. “In this sense, one’s sex category presumes one’s sex and stands as proxy for it in many situations, but sex and sex category can vary independently, that is, it is possible to claim membership in a sex category even when the sex criteria are lacking” (West and Zimmerman, 1987: 127). Finally, gender is defined by West and Zimmerman (1987) as “the activity of managing situated conduct in light of normative conceptions of attitudes and activities appropriate for one’s sex category” (127). Consequently, gender is often seen as a natural part of people’s identities, but in reality, the negotiation and “doing” of gender is much more complex than this.

West and Zimmerman (1987) argue against the idea of gender being a “role” or “display” that individuals perform. This view assumes that individuals behave in certain ways within certain situations due to the perceptions others have of the appropriate behaviors in which to engage. “While it is plausible to contend that gender displays –

construed as conventionalized expressions – are optional, it does not seem plausible to say that we have the option of being seen by others as female or male” (West and Zimmerman, 1987: 130). Consequently, viewing gender as a display is an improper technique for viewing and analyzing gender, because, unless certain features or qualities of an individual significantly challenge their original sex categorization, a male would not be seen as being female by others within everyday social interactions, and therefore, could not adjust his gender display accordingly (West and Zimmerman: 1987: 130).

West and Zimmerman (1987) also argue that individuals are held accountable for their gendered behaviors which are both “serious and consequential” (136). The situated behaviors in which individuals in our society engage are measured against the norms and values that comprise our societal structure. However, “to ‘do’ gender is not always to live up to normative conceptions of femininity or masculinity, it is to engage in behavior *at the risk of gender assessment*. While it is individuals who do gender, the enterprise is fundamentally interactional and institutional in character, for accountability is a feature of social relationships and its idiom is drawn from the institutional area in which those relationships are enacted” (West and Zimmerman, 1987: 137).

West and Zimmerman (1987) argue that in every social interaction and relationship various resources are available for individuals to “do” gender which differentiates men and women in ways that are not “natural, essential, or biological” (137). One resource allocated for “doing” gender is the physical aspects of the social setting in which a social interaction takes place. For example, West and Zimmerman note that in our society, public restrooms are mutually exclusive in that men use one

restroom and women use another. By separating women and men in this way, it is assumed that essential differences exist between the two groups of individuals.

Another resource for “doing” gender, according to West and Zimmerman (1987), is what they refer to as standardized social occasions (137). “Goffman (1977) cites organized sports as one such institutionalized framework for the expression of manliness. There, those qualities that ought ‘properly’ to be associated with masculinity, such as endurance, strength, and competitive spirit, are celebrated by all parties concerned – participants, who may be seen to demonstrate such traits, and spectators, who applaud their demonstrations from the safety of the sidelines” (Goffman, 1977: 322 as cited in West and Zimmerman, 1987: 137-138). Therefore, sporting events are one resource used to “do” masculinity in our culture.

Each of the previously mentioned resources aid in the construction and continuance of gender as differentiating women and men in our culture. But, individuals also encounter situations that challenge the sex category that others identify them as being a part of, which can lead to “role conflict.” One example of this specified by West and Zimmerman (1987) is that of a female physician. In terms of her profession, the doctor may be given respect for her occupational position within society, but, nonetheless, is “subject to evaluation in terms of normative conceptions of appropriate attitudes and activities for her sex category and under pressure to prove that she is an ‘essentially’ feminine being, despite appearances to the contrary” (West, 1984: 97-101 as cited in West and Zimmerman, 1987: 139-140). Consequently, because a female may

engage in a stereotypically male profession, she is expected by others to demonstrate her femininity in other ways.

West and Zimmerman's (1987) view of gender as something that is "done" by individuals in our society through the allocation of resources is consistent with the view used in this thesis. The next section examines masculinity as a specific gender group within our culture.

Masculinity

Masculinity, as a gender category, has not always been viewed in the same manner as it is today. The notion of masculinity is not static; it varies in time and space and is culturally constructed to reflect these dimensions. Moreover, contemporary research on gender recognizes that various types of masculinities exist. Patricia Hill Collins (2000) utilizes the term "matrix of domination" to refer to the ways in which oppressive factors such as race, class, gender, and sexuality interconnect and are organized in various ways to produce domination over others (18). Moreover, this framework provides the opportunity to explain how masculinity can be demonstrated through a variety of ways. For example, white men are not always dominant over black men, and men are not always dominant over women. A top-down approach to domination is not always in existence. The influences of race, class, and gender intersect to create various hierarchies of power. For purposes of this research, viewing gender and other oppressive factors as "matrices of domination" provides flexibility and helps avoid locating certain types of masculinities based on stereotypical thought by leaving open the possible types of masculinities that can be created.

Throughout history, the concept of masculinity has undergone tremendous transformation. In order to understand the existing ways in which masculinity is “done” in today’s society, we need to examine how it initially emerged as a social concept. R.W. Connell (2005) states that, “since masculinity exists only in the context of a whole structure of gender relations, we need to locate it in the formation of the modern gender order as a whole” (185). Connell (2005) argues that the modern arrangement of gender identity initially emerged as a concept around the 16th century (186). Several important developments in the emergence of masculinity include the rapidly increasing modern capitalist market of the 16th century, the establishment of overseas empires, the growth of commercial capitalism, and the onset of a large-scale European civil war (Connell, 2005: 186-189), all of which aided in masculinity being associated with sexuality, work, and power.

In his book, Making Societies: The Historical Construction of Our World, William G. Roy (2001) argues that gender differentiation occurred even earlier than the 16th century. Roy asserts that the division of gender most likely emerged with the development of tools during prehistoric societies. “The gendered division of labor grew out of the exigencies of expanded food production and child minding; it was a cultural solution to a technological problem that resulted in changed social organization” (Lorber, 1994: 129 as cited in Roy, 2001: 116). As social institutions came into play during this time period, gender became a standard by which societal resources, such as food and clothing, were disseminated. Moreover, as agricultural societies began to materialize, the profitable roles of women began to diminish. “The control of resources became tied to

the control of land, in which men had an advantage because of their physical strength. At the same time, women's lives became centered more on childbearing, resulting in patriarchy" (Roy, 2001: 117).

Not only is the history of masculinity ambiguous within our culture, but also the definition of masculinity is somewhat unclear in the fact that divergences exist as to the specific definition of the term. Certain common elements, however, do appear and reappear in various definitions. In our society, "specific behavioral characteristics and personality traits tend to be associated with masculinity, specifically in contrast to femininity" (Deaux, 1987 as quoted in Stohr and Hemmens, 2004: 230). Men construct various forms of masculinities, but the common elements of diverse masculinities in our culture typically emerge from hegemonic stereotypes which represent masculine characteristics as related to power, aggressiveness, rationality, and dominance. The expressions associated with various masculinities hold a sense of supremacy (Stohr and Hemmens, 2004: 230), whereas many the characteristics of varieties of femininities are seen as representing inferiority. For example, possessing the ability to dominate others, which is a hegemonic notion of masculinity, is generally seen as being advantageous or desirable. Acting in a more fragile manner, however, which is a stereotypical notion of femininity, is normally viewed as carrying "profoundly derogatory implications" (Stohr and Hemmens, 2004: 230).

Not only is masculinity viewed as being superior to various types of femininities in our society, but different types of masculinities are seen as being advantageous over other forms. According to R. W. Connell (1995) "modern societies contain a variety of

forms of masculinity that are ordered hierarchically” (as cited in Dunk and Bartol, 2005: 31). Hegemonic, subordinate, complicit, and marginal masculinities “differ in terms of their relationships with the femininities and social classes of a given society” (Connell, 1995 as cited in Dunk and Bartol, 2005: 31).

Hegemony is a “cultural dynamic by which a group claims and sustains a leading position in social life” (Connell, 2005: 77). In our society, men have asserted and maintained a dominant position over women and over other men. Moreover, in our society at any point in time, certain forms of masculinity are superior to other forms. This fluctuation in the type of masculinity that is superior at a certain moment depends on the acknowledged social values and norms of that particular time period. For purposes of this paper, hegemonic masculinity is defined as the ideal form of masculinity to which other types of masculinity are secondary and the one which all men are expected to achieve. In reality, no man can ever achieve this ideal type, but nonetheless, are expected to achieve it. In terms of hegemonic masculinity, the majority of men benefit from the control of women, while others benefit by controlling other men (Donaldson, 1993: 655).

In addition to hegemonic masculinity, according to Connell, (2005), another category of gender relations between groups of men in our society is subordinated masculinity. Connell (2005) notes that the most significant example of this type of inferiority in Western societies is the domination of heterosexual males over homosexual males, making homosexuality a subordinated masculinity.

An additional form of masculinity, according to Connell (2005), is complicit masculinity. This type of masculinity includes men in our society who may not embody

hegemonic masculinity directly, but nevertheless, profit indirectly by the holistic notion of hegemony and the general subsidiary position of women. “Masculinities constructed in ways that realize the patriarchal dividend, without the tensions or risks of being the frontline troops of patriarchy, are complicit in this sense” (Connell, 2005: 79).

In their article, “Playing in the Gender Transgression Zone: Race, Class, and Hegemonic Masculinity in Middle Childhood,” C. Shawn McGuffey and B. Lindsay Rich (1999) examine the ways in which boys and girls ages five to twelve who are enrolled in a summer camp negotiate gender relations among themselves. The researchers examine this phenomenon by utilizing the concept of hegemonic masculinity as an analytic tool in order to concentrate on how gender relations and, more specifically, the performance of masculine hegemony within these relations, were “done” (West and Zimmerman, 1987 as quoted in McGuffey and Rich, 1999: 73).

The findings illustrate that boys and girls in middle childhood emulate the overall gender order of our society, and the previously three mentioned types of masculinity – hegemonic, subordinated, and complicit masculinity – are evident in the gender relations between children. The study shows that the hierarchy formed by the male children is based on superiority. “The top boys rule the hierarchy and manipulate it so that it preserves their position and thus their higher status. Hegemonic masculinity is public and is used to sustain the power of high-status boys over subordinated boys and over girls” (McGuffey and Rich, 1999: 86). Thus, as stated previously, hegemonic masculinity gives power and authority to high status boys or men over girls and subordinated boys. Moreover, the study illustrates that, even though every boy does not benefit directly from

hegemonic masculinity, “they express complicity with the hegemonic regime because the gender order ensures them social status over girls” (McGuffey and Rich, 1999: 86).

A final type of masculinity is marginalized masculinity, which brings class and race relations into play. As stated previously, all men are not equal to one another. Racial and class boundaries exist in men’s lives that shape how masculinity is negotiated. For example, certain black athletes in our society may be viewed as holding a high degree of hegemonic masculinity. According to Connell (2005), however, “the fame and wealth of individual stars has no trickle-down effect; it does not yield social authority to black men generally” (81). Therefore, hegemonic masculinity is an ideal of masculinity that omits black men. Just as men, as a whole, have claimed dominance over women, certain types of masculinities are superior over other varieties.

R. W. Connell’s (2005) categorization of masculinities is useful in examining how men in prison negotiate masculinity in the absence of women. Not only is masculinity measured against femininity in our culture, but differentiated types of masculinities are measured against one another. Just as men in mainstream society obtain differentiated masculine identities based on the “resources” available to do so, men in prison are not equally stratified. The current study design provides an avenue for examining the differential types of masculinities that exist among prison inmates and how various masculine forms are negotiated and sustained within these institutional settings.

“Accomplishing” Masculinity

In the book, *Masculinities and Crime: Critique and Reconceptualization of Theory* (1993), James W. Messerschmidt presents a theory of gender that is consistent

with West and Zimmerman's (1987) view of "doing" gender. Messerschmidt (1993) offers a comprehensive feminist theory that incorporates the sociology of masculinity in order to examine the ways in which individuals in our society accomplish gender, specifically masculinity. According to Messerschmidt, masculinity is accomplished through social action and social structure. Of particular importance are the ways in which the social structure constrains or permits behaviors in which social actors engage. Messerschmidt states that when examining masculinity, the context of men's behavior within society cannot be ignored. Therefore, the differential social contexts in which individual's lives are situated determine whether legal or illegal behaviors are used to negotiate masculinity. Moreover, illegal behaviors must be viewed as occurring like any other behavior. Thus, this theory links micro and macro levels of analyses by taking into account social action as well as the social structure to examine the different ways masculinity is accomplished.

In our society, we ascribe the "appropriate" sex category to individuals when they present certain social representations such as speech, dress, or demeanor. However, gender involves much more than the presentation of certain social signs. Gender involves a "situated accomplishment: the activity of managing situated conduct in light of normative conceptions, attitudes, and activities appropriate to one's sex category" (West and Zimmerman, 1987: 127 as cited in Messerschmidt, 1993: 79). Therefore, gender is defined as a behavioral reaction to the specific conditions and situations in which individuals participate. Individuals do gender according to the social settings in which they find themselves (Messerschmidt, 1993: 174).

Messerschmidt's theory of masculinity accomplishment begins with two theoretical assumptions. First, theoretical links between race, class, and gender must exist. Race, class, and gender cannot be viewed as independent of one another. Rather, they must be viewed as occurring within the same ongoing social practices. Second, it must be recognized that legal and illegal behaviors represent social practice and social structure concurrently. Therefore, gendered behaviors, whether legal or illegal in nature, are both a consequence of the individual's immediate interactions and are simultaneously constituted through the macro-level social structure of their society.

Messerschmidt (1993) defines social structure as "regular and patterned forms of interaction over time that constrain and channel behavior in specific ways" (63). Social structures are not external to social actors. Rather, they are initiated, reproduced, and transformed by men and women through social situations and interactions. As individuals engage in social action, they inadvertently assist in the creation of social structures that then serve to facilitate or limit social action. Therefore, masculinity must be recognized as structured action: the collective effect of social practices and social structures on an individual's gendered behavior. Social structures can be understood only as constituting practices; in turn, social structures enable and constrain social action (Messerschmidt, 1993: 62). In other words, masculinity is what men do under specific restrictions within our society and the varying degrees of power associated with these restrictions (Messerschmidt, 1993: 81). Social structures arrange the way individuals perceive their circumstances. In turn, individuals in society realize their actions and modify them according to their interpretation of other's responses (Messerschmidt, 1993:

77). Therefore, individuals construct their behaviors in such a way that others indisputably view them as effectively expressing the gender group they personally identify with. In other words, we do masculinity or femininity to illustrate to others our “gender.” Based on this view, masculinity is accomplished. It is constructed in specific social situations and, in turn, reproduces social structures.

Messerschmidt asserts that three specific social structures lend support to relations between men and women: the gender division of labor, gender relations of power, and sexuality. Through everyday interactions, social actors simultaneously produce race, class, and gender divisions through these three social structures. Social structures are constituted by social action and, in turn, provide resources for constructing masculinity (Messerschmidt, 1993: 117). Therefore, through social interaction and the social structures of the gender division of labor, gender relations of power, and sexuality, men construct a variety of masculinities (and women construct a variety of femininities) with the resources the social structures allow. Men attempt to accomplish gender through “specific conceptions of hegemonic masculinity, which express and reproduce social divisions of labor and power as well as normative heterosexuality” (Messerschmidt, 1993: 83). As stated previously, hegemonic masculinity is the fundamental form of masculinity in our society to which other types of masculinity are secondary and the one which all men are expected to achieve.

For example, the family-wage structure confirms the husband/father as the exclusive wage earner of the family. Women’s work is subordinated within a specific masculine-dominated gender division of labor (Messerschmidt, 1993: 66), and, therefore,

women's unpaid work in the home is devalued. Hegemonic masculinity becomes linked with being a good monetary provider by demonstrating power, success, and achievement. The family-wage system fashioned the social construction of a new type of white-adult masculinity and femininity. This gender construction, however, differs by race and class. Lower class men may not be allotted the resources to construct a breadwinner-focused masculinity. They may have to utilize other resources for accomplishing their gender. As stated previously, the techniques men employ to construct masculinity depend on their particular positions within society.

As illustrated previously, masculinity is accomplished in a variety of ways given that men reproduce masculine ideals in specific, structured practices. The type of masculinity constructed by a particular individual depends on access to power and resources as well as societal beliefs. A social connection exists between types of masculinities, but these differing masculinities are far from equal. Therefore, as illustrated previously, men of differing class and racial groups will construct masculinity very differently from one another.

As asserted earlier, men use their access to power and resources to effectively express their gender to others. Crime is one resource for constructing masculinity and is generally used when other resources for accomplishing gender, such as paid employment or normative heterosexuality, are unavailable. When men lack the legitimate resources required for accomplishing masculinity, sex category becomes particularly important. "Because types of criminality are possible only when particular social conditions present themselves, when other masculine resources are unavailable, particular types of crime

can provide an alternative resource for accomplishing gender and, therefore, affirming a particular type of masculinity” (Messerschmidt, 1993: 84). For example, in male dominated occupations (or other social areas of gendered competition), women are viewed as competition. Men differentiate masculinity from femininity as a resource for constructing oneself as a real man. If women can do the same things men can, men lack that resource for asserting their manhood. Thus, in the workplace, men may physically or sexually harass women in order to secure the maleness of the job by emphasizing the femaleness of women. Doing gender means creating differences between men and women.

Messerschmidt’s (1993) theory of structured action is particularly useful because it links the individual “performance” of gender to social structural conditions. What is absent in Messerschmidt’s model, however, is an explanation of how ideology also structures human action. Societal ideologies are ideas that reflect the dominant and often accepted notions of a particular culture and are reproduced by individuals or groups within that culture. Moreover, ideologies serve as societal strategies for creating an ideal social order based on dominant views. Gender ideology often includes behaviors and actions that are appropriate or inappropriate for individuals of certain gender categories to engage in. For instance, traditional gender ideologies are supported by the belief that men are expected to work in public sphere of social life, while women should work in private spheres. Consequently, negative social repercussions may result if the traditional gendered behaviors are not practiced.

For purposes of this study, Messerschmidt's theory is employed as a guiding theoretical framework. However, in addition to understanding how social structures shape masculinity within prison, I also am attentive to the ways in which accepted beliefs about gender in our society guide the behaviors of the participants utilized in this examination. Structural conditions are important in examining how male prison inmates negotiate masculinity, but societal beliefs determine the "blueprint" for gender negotiation. The juxtaposition of structure and ideology is more valuable in explaining gender negotiation than depending on structure alone, because each plays an imperative role in influencing individual behaviors.

In sum, according to Messerschmidt's theory, the accomplishment of gender is based on social action, which reinforces and is reinforced by social structures. Social structures, in turn, enable or constrain an individual's behavior. Men accomplish gender in a variety of ways, depending on their particular position within society and, therefore, their access to power and resources. In addition to structure, accepted cultural ideologies also work to organize and arrange human action. To this end, no one type of masculinity exists. Legal behaviors, just as illegal one's, are ways men accomplish masculinity depending on the resources available to them. Based on Messerschmidt's theory and the incorporation of ideology, this study examines how masculinity negotiation varies within and between prison settings due to the differential degree of social structural constraints placed on individual inmates, and therefore, the resources and degrees of power they have at their disposal. In addition, current beliefs about how men in our society are expected to behave are taken into account.

Influence of Class on Masculinity Negotiation

The social structure of prison is not the only factor upon which masculinity negotiation is dependent. As stated in Messerschmidt's theory, the accomplishment of masculinity also depends upon class and race relations. While social class is important in understanding the negotiation of masculinity, determining the social class of men in prison presents some difficulty. It is true that most male inmates are considered to be "poor" before coming to prison, since poverty is a precursor to both crime and the likelihood of punishment. But while most men in prison occupied a low socio-economic status before coming to prison, this social condition is probable, not inevitable.

Determining the social economic class of men in prison presents even greater difficulty. Class is redefined after entering prison. "Class" takes on a different form and meaning within the prison context. Within this milieu, a different type of class structure is created with its own currency, informal economy, and exchange procedures. Due to the fact that I am unable to measure the social class of prisoners by conventional standards, I looked for prison based indicators of social class, such as access to power and resources, during the interviews.

Influence of Race on Masculinity Negotiation

Race is another important dimension of masculinity negotiation in prison. In our society, an individual's race directly or indirectly determines where he is positioned within society and, therefore, establishes the types of resources he has to negotiate certain aspects of his life. In prison, just as in mainstream society, masculinity negotiation is

dependent upon race relations due to the differential resources and degrees of power available to accomplish masculinity.

As stated in the previous section, for the purposes of this examination, class position will be transformed from the way it is viewed in mainstream society. This examination has the unique advantage of opening the possibility to study race without the influence of class as it is traditionally viewed, but as a transformed part of prison life. As stated in Messerschmidt's work (1993), race, class, and gender cannot be examined independently of one another. They all are part of the same social processes. Racial distinctions are, in large part, dependent upon class position. Therefore, in the current research study, race, along with class and gender, are examined in terms of the various ways in which male inmates negotiate masculinity within the prison context and how the negotiation of masculinity may vary between and within different prison institutions.

For purposes of this study, two racial categories of individuals are examined, black and white. The current research observes how particular masculinities are negotiated or formed differentially for white and black male prison inmates given the availability of material resources and interpersonal power in addition to current societal ideology. Due to perceptions of racial differences, I assert that masculinity will be negotiated differently given inmates' position in minimum and maximum-security institutions, but masculinity negotiation also will vary by racial categories within each institution type.

Resources for “Doing” Masculinity

Certain characteristics exist in our society as differentiating various types of masculinities. However, not all characteristics are utilized by all men in terms of “doing” masculinity. When one resource is unavailable to be used in masculinity negotiation, others may be called on to accomplish it in an attempt to accomplish the hegemonic ideal.

Exerting power and control over others is a significant characteristic of hegemonic masculinity in our culture. “Historically, and in contemporary life in most cultures across the globe, males hold more power and privilege – both publicly and privately -- than females” (Goodstein, 2001: 1). For example, in our society, men who come close to living up to the masculine ideal have historically dominated the public space of employment and the private space of domestic life. Additionally, “power is an important structural feature of relations between men and women” (Messerschmidt, 1993: 71) as well as among men. Not only do men, generally, hold power over women in our society, but gendered power relations among men are differentiated as well.

Men use various resources to assert their power and domination, such as exerting power relations within the realms of employment, language, and knowledge. The following sections discuss and examine several hegemonic characteristics or resources for accomplishing masculinity in an attempt to situate the notion of “doing” masculinity within our culture to examine how male inmates negotiate masculinity through the assertion of power.

Material Resources

One way power is constructed among individuals is by the possession of material resources. Material resources aid in constructing social structural relations of power by arranging individuals in relation to one another (Messerschmidt, 1993: 71). Moreover, “specific social groups possess, or are restricted from access to, material resources, a situation that places them in an unequal social relation to other groups” (Messerschmidt, 1993: 71). For example, individuals in our society with more monetary capital often have greater opportunities to advance in the social realms of education, business, and government. This monetary advantage almost automatically gives the individuals who are privileged by it certain powers over others, such as being the leader of a company or running for political office. The social groups devoid of financial resources are put at a disadvantage and must utilize alternative resources for “doing” masculinity.

Not only are material resources distributed unequally among individuals, but the types of coveted material resources that individual males possess that symbolize power vary depending on where one is positioned within society. For example, in some lower class communities, material resources, such as wearing certain brands or types of shoes, is seen as a status symbol in terms of masculinity. According to Elijah Anderson’s (1999) ethnography Code of the Street, physical items and physical appearance, including clothing and shoes, play an important function in ascertaining one’s identity (73). “In acquiring valued things, therefore, an individual shores up his or her identity” (Anderson, 1999: 74-75), including an individual’s identity as a man.

In sum, material capital is one resource male prison inmates can use to negotiate masculinity through the demonstration of power by acquiring differential amounts and kinds of material resources.

Interpersonal Power

Material resources are not the only way to exert power over others. As Messerschmidt (1993: 72) states, material resources are often unnecessary at the interpersonal level for the purpose of exerting power over others. Individuals also can dominate others within their daily social relationships and interactions.

As stated previously, men can exert power over women as well as over other men within our society and the resources available to do so vary for each individual. In her article, “Class-Based Masculinities: The Interdependence of Gender, Class, and Interpersonal Power,” Karen D. Pyke (1996) presents a theoretical structure that incorporates interpersonal power with the more extensive societal frameworks of class and gender inequalities. Pyke (1996) asserts that interpersonal power reproduces, composes, and reconstitutes class and gender relations and states that “the ascendant masculinity of higher-class men and the subordinated masculinity associated with lower-class men are constructed in relation to one another in a class-based gender system. Class-based masculinities provide men with different mechanisms of interpersonal power that, when practiced, (re)constitute and validate dominant and subordinated masculinities” (527-528). For example, men who are not particularly successful in their public lives may compensate by behaving more dominantly in their private lives, therefore, representing and corroborating a masculine dominated societal arrangement.

Research of this type illustrates how interpersonal power can be used to negotiate masculinity in the absence of other, more tangible resources.

In sum, material resources and interpersonal power are two resources that can be utilized by men to negotiate masculinity within our culture. If monetary and material possessions are unobtainable for certain individuals, interpersonal power may come into play as an important resource for “doing” masculinity. Consequently, it makes sense to examine how particular masculinities are created and negotiated within the prison environment given the availability of certain resources and differential degrees of power.

Employment

Employment is another societal resource that can be called upon by men in order to negotiate masculinity through the demonstration of power. Linda McDowell (2005) states that the meaning of hegemonic masculinity in capitalistic societies is, by definition, coupled with engaging in employment activities. “Being a real man involves paid employment, whether in the embodied spaces of manual labor or the cerebral spheres of high-tech industry, business services or science” (McDowell, 2005: 19-20). Moreover, power relations between men and women and among different groups of men are established through labor market participation.

As stated previously, participation in the labor market is a characterization of masculinity within our culture. The ways in which men negotiate or “do” gender and demonstrate power between and within differentiated occupations, however, varies. For example, men who occupy hegemonically intellectual and scholarly positions, such as being a physician or lawyer, negotiate masculinity in terms of their occupation very

differently from men who hold positions of manual labor. Moreover, men who hold the same occupational positions within society may negotiate masculinity differently from others who hold the same or similar positions. For instance, a male banker may utilize the intellectual nature of this occupation to negotiate masculinity. On the other hand, a different male banker may use the loud, aggressive nature of this occupation to accomplish the same objective.

Working class men often have been viewed as being secondary in our society to men who hold more intellectual occupational positions. Many studies have shown, however, how working class men negotiate masculinity in the face of their subordination in mainstream society. For example, in his book, “Managing the Shopfloor: Subjectivity, Masculinity, and Workplace Culture,” D.L. Collinson (1992) illustrates how men who hold labor-intensive occupations construct working-class masculinities based on the repudiation of the “other,” such as administrative workers and women within the occupational structure. Therefore, by engaging in behaviors that negate and subordinate other individuals within the same occupation, working-class men can advance their own masculine identity and exemplify varying relations of power, even if it only reaches within the workplace environment.

As illustrated, masculinity can be negotiated through not only holding an employment position, but also within the workplace. The previous examples emphasize West and Zimmerman’s (1987) position that in every social interaction and relationship, various resources are available for individuals to “do” gender and illustrate how employment can be utilized as a resource for “doing” gender and demonstrating power.

Furthermore, the lack of employment provides the opportunity for male prison inmates to create differing types of masculinities.

Emotions

In our society, individuals who show intense emotional responses to situations are often viewed as being feminine, weak, and, subsequently, less powerful than individuals who avoid such responses. Studies illustrate that, in our society, men generally exhibit emotional reactions to various situations that are weaker in intensity and are less complex than the emotional reactions of women. In his article, “On Sex Roles and Representations of Emotional Experience: Masculinity, Femininity, and Emotional Awareness,” Michael Conway (2000) addresses the argument that the emotional responses of individuals exhibiting a high degree of masculinity are less complex than individuals exhibiting a high degree of femininity. In this study, Conway (2000) found that, “both male and female participants who were higher in masculinity exhibited less complex representations of the emotions they and others might experience in evocative situations” (Conway, 2000: 694).

Not only does the intensity and complexity of emotional responses vary between individuals exhibiting masculine and feminine traits, but also among individuals within the same gender category. Matthew Jakupcak et al. (2003) examined this phenomenon in their study, “Masculinity and Emotionality: An Investigation of Men’s Primary and Secondary Emotional Responding.” Gender distinctions in emotional responses have most often been illustrated across mechanisms of primary emotional responding, but have rarely been studied in terms of secondary emotional responding. Jakupcak et al. (2003)

define primary emotional responding as “affective reactions that include an integration of sensory and perceptive information, contain sensory or bodily felt components, and represent adaptations to specific circumstances or situations” (111). The researchers define secondary emotional responding as “an individual’s learned reaction to the experience of primary emotions, such as a fear of experiencing fear or feelings of anxiety in response to the experience of anger” (111).

Based on the research findings, Jakupcak et al. (2003) conclude that “men vary in their primary emotional responses (in terms of affect intensity) in a pattern consistent with the continuum of masculinity. Men who endorse less hegemonic ideologies of masculinity may experience intensity in their primary emotions, whereas men who engage in extremely hegemonic notions of masculinity serve as a social prototype by avoiding their emotions, thus they report lower affect intensity and thereby confirm cultural beliefs about men’s emotional behaviors” (118).

To this end, lack of emotional response is another resource that can be called upon and utilized by men to negotiate masculinity and demonstrate power relations between and among groups of men. According to West and Zimmerman’s (1987) argument, men who behave in inappropriately emotional ways may be subject to scrutiny by others within society. Therefore, one way of demonstrating one’s masculinity within the prison context is by adhering to hegemonic masculine notions of emotional responses by limiting the quantity and types of emotions that are displayed.

Language

“Discourse is understood as a form of social practice within a sociocultural context; that is to say, language users are not isolated individuals. They are engaged in communicative activities as members of social groups, organizations, institutions, and cultures” (Galasinski, 2004: 19). Therefore, linguistic expression, based on societal norms and expectations, is one resource individuals utilize within everyday social interactions to communicate with others about oneself, including indicating social groups with which one belongs, representing one’s social identities, and demonstrating power relations between individuals.

In her article, “Women, Language, and Identity,” Janet Holmes (1997) examines the ways in which men and women use verbal discourse to create gender identity and to construct gendered boundaries within social relationships. “Women and men differ in the relative frequency with which they use particular linguistic variants, and in some communities, they also differ in the range of styles which they control, a pattern that reflects the differing demands of gendered social roles” (Holmes, 1997: 215). Moreover, in her analysis, Holmes (1997) found that, within male conversations, doing masculinity through language tends to involve arranging oneself as being in control, knowledgeable, skilled, and competent (209-210).

In his article, “Homosocial Desire in Men’s Talk: Balancing and Re-creating Cultural Discourses of Masculinity,” Scott Fabius Kiesling (2005) examines how men in the United States produce homosocial aspirations through verbal discourse. Kiesling (2005) states that “in a society in which dominant discourses of masculinity provide

competing scripts of male solidarity and heterosexuality, the achievement of closeness among men is not straightforward but must be negotiated through ‘indirect’ means” (695) through creating gender distinction, heterosexism, power, and male solidarity (701).

One example of Kiesling’s idea of the production of homosocial desires by men exists in the discourse that surrounds male sports. According to Myriam Medzian (2004), “the language of sport is filled with insults suggesting that a boy who is not tough enough, who does not live up to the masculine mystique, is really a girl or homosexual” (308). Often times, coaches will use sexual and/or feminizing insults to stimulate or threaten athletes (Medzian, 2004: 308). By insulting other men who do not live up to the social expectation of masculinity, male coaches create gender differences between men and women, denigrate homosexuality, and construct power and male solidarity.

In sum, language is another resource male prison inmates can utilize in order to negotiate gender through the demonstration of power by verbally creating other, less powerful types of men.

Sports and Fitness

Sport is another resource that can be utilized by men for “doing” masculinity in our culture. Sport is a gendered institution and a social sphere where gender identities are produced. The sporting institution “was conceived of and evolved as a masculine space, supporting male dominance not only by excluding or marginalizing women, but by naturalizing a connection between masculinity and the ‘skills’ or sport; aggression, physical strength, success in competition, and negation of the feminine” (Bryson, 1987 as cited in Hall, 2005: 157).

Historically, sports have been structured as segregated by sex category. For the most part, men only play sports with other men and women with other women. Moreover, in our society, certain sports are viewed as being appropriate for men to engage in and other sports appropriate for women. Michael A. Messner (2005) states that sport “is a highly visible forum in which male and female bodies are literally ‘built,’ their limitations displayed, their capacities debated. As such, it is a key site for ideological contest over the meanings of masculinity, as well as femininity” (314).

Although women’s participation in sports has increased over history, for the most part, sporting activities have been dominated by men. Moreover, an underlying understanding exists within our culture that certain individuals are more capable of taking part in sporting activities than other individuals, and more specifically, certain men are more capable of taking part than others. According to Ian Wellard (2002), men who are more capable of participating in sports take on an “exclusive form of masculinity which draws upon traditional orthodox understandings of heterosexual masculinity” (237). One social category of men who are generally excluded from the sporting sphere is homosexual males. Wellard (2002) asserts that in the realm of sports, “the physical assertion of one’s masculinity is put to the test and for gay sports players there can be a conflicting sense of identity” (239). In her book, Slow Motion: Changing Masculinities, Changing Men, Lynne Segal (1990) states that, due to this identity conflict, heterosexual males who participate in sports often assume a super-macho manner based on hegemonic notions of heterosexual masculinity (as cited in Wellard, 2002: 239). Therefore,

participation in sports is characterized by certain aspects of masculinity, including aggressiveness, toughness, competitive achievement, and power.

Race relations also play a role in examining sport as a social institution. Richard Majors (1987) asserts that “contemporary black males often utilize sports as one means of masculine self-expression within an otherwise limited structure of opportunity” (209). In our society, many black males are restricted from accomplishing hegemonic masculinity. “The dominant goals of hegemonic masculinity have been sold to black males, but access to the legitimate means to achieve those goals have been largely denied to black males” (Staples, 1982 as cited in Majors, 1987: 210-211). One of the ways black males negotiate dominant masculinity in the face of institutional racism is by participation in sporting activities.

To this end, participation in sporting events is another resource men can use to negotiate masculinity and demonstrate varying relations of power in our society and can be used to examine how male inmates negotiate masculinity within the prison context. Moreover, the examination of men’s involvement in sports can be an avenue for exploring racial differences between male prison inmates within this institutional context.

Normative Heterosexuality

One earmarked feature of hegemonic masculinity in our culture is normative heterosexuality. “In mainstream society, heterosexuality is presumed compulsory” (Holmberg, 2001: 88). More specifically, men must desire to engage in sexual intercourse with women, which according to Messerschmidt (1993: 75), “results in a ‘naturally’ coercive ‘male’ sexuality.” As stated previously, the hegemonic male is a

white man, but this mainstream ideal also is a heterosexual male who is victorious in overpowering and dominating women, especially as it relates to sexual activity.

One way men demonstrate their heterosexuality in social situations is by utilizing language centered on denigrating women in an effort to assert dominance and power over others. Males often use sexual language that is offensive towards women to refer to other men who are not conforming to conventional standards of masculinity. According to Lynne Segal (2001), “collectively, it is clear, calling up images of male sexual performance serves to consolidate and confirm masculinity, and to exclude and belittle women” (105).

Moreover, homosexual men, in our society, are conventionally viewed as being much less masculine and much less powerful than heterosexual males. According to R. W. Connell (2005), “patriarchal culture has a simple interpretation of gay men: they lack masculinity” (143). Therefore, men in our society who self-identify with a heterosexual orientation often have negative feelings towards homosexual males.

In their article, “Heterosexual Masculinity and Homophobia: A Reaction to the Self?” Peter S. Theodore and Susan A. Basow (2000) examine heterosexual masculinity and homophobia. They illustrate that males in their late youth and early adult years who feel they do not live up to our society’s conventional norms of masculinity are most likely to embrace attitudes and values consistent with homophobia (Theodore and Basow, 2000: 42).

This research demonstrates the importance of normative heterosexuality as it relates to hegemonic masculinity and power in male prisons and the possible

repercussions of not “conforming” to our society’s hegemonic ideal. Due to the fact that, for the most part, male prison inmates are denied heterosexual interactions, especially as it relates to sexual activity, they are even further removed from the hegemonic ideal. As a result, male prison inmates may need to utilize resources other than normative heterosexuality in the prison environment in order to negotiate various types of masculinities.

Knowledge and Rationality

A more untraditional characteristic of hegemonic masculinity in our culture is the possession of knowledge and rational ways of thinking. According to R.W. Connell (2005), “a familiar theme in patriarchal ideology is that men are rational while women are emotional” (164). Furthermore, historically, a significant division has occurred between men who are dominant in straightforward ways (i.e., physically dominant or societal leaders) in opposition to types of masculinities centered on technical knowledge (Connell, 2005: 165).

Merran Toerien and Kevin Durrheim (2001) also argue that knowledge, as opposed to ignorance, especially as it pertains to women, is important in negotiating masculinity and demonstrating power and aids men in distancing themselves from hegemonic notions of a macho masculine type. “Although a reliance on knowledge positions the ‘real man’ at a distance from the ‘macho man’, the type of knowledge provided works to entitle men to act according to their ‘real’ masculine nature without seeming blatantly sexist” (Toerien and Durrheim, 2001: 47).

Technical knowledge and rationality are, however, not the only types of knowledge that males in our society can hold. Various types of masculinities put differing degrees of importance on particular types of knowledge. Consequently, within certain social groups, having street knowledge holds precedence over more conventional types of knowledge. In his ethnography, Code of the Street, Elijah Anderson (1999) states, “For many young men, the operating assumption is that a man, especially a ‘real’ man, knows what other men know – the code of the street. And if one is not a real man, one is diminished as a person. Moreover, the code is seen as possessing a certain justice, since everyone supposedly has the opportunity to learn it, and thus can be held responsible for being familiar with it” (91). Therefore, in the case of certain street cultures, knowledge of life on the streets is much more significant and pertinent than knowledge learned from a book. Moreover, individuals who possess street knowledge are often dominant over others within this specific societal context.

Thus far, the current text has situated gender and masculinity in the context of our society and discussed how gender, and more specifically masculinity, is “done” in our society through the demonstration of power. Next, I examine how masculinity is “done” within the social realms of crime and violent behavior and how the “doing” of masculinity can aid in situating the question of how male inmates negotiate or “do” masculinity within the prison setting.

Masculinity and Crime/Violence

“Criminologists have long acknowledged that crime is gendered – and that the gender of crime is masculine” (Goodstein, 2001: 11). Moreover, a large majority of the

criminal activities and violence that occur in our society are perpetrated by or directed towards males. Throughout the life course, criminal behavior and violence are possibly the most unyielding, observed differences between men and women. “The most consistent pattern with respect to gender is the extent to which male criminal participation in serious crimes at any age greatly exceeds that of females, regardless of source of data, crime type, level of involvement, or measure of participation” (Michael Gottfredson and Travis Hirschi, 1990: 145 as cited in Kimmel and Aronson, 2004: 396).

Several explanations can account for this difference in gendered behavior. According to Goodstein (2001), “masculinity involves a certain amount of aggressiveness, and men are valued for their dominance and risk-taking ability. These attributes are compatible with criminal activity, which frequently requires boldness and the ability to dominate others” (3).

In the previously presented view, criminal behavior is something that is carried out, for the most part, because an individual is a man. The current thesis, however, argues that one is a man because he engages in certain behaviors that are characteristic of hegemonic masculinity, one being criminal behavior. As stated previously, James Messerschmidt (1993) argues that crime can be utilized by men as a resource for doing or accomplishing gender within a specific situation, in the same way as any conventionally masculine attribute. Messerschmitt states that the accomplishment of gender is based on social action, which reinforces and is reinforced by our society’s social structures. Social structures, in turn, enable or constrain an individual’s behavior. Men accomplish gender in a variety of ways, depending on their particular position within society and, therefore,

their access to power and resources despite receiving identical cultural messages of hegemonic masculinity. To this end, no one type of masculinity exists. Therefore, according to Messerschmidt, (1993), criminal behavior can be used as a resource for negotiating hegemonic masculinity.

Non-Sexual Violence

Hegemonic violence is a characteristic of masculinity in our society. According to Loy (1995), “relations among men in patriarchal societies are secured by violence” (as cited in Sabo, et al., 2001: 8). Moreover, in our society, “there remains a strong cultural connection between admired masculinity and violent response to threat” (Messerschmidt, 2000: 298). The violence/aggression aspect of hegemonic masculinity in our culture replicates the idea that aggression implies such positive attributes as the acquisition of material rewards, respect, high regard, and social power (Messerschmidt, 2000: 298). However, this celebrated, institutionalized, hegemonic form of violence is only one type that exists in our society. Other forms of violence exist that challenge the hegemonic ideal, such as “street” violence.

As stated previously, a large majority of violence in our society is perpetrated by men, as well as towards men. Antony Whitehead (2005) argues that masculinity may possibly work as a risk factor in terms of violence perpetrated by men (411). According to Whitehead (2005), two categories of violence exist in relation to other men: violence which includes other men as creditable opponents and violence which separates the ‘victim’ from manhood in terms of humiliating and feminizing. In either case, the offender’s sole purpose is to assert and confirm his masculinity (417). “If cases of man

to man violence are analyzed in terms of the function of that violence in allowing the offender to assert his sense of being a man, masculinity may emerge as a dynamic risk factor, particularly in cases involving racism and homophobia” (Whitehead, 2005: 418).

Non-sexual, male-perpetrated violence against women often occurs for similar reasons as man-to-man violence. According to Neil Websdale and Meda Chesney-Lind, (1998), “male violence against women is both a reflection of their sociopolitical domination over women, and, at the same time, yet another way of establishing control, maintaining it, or both” (79).

Moreover, men in our society often engage in violent behavior as a way of negotiating masculinity when other resources for doing so are absent. Mark Totten (2003) examined the effects of familial and gender ideologies on marginalized, male youth who came from violent backgrounds or were involved in gangs. Totten’s (2003) findings suggest that the youth engaged in abusive and violent behavior towards girlfriends, homosexuals, and racial minorities as a response to “blocked access to traditional institutional benefits of patriarchy. Violence compensated for perceived threats to their masculine identities” (70). In terms of the prison environment, James Gilligan (1997) asserts that denying male prisoners heterosexual contact increases the likelihood of violent behavior in and once released from prison (164). “Heterosexual deprivation in itself constitutes a symbolic castration or emasculation of those men who are heterosexual – a shaming of them as men” (Gilligan, 1997: 164). In either case, men often aim to prove or demonstrate hegemonic masculine characteristics such as control,

dominance, and aggression through the use of violence, especially when one's masculine identity is threatened.

Sexual Violence

Men also perform rape against women in an effort to assert dominance or control. According to Groth (1979, 1983), "rape involves the act of sexual intercourse, and sexual assault by definition includes sexual behavior. However, rape and sexual assault use sexual behavior to express aggression, not sexuality" (as cited in Allison and Kollenbroich-Shea, 2001: 157). Similarly, Sarah K. Murnen, Carrie Wright, and Gretchen Kaluzny (2002) assert that "in feminist sociocultural models of rape, extreme adherence to the masculine gender role is implicated in the perpetuation of sexual assault against women in that it encourages men to be dominant and aggressive, and it teaches that women are inferior to men and are sometimes worthy of victimization" (359). Therefore, not only do men use sexual violence as a way of asserting their aggression or supremacy, but our society's patriarchal masculine ideology almost encourages this behavior.

In addition to sexual violence being utilized as a way for men to assert dominance or aggression, sexual violence also can be utilized by males as a resource for negotiating masculinity when other resources for doing so are unavailable. In his article, "Becoming 'Real men': Adolescent Masculinity Challenges and Sexual Violence," James Messerschmidt (2000) examines adolescent males and sexual violence and asserts that patterns of adult male sexual violence replicate that of pubescent males (286). Messerschmidt (2000) examines and analyzes the life history narratives of two teenage

boys who create subordinate masculinities by engaging in sexually violent acts due to their inability to live up to mainstream standards of hegemonic masculinity within the social context of school. The findings demonstrate how young men “situationally defined as subordinate may respond by reconstructing dominant masculinity through available resources, and sometimes the response involved crime and/or violence. Sexual violence was the perceived available resources summoned by each boy because, quite simply, each lacked other contextual resources with which to accomplish gender according to the situationally defined criteria at school” (Messerschmidt, 2000: 303-304).

To this end, engaging in criminal and/or violent behavior is another resource that can be called upon and utilized by men to negotiate masculinity. However, as stated previously, “there is no simple standard of being a man that guides all male behavior, including violence” (Messerschmidt, 1993; Polk, 2003 as cited in DeKeseredy and Schwartz, 2005: 356). “In fact, although society functions in many ways to promote male violence, there remain in any situation other means of expressing one’s masculinity” (Connell, 2000 as cited in DeKeseredy and Schwartz, 2005: 356).

Summary

Based on Messerschmidt’s theory, I argue that masculinity negotiation varies by prison setting due the differential nature of social structural constraints placed on individual inmates, and therefore, the resources and degrees of power they have at their disposal. Moreover, not only will inmates in a particular prison construct masculinity in different ways from inmates in another prison setting, but inmates in the same prison also

will construct masculinity in various ways for the same reasons. Furthermore, current societal ideologies about how men in our culture are expected to conduct themselves are taken into account.

Individuals in minimum security institutions have different resources available to them for negotiating masculinity than maximum-security inmates and will, in turn, construct different types of masculinities. For example, inmates in minimum-security institutions have more opportunities for employment due to the fact that many minimum-security institutions are oriented towards work-related activities. Some inmates occupy positions within the prisons, such as maintenance, laundry, or kitchen duties. Minimum-security inmates also can occupy positions with Department of Transportation road crews or even can work under contract for local government agencies performing various duties. Prison inmates who are nearing parole may even be eligible for work release programs (<http://www.doc.state.nc.us/dop/custody.htm>) in which qualified inmates are allowed to leave the prison perimeter for work. Therefore, paid employment could be one resource called upon by minimum-security inmates to negotiate masculinity. In contrast, maximum-security inmates, for the most part, do not have the opportunity to participate in paid employment. They are confined to their cells for a large majority of their day, and when released from their cells, their movement is strictly controlled. Maximum-security inmates, therefore, must utilize resources other than paid employment for negotiating masculinity

Likewise, inmates in maximum and minimum-security prisons, independent of the opposing institution type, will construct various masculinities within that particular

institution due to the fact that socially unequal masculinities exist among men based upon race, class, and positions of power within the respective institutions. Moreover, current societal ideologies will influence the negotiation of masculinity of inmates in both prison environments. When individuals are expected to behave in certain culturally acceptable ways but are unable to do so due to a lack of particular resources, other resources must be utilized and various types of masculinities constructed.

Messerschmidt's theory also asserts that in situations where an individual's masculinity could possibly be called into question, sex category becomes particularly important. Prison is one extreme example of this. Men's behaviors in prison are an exaggeration of many culturally acceptable notions of hegemonic masculinity (Sabo, et al., 2001: 13). This exaggeration occurs because, unless otherwise proven, an inmate's sense of masculinity is threatened. In prison, men must visibly prove to others that they are "men" by engaging in behaviors that make it unmistakably evident that one is a "man." As James Gilligan (1997) states, "prison deprives those locked within of the normal avenues of pursuing gratification of their needs and leaves them no instruments but sex, violence, and conquest to validate their sense of manhood and individual worth" (181). Therefore, overstated efforts to assert one's masculinity often are employed so no questions exist as to an individual's manhood.

CHAPTER III

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE: DOING MASCULINITY

“Doing” Masculinity in Social Context

West and Zimmerman’s (1987) sociological theory of “doing” gender and Messerschmidt’s theory of structured action have been examined in relation to many social domains. The prison environment, however, is not one of them. Nevertheless, many insights can be gained by reviewing research studies that examine the ways in which gender, namely masculinity, is negotiated in various social contexts in order to examine the ways in which prison inmates negotiate masculinity within the unique social situation in which they find themselves.

Through ethnographic research, Ophra Leyser (2003) examined how male hospital patients create and carry out masculinity in a total institution. The researcher inhabited the hospital for four days a week for three months and observed forty residents, twenty-three men and seventeen women. Approximately twenty-five staff members also were observed during the study period.

Leyser’s (2003) research suggests that the creation and enactment of gender is largely dependent on structural constraints (354), signifying the importance the position of a person within society has on gender negotiation. Moreover, the researcher noted that despite the fact that the hospital residents embraced conventional beliefs about gender

and carried out behaviors consistent with masculinity in ways analogous to individuals in mainstream society, certain behaviors, “would not be found in other contexts due to the hospital constraints, such as a perpetually public forum for all interactions and a limited use of resources for maintaining and performing masculinity” (Leyser, 2003: 354). For example, inside the hospital setting, as well as in mainstream society, one way masculinity is negotiated is through verbal transactions between individuals. According to Leyser, language was employed as a way of negotiating masculinity by the hospital residents much more freely during unstructured time, in the absence of authority figures by utilizing more curse words and having conversations that included overtly sexual matters (344). On the other hand, when in the presence of hospital staff, the language utilized by the residents in negotiating masculinity was much more restricted.

Leyser (2003) also notes the utilization of material and non-material resources by the hospital residents for the negotiation of masculinity. Due to the social environment in which the hospital residents were situated, material resources were not readily available for negotiating masculinity. Therefore, “male residents were forced to draw primarily on *ideological components* of gender to assert their gender identities,” such as using sexuality as a way of ‘doing’ gender (Leyser, 2003: 356). For instance, within the hospital milieu, some male patients engage in the objectification of women as sexual objects as a way of negotiating masculinity by boasting about real or imaginary sexual capabilities or conquests and engaging in discussions around having numerous girlfriends (345-346).

The previous research study illustrates how gender negotiation takes place within certain societal constraints and restrictions. Moreover, it shows how certain resources are utilized to negotiate masculinity when other types are not available. In his article, “Ladykillers: Similarities and Divergences of Masculinities in Gang Rape and Wife Battery,” Chris O’Sullivan (1998) examines instances of gang rape and domestic violence as they relate to masculinity as an identity and illustrates how two seemingly related violent acts can be used to negotiate masculinity by representing very different characterizations of masculinity. Sullivan reveals that gang rape was described as being “fun” and was more about the relationship among the men performing the act than about their relationship to the women they were raping. Domestic battering, on the other hand, is more often a concealed, private assertion of power incorporating emotions and feelings. While both of these violent acts may come from patriarchy and sexism, “gang rape pertains to dominance in society and battery to dominance in the family,” (O’Sullivan, 1998: 106) revealing two different ways in which masculinity can be “done” in terms of violence against women.

In practically every social situation, social variables other than social location, such as race, also play an important role in the ways individuals negotiate their gender. In their article, “Doing Gender: Sorting out the Caste and Crime Conundrum,” Sally S. Simpson and Lori Elis (1995) examine 1) the ways in which hegemonic notions of gender are framed within various social institutions, such as work, school, family, and peer groups; 2) how “doing” gender within these social locations is transformed by race; and

3) the associations between social structure, social action, and delinquency for male and female juveniles (47).

Simpson and Elis's (1995) study utilizes three criminological perspectives, one of which is Messerschmidt's theory of structured action. The research supports Messerschmidt's theory, and Simpson and Elis (1995) state that "differential access to and influence of these structures lead to the development of oppositional and accommodating masculinities and femininities (i.e., doing gender) that dictate whether and what types of crime are committed by males and females, blacks and whites" (73). For example, parental influence is a factor that is associated with property and violent offending by juveniles. Simpson and Elis's (1995) findings illustrate that, "contrary to expectations, parental influence is a more powerful predictor of violence inhibition for black males than for white males" (63). However, the findings show no evidence that parental influences reduce female delinquency more than male delinquency (Simpson and Elis, 1995: 63). The previously reference study illustrates the importance of social position on the behaviors of individuals in our society.

Next I discuss masculinity and prison culture to create a connection between "doing" and accomplishing gender and prison life in order to begin examining the negotiation of masculinity in male prisons.

Masculinity and Prison

Sociological research is limited in terms of examining how masculinity is negotiated or "done" within the prison setting. According to Don Sabo, Terry A. Kupers, and Willie London (2001), oppression based on class and race have been examined in

prison analyses, but the assessment of gender has been limited (3). “Unless dealing specifically with sexuality, [prison] studies seldom treat the gender of their male subjects as in any way problematic; in doing this it is likely they are missing out on a key variable” (Morgan, 1986 as cited in Newton, 1994: 193). Nevertheless, as stated previously, useful literature does exist in order to situate the negotiation of masculinity within the prison context.

In her article, “Gender Theory and Prison Sociology: Using Theories of Masculinity to Interpret the Sociology of Prisons for Men,” Carolyn Newton (1994) illustrates how general sociological theories of masculinity can be utilized to examine male prison inmates. Newton (1994) suggests that the solidarity among inmates and the understood and accepted prison code arranged between inmates is similar to male bonding in mainstream society (193). Moreover, Newton (1994) proposes that “the hierarchies among men in prison described by prison sociologists are directly related to, and perhaps a function of, the power relations of hegemonic masculinity” (193). Therefore, the ways inmates react to and behave within prison is influenced by the social structures of our society.

Similarly, Yvonne Jewkes (2005) asserts that our culture’s norms and standards of masculinity, coupled with the pains of imprisonment inmates experience, may bring about overstated and embellished forms of masculinities (61). The explicit masculine behavior that often is found within the prison walls is not specific to the prison institution, but mirrors masculine behaviors that are evident in mainstream society. Moreover, she states, “the desire to prove one’s manhood, which frequently leads to

criminal behavior, conviction, and imprisonment, may itself, then, be a prerequisite to a successful adaptation to life inside [prison]” (51), which demonstrates the importance of our culture’s established patriarchal traditions within this institutional environment. Therefore, we cannot assume that the masculine values of mainstream society or the values of prison life exclusively determine the masculine behaviors that occur within male prisons, but that the institutionalized behaviors occur as a result of culture in and out of prison. In sum:

The same forces that exist throughout the patriarchal world and that find their least sophisticated expression among underclass males exist in prison to sustain an equilibrium where power is held by those who maintain a hegemonic masculine front, amounting to an abhorrence of femininity (in men as well as women), aggressive homophobia, and a personal code of behavior based on confrontation and force rather than negotiation and respect; in short, a hypermasculinity in which ‘normal’ values and behavioral patterns of powerful men take on an extreme form in the face of powerlessness against the institution (Jewkes, 2005: 61-62).

Moreover, the prison milieu may support hegemonic masculine behavior by rewarding behaviors such as aggression and violence. According to Faith E. Lutze and David W. Murphy (1999), “correctional environments that support overreliance on male sex-role stereotypes may inadvertently support behaviors and attitudes that inhibit prosocial behavior by rewarding aggression and hindering the transition from prison to law-abiding lifestyle” (Lutze and Murphy, 1999: 231). Therefore, inmates in male prisons may behave in hegemonically masculine ways based on the unintentional, unconscious positive reinforcements they receive while in this specific environment.

Inmates' behaviors also are influenced by their individual backgrounds. Janine Janssen (2005) states that aspects of one's life, such as gender, race, class, prior incarcerations, criminal record, and relationships with other individuals, control the ways incarceration is experienced (182). Men who have experienced hegemonic masculine behaviors in mainstream society are more likely to utilize antagonistic behaviors while in prison. "In general, one could state the female inmates are more often described as 'model inmates', whereas (aggressive) forms of open resistance are usually ascribed to males" (Janssen, 2005: 182).

Various social controls exist that influence the behaviors of male inmates, including our society's social structure, the personal lives of individual inmates, the prison environment, and conventional ideology. Due to the differential influences on inmates' gendered behavior, different types of masculinities exist. Hegemonic notions of masculinity do exist within the prison setting. However, often times, the resources for "doing" masculinity according to mainstream standards are absent within the institution.

In his article, "Competing Masculinities in a Prison," Mahuya Bandyopadhyay (2006) argues that our culture's central norms of masculinity often are challenged in prison, and therefore, alternative ways of "doing" masculinity and ways of dealing with the loss of one's masculinity outside prison must be established, resulting in masculinities that may differ a bit from one's found in mainstream society. Bandyopadhyay (2006) argues that characteristics of hegemonic masculinity are represented in the prison setting, but "the notion of hegemonic masculinity is a seriously contested idea and there are alternate and competing masculinities and identities that male prisoners take on and

demonstrate” (188). As stated previously, hegemonic masculinity is an ideal type which men can never achieve. Therefore, other, opposing forms of masculinity arise in the prison setting in order for male prison inmates to demonstrate their masculinity.

For example, Bandyopadhyay asserts that hegemonic notions of masculinity found outside prison include actively participating in one’s own future, being the protector of his family, and being a powerful man in his community (186). However, within the prison context, these qualities are not always obtainable. In the prison examined in Bandyopadhyay’s study, certain inmates, who were typically well-educated, worked in the administrative office as ‘writers.’ The job of writers includes maintaining and organizing documentation, sending letters, and performing simple errands for staff members, such as going to get a glass of water or cleaning an officer’s desk. While the typical tasks of the ‘writers’ are often viewed as responsibilities performed by females, they brought about a sense of freedom for the male inmates. “The fact of being in different spaces at different times of the day introduces a variety of interactional settings, which enables a greater possibility of unmonitored and unregulated interaction” (Bandyopadhyay, 2006: 191). Various other benefits of working as a ‘writer’ in this particular prison include obtaining inside information generally only known to staff and occasionally being given money. Moreover, not only are ‘writers’ seen as being model prisoners to the staff, but other inmates also view inmates with this job as having a certain amount of power. “In the eyes of other prisoners, writers are influential because of their access to the prison administration” (Bandyopadhyay, 2006: 192). The previously mentioned example illustrates how, inside prison walls, stereotypically female

tasks can be utilized as resources for negotiating one's masculinity, to the extent that masculinity is characterized by acquiring a certain degree of relative power.

Summary

As stated previously in this paper, limited literature exists regarding the ways male inmates in long-term, single sex correctional facilities negotiate masculinity. The sociological literature does, however, provide insight into how this may be done.

The current research study contributes to this research context in several ways. First, most literature on gender centers on gender in mainstream society. While research on gender in mainstream society is imperative, it also is important to analyze how gender is negotiated in a variety of social spaces.

This research also adds to existing literature on prison. Many studies assert that prison is a highly gendered institution, but literature does not currently exist to explore how gender is negotiated in the prison environment.

This paper explores various configurations of masculinity in our culture in an attempt to situate how male inmates negotiate masculinity in prison by examining two differential prison institutions. Moreover, this research observes how certain masculinities are negotiated differently for white and black male prison inmates given the material and interpersonal resources that may or may not be available to do so.

CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

Method

Prison inmates are, for the most part, an untapped resource within sociological research. The purpose of this study is to learn more about prison, prison life, and the obstacles male inmates face while incarcerated. More specifically, this examination focuses on the ways in which male inmates negotiate masculinity within the prison setting, and how the ideas about and accomplishments of masculinity vary by the institutional setting in which these inmates are situated. Furthermore, the current study examines how masculinity is negotiated by race within various prison environments. Therefore, face-to-face interviews were conducted with prison inmates from two prison institutions in North Carolina: Dan River Prison Work Farm in Yanceyville, North Carolina and Davidson Correctional Center in Lexington, North Carolina. Reliance on interviews with incarcerated offenders is essential to ensure the accuracy of the research examination through the acquisition of direct, first-hand knowledge.

While many sociological studies rely on quantitative research methods as a way to examine social phenomena, this research utilizes a qualitative approach. In general, quantitative studies are useful in uncovering tangible, mathematical ideas, while qualitative examinations are “an ideal approach to elucidate how a multitude of factors such as individual experience, peer influence, culture, or belief interact to form people’s perspectives and guide their behavior” (Rich and Ginsburg, 1999: 372). Therefore, a

qualitative research approach is desirable when examining the lives of prison inmates and the features of institutional life that direct their behaviors.

Not only are qualitative research methods best suited for the types of questions this study aims to answer, but qualitative methods, in general, offer a more comprehensive and powerful account of social life. According to Robert S. Weiss (1994), “qualitative interview studies have provided descriptions of phenomena that could have been learned about in no other way” (12). Moreover, Clifford Geertz (1973) asserts that, “what quantitative researchers often miss, through no fault of their own, is the richness of meaning, depth of understanding, and flexibility that are hallmarks of qualitative research” (as cited in Patenaude, 2004: 70S). Therefore, for purposes of this research study, interviewing allows the researcher to obtain in-depth information from male prison inmates in order to closely examine how male inmates negotiate masculinity within this institutional context.

Several advantages exist in utilizing face-to-face interviews instead of employing more objective methods, such as collecting data through a quantitative survey. One benefit lies in the fact that data collection by means of interviewing occurs in a more naturalistic setting (Rich and Ginsburg, 1999: 373), which allows for a context-specific examination of the social phenomenon being analyzed. According to Anselm L. Strauss (1987), “qualitative researchers tend to lay considerable emphasis on situational and often structural contexts, in contrast to many quantitative researchers, whose work is multivariate but often weak on context” (2).

Another advantage is that certain literacy issues that may exist can be circumvented through the use of face-to-face interviews (Rich and Ginsburg, 1999: 373). When utilizing surveys, researchers are working under the assumption that every participant can read and comprehend questions at a certain level. This, however, is not always the case. Through interview techniques, the researcher has the opportunity to adapt and modify questions, if needed, in order for the participant to fully understand what is being asked. In addition, the researcher also can tailor the research questions to fit the experiences of each individual participant instead of asking identical questions to everyone. "If we depart from the survey approach in the direction of tailoring our interview to each respondent, we gain in the coherence, depth, and density of the material each respondent provides" (Weiss, 1994: 3). Moreover, by using face-to-face interviews, the researcher can further inquire if additional examples or explanations are needed on a particular topic. Therefore, not only are interviews useful in making sure the participant understands what is being asked, but also to ensure that the researcher understands the answers that are being provided. Being able to circumvent literacy issues is particularly important when interviewing prison inmates because, often times, the education levels of this population are relatively low.

In sum, the meaning and significance of qualitative interviewing is essential in understanding the depth and complexity of human behavior within a particular social context. "Qualitative analyses are more than merely useful: They are often indispensable" (Strauss, 1987: 4).

Institutional Approval to Conduct Research

Approval to conduct the current research study was required by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of both the University of North Carolina at Greensboro and the North Carolina Department of Correction. Preliminary approval was granted by both institutional entities for the pilot study portion of the research examination. Final approval from each institution for the remainder of the study was granted based on successful completion of the pilot interviews. North Carolina's DOC approved Dan River Prison Work Farm in Yanceyville, North Carolina and, subsequently, Davidson Correctional Center in Lexington, North Carolina as the prison institutions at which the interviews could be conducted. Both institutions are minimum custody. Access to a maximum-security prison was denied by the DOC's District Supervisor and the DOC's Institutional Review Board.

Research Procedure

Study Design

Initially, I requested access to inmates from two diverse institutional settings (minimum and maximum-security), but was denied admission to a maximum-security site by North Carolina's DOC. Therefore, as stated previously, all participants were recruited from two minimum-security facilities: Dan River Prison Work Farm in Yanceyville, North Carolina and Davidson Correctional Center in Lexington, North Carolina. Consequently, half of the participants were asked to think about their individual prison experiences retrospectively. In order to examine the differential nature of masculinity within various prison institutions, inmates who have served time in

minimum-security institutions were asked to provide information based on experiences in minimum-security institutions and participants who have served time in close-security institutions (heretofore referred to a maximum-security) were asked to provide information based on their experiences in maximum-security settings.

In North Carolina, maximum-security units are incorporated in various close-security prisons. While maximum custody units often confine the most dangerous prisoners who are perceived as being a threat to other inmates, prison personnel, and public safety, maximum and close custody prison units are similar in terms of structure, confinement, inmate movement and supervision.

(<http://www.doc.state.nc.us/dop/custody.htm>). Therefore, based on the similarities between the two institution types, the term ‘maximum-security’ will be used throughout this paper to refer to inmates who answered questions based on experiences in maximum or close custody prison units.

As stated previously, information was collected about the participants’ experiences in prison through oral, face-to-face focused interviews.¹ Due to the fact that some sensitive material was addressed during the interviews, the questions were structured in a way that began and ended each discussion with less sensitive topics, such as questions on prison structure and sports. More personal interview questions, such as those about sexuality and rape within prison, were embedded in the middle of the interview protocol. In her book, Why Battered Women Kill, Angela Browne (1987) utilizes this interview technique to examine patterns of male perpetrated physical abuse

¹ See Appendix A for Minimum-Security Interview Protocol and Appendix B for Maximum-Security Interview Protocol

on female partners and the events that occur prior to the homicide of the male offender by the female victim. According to Browne (1987):

The overall format of the questionnaire is crucial in conducting interviews on such an emotionally charged topic. The interview schedule was structured so that questions about violent incidents came during the middle of the interview, with less upsetting topics discussed at the beginning and the end. This gave subjects an opportunity to relax and adjust to their surroundings and the interviewing process before the most difficult questions were asked. It was equally important to provide closure for subjects at the end of the interview (194).

Each interview lasted between approximately 45 and 150 minutes. The interview sessions were audio-taped and subsequently transcribed for analysis. Written notes also were taken during the interview sessions including notes on verbal and nonverbal responses given by the participants throughout the process.

Human participants' consent was required since individual interviews were conducted with prison inmates at Dan River Prison Work Farm and Davidson Correctional Center. In an effort to avoid reading deficits among inmates, the informed consent was verbally presented and explained to each research participant. After signing the consent form, each participant was provided a copy of the document².

Sample

Consideration of time constraints and logistics for participants and the North Carolina Department of Correction (DOC) staff as well as the study completion timeline were integral factors in determining the number of participants in this study; however, I

² See Appendix C for Consent Form

requested a sufficient number of participants to avoid compromising the validity of the examination. I initially wanted to include five white and five black participants who would answer the interview questions based on experiences in minimum-security facilities and five white and five black participants who would retrospectively recall experiences from maximum-security institutions in order to examine the differential nature of masculinity negotiation between and within various institution types and between and within differing racial categories. However, some difficulty existed in recruiting participants throughout the process. Therefore, fourteen male inmates ultimately participated in the study: five white and five black participants who answered the interview questions based on minimum-security experiences and two black and two white participants who answered questions based on maximum-security experiences.

Through the use of purposive sampling, specific criteria relating to the research examination were formulated.³ Specific details regarding the study's sampling criteria will be discussed later. The sampling criteria was presented to North Carolina's DOC who, in turn, generated a list of participants who met the study criteria. I also had access to each potential participant's public file information by means of the North Carolina Department of Correction Public Access Information System (<http://webapps6.doc.state.nc.us/apps/offender/menu1>). The file information included, but was not limited to, gender, age, race, previous and current offense(s), previous and current incarcerations and corresponding prison locations, current prison admission date,

³ See Appendix D for Sampling Criteria Sheet

custody classification, current prison location, and projected release date for the inmates' current sentence.

Subsequent to receiving the generated list from the North Carolina DOC, I mailed participant recruitment letters to each potential participant identified by the North Carolina DOC.⁴ Each participant recruitment letter contained a sheet on which to indicate whether or not the individual is interested in participating in the research interview. The letter, subsequently, instructed each potential participant to return the completed form to a specific, well-known location at each prison institution. Specified personnel at the institutions collected the completed forms and informed me of the individuals willing to participate in the interviews. I waited approximately two weeks for affirmative responses to come in. If more than the desired number of participants agreed to participate in the interview, I selected the names of applicable participants on a first-come basis. If the desired number of participants was not obtained during the two week period, I conducted the interviews of the individuals who agreed to participate and waited for additional responses to be turned in or contacted the North Carolina DOC for any additional relevant names.

As stated previously, all participants were recruited from Dan River Prison Work Farm in Yanceyville, North Carolina and Davidson Correctional Center in Lexington, North Carolina. No incentives of any kind were offered to participants for involvement in the study.

⁴ See Appendix E for Participant Recruitment Letter

Sampling Criteria. As stated previously, explicit criteria relating to the current research examination were formulated through the use of purposive sampling. Only male prison inmates were utilized in the study due to the fact that masculinity, the social construct that conventionally includes only males, is being examined. In addition, only white and black inmates were studied due to the fact that the large majority of prison populations in the United States are comprised of these two groups. Obtaining a sufficient number of participants from other racial categories would have been difficult. According to the North Carolina DOC's Statistical Abstract Query, from January 1, 2007 to December 31, 2007, 34.9% of all prison inmates in North Carolina were white and 57.7% of all prison inmates in North Carolina were black.

The participants used in the study were between the ages of twenty and forty-two due to the fact that the majority of prison inmates are within this age range. In North Carolina, between the dates of January 1, 2007 to December 31, 2007, 61.6% of prison inmates are between twenty and thirty-nine years of age (North Carolina DOC's Statistical Abstract Query). Moreover, I wanted participants of somewhat similar ages due to the fact that a very young man may view masculinity and his prison experience very differently than an elderly man. As stated previously, a total of fourteen male prison inmates participated in the full-scale examination to discuss their experiences within the two different institutional settings.

Individuals who have been convicted of any type of offense and who have received any type of treatment while incarcerated were eligible to participate in the study. Participants who were asked to discuss their experiences in a minimum-security setting

must not have had any prior incarcerations within North Carolina, other than having served time at another minimum-security facility for the same conviction. Serving time in other institution types may distort the visualization of the current prison experience. I recognized, however, that prior incarcerations in other states, in federal institutions, or while under the age of eighteen could not be accounted for. In addition, minimum-security participants should have been incarcerated in their current security level (minimum) for at least one year in order for the participants to become adequately accustomed to life in prison and the prison routine.

Participants who were asked about their experiences in a maximum-security setting must have been incarcerated in a maximum security institution for a least one year for any prior offense(s). Furthermore, participants studied from this particular point of view must have been incarcerated in maximum custody for at least one year at some point prior to being transferred to Dan River Prison Work Farm or Davidson Correctional Center. All participants must have had a total sentence length of between two and ten years for the current offense.

In accordance with limitations imposed by the North Carolina DOC, the present research study excludes prison inmates with an active mental illness, mental retardation, inmates who are excessively violent, and inmates on death row.

Data Analysis

The current study utilizes Messerschmidt's theory of structured action and examines the application of the theory in a different context than has formerly been studied. Because this examination is guided by a specific theory, the coding categories,

as well as the study's interview questions, were predetermined prior to any interview taking place.

The coding categories utilized in this study were chosen from a body of existing literature on masculinity and are based on conventional notions of masculinity that exist in our present society. For example, participating in the labor market and engaging in sports and fitness activities are characterizations of masculinity in our culture today. Therefore, the study's interview questions were formulated based on certain dimensions of conventional characterizations of masculinity within the prison institution and the interview transcripts were subsequently analyzed in order to locate such information.

Qualitative data analysis often utilizes a variety of techniques or "as commonly practiced, may use procedures not appreciably different from the pragmatic analytic operations used by everyone in thinking about everyday problems" (Strauss, 1987: 3). The same is true of this examination. In order to analyze the acquired data, I located information in the interview transcripts based on the constructed data categories derived from existing sociological literature. The derived data categories include power, normative heterosexuality, sexual violence, non-sexual violence, masculinity, material resources, employment, language, emotions, sports/fitness, and knowledge. Within each transcript, each specific data category was placed in a separate computer file containing excerpts from the appropriate transcript sections in an effort to visibly distinguish certain categories within each interview. For example, discussions of masculinity that take place during the interviews will be placed in a document designated only for that coding category. Each time masculinity is discussed by a participant the narrative selection was

copied and placed in the appropriate document. In addition to examining the interview transcripts for accounts of the constructed data categories, within each category, I also looked for descriptions that were consistent with conventional ideology, as well as accounts that contradicted current thinking. Moreover, I allowed for new data categories to emerge from the interviews and, consequently, recoded each transcript accordingly. For example, the idea of respect initially emerged during the pilot interviews. Therefore, I recoded each pilot interview and coded the interviews for the full scale examination for ideas relating to respect.

Study Limitations

Several limitations of this research examination exist. First, as stated previously, at the time of the interviews, all of the participants were in minimum custody prisons. Therefore, some of the research participants were asked to retrospectively remember previous prison experiences in maximum-security institutions, while others spoke about current experiences in minimum custody. The possibility exists that, for the participants who were asked to recall past experiences in maximum-security institutions, their responses may have been shaped by the relationship between their current institutional environment and the prison environments they are asked to remember. According to Merton, Fiske, & Kendall (1990):

Retrospection is required to capture the subject's experience of the stimulus situation in circumstantial detail. Without such retrospection, interviewees may on occasion report reactions which are not linked to the stimulus, or which are

superficial, or which are essentially reactions to the interview situation rather than to the original experience of the stimulus (38-39).

Therefore, the possibility exists that the current and former experiences of the participants who answered questions based on previous time spent in maximum custody prisons may have been interconnected with their current situations and, therefore, may have affected or shaped their particular interview responses. However, as will be seen later, the responses provided from participants who answered questions based on experiences in maximum-security institutions appear to reveal prior maximum custody experiences more so than experiences in their current institutional settings.

A second limitation is the relatively small size of the sample. As stated previously, I initially wanted a total of twenty male inmates to participate in the examination. However, due to various recruitment difficulties and time constraints only fourteen total participants took part: five white and five black participants who answered the interview questions based on minimum-security experiences and two black and two white participants who answered questions based on maximum-security experiences. While the sample size of participants answering questions based on experiences in maximum-security institutions is quite small, on the whole, the statements expressed by this group were powerful and commanding and the cohesiveness of the answers among the participants demonstrates that the feelings and ideas expressed are common of life in maximum-security prisons.

Third, the possibility exists that the social identities of the researcher elicited certain participant responses due to the fact that interviewer characteristics such as race,

gender, age, conduct, and appearance are observable and perceptible and, in some way, may shape the interview experience. According to Robert S. Weiss (1994: 137), studies of survey interviewing have shown that respondents do use observable characteristics of the interviewer, including the interviewer's skin color, dress, demeanor, age, and sex, to guess where they might find common ground. Their judgment in this respect then affects the opinions and attitudes they voice." Moreover, the possibility exists that, during the interviews, the participants shaped their responses in hegemonically masculine ways for the same reason. Therefore, "while contextually situated, these relationships nonetheless are influenced by the identities and histories of those involved, researcher and researched alike" (Arendell, 1997: 364).

During the interviews, I tried to reduce the potential effects of my influence on the participants and their responses and reactions towards me in various ways. First, I attempted to make the participants as comfortable as possible with me, the interviewer, as soon as they entered the interview location. I acknowledged that many of the individuals interviewed are often treated with a lack of deference by others, or at the very least perceive to be treated in this way, particularly in the environment in which they currently find themselves. Therefore, I made sure to make eye contact and shake hands with the participants as they entered the room in an effort to increase rapport between the participant and myself by being personable, friendly, and approachable while, at the same time, being vigilant not to traverse an appropriate researcher-participant boundary. Second, before the interviews began, I informed each participant that I was in no way there to judge their actions, behaviors, or responses during the interview process and

reiterated several times that I would be the only person who would be aware of and view their responses. Third, before entering the prison environments, I modified my personal appearance in an effort to downplay my own feminine characteristics, such as putting my hair back, wearing loose fitting clothing, not wearing shoes with high heels, and by applying a modest amount of make-up. My physical appearance during the interviews is an important aspect of this research study because, if I presented myself in an overtly feminine or sexual way, the responses of the participants would have reflected that. More specifically, if my physical appearance appealed to the participants in any way, they may have shaped their responses and behaviors to appear more masculine simply as a response to my overt femininity.

To this end, the data and conclusions of this research examination are an interpretation of masculinity negotiation within the prison environment due to the fact that differing amounts of genuine disclosure by the research participants may have existed. The observable consequences of the social capital I brought into the interactions with the respondents and the effects it had on the interview process and participant responses will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter of this examination.

Pilot Interviews

Preliminary approval was received by both UNCG's Institutional Review Board and North Carolina's Department of Correction to conduct five pilot interviews prior to the implementation of the full-scale study. North Carolina's DOC granted approval for the pilot interviews to be conducted at Dan River Prison Work Farm in Yanceyville, North Carolina.

I presented the original sampling criteria to North Carolina's DOC who, in turn, produced a list of potential participants who met the appropriate criteria. I then mailed participant recruitment letters to each potential participant identified by North Carolina's DOC. As stated in the recruitment letters, each potential participant who agreed to participate was instructed to check the appropriate box and return the form to Dr. Michael Conley at the prison's medical facility. Dr. Conley subsequently contacted me regarding the individuals who agreed to participate.

The study's sampling criteria were initially presented to North Carolina's DOC during early summer of 2007, yielding four potential participants. Participant recruitment letters were sent out to each individual, producing one positive response. The first pilot study participant was interviewed on July 18, 2007.

Because the necessary number of pilot study participants was not obtained through the first round of recruiting, the sampling criteria were adjusted in order to generate a greater number of potential respondents. With the help of North Carolina's DOC, the sampling criteria were modified such that the age range for selecting potential participants was expanded from 24-35 years of age to 20-42 years of age. After obtaining approval from UNCG's IRB, the modified sampling criteria were again presented to North Carolina's DOC. The second list generated by the DOC yielded fourteen potential participants, some of whom were included in the first listing. Consequently, participant recruitment letters were sent to each individual on the list who had not previously received a letter. Again, only one positive response was received. The second pilot study participant was interviewed in early October 2007.

Once more, the sampling criteria were modified in order to obtain the desired number of participants for the pilot portion of the research study. Two of the sampling criteria were altered; type of offense and treatment while incarcerated. Originally, the participant criteria stipulated that individuals with convictions of drug offenses only would be utilized for the examination. In addition, participants were not to have gone through any extensive treatment programs while in prison and each participant should have received approximately the same amount of treatment during their current sentence. However, the previously identified criteria greatly narrowed the potential sample of participants, making it difficult to obtain the desired number of participants. Therefore, the sampling criteria again were modified to match that proposed by the current research examination such that: 1) the type of offense criterion was omitted and opened up to all offense types, and 2) the treatment criterion was omitted and opened up to include individuals who had undergone any type of treatment while incarcerated.

Again, after obtaining approval from UNCG's IRB, I presented the sampling criteria to North Carolina's DOC. The third list yielded forty-six names, some of whom were included on the previous lists. Participant recruitment letters were mailed to the newly identified individuals. Several responses were received, well beyond the number needed to complete the pilot interviews. As a result, I alphabetized the list and selected every other name until a total of five names were chosen in order to obtain the sample for the pilot portion of the examination. The final three participants were interviewed on January 8th and January 10th, 2008. The individuals who confirmed that they would be

interested in participating in the research examination, but who were not chosen for the pilot study, were held until the main part of the research study was conducted.

During each interview, the following occurred: The participant entered the interview room, and I provided background about myself, including who I am, what I am studying, and general views on how I feel prison research based on first-hand knowledge is important. Subsequently, the informed consent form was presented, explained, and signed. Each participant received a copy of the consent form for his records.

Information was collected about the participants' experiences in prison through an audiotaped, oral interview. Throughout the process, each participant was encouraged to ask any questions about the research project itself or his participation, and I addressed any concerns the participants had. At the conclusion of the interview, each participant was thanked for his time.

During the pilot study, several participants were interested in how they were chosen to take part in the examination. Also, a number of participants expressed that they decided to participate in the study in order to help others, especially youth, before they end up in prison. One participant stated:

I won't encourage nobody to commit no crime or, or wanna see what the inside of it [prison] look like. You know. And the reason why I agreed to do this program is for the simple fact that you know, to help you out and you know, maybe help somebody out along down the line. Cause, you know, if, maybe if I would've seen a documentary or some type of book that's giving me a heads up on what I'm bout to go through, maybe I wouldn't've done the things that I done. You understand what I'm saying? People ain't talking about it enough. You know, and I feel like it should really be talked about cause it's a real issue. You know, it'll mess your life up. It'll mess your life up, now.

Preliminary Findings. Subsequent to conducting the pilot interviews, I discovered that several modifications needed be made to the interview protocol and the participant recruitment letter in order to improve the research process.

First, throughout the pilot interviews, I observed the need to directly state to each participant to answer the questions based on experiences that occurred within the prison institution in which he was located. Several times, participants wanted to answer questions based on experiences that took place in other prisons in which they had previously been a part. Therefore, two interview protocols were used. One directing inmates who were answering questions based on minimum-security experiences to only state experiences from that institution type, and another directing inmates who were answering questions based on maximum-security experiences to only assert experiences from that particular security level.

Second, I believed that the use of the word 'inmate' within the interview protocol should be limited, if not eliminated. The use of that specific word brings with it a negative connotation and reminds the participants of the negative situation in which they find themselves. Therefore, the word 'inmate' was eliminated, as much as possible, from the interview questions. In addition, a concluding question was inserted into the interview schedule permitting participants to make further statements or raise additional questions regarding the research examination if so desired.

Two changes also were made to the participant recruitment letter. The participant recruitment letter has two parts: the invitation to participate and a response sheet. A

prison official brought to my attention that the response sheet did not have a place for potential participants to supply identifying information. In one case, an affirmative response was received, but no identifying information was provided. Therefore, a space was added to the response sheet of the participant recruitment letter for each potential participant to specify his name and associated Department of Correction identification number in order to identify which applicable individual to contact for the interview. As indicated on the consent form, all measures were taken to protect the confidentiality of the participants. I was the only individual to have access to the actual names of study participants. The data, as well as the response sheets provided by the participants, were stored in a locked filing cabinet and were not made available to any other source.

Second, not every individual who indicated his willingness to participate in the study was utilized due to constraints on the number of interview participants required for the examination. Therefore, a specification was added to the participant recruitment letter and response sheet stating that only the individuals who are selected to take part in the study will be notified and that failure to be notified indicates not being selected due to over response, not due to any fault on the part of the participant.

The pilot study data were loosely coded in order to discern preliminary patterns and to determine if any coding categories emerged that should be incorporated into the questions or coded in the actual study.

Based on the first round of coding, several noteworthy patterns emerged. In response to questions about possessing items in prison, the importance of acquiring and possessing material items was common among all pilot participants. According to the

interview transcripts, several items were noted as being particularly important in prison, including possessing new shoes, new clothes, money, and obtaining certain types of food from the canteen. In order to obtain desired items in prison, one must hold a certain degree of power over other inmates. One participant stated, “In prison, people judge you by status; how new your shoes are, how often you go to the store [canteen]. Power is not transcended through violence, but through doing things for other people,” and having the favors reciprocated. One participant stated that he received a new shirt from another inmate who works in the clothes house specifically for this research interview. “There is an unspoken code: if I do something for you, just look out for me.”

In addition to the significance of possessing material items, four of the five pilot participants expressed the importance of and desire to have a woman or women in their lives. Moreover, women were repeatedly mentioned when the participants were asked about the most desired material items in prison, illustrating the patriarchal view of women as possessions.

Interviewer: What are some of the most desirable things that guys want to have in here?

Participant: A woman. [Pauses for a few seconds]

Interviewer: What other kinds of things?

Participant: A woman.

Interviewer: That's it? [Both laugh]

Participant: I mean, what else?

Interviewer: Ok.

Participant: I mean, what else you want?

Furthermore, one participant stated that he probably would not have responded to my participant recruitment letter if it was sent by a man.

Participant: ...to see a woman's face it's, it's a blessing. You know, I'm straight. I want to see a woman's face. I don't want to see this man's face all day.

Interviewer: Right.

Participant: So, you know, when I got that letter from you, I went to the mail room. So, I'm like, "Who writing me now?" Cause you know, I had just gotten my letters from my daughters down here. [Mumbles something] So, me and my man, me and a friend of mine, we was walking back down. I said, "Uh, somebody from UNCG?!" He said, "What?! ??? You might want to hook up with that home. Holla at her." I said, "I don't know who this is." So, when I, you know, I read it. Like, shh. I don't, I'll go on through it. Let me, let me see who this is. You know, that's, you know, my mindset is just that way. ??? Now if it had said a male name, I'd been hesitant. I talk to dudes in here! You know, I talk to my programmer if that's what I need.

Accordingly, the pilot participants view heterosexuality as being important within the prison environment. When asked about the significance of being 'straight' in prison, one participant responded, "That's all you got. That's your manhood." In addition, the same participant mentioned that being 'straight' is what other people in prison think about you. "You're either straight or gay."

Another theme that emerged from the pilot interviews as being particularly salient is that of employment within the prison. The most desirable jobs within the prison institution are jobs where inmates work near members of the prison administration who are viewed as possessing the highest degree of power within the institution. When an inmate holds an employment position near individuals who possess the most power

within the institution, they often enjoy additional benefits. However, the high status job occasionally comes with negative consequences from the other inmates.

Interviewer: What about the administration janitor?

Participant: Well him, you know, he just get to net, network with the big dogs. You know, alota time he looked at as more like the snitch of the group. Sometimes that can be a blessing or a curse. Cause, you know, alota times when you in high position in these jobs, people always intend to say, "he's a snitch." And that's just a way for the people who envy to try to discredit your name.

Interviewer: Right.

Participant: So, you know, if you constantly working up front with the Superintendent, you know, and he uh, bringing in that wholesome coffee everyday or feeding you that bagel every morning, pretty soon they [other inmates] gonna start asking you uh, "I wonder how that stuff getting in, getting in?" You know. And, then, you know, uh, not saying that the staff becoming friends with the inmates, but you know, it's like we human beings too. The only thing that separate us is the clothes.

Interviewer: Right.

Participant: You know. The [administration]...you know, claim, "You know, I really like this guy." You know, and then, he can start feeling like he can trust him but the person saying they ain't gonna do nothing about it or they ain't gonna tell nobody that you told. So, you know, but in the same, but in the same sense, it can be helpful in the simple fact that uh, you may work good for this person. He may uh, allow you to go out for work release. "Hey, look. I'm gonna recommend you for this spot here. I know this guy. He worked for me. You know, I pretty much trust him to some point or another."

However, desiring jobs within prison that create opportunities for working near members of the prison administration were not communicated in the full-scale interviews.

One data category identified throughout the pilot interviews that was not anticipated prior to the examination is the idea of respect in prison as it relates to power among inmates. "Power is really displayed through respect." The participants spoke

about having respect for others as well as having respect for themselves. The following interview excerpt illustrates the importance of respect in prison:

Interviewer: So, you're saying that the kind [of violence] that isn't important is like the stupid little petty fights.

Participant: Yeah.

Interviewer: So, what kind is important?

Participant: What kind is important?

Interviewer: Yeah.

Participant: It's respect, really.

Interviewer: Ok.

Participant: You know. I mean, that's all a person got in here is their self-respect.

Interviewer: Right.

Participant: You don't have that then, you know, you don't have nothing. That's, you gonna get ran over.

The final research results incorporate the concept of respect as a resource that male prison inmates can utilize to negotiate masculinity within male prison institutions.

In sum, the previously illustrated patterns preliminarily indicate that male prison inmates negotiate masculinity in various ways by utilizing resources that are available in the prison environment while, at the same time, striving toward hegemonic characterizations of masculinity that exist outside prison. The pilot interviews served as a catalyst for conducting the full-scale examination and proved not only to be helpful in improving the data collection instrument, but also in providing invaluable experience for the researcher.

Full-Scale Examination

After the pilot interviews were successfully completed, UNCG's IRB and North Carolina's DOC approved Dan River Prison Work Farm for the full-scale examination. In early June 2008, as with the pilot interviews, I presented the sampling criteria to North Carolina's DOC who, subsequently, sent me a list of the potential participants who fit the conditions imposed by the study. The first list yielded eighteen new inmates who met the minimum-security criteria and twelve who met the maximum-security criteria. I consequently mailed participant recruitment letters to each identified individual who had not previously appeared on a participant list. Six positive responses were received and two interviews were conducted on three separate days; June 26, June 30, and July 7, 2008. Three of the participants interviewed answered questions based on experiences in minimum custody and three participants interviewed answered questions based on maximum security experiences.

After not receiving any additional positive responses for a period of time, I requested an updated list of potential participants from Dan River Prison Work Farm. The second list yielded five new individuals who met the minimum-security criteria, whom participant recruitment letters were mailed to, and no new individuals who met the maximum-security criteria. Two positive responses were received from individuals who were to answer questions based on experiences in a minimum-security institution. The interviews were scheduled for August 7, 2008. One interview was completed and one individual decided not to take part in the examination prior to the interview taking place.

At this point, my final interview group included four minimum-security participants and three maximum-security participants, which fell far short of my initial target number of participants. As a result, initial two rounds of recruiting, an additional prison institution was added in order to have an additional population with which to sample. North Carolina's DOC approved Davidson Correctional Center in Lexington, North Carolina as the subsequent site for recruiting study participants. After UNCG's IRB and the North Carolina DOC formally approved the new site, a third sample list of potential participants was generated. The third list produced sixteen new potential participants who corresponded with the minimum-security criteria and five who corresponded with the maximum-security criteria. Participant recruitment letters were sent out to each individual producing eleven positive responses. Because I was looking for a certain number of participants to comprise each subset of participants, not everyone who replied that they would be interested in participating actually was allowed to participate. Using a random number generator, I randomly selected the individuals who participated based on the number needed to fill each subgroup. The subsequent interviews were conducted during February 2009. This yielded an additional six minimum-security participants and one maximum custody participant. The following table provides information about the participants interviewed including, age, whether they answered questions based on minimum or maximum-security experiences,

approximate total time incarcerated⁵, and the specific prison institution at which they were interviewed.

Participant	Dan River Prison Work Farm	Davidson Correctional Center	Age (20-42)	Minimum/Maximum Security	Approximate total time incarcerated
MINBlack1	X		41	Minimum	3 years 6 months
MINBlack2	X		34	Minimum	1 year 2 months
MINBlack3	X		28	Minimum	3 years 2 months
MINBlack4		X	32	Minimum	4 years 6 months
MINBlack5		X	31	Minimum	2 years
MAXBlack1	X		38	Maximum	11 years 11 months
MAXBlack2	X		35	Maximum	11 years
MINWhite1	X		27	Minimum	5 years
MINWhite2		X	28	Minimum	2 years 8 months
MINWhite3		X	27	Minimum	4 years 5 months
MINWhite4		X	25	Minimum	2 years 7 months
MINWhite5		X	31	Minimum	4 years 11 months
MAXWhite 1	X		37	Maximum	7 years 11 months
MAXWhite 2		X	42	Maximum	11 years 4 months

The same interview procedures occurred during the full-scale examination as in the pilot study.

⁵ The total time incarcerated (up until the interview was conducted) for participants who answered questions based on maximum-security experiences may include prison time spent in security levels other than maximum or close custody. However, each participant from this group met the sampling criteria and, therefore, spent at least one year in maximum or close-security prison institutions.

Conclusion

The idea that prisons are particularly masculine environments is solidly grounded in current sociological literature. However, limited literature exists regarding the ways masculinity is negotiated within prison settings. This study expands on existing literature into sociological understandings of gender negotiation by including a previously overlooked population and, thus, is poised to make a significant contribution to the field. Using James W. Messerschmidt's (1993) structured action theory, the current examination draws on in-depth interviews conducted with fourteen male prison inmates at Dan River Prison Work Farm and Davidson Correctional Center about their experiences in minimum and maximum-security settings to explore how male prison inmates situationally negotiate masculinity within these institutional environments. The following chapter delineates the results of the interviews in an attempt to answer the research questions posed by this examination.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS: MASCULINITY NEGOTIATION THROUGH FIRST-HAND ACCOUNTS

Negotiation of Masculinity in Prison

The main purpose of this research study is to examine how male inmates negotiate masculinity, using James Messerschmidt's theory of structured action as the theoretical link. According to Messerschmidt's theory, the accomplishment of gender is based on social action, which reinforces and is reinforced by social structures in a reciprocal process. Therefore, the types and amount of resources that are available to people vary by where each individual is positioned in society.

Based on this theory, I argue that masculinity negotiation will vary by prison settings due to the differential nature of social structural constraints placed on individual inmates and, therefore, the resources and degrees of power they have at their disposal. In addition, not only will inmates in a particular prison construct masculinity differently from inmates in another setting, but inmates in the same prison also will construct masculinity in various ways for the same reasons.

The following analysis examines the four research questions posed at the outset of this project: 1) How does the negotiation of masculinity vary in minimum and maximum custody prisons? 2) How does the masculinity negotiation vary by race within and among each institutional setting? 3) Is prison violence one resource used to negotiate masculinity, and if so, to what extent? 4) How do male prison inmates negotiate

masculinity when conventional notions of femininity are omitted? As stated previously, fourteen male inmates participated in the final study: five white and five black participants answered the interview questions based on minimum-security experiences and two black and two white participants answered questions based on experiences in maximum-security prisons.

Differential Negotiation of Masculinity by Prison Security Level and Race

As Messerschmidt's theory states, men negotiate gender in specific ways given the social structural constraints placed on certain individuals and, therefore, the differential resources and degrees of power that are accessible to them. Moreover, masculinity negotiation also is dependent upon current societal ideologies that guide individual behavior and are influenced by the views and norms of a particular society at a particular time. Therefore, according to the theory and the incorporation of current ideology, it should be expected that differences in minimum and maximum security prisons would lead to the negotiation of differential types of masculinities. In addition, male prison inmates who identify with different racial categories, namely black and white, should negotiate various types of masculinities for the same reasons. The following sections illustrate the differential resources that are present or absent for individuals in varying prison security levels and of differing racial categories that allow for the playing out of gender roles within these settings and the various types of masculinities negotiated as a result.

Material Resources by Setting. The acquisition of material resources is one way power is created among individuals. Based on the interviews, both minimum and

maximum-security participants specified that certain material possessions are desired within both institution types, including canteen items such as food not served in the prison cafeterias and hygiene products that must be purchased by individual inmates. In addition, participants from both security levels noted the desire to obtain items that are nicer than the general population enjoys, such as having a superior radios, shoes, watches, and clothes. However, all four participants who answered questions based on experiences in maximum-security institutions (hereafter referred to as maximum-security participants) also stated that prohibited items, such as drugs, alcohol, and sex, are desired by prison inmates in maximum custody institutions. When I asked participant MAXB2 what are the most desired items to have in maximum-security prisons, he answered, “Oh shit. That’s easy. Drugs.” Only three out of the ten participants who answered questions based on minimum-security experiences (hereafter referred to as minimum-security participants) mentioned prohibited items as being desirable in prison. In addition, two out of the four maximum-security participants stated that items are often traded for drugs, particularly marijuana, and that drugs are a commodity frequently used as money within the prison environment. Participant MAXB1 stated:

Only, only items that would be traded for anything is reefer...If you ain’t got money, marijuana will get anything in the prison system you want. Marijuana is like gold in here...If you got that, you can get anything you want. [Chuckles] You can get a, you can get a homosexual with it. [Chuckles] You can get friends. [Chuckles]...You can buy friends with it and everything.

Prohibited items were not mentioned by the minimum-security participants as being items traded or utilized as money.

Participants who answered questions based on both institution types stated that inmates who possess desired items often benefit from certain privileges. For the most part, minimum and maximum-security participants noted similar privileges enjoyed by inmates in both security levels for possessing certain desired items, including possessing an increased degree of power, status, or respect and having the ability or opportunity to gain financially by selling or renting out items. One reason for this is because individuals who possess desired items must be able to stand up for themselves to defend their possessions. According to participant MAXW1, "...they gave 'em more respect...Because in order for 'em to have it [desired possessions] they have to be able to keep it, you know, without other inmates taking it." Inmates who possess coveted items are respected because other inmates know they cannot be taken advantage of.

The participants from each security level also noted that simply possessing the desired items is a privilege in itself and that small things, such as nice toothpaste or deodorant, become important to possess. In mainstream society, possessing high-quality toiletries is often taken for granted, but in prison high-quality items are uncommon. The following dialogue illustrates the view that items that are taken for granted in mainstream society are often viewed as being important to possess in prison. According to participant MINW2:

P: Well, just little things, I guess just little things like deodorant or could be toothpaste. Just anything that reminds you of a better place like home or...

I: Right.

P: I think it reminds you of freedom.

I: Yeah.

P: Kinda weird, but.

I: What's kinda weird?

P: I mean, little things like that, you know, there's a lot of little things in prison that, that mean a lot.

I: Sure.

P: Compared if you were out, like to you [referring to interviewer]. You might have good toothpaste at home or deodorant. And you get up in the morning and, and not think about it cause it's normal. But, in here it's like, those things are not normal. It's like...

I: Right.

P: ...I don't know. I guess prison just takes away, can take away so much.

Additionally, possessing desired material possessions was seen as being much more important to maximum-security participants than to minimum-security. Half of the minimum-security inmates stated that acquiring desired material possessions is not important in prison. All four maximum-security participants, on the other hand, stated that having desired items is important and possessing or not possessing the items has much more severe consequences. One participant stated that having the items could be used as protection in maximum-security prisons and the consequence for not possessing coveted items could be death. According to participant MAXB2:

...it could be protection. Ok, now, say for instance, a mother fucker this big. Ok, he ain't as big as your chair leg. Can't fight. He don't wanna be a boy. But, he have access to reefer...the reefer is his...protection...But, that's how he pay 'em [to protect him]. He got a little money in his pocket. He got a little power now. He got a little clout. But he this big [indicating small]. Can't fight. Nothing. But, he got the muscle behind it. You understand what I'm saying? Now, somebody run up on him they already know the consequences of, "Ok, if you fuck with him then here they come." You understand what I'm saying? And that's how it go. You know. That's what it's important for.

Certain resources for negotiating masculinity, such as violence, are not accessible for the inmate referenced in the previous quote. However, since he possesses marijuana, which is a coveted item in maximum-security prisons, he can sell the item for money and trade it for protection and, therefore, uses material possessions to negotiate masculinity as opposed to other resources which he cannot obtain.

Overall, based on the interviews conducted with prison inmates, maximum-security inmates are more likely to negotiate a type of masculinity around obtaining desired items, particularly prohibited items such as sex, drugs, and alcohol. Based on the interviews conducted with both groups of participants, individuals who possess certain coveted items have privileges over individuals who do not. These privileges include holding a higher degree of power, status, or respect over other inmates and having the opportunity to gain financially from selling or renting out the items. Obtaining money in prison becomes important because obtaining monetary capital is restricted within the prison environment.

While all participants discuss the significance of access to certain items, they also reveal that the types of material possessions that individuals acquire that serve as symbols of power or control differ depending on where one is positioned within a certain social context. As already shown, the types of possessions that are important in minimum and maximum-security institutions vary, and prohibited items are desired and hold a higher status in maximum-security. Acquiring desired possessions in maximum-security has much more significant consequences and often serves more important functions than in

minimum-security, such as providing protection for inmates who may otherwise be taken advantage of or hurt. Acquiring and keeping coveted material possessions may be more important in maximum-security institutions because more restrictions are placed on maximum custody inmates and, therefore, fewer resources are at their disposal for the negotiation of masculinity. Thus, material possessions are used to negotiate masculinity in prison when other resources are unavailable to these inmates.

Material Resources by Race. Based on the interviews, both black and white participants specified, with similar frequency, that legal and illegal material possessions are desirable within the prison environment. In addition, both black and white participants expressed that similar items are often used in trades and as monetary capital. Overall, minimal differences existed between the responses of the black and white participants regarding the types of material possessions that are desired, used in trades, and used in the place of money.

Four black and four white participants expressed that individuals in prison who possess desired items often hold a higher degree of status, power, and respect than individuals who do not possess coveted items. Participant MINW3 expressed:

Some [inmates] think its important cause, like we was saying, that's more of a power thing. You got that, you got power. Cause people need you for something. You see what I'm saying? You got a porno or the books that you can, you know, masturbate to. Umm, people need you, because you can't get 'em no where else. You know?"

In addition, participants from both racial categories mentioned that inmates often gain financially from obtaining coveted items. According to participant MINB3, "... if you got something somebody want, they gonna pay for it. That's, that's the biggest gain that I see." However, three white and three black participants expressed that it is not necessarily important to possess coveted items while in prison.

Although the theory would suggest that inmates who identify with different racial categories will negotiate masculinity in various ways, the interviews reveal that black and white inmates negotiate masculinity, at least in regard to the use of material resources, in similar ways. Participants from both racial categories have similar views on desired items, privileges established, and the importance of acquiring specific items while in prison, and, therefore, negotiate masculinity similarly in terms of material possessions.

Interpersonal Power by Setting. Interpersonal power is another way men can negotiate masculinity by dominating others in social relationships and interactions. The personal characteristics inmates noted that bring status while in prison were fairly uniform over the two groups of participants and include possessing material items and/or money, dominating the prison block or card games, carrying oneself in a respectful manner and being willing to standing up for oneself and fight, having respect for oneself and others, and being a man of your word. In addition, in each security level, one participant stated that homosexuals often hold the most power because they often can obtain a relatively large amount of information about inmates and staff and often possess desired material items.

Similarly, the personal characteristics noted to give prison inmates low status were consistent among both groups and include being disrespectful, having committed crimes against children or women, being viewed as weak and not being willing to stand up for oneself and fight, snitching, and stealing. Participant MAXW2 stated:

...I seen people get just, just, just the shit slapped out of them just cause they weak. They look weak. So, you know what I'm saying, for him to feel like he got more power over another man, he might go slap this weak boy. He knew the boy wasn't going to fight anyway. You know. He ain't got no fight in him.

Overall, among participants who answered questions based on both security levels, inmates who have a lot of power in prison are seen by the other inmates as being more masculine and tougher, and are more respected. Similarly, inmates who have little or no power in prison are viewed by the other inmates, for the most part, as being mentally and physically weak and are often overlooked. According to participant MINB3,

A lot of times the people with the lower status gonna be weaker. You know what I'm saying? You're obviously gonna find that person and, yeah, they gonna run over him...If they get the chance, they gonna run over him. [Chuckles] I done seen it too many times the last five years.

Nine out of the ten minimum-security participants interviewed expressed that having power in minimum custody institutions is not necessarily important and that no one really has power over anyone else in minimum-security because, for the most part,

the inmates are preparing for release. In addition, they argue that possessing power in prison can get inmates in trouble.

Conversely, all four of the maximum-security participants expressed that possessing power in maximum custody is important for several reasons. First, if one does not have power, he will be taken advantage of. One maximum-security participant even stated that power is important in order to survive physically, mentally, and spiritually. Participant MAXB2 stated, “Without some power you’d be dead. Without some power you will die behind the wall. Whether if it’s from starvation or...spiritually. You know. They’ll kill your spirit too.” Additionally, having power in maximum custody is important because one can earn the respect of the inmates and officers, and they will, in turn, perform favors and acquire possessions for you that may be desired. Often times, the favors are performed due to manipulation. According to participant MAXB1:

Cause, once a officer, once a officer give you something, they don’t supposed to give you nothing. If they give you something, so you be like, “Hmm. Ok. So, he done gave me some chips.” So the next time you gonna go try to manipulate him. “Look man, bring me a steak or something. You know we don’t get steak here.” So, he bring the steak. So, now you’ve got him in the crossfire. When he bring you that steak and gave you them chips, he knew he wasn’t supposed to do it. Now, the way you do him, “Now you’ll bring me an ounce of dope.” So, he be like...”Nah, man. I can’t.” “Oh, you gonna do it or we gonna see why you can’t be fired cause you done bring me this and that.” And then, he be like, “Alright. Alright. Just cool it.” And then that’s how you get your power over the officers...you got the power over him cause you, you feeding him and you’re manipulating his mind.

Thus, power is differentially available within and between minimum and maximum-security institutions. Power dynamics only can be understood when placed

within a specific social context. Within the prison environment, inmates are subjected to circumstances of deprivation and, thus, are positioned in a struggle for resources with which to negotiate masculinity. In this way, social conditions structure power relations between individuals within various societal settings. In addition, men and women possess differing amounts and types of power depending on where they are positioned within a particular societal context. Therefore, in order for certain individuals in prison to hegemonically negotiate masculinity through the use of power, other inmates have been informally categorized as being powerless and weak based on certain personal characteristics, such as not being willing to fight and stand up for oneself.

In addition, as noted earlier, men who are not particularly successful in their public lives may compensate by behaving more dominantly in their private lives. Male prison inmates who can effectively dominate other men in prison may do so because, while in prison, no other ways exist in which to exert power. Within the prison environment, inmates are, for the most part, powerless in that almost every aspect of their lives is dictated and predetermined by prison personnel. This is more pertinent to maximum-security inmates than minimum because, based on the differential prison structures, minimum-security inmates have more control over their personal lives, and thus power is perceived as being less important within minimum custody institutions. Similarly, maximum custody inmates have less control over their own lives and are, for the most part, in positions of less power within maximum-security prisons. Therefore, maximum-security inmates are more likely to negotiate a type of masculinity that approaches hegemony by overpowering other inmates in interpersonal situations.

Interpersonal Power by Race. Black and white participants noted similar characteristics as providing inmates status in prison. Both black and white inmates expressed that possessing money and standing up for oneself gives men power or status within the prison population. However, divergent responses also were provided by participants of differing racial categories. Two white participants stated that committing violence while in prison can give inmates status. Often times in prison, the size of an inmate is not of importance if he is willing to commit violence. Participant MAXW2 stated:

...I've seen dudes, little dudes have much power and much respect cause of what he'll do to you. You know what I'm saying? He might not, he might not be able to bench 200 pounds, but he'll put some steel in you. He don't care. You know. Umm, they just don't care. I had a partner named [name]. And uh, I don't know how many life sentences he had, but I know he wasn't ever going home. And he, that dude was dangerous. Uh, [names someone else]...dangerous. Uh, these dudes, they wasn't that big. But, the biggest dude on the yard wasn't about to go mess with 'em. Cause, he know that, that, that he didn't care.

In addition, white participants mentioned having female significant others or friends in mainstream society who write letters or call on the telephone and having a noteworthy street reputation often provides prison inmates with status.

Black participants, on the other hand, expressed that respecting oneself, staying out of trouble, working, possessing materialistic items, having been in prison a long time, being physically strong, and being a man of one's word will provide inmates with power or status in prison. When asked what personal characteristics give men power or status in prison, participant MAXB2 responded, "Your word. Being a man of your word.

Standing up for yourself. That's first and foremost. Be a man about whatever it is that you do."

Similarly, black and white participants provided somewhat divergent responses when asked what personal characteristics can get inmates hurt or low status in prison. Both black and white inmates expressed that committing sexual crimes against children or women, snitching, stealing, being disrespectful to other inmates, and being a bully can get inmates low status or hurt within the prison environment. However, five black participants mentioned disrespecting other inmates as a way to achieve low status. Only one white participant shared the same viewpoint.

Four white participants and one black participant stated that the men who have the least power within the prison population are viewed as being weak mentally and physically and are often taken advantage of. According to participant MINW1:

Uh, a lot of 'em will tell you [Chuckles]...'When you first get into prison, find the biggest, baddest guy you can and knock the shit out of him.' [Laughs]...And like, to me, when I first come in I said, 'what's the purpose of that?' And they said, 'Well, you know, that'll let 'em know that you, you're not gonna be pushed around.' I was like, 'Whatever.' You know what I'm saying? Of course I didn't do that...And of course they acted on that. So, I had to fight for it. But once they seen that I would fight to stick up for what I believed was right or to stick up for myself, they don't mess with you no more.

The participants provided similar responses regarding how inmates who possess a lot or minimal power are viewed by others. White and black participants responded that inmates who possess a high degree of power are often seen as being tough, more masculine, and are respected more. In addition, four white and three black participants

expressed that inmates who have little or no power or status within the prison population are often perceived as being weak and, as stated previously, are often taken advantage of. Moreover, black inmates stated that men who have no power in prison are often viewed as being less of a man and like they cannot take care of themselves financially or mentally.

On the whole, black and white participants expressed that possessing a high degree of status in prison makes one's time more comfortable because inmates can get things they want and need, gain credibility within the prison population, and inmates can support themselves and have a better life in prison. Conversely, a large majority of the participants stated that men with little or no power in prison are often taken advantage of, are victims of violence, and have an overall difficult time while in prison.

In sum, white participants stated more that violence and having possessed a strong street reputation provide men in prison with a high degree of status or power. Black participants did not express this viewpoint. Therefore, based on the interviews, white inmates tend to create a type of masculinity around power that is a result of violence and street credibility, while black inmates do not. However, black participants emphasized disrespecting other individuals throughout the interview, specifically as it relates to inmates with little or no power in prison. Therefore, based on the interviews, black inmates are more inclined to negotiate a type of masculinity around power that focuses on being respected by others.

In addition, participants of both racial categories emphasized the weakness of inmates with little or no power throughout the interview. As the theory would suggest, in

order for certain inmates to negotiate masculinity by exhibiting mental and physical strength, they must socially situate others as being weak. Based on the interviews, certain prison inmates successfully negotiate masculinity in this way, by juxtaposing themselves to a weaker other.

Employment by Setting. Employment is another resource that can be utilized by men in order to negotiate masculinity through the demonstration of power. Seven out of the ten minimum-security participants expressed that almost everyone in minimum custody has a job. In addition, based on the maximum-security participants, a lot of inmates in maximum custody work, but not nearly as many as in minimum custody. According to maximum-security participant MAXB1, "...well, you ain't got too many people wanna work [in maximum-security], cause most of 'em got twenty years or better, fifteen years or better and ain't getting out no time soon....They ain't, they ain't got no reason to work."

Certain jobs are available in both minimum and maximum-security institutions, such as working in the kitchen, canteen, laundry facility, and barber shop and as janitors cleaning various parts of the prison. All ten minimum-security participants interviewed stated that additional employment opportunities such as Community Work Crew, road squad, and work release are available in minimum custody which often allow inmates to leave the prison grounds for a period of time and to work and interact in mainstream society. Jobs outside the prison grounds are not available for maximum-security inmates.

Based on the interviews, the types of jobs that are most desirable in minimum and maximum-security institutions differ. Eight of the ten minimum-security participants

expressed that Community Work Crew, road squad, and work release are the most desirable jobs because inmates are provided the opportunity to leave the prison grounds and interact with society, even if for a short period of time. When asked why jobs that allow inmates to leave the prison are desirable, participant MINB3 stated:

...you're basically free. You know what I'm saying? You get to see the world. Especially when you've been out [of mainstream society] as long as me, just being able to go out there and just see all the things that just took place since you been gone.

In 1994, North Carolina established Structured Sentencing. Under Structured Sentencing, individuals who are sentenced to prison are given a minimum and maximum prison term and inmates can decrease their maximum by working or attending classes which provide gain time or merit days. Five of the ten minimum-security participants stated that any job that gives the most gain time or merit days off a maximum sentence is a good job, such as working in the kitchen, barber shop, canteen, and the laundry facility. Participant MINB1 stated:

Yeah, you come in with a, a minimum and a maximum. And then in order to get down to your minimum you have to work. Just by working every, every month, X amount of days is took off, took off where you go closer to your minimum and closer to your minimum. But, if you don't work, you have, you stay at your maximum, which means you'll have to do more time if you didn't work. And in that way it's considered important to me.

In addition, five minimum-security participants mentioned that relatively high paying jobs are desirable, which include maintenance, laundry facility, community work crew, and work release.

On the other hand, three out of the four maximum-security participants interviewed expressed that the kitchen is a good job because inmates can control how the food is handled, can stay physically fit by carrying heavy bags of food, and if an inmate is not receiving any money from home, can still eat well. In addition, two out of the four maximum-security participants stated that inmates want to work where women prison personnel work. According to participant MAXB2:

Depending on where the women at. Wherever the women at, oh, that's where you want to work at. Wherever you can get close to a woman, you, that's what you want. If, if all the women work in segregation, ok, you want a seg job. If all the women work in operations, ok, you want to be in programs or the, the, the, do the uh, operations janitor. You know, something like that.

Both minimum and maximum custody participants expressed that having a job in prison means a lot but for different reasons. Four of the minimum-security participants stated that having a job means they can acquire money to save for release, to send home for their families, or to help support themselves while in prison. In addition, four minimum custody participants stated that, by having a job, they can accrue gain time or merit days and can help prepare for their eventual release into mainstream society. In opposition, half of the maximum-security participants interviewed stated that having a

job means they get to be close to women, which was often viewed as being important in maximum custody prisons.

In addition, all participants were asked if inmates who have jobs are viewed differently than inmates who do not have jobs. All ten minimum-security inmates stated that inmates who have jobs are not viewed any differently than inmates without jobs because almost everyone works. On the other hand, three of the maximum-security participants stated that men who do have jobs in prison are seen differently than men who do not because having a job means they have something to look forward to other than the monotony of every day prison life. They can stay busy which helps to pass the time, and they enjoy certain benefits that men who are not working do not have, such as moving around the prison grounds. One maximum-security participant also stated that inmates with jobs are respected a little more than inmates without jobs.

Overall, all ten of the minimum-security participants and three of the four maximum-security participants stated that having a job while in prison is important. Minimum-security participant MINB4 stated, “You don’t want to be here not doing nothing. Sitting around. That’s dead time. On the camp all day. That’s the worst thing you can do.”

As stated previously, hegemonic masculinity involves engaging in paid employment. In addition, power relations between men are established through participating in the labor market. Based on the interviews, inmates in both minimum and maximum-security inmates negotiate masculinity by engaging in employment opportunities. However, minimum-security inmates negotiate this type of masculinity

more often and in more diverse settings than inmates in maximum custody, because this particular resource is available more often for minimum custody inmates. In addition, minimum and maximum custody inmates view holding employment positions as being important for different reasons. Minimum-security inmates are more inclined to create a type of masculinity around being the “breadwinner” by obtaining monetary compensation to help support themselves while in prison and to send to their families outside prison. Maximum-security inmates are not able to negotiate masculinity in this way because they are not allowed to work jobs that pay a relatively large amount. Working within the prison confines pays from forty cents to a dollar a day. In opposition, inmates in minimum custody on work release can make minimum wage, which allows them to take care of themselves and their families monetarily. Therefore, the types of masculinity negotiated by minimum-security inmates in terms of employment come closer to hegemonic masculinity than the types negotiated by maximum-security inmates.

In opposition, maximum-security inmates prefer employment opportunities close to women, which become their way of negotiating masculinity.

Employment by Race. Based on the interviews, similar employment opportunities are available for black and white prison inmates. Participants from both racial groups indicated that jobs within and outside the confines of prison are available.

Most of the participants from each racial category expressed similar types of jobs are the most desirable within prison. The participants stated specifically that Community Work Program and work release are the most desirable jobs to have because the inmates who hold these jobs are afforded the opportunity to leave the prison grounds and interact

with society, make more money than jobs on the prison grounds, and engage in actual work that would be performed outside prison. Accordingly, both white and black participants stated that jobs that pay relatively high salaries and that provide the most gain time or merit days in order to serve only the minimum sentence imposed are desirable. Participants from both racial categories also mentioned certain jobs on the prison grounds that provide particular benefits specific to each job. For example, inmates who work in the laundry facility have access to better clothes than the rest of the prison population, which is viewed by the inmates as being an advantage to having this particular employment opportunity. According to participant MAXB1:

Every job you get a benefit. It's, it don't matter where you work at. Wherever you work, you benefit from that job. You get gain time. And then, plus, your boss lady or busman or whoever, they give a feel for you and know who you is...and then they'll be like, 'Well, he ain't gonna tell nothing. So I bring this for them so he won't go back on the yard and tell everybody that this is what I'm doing up here in the clothes house.' Cause, whatever happens in the clothes house, stays in the clothes house.

While white and black inmates tend to agree on the most desirable jobs to possess in prison, one difference exists. Two black inmates expressed that the most desirable jobs to have are where women personnel also work. As stated previously and as will be shown shortly, male prison inmates are, for the most part, deprived of interactions with women and, therefore, covet time spent with individuals of the opposite sex. White participants did not express that working with women is necessarily desirable. White participants did, however, mention that having a job provides the opportunity to obtain

monetary compensation more than black participants. Therefore, black prison inmates are more likely to negotiate a type of masculinity that involves the presence of women, while white prison inmates are more inclined to negotiate masculinity around monetary gain and financial success.

In sum, based on the interviews, the views of black and white inmates on employment in prison are fairly synonymous with one another. However, black inmates stated several times that working near women is a desirable part of particular jobs. Therefore, black inmates are more inclined to negotiate masculinity through employment and sexuality collectively, while white inmates tend to utilize employment and financial success as primary means for accomplishing gender.

Emotions by Setting. Research shows that men often show less emotional responses towards situations than women. Therefore, demonstrating a lack of emotional response is another resource that can be called upon by men to negotiate masculinity and demonstrate power relations between and among groups of men.

Based on the interviews, the participants specified that showing emotions in prison that are stereotypically feminine, such as sadness, is often viewed in a negative light and often is seen as a weakness. According to one maximum-security participant, however, anger is an appropriate emotion to show in prison. As shown previously, inmates do not want to be seen as weak, because that makes them a target. The following dialogue between the interviewer and participant MINB1 illustrates this point:

P: Showing the wrong emotions might be looked upon as being weak.

I: What are the wrong emotions?

P: Crying, of course. But that's, that's...umm, maybe sensitive [sensitivity] towards others is looked down upon on.

I: Uh, huh.

P: Then the, the sensitive type emotions, I guess they're not frowned upon, but no one wants to really be seen as, as weak.

I: Right

P: Cause, jail [prison] is a big test [testosterone] or big masculine place. [Chuckles]

I: Right

P: You know, people, people, people tend to, you always, you always have a bunch of people who tend to feed on the weak.

When asked if the participants feel free to show their emotions to other inmates in prison, four of the maximum-security participants stated that they do not feel free to show emotions to the other inmates, particularly if they are viewed to be feminine. Maximum-security participant MAXB2 stated, "There's just certain emotions and things that you shouldn't show. You definitely shouldn't show no weakness. Never that." In addition, seven of the minimum custody participants and three of the maximum custody participants stated that they do not feel free to show their emotions to staff because staff also can take showing emotions as a sign of weakness. Overall, it is more acceptable to show emotions in minimum-security institutions than maximum-security.

Five participants from minimum-security and two from maximum-security expressed that one way they deal with holding their emotions in is by working out or engaging in sports or fitness activities. The minimum custody participants interviewed also indicated that they read religious texts, pray, read books, write, draw, listen to the radio, or talk to a friend in prison to deal with holding emotions in. Two maximum-security participants, on the other hand, stated that they go to their cells to be alone, and

when they emerge, act like nothing is wrong. When asked how he deals with holding his emotions in, participant MAXB1 stated:

Just go to my room [cell]. Just, you know, like, you had like a little window. I'd put a blind up, just sit in my room and just be thinking. Might just be in there smoking a cigarette with the blind up [so no one can see]. Releasing my little anger and, or something happen and I might want to cry. Can't nobody see me crying in my room. Or can't, or hear me cause I might have my radio. And then, after that over, take my blind down, come back out. Everything just fine."

One maximum custody participant also stated that he turns all his emotions to violence or anger. The following dialogue between the researcher and participant MAXW1 illustrates this point:

I: So, how did you deal with holding your emotions in? How'd you deal with not showing 'em?
P: Just don't.
I: Did you have other things you did like working out or reading...
P: No.
I: ...or writing or anything?
P: You turn all your emotions to violence or anger.

Several of the participants had a difficult time expressing the specific concealed emotions they possess, but could articulate situations that may cause negative emotions. When asked "what emotions do you have that you may not want the other guys in prison to know about," participant MINW2 stated:

Yeah. Yeah, I mean, I have a lot, you know, of things going on outside. You know, I have a little boy. And it's like I, I don't even know him. I mean, he was born since I've been incarcerated. And...and situations with, you know, my son's mom and she keeps him from me. And just, there's a lot of things that go on.

As stated previously, individuals in our society who show intense emotional responses to situations are often viewed as being feminine, weak, and, subsequently, less powerful than individuals who avoid such responses. In addition, emotional responses often vary between men and women and among groups of men. As demonstrated in this section, the amount and complexity of emotional responses demonstrated by men in differential prison settings are similar to one another. For the most part, participants from each security level agree that showing certain types of emotions and demonstrating them too frequently is an indication of weakness in prison. Therefore, for the most part, minimum and maximum-security prison inmates effectively negotiate masculinity by limiting the quantity and types of emotions that are displayed in the prison environment. However, maximum-security inmates are inclined to negotiate gender in this way more often than inmates in minimum custody. In addition, inmates from both institution types tend to lack a comprehensive language around emotions, and therefore, often have difficulty expressing specific emotions they are experiencing.

Emotions by Race. Both white and black participants provided somewhat different responses to the acceptability of showing emotions in prison. Six white and two black participants stated that showing emotions in prison is not acceptable as it is often viewed by the inmates as a weakness. When speaking about not showing emotions in prison, participant MAXB1 stated, "...if you show your sensitive side. Cause they might

take that for a weakness. And then somebody might try you...to see how you act.” In addition, five black participants stated that showing emotions in prison is acceptable to a certain extent and expressed that only certain emotions are acceptable to show. The participants specified that showing emotions that are considered feminine, such as crying due to sadness or loneliness, is not acceptable due to the fact that it may be taken as weakness. However, anger was specified as an appropriate emotion to show. Participant MAXB1 stated, “...I ain’t like showing emotions. [Chuckles] See, I ain’t show emotions in the streets, so I didn’t really show ‘em in, in prison. So, only time I show emotion, if I’m angry and I know I’m ready to fight or something.”

Although differences exist based on the race of respondents in terms of the appropriateness of displaying emotions in prison, white and black inmates responded similarly to whether or not they feel comfortable expressing emotions to other inmates or to prison personnel. Most of the participants stated that they do not feel free to show emotions to other men or staff in prison, primarily because showing emotions can lead to an inmate being taken advantage of and can be seen as a weakness. According to participant MINB1:

Cause people, cause people see what, what, what you’re sensitive to, they, people, they, we have a whole bunch of people take advantage. There’s a lot of people take advantage of others in here. And if you don’t wanna be exposed to those type of people you, you just, you don’t show it.

All participants from both racial categories stated that times exist when they may hold emotions internally and not outwardly express them and provided similar ways they

deal with holding emotions inside. However, only white participants expressed that, in order to deal with holding their emotions in, they turn all their emotions to violence or anger. Black participants did not mention violence or anger as ways of coping with buried feelings.

In addition, several participants from each racial group had a difficult time expressing specific emotions they possess, but instead, would speak about events or occurrences in their lives that cause negative feelings. The following dialogue between the researcher and participant MINW5 illustrates this point:

I: So, what emotions do you have that you may not want the other guys to know about? You said you talk about 'em with your friends and stuff, so.

P: Umm, maybe if I ain't seen my daughter in a while, you know, and... [pauses for a few seconds]

I: Right. So, maybe sadness over not being able to see her?

P: Yeah.

For the most part, showing emotions in prison is acceptable unless the emotions are perceived as being feminine. Overall, black inmates viewed showing emotions in prison as being more acceptable than white inmates. However, black participants expressed more frequently that they do not show emotions that are considered to be feminine or sensitive in nature. Therefore, for the most part, black and white male prison inmates negotiate masculinity by concealing emotions that may threaten their masculinity, specifically emotions that are perceived to be sensitive or feminine.

In addition, both white and black inmates engage in stereotypically masculine activities in order to deal with holding emotions in, such as working out. They utilize

sports as a resource for negotiating masculinity to deal with hiding certain emotions. However, white inmates expressed that they turn their emotions to violence/anger and employment opportunities, whereas black inmates do not. Therefore, in order to negotiate masculinity, white inmates are more inclined to utilize violence and employment in order to mask emotions that may not be appropriate to display in the prison environment.

Language by Setting. Language is another resource male prison inmates can utilize in order to negotiate gender through the demonstration of power by verbally creating other, often less powerful types of men. Individuals in our society use language to communicate to others about oneself and to express power relations between individuals.

The participants interviewed were asked if it is important to use slang words or expressions in prison and expressed that it is not important to use slang in prison. However, two of the minimum-security participants and three of the maximum-security participants stated that it is important to use slang in prison because it is way to effectively communicate with other inmates while in prison. When asked if using slang in maximum-security institutions is important, participant MAXB1 stated, "... it goes back to being street. You know what I'm saying? You gotta be street smart in the penitentiary, so if a person using the slang, you gotta know what that slang mean." Furthermore, one maximum custody participant stated that it is not necessarily important to use slang, but inmates can tell a lot about a person if they use slang expressions, such as what type of crime they are in prison for. According to this particular participant,

inmates who are in prison for violent crimes are more likely to use slang than individuals who are in prison for white collar or 'paper' crimes.

Six minimum-security inmates and three maximum-security inmates expressed that words are used in prison that are not used in mainstream society. The maximum-security participants interviewed specified terms around illegal possessions, violence, and sexuality, such as calling marijuana "Christmas trees" or "green beans," calling a weapon a "shank" or "tool," calling masturbation "jacking," and using "boy" or "bitch" to refer to a homosexual in prison. The following dialogue with participant MAXB2 illustrates this point:

P: Now to you jacking means what?

I: I don't know. I, I think you were using it earlier as masturbation.

P: See...right! That's what jacking is. You know what I'm saying? But, ok, if you use jacking in the street they think you talking about jacking somebody.

I: Oh, like robbing.

P: It's the same word but it's just a different meaning.

I: Right.

P: Uh, a tool. You know? In the street a tool is a screwdriver or a hammer.

I: Uh, huh.

P: On state a tool is a mother fucking shank. Just don't say shank no more.

Inmates from both security levels often use derogatory female terms, such as bitch, to speak badly about other inmates or to refer to inmates who are less masculine. It may be important for prison inmates to refer to weaker individuals in offensive female terms in order for the more masculine and dominant inmates to position themselves as such.

The participants also were asked if it is important to go along with what other guys are saying in prison or if it is ok to stand up for what one believes. All ten of the

minimum-security and two maximum-security participants stated that it is not important to go along with others in prison because it often leads to trouble and that only weak people and inmates who are not men go along with the crowd. According to participant MINB4, "I don't never go on what somebody else say. That's a weak person. A weak mind." In addition, participant MAXW2 stated that individuals who follow the crowd are often not respected. "...you gotta lose respect for somebody like that. You know, if you man up and say, 'Nah, you know, I'm not gonna be no follower.' Uh, nah. Cause you might fall for anything."

In opposition, two maximum-custody participants expressed that going along with other inmates is important if one cannot stand up for oneself.

In sum, using slang in minimum or maximum custody institutions is not necessarily important, nor is it used as a resource for negotiating masculinity. However, when used, slang can often help effectively communicate with others, hide information from prison personnel, and can be a way of finding out about others in prison. In addition, maximum security inmates often negotiate masculinity by utilizing language that focuses on illegal possessions, violence and sexuality, while minimum-security inmates do not. However, inmates from both security levels negotiate more powerful types of masculinities by situating other, less power inmates as feminine by referring to them as derogatory feminine names.

Language by Race. Based on the interviews, white and black inmates offered similar responses to the importance of language in prison. Overall, white and black participants stated that using slang vocabulary in the prison environment is not important.

For the most part, black and white participants stated that words exist in prison that are not generally used in mainstream society. Individuals from both racial groups mentioned prison dialect relating to illegal drugs and sexuality, such as referring to masturbation as “jacking.”

In addition, six white and six black participants did not view going along with what other inmates are saying as being important. As stated previously in this paper, standing up for oneself and what one believes is more essential in prison than going along with what others believe.

Inmates from both racial groups presented words specific to the prison environment relating to sexuality. Therefore, one way masculinity is negotiated through language is by creating words and subsequent meanings for the words that express and illustrate the importance of sexuality in prison. Moreover, throughout the interviews, participants from each racial group referred to certain inmates in derogatory female terms, such as using the word bitch. Words of this type are often reserved for inmates who are perceived as being less masculine and are used to differentiate inmates who effectively demonstrate masculinity in opposition to inmates who do not.

Sports and Fitness by Setting. Men also can use sports and fitness activities as resources to negotiate masculinity in our culture. All participants interviewed stated that inmates participate in sports tournaments planned by the prison and informally participate in sports with other prisoners including basketball, horseshoes, volleyball, and weight lifting. Nine out of the ten minimum-security participants and all four maximum-security

participants expressed that lifting weights and working out occurs frequently within the prison environment.

Seven minimum custody and three maximum custody participants expressed that staying in shape and having big muscles gives guys status within their respective prison environments, and often times, aids in preventing violent interactions. The following dialogue with participant MAXW1 illustrates this point:

P: ...because size means a lot because they don't wanna, you ain't gonna have some real little dude jumping on a big dude.

I: Right.

P: Yeah. Or just being real strong. Cause they had a dude here, me and him had problems at other camps.

I: Uh, huh.

P: And I know he don't have no heart. But he goes down there and curls two-fifteen. You know?

I: Right.

P: And everybody thought, "Well, hell. That dude's strong. Let him alone." So. They gave him more of a bark instead of a bite.

I: Yeah. That, that doesn't necessarily mean he can back it up.

P: Yeah.

I: Ok.

P: Just nobody wants to try.

I: Yeah.

P: [Chuckles]

On the other hand, three minimum-security and one maximum-security participants stated that possessing a muscular physique does not necessarily give inmates higher status. Participant MAXB2 stated:

Big ain't the thing no more. You know, they don't scare nobody no more. You know what I'm saying? They might scare people in the street. It don't scare

people in the penitentiary no more. Because, I done seen mother fucker lift everything on the weight pile. Suck a dick like a mother fucker. You know what I'm saying? Lift everything on the weight pile, get knocked slap the fuck out. So, it don't, you know, cause, being big was that bully thing. You understand what I'm saying? The bigger you were, you know, you muscle people around. Bully 'em. That don't work no more. Because, they stick that thing in you, that tool. That tool'll deflate you. Like popping a balloon. [inaudible] for about six months, come back around and you about this big (small). It's over for ya.

In addition, one maximum-security participant stated that inmates want others who excel at a certain sport on their team. This, in turn, creates a certain degree of status for inmates who perform well at sports and fitness activities.

The participants interviewed from each security level stated that engaging in sporting activities have different benefits for individuals in minimum and maximum-security institutions. Various minimum custody participants stated that individuals who participate in sports have the opportunity to obtain bragging rights and prove that they are the best at a certain sport. In opposition, individuals interviewed who answered questions based on experiences in maximum-security institutions stated that the main benefit to inmates in their respective custody level is staying in shape and getting strong. Overall, most of the participants stated that it is important to participate in sports and fitness activities while in prison.

In sum, inmates in minimum and maximum-security institutions use sports and fitness activities as a resource for negotiating masculinity either by excelling at a certain sport or by acquiring physical strength as a result of working out. As stated earlier in this paper, the sports arena is a social location where certain masculine bodies are created and others questioned. For prison inmates, lifting weights and working out in order to obtain

a muscular physique is a way certain masculine bodies are created within the prison environment. This type of masculinity is negotiated in opposition to other inmates who do not participate in activities that produce a muscular body type.

Sports and Fitness by Race. The black and white participants interviewed stated that prison inmates engage in sporting tournaments planned by the prison as well as informal sports with groups of other inmates or alone. When speaking about lifting weights, participant MAXB1 stated, “Cause I wanted to keep in shape and a lot of guys like to keep in shape. That’s, that’s really where the weights come in, where you’re being manly and stuff. You like to lift weights.”

Five white and five black inmates stated that staying in shape and possessing a muscular physique provides prison inmates with status or power. When speaking about the importance of having large muscles, participant MINB4 stated, “...it’s just a man thing. You know what I’m saying? A masculinity thing. You know you got people that gotta boost theirself up real good about theirself.” Participant MAXW2 stated that if others see you lifting weights, they are less likely to take advantage of you. He stated,

Umm, but like I said, you know, if somebody, they see you, you go all out, they not gonna mess with you. If they see you taking care of yourself, they know they probably got a fight on their hands. You know. If you ain’t doing nothing with yourself or you just letting, then you, I guess you’re perceived as weak.

In addition to staying in shape, participants from each racial group stated that sporting activities provide opportunities for bragging privileges through competition for individuals who excel in certain areas. When asked what benefits the inmates enjoy from

participating in sports and fitness activities, participant MINB1 stated, "...trying to prove that you're, you're' the best. That you could be the best. Or, you know. This competition thing is big in here."

In sum, white and black inmates negotiate masculinity through sports and fitness activities by staying in shape, creating a muscular physique, engaging in competition with other males, and bonding with other men. As stated previously, through sports, masculine bodies are produced. Based on the interviews, both white and black male prison inmates attempt to produce hegomonically masculine bodies by creating a large, muscular physique.

Knowledge and Rationality by Setting. A more unconventional characterization of masculinity is knowledge and rational ways of thinking. Men can utilize various types of knowledge to negotiate masculinity by possessing certain types of useful knowledge over other men.

Five minimum-security participants and four maximum-security participants expressed that street knowledge was the most useful type of knowledge in their respective prison institutions. The minimum custody participants stated that this type of knowledge was useful because it is important to know who one can and cannot trust in prison. It also is beneficial in terms of knowing how not to get caught engaging in illegal behaviors in prison, and it is important to know how to negotiate things like in the streets, such as hustling for material and monetary possessions. According to maximum-security participants, street knowledge is important because inmates have to possess this type of

information in order to survive in prison to avoid being taken advantage of. According to participant MAXB2:

...you learn to survive in the streets. You know what I'm saying? You learn to fight in the streets. You learn to stand on your own in the streets. You know what I'm saying? So, all of that is a plus when you come in here. You know what I'm saying? To uh, be a mother fucker who's always kept in the house and pampered and everything that you wanted came to you on a silver platter, you know what I'm saying, nah, you gonna goddamn become a uh, uh, uh...you prey then. That's all that is. You know what I'm saying? If you was always sheltered in the streets, you prey in the penitentiary."

In addition, nine minimum-security participants expressed that book knowledge is the most useful in prison because it can be utilized after release in mainstream society. Participant MINB1 stated, "Book power...book knowledge to me is anything I can get on paper that shows that I've achieved something...any accomplishment I wanna do here is, is, is things that I know I could use on the outside world."

However, maximum-security participants did not mention book knowledge as being useful due to the fact that being released from prison may never occur. Based on the interviews, maximum-security inmates are mostly concerned with how to survive in their present situations and, therefore, do not have the luxury of preparing themselves for life in mainstream society. According to participant MAXB1:

Book knowledge is good, but you can have all the book sense in the world and ain't got no street knowledge and you gonna get ranned [ran] over. Cause, in the street you, you more know how to hustle, provide and survive in the street. That's the same way in the penitentiary. You gotta know how to survive.

As stated previously in this paper, a division exists in our society between men who are physically dominant within a particular society and men who possess technical knowledge. In addition, as stated previously, within certain cultures, knowledge of life on the streets is much more important and useful than knowledge learned from a book or through formal education. Moreover, individuals who possess street knowledge are often dominant over others within this specific societal context.

This is evident when examining the difference in minimum and maximum-security inmates in terms of the most useful types of knowledge to possess. Based on the interviews, minimum-security inmates create various types of masculinities around street knowledge and book knowledge as it relates to preparing for release into mainstream society. In opposition, maximum-security inmates mostly negotiate masculinity by utilizing street knowledge because they must attempt to survive in the situations they currently find themselves. As will be discussed later in this paper, more violent behavior occurs in maximum-security institutions, and, therefore, inmates must possess street knowledge in order to understand how to deal with and negotiate violent and aggressive social interactions. In addition, release is a long-term objective or may never even occur for inmates in maximum custody. Thus, learning book knowledge in order to prepare for release is often viewed by maximum-security inmates as a waste of time. Furthermore, within maximum-security prisons, inmates who possess street knowledge are viewed as being dominant over inmates who do not possess this type of knowledge because, as illustrated previously, inmates without street knowledge in this prison security level are

often taken advantage of and fall victim to more dominant inmates. In order for certain inmates to negotiate masculinity through the use of street knowledge, other inmates must be positioned as being weaker, and the weaker inmates in this institution type often lack knowledge that is learned from the streets.

Knowledge and Rationality by Race. Five white and four black participants expressed that they found street knowledge to be the most useful in prison. In addition, six white and five black participants stated that they found book knowledge to be the most useful while in prison primarily because this type of knowledge can be beneficial once released from prison.

Therefore, no variation exists between black and white inmates in the negotiation of masculinity through knowledge. Inmates from each racial category primarily negotiate masculinity in prison through street knowledge. Individuals who possess street knowledge are often more prepared to handle specific situations that may arise in prison, such as knowing how not to get taken advantage of. Moreover, individuals who do not possess this type of knowledge are viewed as being weaker because they do not have a lot of the skills needed to effectively negotiate prison life. However, as indicated by the interviews, black and white inmates also negotiate masculinity by acquiring book knowledge in order to help prepare for release.

Respect by Setting. One theme that emerged from the interviews was the idea of respect in prison as it relates to power among inmates. Throughout the interviews, almost every participant mentioned the idea of 'respect' in one capacity or another. "Issues of respect, honor, and pride repeatedly are described as central features of male identity

formation beginning in early adolescence” (Wilkinson, 2001: 235). According to Elijah Anderson (1999), “in the inner-city environment respect on the street may be viewed as a form of social capital that is very valuable, especially when various other forms of capital have been denied or are unavailable” (66). This appears to be true for the prison environment as well. In addition, in referring to maximum-security inmates, James Gilligan (1997) stated, “I have yet to see a serious act of violence that was not provoked by the experience of feeling shamed and humiliated, disrespected and ridiculed, and that did not represent the attempt to prevent or undo this ‘loss of face’ – no matter how severe the punishment, even if it includes death” (110). This quote illustrates the importance respect plays within the prison environment and the lengths inmates will go to protect their respect.

The following are two main ideas centered around respect that were communicated in the interviews. First, inmates from both security levels mentioned respect as it relates to fighting in two ways. Six minimum and four maximum-security inmates stated that disrespect can lead to fights in prison. In addition, participants from both groups expressed the importance of fighting in order to keep or gain respect within the prison population. According to participant MINB3:

...you can't let nobody disrespect you. You know what I'm saying? Uh, it's a respect thing. You know what I'm saying? A lot of times you might not even be looking, looking for a fight, but if somebody disrespect you, you gotta do what you gotta do.

Moreover, participants expressed that the important aspect of fighting is not necessarily winning, but being willing to back up one's self-respect by being prepared and ready to fight. Participant MAXB2 stated:

There is no turn the other cheek in the penitentiary when somebody smack the shit out you. You better smack him back. Just take the ass whipping. If he whip your ass, so what? So what?! You fought him though. We gonna respect you for that You know what I'm saying? 'Goddamn, man. He smacked the damn dog shit out you,' '[Inaudible], man. I tried to kick his ass.' Ok, and we gonna respect that than you just letting him do it. You know what I'm saying? C'mon man. You just can't let nobody just beat the shit out you."

The second idea centered around respect is the idea of respect as a characteristic of masculinity. Both minimum and maximum-security participants expressed that inmates with a relatively high degree of respect within the population are often seen as being more masculine.

The theme of respect and the importance of being respected throughout the interviews is fairly consistent among inmates who talked about experiences from minimum and maximum security institutions. In terms of Messerschmidt's theory, respect seems to be an important form of social capital among prison inmates in terms of negotiating masculinity when other resources may be unavailable. Based on the interviews, it seems that respect is a characterization of status and manhood that emerges from the hegemonic stereotypes of power and dominance. Being respected has many benefits for the inmates such as not being taken advantage of and not being as much of a target for violence. But, as the theory would suggest and as the results show, this form of

capital is not available to everyone. Respect is allocated differentially to men in prison based on where they are positioned within the population of prisoners. So, inmates with the highest status often hold a greater degree of respect than inmates with lower status, and inmates who are respected are often seen as negotiating masculinity more effectively.

Respect by Race. Six white and four black participants stated that disrespect can lead to fights in prison and often times inmates will have to fight in order to keep or gain respect. In addition, one white and three black participants emphasized respect as a characteristic of masculinity in prison. According to participant MAXB1, “What made a man was his, his self. You know what I’m saying? His self-esteem. How he, and the respect he carried for his self. And the way he carried his self in the prison.”

Therefore, no variation exists between white and black inmates in terms of negotiating masculinity through respect by respecting others and, in turn, gaining respect. One important way inmates gain respect in prison is by standing up for themselves and letting other inmates know they cannot be taken advantage of. In this way, inmates of each racial group assert and negotiate masculinity effectively.

Friendships and Doing Time Alone or Collectively by Setting. Other themes that were brought up by participants during the interviews are the ideas of male friendships and doing time alone or with other inmates. Independence and autonomy are characterizations of masculinity in our culture that often influence the social groups of which men are a part. Research shows that same-sex male friendships are less communicative, compassionate, and accommodating than female same-sex friendships (Bank & Hansford, 2000; Burleson, 2003 as cited in Sheets & Lugar, 2005). In addition,

men “are less likely to turn to friends in times of trouble” (Rubin, 1986 as cited by Sheets & Luger, 2005: 132). Literature also shows that men and women prefer to form friendships with women possibly due to the fact that women add an increased sense of intimacy to friendships (Reeder, 2003). In prison, however, women are not present to serve as an ingredient in friendship formation, so men must either form friendships with other men or carry out the prison experience alone.

Six minimum-security and two maximum-security participants stated that it is easy to make friends in prison. However, inmates from both security levels expressed that it is not desirable to make a lot of friends, but only to associate with a few people. Also, several participants from each security level did not consider themselves to have friends at all, but considered other inmates with whom they interact to be associates. According to participant MAXB2, “You don’t do that [make friends]. You make associates. Acquaintances. You know. People in passing. You know. There ain’t no, ain’t no friends in the penitentiary.”

The participants were asked what it means to have a friend in prison. Five minimum-security and three maximum-security participants expressed that it means a lot to have a good friend in prison, someone inmates can trust and who will support others no matter what. Participant MAXB1 stated:

...I mean, it, it was alright if you had a friend cause then you ain’t never have to worry about if he [another inmate] gonna get me from behind or this man gonna try to stab me from behind or fight me. Cause you always got somebody that’s gonna be there beside ya and he got, he might have the same amount of time you got. He got the same intentions are you got. You ain’t playing no games, so you

play for keeps. So, that's how it is. You gotta have at least one good friend that's gonna watch your back and you watch his. If, if you got that then you, you will be alright.

Seven participants who answered questions based on experiences in minimum custody prisons stated that they would continue to be friends with the people they were friends with in prison in mainstream society because the individuals they associate with are trustworthy, have a positive outlook on life, possess similar long-term goals, are willing to change, or because they knew them before coming to prison. In addition, two maximum-security participants stated that they would be friends with people they associate with in prison after release but for different reasons. The two main reasons maximum-security participants mentioned for continuing their friendships outside prison are because their friends are loyal and completely support them no matter what. Participant MAXW2 stated, "If I was down, I was all the way down with you."

Four minimum custody and three maximum custody participants expressed that they generally do their time in prison alone. The participants from both security levels indicated that doing time in prison by oneself often makes the time easier because fewer opportunities present themselves to produce troublesome situations when associating with other inmates is limited. In opposition, four minimum-security participants and one maximum-security participant mentioned that they prefer to carry out their time in prison with a small group of inmates. However, based on the interviews, associating with other people while in prison occurred much more regularly in minimum-security than in maximum. One maximum-security participant emphasized the importance of staying to

oneself when first entering prison, diligently discovering which inmates to hang around and which ones to avoid, and keeping one's circle of acquaintances small. The following dialogue with participant MAXB2 illustrates this point:

I: So, what was your first interaction with the other guys like in the maximum security prison?

P: You don't do that.

I: You don't interact with other guys a lot?

P: Not, not off top. Not coming in, you don't.

I: Ok.

P: You know, coming in, you wanna stay usually to yourself. Uh, you know, and just peep out your surroundings first before you go out there like that. You know?

I: Right.

P: Because you gotta lot of predators and things like that out there. You know. And that's what they do. They, they thrive on the, on the newcomers. The ones that ain't, they fresh. They just coming in. Don't know nothing about it.

I: Right.

P: You know what I'm saying? And it's quick for somebody to act like they befriending you, but, you know, the whole time they got a, another ulterior motive behind doing it.

I: Right.

P: Out the gate, ain't nobody what they seem.

The participants also were asked if inmates assemble together in specific groups or if the individuals who comprise the prison population, for the most part, intermingle. For the most part, inmates in minimum custody prisons interact with other inmates and are not restricted to certain groups. However, the minimum-security participants did note a few instances when specific groupings occur. The largest number of responses affirmed that inmates in minimum custody occasionally amalgamate based on race, religion, and inmates who are from the same neighborhood or city in mainstream society. The maximum-security participants expressed that assembling in specific groups occurs

more frequently in maximum custody prisons and often occurs based on religion, race, and validated gangs such as the Bloods and Crips.

In sum, maximum-security inmates are more likely to carry out their time in prison alone. While the participants did not directly discuss friendships and their connection to masculinity, it seems to be the case that maximum custody participants are more likely to create a type of masculinity around independence and autonomy. On the other hand, minimum-security inmates are more likely to intermingle with inmates throughout the prison population and, therefore, are less likely to produce an independent type of masculinity. In addition, individuals in minimum custody institutions do not associate in specific groups as frequently as inmates in maximum custody prisons. In minimum security, for the most part, inmates coalesce with one another and do not attach to certain groups. In maximum custody, however, inmates who associated with particular groups of people are more likely to remain in specified groups and are less likely to mingle with inmates who associate with different categories of individuals. Therefore, in this instance, maximum-security inmates create a type of masculinity around exclusivity and superiority, restricting access to their particular groups to individuals who fit certain criteria.

Friendships and Doing Time Alone or Collectively by Race. Five white and three black participants expressed that it is easy to make friends in prison, but emphasized the importance of maintaining a small group of individuals with whom they interact. In addition, one white and three black participants stated that they do not consider anyone in

prison as friends, but associates, which implies a less degree of investment or commitment than friendships. According to participant MINB3:

You might have a associate, but he ain't gonna be your friend. Cause a friend ain't gonna let you down. You know what I'm saying? And a lot of these people in here, when you think they're your friends, when you least expect it, they'll let you down.

Both black and white participants mentioned that having a true friend in prison is important and means having someone to serve as a support in prison. Participant MAXB1 stated:

But, by being in prison, you got to, you know, you got to get into it with somebody. If it's just one, maybe two. You still gotta have somebody to be your friend and be your associate cause, cause if you got two or three guys that's wanna do something to you, you ain't, you can't beat two or three guys and then one might have a weapon. One might have a lock in the sock...The other one might have a knife. The other might have three bars of soap in a sock. So you don't know, you can't beat three guys. So, you got to have...got to have somebody as, as a associate. Yeah, cause if you ain't got associates, boy, you in a world of trouble.

Both black and white participants expressed that they prefer to carry out their time in prison alone, because, often times, associating with other inmates in prison can cause trouble.

Overall, based on the interviews, white participants placed a greater emphasis on friendships than black participants. In effect, black participants seemed to distance themselves from others by limiting or avoiding close relationships with others. As stated

previously, male friendships are often characterized by less compassion and support than female friendships. Moreover, masculinity is often characterized by independence and autonomy. Therefore, black inmates engage hegemonically masculine friendships that lack support and sympathy and, therefore, negotiate masculinity by exercising independence. White inmates, on the other hand, engage in friendships that are supportive and understanding and, therefore, are less likely to negotiate hegemonic masculinity through friendships.

Inmate Accounts of Masculinity by Setting. The participants interviewed were asked specifically about masculinity in and out of prison. Three minimum custody and three maximum custody participants stated that being a man in prison requires becoming physically strong through sports and fitness activities. However, further characteristics of masculinity delineated by minimum and maximum-security participants differ somewhat. Minimum-security participants also expressed that features of masculinity include being responsible, having respect for oneself and others, standing up for oneself in order to avoid disrespect, supporting oneself financially, and accepting the consequences for one's actions. Participant MINB3 stated that he does not feel like a man because, within the confines of the prison institution, he cannot take care of his responsibilities in mainstream society. He states:

To me, I feel less of a man because I'm not out there handling my responsibilities. You know what I'm saying? So, to me, being in here ain't necessarily being a man, you know what I'm saying, because you're not doing the things that a man should do. You know what I mean? You in prison.

In opposition, maximum-security participants expressed that additional characteristics of masculinity include carrying oneself like a man as opposed to a boy and flirting with women in an effort to unquestionably prove one's heterosexuality.

Participant MAXB1 stated, "I flirted with the uh, officers. And lift weights. And just, you know, doing what I supposed to be doing. You know what I'm saying? And you never saw me talking to a uh, homosexual."

Participants from minimum and maximum custody institutions expressed that they view themselves as being more of a man since coming to prison and show they are masculine in their respective institution types in various ways. Minimum-security participants stated that they still take care of their families financially and by being fathers, show respect and responsibility, engage in education, make long-term goals, work, study, and are more truthful in their relationships with women. In opposition, maximum custody participations stated that they demonstrated masculinity in maximum-security prisons by becoming physically strong by engaging in sports and fitness activities, trying to handle conflicts without violence, flirting with female officers, engaging in appropriate grooming habits, and not gossiping about their relationships with women. Participant MAXB2 stated, "That's another thing you don't do in the penitentiary. What goes on behind closed doors stays behind closed doors... You don't go running around telling mother fuckers [about relationships with women], you know, that's on him, man. That's, that's, that's girl stuff. You know what I'm saying? You can't be a man if you run around and talk about girl stuff."

Minimum-security inmates tend to perceive characteristics of masculinity as relating to taking care of responsibilities outside prison, while maximum-security inmates are inclined to view masculine characteristics as behaviors they engage in that influence their situations in maximum custody institutions. Therefore, minimum custody inmates tend to create a type of masculinity around being the family breadwinner and taking care of personal responsibilities. Maximum custody inmates, on the other hand, are more inclined to view masculine characteristics as striving for physical strength and engaging in relationships with women. They utilize physical strength/appearance and sexuality as resources for negotiating masculinity more than minimum custody inmates.

Inmate Accounts of Masculinity by Race. While some of the responses relating to masculinity are similar for white and black participants, differences also exist between responses in terms of inmate perceptions of masculinity in prison. White participants expressed that masculinity in prison takes into account supporting oneself financially, walking away from potentially violent interactions, and accepting the consequences for inappropriate behaviors. On the other hand, two black participants stated that, in their view, masculinity includes engaging in only heterosexual interactions, including flirting with women.

In addition, six white and five black participants feel they are more masculine since coming to prison for various reasons. Both white and black inmates expressed that, since coming to prison, they take care of their families more and have an improved sense of responsibility. White participants believe they are more masculine now because they engage in employment opportunities and stick to their word. On the other hand, black

participants view themselves as being more masculine because they now place a greater importance on education, treat others with respect, and are more honest in their relationships with women.

Black participants view masculinity as being characterized by engaging in sexual relationships with women and expressed this point various times, whereas the white participants did not. For black inmates, masculinity and heterosexuality are interconnected, and therefore, black inmates utilized sexuality as a resource for negotiating masculinity. On the other hand, white inmates specify employment opportunities more often when characterizing masculinity and, therefore, are likely to utilize employment opportunities as a resource for negotiating masculinity.

Violence as a Resource for Negotiating Masculinity

The third research question posed is whether prison violence is used as a resource to negotiate masculinity within prison, and if so, to what extent and does it vary among security levels. The subsequent sections examine the differential nature of non-sexual and sexual violence in minimum and maximum security institutions as they relate to the negotiation of masculinity by the individuals in differential security settings.

Non-sexual Violence by Security Level. In our society, violence is a characteristic of masculinity. The violent and aggressive features of masculinity reproduce the idea that aggression involves positive attributes such as the acquisition of material incentives, respect, and power. Therefore, violence is often used as a way of asserting one's masculinity.

Prison inmates in minimum and maximum-security institutions expressed comparatively different views of non-sexual violence in their respective institutions. All ten minimum custody participants stated that they do not perceive minimum-security prisons as being violent. When speaking about whether or not minimum-security prisons are violent, participant MINW1 stated:

And it's mainly a fistfight. Never nothing else. It's, you just don't have those, those type of guys [here in this minimum]. And then the, the, the guys that are here that uh, [Sucks through teeth] may say were prone to violence or have done some things like killed somebody, well, they've been in prison for twenty, twenty-five, thirty years already. And they're working on trying to get out of here. You know what I'm saying?... ninety percent, ninety or more, like ninety-nine percent of them are gonna steer clear of all that. Cause they know that kills any chance of them ever getting out of this place.

In opposition, all four maximum custody participants viewed the maximum-security institutions of which they once were a part as being extremely violent.

According to participant MAXB2:

Close [maximum] custody is very dangerous. You know what I'm saying? Because, to where medium custody and, and this kiddie camp right here [minimum], you know, they tend to come out they mouth with some real nasty fly stuff. You know what I'm saying? And they just, that's playing to them. That's not playing in close custody. Those words will get you fucked up.

In addition, maximum-security participants expressed that violence occurs frequently in prison because, for the most part, inmates in maximum custody have relatively long

prison sentences to serve and have nothing to lose by engaging in violent behavior.

According to participant MAXB2:

Because really don't nobody have nothing to lose. What they got to lose? You know? Here it is. This dude uh, been down six months, but he got forty-five years. And that's his minimum. You know what I'm saying? Come on now! What I'm supposed to do with all that time?

According to minimum and maximum custody participants, the types of violence that occur within their respective security levels differ a great deal. Ten minimum-security participants expressed that physical and verbal fights occur in minimum custody institutions. However, in addition to fighting, maximum-security participants expressed that other, more serious types of violence also occur in maximum custody, including stabbings, beatings by hand or with hard objects such as locks, robberies, rape, violent rioting, cutting with razors, and throwing bleach, boiling water, grease, or oil on others.

Minimum and maximum custody participants mentioned various reasons why violence occurs in their respective institution types. Participants from both minimum and maximum-security expressed that violence occurs mainly as a response to disrespect by other inmates. Participant MINB1 stated, "...prison is a, is a place you don't really wanna lose respect. So, a lot of times, before you allow yourself to lose respect...it'll go to blows." Additional reasons violence occurs in prison, according to participants of each security level, includes stealing, snitching, fighting over homosexuals, fighting over female guards, verbal misunderstandings, card games or sporting events, people cutting in the canteen or cafeteria lines, and television. Maximum-security participants also

stated that lying, fighting over money, and committing violence against inmates who previously committed acts of sexual violence against women and children also are causes of violence in prison. According to participant MAXB2, “Yeah. There’s this dude, you know, ok. He’s a baby raper [rapist]. I don’t like them. No. We be beating ‘em up too. We torture them in here. Rapists too. We do them the same way.”

As would be expected, all four maximum-security participants and only four of the minimum-security participants view violence as an important part of prison life in their respective institutions, because it is a way to maintain self-respect and stand up for oneself. The following dialogue between the researcher and participant MINW4 illustrates this point:

P: Violence is an important part of your life anywhere.

I: Why is that?

P: Well, you gotta know how to take up for yourself. You can’t let people run over ya.

I: Ok.

P: Even in prison or on the street. Hell, that’s what got me in here was violence.

In addition, all four maximum-security participants and one minimum-security participant stated that violence in prison is a way to maintain order within the population. Therefore, when inmates are perceived as having violated the informal prison code, they must be punished through violence. According to participant MAXB2, “Yeah, you gotta have violence to have order in there. Cause some people just don’t understand talking. You know? Some people take you trying to conversate with ‘em about a situation as weakness.”

Similarly, six minimum custody participants expressed that violence is not important in prison because it infrequently occurs, and when it does occur, only leads to negative consequences. Maximum custody participants did not share this sentiment.

Based on the interviews, violence plays a role in the social life of minimum and maximum security institutions, but plays a much more significant role in maximum security prisons. Moreover, more serious types of violence occur in maximum security prisons as compared to minimum security. Therefore, maximum-security inmates construct a more violent type of masculinity than minimum security inmates, possibly because less violent resources are more readily available to minimum security inmates.

According to the participants, violence is important for two main reasons. First, participants from both security levels expressed that maintaining or gaining respect through violence is very important. According to Messerschmidt's (1993) theory, certain inmates may use violence as a resource to negotiate masculinity when other resources are unavailable, particularly if they feel their masculine identity is threatened by being disrespected. Second, specifically for maximum security inmates, violence serves as a source of informal social control among the inmate population. Often times, according to the participants, inmates must be punished for engaging in unacceptable behaviors that violate the informal prison code. Therefore, inmates who engage in violence as a response to disrespect and as way of maintaining 'order' in prison negotiate masculinity through dominance, control, and aggressiveness.

Non-Sexual Violence by Race. White and black participants view their respective security levels similarly in terms of the amounts of violence that occur in them.

Approximately two-thirds of the participants do not view prison as being violent.

According to participant MINW1, "...it's just not that big a deal here. You know what I'm saying? You don't really have all that really going on."

Both white and black participants expressed that being disrespected is the main cause of violence in prison. Similarly, approximately half of the participants view violence as being important in prison because it establishes order within the population of inmates and serves as a way for inmates to stand up for themselves.

In sum, white and black inmates perceive the amounts and types of violence that occur in prison similarly. In addition, about half of the white and black inmates expressed that violence is important in prison. Therefore, non-sexual violence is one resource that may be called upon by inmates of both racial groups in order to negotiate masculinity, particularly if other resources are unavailable.

Sexual Violence by Security Level. In our society, men use sexual violence as a way of asserting their aggression or domination. But also, our society's patriarchal masculine ideology almost encourages this behavior. Therefore, sexual violence can be used by males as a resource for negotiating masculinity when other resources for doing so are unavailable.

Minimum and maximum-security participants expressed different views on the occurrence of sexual violence or rape in their respective prison security levels. None of the ten minimum-security participants possess knowledge of anyone being raped in minimum custody. However, all four maximum custody participants expressed that they know inmates who have been raped in maximum-security.

Both minimum and maximum custody participants provided reasons for why men rape other inmates in prison. Participants from each security level indicated that certain inmates rape others to overpower or dominate them.

Furthermore, maximum custody participants stated two additional reasons why inmates rape others in prison. First, just like with non-sexual violence, sexual violence is often used in prison as an informal punishment for inmates who committed sexual crimes against women or children. In addition, maximum-security participants expressed that inmates, particularly those who have been in prison for an extended period of time, will often rape others just to engage in sexual activity. Moreover, the participants stated that, often times, the victims are viewed as being 'pretty' or feminine. According to participant MAXB1, "...the guy might've been down a long time. 'I'm gonna make him my boy.' But, if he don't wanna be his boy, he gonna make 'em anyway. He gonna take it. Yeah, that, that happened a lot."

Participants from both security levels provided responses to what type of inmates are the most likely to be raped in prison. Both minimum and maximum-security participants agreed inmates who are the most likely to be raped are those who are perceived as being weak and will not stick up for themselves and inmates who have feminine features or are seen as 'pretty,' The following dialogue with participant MINB3 illustrates this point:

I: What are some of the reasons guys are raped in prison?

P: Only one reason, they weak...certain people feel like your vulnerable and they gonna, they gonna try you."

The participants also were asked if specific language exists relating to sexual violence in prison. Maximum custody participants also expressed that inmates who are raped are called “bitches,” which helps to illustrate the idea that inmates who are perceived to be weak are often referred to in language that is offensive to or used to describe women.

Overall, ten minimum and two maximum-security participants expressed that rape is not an important part of prison life. In minimum-security, rape is unimportant because it does not occur often. On the other hand, two maximum custody participants perceive sexual violence as serving specific functions within the prison environment. First, participants expressed that having homosexual relationships in prison helps relieve stress and pressure in prison. According to participant MAXB1:

Cause you, like I'm saying, you had a lot of women there, but you, guys still had to umm, be in there and they, they mostly, you know, with the men. Cause if you, if you trying to rape a woman and they catch you, it's over for you. You know? They give you a whole lot of time...So, nah. It, it, they needed them boys there. Yeah. To, to help relieve stress and pressure.

In addition, participant MAXW2 expressed that the sexual aspect of sexual violence in prison is important. He stated,

I think that's important as far as, you know what I'm saying, I don't really look down on no dude if, you know, he ain't never getting out and he be with a punk and they have they little thing and, cause that's all they got. So, I ain't gonna say I look down on them for that.

Based on the interviews, sexual violence occurs more frequently in maximum security institutions and, therefore, will be utilized more often in maximum custody prisons for negotiating masculinity. In addition, both minimum and maximum-security participants indicated that, for the most part, men rape others to overpower or dominate them. Similarly, the participants also expressed that inmates are often raped in prison because they are perceived as being weak. Therefore, by exploiting weaker inmates, more dominant men are able to effectively negotiate their masculinity through the use of sexual violence.

Sexual Violence by Race. The white and black participants interviewed for this examination expressed similar views in terms of the occurrence and details of sexual violence in prison. In addition, while most of the participants interviewed do not have knowledge of rape occurring in prison, they are familiar with some of the reasons why men are raped and what inmates are mostly likely to fall victim to sexual violence in prison. Correspondingly, participants in both racial categories expressed similar reasons regarding what types of inmates are the most likely to be raped in prison. Again, inmates who are the most likely to be victims of sexual violence in prison are often viewed as being weak, are seen as being ‘pretty’ or feminine, and committed acts of sexual violence against women or children before coming to prison.

As stated previously, the participants indicated specific terms that are utilized in prison to refer to inmates who are victims of sexual assault. However, only white

participants mentioned the word “bitch” when referring to inmates who are raped in prison, which, again, demonstrates the negative nature of femininity in prison.

In addition, the white and black participants interviewed expressed that, for the most part, sexual violence is not an important part of prison life because either it does not happen in prison or a sufficient number of willing homosexuals exist with whom inmates can have consensual sexual relationships.

Overall, white and black inmates indicated similar responses to questions regarding sexual violence in prison. Therefore, for the most part, both white and black inmates in maximum-security prisons may utilize prison rape as a resource for negotiating masculinity, particularly when other resources are unavailable. However, only white participants utilized derogatory female names when referring to inmates who are raped in prison. Therefore, white inmates are more likely to utilize language as it relates to sexual violence in demonstrating masculinity.

Negotiation of Masculinity in the Absence of Women

The last research question examined asks how do male inmates in single sex, long-term correctional facilities negotiate masculinity in the absence of women? As shown previously in this paper, individuals create diverse types of masculinities and femininities as opposed to more singular types as once thought. In addition, in order for various types of masculinities to exist, various types of dissimilar masculinities and femininities also must exist within the same temporal and spatial locations. The following section illustrates the ways male inmates negotiate various types of masculinities in an environment where conventional notions of femininity are absent.

Normative Heterosexuality by Security Level. As stated previously in this paper, heterosexuality is one feature of masculinity in our culture. As a part of heterosexuality, men must desire to engage in sexual relationships with women. Again, while hegemony is unattainable, the hegemonic man is often a heterosexual male who successfully overpowers and dominates women, especially as it relates to sexual behaviors. One technique men use to demonstrate heterosexuality is by using language centered on debasing women in an effort to assert dominance and power over others. Men often utilize sexual language that is offensive towards women to refer to other men who are not conforming to conventional standards of masculinity. Furthermore, in our society, homosexual men are traditionally seen as being less masculine and less powerful than heterosexual men. Often times, homosexual men must deal with repercussions for not conforming to the heterosexual ideal.

Participants from minimum and maximum-security institutions provided divergent responses to the frequency with which they get to interact with women. Eight minimum-security participants stated that they interact with women very little. However, two minimum and four maximum-security participants expressed that they interact with women daily, but, for the most part, the interactions generally consist of short, detached conversations. Conversely, the situations in which minimum-security inmates indicated they interact with women were more diverse than the situations of maximum-security participants. All minimum and all maximum custody participants stated that inmates interact with women who work in the prison and during visitation once a week. However, minimum custody participants also indicated that interactions with women can

occur while working on work release in the community or while attending church, restaurants, or their homes with community volunteers. Again, only minimum-security inmates are permitted to leave the prison grounds for any reason, and therefore, inmates from maximum custody prisons cannot interact with women in these diverse settings.

Although times exist when minimum and maximum custody inmates can interact with women, for the most part, opposite sex interactions are limited for prisoners. The participants from each security level indicated different ways of dealing with not being permitted to interact with women regularly. Four minimum-security participants expressed that inmates masturbate to deal with inadequate relations with women. Participants from this security level also indicated that inmates engage in homosexual relationships, engage in conversations about lusting over or desiring women, hang up pictures of women from magazines, talk on the phone to their female significant others and people outside prison in order to cope with life without women. Conversely, maximum-security participants expressed two main avenues for dealing with this. First, all four maximum custody participants stated that inmates often masturbate to, flirt with, and talk with the female guards who are positioned in the prison. According to participant MAXW2:

Alright, you got, you got the little single cells and everything. And a woman walk in. Well, they [inmate] go in there [cell] and shut that door and start touching theirself...I think that's only interaction, you know, a lot of 'em's got, cause like if you don't get no visit, that's only interaction you can get is to actually see a woman is that guard that come through the door.

In addition, participant MAXB2 who answered questions based on experiences in maximum-security stated that working out and playing sports aids in not being able to interact with women regularly. However, sometimes engaging in sports and fitness activities is not enough to help deal with this. He states:

You know, umm, sexual frustration is the, the worst thing that you can have. You feel me? And, that's how you, you try to deal with that. Run. You play ball. Work out, you know what I'm saying, to get that off. You know. But, you know, it don't always work. Sometimes it's very hard to get that off. That's probably one of the hardest things to, you know, try to keep under wraps. You know what I'm saying?

The participants also were asked if any inmates within the population take on the role of women in prison. Four minimum-security participants stated that inmates in minimum custody do not take on the role of women. However, six minimum-security and all four maximum-security participants expressed that certain inmates do possess feminine characteristics and take on a female role while in prison. The participants expressed that inmates act like women by wearing tight clothes, putting on make-up, growing their hair long, engaging in sexual behaviors with other male inmates, walking like women, and changing their voices to sound more feminine. The following dialogue between the researcher and a maximum-security participant illustrates this point and provides insight into the importance of inmates in maximum custody transforming themselves into women. According to participant MAXW2:

P: They dress up like women or they wear the make-up like women or...they punks. You know? Uh, that's the only woman a lot of them men [in maximum-security] is ever gonna get. You know? Uh...

I: Cause they're gonna be in there for...

P: Forever.

I: Right.

P: Yeah, forever. Til they die.

During the interviews, the participants were asked specifically about views of homosexual inmates in prison. Various views exist between and within each institution type. Three minimum-security and two maximum-security participants stated that some inmates respect homosexuals in prison while others do not. However, six minimum custody participants expressed that, overall, prison inmates disagree with homosexual inmates' lifestyles, but it is not necessarily viewed as being a big deal in prison. Nevertheless, homosexual inmates are often viewed as being weaker than heterosexual prison inmates. The participants expressed that homosexual inmates are often called names, gossiped about, and ignored within the prison environment.

Conversely, two maximum-security participants expressed that benefits exist to having homosexuals in prison. First, homosexual inmates often have more opportunities to obtain material possessions and information in prison and, therefore, are eventually needed by the other inmates in order to acquire coveted items and information. Therefore, homosexual inmates are often respected for their ability to acquire these things and so they will agree to share with others. Participant MAXB2 stated:

...But, if you got a [inaudible] you don't understand and come to realize that, you gonna need 'em, you gonna need 'em sooner or later. You know what I'm

saying? I don't care who you are. You can be the toughest, meanest, baddest thing walking God's green Earth. You gonna need them on the inside, sooner or later. For something...You gonna need 'em for something. Because in order to get, ok. Most people come out the street, they got a drug habit. You understand what I'm saying? Whether it's reefer, crack, powder, ecstasy, alcohol, whatever. You understand what I'm saying? You got to see the punk in order to get any of it. You need a shank? Uh, you need to know where the canteen man is? You need to know who the loan shark is? You need to know who fucked with who? You gotta see the punk. You understand what I'm saying? Because he [homosexual] gonna let you know about everything.

In addition, homosexuals can aid in keeping the tension low in prison by providing a sexual outlet for inmates. Participant MAXW1 stated, "...a lot of 'em [other inmates] appreciate it...Cause they're never going home. They'll never be with another female. So, they're stuck."

In addition, the participants were asked whether or not they see a difference between inmates who are openly gay and those who identify with being heterosexual but engage in homosexual relationships while in prison. Five minimum-security and two maximum-security participants expressed that they do not view a difference between the two previously mentioned groups of inmates. Participants from each security level stated that they see inmates who are openly gay and those who identify with being heterosexual even though engaging in homosexual activities both as being gay. However, five minimum custody and two maximum custody participants expressed that openly gay inmates are respected more than inmates who are not open about engaging in homosexual behaviors. Moreover, inmates who hide homosexual relationships are often viewed as being weaker than openly homosexual inmates. According to participant MINW1:

Oh man, I respect them more than I do, you know, the, the closet guys. You know what I'm saying? Because at least they're saying, 'hey, yeah, I'm this.' You know what I'm saying? And, I mean, you know, if you can be more straight forward. Myself, I respect them more for the honesty. You know what I'm saying?"

The participants interviewed from each security level presented similar views in regards to the importance of being heterosexual in prison. Seven minimum and all four maximum custody participants expressed that it is important to be heterosexual or straight in prison for various reasons. Participants from each institution type stated that, often, heterosexual inmates have an easier time negotiating their sentences in prison because they do not have to face some of the challenges homosexuals face, such as being treated poorly by others and being taken advantage of due to being seen as weak. In addition, participants from both minimum and maximum custody institutions asserted that it is important to be heterosexual in prison because, if not, inmates are perceived as being less of a man. The following dialogue with participant MAXB1 expressed this point:

I – So, did you think it was important to be straight there?

P – Yeah!

I – And why was that important?

P – Cause you, you, if you ain't got your manhood, you ain't, you ain't a man. You got to have your manhood. And, if a person don't want, don't want they manhood, then he might as well be gay. Ain't no way, ain't no way he's gonna give his manhood up. That's, that's crazy. [Chuckles]

I – So, the gay guys were seen as being not men?

P – Yeah.

I – Ok.

P – They, they're more like seen as women. You treat 'em like women.

I – Even if you weren't gay, you treat them like women?

P – Yeah.

I – Ok.

P – Yeah. The majority, a lot of guys do. They treat ‘em like women. That’s just the way it is in prison.

The participants also were asked if they saw any benefits to being in a place that involves limited contact with women. Five minimum and three maximum-security participants expressed that they do not see any benefits to having limited contact with women. When participant MAXB2 was asked if any benefits exist to not being able to interact with women regularly, he responded, “Me personally, no. Because I’d like to spend all my time with a woman. Every day, all day. Every waking moment.” However, four minimum and one maximum custody participant expressed that they do see benefits to being in a place that does not contain many women. Participants from each security level stated that their time in prison would be easier if no women were around due to the fact that women often bring about weaknesses and emotional or sexual feelings in men. In addition, thinking about women can cause inmates to be distracted from what is occurring in their current situations. Participant MINB3 stated:

I mean, to me, I’d rather do my time without women. You know, because, every time you see a woman come around, she got on some tight pants, that’s all you think about. You know what I’m saying? That’s all that’s going through your mind. You know what I mean?

According to one minimum-security participant, another benefit to not having women around is that there would be less masturbation by the male inmates. Participant MINW1 expressed:

I don't like, I don't like talking like this in front of a lady, but you don't have guys jacking off all the time. You know what I'm saying? You know what I'm saying? You'll have 'em [Laughs] peeking around the corners. You know what I'm saying? I mean, just doing some obscene stuff...They'll be watching 'em and looking at 'em and stalking 'em and all kinds of other stuff."

In sum, minimum-security participants have the opportunity to interact with women in more diverse settings than maximum-inmates. However, inmates in minimum custody prisons do not view the opportunities they have to interact with women as being sufficient or even as interacting. Consequently, for the most part, minimum and maximum-security inmates do not have the opportunity to negotiate masculinity by using heterosexuality in conventional ways and, therefore, must create alternative ways of utilizing heterosexuality as a way of demonstrating masculinity.

As stated previously, various types of masculinities are defined relative to various types of femininities. So, for men to be able to define what masculinities exist, femininities also must exist to contrast it to. The majority of the participants interviewed stated that certain men in prison take on the role of women and actually identify as being women. However, this occurs much more often in maximum custody prisons. By having certain men take on the role of women, the masculinities of the more powerful men become more visible. This is one way certain men in prison negotiate masculinity by using heterosexuality. Again, according to Messerschmidt's theory, not every male prison inmate can negotiate masculinity through these hegemonic means, and for some to do so, it is necessary for other inmates to take on the role of women.

Additionally, in prison, particularly in minimum custody, homosexual inmates are viewed as being weaker than heterosexual inmates. Therefore, heterosexual inmates in minimum custody prisons often negotiate masculinity by positioning themselves as being stronger, tougher, or more masculine than homosexual inmates. This occurs in maximum-security as well, but not to the same extent as in minimum. Maximum custody prisoners, on the other hand, tend to use homosexual inmates in order to obtain material possessions, sex, or information and often treat gay prisoners as being women. Therefore, maximum-security inmates are inclined to negotiate masculinity through heterosexuality by viewing and treating gay inmates like women and juxtaposing weaker, more feminine ‘others’ to more powerful and masculine inmates.

The participants also stated that, in order to deal with limited interactions with women, they often masturbate and, therefore, create an additional way of negotiating masculinity through heterosexuality. Messerchmidt’s theory asserts that in situations where a person’s masculinity could possibly be called into question, sex category becomes particularly important. In prison, men must visibly prove to others that they are “men” by engaging in behaviors that make it unmistakably evident that one is a “man.” So, in prison, showing that one is attracted to women is very important and usually takes the form of masturbating to or flirting with the female guards.

Normative Heterosexuality by Race. As stated previously, the participants interviewed were asked about interactions with women in prison. Four white and four black participants expressed that they interact with women very little, while three white and three black stated that cross-sex interactions occur on a daily basis. In addition, the

women with whom interactions are possible are similar for white and black inmates. Furthermore, the participants from each racial category offered similar responses to how they deal with limited interactions with women.

In addition, white and black participants experienced inmates who take on the role of women and homosexual inmates similarly. Again, both white and black participants expressed that homosexual prisoners are often viewed as being weak. However, both white and black participants indicated that certain benefits exist to having homosexuals in prison, including decreasing the tension between inmates and being able to utilize homosexual prisoners to obtain material possessions and information that otherwise would not be acquired. Furthermore, both white and black participants stated that homosexual inmates are often treated better by staff members and can often acquire possessions and information that heterosexual inmates cannot attain.

Five white and three black inmates view inmates who identify with being heterosexual but engage in sexual relationships in prison differently than open homosexuals in prison. For the most part, participants from each racial group view each as being gay. In addition, white and black participants specified that they respect openly gay inmates more than inmates who hide their homosexual relationships and often view inmates who conceal their mixed sexuality as being weaker than openly gay prisoners.

Overall, both white and black participants believe it is important to be heterosexual in prison because individuals who are gay are not viewed as being masculine. In addition, the participants expressed that being straight makes carrying out one's time in prison easier because inmates are less likely to be taken advantage of.

When asked if it is important to be straight in prison, one white participant, MAXW2, stated, “Hell yeah! I mean, I ain’t gonna be no girl. Uh, you know, I feel like you got to be hard...you know, in max. You know. You got to be hard. You soft, you’ll get took advantage of.” However, white and black inmates presented different views regarding the benefits of being in a place with few women.

In sum, both white and black participants expressed that they deal with having limited contact with women in prison by engaging in various forms of sexual expression, such as masturbation, flirting with female correctional officers, and lusting over women. Therefore, inmates of both racial categories negotiate heterosexual masculinity by engaging in expressions of cross-sex sexual interactions.

In addition, inmates from each racial group differentiate themselves from gay inmates by situating homosexuals as being weak. Therefore, both black and white inmates negotiate masculinity by juxtaposing themselves to a less masculine, weaker category of inmates.

Conclusion

Messerschmidt argues that masculinity negotiation differs by prison setting due to the fact that disparities exist in the nature of social structural constraints placed on individual prison inmates, and therefore, the resources and degrees of power they have to negotiate gender. In addition, inmates in the same prison construct masculinity in various ways for the same reasons.

Inmates from both minimum and maximum custody institutions negotiate masculinity by using resources such as sports and fitness activities, respect, language,

particularly as it relates to using derogatory female words when referring to weaker inmates, sexuality, and knowledge.

Nevertheless, differences also exist in the negotiation of masculinity by prison inmates. Based on the interviews, maximum-security inmates negotiate masculinity by utilizing material resources, particularly prohibited items such as sex, drugs, and alcohol, interpersonal power, lack of emotions, independence and autonomy by putting less emphasis on friendships, physical strength, non-sexual and sexual violence, and sexuality much more than inmates in minimum custody prisons. On the other hand, minimum-security inmates have the opportunity to negotiate masculinity by using employment more often and in more diverse settings than maximum custody inmates.

In addition, very few differences in the negotiation of masculinity were found by race. However, the differences that did occur are significant. White inmates continuously characterized masculinity as engaging in employment opportunities and gaining financial success. On the other hand, black inmates continuously characterized masculinity as engaging in sexual relationships with women.

The data presented in the preceding section confirms that various masculinities do exist within prisons and between prison security levels based on certain resources that are available or unavailable to each inmate within and across different institutional settings. In addition, inmates from various prison security levels negotiate masculinity by utilizing various and differing resources. However, as stated previously, fewer differences exist in terms of negotiating masculinity for white and black inmates than from different institution types. Regardless, inmates demonstrate masculinity by utilizing resources that

are specific and available to them depending on where they are positioned within certain social contexts.

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The overall purpose of this research was to examine how male prison inmates negotiate masculinity within the prison setting. To date, limited literature exists examining the role masculinity plays in prison life and the ways in which masculinity is negotiated or accomplished in prison. However, the current study offers an initial view into the ways male prison inmates 'do' masculinity within the prison environment.

Theory of Structured Action in the Prison Environment

Four specific research questions are posed by the research examination. First, how does masculinity negotiation vary by minimum and maximum-security institutions? Minimum and maximum custody prisons differ in terms of structure, constraints placed on inmates, and security level. Therefore, I assert that the resources available to inmates within each institutional type differ and, therefore, masculinity will be negotiated differently by inmates in each prison environment. Similarly, the second research question asks, how does masculinity negotiation vary by race within and between minimum and maximum-security institutions? Differential amounts and types of resources are available to inmates who identify with various racial categories in the same way that different resources are available to inmates in various security levels. Therefore, as with inmates in different security levels, I assert that white and black inmates will negotiate masculinity differently based on the differential nature of resources available for the negotiation of masculinity.

Violent behavior does exist in prison. The third research question asks, is violence one resource prison inmates use to negotiate masculinity, and if so, to what extent? Consequently, does violence as a masculinity negotiating resource vary by the type of prison setting in which inmates are situated? Last, how do male inmates in single-sex, long-term correctional facilities negotiate masculinity in the absence of women? As stated throughout this paper, men construct various types of masculinity based on the resources available for them to do so. However, differing types of masculinities can only exist if various femininities also exist within the same time and space. Therefore, examining the ways in which male inmates negotiate or accomplish masculinity in prison when conventional notions of femininity are omitted is significant to the overall examination.

In sum, Messerschmidt's (1993) theory states that gender is accomplished through social action and social structure in a reciprocal process. As individuals engage in social action, they involuntarily support the production of social structures that, in turn, serve to facilitate or limit social action. Therefore, masculinity is accomplished by men in our society when put under specific restrictions with differentially associated degrees of power (Messerschmidt, 1993). In addition, individuals in our society 'do' masculinity or femininity to demonstrate to others our 'gender.' Based on this view, masculinity is accomplished and created in specific social situations which then reproduce social structures. In addition, Messerschmidt's (1993) theory asserts that the context in which men's behaviors occur must be taken into account. Therefore, the different social contexts in which individual's lives are situated determine what behaviors are used to

negotiate masculinity. According to Messerschmidt (1993), individuals do gender according to the social settings in which they find themselves (174). The types of masculinity constructed by a particular person depend on their access to power and resources, as well as societal beliefs. Even though a social relationship exists between types of masculinities that are produced by different individuals, the types of masculinities created are not equal to one another. Therefore, I assert that inmates will construct various types of masculinities depending on the social contexts and situations they find themselves.

Based on the interviews, minimum and maximum-security inmates do negotiate masculinity in different ways based on the differential types and amounts of resources available to them. However, certain similarities also exist. Let me begin with those. Inmates from both minimum and maximum custody institutions negotiate masculinity by using sports and fitness activities, respect, and language, particularly as it relates to using derogatory female words when referring to weaker inmates. In addition, inmates from each security level negotiate masculinity through knowledge. However, the types of knowledge utilized differ based on the type of institution inmates find themselves. More specifically, minimum-security inmates are more inclined to use book knowledge, while maximum custody prisoners tend to use street knowledge.

Also, inmates from both institution types utilize sexuality in the negotiation of gender. However, expressing sexuality in prison through traditional means is not possible, so prison inmates must come up with unconventional ways of demonstrating heterosexuality. This is often done by strong inmates juxtaposing themselves against

weaker and, often, homosexual inmates. In addition, men in both security levels often masturbate to take the place of having physical, sexual intercourse with women or sometimes even men. According to Kassebaum (1972) and Tewksbury (1989), as with men in the mainstream population, the rate of masturbation in male prisons is relatively large (as cited in McGaughey and Tewksbury, 2002).

However, various types of homosexualities exist within the prison environment, each of which holds a different value or significance within prison. As the interviews suggest, some men in prison are forced to engage in sexual behaviors with fellow inmates, while others embrace the more feminine roles that come with being a subservient homosexual in prison. According to Christian Parenti (2008), “the subordinate ‘gender’ in male prisons includes the so-called ‘punks,’ straight or gay men forced into a submissive sexual role, as well as ‘queens,’ gay men and transsexuals who may embrace homosexual sex and their gendered role as the sexual submissive.” (184-185). In addition, Parenti (2008) states:

Queens may suffer as sexual slaves and rape victims, but very often they use their sexual powers to play stronger inmates off against one another or to find a husband of their own liking. Punks and queens, like women in the straight world, are forced into roles that range from nurturing, mothering wife to denigrated, over-worked “whore” (185).

In addition, the interviews suggest that men who dominate others through the use of sexual violence are often viewed as being more masculine than their victims. The

victims, on the other hand, often are viewed as weaker and less manly. As Parenti (2008) states:

Although the ‘wolves’ and ‘booty bandits’ have sex with other men, they are, in the hyper-macho cosmology of prison, not homosexual because they are not sexually penetrated. The cult of ‘manhood’ – and the struggle to defend, defile, and define it – is the axis around which the prison sex system turns (184).

Therefore, the types of homosexualities that exist within prison are not equal to one another. Some homosexual inmates are able to position themselves as being more masculine by dominating weaker homosexuals and are able to negotiate a type of masculinity around domination and control.

However, differences also exist in the negotiation of masculinity by prison inmates. Based on the interviews, maximum-security inmates negotiate masculinity by utilizing material resources, particularly prohibited items such as sex, drugs, and alcohol, interpersonal power, lack of emotions, independence and autonomy by putting less emphasis on friendships, physical strength, and sexuality much more than inmates in minimum custody prisons. In addition, inmates in maximum custody prisons negotiate masculinity by using non-sexual and sexual violence much more than inmates in minimum custody prisons in terms of the quantities and types of violence that occur within their specific institution type. However, for inmates in both security levels, men rape others in order to overpower and dominate weaker inmates.

In opposition, minimum-security inmates have the opportunity to negotiate masculinity by using employment more often and in more diverse settings than maximum

custody inmates and often construct a type of masculinity centered on being the family 'breadwinner.' Maximum-security inmates do not have this opportunity.

Again, Messerschmidt's (1993) theory asserts that individuals engage in certain behaviors to demonstrate to others that they identify with a particular gender category. This was found to be true within the prison context. Based on the interviews, prison inmates often engage in certain behaviors to show they are men, which includes being able to support oneself financially, stand up for and defend oneself, and by making it unmistakably evident that one is heterosexual.

In addition, the differential nature of masculinity negotiation by inmates in minimum and maximum-security institutions is consistent with Messerschmidt's (1993) theory of Structured Action. Again, the theory asserts that the contexts in which individuals' behaviors occur must be taken into account. Consequently, the differential contexts in which men's lives are situated influence what behaviors are used in the negotiation of masculinity. Therefore, the specific prison settings in which inmates find themselves play an important role in the differential types of masculinities negotiated.

Also, Messerschmidt's (1993) theory asserts that the types of masculinities produced by particular individuals depends on their differential access to power and resources. As shown in this study, minimum and maximum-security inmates are placed under various types of restrictions based on their respective security levels. The disparities in minimum and maximum-security institutions permit and/or constrain the social action of the individuals who live in them, thus permitting and/or constraining the resources available for inmates to negotiate masculinity. For example, as stated

previously, minimum custody inmates have more opportunities to engage in employment than maximum custody inmates and, therefore, have this particular resource at their disposal more often and in more diverse settings for the negotiation of masculinity.

Likewise, similarities and differences exist in the negotiation of masculinity by white and black prison inmates. While white and black inmates tend to use similar resources for negotiating masculinity, they often take advantage of different aspects of the same resources. For example, white and black inmates both utilize interpersonal power in the negotiation of masculinity. However, white inmates tend to use power in terms of violence and street reputation, while black inmates do not. Conversely, black inmates are inclined to use power as it relates to respect in the negotiation of masculinity.

For the most part, very few differences in the negotiation of masculinity were found by race. However, the differences that did occur are significant. Throughout the interviews, white inmates often characterized masculinity as engaging in employment opportunities and gaining financial success. In our society, white men are often more economically advantaged than minority men. According to Weis, Proweller, and Centrie (2001), white men are economically advantaged as compared to black men because of their skin color. "It is their whiteness and maleness that privileges them" (Weis, Proweller, and Centrie, 2001: 269). Therefore, white prison inmates may value financial success more than black inmates due to the fact that white men are often more financially successful in mainstream society.

On the other hand, black inmates continuously characterized masculinity as engaging in sexual relationships with women. Cornel West (2001) argues that

“Americans are obsessed with sex and fearful of black sexuality” (119) because of the stereotypes that exist in our society regarding the sexuality of black Americans. In addition, West (2001) states:

Black male sexuality differs from black female sexuality because black men have different self-images and strategies of acquiring power in the patriarchal structures of white America and black communities. Similarly, black male heterosexuality differs from black male homosexuality, owing to the self-perceptions and means of gaining power in the homophobic institutions of white America and black communities: (127).

In addition, according to C. Shawn McGuffey (2008), black males may accomplish complex heteronormative gender and sexual relationships that give emphasis to male dominance and heterosexuality as a way of resisting stereotypes of inferiority and inadequacy (as cited by Collins, 2004 and Crenshaw, 1991). Therefore, black prison inmates may place greater emphasis on sexuality, specifically heterosexuality, more than white inmates as a way of resisting stereotypes of black sexuality in mainstream society.

In addition, only white participants expressed that, in order to deal with holding their concealed emotions in, they turn their negative emotions to violence or anger. Black participants, on the other hand, did not mention utilizing violence or anger as outlets for expressing negative emotions. As stated previously, street knowledge and the “code of the street” play an important role in prison life, regardless of the race of the inmates who comprise the population. Historically, “in many working-class and impoverished black communities today...social behavior in public is organized around the code of the streets” (Anderson, 1999: 109). In addition, “for those living according

to the rules of that culture, it become important to be tough, to act as though one is beyond the reach of lawful authority – to go for bad” (Anderson, 1999: 112). Therefore, the differentiation between white and black participants in terms of their responses to dealing with negative emotions may be because black inmates are assumed to have successfully negotiated the “code of the streets,” while white inmates must externally prove that they also can negotiate this aspect of street culture. As Anderson (1999) asserts, “an important part of the code is not to allow others to chump you, to let them know that you are ‘about serious business’ and not to be trifled with. The message that you are not a pushover must be sent loudly and clear” (130).

Again, in this situation, the specific contexts that white and black prison inmates find themselves are significant in negotiating masculinity. Just as inmates in minimum and maximum-security institutions have various resources available to them, so do inmates of differing racial categories. Again, the racial disparities of prison inmates allow and/or restrict the social action of the certain individuals. Therefore, the resources available for white and black inmates to negotiate masculinity vary and are permitted and/or constrained based on where these particular inmates are positioned within society.

After analyzing the data for this study, several aspects of masculinity negotiation emerged that were not initially considered. As stated previously, the theme of respect emerged after the analysis of the pilot interviews. In addition, the overall theme of male friendships and associations in prison came into view after data from the full-scale examination was analyzed.

In addition, one unexpected finding emerged that contradicts current literature on masculinity. As stated previously in this paper, current sociological literature on gender asserts that homosexual men often have less power and are viewed as being less masculine than heterosexual men. However, based on the interviews, in certain situations, the opposite occurs in maximum-security prisons. In certain instances, maximum-security inmates view homosexual men in prison to hold a high degree of status and power because they can often obtain possessions and information that are unavailable to the heterosexual population and, therefore, are often needed by heterosexual inmates in prison. Therefore, homosexual prison inmates often can acquire and possess more power than heterosexual inmates. As stated previously, material resources often aid in creating social structural relations of power by arranging individuals in relation to one another (Messerschmidt, 1993: 71). As a result, the fact that homosexual inmates are provided the opportunity to possess power within maximum-security prisons may be due to the fact that they are often in positions of acquiring desired material items that other inmates want, therefore transforming and shaping power relations between heterosexual and homosexual prison inmates.

Messerschmidt (1993) asserts that the types of masculinities created by men in our society are socially unequal to one another based on varying races, classes, and positions of power. Similarly, inmates' perceptions of the resources available to negotiate masculinity also are unequal and, throughout the interviews, were involuntarily placed in a hierarchy of importance by the participants. For example, being heterosexual and able to defend one's self were viewed by the participants as being a significant aspect

of masculinity. However, while providing self-sustaining financial support also was viewed as being an important feature of masculinity, it was not perceived to be as important as sexuality or personal protection. In addition, some resources that conventionally characterize masculinity were not specifically stated by the participants as doing so. For example, current sociological literature points to independence and autonomy as characterizing masculinity in our society. While the participants in this study felt that being independent and autonomous in prison is important, they did not necessarily equate it directly with masculinity. This same point could be made about homosexual inmates in maximum-security institutions. As stated previously, homosexuals, in some cases, express masculinity in terms of having access to material possessions and information. However, the participants did not directly associate this type of homosexuality with masculinity. Therefore, within the prison setting, some resources are viewed by inmates as having a direct relationship to masculinity, while others are not.

In sum, the overall findings are consistent with Messerchmidt's (1993) theory of structured action. Based on the information provided by the participants, male prison inmates do negotiate masculinity differently based on the specific societal contexts in which they find themselves. Inmates in minimum and maximum-security institutions and inmates of differing racial groups construct various types of masculinities based on the resources and degrees of power available for them to do so. However, the differential security levels in which prison inmates find themselves are much more important in terms of negotiating masculinity than race. Prison security level may have a more

profound impact on masculinity negotiation in prison because the relationships of inmates to one another and to prison personnel are so overwhelmingly different than are found in mainstream society and, therefore, have a significant impact on the ways male prison inmates view themselves, their relationships with others, and their overall position within society.

As Messerschmidt (1993) asserts, the types of masculinities constructed by men are connected, but are far from being equal to one another. For example, inmates who construct a type of masculinity around normative heterosexuality approach the hegemonic masculine idea more than inmates who negotiate masculinity around exhibiting a lack of emotions due to the fact that heterosexuality is one of the most significant characterizations of masculinity in our society.

Interviewer Effects on and Nonverbal Signs of Masculinity Negotiation

As stated throughout this document, James Messerschmidt's theory of structured action asserts that men differentially negotiate masculinity based on the situational opportunities and resources available for them to do so. According to Michael L. Schwalbe and Michelle Wolkowicz (2002: 205-206 as quoted in Presser, 2005: 2071), "an interview situation...is an opportunity to signify masculinity inasmuch as men are allowed to portray themselves as in control, autonomous, rational, and so on. It is a threat inasmuch as an interviewer controls the interaction, asks questions that put these elements of manly self-portrayal into doubt, and does not simply affirm a man's masculinity displays." While the central purpose of the interviews conducted for this study is to examine how male inmates negotiate masculinity within the prison context,

noteworthy examples of gender negotiation took place during the interviews through the verbal and nonverbal responses provided by the participants. In addition, the social identities I, as the researcher, brought into the interview situation most certainly impacted and shaped the participants and their responses throughout the process. One of the main elements that aided in producing this particular type of gender negotiation is the fact that a cross-gender interviewer-participant relationship existed. According to Lois Presser (2005: 2071), “enactments of presentably male or female behavior occur in all research. Cross-gender studies simply bring the processes of gender accomplishment into plain view.”

Various power dynamics occur in every relationship and social interaction individuals engage in, and the interviewer-participant relationship is no exception. As stated previously in this paper, control and dominance are two characterizations of masculinity in our society. Often times in interview relationships, the interviewer is perceived as having a certain degree of power over the respondents. According to research conducted by Lorna McKee and Margaret O’Brien (1983), however, researchers do not always possess the most power during interviews, and male participants often attempt to assert their dominance during interviews in various ways (as cited in Lee, 1997), particularly through nonverbal means. According to Rachkowski and O’Grady (1988 as cited from Henley, 1977), “nonverbal gender difference reflect underlying sex role socialization and become a form of social control to keep males and females within their expected sex roles.” In addition, Rachkowski (1988) asserts that, based on gender characterizations in our society, certain nonverbal actions and behaviors are specific to

men and others to women. Nonverbal behaviors specific to men “are perceived as portraying more potent, dominant attitudes” (Rachkowski & O’Grady, 1988: 772). Men also have a propensity to “initiate touch and interrupt more often than women (Davis & Weitz, 1981; Henley, 1977 as cited by Rachkowski & O’Grady, 1988: 772). Nonverbal behaviors and actions that occurred during the interviews for this examination included eye contact, body positions and movements, facial expressions, touching, and physical proximity of the participants and myself throughout the interviews.

As stated previously, Schwalbe and Wolkomir (2002: 205-206) assert that interviews can serve as an opportunity for male participants to negotiate and accomplish masculinity, but also can produce occasions when one’s masculinity could possibly be called into question. Therefore, it may become necessary for male participants to assert dominance and control during the interview through various means, especially when the perception exists that their masculinity may be at risk or is being questioned.

One participant, for example, attempted to assert dominance and control throughout the interview primarily through the use of specific body positions and facial expressions. Body movements and positions are “major cue(s) we use to infer intention and motivation, to perceive cause and effect, and to make causal attributions” (Heider, 1958, Heider & Simmel, 1944 as cited in Koch, 2004: 174). This particular participant glared at me peculiarly when he first walked into the interview room and walked straight by me and sat in a chair at the interview table. The participant’s initial actions of walking into the room and disregarding my presence or intentions for being there demonstrate his attempt to assert control through nonverbal cues and body language. Moreover,

throughout the interview, the participant sat back in his chair with his legs firmly crossed staring at me almost defiantly, especially during the beginning of the interview and when the conversations turned to sexuality. The participant's demeanor and appearance was that of acting cocky and overconfident throughout the process. Through his body positions and movements, the participant positioned me as the weak, female "other" and made it unmistakably evident that he, at least in his opinion, was the stronger, more dominant person in this particular interaction.

In mainstream society, women are often perceived as being docile, passive, and complacent, particularly as it relates to interactions with men. This gendered societal ideal occurred during the interviews for the current examination as a way for the participants to negotiate masculinity, while I negotiated femininity, whether cognizant of the fact that this was happening or not. According to Lee (1997 as cited from Smart, 1984) "in order to complete an interview female interviewers may feel obliged to listen placidly while male interviewees express sexist views." Often times the participants would refer to fellow inmates in negative ways by calling them derogatory or denigrating female names, particularly "bitch." Some of the participants, particularly the participants recalling experiences from maximum-security institutions, would often juxtapose the ideas of 'man' and 'girl.' One participant stated, "you can't be a man if you run around and talk about girl stuff. You know what I'm saying?" In this way, the word 'girl' is viewed and perceived as having a negative connotation and, in prison, often implies that inmates are not good enough because they cannot live up to certain expectations of masculinity. In these instances, the participants were negotiating masculinity by utilizing

words with negative female connotations in a way that lauds masculinity as the superior, most powerful gender and belittles femininity as the weaker. I, on the other hand, was negotiating femininity when the participants would speak of denigrating words by passively listening and accepting the vocabulary and expressions that were being spoken.

Another way the participants in the interviews negotiated masculinity through nonverbal techniques during the interviews that was influenced by the gender of the interviewer was through asserting heterosexuality. “Results from a number of studies suggest that men impute more sexual meanings to heterosexual interactions than do women” (Abbey, 1982; Major & Heslin, 1982; Rubin, 1970; Rytting, 1976; Zellman & Goodchilds, 1983 as cited in Abbey & Melby, 1986: 283). Therefore, it is possible that the participants attributed sexual significance to certain interactions that were meant to be platonic. In addition, “women are inseparable from the ways femininity is imagined and fantasized within the constraints of gender hierarchy and heterosexual norms” (Cornell, 1995: 75 as cited in Jarviluoma, Moisala, & Vilkkko, 2003: 12). During the interviews, the differences between the gender group I, as the female researcher, identify with and the group the participants identify with became apparent, particularly when discussing sexuality in prison. When speaking about masculinity and femininity, several participants commented on various stereotypically feminine features I possess, such as being ‘soft,’ in an effort to juxtapose my feminine characteristics to more masculine characteristics that are often found within the prison environment. The participants who engaged in this juxtaposition negotiated masculinity by opposing it to feminine characteristics, namely being ‘soft.’

Various nonverbal cues, such as eye contact, physical proximity, touch, can be misinterpreted by an individual in the interaction. According to Koukounas & Letch (2001: 443-444), “these nonverbal cues are open to misperception so that there may be a distortion between the sender’s intent and the receiver’s interpretation” (as cited from Abbey & Melby, 1986). A nonverbal message of nonsexual friendliness may be misperceived as sexual interest if the receiver of the information does not process the nonverbal cues accurately.” In addition, according to Weiss (1994: 141), “it is possible for women who are interviewers to be challenged by male respondents who want to test the women’s sexual accessibility.”

One participant attempted to examine my sexual and personal openness and accessibility during our interview. Randomly, the participant stated that he is not a stalker or a pedophile, but is emotionally connected to women. He continued to tell me I had beautiful eyes and later said he was infatuated with me. The participant expressed that he had a desire to write and correspond with me and wanted to know if I would write him back on a personal level. I informed the participant that I would answer any questions he had about the research through future correspondence if the need arose, but could not cross the boundary between research and personal communication. During this dialogue, the participant seemed to be making uninterrupted eye contact with me. This participant was attempting to measure my sexual and personal accessibility by seeing if I would be willing to correspond with him on a personal level once the interview was over. The possibility exists that the nonverbal behaviors I engaged in were misinterpreted by the participant as being personal or sexual in nature. Moreover, the participant was

negotiating a type of masculinity around heterosexuality by engaging in this discourse. He was making it more than apparent that he is heterosexual and very attracted to women.

Through the previously mentioned interaction, I also negotiated femininity in stereotypical ways. Instead of stopping the participant from finishing his remarks, I passively let him finish and politely explained to him that the boundary between research and personal life cannot be crossed. In this instance, the participant and I both negotiated our gender effectively in terms of the norms of the gender groups in which we each associate.

The ideas of sex and gender and the fact that the participants and I were in cross-sex relationships were observed throughout the interview process, but became more apparent when the discussions turned to sexuality, particularly as it relates to homosexuality. Several of the interview questions asking about sexuality inquired specifically about homosexuality. During the conversations about sexuality, and homosexuality specifically, some of the participants engaged in more eye contact and would even move physically closer to me. One participant actually touched me on the hand and complimented several physical characteristics I possess. Engaging in these behaviors seemed to be a way the participants showed, through their bodies, that they were in no way homosexual and were negotiating a type of masculinity around heterosexuality.

Descriptions that are Consistent with and Contradict Current Ideology

Messerschmidt's theory of Structured Action does not address how ideology organizes human action. Ideology encompasses behaviors and actions that are appropriate or inappropriate for certain individuals to engage in and often reflects the central ideas of a particular society at a specific time. "Gender is constructed ideologically when men and women believe that certain qualities, such as intimacy, characterize one gender rather than another" (Walker, 2001: 370). The current section addresses the role of ideology in the negotiation of masculinity within the prison environment and describes characterizations of masculinity that are consistent or inconsistent with current ideology within the prison environment. According to Karen Walker (2001) "while one behavior in an interaction may violate the norms of gender ideology, other behaviors are simultaneously conforming to other ideologies of masculinity" (376).

The ideas prison inmates have about gender are not altered by entering the prison environment. Conversely, the interviews suggest that prison inmates enter prison with consistent, rigid, traditional ideologies regarding gender and what it means to be a man in our society. Prison inmates utilize the resources that are available to them to effectively accomplish the ideas of masculinity in our culture.

For example, a large majority of the participants interviewed believe they should engage in certain behaviors due to the fact that they are men and indicated that they behave and conduct themselves, for the most part, in ways that are consistent with current ideology. One ideological belief the participants have about masculinity that is prevalent

in our society is that men should not be dependent on others for their financial well-being. As stated previously, several participants feel like they are not men in prison because they cannot support themselves monetarily, which is one ideological view they have about masculinity and manhood in our society. One participant stated:

...now you ain't doing none of that for your family. So, how can you call yourself a man? You know what I mean? Now, they sending you money. [Chuckles] Put money on your books. That make me feel less, you know what I'm saying, cause that's money that they could be using for them kids. You know what I mean?

In addition, the participants interviewed believe that men should stand up for and protect themselves. When asked what it means to be a man, one participant stated, "Standing up for yourself. That's first and foremost. Be a man about whatever it is that you do." Again, the idea that men should stand up for and defend themselves is not unique to male prison inmates, but is an ideological view that reflects the ideas of our culture.

Probably one of the most significant cultural ideas about masculinity that the participants have relates to sexuality, particularly heterosexuality. As stated previously, normative heterosexuality is one earmarked feature of masculinity in our society. The dominant views of our society situate men as "naturally" sexual beings. When speaking about viewing the female guards sexually, one maximum-security participant stated:

You [the State] put a female I a, in a tight, nice little uniform. Ok, I'm a man. Of course I'm gonna lust. I'm a lusting after a woman. He [the State] gonna tell her

to write me up for a B6. That's what it's called. Sexual masturbation. Charge me ten dollars. All because I'm being human. All because I'm being a man. I miss, I miss touching a women. I miss holding her. I miss the sweetness that, you know, her body gives off and all that. How do you fault me for that?

The participant quoted above believes that lusting after and desiring women is a natural part of being a man and disagrees with the prison system punishing men for engaging in a behavior that is instinctive to men.

In addition, many of the participants believe that being a man includes being heterosexual. The following dialogue illustrates this point:

P: Because you should never, whatever predicament you in, you should always stay, be a man and don't, just, I feel like you always should be a man.

I: And part of that's being straight?

P: Yeah, being straight.

Again, the participants' beliefs do not occur in a vacuum, but are shaped by our society's dominant ideas. The contemporary ideas of our society situate heterosexual men as being more masculine than homosexual men. This cultural idea plays out to a great extent in prison.

Moreover, based on the interviews between minimum and maximum-security prison inmates, it seems that the more structured and inflexible the prison institution the more mainstream the gender ideologies of the inmates become. Therefore, maximum-security inmates tend to have more traditional ideas about gender and the appropriate conventional behaviors to engage in than minimum-security inmates.

While most of the views the participants have about masculinity and the subsequent behaviors they engage in are consistent with current ideology, some views and actions contradict the ideas about masculinity in our society. For example, based on the interviews, white inmates are inclined to engage in friendships for support while in prison and view showing emotions as being an acceptable part of masculinity. One participant stated:

To me...that's [showing emotions] part of a person. You know what I'm saying? I don't think that they would not accept you for showing your emotions. You know what I'm saying? Because, I think, as well as a woman, a man, he has emotions too.

However, "contemporary ideologies about men's friendships suggest that men's capacity for intimacy is sharply restricted" (Walker, 2001: 367). In addition, Walker (2001) asserts that men often have difficulty expressing their emotions to friends. Therefore, the fact that white prison inmates engage in supportive and communicative relationships with other men is inconsistent with our society's current ideology.

Evidence of Prison Based Indicators of Social Class

Based on Messerschmidt's (1993) theory, race, class, and gender must be viewed as occurring together within the same social practices. Therefore, the negotiation of gender cannot be viewed separately from race or class relations. However, difficulties often exist in determining the social class of prison inmates. While most inmates are believed to be "poor" before coming to prison, this social condition is only likely, not

certain. Throughout the interviews, three primary indicators of social class emerged: language, knowledge, and employment.

First, based on the interviews, language can be viewed as an indicator of social class within the prison environment. Several participants stated that inmates who use slang words or expressions in prison are often ignorant or uneducated, implying that prisoners who employ slang language are part of a 'lower class' of individuals. In addition, one participant indicated that inmates can tell what type of crime a person committed based on whether or not they engage in slang vernacular. More specifically, he stated that if individuals use slang, they are more likely to have committed a violent crime, whereas if inmates refrain from using slang, they likely committed a 'paper' or white-collar crime. Violent crimes and white-collar crimes are often associated with the lower and upper classes respectively. Therefore, by using certain language in prison, inmates perceive they can determine the social classes other inmates were a part of in mainstream society.

In addition, knowledge can be viewed as an indicator of social class in prison. A majority of participants interviewed stated that street knowledge is the most useful type of knowledge to possess in prison. Generally, individuals who possess knowledge that is acquired from life in the streets are underprivileged financially and often attempt to increase their financial situations in mainstream society by engaging in illegal behaviors. Consequently, by engaging in behaviors that are conventionally learned in the streets, inmates can socially situate others as having been 'poor' before coming to prison.

The third indicator of social class in prison, based on the interviews, is employment. Several minimum-security participants stated that being employed in work release jobs while in prison provides the opportunity for inmates to be better prepared to work a minimum wage job when released into mainstream society. The fact that certain inmates indicated that work release prepares inmates to make relatively low earnings when released from prison suggests that they also were making low wages before coming to prison. Therefore, employment can be utilized as an additional indicator of social class in prison.

This discussion on prison based indicators of social class is important to the discussion of masculinity in prison because, as stated previously, individuals negotiate various types of masculinities based on where they are positioned within society. Therefore, the social classes prison inmates identify with being a part of in mainstream society influences the resources utilized in prison for negotiating masculinity.

Enhancements for Future Research

Based on the limitations of the current examination, several improvements for conducting a future research study of this type emerged. First, for this study, the maximum-security participants interviewed were asked to retrospectively recall experiences from previous prison terms. Consequently, the previous experiences reported by participants from this institution type may have been shaped by the relationship between their current and past prison experiences. In order to more accurately examine how maximum custody inmates negotiate masculinity in prison,

inmates from this security level should be interviewed while in maximum custody institutions.

An additional limitation to this study is the relatively small number of maximum-security participants interviewed as compared to minimum-security participants. While this limitation could not have been avoided in the current study due to logistical and temporal constraints, increasing the sample size of maximum-security participants is important in comparing the resources used by minimum and maximum custody inmates in negotiating masculinity.

Future Research Directions

Based on the current examination, continued inquiry into the negotiation of additional characterizations of gender in our society's prison institutions is warranted. Currently in our society, the immigrant prison population is increasing at alarming rates. One research topic of interest centers on the differences in ideas of masculinity of various cultures and the ways in which different views influence the negotiation of masculinity with the prison environment.

In addition, as stated throughout this paper, conventional characterizations of masculinity and femininity differ. Therefore, one further research question asks, how do female prison inmates negotiate gender in single sex, female prison institutions? Furthermore, are any conventionally masculine characteristics, such as violence, utilized by female inmates in terms of negotiating gender in prison and if so, to what extent? In addition, the current study confirms that sexuality plays an important role in male prisons and is often brought to the forefront by the fact that women are absent within the prison

setting. However, while sexuality, specifically heterosexuality, is a conventional characterization of masculinity, the opposite holds true for femininity. Therefore, an additional question of interest related to female prisons asks, what role does sexuality play in female prisons in terms of negotiating femininity?

Conclusion

In sum, based on the interviews, security level has a much greater impact on differential ways of negotiating masculinity than race. Inmates from both security levels negotiate masculinity by using sports and fitness activities, respect, language, particularly as it relates to using derogatory female words when referring to weaker inmates, and sexuality. However, differences also exist. Based on the interviews, maximum-security inmates negotiate masculinity by utilizing material resources, particularly prohibited items such as sex, drugs, and alcohol, interpersonal power, lack of emotions, independence and autonomy by putting less emphasis on friendships, physical strength, sexuality, and non-sexual and sexual violence much more than inmates in minimum custody prisons. In opposition, minimum-security inmates have the opportunity to negotiate masculinity by using employment more often and in more diverse settings than maximum custody prisoners.

For the most part, black and white inmates utilize similar resources for negotiating masculinity. However, the differences that did occur are significant and important. Throughout the interviews, white inmates often characterized masculinity as engaging in employment opportunities and gaining financial success, while black inmates did not. In addition, white inmates expressed that they transform negative emotions into

violence or anger. Black participants, on the other hand, did not mention utilizing violence or anger as outlets for expressing negative emotions.

As illustrated throughout this thesis, masculinity organizes the lives of prison inmates and is connected to personal identity, self-worth, and sometimes survival. In prison, gender category become particularly important because, when everything else is taken away, one's gender and the ways in which they demonstrate that to others may be all they have. In addition, it is important to understand that the behaviors and interactions that occur within the prison context are complex and do not take place because of any one factor. Nevertheless, masculinity in male prison environments arranges and systematizes the relationships and actions of the individuals who are a part of them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbey, Antonia. 1982. "Sex Differences in Attributions for Friendly Behavior: Do Males Misperceive Females' Friendliness?" Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 42: 830-838.
- Abbey, Antonia, and Christian Melby. 1986. "The Effects of Nonverbal Cues on Gender Differences in Perceptions of Sexual Intent." Sex Roles. 15: 283-298.
- Allison, Julie and Irene Kollenbroich-Shea. 2001. "Sexual Assault." Pp 154-164 in Women, Crime, and Criminal Justice. Ed by Claire M. Renzetti and Lynne Goodstein. California: Roxbury Publishing Company.
- Anderson, Elijah. 1999. Code of the Street: Decency, Violence, and the Moral Life of the Inner City. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Arendell, Terry. 1997. "Reflections on the Researcher-Researched Relationship: A Woman Interviewing Men." Qualitative Sociology. 20: 341-368.
- Bandyopadhyay, Mahuya. 2006. "Competing Masculinities in a Prison." Men and Masculinities. 9: 186-203.
- Bank, B.J. and S.L. Hansford. 2000. "Gender and Friendship: Why are Men's Best Same-Sex Friendships Less Intimate and Supportive?" Personal Relationships. 7: 63-78.
- Bourdieu, P. 1984. Distinctions. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Browne, Angela. 1987. When Battered Women Kill. New York: The Free Press, A Division of Macmillan, Inc.
- Bryson, L. 1987. "Sports and the Maintenance of Masculine Hegemony." Women's Studies International Forum. 10: 349.
- Burleson, B.R. 2003. "The Experiences and Effects of Emotional Support: What the Study of Cultural and Gender Differences Can Tell Us About Close Relationships, Emotion, and Interpersonal Communication." Personal Relationships. 10: 1-23.
- Carrabine, Eammon, and Brian Longhurst. 1998. "Gender and Prison Organisation:

- Some Comments on Masculinities and Prison Management.” The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice. 37: 161-176.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 2000. Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment. New York, New York: Routledge.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 2004. Black Sexual Politics. New York: Routledge.
- Collinson, D.L. 1992. Managing the Shopfloor: Subjectivity, Masculinity and Workplace Culture. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Connell, R.W. 1995. Masculinities. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Connell, R.W. 2005. Masculinities, Second Edition. Berkeley and Los Angeles California: University of California Press.
- Conway, Michael. 2000. “On Sex Roles and Representations of Emotional Experience: Masculinity, Femininity, and Emotional Awareness.” Sex Roles. 43: 687-698.
- Cornell, Drucilla. 1995. “What is Ethical Feminism?” In Feminist Contentions: A Philosophical Exchange. Ed by Seyla Benhabib, Judith Butler, Drucilla Cornell, and Nancy Fraser. New York: Routledge.
- Crenshaw, Kimberle. 1991. “Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color.” Stanford Law Review. 43: 1241-1299.
- Davis, M., & Weitz, S. 1981. “Sex Differences in Body Movements and Positions.” In Gender and Nonverbal Behavior. Ed by C. Mayo & N.M. Henley. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Deaux, K. 1987. “Psychological Constructions of Masculinity and Femininity.” Pp. 289-303 in Masculinity/Femininity: Basic Perspectives. Ed. by J. Reinisch, L. Rosenblum, and S. Sanders. New York: Oxford University Press.
- DeKeseredy, Walter S., and Martin D. Schwartz. 2005. “Masculinities and Interpersonal Violence.” Pp. 353-366 in Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities. Ed by Michael S. Kimmel, Jeff Hearn, and R.W. Connell. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Donaldson, Mike. 1993. “What is Hegemonic Masculinity?” Theory and Society. 22: 643-657.
- Dunk, Thomas, and David Bartol. 2005. “The Logic and Limitations of Male Working-

- Class Culture in a Resource Hinderland.” Pp. 31-44 in Spaces of Masculinities.. Ed by Bettina van Hoven and Kathrin Horschelmann. New York: Routledge.
- Eagly, A., and V. Steffen. 1984. “Gender Stereotypes Stem from the Distribution of Women and Men into Social Roles.” Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 46: 734-754.
- Galasinski, Dariusz. 2004. Men and the Language of Emotions. New York, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Geertz, Clifford 1973. The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays. New York: Basic Books.
- Geis, F., V. Brown, J. Jennings, and D. Corrado-Taylor. 1984. “Sex vs. Status in Sex-Associated Behaviors. Sex Roles. 11: 771-785.
- Gerson, Judith M., and Kathy Peiss. 1985. “Boundaries, Negotiation, Consciousness: Reconceptualizing Gender Relations. Pp. 114-126 in The Gendered Society Reader. Second Edition. Ed. by Michael S. Kimmel and Amy Aronson. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gilligan, James, M.D. 1997. Violence: Reflections on a National Epidemic. New York: Vintage Books.
- Goffman, Erving. 1977. “The Arrangement Between the Sexes.” Theory and Society.4: 301-331.
- Goodstein, Lynne. 2001. “Women, Crime, and Criminal Justice -- An Overview.” Pp 1-10 in Women, Crime, and Criminal Justice. Ed by Claire M. Renzetti and Lynne Goodstein. California: Roxbury Publishing Company.
- Gottfredson, Michael and Travis Hirschi. 1990. “The Gender of Violence.” Pp 396 in The Gendered Society Reader. Ed. by Michael S. Kimmel and Amy Aronson. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hall, C. Michael. 2005. “Shifting Spaces of Masculinity: From Carisbook to the MCG.” Pp. 155-164 in Spaces of Masculinities. Ed by Bettina van Hoven and Kathrin Horschelmann. New York: Routledge.
- Hall, Elaine J. 2000. “Developing the Gender Relations Perspective: The Emergence of a New Conceptualization of Gender in the 1990’s.” Current Perspectives in Social Theory. 20: 91-123.
- Heider, Fritz. 1958. The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations. New York: Wiley.

- Heider, Fritz, & Simmel, M. 1944. "An Experimental Study of Apparent Behavior." American Journal of Psychology. 57: 243-259.
- Henley, N. 1977. Body Politics. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Holmberg, Carl Bryan. 2001. "The Culture of Transgression: Initiations into the Homosociality of a Midwestern State Prison." Pp. 78-92 in Prison Masculinities. Ed. by Dan Sabo, Terry A. Kupers, and Willie London. Philadelphia, Temple University Press.
- Holmes, Janet. 1997. "Women, Language, and Identity." Journal of Sociolinguistics. 1: 195-223.
- Jakupcak, Matthew, Kristalyn Salters, Kim L. Grants, and Lizabeth Roemer. 2003. "Masculinity and Emotionality: An Investigation of Men's Primary and Secondary Emotional Responding." Sex Roles. 49: 111-120.
- Janssen, Janine. 2005. "Tattoos in Prison: Men and their Pictures on the Edge of Society." Pp. 179-192 in Spaces of Masculinities. Ed. by Bettina van Hoven and Kathrin Horschelmann. New York: Routledge.
- Jarviluoma, Helmi, Pirkko Moisala, and Anni Vilkkko. 2003. Gender and Qualitative Methods. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Jewkes, Yvonne. 2005. "Men Behind Bars: 'Doing' Masculinity as an Adaptation to Imprisonment." Men and Masculinities. 8: 44-63.
- Kassebaum, G. 1972. "Sex in Prison: Violence, Homosexuality, and Intimidation are Everyday Occurrences." Sexual Behavior. 2: 39-45.
- Kiesling, Scott Fabius. 2005. "Homosocial Desire in Men's Talk: Balancing and Re-creating Cultural Discourse of Masculinity." Language in Society. 34: 695-726.
- Kimmel, Michael S., and Amy Aronson. 2004. The Gendered Society Reader. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Koch, Sabine C. 2004. "Constructing Gender: A Lens-Model Inspired Gender Communication Approach." Sex Roles. 51: 171-186.
- Koukounas, Eric & Nicole M. Letch. 2001. "Psychological Correlates of Perception of Sexual Intent in Women." The Journal of Social Psychology. 14(4): 443-456.
- Lee, Deborah. 1997. "Interviewing Men: Vulnerabilities and Dilemmas." Women's

Studies International Forum. 20: 553-564.

Leyser, Ophra. 2003. "Doing Masculinity in a Mental Hospital." Journal of Contemporary Ethnography. 32: 336-359.

Lorber, Judith. 1994. Paradoxes of Gender. Yale University Press.

Loy, J. 1995. "The Dark Side of Agon: Fratriarchies, Performative Masculinities, Sport Involvement and the Phenomenon of Gang Rape." In International Sociology of Sport: Contemporary Issues. Festschrift in Honor of Gunther Luschen, ed. K.H. Beffe and A. Ruffen. Stuttgart, Germany: Berlag Stephanie Naglschmid.

Lutze, Faith E., and David W. Murphy. 1999. "Ultramasculine Prison Environments and Inmates' Adjustment: It's Time to Move Beyond the 'Boys will be Boys' Paradigm." Pp. 228-249 in The Inmate Prison Experience. Ed by Mary K. Stohr and Craig Hemmens. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.

Major, B., & R. Heslin. 1982. "Perceptions of Cross-sex and Same-sex Nonreciprocal Touch: Is it Better to Give than to Receive?" Journal of Nonverbal Behavior. 6: 148-162.

Majors, Richard. 1987. "Cool Pose: Black Masculinity and Sports." Pp. 209-217 in The Masculinities Reader. Ed by Stephen M. Whitehead and Frank J. Barrett. Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

McDowell, Linda. 2005. "The Men and the Boys: Bankers, Burger Makers, and Barmen." Pp. 19-30 in Spaces of Masculinities. Ed by Bettina van Hoven and Kathrin Horschelmann. New York: Routledge.

McGaughey, Deanna and Richard Tewksbury. 2002. "Masturbation." Pp. 133-142 in Prison Sex. Ed by Christopher Hensley. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc.

McGuffey, C. Shawn. 2008. "'Saving Masculinity': Gender Reaffirmation, Sexuality, Race, and Parental Responses to Male Child Sexual Abuse." Social Problems. 55: 216-237.

McGuffey, C. Shawn, and B. Lindsay Rich. 1999. "Playing in the Gender Transgression Zone: Race, Class, and Hegemonic Masculinity in Middle Childhood." Pp. 73-87 in Men's Lives. Fifth Edition. Ed by Michael S. Kimmel and Michael A. Messner. Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, A Pearson Education Company.

McKee, Lorna, & Margaret O'Brien. 1983. "Interviewing Men: Talking Gender

- Seriously. Pp. 147-161 in The Public and the Private. Ed by Eva Gamarnikow, David Morgan, June Purvis, & Daphne Taylorson. London: Heinemann.
- Medzian, Myriam. 2004. "Sports: When Winning is the Only Thing, Can Violence be Far Away?" Pp. 301-309 in Violence and Gender: An Interdisciplinary Reader. Ed by Paula Ruth Gilbert and Kimberly K. Eby. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education/Prentice Hall.
- Merton, Robert K., Marjorie Fiske, & Patricia L. Kendall. 1990. The Focused Interview: A Manual of Problems and Procedures. Second Edition. New York, New York: The Free Press.
- Messerschmidt, James. 1993. Masculinities and Crime: Critique and Reconceptualization of Theory. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Messerschmidt, James. 2000. "Becoming 'Real Men': Adolescent Masculinity Challenges and Sexual Violence." Men and Masculinities. 2: 286-307.
- Messner, Michael A. 2005. "Still a Man's World? Studying Masculinities and Sport." Pp. 313-325 in Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities. Ed by Michael S. Kimmel, Jeff Hearn, and R.W. Connell. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Morgan, D.H.J. 1986. "Gender" in Key Variables in Social Investigation. Ed by R. Burgess. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Morgan, D.H.J. 1992. Discovering Men. London: Routledge.
- Murnen, Sarah K., Carrie Wright, and Gretchen Kaluzny. 2002. "If 'Boys Will Be Boys,' then Girls Will Be Victims? A Meta-Analytic Review of the Research That Relates Masculine Ideology to Sexual Aggression." Sex Roles. 46: 359-375.
- Newton, Carolyn. 1994. "Gender Theory and Prison Sociology: Using Theories of Masculinities to Interpret the Sociology of Prisons for Men." The Howard Journal. 33: 193-202.
- North Carolina Department of Correction. 1995-2008. North Carolina Division of Prisons. Inmate Classification: Assigning Inmates to Prison. Raleigh, NC. Retrieved March 14, 2008. (<http://www.doc.state.nc.us/dop/custody.htm>).
- North Carolina Department of Correction. 2001. North Carolina Department of

- Correction Office of Research and Planning Statistical Abstract Query. Raleigh, NC. Retrieved February 6, 2007. (http://crmis42.doc.state.nc.us/cgi-bin/hsrun.exe/crmis42haht/SimpleAbstractQuery/SimpleAbstractQuery.htm;start=HS_AbstractSubmit).
- North Carolina Department of Correction. 2002. North Carolina Department of Correction Public Access Information System. Raleigh, NC. Retrieved February 3, 2008. (<http://webapps6.doc.state.nc.us/apps/offender/menu1>).
- North Carolina Department of Correction. 2005. "Assigning Inmates to Prison." Raleigh, NC. Retrieved March 28, 2006. (<http://www.doc.state.nc.us/dop/custody.htm>).
- O'Sullivan, Chris. 1998. "Ladykillers: Similarities and Divergences of Masculinities in Gang Rape and Wife Battery." Pp. 82-110 in Masculinities and Violence: Research on Men and Masculinities. Ed. by Lee H. Bowker. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Parenti, Christian. 2008. Lockdown America: Police and Prisons in the Age of Crisis. Brooklyn, New York: Verso.
- Patenaude, Allan L. 2004. "No Promises, but I'm Willing to Listen and Tell What I Hear: Conducting Qualitative Research among Prison Inmates and Staff." The Prison Journal. 84: 69S-91S.
- Polk, K. 2003. "Masculinities, Femininities, and Homicide: Competing explanations for Male Violence." Pp. 133-146 in Controversies in Critical Criminology. Ed by M. D. Schwartz and S. E. Hatty. Cincinnati: Anderson.
- Presser, Lois. 2005. "Negotiating Power and Narrative in Research: Implications for Feminist Methodology." Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society. 30: 2067-2090.
- Pyke, Karen D. 1996. "Class-Based Masculinities: The Interdependence of Gender, Class, and Interpersonal Power." Gender and Society. 10: 527-549.
- Rachkowski, Rita and Kevin E. O'Grady. 1988. "Client Gender and Sex-Typed Nonverbal Behavior: Impact on Impression Formation." Sex Roles. 19: 771-783.
- Reeder, Heidi M. 2003. "The Effect of Gender Role Orientation on Same- and Cross-Sex Friendship Formation." Sex Roles. 49: 143-152.
- Rich, Michael, M.D., M.P.H., and Kenneth R. Ginsburg, M.D., M.S.ED. 1999. "The

- Reason and Rhyme of Qualitative Research: Why, When, and How to Use Qualitative Methods in the Study of Adolescent Health.” Journal of Adolescent Health. 25: 371-378.
- Ridgeway, Cecilia L., and Shelley J. Correll. 2004. “Unpacking the Gender System: A Theoretical Perspective on Gender Beliefs and Social Relations.” Gender & Society. 18: 510-531.
- Roy, William G. 2001. Making Societies: The Historical Construction of Our World. California: Pine Forge Press.
- Rubin, L. 1986. “On Men and Friendship.” Psychoanalytic Review. 73: 165-181.
- Rubin, Z. 1970. “Measurement of Romantic Love.” Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 16(2): 265-273.
- Rytting, M.B. 1976. “Sex or Intimacy: Male and Female Versions of Heterosexual Relationships.” Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, Illinois.
- Sabo, Don, Terry A. Kupers, and Willie London. 2001. “Gender and the Politics of Punishment.” Pp. 3-18 in Prison Masculinities. Ed. by Don Sabo, Terry A. Kupers, and Willie London. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Schwalbe, Michael L., and Michelle Wolkomir. 2002. “Interviewing Men.” Pp. 203-219 in Handbook of Interview Research: Context and Method. Ed by Jaber F. Gubrium and James A. Holstein. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Segal, Lynne. 1990. Slow Motion: Changing Masculinities, Changing Men. Rutgers University Press.
- Segal, Lynne. 2001. “The Belly of the Beast: Sex as Male Domination.” Pp. 100-111 in The Masculinities Reader. Ed. by Stephen M. Whitehead and Frank J. Barrett. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Sheets, Virgil L. and Robyn Lugar. 2005. “Friendship and Gender in Russia and the United States.” Sex Roles. 52: 131-140.
- Silver, Catherine B. 2003. “Gendered Identities in Old Age: Toward (de)gendering?” Journal of Ageing Studies. 17: 379-397.
- Simpson, Sally S., and Lori Elis. 1995. “Doing Gender: Sorting out the Caste and Crime Conundrum.” Criminology. 33: 47-81.

- Smart, Carol. 1984. The Ties that Bind. London: RKP.
- Staples, R. 1982. Black Masculinity. San Francisco: Black Scholar Press.
- Stohr, Mary K., and Craig Hemmens. 2004. The Inmate Prison Experience. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Strauss, Anselm L. 1987. Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists. New York, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tewksbury, R. 1989. "Measures of Sexual Behavior in an Ohio Prison." Sociology and Social Research. 74: 34-39.
- Theodore, Peter S., and Susan A. Basow. 2000. "Heterosexual Masculinity and Homophobia: A Reaction to the Self?" Journal of Homosexuality. 40: 31-48.
- Toerien, Merran, and Kevin Durrheim. 2001. "Power through Knowledge: Ignorance and the 'Real Man'." Feminism and Psychology. 11: 35-54.
- Totten, Mark. 2003. "Girlfriend Abuse as a Form of Masculinity Construction among Violent, Marginal Male Youth." Men and Masculinities. 6: 70-92.
- Websdale, Neil, and Meda Chesney-Lind. 1998. "Doing Violence to Women: Research Synthesis on the Victimization of Women." Pp. 55-81 in Masculinities and Violence: Research on Men and Masculinities. Ed. by Lee H. Bowker. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Walker, Karen. 2001. "I'm Not Friends the Way She's Friends: Ideological and Behavioral Constructions of Masculinity in Men's Friendships." Pp. 367-379 in Men's Lives. Ed. by Michael S. Kimmel and Michael A. Messner. Needham Heights, Massachusetts: A Pearson Education Company.
- Weis, Lois, Amira Proweller, and Craig Centre. 2001. "Re-examining 'A Moment In History:' Loss of Privilege Inside White Working-Class Masculinity in the 1990's" Pp. 268-282 in Men's Lives. Ed. by Michael S. Kimmel and Michael A. Messner. Needham Heights, Massachusetts: A Pearson Education Company.
- Weiss, Robert S. 1994. Learning from Strangers: The Art and Method of Qualitative Interview Studies. New York, New York: The Free Press.
- Wellard, Ian. 2002. "Men, Sport, Body Performance and the Maintenance of Exclusive Masculinity." Leisure Studies. 21: 235-247.
- West, Candace. 1984. "When the Doctor is a 'Lady': Power, Status, and Gender in

- Physician-Patient Encounters.” Symbolic Interaction. 7: 87-106.
- West, Candace, and Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. “Doing Gender.” Gender & Society. 1: 125-151.
- West, Cornel. 2001. Race Matters. New York: Vintage Books.
- Wharton, Amy S. 2005. The Sociology of Gender: An Introduction to Theory and Research. United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing.
- Whitehead, Antony. 2005. “Man to Man Violence: How Masculinity May Work as a Dynamic Risk Factor.” The Howard Journal. 44: 411-422.
- Wilkinson, Deanna L. 2001. “Violent Events and Social Identity: Specifying the Relationship Between Respect and Masculinity in Inner-City Youth Violence.” Sociological Studies in Children and Youth. 8: 235-269.
- Zellman, G.L. and J.D. Goodchilds. 1983. “Becoming Sexual in Adolescence.” In Changing Boundaries: Gender Roles and Sexual Behavior. Ed. by E.A. Allgeier and N.B. McCormick. Palo Alto, California: Mayfield.

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE:

MINIMUM-SECURITY PARTICIPANTS

- *The principal investigator has compiled the following questions according to the variables important to the research analysis. The headings are for the researcher's use only and will not be discussed with the participants. It is understood that interviews are to be fluid and that some questions that appear later on in the interview schedule may get covered in earlier conversations and thus, if covered, will not be repeated later.*
- *Alternative ways to ask questions in italics (or examples of answers).*

Interview Schedule: Minimum-Security Participants

I want to begin by asking you some general questions about how you got to prison and a little about life in prison and the prison routine. Please remember, do not tell me about any crimes you have committed or are planning to commit. Also, please answer all questions based on your experiences here in [minimum-security institution].

Entry into Prison:

- 1) How long have you been in this prison?
- 2) The first time you entered this prison, what was your first impression? *What feeling or thoughts did you have when you entered the general population in prison?*
- 3) What was your first interaction (contact, dealings) with other guys like in this prison? *Was it positive? Negative? What happened?*

Prison Structure:

- 1) How would you describe this prison environment? *Peaceful? Tense? Stressful? Laid back?*
- 2) What prison programs are available to you now? *Such as educational or substance abuse treatment programs?*
- 3) Do you participate in any of these programs?
- 4) Have these programs been available to you the entire time of your incarceration in this institution?
- 5) Have programs been available in the past that are not available now?
 - a. Did you participate in these programs in the past?
 - b. If so, which ones?

- 6) How would you describe how crowded this prison is? *Overcrowded?*
Comfortable? Under crowded?

Now that we've discussed your entry into prison and a little about the way the prison is organized, I want to ask you a few questions about prison life. Also, please answer all questions based on your experiences here in [minimum-security institution].

Social Environment:

- 1) What organized activities or programs planned by the prison do the guys here engage in on a daily basis such as education or substance abuse programs?
 - a. Does everyone participate in these activities?
 - b. Who is included and why?
 - c. Who is excluded and why?
- 2) What activities do people here engage in on a daily basis to pass the time or to have fun such as playing sports or games?
 - a. Does everyone participate in these activities?
 - b. Who is included and why?
 - c. Who is excluded and why?
- 3) Do you generally do your time alone or with other guys? *Alone? Collectively?*
 - a. Is this the same way other guys do their time in prison (*generally*)?
- 4) What activities do people in here (prison) do together?
- 5) What activities are done alone?
- 6) In your opinion, how easy or difficult is it to make friends in this prison?
- 7) What does it mean to have a "friend" in prison?
- 8) Would you be friends with the people you are friends with now outside of prison?
 - i. If yes, what qualities do they have that make a good "friend"?
 - ii. If not, why would you not be friends with them on the outside?
- 9) Do the guys in here hang out in specific groups?
 - a. If so, what kind of groups? Can you describe them. *Names of groups, characteristics of members (race, etc), large or small group, what kind of activities they engage in, etc.*

Power:

- 1) What does having power in prison mean to you?
- 2) What personal characteristics get you status in this prison? (*Having a job? Having a muscular body?*)
- 3) What personal characteristics can get you hurt in this prison? (*Not having a job? Being seen as 'weak'? What does 'weak' mean? What makes a guy 'weak'?*)
- 4) What does it mean to have a lot of power among the guys in here? *What does it mean to have high status? Physical and psychological features.*
- 5) What does it mean to have no or little power among the guys in here? *What does it mean to have low status? Physical and psychological features.*
- 6) What types of guys have the most power within this prison?
 - a. What gives them power?

- 7) What words are used to refer to those with power here?
- 8) What types of guys have the least power here?
 - a. Why is this so? *Who has the least power?*
- 9) What words are used to refer to those with little or no power in this prison?
- 10) How are the guys who have a lot of power seen by other people in this prison? As *being "manly?" Tough?*
- 11) How are the guys who have little or no power seen by the other guys? *Weak? Less of a man? Feminine?*
- 12) Do you think it is important to have power in prison?
 - a. If so, how is power important in prison?
 - b. If not, why is power not important in prison?

Knowledge:

- 1) What types of knowledge have you found to be most useful to you in this prison? *Such as book knowledge? Knowledge of prison life?*
- 2) How is this knowledge useful?
- 3) Do you think it is important to have "book knowledge" in here, such as the kind of knowledge you get from school or from reading books, the newspaper, etc.? *Seen as being helpful? Harmful?*
 - a. If so, how is this knowledge important to have in prison?
 - b. If not, why is this knowledge not important to have in prison?
- 4) Do you think it is important to have prior knowledge of prison life by having been here before or hearing about it from others? *Seen as being helpful? Harmful?*
 - a. If so, how is this knowledge important?
 - b. If not, why is this knowledge not important?

Now I am going to ask you several questions about sexuality and violence in prison. To make this easier, I will ask the questions in a way that you should exclude yourself in your answers, so no one will know if you are talking about yourself or someone else. So, questions may start with "Do you know anyone who has ever..." By wording the question in this way, you should not say who it was, not even yourself. Do not tell me about any crimes you have committed or are planning to commit. I do not want to know if you are doing any of these things! Also, please answer all questions based on your experiences here in [minimum-security institution].

Normative Heterosexuality:

- 1) How often do 'you guys' get to interact with women?
- 2) Who are the women you interact with?
 - a. In what types of situations does this interaction happen?
- 3) For the most part, there aren't many women around for you guys to interact with. How is this dealt with? *How do they deal with not being able to see and interact with women regularly?*
- 4) Do any of the guys in here take on the role of a woman?

- 5) In your opinion, what do the other guys in here think about other inmates who are openly gay?
- 6) How are open homosexuals treated in here? *Or, how are the guys treated if they are openly gay?*
- 7) Do you think it is important to be “straight” in this prison?
 - a. If so, how is being straight important in prison?
 - b. If not, why is being straight not important in prison?
- 8) Do you think there is a difference between people who are openly gay in here and those who have sexual relations with men in prison, but not out of prison?
 - a. If so, how are they different?
 - b. If not, why are they not different?
- 9) How do you view female guards in terms of being women? *(Do you view them as being feminine or masculine? Do they have as much power as male guards?)*
- 10) Do you see any benefits to being in an environment that doesn’t have many women?

Do not tell me about any crimes you have committed or are planning to commit.

Violence (non-sexual, sexual):

- 1) Do you think this prison is violent?
- 2) Do you think prisons in general are violent?
- 3) What kinds of violence happen?
- 4) What kinds of things can lead to violence in prison?
- 5) Do any other types of violence happen in prison?
- 6) Do you think violence is an important part of prison life?
 - a. If yes, why do you think violence is an important part of prison life?
 - b. If no, why don’t you think violence is an important part of prison life?

Do not tell me about any crimes you have committed or are planning to commit.

Rape:

- 1) Do you know anyone who has been raped in this prison?
- 2) What are some of the reasons men are raped in prison? *Why do you think the aggressor rapes? What do you think are some of the things he thinks about? Why do you think he does it?*
- 3) What words are used to refer to men who rape others?
- 4) What kinds of people in prison are likely to be raped?
 - a. Why do you think these guys are raped?
- 5) What words are used to refer to men who get raped?
- 6) Do you think rape is an important part of prison life?
 - a. If yes, why do you think rape is an important part of prison life?
 - b. If no, why don’t you think rape is an important part of prison life?

These next questions are about masculinity in and out of prison. By “masculinity,” I mean the kinds of things that men do and say to show that they are “men” or “manly.” Also, please answer all questions based on your experiences here in [minimum-security institution].

Masculinity:

- 1) What do guys in here generally think it means to be “a man” in prison? *How do you define being “a man” in prison?*
 - a. Do you agree? Why or why not? *Are there lots of ways to be “manly” in prison?*
- 2) How have your views of yourself as “a man” changed since coming to prison?
- 3) How do you show you are a man in here?
- 4) How did you show you were a man outside prison?

Now I am going to ask you some questions specifically about life in prison. Do not tell me about any crimes you have committed or are planning to commit. Also, please answer all questions based on your experiences here in [minimum-security institution].

Material Resources/Contraband:

- 1) What are some of the most desirable material possessions that people in here want to have (legal and illegal)? *What are some belongings that the guys want to have the most (legal and illegal)?*
- 2) What kinds of privileges do the guys who have these belongings have?
- 3) What types of trades occur for these items? *Money, services, other goods?*
- 4) What do guys in prison use for “money”? *What is the currency?*
- 5) Why do you think it is important to have these items in prison?

Employment:

- 1) What types of jobs are available in here?
- 2) What types of jobs are preferred in this prison?
 - a. Why do guys want these jobs in here?
- 3) About how many guys hold jobs in here?
- 4) How are the guys chosen for jobs here?
- 5) Do you have a job?
- 6) What does having a job mean to you?
- 7) Do you think it is important to have a job in prison? *How much value (importance, worth) is put upon having a job in prison?*
 - a. If so, how is having a job in prison important?
 - b. If not, why is it not important to have a job in prison?
- 8) How do you think guys in here are seen who have a job?
- 9) How do you think guys in here are seen who do not have a job?

Emotions:

- 1) How are showing emotions viewed by other guys in here? *If you openly show emotions, how do other guys see you? Positively? Negatively? Weak? Strong? Tough?*
- 2) Do you feel free to show your emotions to other guys in here?
 - a. If not, why don't you feel free to show your emotions to other guys?
- 3) Do you feel free to show your emotions to staff?
 - a. If not, why don't you feel free to show your emotions to staff?
- 4) If you do not show your emotions, how do you deal with holding your emotions in?
- 5) What emotions do you have that you may not want other guys in here to know about?

Language:

- 1) Do you think it is important to use slang in prison?
 - a. If so, how is using slang important in prison?
 - b. If not, why is using slang in prison not important?
- 2) Are there any words that are used here that aren't used outside prison?
- 3) Do you think it is important to go along with what other guys are saying in here? *Maybe about another inmate, staff, or something someone else wants you to do?*
 - a. If so, why do you think it is important to go along with what other guys are saying in prison?
 - b. If not, why don't you think it is important to go along with what other guys are saying in prison?

Sports and Fitness:

- 1) Is it important to participate in sporting or fitness activities?
 - a. If yes, why do you think it is important to participate in sporting or fitness activities?
 - b. If no, why don't you think it is important to participate in sporting or fitness activities?
- 2) What physical characteristics give a person status (*rank, high social position*) in prison?
- 3) Are any planned sports available for the guys to take part in here?
- 4) What informal sports do the guys participate in? *In other words, what sports do the guys play on their own, without any staff planning, such as weight lifting?*
 - a. If yes, what do you think the guys get out of participating in these activities?
 - b. If not, why do you think the guys do not participate in these activities?

Conclusion:

- 1) Is there anything else you would like to add or anything else you want me to know about prison life that we haven't already talked about?

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE:

MAXIMUM-SECURITY PARTICIPANTS

- *The principal investigator has compiled the following questions according to the variables important to the research analysis. The headings are for the researcher's use only and will not be discussed with the participants. It is understood that interviews are to be fluid and that some questions that appear later on in the interview schedule may get covered in earlier conversations and thus, if covered, will not be repeated later.*
- *Alternative ways to ask questions in italics (or examples of answers).*

Interview Schedule: Maximum-Security Participants

I want to begin by asking you some general questions about how you got to prison and a little about life in prison and the prison routine. Please remember, do not tell me about any crimes you have committed or are planning to commit. Also, please answer all the questions based on your experiences in the maximum-security prison you were in.

Entry into Prison:

- 1) How long were you in the maximum-security prison?
- 2) The first time you entered the maximum-security prison, what was your first impression? *What feeling or thoughts did you have when you entered the general population in prison?*
- 3) What was your first interaction (contact, dealings) with other guys like in the maximum-security prison? *Was it positive? Negative? What happened?*

Prison Structure:

- 1) How would you describe the prison environment in maximum-security? *Peaceful? Tense? Stressful? Laid back?*
- 2) What prison programs were available to you? *Such as educational or substance abuse treatment programs?*
- 3) Did you participate in any of these programs?
- 4) Were these programs available to you the entire time of your incarceration in this institution?
- 5) Were programs available part of the time you were in that prison, but not the entire time? *(Were programs cancelled for any reason during any part of your time there?)*

- a. Did you participate in these programs?
- b. If so, which ones?
- 6) How would you describe how crowded that prison was? *Overcrowded? Comfortable? Under crowded?*

Now that we've discussed your entry into prison and a little about the way the prison is organized, I want to ask you a few questions about prison life. Also, please answer all the questions based on your experiences the maximum-security prison you were in.

Social Environment:

- 1) What organized activities or programs planned by the prison did the guys there engage in on a daily basis such as education or substance abuse programs?
 - b. Did everyone participate in these activities?
 - c. Who was included and why?
 - d. Who was excluded and why?
- 2) What activities did people there engage in on a daily basis to pass the time or to have fun such as playing sports or games?
 - e. Did everyone participate in these activities?
 - f. Who was included and why?
 - g. Who was excluded and why?
- 3) Did you generally do your time alone or with other guys? *Alone? Collectively?*
 - h. Is this the same way other guys did their time in that prison (*generally*)?
- 4) What activities did people in there (maximum prison) do together?
- 5) What activities were done alone?
- 6) In your opinion, how easy or difficult was it to make friends in the maximum-security prison?
- 7) What did it mean to have a "friend" in prison?
- 8) Would you be friends with the people you were friends with in the maximum-security prison outside of prison?
 - i. If yes, what qualities did they have that made a good "friend"?
 - ii. If not, why would you not be friends with them on the outside?
- 9) Did the guys in there hang out in specific groups?
 - i. If so, what kind of groups? Can you describe them. *Names of groups, characteristics of members (race, etc), large or small group, what kind of activities they engaged in, etc.*

Power:

- 1) What did having power in the maximum-security prison mean to you?
- 2) What personal characteristics got you status in that prison? (*Having a job? Having a muscular body?*)
- 3) What personal characteristics got you hurt in that prison? (*Not having a job? Being seen as 'weak'? What does 'weak' mean? What made a guy 'weak'?*)
- 4) What did it mean to have a lot of power among the guys in there? *What did it mean to have high status? Physical and psychological features.*

- 5) What did it mean to have no or little power among the guys in there? *What did it mean to have low status? Physical and psychological features.*
- 6) What types of guys had the most power within that prison?
 - c. What gave them power?
- 7) What words were used to refer to those with power there?
- 8) What types of guys had the least power there?
 - d. Why was this so? *Who has the least power?*
- 9) What words were used to refer to those with little or no power in that prison?
- 10) How were the guys who had a lot of power seen by other people in that prison? *As being "manly?" Tough?*
- 11) How were the guys who had little or no power seen by the other guys? *Weak? Less of a man? Feminine?*
- 12) Do you think it is important to have power in maximum-security prison?
 - e. If so, how is power important in prison?
 - f. If not, why is power not important in prison?

Knowledge:

- 1) What types of knowledge did you find to be most useful to you in that prison? *Such as book knowledge? Knowledge of prison life?*
- 2) How was this knowledge useful?
- 3) Did you think it was important to have "book knowledge" in there, such as the kind of knowledge you get from school or from reading books, the newspaper, etc.? *Seen as being helpful? Harmful?*
 - c. If so, how was this knowledge important to have in that prison?
 - d. If not, why was this knowledge not important to have in that prison?
- 4) Do you think it is important to have prior knowledge of prison life in maximum-security prisons by having been there before or hearing about it from others? *Seen as being helpful? Harmful?*
 - e. If so, how is this knowledge important?
 - f. If not, why is this knowledge not important?

Now I am going to ask you several questions about sexuality and violence in prison. To make this easier, I will ask the questions in a way that you should exclude yourself in your answers, so no one will know if you are talking about yourself or someone else. So, questions may start with "Do you know anyone who has ever..." By wording the question in this way, you should not say who it was, not even yourself. Do not tell me about any crimes you have committed or are planning to commit. I do not want to know if you are doing any of these things! Also, please answer all the questions based on your experiences the maximum-security prison you were in.

Normative Heterosexuality:

- 1) How often did 'you guys' get to interact with women?
- 2) Who were the women you interacted with?
 - a. In what types of situations did these interactions happen?

- 3) For the most part, there weren't many women around for you guys to interact with. How was this dealt with? *How did they deal with not being able to see and interact with women regularly?*
- 4) Did any of the guys in there take on the role of a woman?
- 5) In your opinion, what did the other guys in there think about other inmates who are openly gay?
- 6) How were open homosexuals treated in there? *Or, how were the guys treated if they were openly gay?*
- 7) Did you think it was important to be "straight" in that prison?
 - b. If so, how was being straight important in that prison?
 - c. If not, why was being straight not important in that prison?
- 8) Did you think there was a difference between people who were openly gay in there and those who had sexual relations with men in prison, but not out of prison?
 - d. If so, how were they different?
 - e. If not, why were they not different?
- 9) How did you view female guards in terms of being women? *(Did you view them as being feminine or masculine? Did they have as much power as male guards?)*
- 10) Did you see any benefits to being in an environment that didn't have many women?

Do not tell me about any crimes you have committed or are planning to commit.

Violence (non-sexual, sexual):

- 1) Did you think that prison was violent?
- 2) Do you think prisons in general are violent?
- 3) What kinds of violence happen in the maximum-security prison?
- 4) What kinds of things lead to violence in that prison?
- 5) Did any other types of violence happen in that prison?
- 6) Do you think violence is an important part of prison life in maximum-security prisons?
 - c. If yes, why do you think violence is an important part of prison life?
 - d. If no, why don't you think violence is an important part of prison life?

Do not tell me about any crimes you have committed or are planning to commit.

Rape:

- 1) Did you know anyone who has been raped in that prison?
- 2) What are some of the reasons men are raped in maximum-security prisons? *Why do you think the aggressor raped? What do you think were some of the things he thought about? Why do you think he did it?*
- 3) What words were used to refer to men who raped others?
- 4) What kinds of people in that prison were likely to be raped?

- c. Why do you think these guys were raped?
- 5) What words were used to refer to men who got raped in maximum-security prisons?
- 6) Do you think rape is an important part of prison life in maximum-security prisons?
 - d. If yes, why do you think rape is an important part of prison life?
 - e. If no, why don't you think rape is an important part of prison life?

These next questions are about masculinity in and out of prison. By "masculinity," I mean the kinds of things that men do and say to show that they are "men" or "manly." Also, please answer all the questions based on your experiences the maximum-security prison you were in.

Masculinity:

- 1) What did guys generally think it meant to be "a man" in maximum-security prison? *How did you define being "a man" in prison?*
 - a. Did you agree? Why or why not? *Were there lots of ways to be "manly" in prison?*
- 2) How have your views of yourself as "a man" changed since coming to prison?
- 3) How did you show you are a man in there?
- 4) How did you show you were a man outside prison?

Now I am going to ask you some questions specifically about life in prison. Do not tell me about any crimes you have committed or are planning to commit. Also, please answer all the questions based on your experiences the maximum-security prison you were in.

Material Resources/Contraband:

- 1) What were some of the most desirable material possessions that people in there wanted to have (legal and illegal)? *What were some belongings that the guys wanted to have the most (legal and illegal)?*
- 2) What kinds of privileges did the guys who had these belongings have?
- 3) What types of trades occurred for these items? *Money, services, other goods?*
- 4) What did guys in that prison use for "money"? *What is the currency?*
- 5) Why do you think it is important to have these items in maximum-security prison?

Employment:

- 1) What types of jobs were available in there?
- 2) What types of jobs were preferred in that prison?
 - a. Why did guys want these jobs in there?
- 3) About how many guys held jobs in there?
- 4) How were the guys chosen for jobs there?
- 5) Did you have a job?

- 6) What does having a job mean to you?
- 7) Do you think it is important to have a job in maximum-security prisons? *How much value (importance, worth) was put upon having a job in that prison?*
 - b. If so, how was having a job in that prison important?
 - c. If not, why was it not important to have a job in that prison?
- 8) How did you think guys in there were seen who had a job?
- 9) How did you think guys in there were seen who did not have a job?

Emotions:

- 1) How were showing emotions viewed by other guys in there? *If you openly showed emotions, how did other guys see you? Positively? Negatively? Weak? Strong? Tough?*
- 2) Did you feel free to show your emotions to other guys in there?
 - a. If not, why didn't you feel free to show your emotions to other guys?
- 3) Did you feel free to show your emotions to staff?
 - b. If not, why didn't you feel free to show your emotions to staff?
- 4) If you did not show your emotions, how did you deal with holding your emotions in?
- 5) What emotions did you have that you may not have wanted other guys in there to know about?

Language:

- 1) Did you think it was important to use slang in that prison?
 - c. If so, how was using slang important in that prison?
 - d. If not, why was using slang in prison not important?
- 2) Were there any words that were used there that aren't used outside prison?
- 3) Did you think it was important to go along with what other guys were saying in there? *Maybe about another inmate, staff, or something someone else wanted you to do?*
 - e. If so, why did you think it was important to go along with what other guys were saying in that prison?
 - f. If not, why didn't you think it was important to go along with what other guys were saying in that prison?

Sports and Fitness:

- 1) Was it important to participate in sporting or fitness activities in that prison?
 - c. If yes, why did you think it was important to participate in sporting or fitness activities?
 - d. If no, why didn't you think it was important to participate in sporting or fitness activities?
- 2) What physical characteristics gave a person status (*rank, high social position*) in that prison?
- 3) Were any planned sports available for the guys to take part in there?

- 4) What informal sports did the guys participate in? *In other words, what sports did the guys play on their own, without any staff planning, such as weight lifting?*
 - e. If yes, what did you think the guys got out of participating in these activities?
 - f. If not, why did you think the guys did not participate in these activities?

Conclusion:

- 1) Is there anything else you would like to add or anything else you want me to know about life in a maximum-security prison that we haven't already talked about?

APPENDIX C

INFORMED CONSENT

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO

North Carolina Department of Correction

CONSENT TO ACT AS A HUMAN PARTICIPANT: LONG FORM

Project Title: Negotiating Masculinity Within Prison

Project Director: M. Kristen Hefner

Participant's Name: _____

DESCRIPTION AND EXPLANATION OF PROCEDURES:

You are being asked to take part in a study called, "Negotiating Masculinity Within Prison," conducted by M. Kristen Hefner, an MA student in the Department of Sociology at the University of North Carolina-Greensboro (UNCG).

The purpose of this study is to learn more about prison, prison life, and obstacles male inmates face while in prison. Participants are selected by criteria specific to the research project. The researcher provided a list of these criteria to the Department of Corrections, which then generated a list of appropriate participants who met these criteria. The researcher then selected participants from this list at random. The expected length of time of your participation is approximately one and a half to two hours. The interview will be audio-taped to make sure that the researcher has an accurate record of what took place and what the participants said.

During the course of this study, the following will occur: The participants will enter the interview room, and the informed consent form will be presented, explained, and signed. Information will be collected about the participants' experiences in prison through an oral interview. Participants will be encouraged to ask any questions about the research project itself or their participation and the researcher will address any concerns the participants may have. At the conclusion of the interview, the participants will be thanked for their time and provided a copy of the consent form.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS:

You will not benefit directly from taking part in this study. Neither your sentence nor your management by prison staff will change. Your answering questions may help people learn more about prison life and the obstacles inmates face while in prison. In addition, you will have the opportunity to speak about your own experiences in your own words.

The potential benefits of this study to society include helping people learn more about prison life and the obstacles inmates face while in prison.

The potential benefits to the Department of Correction include gaining information about how different prison settings influence inmate's behaviors and lives.

RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS:

This study poses minimal risks to research participants. The possible risk to you is that the interview may bring up feelings of anger or sadness as you discuss your prison experience. If you find yourself in distress, you can be referred to prison staff to talk about these feelings, if you feel that is necessary. However, all precautions have been made to reduce this risk as much as possible. Federal guidelines require that you be informed that no threat of physical harm or injury exists as a result of your participation in this study.

OPPORTUNITY TO ASK QUESTIONS:

At any point during the interview session, please feel free to stop if you have questions. Should you have questions following the session, please contact the Principal Investigator, M. Kristen Hefner, at UNCG Department of Sociology, 337 Graham Building, Greensboro, NC 27412

OPPORTUNITY TO WITHDRAW WITHOUT PENALTY:

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may decline to participate without penalty. If you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the study at any time. If you decide not to participate or to stop participating, you will be returned to your regular assignment as soon as possible. If you withdraw from the study before data collection is completed, your data will be destroyed. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your release date or parole eligibility. There is no reward to you if you take part. Your sentence will not change if you take part or if you do not take part in this study.

CONFIDENTIALITY:

All answers that you give will be kept confidential. There are several exceptions to this secrecy: if you seem suicidal, if you tell the researcher that you are thinking about hurting yourself, hurting someone else, planning an escape, plan to commit a crime in the future, or if you admit to unreported crimes committed while in prison, these matters are not a secret. You know that the researcher must pass this information on to the prison staff.

The investigator will be assigning each participant a pseudonym, or fake name, to ensure the confidentiality of your identity and your answers. Only the researcher will know which fake name matches which real name. The audio-tapes and transcripts from the interviews will be stored in a locked filing cabinet and will not be made available in their entirety to any other source other than the researcher. Transcripts also will be stored as computer files in the personal computer of the principal investigator, which is not open to public use, and these files will be password protected. In the event of a publication or presentation resulting from the research, no personally identifiable information will be made public. Upon completion of the principal investigator's MA thesis and any publications based on these data, the audio tapes and computer files will be erased, and the personally identifying information shredded. The transcriptions of the interviews will be kept in a locked file cabinet indefinitely.

Although every effort will be made to keep research records private, there may be times when federal or state law requires the disclosure of such records, including personal information. This is very unlikely, but if disclosure is ever required, the Department will take all steps allowable by law to protect the privacy of personal information.

The Department of Correction staff is not conducting this research project. They will not get a copy of your name or your answers. The Department will receive a copy of the overall results at the end of the study but will not be able to identify you personally from the copy they receive.

By signing this consent form, you agree that you understand the procedures and any risks and benefits involved in this research. You are free to refuse to participate or to withdraw your consent to participate in this research at any time without penalty or prejudice; your participation is entirely voluntary. Your privacy will be protected because you will not be identified by name as a participant in this project.

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro Institutional Review Board, which insures that research involving people follows federal regulations, has approved the research and this consent form. Questions regarding your rights as a participant in this project can be answered by contacting Mr. Eric Allen at UNCG Office of Research Compliance, 203 Foust Building, Greensboro, NC 27412. Questions regarding the research itself will be answered by Kristen Hefner at UNCG Department of Sociology, 337 Graham Building, Greensboro, NC 27412. If you have any unpleasant feelings following your participation, you may contact [directions specific to each institution]. Any new information that develops during the project will be provided to you if the information might affect your willingness to continue participation in the project.

By signing this form, you are agreeing to participate in the project described above.

Signature of Research Participant

Date

Printed Name of Research Participant

Signature of Research Investigator

Date

Printed Name of Research Investigator

APPENDIX D

SAMPLING CRITERIA

- 1) Race – Black and white inmates
- 2) Sex – Only male inmates will be studied
- 3) Number of study participants:
 - a. 5 black inmates who have served time in minimum-security only
 - b. 5 white inmates who have served time in minimum-security only
 - c. 5 black inmates who have served time in close (maximum) custody
 - d. 5 white inmates who have served time in close (maximum) custody
- 4) Number of pre-test participants:
 - a. 5 total from Dan River Prison Work Farm
- 5) Age – 20-42
- 6) Type of offense – Open to all offense types
- 7) Total length of sentence – Between 2 and 10 years for the current offense.
- 8) Prior incarcerations:
 - a. Inmates who will be examined from a minimum-security perspective must have no prior incarcerations within the state of North Carolina other than having served time at another facility for the same conviction due to the fact that this may distort their vision of this particular prison experience. I understand that prior incarcerations in other states or in a federal institution cannot be accounted for.
 - b. Inmates who will be examined from a maximum-security perspective must have been incarcerated in a close security institution for at least one year for any prior offense.
- 9) Length of incarceration prior to interview:
 - a. Inmates who will be examined from a minimum-security perspective should have been incarcerated in his current security level (minimum) for at least one year.
 - b. Inmates who will be examined from a close custody standpoint must have been incarcerated in close custody for at least one year at some point prior to being transferred to [minimum-security institution].
- 10) Treatment vs. No Treatment (drug treatment, extensive counseling, etc) – Inmates can have gone through treatment while incarcerated.

APPENDIX E

PARTICIPANT RECRUITMENT LETTER

Date

Participant Name

Address 1

Address 2

Dear _____:

I am a graduate student at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro (UNCG) studying prisons, prison life, and some of the obstacles male inmates face while in prison.

A preliminary review of your prison records suggests you may be eligible to participate in a research study related to these topics. The study consists of a face to face interview or discussion. During the course of this study, this is what you can expect to occur: First, you will be presented with a consent form (or permission form) which will be explained to you in detail. You will be encouraged to ask any questions about the research project or your participation in it and I will address any concerns you may have. If you decide to participate, you will sign the consent form. You will then be asked about your experiences in prison in an oral interview. At the end of the interview, you will be given a copy of the consent form. The interview will last about two hours and will involve just one visit with you at your institution.

All answers that you give will be kept private or confidential. There are limits to this confidentiality, however. If you report that you plan to harm yourself or anyone else, or if you report that you are planning an escape, if you report that you are planning to commit a crime in the future, that information must be passed on to the appropriate authorities.

It is important that you know you will not benefit directly from taking part in this study. Neither your sentence nor your supervision by prison staff will change. Your participation and answering these questions may help researchers learn more about prison life and the obstacles inmates face while in prison. In addition, you will have the opportunity to speak about your own experiences in your own words.

This study poses minimal risks to you as a participant. The possible risk to you is that the interview may bring up unpleasant feelings as you discuss your prison experience. If you find yourself in distress, you can ask to be referred to mental health staff to talk about these feelings.

The NC Department of Correction is *not* conducting this research project. They will not get a copy of your name as a participant or your answers. The Department will receive a copy of the overall results compiled at the end of the study, but will not be able to identify you personally from the information they receive.

Participating in this research is voluntary. You may refuse to participate without penalty. And even if you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the study at any time. If you decide not to participate or you should stop participating, you will be returned to your regular assignment as soon as possible. If you stop the study before the interview is finished, all information connected with your interview will be destroyed. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your release date or parole eligibility.

If you are interested in participating in this study, please send the enclosed form via inside mail to the mental health office at your facility. If you decide to take part in this study, there will be a delay before you are contacted again about it. Further, only a certain number of participants may be interviewed for the study. Therefore, only the participants who respond first will be chosen to participate. Being selected for the study is based only on the responses received the earliest. If you are not contacted, the needed number of participants already has been reached.

Kristen Hefner

Name: _____

DOC #: _____

Yes, I will participate in this study. I understand that I will not receive any benefits for my participation and that my participation is completely voluntary. I also understand that only a certain number of participants are needed for the study and therefore, I may not be contacted if that number is reached before I respond.

No, I do not want to participate in this study.

Please mark one box and return to:

[Location specific to each institution]

APPENDIX F

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION APPROVAL

**North Carolina Department of Correction
Research Certification**



Project Title: Negotiating Masculinity Within Prison

Principal Investigator: Kristen Hefner, UNC-G Graduate Student

Project Number: 0606-02

Date of Certification: 04/29/08

This letter certifies that the project noted above has been reviewed and received approval for merit, human subjects protection, and Divisional authorization. This letter of certification enumerates the allowable research activities and sites. If an activity is not specified in this letter, it is not allowed. The DOC reference number must be used on all correspondence.

Research activities may commence only after the Principal Investigator has arranged for access with contacts. The following staff are the departmental contact(s) who will work with you on this project:
David Edwards, MRP at R&P; Michael Conley, PhD, DOP Piedmont Regional Office; Amanda Cobb, Assistant Superintendent, Dan River PWF

The Principal Investigator must retain an original copy of this letter of certification. It is the only accepted means of authorizing access to research subjects. The investigator should show the letter to staff contacts and must do so when requested. This letter of certification expires on 2009-04-21

While the department will contact the Principal Investigator 3 months in advance of the approval expiration as a reminder, the Principal Investigator is responsible for renewing the approval of the research, both with the NC Department of Correction and with his/her institution's IRB. The request for renewal is specified in Policy I-D.

The following is a list of the approved research activities and the specific facilities where activities are to be conducted:
See attached document

Signed: [Signature]
Research Merit Panel Chairperson

Date: 4/29/08

Signed: [Signature]
Human Subjects Review Committee Chairperson

Date: 4/29/08

Signed: [Signature]
Divisional Authorization Authority

Date: 4/30/08

Recruiting Participants

- The researcher will present the sampling criteria to North Carolina's DOC who will, in turn, produce a list of potential participants who meet the criteria set forth by the researcher.
- The researcher will then mail participant recruitment letters to each potential participant identified by North Carolina's DOC. As stated in the recruitment letters, each potential participant who agrees to participate will be instructed to check the appropriate box and return the form to Dr. Michael Conley at the prison's medical facility. Dr. Conley will subsequently contact the researcher regarding the individuals who agreed to participate.
- The researcher will contact Amanda Cobb, Assistant Superintendent for Programs, at Dan River Prison Work Farm, with the names of the participants who will take part in the study. Mrs. Cobb has agreed to coordinate the interview times between the researcher and the participants.

Interviews at Dan River Prison Work Farm

During each interview, the following will occur:

- The participant will enter the interview room, and the informed consent form will be presented, explained, and signed. Each participant will be offered a copy of the consent form for their records.
- Information will be collected about the participants' experiences in prison through an audiotaped oral interview (there is written permission). Each participant will be encouraged to ask any questions about the research project itself or their

APPENDIX G

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO IRB APPROVAL FOR PILOT STUDY



THE UNIVERSITY of NORTH CAROLINA
GREENSBORO

Office of Research Compliance

2718 Hall for Humanities and Research Administration
PO Box 26170, Greensboro, NC 27402-6170
336.256.1482 Phone 336.256.1482 Fax
www.uncg.edu/orc/

May 14, 2007

Ms. Kristen Hefner
In care of Dr. Sandra Westervelt
Sociology
337 Graham Building
Refer to: IRB No.067036

Dear Ms. Hefner,

As required by University policy the UNCG IRB has reviewed your research protocol entitled "Negotiating Masculinity Within Prison" (IRB No. 067036) as permitted under UNCG's Federal Wide Assurance (FWA 00000216). Your above minimal risk protocol has been approved by the Full Board.

Contingencies

- This approval is only for the pilot interviews. The full sample must be approved through the Department of Corrections and UNCG IRB which must be submitted as a modification application for review and approval prior to implementation

You should be aware that any changes in your protocol must be approved by the IRB prior to being implemented. Likewise, any problems, complaints or injuries that arise during the course of your project which involves human participants must be reported promptly to the Office of Research Compliance. The approved stamped informed consent form is attached. This version must be used when obtaining informed consent as outlined in this protocol but stamp does not need to appear on the form.

This research protocol is valid for one year and will expire on 9-26-07. You will receive a continuing review form to keep this protocol active prior to its anniversary date. Thank you for your cooperation on this matter and best wishes on your project.

Sincerely,

Eric Allen, Director
Office of Research Compliance

Cc:

APPENDIX H

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO IRB APPROVAL
FOR FULL SCALE STUDY



THE UNIVERSITY of NORTH CAROLINA
GREENSBORO

Office of Research Compliance

2718 Beverly Cooper Moore and Irene Mitchell Moore
Humanities and Research Administration Building
PO Box 26170, Greensboro, NC 27402-6170
336.256.1462 Phone 336.256.1482 Fax
www.uncg.edu/orc/

May 16, 2008

Dr. Sandra Westervelt
Sociology
337 Graham
Refer to: IRB No: 067036

Dear Dr. Westervelt,

As required by University policy a member of the UNCG IRB has reviewed and approved your modification application to the protocol entitled "Negotiating Masculinity within Prison" (IRB No. 067036). This modification allows or grants:

- Change in Procedure—two interview schedules will be used: deletion of the word "inmate" from interview protocol; Concluding question added permitting participants to make additional statements; space provided on recruitment letter for participant identification information; specification added to recruitment letter clarifying that those selected for interview will be notified, if no notification, not selected; line added to recruitment letter for information of returning response sheet
- Change in Sampling Criteria—five white and five black inmates serving time only in minimum security prisons will be used for study; certain participants must have been incarcerated in a close custody institution for at least one year for prior offenses; inmates being examined about their maximum security experiences need to have been incarcerated in setting for at least one year; stipulation that sampling criteria will not be gathered from prison farms or work release programs is no longer valid
- Change in Consent Form—reflects changes in procedure

You should be aware that any other changes in your protocol must be approved by the IRB prior to being implemented. Likewise, any unanticipated problems, complaints or adverse events that arise during the course of your project which involves human participants must be reported promptly to the Office of Research Compliance. The changes in this modification are valid for the duration of the study unless other changes are approved which circumvent this modification application approval. Thank you for your cooperation on this matter and best wishes on your project.

Sincerely,


Eric Allen, Director
Office of Research Compliance
Cc: