



**PENETRATING THE FENCES:
A GENDER ANALYSIS OF THE PRISON**

by Francine Pinnuck

BA (Monash), Grad Dip Ed (ICE), BSW (Monash), MA (Adelaide)

**A thesis presented for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy**

Department of Social Inquiry

University of Adelaide

August, 1999

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	vi
DECLARATION	viii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ix
Chapter	Page
1 INTRODUCTION	1
Setting the context	1
Theoretical directions	4
Overview	8
2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE	11
Section 1: Investigating the modern prison	13
Making the body docile	18
Section 2: Explorations of the experience of woman as criminal and prisoner	25
The quest for women-friendly prisons	32
Drug Use: Differences between men and women prisoners	33
Prisoner mental health	36
Prisoners as mothers	37
Sexual assault in men's and women's prisons	42
Gender and prisoner misconduct	44
Sex in women's prisons	45
Section 3: The prison and masculinity	47
Causes of men's crime	48

Chapter	Page	
3	METHODOLOGY	56
	The research method and tools	56
	Difficulties conducting the research	63
	The interviews	65
	The interview schedule	68
	Validity of the research	70
4	THE MEN'S PRISON	72
	Section 1: Learning to be a real criminal	73
	Youth Training Centres	73
	Doing crime	75
	The all-male criminal family	83
	Women prison officers	90
	Young men's initiation into prison	93
	Changes in prison: Drugs and disloyalty to The Code	102
	Section 2: Policing boundaries between protection and mainstream	108
	Protected men: The Other to criminal masculinity	109
	The gaze: The panopticon and masculinity	112
	Child sex offenders: The Other to dominant heterosexual masculinity	117
	Rape in the men's prison	130
	Men's prison summary	137

Chapter	Page
5 THE WOMEN'S PRISON	139
The female criminal	139
First experience in prison	143
Violence in the women's prison	150
Rape in the women's prison	153
Reforming the wayward	156
Inside and outside support	161
Support for Nunga prisoners	165
Building a community: The Living Skills Unit	167
Finding support in high security	168
Relationships with prison officers	168
The gaze on women prisoners	181
Styles of conflict resolution	184
Mothering from prison	194
Marking the body	202
Women's prison summary	213
6 CONCLUSIONS: GENDER AND TECHNIQUES OF POWER	216
Gender: The Invisible Technique of Power	216
Medication and gender	216
The multiple gazes	218
Criminal masculinity: A technique of power	221
Women prisoners different rather than The Other	225
Implications and challenges	229
The key reform challenge	231

APPENDICES	232
Appendix A: Interview schedules for prisoners	232
Appendix B: Interview schedules for prison officers and staff	235
Appendix C: Interview schedules for professional staff	237
Appendix D: Glossary	239
Appendix E: Letters to prisons	247
Appendix F: Consent form	249
Appendix G: Participant information sheet	250
BIBLIOGRAPHY	251

ABSTRACT

This thesis explores the prison experiences of female and male prisoners. The study aims to record and analyse the ways in which prisoners represent their experiences behind the wall. To do this, the study has involved in-depth interviews with 100 prisoners or ex-prisoners. Specifically, 54 male prisoners from Yatala Labour Prison and 38 women prisoners from Adelaide Women's Prison in Adelaide, South Australia were interviewed. Interviews conducted with a further six male and two female ex-prisoners from South Australia and Victoria have also been included. All the male prisoners interviewed at Yatala Labour Prison were maximum security prisoners. Fifteen of the 38 women interviewed were low security prisoners accommodated in the Living Skills Units at Adelaide Women's Prison. The study also draws on 53 interviews conducted with prison staff from Yatala Labour Prison and Adelaide Women's Prison. Forty of the 53 interviews were with prison officers, and the remainder were with professional staff and managers.

This thesis reviews previous studies and understandings of 'the prison' and prisoners' experiences, and it compares and contrasts these studies and understandings with insights gained from the interviews conducted with prisoners in South Australia.

The existing literature provides a starting point from which 'the prison' and prisoners' experiences can be analysed. While previous studies have established that women prisoners' experiences of prison are often traumatic, the task for this research is to explore the extent to which this trauma is likened to existing understandings of 'the prison', and 'the prisoner' both in legal and popular discourse. This thesis provides new understandings about the culture of 'the prison'. Through its interrogation of the French philosopher Michel Foucault's thesis of penalty and the analysis of interviews with prisoners, it explores the different ways in which gender operates in men's and women's prisons as a core technique of power.

Furthermore the thesis investigates the meaning of masculinity for criminality and how a specific form of masculinity is inscribed in the language and understandings of what constitutes a 'real criminal'. In so doing, this study provides new understandings about the ways in which a particular form of criminal masculinity is sustained, especially in the face of increasing female imprisonment.

DECLARATION

This work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference is made in the text.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being available for loan and photo copying.

Francine Pinnuck

Date:

1 December 1999

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are many people who have assisted, supported and encouraged me to complete this thesis. They have done this in different ways and I am deeply grateful to them. In particular I want to thank:

Dr Margie Ripper from the Department of Social Inquiry at The University of Adelaide. I owe a special debt of gratitude for Margie's superb supervision and intellectual rigour and support. Margie's encouragement and belief in my ability from the beginning to the end of this project has been unwavering and indeed crucial.

Similarly, I am most appreciative of the assistance of Dr Lynda Burn from the Philosophy Department at Flinders University. With Margie, Lynda provided excellent supervision in the final year of my candidature. I am most grateful for her interest in reading my work, and for her challenging and informative feedback.

Diego Natale who has lived this thesis with me and never failed to encourage and believe in me; I am more than grateful.

The former Chief Executive Officer of South Australian Correctional Services, Ms Sue Vardon, along with the Managers of Adelaide Women's Prison and Yatala Labour Prison, for granting me permission to conduct this research in the South Australian prison system.

To all the men and women who volunteered to be part of this research. Without the participation and support of inmates, officers and program staff from Yatala

and Adelaide Women's Prison, I would not have been able to complete my research. For this I am most grateful.

The staff and postgraduate students from the Department of Social Inquiry at The University of Adelaide for their interest and encouragement. Additionally to Norma Nitschke for her support.

Finally, this thesis is dedicated to Frank (1952–1994). He was instrumental in my decision to write this thesis. His input and knowledge of prisons was an enormous help.

Each of my works is
part of my biography

Michel Foucault

(from an interview with Michel Foucault in Martin, et al. 1982:11).

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION



Setting the context

This thesis is entitled *Penetrating the Fences: A Gender Analysis of The Prison*. 'Penetrating the Fences' is an expression which gained significance for this study of gender relationships within the prison from the moment I read the sign affixed to the perimeter wire of Yatala Labour Prison in Adelaide, South Australia. The sign read: *Do not penetrate this perimeter. Armed officers patrol this area*. Not only is the masculine image of penetration at the centre of my study, but the necessity to penetrate the 'fences' of the prison has been a driving force in my research.

The prison has emerged as an object of attention and criticism in the work of a range of feminist and non-feminist scholars including philosophers, sociologists and criminologists. However, among this diverse body of material, surprisingly little research has been undertaken which interrogates the very different experiences of men and women prisoners. In particular there is a paucity of research which adequately investigates the gendered effects that the different prison experiences have on and in prisoners' bodies. Additionally there has been very little research which explores the impact of the prison experience on identity or well-being.

While feminist criminologists have questioned and exposed the difficulties that women prisoners commonly experience, there is nevertheless considerable research within criminology which continues to accept that 'the prison' and the criminal are masculine. Australian criminologist Kerry Carrington suggests that there is merit in arguments such as that put forward by Judith Allen that feminist criminology has generally not forced criminology to 'confront its sex question in relation to the male sex' (Carrington, 1990a: 15; Allen, 1989: 23). Similarly, my approach in this study of men's and women's prison experiences has been shaped by feminist concerns about the 'man question' in criminology and in particular by the popular cultural

representation of male criminals as exciting heroes and women criminals as wayward and pathetic. Indeed in this thesis, sociological and feminist theories about the construction of masculinity and femininity have been utilised to develop understandings about the prison. Specifically they have provided an important point from which to begin to interpret and understand the culture and function of the prison as well as meanings of criminality and imprisonment for the men and women concerned.

The aim of this research is to investigate the culture and function of the prison by analysing men and women prisoners' accounts of their experiences of prison. There is unfortunately a lack of research which examine the different cultures within the men's and women's prisons. In most studies researchers have sought the attitudes and experiences of male prisoners only, a practice I will not repeat. A pitfall in seeking the perceptions of only male prisoners and then reaching conclusions about all prisoners lies in the failure to anticipate that women may not have the same lived experiences of prison and of being criminal.

The key objective has been to develop understandings about the complex ways in which the prison participates in the construction of gender and criminality. In particular I am analysing the way in which the prison makes possible some forms of gendered criminal identity. From my experience of having worked in men's and women's prisons I suspected that there was something about the gendered nature of the prison environment that was a contributing factor to what seemed to be the very different prison experiences of men and women prisoners. In order to develop these understandings, I made the decision to study the whole prison. I needed to study the whole prison and in particular to explore the various ways in which the prison is a site for the construction and reproduction of both gender and criminality.

In order to achieve the aim and objectives of the thesis, I needed to record the lived experiences of men and women prisoners, but also that of prison officers and others

working in the prison. There are several reasons why I decided to interview men and women prisoners and staff. Among these reasons is that interviews provide a rare opportunity to 'hear' the voices of those who are living the experience.

Interviewing men and women prisoners and staff allows for greater examination of the culture and function of the prison. Additionally a study like this one provides an insight into the different ways in which men and women prisoners experience the culture of the prison. This is an important issue to consider because the interviews provide an insight into the ways in which the prison itself operates in the construction of gender and criminality through its management of time, space, drug usage and prisoners' relationships within and outside the prison.

This thesis explores why among men and women prisoners there are different experienced meanings of prison, prisoner and criminal. Although past research has established that men and women prisoners experience prison differently (Howes, 1994 Carrington, 1990a), there has been very little research which investigates the factors which constitute and reproduce this difference. This study has been able to elicit understandings about the structures and mechanisms of power and how these various forms are exercised and maintained in the prison. It also develops new understandings about the ways in which criminality is constructed and maintained both within and outside the prison and how gender impacts on the prison experience.

This study also investigates the ways in which men and women adapt to being in prison. There are a number of studies which suggest that women are traumatised when separated from their children and that they receive less outside support than do male prisoners (Clark, 1995; Hairston, 1991; Larman & Aungles; 1991, Fishman, 1988; Genders & Players, 1986). Additionally there are studies that focus on the inside support that women prisoners form among themselves (Mawby, 1987). I want to examine the different forms of support for men and women prisoners and in particular

investigate whether male are more or less likely than women prisoners to create 'homes' and 'family' environments within the prison.

Theoretical directions

Whilst this study has involved recording the lived experiences of men and women prisoners and others working in the prison, it has also enabled me to test some of the key theorists working in the areas of criminology, philosophy and gender studies. In particular the study tests the French philosopher Michel Foucault's thesis on surveillance, docility and the notion that institutions such as the prison are a crystallisation of the wider society (1982:222). Foucault and others such as the American sociologist Erving Goffman provide comprehensive descriptions of 'the prison', however all their work is gender blind. In this thesis I want to address the issue of gender and in particular explore the prison as a site for the construction and reproduction of distinctive forms of masculinity, femininity and criminality.

Whilst Foucault's work has clearly influenced the theoretical direction of the thesis, my interest in the research project was stimulated by my observation that men and women experience prison in different ways. My major concern was that women prisoners have, in the main, been overlooked or not considered to have contributed in any fundamental way to understandings about prisons and prisoners. The thesis therefore challenges Foucault's androcentric analysis because it has ignored both women and gender as a technique of power within the prison. I do not assume that there is a genderless, universal prisoner body. In contrast my study produces very different understandings of 'the prison experience' to those of Foucault and Goffman simply because it includes men's and women's lived experiences.

Despite Foucault's gender blindness, there are several areas of his work that I find useful and have drawn from in developing the theoretical direction of this thesis. I use the Foucauldian notion of the prison as a key contributing factor in the production and

perpetuation of criminality. Additionally his analysis of the body as a key site of power has provided the study with a starting point from which to investigate the effects various techniques of power have on men and women prisoners' bodies.

The thesis takes up and interrogates the Foucauldian assumption that one of the core disciplinary techniques, the panopticon gaze, has the same effect in and on the bodies of all prisoners. In challenging this assumption, the thesis explores the ways in which the different techniques of power are used and documents the effects they produce, and asks whether the internalisation of the various gazes causes particular types of gendered prisoner bodies.

The thesis seeks to identify the main foci of power in men's and women's prisons and in doing so will take up and use Foucault's concept of surveillance being a 'painless penalty' (1977a: 138). I find Foucault to be particularly useful in his analysis of the ways in which the modern form of surveillance produces a number of effects on the bodies of prisoners. One of these key effects is that individuals are induced to a state of conscious and permanent visibility. It is the various forms of surveillance and the impact of them that the thesis interrogates. Indeed Foucault's analysis of surveillance provides me with a theoretical framework from which to analyse how identity is constructed and how power is maintained and reproduced in the prison and in the broader society.

In addition to this, Foucault's work has helped me in developing more complex understandings about how discipline is internalised to produce what Foucault refers to as 'docile bodies' (1977a: 138). Foucault's work on the ways in which the prisoner's body is made docile has impacted on the theoretical direction I have taken in the thesis. The ways in which the thesis expands Foucault's analysis of docility and delinquency is in its examination of the gendered ways in which both the docile and delinquent prisoner are made possible. The inclusion of and examination of the impact of the gendered prisoner body is one of the crucial differences between my work and

Foucault's. After establishing this, the thesis investigates the extent to which the different disciplinary techniques of power produce different effects in and on men and women prisoners' bodies.

One of the key areas that the thesis investigates is that of space and the marking of the body within particular spaces. Again I apply Foucault and British moral philosopher Jeremy Bentham's awareness of the important role architecture has in the prison. However I extend this analysis to include both literal and metaphorical 'spaces' available to the prison, prison staff and prisoners. I suspect that the use of particular spaces within the prison has significant meanings in terms of prisoners' identities. The thesis therefore explores how both physical and metaphorical spaces are used within the prison and how prisoners' bodies are marked by the particular cultural space they occupy.

Australian feminist philosopher Elizabeth Grosz's work on space being both psychic and physical has helped shape the theoretical direction this thesis has taken. Whilst Grosz's work is on a more abstract level, her particular emphasis on the ways in which bodies are marked according to their cultural and gender requirements is an analysis that I find particularly effective in analysing the various ways in which prisoners bodies are marked according to the space they occupy (1994: 142).

Additionally I find useful Grosz's suggestion that men appropriate space to effect their own self-representations (1995:121). I take up this point of Grosz's and explore the extent to which the space one occupies makes possible some identities and subjectivities and at the same time prevents others. In particular the thesis will not only investigate how space functions within the prison, but also the particular ways in which men and women prisoners occupy and experience these different physical and metaphorical spaces.

Another key influence on the direction this thesis has taken has been the work of the French existentialist Simone de Beauvoir. The thesis uses the notion of 'the Other' as developed by de Beauvoir in her work *The Second Sex*. In particular the thesis will examine who occupies the position of what de Beauvoir calls 'the Subject' and who is 'the Other' in the prison (1975:16). It will also tease out whether women prisoners can ever really occupy either of these positions.

Australian sociologist Robert Connell's work on masculinities has helped shape the theoretical direction this thesis has taken. I find particularly useful his social constructionist position of analysing gender and criminality which includes his examination of the ways in which particular forms of masculinity are constructed and maintained. Connell's argument that masculinity is something that has to be made and performed is particularly relevant to this thesis' examination of the ways in which those who do not perform a particular form of masculinity experience prison (1995:77). As Connell states:

A great deal of crime makes sense only when it is seen as a resource for the making of gender, and in most cases that means it is a strategy of masculinity. (1993: xi)

In investigating Connell's assertion, the thesis seeks to develop understandings about the ways in which prisoners 'perform' gender. By putting gender at the centre of the performance of criminality and making criminality central to the performance of gender, it is possible to trace the dimensions of the particular forms of masculinity and femininity available within and reproduced by prisons.

Overview

Prisoners bring to the prison experience their own characteristics and attitudes which are a result of their own accumulated life histories. However, it is hypothesised that the lived experiences of men and women prisoners are very different. It is postulated that these differences bring with them major implications in the ways in which both groups experience prison.

Penetrating the Fences: A Gender Analysis of The Prison examines the lived experiences of 60 male and 40 female prisoners, and 53 prison workers, of whom 40 were prison officers. Face to face interviews, participant observation and keeping detailed field notes were the main methods used to obtain material for this study.

Penetrating the Fences: A Gender Analysis of The Prison has, including this introduction, six chapters. The second chapter reviews and provides an analysis of Australian and international scholarship relevant to prison culture and prisoner experience. The most striking feature to emerge from the literature is that whilst past research has established that men and women prisoners experience prison differently (Howes, 1994) Carrington, 1990a), there has been very little research which investigates the factors which constitute and reproduce this difference.

The literature review examines the work of philosophers including Michel Foucault and in particular his analysis of penality as outlined in *Discipline and Punish*. Other work addressed includes the British eighteenth-century moral philosopher Jeremy Bentham's design of the panopticon, French existentialist Simone de Beauvoir's proposition on woman as The Other and man as The Subject and Australian Elizabeth Grosz's work on space. The work of a number of 'classical' sociologists of penality is analysed including that of Erving Goffman in his investigation of total institutions; Clemmer in his 1958 American study entitled *The Prison Community*; labelling theorists including American Howard Becker and scholars' work on masculinity and

gender including Australian sociologist Robert Connell, Joachim Kersten and British feminist Carol Smart. Also included is an analysis of the scholarship of a number of criminologists including Scottish academic Pat Carlen, Australian feminists Adrian Howe and Kerry Carrington, and American Lorraine Gelsthorpe, all of whom provide, to varying degrees, an analysis of gender.

Chapter 3 describes the research project itself, including the methods employed in selecting the participants. This study has adopted a qualitative research framework to study the experiences of men and women prisoners and has created data which is both rich and complex, and derived from the subjects themselves.

Chapters 4 and 5 offer an analysis of the material gained from interviews and discussions with male and female prisoners and prison staff in South Australia. In Chapter 4 the men's prison is reconsidered in the light of the gender power at work within it. Specifically I analyse the ways in which male prisoners 'do' prison. In doing this, I examine the various 'rituals' of initiation and the ways in which particular forms of heterosexual masculinity are entrenched, celebrated and legitimated by both the prisoners and prison authorities. Additionally an investigation of the ways in which crime is a physical manifestation of masculinity in that it allows men a particular way of 'doing' gender is provided.

In Chapter 5 the women's prison is similarly investigated. I challenge understandings about the prisoner body being universal and not marked by gender, age or race. An analysis is provided of 'woman' as a shifting subject rather than a homogeneous group. Further to this, the chapter explores what has been an ongoing dilemma for feminists: the issue of women criminals being positioned as victims. I examine whether women are positioned within the prison as the undesirable 'Other' both to real (masculine) criminality and to real femininity. My particular focus is the gendered effects the positioning of women prisoners has on and in their bodies.

An analysis is provided of the ways in which women internalise perceptions that they are 'failed' mothers. I examine the particular ways in which they physically and metaphorically mark their bodies to alleviate the pain of not being able to mother. In addition I explore the ways in which women maintain a home or identity that extends beyond the prison and particularly in relation to child-mother relationships.

The final chapter draws together and discusses the implications of the major findings of the study for scholarship on penalty and on gender. I suggest that there are particular forms of behaviour that are consistent with the culture of the men's prisons and dominant heterosexual masculinity but which are considered an anathema in women's prisons. I discuss the advantages of women adhering to the cultural norms of femininity in that it has the effect of providing them with other 'real' and 'achievable' subjectivities such as 'real' and 'good' mothers. Additionally, management implications that arise from the thesis are outlined, and suggestions for further research made.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter will examine Australian and international research into prison culture and prisoner experience, and in doing so, will document the broad picture of prison culture which has been developed by previous researchers. It will also demonstrate the need for further analysis, informed by coherent theoretical frameworks, to find new understandings of men's and women's prison experiences.

Studies of prisoners have focused on issues of criminality, privatisation, violence, drug and alcohol abuse and the enforcement of stereotyped notions of men and women prisoners. The majority of studies on prisoners have used large scale questionnaire surveys (Craddock, 1996; Bonta, Pang & Wallace-Capretta, 1995; Culbertson & Fortune, 1986). While these studies do provide a broad picture of issues arising from prison practices and culture, their research methodology restricts them from addressing the issues in depth. The exceptions to this have been those scholars who have used interviews and questionnaires, and sought to investigate the culture of the prison and the experience of men and women prisoners. These scholars are almost exclusively feminists from the disciplines of social work, criminology, sociology and history (Smart, 1995; Eastaer, 1994; Gow, 1994; Carlen, 1993; Howe, 1994, 1996; George, 1993; Cain, 1990; Chesney-Lind, 1989; Brown, Kramer & Quinn, 1988; Miner & Gorta, 1987; Clark, 1979).

In order to address these different literatures systematically this chapter is divided into three sections. In the first section, which is entitled 'Investigating the modern prison', I will examine the work of philosophers, sociologists and criminologists who have contributed to understandings of the prison.

The second section is entitled 'Explorations of the experience of woman as criminal and prisoner'. Here I examine the literature on the way in which prison culture has

evolved and is sustained. I also analyse the gendered assumptions of non-feminist research on women prisoners.

In the third section of this chapter entitled 'The prison and masculinity', I will examine the literature that explores the ways in which meanings of gender are played out in the prison.

Section 1: Investigating the modern prison

One of the first sociological studies of prison life was Clemmer's work entitled *The Prison Community* (1958) which was compiled from interviews with male prisoners at Illinois State Penitentiary, in the 1930s. The most significant aspect of Clemmer's study is the way in which he describes the power structures operating within the American prison. While recognising the power that the prison authorities exercise, Clemmer also highlighted the way in which prisoners create a power hierarchy. He identified that race, sexual preference (homosexual or heterosexual) and disposition (masculine or effeminate) are important factors in the maintenance of order in the prisoner community (Clemmer, 1958: 299). Clemmer used the term 'prisonization' to denote what he defined as male prisoners 'taking on in greater or lesser degrees the folkways, mores, customs and general culture of the penitentiary' (1958: 299). In contrast to the position taken in later work by American sociologist Erving Goffman, Clemmer argued that the effects of imprisonment on the prisoner were likely to be permanent, to the point that they would find it difficult to lead a law-abiding life outside prison.

Goffman's work, and in particular his study published in 1961 entitled *Asylums*, in which he put forward the concept of the 'total institution', made a significant contribution to early sociological analysis of the prison system. He described a total institution as 'a place of residence and work where a large number of like-situated individuals, cut off from the wider society for an appreciable period of time, together lead an enclosed, formally administered round of life' (Goffman, 1961: xiii). In his discussion on total institutions, among which he includes the prison, Goffman argues that the interpretative scheme of the total institution begins to operate as soon as the inmate enters. He writes that the 'entrance [to the total institution] is *prima facie* evidence that one must be the kind of person the institution was set up to handle' (Goffman, 1961: 84). Goffman identifies barriers that are erected between the prisoner and the outside world when an individual is admitted to a total institution as the means

of creating and sustaining a 'particular kind of tension between the home world and the institutional world' (1961: 13). While I agree with Goffman's argument that the persistent tension between the 'home world' and the 'institutional world' is used as a management strategy by the prison (1961: 13), his analysis is limited. There is a need to explore the gendered effect of the ways in which this tension is experienced by men and women prisoners. My contention is that the difference between the home and institution makes the prison experience harder for female prisoners and non-criminality harder for male prisoners. In particular, I will be investigating whether there is a coherent, unified identity for all prisoners or whether they experience multiple and incompatible gendered subjectivities.

In his discussion of the impact of the total institution on the self, Goffman suggests that the subjugation and humiliation of the inmates is a common feature of prison culture. While he argues that subjugation and humiliation take the form of both physical and psychological invasions, the most significant of these are said to be not the physical, but rather the other losses incurred on admission to a total institution (Goffman, 1961: 18). I too am interested in exploring what men and women prisoners feel to be the losses incurred through being in prison.

Goffman's work has similarities with Foucault's in that they both refer to the way in which total institutions invade the self and 'strike the individual's soul'. However, there are major differences between them. For example, Goffman identifies the structures of the prison and the practices of humiliation as leading to curtailment of 'the self'. The implication is that the prison has total power over the prisoners, which is damaging to prisoners' identities through its brutal and humiliating practice. If a more humane face were implemented within the institution and if humiliating practices were eradicated, it would follow that the negative effects on identity could be prevented. Goffman asserts that the effect of imprisonment is not permanent, and that 'after the release the inmate forgets a great deal of what life was like on the inside and learned negative feelings from the inside are weakened' (1961: 66). Indeed Goffman's

assessment of the impact of the prison experience on individuals now appears somewhat simplistic. Goffman's model of power is consistent with theories of the time, where power was conceptualised as being coercive, total and held over prisoners by those in authority. However, his externalised concept of power limits the analysis of surveillance as being both internalised and externalised. Specifically his analysis discounts the indelible impact that permanent surveillance has on the body and mind of the prisoner.

The panopticon developed by British eighteenth-century moral philosopher Jeremy Bentham, marks the beginning of controlling and disciplining the body without using physical force or violence. In his 1787 *Panopticon Letters* Bentham outlines some of the key aspects of the modern prison, and in particular the use of total surveillance as an effective, easy and humane exercise of power (Bozovic, 1995: 35). For Bentham, the architectural design of the prison was crucial in providing prison authorities with the ability to exercise total surveillance over the prisoners. For example, he stipulated that the panopticon building was to be circular and the rooms the prisoners occupy were to be called cells. The cells were to be divided from one another with prisoners having no means of communication with each other; they would have a window and a door with an iron grating. The apartment or the 'inspector's lodge' would be in the centre of the building in order to maximise surveillance with the minimum risk to staff from unchained prisoners (Bentham in Bozovic, 1995: 35–6).

Bentham's panopticon was designed to enable the inspector's or prison officer's gaze to observe all activity. Specifically, Bentham developed new understandings about technologies of power and, in particular, the penetrative power of surveillance through 'the gaze' of the jailer. He posited that the knowledge by prisoners that they are under constant surveillance directly controls and suppresses rule-breaking behaviour as there is an implicit fear of the consequences of detection. Of significance is that Bentham's panopticon had the effect of establishing a new economy of power, a normalising disciplinary power which could be more efficiently distributed and incur less cost in

both economic and political terms. In his text *Discipline and Punish* Michele Foucault explains that one of the effects of the unseen gaze is that the prisoner is always aware that he/she is being watched and, as a consequence, maintains a state of self-surveillance resulting in the discipline being internalised (1977a: 195–6). There is no need for displays of physical force or violence because the subject of surveillance disciplines him/herself. The power of the gaze to effect change is strengthened because it is desubjectified or detached from its bearer.

In his discussion on the history of penality, Foucault identifies a defining moment when the principle was established that punishment should 'strike the soul rather than the body'. He explains: 'the expiation that once rained down upon the body must be replaced by a punishment that acts in depth on the heart, the thoughts, the will, the inclinations' (Foucault, 1977a: 6). For Foucault, striking the soul or the non-corporal marked the beginning of the criminal justice system biting into what he refers to as 'this bodiless reality' (1977a: 17). He writes: 'this real, non-corporal soul is not a substance, it is the element in which are articulated the effects of a certain type of power and the reference of a certain type of knowledge, the machinery by which the power relations give rise to a possible corpus of knowledge, and knowledge extends and reinforces the effects of this power' (Foucault, 1977: 29).

While Foucault provides a useful conceptual framework for understanding how self-surveillance occurs, his analysis is androcentric and ignores the ways in which the gaze manifests in the bodies of prisoners in different and gender-specific ways. Specifically, he presumes a genderless, universal prisoner 'soul' and does not consider that the same techniques of surveillance may have different impacts on women and men. Despite his neglect of gender as a significant issue in the meaning of being a criminal/prisoner, his work on the importance of the body as a site of power, along with his emphasis on the sexual body as a target and vehicle of power, are useful to this thesis in several ways. I am interested in the ways in which surveillance is a penalty free of physical pain, yet it induces in individuals a state of conscious and

permanent visibility. I will investigate the ways in which 'painless penalties' such as unceasing surveillance are implemented. In doing this, I will also analyse the gendered way this 'pain free' technique of power explores, breaks down and rearranges prisoners' bodies, producing different forms of what Foucault describes as subjected, practiced and docile bodies (1977a: 138). That is, I will explore how techniques of power are 'mapped' on the bodies of men and women prisoners in ways that either reproduce or disavow culturally dominant or preferred constructions of masculinity and femininity.

There are many questions arising from Foucault's principal assertion about relations of power and knowledge. Feminist philosopher Jana Sawicki expounds Foucault's main argument that power is exercised rather than possessed, decentralised rather than applied from the top down, and productive rather than repressive (1996a: 23). For Foucault power cannot be seized or shared, but rather is relational, in that it is exercised from a variety of points. As British feminist McNay points out, Foucault recognises that there are states of domination characterised by power relations which are irreversible (McNay, 1992: 67). That is, he asserts that in all situations where some choice is exercisable, relations of power/knowledge act simultaneously as an enabling and productive phenomenon and as a repressive factor.

In *The History of Sexuality* Foucault defines power as inextricable from resistance. He argues that power relationships are constantly being reconstituted, and in that reconstitution new meanings and knowledge are produced. For Foucault, resistance rises at the very point where power relations are at their most intense and unyielding. His argument is that power is a productive force and that all power relationships are potentially precarious and volatile because wherever authority is imposed, resistance will occur. He writes: 'there are no relations of power without resistance' (in Gordon, 1980: 142).

Foucault's conceptualisation of power/knowledge is, according to philosopher Dreyfus and anthropologist Rabinow, a 'radically new interpretation' (1992: 117). Dreyfus and Rabinow explain that, according to Foucault, knowledge is 'a central component in the historical transformation of various regimes of power and truth' (1992: 117). For Foucault, power/knowledge is not simply repressive or one dimensional, but rather it is fragmented, irregular, contains internal strains, and does not work to a single effect. Furthermore as philosopher Thomas Wartenberg points out, Foucault's fundamental thesis is that every item of knowledge is equally a means for attaining power (1990: 139). Similarly, I draw from Foucault in my analysis of how the various forms of knowledge in the prison operate to control and change the prisoners' bodies and minds. There are a variety of surveillance techniques used in the prison, which require both prisoners and staff to monitor the inmates' innermost thoughts, physical health and medication. I am interested in the way in which medical and psychological knowledge, along with other modern forms of surveillance such as intercoms and video cameras, produce gendered, docile bodies, while simultaneously producing resistance, delinquency and the possibilities for change.

Making the body docile

Another key concept developed by Foucault is the notion that institutions are a crystallisation of society. I will take up Foucault's challenge that:

One must analyse institutions from the standpoint of power relations, rather than vice versa, and that the fundamental point of anchorage of the relationships, even if they are embodied and crystallised in an institution, is to be found outside the institution. (1982: 222)

This suggestion is crucial to this thesis as it poses a challenge to look outside the structures and practices of the institution and consider the prison as a reflection of the everyday functioning of society. I will investigate the extent to which the prison is a

synthesis of the most extreme forms of surveillance and self-surveillance and the production of gender found within the broader society.

One of the key contributors to the literature on the medicalisation of the body, and in particular the criminal body, is Foucault. In his 1978 address to the Law and Psychiatry Symposium at York University in Toronto, Canada he pointed out the ways in which the 'psychiatrization of crime' had developed (Foucault, 1990b: 125). In particular he described the way in which psychiatry became instituted as a new medical technology in the treatment of mental disorders and positioned itself to 'enable the judicial machine to police public hygiene' (Foucault, 1990b: 125). Similarly I am interested in the ways in which the medical profession, and in particular, psychiatry, is positioned within the prison as providing the truth on prisoners' bodies and minds. Additionally gender is also implicated in this analysis as women in prison (as in the wider society) experience greater medication than do men.

In 'Prison Talk' Foucault writes that 'the medical system has always served as an auxiliary to the penal system, even today when the psychiatrist collaborates with the judge, the court and the prison' (1980: 44–5). Foucault argues that psychiatrists were interested in what he refers to as the 'great crimes', not because of their desire to take over criminality, but rather because they wanted to find a way to justify psychiatry's functions (1980: 135). One of the main functions of psychiatry is, according to Foucault, 'to impose upon the mentally ill a therapeutic confinement' (1980: 135). That is, psychiatry gained prestige from conceiving itself as a medical discipline able to protect against the dangers inherent in the social body (Foucault, 1980: 134).

The mechanisms by which both the docile and delinquent prisoner are made possible are based on the different organisations, practices and structures within the prison, at the core of which is the medical or clinical gaze. According to Foucault, the formation of clinical knowledge about the prisoner means that 'the knowledge of each inmate, of his behaviour, his deeper states of mind, his gradual improvement' can be achieved

(1977a: 249). Foucault argues that the prison is an institution where delinquents are created, with clinical knowledge being one of the methods used to categorise and create the delinquent criminal. Sociologist Mitchell Dean argues that 'the criminal is subjectified/subjected as one who has infringed societal norms of behaviour, as the delinquent, the deviant, as maladjusted, as one capable or incapable of normalisation' (Dean 1994: 161). Foucault's and Dean's works are useful to my consideration of the extent to which judgements made by both the prison staff and the prisoners operate to mark boundaries between acceptable and unacceptable criminals. In addition, their argument that there are various knowledges involved and used by professionals to judge and classify prisoners is also useful and one that this thesis will explore. I will investigate the role of the clinical gaze in the invasive investigation and penetration of male and female prisoners' bodies, which in turn produces both docile and delinquent prisoners.

Foucault's analysis of the ways in which psychiatrists are empowered through the use of discourses of 'expert' and technical practices to assess and diagnose the prisoner is useful in several ways. First, his work provides a starting point from which to look at other forms of surveillance such as the gaze of the social worker, psychologist, another prisoner or members of the medical profession. Secondly, it raises questions about the ways in which various apparatuses of power/knowledge are used to produce docile bodies. Thirdly, it is beneficial in eliciting new understandings of the ways in which the processes of observing, monitoring and classifying what is 'deviant' activity makes possible the creation of 'normality'. Finally, it raises questions about how these various apparatuses of power and knowledge define and distinctly mark out the boundaries of normality and abnormality and, in doing so, disavow the possibility of other experiences and practices. I accept Foucault's thesis that the medical system has become an auxiliary to the prison and that its use as a form of discipline marks prisoners' bodies, but I contend that this is achieved in gender-specific ways. Specifically, I will investigate the ways in which prisoners' bodies, and in particular women's bodies, are 'medically policed', and explore the implications of this policing.

In his early work on the *Birth of the Clinic*, Foucault provides examples of the way in which objectification occurs through the division of the mad from the sane, the sick from the healthy, the criminals from the 'good boys' (1982: 208). His argument that the subject is divided both inside and from others is useful to my work in that it allows for new understandings of the ways in which prisoners are 'objectivised' (Foucault, 1982: 208). I interpret Foucault's notion of objectification as the mode by which human beings are transformed from subjects to objects of inquiry. My interest is in the ways in which the dividing practice or objectification is also evident in various relationships within the prison. I will analyse both the physical and metaphorical spatial divisions that operate within the prison, between officers and prisoners, men and women prisoners, and between and among 'protection'¹ and 'mainstream' prisoners. In this way I am able to reveal the complex web of assessment and classification that operates to maintain power relations within the prison.

With its emphasis on architectural dimensions of division, Bentham's panopticon provided my starting point for understanding the effects of the design of space in the modern prison. Specifically, Bentham's panopticon deliberately partitions certain individuals from others as a means of ensuring that they know their place within the general economy of space. Similarly, Foucault recognised the importance of space as a fundamental means of disciplinary power. In an address to geographers, Foucault described himself as 'obsessed with space', and argued that 'as soon as one can analyse knowledge in terms of region, domain, establishment, displacement, transfer, one can grasp the process by which knowledge functions as a power and show its effects' (1976: 71–85). He goes on to suggest that the spatialisation of knowledge impacts upon individuals in a particular way. He writes, 'the individual, with his characteristics, with his identity, in his own twists and turns, is the product of relations of power which exerts over bodies multiplicities, movements, desires, forces' (1976 71-85). Foucault's analysis of the way space functions as a means of disciplinary power is useful to this thesis. I am interested in the way in which space in the prison is

¹ Also known as Protective Custody. This section accommodates those prisoners who are not physically safe to remain in the mainstream sections of the prison.

defined, allocated and experienced by men and women prisoners. Furthermore, I will explore the processes by which space in prison is acquired and legitimated, and used, by both prisoners and staff, with disciplinary effects. In particular I will analyse the ways in which the various spaces that prisoners occupy directly impact on their bodies, as well as on the reproduction of deviance, and the reproduction of normative heterosexuality.

Australian feminist philosopher Elizabeth Grosz's work *Space, Time and Perversion* provides an extension to the concept of architectural or physical space. I find the way in which Grosz encourages a conceptualisation of space as being simultaneously psychic and physical, inside and outside, to be useful. In her discussion on psychoanalysis and corporeality, Grosz writes that psychoanalysts have 'a good deal to say about how the body is lived and positioned as a spatio-temporal being' (1995: 85). She argues that the explorations of conceptions of space and time are necessary correlates of the exploration of corporeality (Grosz, 1995: 84). As Grosz points out there, are two reasons for this. First, bodies are always understood within a spatial and temporal context (Grosz, 1995: 84). Secondly, 'space and time remain conceivable only in so far as corporeality provides the basis for our perception and representation of them' (Grosz, 1995: 84).

Grosz argues that the 'kind of world we inhabit, and our understandings of our places in these worlds are to some extent an effect of the ways in which we understand space and time' (1995: 97). For Grosz it is our positioning within space that gives the subject 'a coherent identity and an ability to manipulate things including its own body parts in space' (1995: 92). Her argument that bodies are marked according to cultural requirements is one I find particularly useful in analysing the various ways in which prisoners bodies are marked according to the spaces they occupy (1994: 142). I will examine the way in which the criminal brotherhood occupies a particular space known as the 'mainstream', and how their bodies are marked in ways which represent and reaffirm their position within this space. My interest is in the way other spaces,

particularly 'protection' and the women's prison, are spaces inhabited by undesirables or pseudo-criminals.

Grosz suggests that men have produced a universe which has expunged the bodies and contributions of women (1995: 121). She notes that:

Conceptions of spatiality and temporality have rarely been the explicit object of feminist reflection; they have always appeared somehow above the more mundane concerns of day-by-day politics, too abstract, too neutral and self-evident to take as an object of critical feminist analysis.

(Grosz, 1995: 120)

She argues that men have hollowed out their own interiors and projected them outward, and in return have required women as supports for this hollowed-out space (Grosz, 1995: 121). It is men's appropriation of the right to a place or space that Grosz argues correlates with their 'seizure of the right to define and utilise a spatiality that reflects their own self-representations' (1995: 121). This observation is never truer than in the prison which is carved out to be a 'legitimate' masculine space both psychically and physically, with women prisoners occupying the fringe. Furthermore, one of the aims of this thesis is to develop a feminist analysis of the ways in which space is allocated and used in prisons as a form of discipline. That is, I will analyse the ways space functions to maintain the marginalisation of particular prisoners and ultimately how this impacts on their experience of prison. I will also explore the particular ways in which men and women occupy and experience different metaphorical spaces.

Grosz's analysis of the way in which space provides subjects with identity is crucial to my exploration of the relationship between space and criminal identity. I will examine the extent to which the space one occupies makes possible some identities and subjectivities while precluding others. In addition I will explore how these different identities impact on and influence prisoners' experiences of prison.

In extending the metaphor of an 'other' space I also will draw on the work of French existentialist Simone de Beauvoir, who writes that woman is 'defined and differentiated with reference to man and not he with reference to her; she is incidental, the inessential as opposed to the essential. He is the Subject, he is the Absolute, she is the Other' (1975: 16). De Beauvoir's proposition that woman occupies a secondary place to or is the Other to man is particularly relevant to this thesis. I am interested in exploring de Beauvoir's notion of the Other and investigating whether her thesis has relevance to men and women prisoners. In particular, I will explore the extent to which women prisoners are usefully understood as the Other to the Subject, male prisoners.

Section 2: Explorations of the experience of woman as criminal and prisoner

Bad women are women gone astray. They are women who, in one way or another, have abandoned their femininity and hence their right to be given the law's protection or favour. (Naffine, 1990: 142)

Among the main voices discussing female criminality have been feminists within the fields of criminology, psychiatry, social policy, sociology, social work, psychology and religion. Some of these have portrayed women who commit crime as victims of circumstance, with little agency and control (Sobel, 1982). Others have argued that women who commit crime are wayward, deviant, freaks, poorly socialised, uncontrollable, sexually promiscuous or paranoid (Savitz & Rosen, 1988; Scott, 1977). In this section I will discuss the ways in which women who commit crime have been represented in feminist and non-feminist literature.

A key area that I will be exploring in this thesis is the ways in which women and men become involved and continue to be involved in crime. Within the existing literature there are many attempts to explain how men and women become involved in crime. For example, Pat Carlen (1982) and Lorraine Gelsthorpe (1987) among others, point out that explanations for women's criminality portray them as victims, as having dysfunctional family backgrounds, or as not having strong husbands to keep them under control. Carlen's report of comments made by a Scottish sheriff about the causes of women's criminal deviance is illustrative: 'Not many women with steady husbands or cohabitees commit crime. They're kept occupied' (Carlen, 1982: 103). It is clear that in the minds of these sheriffs, men are the leaders in preventing women's involvement in crime, and that criminal women have escaped 'proper' control by 'their' men. Domesticity, or at least heterosexual coupling, is represented as an antidote to female criminality. According to this outlook the criminal world is synonymous with the public domain.

An example of the prison being a reproduction of the wider society is provided by the way in which women criminals have been described within criminology. There are descriptions of women prisoners rejecting femininity, with reports of them 'lacking proper femininity' (Kersten, 1990: 487); being 'chromosomally or genetically abnormal' (Smart, 1977: 93); and having a 'hormonal imbalance' (Chadwick & Little, 1987: 254). In contrast, there are other descriptions which suggest that women criminals are demonstrating their essential femininity, with accounts of them being 'unstable and irrational' (Heidensohn, 1987: 18); 'troublesome' (Hudson, 1990: 119); and 'distasteful or dangerous' (Armstrong, 1977: 110). These descriptions are particularly relevant to this thesis in that they indicate that there are contradictory ways in which women prisoners are positioned, depending on whether the point of comparison is with male prisoners or with 'real' women.

American criminologist Jill Rosenbaum argues that there are a number of factors which contribute to women becoming involved in crime. She suggests that women who 'end up in state facilities tend to come from the most troubled families' (1989: 32). Rosenbaum adds that 'society's attitudes towards females and their particular needs may have a great deal to do with the fate of delinquent and runaway girls' (1989: 32). Social determinist theories such as these have replaced an earlier emphasis on biological determinism. For example, the 1950s theorist Otto Pollak hypothesised that women's crime was influenced by what he termed biological and 'psychological disturbances' such as pregnancy, menstruation and menopause (1979: 37–44). He maintained that if women did not follow their assigned roles they would become more 'masculine', which could lead them into criminal behaviour identical to that of males (cited in Patterson, 1995: 35–6). Others offer psychiatric explanations; for example Edward M. Scott in his research on therapy with female offenders suggests that 'women prisoners of the future will mostly be of the paranoid type' (1977: 215). Both Pollak's and Scott's explanations of women's commission of crime are steeped in biological determinism and reinforce universalised stereotypes of women. They also view criminal activity as a male occupation and domain.

Another approach to explaining female crime through external (social) factors has been influenced by the work of labelling theorists (Cullen, 1984; Becker, 1963; Tannenbaum, 1938). American sociologist Howard Becker developed his labelling theory in his 1963 publication entitled *Outsiders*, about the lives of male jazz musicians living on the fringes of conventional society. He suggests that there was nothing inherently criminal or deviant about the criminal act, but rather that crime is a process of labelling by those who have power. According to Australian law academic Naffine, Becker credits the men participating in his research with being 'social critics' with an understanding of their situation, and he argues that they would be an excellent resource in assisting criminologists to explain deviant behaviour (1987: 83). As British criminologist John Braithwaite explains:

Labelists such as Becker see subcultural formation arising in part from the fact that the society creates similar types of outcasts with a common fate who face the same problems. These outcasts therefore commonly band together and create deviant subcultures that provide social support for deviant behaviour. (1989: 21)

There is an assumption that there is a homogenous subculture among prisoners which differentiates them as a group from 'straight' society. I want to test whether this is the case, and in particular investigate the ways in which prison subcultures contribute to the construction of masculinity and femininity.

American criminologists Michael R. Gottfredson and Travis Hirschi make the point that the labelling theorist starts with the 'assumption that differences between individuals in the likelihood that they will commit criminal acts are created by social reactions to morally neutral behaviour' (Cullen, 1990: 159). The work of sociologist Francis Cullen is illustrative. He writes that 'labelling and treating an actor as deviant will cause that person to accept a deviant identity and to reject a conventional self-image' (1984: 126). His argument is that once a person identifies with the label of

deviant he/she will act in a manner consistent with their self-concept (Cullen, 1984: 126).

According to Cullen, if State intervention occurs (for example imprisonment), then 'the actor will be exposed to environments where the encouragement and skills needed to perform wayward roles may be acquired' (1984: 126). This insight links to Foucault's suggestion that one of the key effects of institutions such as the prison is to produce delinquents (1977: 266). While Cullen and Foucault each provide useful insights into the role that institutions such as the prison play in the creation of delinquent identity, they fail to explore the full significance of people being simultaneously positioned as criminal *and* mother, lover, wife, husband, homosexual, protectee ... It is the impact of these multiple and gendered subjectivities that I will explore in the following chapters.

In their discussion on gender and crime, Gottfredson and Hirschi argue that 'women are less likely to be defined as deviant and therefore are less likely to behave in a deviant way' (1990: 147). However, they point out that when girls do commit crime and are taken into custody, they are likely to be more 'harshly treated than boys by the criminal justice system' (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990: 147). Others, including Naffine, take this point further and state that labelling theory has been problematic for women, and in particular for women who commit crime. She accuses labelling theorists as having lost 'sight of the deviant as actor and as social critic' and warns that neither of these valorised positions attaches to the woman prisoner [who is not positioned as] a 'glamorous or impressive character' (1987: 83). Naffine's insight is useful to my thesis that women who commit crime are never heroised within the prison or the wider community as they are commonly depicted as bad and undeserving or weak and gullible victims of circumstance. Male criminals of a particular type, on the other hand, are heroised. In particular I will explore whether women are positioned within the prison as the undesirable 'Other' both to real (masculine) criminality and to real femininity.

Kerry Carrington argues that the 'sex question' in criminology must be addressed (1990a: 15). Carrington's criticism is particularly pertinent to the way in which traditional criminology has tended to revere the criminality of men and simultaneously disregard or discount women offenders. Others, such as criminologist Pat Carlen in her work on Scottish women prisoners, argue that the meaning of women's imprisonment is denied (1982). This unusual phrase 'imprisonment denied' is used by Carlen to illustrate her contention that women's needs are unacknowledged in institutions built to serve the needs and interests of men. I will explore the notion that the operation and practices of the prison deny women a legitimate space and place within the institution because the 'abstract' and 'real' prisoner bodies have always been male. I will challenge understandings about the prisoner body being universal and not marked by gender, age or race.

Australian feminist Adrian Howe also challenges 'the man question in criminology'. In doing so, Howe lists several factors which she says have 'inhibited a feminist theorisation of penality' (1994: 157). First she emphasises the need for a coherent, feminist analytical framework within which researchers can engage with the theoretical challenges put up by critical non-feminist analysts of punishment (Howe, 1994: 158). Secondly, she asserts that one of the reasons for the lack of a feminist analytical framework is that within criminology there has been a failure to engage with the central debates within feminist theory, especially feminist debates with postmodernism (Howe, 1994: 157). In this thesis I will take up Howe's challenge to engage criminological research with feminist debates. In doing so, I will engage with what has been an ongoing dilemma for many feminists working in criminology: the issue of women criminals being positioned as victims.

According to feminist criminologist Frances Heidensohn, 'the most positive portrayal of criminal women or delinquent girls tends, at best, to stress their helplessness and vulnerability and to minimise any depredations they may have caused' (1985: 99). There are a number of examples in the literature of women prisoners being positioned

as weak and vulnerable victims. For example, in her discussion of the difficulties experienced by women in prison, American psychologist Suzanne B. Sobel argues that the prison takes 'total control over the woman's life' (1982: 108). She attempts to explain this by painting a picture of women prisoners as victims who are not given the 'opportunity to develop skills in coping with the outside world nor to explore new ways of relating' (Sobel, 1982: 109). Others, such as Patricia Easteal, insist that women in prison are not 'generally nurtured', that they feel they are not 'cared about' and are treated as 'less than human' (1994: 55). Implicit in both Easteal's and Sobel's work is the positioning of women at the mercy of societal forces rather than as agents in their own lives, able to act in destructive, self-interested or wilful ways. Additionally, both Easteal's and Sobel's conclusions are problematic as they provide no explanation for women's resistance to victimhood. Instead they explain women's involvement in crime as the result of women:

- being pushed into crime by societal factors or forces;
- being passive victims of a coercive jail regime;
- violently reacting to their coercive treatment in jail, which thereby reproduces their deviance.

One of the challenges for feminists in criminology is to reject the notion that all women prisoners are victims of circumstance. Among some feminist criminologists, women's violence is 'explained' by (and diminished in comparison to) greater violence done to them by men. Easteal in her discussion of the culture of women's prisons does address (albeit very briefly) the violence and the corporal disciplinary techniques that women prisoners impose on one another. She discusses the general prisoner code of not talking or informing on another inmate and highlights that 'this rule is also learned quickly in the prison' (Easteal, 1994: 54); she does not consider why it is so important that these rules are learnt quickly, nor does she analyse the impact these disciplinary techniques have on prisoners. Instead Easteal tends to blame the violence in women's prisons on the brutalising experience of prison itself. In the chapters of this thesis which deal with men's and women's experience of prison, I will examine the culture

of prisons, and the importance of what is known as 'The Code'. The Code is the unwritten rules of the criminal world. My interest is in the way in which The Code is practised in gender-specific ways within prisons.

Easteal's lack of analysis of women prisoners' enforcement of disciplinary techniques provides an inadequate understanding of the importance The Code has within the criminal community, and of how it is often reinforced in very different ways in men's and women's prisons. As psychologist James Griffith, in his work on control reinforcement among women prisoners points out, fellow inmates seek to induce normative behaviour by rewards and sanctions (1984: 59). He writes: 'the prisoner culture imposes strong controls on behaviours of inmates, such as defining one's standing within the inmate social hierarchy, the way an inmate is to behave with other inmates and the prison staff, and even one's sexuality' (Griffith, 1984: 59). As part of this, there are often violent consequences if prisoners do not learn and abide by the rules of The Code, for example, they may be subject to physical violence. While Griffith provides an adequate description of The Code, he provides little theorising as to the extent loyalty to The Code is universally accepted and a requirement of proper criminality. I will explore the way in which enforcement of The Code is performed in men's and women's prisons and the different effects this has on gender and power relations.

I am not convinced that feminist criminology should ignore women's capacity to be responsible and dangerous. Adrian Howe's work is particularly useful in highlighting the ways in which resistance is possible. While admitting that in relation to women we are 'only at the beginning of understanding penalty', she raises an interesting argument against the idea of systematic oppression causing women to commit crime. In particular, she asks the question: 'if women's subordination within an inferiorised body is so total as to be self-imposed, how is resistance possible?' (1996: 151). I will illustrate the ways in which men and women prisoners negotiate different possibilities for resistance. I will identify that there are many levels of resistance, with women

prisoners resisting dominant femininity simply by their status as 'criminal'. Furthermore I will argue that while there are opportunities and benefits in resisting, there are also disadvantages because other subjectivities are denied.

The quest for women-friendly prisons

There are a number of theoretical limitations of work within correctional institutions aimed at moderating prison practices to accommodate women's needs. Canadian academic Kelly Hannah-Moffat provides a useful critique of what she refers to as 'woman-centered corrections', a term she describes as having its origins in the 'feminist ethic of care' (1995: 136). She goes on to explain the emergence of women-centred corrections as coming from 'contemporary feminist criticisms of the male-based models of punishment governing women's prisons' (Hannah-Moffat, 1995: 136). Hannah-Moffat's discussion of the philosophy of women-centred prisons reveals three principles. First, that programs are expected to reflect the social realities of women and in doing so, to be able to respond to the individual needs of each woman (Hannah-Moffat, 1995: 142). Secondly, women-centred corrections espouse cooperative rather than hierarchal relations of power, and women prisoners are valued as experts on their own needs and therefore given some autonomy in decision making (Hannah-Moffat, 1995: 142). Thirdly, it is considered that challenging prisoners' lifestyle choices will 'promote the most effective interaction between women and the facilitator [the prison officer] in a supportive, encouraging, empathetic, accepting, challenging and non- confrontational manner' (Hannah-Moffat, 1995: 142).

While Hannah-Moffat says that the Canadian model of a woman-centred prison is regarded by some as 'innovative, progressive, and revolutionary', she disputes this by arguing that penal strategies and feminist strategies for empowerment are 'fundamentally different projects' (1995: 160). She explains that:

The definition and constitution of a woman-centered regime is troublesome because it relies on a problematic category of 'woman', it

is insensitive to wide social, economic, and political cultural relations of power; it sets up a false dichotomy between the woman and male centered regimes; and it denies the material and legal realities of imprisonment. (Hannah-Moffat, 1995: 135)

Hannah-Moffat's strongest claim is that there is a false belief that female centred models are 'less intrusive and less punitive' than male-based models of punishment, and asserts to the contrary that 'the oppressive qualities of incarceration are simply obscured by a feminised social control talk' (1995: 135). Hannah-Moffat's work is important to one of my core aims to analyse the culture of the prison, and examine the ways in which the masculinisation of punishment is produced and maintained in the structures and thinking of the prison community. Her emphasis on 'woman' as a shifting subject rather than a homogeneous group (1995: 144) is particularly useful.

Drug use: Differences between men and women prisoners

There are many reports in the literature which clearly show that prisoners are not a homogeneous group. Many commentators demonstrate that, unlike men, women prisoners often have poor physical and mental health and that there is a high prescription of psychotropic medication within women's prisons (Pinnuck, 1998; El Bassel et al., 1997; Morris & Wilkinson, 1995; Jones et al., 1995; Patterson, 1995; Liebling, 1994; Barstow, 1994; Easteal, 1994; Hampton, 1993; Major, 1993; Shaw, 1992; Pritchard, 1988; Brown & Quinn, 1986, Sobel, 1982). I will explore the extent to which psychotropic medication is implicated in what Foucault refers to as a penalty which is imposed 'free of all pain' (1977a: 11). In particular I will analyse the effects of the medication on both gender and criminality.

There is a substantial body of research which indicates a link between drug use, drug addiction and criminal activities. In a 1995 South Australian investigation of prisoner

drug use it was estimated that some 70 per cent of prisoners have abused drugs before entering prison on their current sentences (Dawes, 1997:113). Australian criminologist M. John Dawes in his PhD entitled *Dying in Prison: A Study of Deaths in Correctional Custody in South Australia 1980–1993* suggests that intravenous drug use in Australian prisons may be higher than reported because of an unwillingness among prisoners to be 'truthful, or disclose fully to their medical practitioners' (1997: 113). Despite this, what is clear is that both illegal and prescription drug use occurs in Australian prisons.

Those writing in the area of prescription drug use in women's prisons include Patricia Easteal in her paper entitled 'Don't Talk, Don't Trust, Don't Feel'; British scholar Clare Barstow who has researched female lifers in English prisons; and Australian criminal justice researcher Carol Major, who argues that the prison authorities reinforce drug use in Australian prisons, 'substituting illegal drug use with condoned prescription drug use' (1993: 3–4). Easteal asserts that medication is one of the most effective non-corporal disciplinary techniques used on the body of women prisoners. While Easteal's research highlights concerns around the use and prescription of psychotropic medication in Australian women's prisons, there is, however, a need to address the following fundamental questions. First, if being a criminal and in prison creates for women symptoms and experience of mental illness, then is medication appropriate? Secondly, if Easteal's assertion that in women's prisons there is an 'indiscriminate use of prescription drugs' (Easteal, 1994:56) is correct, then could it be that the women themselves seek this psychotropic medication? Thirdly, Easteal suggests that the prescription of medication is overwhelmingly the prison's response to women who experience anxiety, anger or depression and express these feelings in 'an institutionally inappropriate fashion or else [who] seek assistance' (1994:54). I will take up Easteal's assertion about indiscriminate drug use and explore the links between the disciplines of medicine (particularly psychiatry) and the penal system.

Clare Barstow's work on medication in prison, like that of Easteal illustrates the way in which psychiatry and the prison work together to produce docile bodies. In

particular, Barstow raises a number of serious allegations which this thesis will address concerning the role of the prison in maintaining prisoners' drug addictions:

Instead of giving adequate counselling, they [prison authorities] dose the women up on psychotropic drugs such as chlorylhydrate, Lygactol, Valium and Phrophiadine. They [women] walk around like mindless zombies but this only keeps the emotions hidden and does nothing to address the problems. It only causes them to be addicted to the drugs so that they are unable to pass a day without high doses. (1994: 8)

Carol Major reports that 'female prisoners are twice as likely as male prisoners in Victoria to be prescribed tranquillisers for the same symptoms' (Major, 1993: 4). In her discussion about women prisoners, Major argues that they are often living in particularly overcrowded conditions, have little privacy, put health and family issues on hold and worry about children and boyfriends/husbands, and use prescription drugs so they don't have to 'face reality' (1993: 4). Her conclusion is that given this prison context, women prisoners 'continue their barrage on the medical staff until they actually get what they want' (Major, 1993: 4). The research on women prisoners' needs and the well documented difficulties many experience in prison (Pinnuck, 1998; Morris & Wilkinson, 1995; Eastal, 1994; Sobel, 1982), suggest that a common way of blocking out the pain of prison has been through the use of psychotropic medication.

There are several studies which give support to the claim that a lack of exercise, use of prescription medication and poor diets contribute to many women prisoners gaining weight (Pinnuck, 1998; Hampton, 1993; Major, 1993). What I am interested in exploring is whether American feminist Sandra Bartky's argument that women aspire to the 'ideal body of femininity' (1988: 71) is an issue among women prisoners.

Prisoner mental health

Criminologist Alison Liebling's (1992, 1994) work on mental health issues, and in particular on suicide among young male and female offenders aged 17 to 21 years in England, is important in that it challenges the prison to address prisoner health holistically. Liebling emphasises that:

... the proportion of women prisoners showing characteristics associated with suicide risk: a history of psychiatric treatment, previous suicide attempts, alcohol or drug abuse, social and economic disadvantage and a history of physical or sexual abuse ... is alarmingly high. (1994: 3)

She claims that 'the rate of suicide among women prisoners is seriously underestimated', and that it is as 'high as the rate for men' (Liebling, 1994: 1). According to Liebling, the high rates of self-injury and suicide among women prisoners may be a result of their easier access to medication, a higher rate of dependency on prescribed drugs and 'a higher frequency of identifiable psychiatric disorder' (1994: 6). While this may be so, what I find challenging in addition about these factors is the possibility that they reflect the medicalisation of women's deviance.

In addition to commentators who argue that women prisoners are over-medicalised, other researchers focus on other inadequacies of prison medical care. American research by Gray et al. into inmate needs and programming in women's jails reported that 'medical services provided to women in jail are often inadequate'(1995: 187). They go on to show that the 'medical services of jails, when provided, were usually provided by physicians who are accustomed to and primarily concerned with men' (Gray et al., 1995: 187). This finding raises a number of concerns about efforts within prisons to address the health problems of women prisoners. It also implies that the health problems of women require specially trained women doctors. Indeed there is compelling evidence suggesting that prison medical centres have been inadequate in their provision and delivery of appropriate health care for prisoners (Morris et al.,

1997; George, & Lazarus, 1994; Denton, 1995; Easteal, 1994, 1992; Prichard, 1988). For example, Easteal reports women prisoners having experienced delays in receiving medical attention, and is highly critical of the 'attitude of the doctors and nurses' (1992: 5). Further criticism of the Australian prison medical service is made by Diane Pritchard who suggests that women's symptoms are not understood as evidence of real mental illness but as signs of deceitfulness and pretence. She illustrates this with the report that the Acting Director of the NSW Prison Medical Service regards those prisoners who self-mutilate as 'attention seekers' or 'aiming to get to a public hospital from which they can escape', and consequently considers that such prisoners 'should be ignored' (1988: 82).

Australian law scholar Barbara Denton's research to determine the prevalence of severe mental and substance dependency disorders among 56 sentenced and unsentenced women prisoners in Victoria also echoes many of the sentiments about inadequate prisoner health care. Denton's conclusion is that the 'failure to provide health services [which are] equivalent to those in the community would appear to be a breach of duty of care' (1995: 176-7). In fact it is clear that the women's prison is a community with additional needs because it contains a high percentage of people who are drug users and/or have mental health problems. Furthermore, the experience of imprisonment may itself cause mental health problems such as reactive depression. There are many factors which exacerbate prisoners' poor mental health, including the loss of the role of mother.

Prisoners as mothers

One of the findings from Allison Morris' and Chris Wilkinson's research on female prisoner needs was that 40 per cent of the women were mothers of dependent children, with nearly half of these being sole parents (1995: 296). From the studies focusing on women prisoners' separation from their children, the loss of the role of mother is documented to be one of the most traumatic consequences of women's imprisonment

(Clark, 1995; Aldridge, 1993; Hahn Rafter, 1993; Shaw, 1992; Ryan & Grassano, 1992; Huft, Fawkes & Lawson, 1992; Bloom, 1992; Larman & Aungles, 1991; Finney Hairston, 1991; Beckerman, 1991; Catan, 1989; Hancock, 1986; Donnelly, 1984). As Clark explains, 'regardless of the quality of their prior relationships, imprisoned mothers' relationships with their children are central to their identities, their affectional lives, and the crisis of imprisonment' (1995: 308). Social work scholar Creasie Finney Hairston's research which involved 56 women prisoners from a county jail in the United States provided findings in support of Clark's statements. Her research focused on women prisoners' mothering roles and responsibilities, their plans for family reunification, and their concerns about their children visiting. In Finney Hairston's research, 70 per cent of the women with children stated that separation from their children and 'not being there when their children needed them' was the 'most difficult thing about jail' (1991: 17). My interest is in exploring how accurate these findings are.

In those cases where children are accommodated within the prison, the research on mothering in prison suggests that there are a number of impediments to women practising effective mothering (Clark, 1995; Beckerman, 1991). One of the recurring criticisms of the Children in Custody Programs has focused on the lack of appropriate resources and facilities for children and their mothers within the prison. Feminist scholar Nancy Harm reports that pregnant female prisoners often do not receive adequate antenatal care and are 'typically separated from their babies at birth' (1992: 105). However, according to Liza Catan, who conducted research on mothers with babies in prison in Britain, it is not just a matter of the lack of appropriate resources, but there are also conflicting views about the benefits of women having their children in custody with them. She acknowledges that separation from the mother is damaging to the child's development and to the woman's view of her self as a mother; however, she also argues that babies cannot develop satisfactorily in restricted and impoverished prison environments (Catan, 1989: 2).

American prisoner Judith Clark demonstrates that women prisoners' ability to mother is often further complicated by 'guilt and repressed anger [which] congeals into depression' (1995: 318). American social work scholar Adela Beckerman argues that mothers who commit crime experience considerable conflict and guilt over not being able to conform to what she refers to as the 'idealised mother'. Beckerman identifies two societal beliefs which contribute to what she sees as a pattern of discrimination against incarcerated mothers. The first is that women who commit crime offend society's idealised picture of women as all-caring, nurturing, and attentive to their children. That is, such women pose 'a threat to the established social order' (Beckerman, 1991: 172). Secondly, Beckerman argues that a woman's criminal activities 'raise concerns about her ability to be a "good" mother' (1991: 172). That is, 'parents involved in illegal activities have often been perceived as irresponsible and, therefore, incapable of properly performing their parental duties' (Beckerman, 1991: 172). Beckerman's conclusion is that women who commit crime receive what she calls a 'double punishment' for their offence (1991: 172). She explains this as 'a prison sentence and the threat of the termination of parental rights, continuing a historical pattern of societal bias against, and hostility toward, imprisoned mothers' (Beckerman, 1991: 180). I am interested in the ways in which women internalise perceptions that they are 'failed' and 'bad' mothers, in particular, the various ways in which women prisoners mark their bodies to alleviate the pain of not being able to mother.

According to Beckerman imprisonment has a 'greater destructive impact on the family lives of woman [sic] prisoners' (1991: 172). In the Australian context, Gloria Larman's and Ann Aungles' (1991) research on the children of prisoners and their outside carers emphasises that prisoners' children are often seen by the prison authorities as 'nuisances and security risks' and the 'variations, pettiness and arbitrariness of rules about prison visiting create uncertainties that increase tensions between prisoners and their children and between prisoners and the outside carers of their children' (1991: 269). Their study adds further support to those who highlight the difficulties of combining motherhood with prison when they argue 'if the mark of a

civilised society is the treatment of its prisoners, then we must ask ourselves what kind of society are we condoning when the rights of children of prisoners are continually marginalised and rendered invisible' (Larman & Aungles, 1991: 269).

In contrast to Larman and Aungles, Shirley Aldridge, from the Department of Ambulatory Paediatrics at The Royal Children's Hospital in Melbourne, Victoria, who claims to have an 'interest in the developmental health of children' (1993: 1), provides a glowing assessment of Australian prisons, where she asserts that children (under five years) may reside with their mothers. She draws her conclusions without having conducted any research with Australian women prisoners into how effectively the prison provides them with the facilities they need to mother. Nor does she refer to any Australian research on the needs of women prisoners. She suggests, however, that the compulsory TAFE course on parenting and child discipline which was taught at Fairlea Prison² was an attempt by that prison to address long-term psychological effects of an early childhood spent in prison (Aldridge, 1993: 33–4). At the time Aldridge wrote, Australian sociologist Linda Hancock's 1986 work was available, but was not referred to. Hancock's study focuses on the needs of women prisoners in Victoria, the State Aldridge refers to as having 'progressive arrangements' for women prisoners with children (1993: 33). In contrast to Aldridge, Hancock's work details many examples of inappropriate treatment of women in prison in Victoria, and in particular, concludes that 'Australian policies [are] inadequate' in the area of 'providing the appropriate facilities for young children to live with their mothers in a custodial setting' (1986: 105).

Also available to Aldridge was the review by criminologists David Brown and Meredith Quinn (1986) of the New South Wales Task Force Report which was critical of the closure of the mothers and babies wing at Mulawa, a maximum security women's prison in Sydney. In her assessment of mothers and babies units and courses

² Fairlea Women's Prison was a maximum security women's prison in Melbourne, Victoria. It closed in 1996 and was replaced by a private prison.

in Australian prisons, Aldridge seemed to be unaware of this critique. Aldridge's only cited interview was with the Prison Governor of the Fairlea Women's Prison. Despite this, she takes the liberty to conclude that 'any mother *may apply* to keep her child in prison with her, even when on remand awaiting sentencing, or pending a decision on the child's future', and goes on to add that 'emergency kits containing all mother and baby needs are kept at reception so that unexpected imprisonment does not necessarily result in mother-infant separation' (Aldridge, 1993: 33, my emphasis). Indeed her findings are contradicted by those already stated and by more recent research by others like Blanch Hampton who, unlike Aldridge, was a prisoner in New South Wales and recorded interviews with women prisoners. In her 1993 book entitled *Prisons and Women*, Hampton reports the following story by Roxanne, a prisoner at Mulawa:

When I was in Mulawa a friend of mine gave birth. She wasn't given any kind of special treatment, in fact she was denied things like extra milk (for calcium). She found it very difficult to love her child and build up a bond when she knew she would have to give the child away eight hours after birth. (1993: 121)

There are a number of studies which suggest that accommodation for women with children in prison is generally inadequate (Pinnuck & Kay, 1994; Hampton, 1993; Larman & Aungles, 1991). Australian criminologist Sue Wynn-Hughes argues that there is a 'need to stop seeing women as a trivial group within the corrections system'. However, while her comments are useful, she could be accused of trivialisation herself with her reference to the 'holiday-type' accommodation at Tarrengower, a low security prison farm for women in Victoria (1988: 137). She goes on to spell out the benefits of having prison environments like that of Tarrengower, highlighting that there are facilities where children and other family members may visit their 'prisoner mother' and experience as 'far as possible' a 'holiday atmosphere' in which the prisoner mother is expected to assume full responsibility for her children, and thereby further develop or improve her existing mothering skills (Wynne-Hughes, 1988: 137). While it is important to have appropriate accommodation and facilities which support

prisoners and their needs, Wynne-Hughes' reference to the 'holiday type' accommodation at Tarrengower does imply that it is not a 'real' prison, because the physical environment is unlike what most imagine in a 'real' prison. For this thesis I interviewed women accommodated in both low and maximum security sections of the prison, and will reflect on the extent to which mothering was possible in these settings.

Patricia Easteal's work on what she refers to as the 'dysfunctional culture of women's prisons' is useful in its description of the disciplinary techniques used with women prisoners (1994: 7). She describes the various punishments issued to prisoners who disobey the rules of the prison, for example the loss of privileges such as telephone calls and visits, or being accommodated in the segregation units, and the impact these punishments have on women prisoners. Work by Hampton supports many of Easteal's claims. In her chapter entitled 'The Daily Grind', Hampton records the story of Julie who states that the sheer terror of being incarcerated is often exacerbated by 'the denial of information', which 'only maintains that fear and sense of disorientation' (1993: 62). I will explore the ways in which women maintain a home or identity that extends beyond the prison and particularly in relation to child-mother relationships.

Sexual assault in men's and women's prisons

There are various forms of punishment used between prisoners for violation of rules. I am interested in the ways in which sexual assault is portrayed as a form of discipline by other prisoners in both men's and women's prisons. In a recent study by Australian lawyer David M. Heilpern of sexual assault of young and predominantly male prisoners in New South Wales, he argues that sexual assault in prison is not random (1998: 69). He states that 'certain characteristics are demonstrably singled out for attention by prisoner rapists' (Heilpern, 1998: 69). Specifically, younger, smaller and gay prisoners within the age range of 17 to 25 are at greater risk of being raped in prison (Heilpern, 1998: 68-9). Heilpern maintains that 'sexual assault in prison is rarely reported' (1998: 7), claiming that 'there is a sexual assault of an 18-25 year old

in the state's [New South Wales] prison system *every 22 minutes*' (1998: 40, his emphasis). Heilpern states that one-quarter of males aged 18–25 incarcerated in New South Wales prisons reported that they had been sexually assaulted while in custody (1998: 68). In the small space he allocates to women prisoners, Heilpern comments that 'from anecdotal evidence and qualitative research it is clear that sexual assault of women prisoners by prison officers and other inmates is widespread' (1998: 66). However, in general Heilpern's work is an example of research being conducted on male prisons and subsequently extrapolated to women's prisons.

Nowhere is it clearer that Heilpern is focusing on men when he speaks of prison than in his recommendations on how prisons may reduce sexual assaults. He writes: 'one method of reducing sexual assault in prisons is to allow male prisoners more contact with women' (Heilpern, 1998: 194). He argues that conjugal visitations, contact with other female inmates or an increase in the proportion of female staff are important factors in reducing sexual assault in prison (1998: 194). He suggests that men who rape are starved of sexual contact and that they need an outlet for their sexual urges. Secondly, Heilpern implies that these men cannot or should not be expected to control their raping. Thirdly he claims that if women were 'made available' to these men, then they would not need to rape other men. That is, sex with women will naturally stop the men from raping men. There is no mention by Heilpern that these men may also rape the women supplied to them. Heilpern appears to be oblivious to feminist critiques of the position he is prescribing. Australian philosopher Linda Burns synthesises this critique in her observation that rape is often endorsed 'as an expression of normal masculine sexuality', and 'too often conceptualised as part of the existing social practice of heterosexuality' (1998: 12). Indeed, the former is exactly what Heilpern is arguing with his offensive suggestion that women could be supplied to the men as a means of stopping rape in men's prisons.

Gender and prisoner misconduct

Criminologist Amy Craddock's comparative research on male and female prisoner misconduct reveals that most rule violations by both men and women involve 'disobeying a prison official' (1996: 69). Her research showed that about half of the men had committed rule violations compared to about a third of the women (Craddock, 1996: 67). An interesting finding of Craddock's research was that among the women, assault, sexual offences (by which she meant consenting sexual relationships) and escape (or attempted escape) were more common than for men (Craddock, 1996: 69). Craddock suggests that the high rate of assault and sexual offence may be a result of different treatment rather than different behaviour. She speculates that women may be more likely to be 'sanctioned for assaults and sexual offences in particular, because staff may see these as especially deviant behaviour for women, or because incarcerated women may actually exhibit more sex non-stereotypical behaviour than incarcerated men' (1996: 68).

Craddock does not state that those crimes considered by the prison to be 'non violent sexual assault' (1996:68) are in many cases consenting lesbian relationships, but it is implied that this is the case. In her discussion about gender and misconduct Craddock conjectures that 'non violent sexual offences may reflect the emotional attachments women tend to form in prison' which, she argues, 'may not imply a propensity for other types of disruptive behaviour' (1996: 77). In the South Australian context under Section 26 A of the Regulations under the *Correctional Services Act 1982* a prisoner must not engage in sexual intercourse with another prisoner; or masturbate another prisoner (1985: 5). Indeed the phenomena of women forming close relationships in prison has been widely reported, and in some instances has been referred to as 'reflecting psychological deprivation' (Culbertson & Fortune, 1986: 32). Much of the literature has focused on homosexuality in prisons and in some cases conflated this with sexual assault.

Sex in women's prisons

Sociologist R.I. Mawby's work on the life and experiences of women prisoners in Askham, an open prison in Britain, makes the point that 'practitioners and researchers in America have felt free to write about the informal organisation of penal institutions for women, and especially about the development of lesbian or familial relationships' (1987: 25). What is particularly interesting about Mawby's analysis is his concern to explain the reasons why some women in prison form what he calls 'pseudo families' (1987: 34). He seems somewhat uncomfortable with lesbianism and the emergence of these 'pseudo families'. He also appears to have difficulty in accepting that these relationships may not only be important and functional for the women involved, but also a 'rational' choice. His explanation for lesbianism in prison is based on women's 'need' for family relationships rather than for sex or intimacy (Mawby, 1987: 34). Furthermore, he argues that women prisoners' isolation from outside family relationships means that these relationships or family structures form inside the prison as a 'practical response to incarceration' (Mawby, 1987: 34). Mawby's argument ignores the importance and significance these sexual relationships have for women prisoners and reinforces a stereotype of female sexuality where desire is subordinate to the need for relationships.

It is also important to consider the different support provided for men and women outside the prison. Women prisoners' comparative lack of supportive relationships outside the prison is a topic of concern. There is a body of literature which suggests that women in prison receive less outside support from significant others than do male prisoners (Larman & Aungles, 1991; Fishman, 1988; Genders & Player, 1986). British scholars Genders and Player conducted observational work, analysed prison records, and interviewed 254 women prisoners and 134 prison staff. They found that prior to their imprisonment 'fewer than half of the adult women prisoners with dependent children lived within a traditional nuclear family setting, namely with their children and either their husband or long-term cohabitee' (Genders & Player, 1986:

360). Other accounts include that of American sociologist Regina A. Arnold, who, in her research into the experiences of black women in prison, found that for 'many female prisoners who were in and out of prison frequently, other criminals became their family' (1990: 160). The different meanings that men and women attach to the notion of 'family' in prison is one of the foci of my research. To begin this exploration I turn to the literature on male prisoner experience.

Section 3: The prison and masculinity

Linguists speak of terms as displaying 'marked' or 'unmarked' forms. Until very recently 'he' was in general use as an unmarked personal pronoun: one had to mark departures from a presumed male reader or company of male subjects. Nouns too have marked and unmarked forms. The unmarked cases of 'nurse', 'nanny', and 'secretary' would seem to be feminine, as in a different vein is 'prostitute': they can all be qualified by adding the prefix 'male', but otherwise they take feminine pronouns automatically. By contrast the unmarked cases of 'prisoner', 'criminal', 'defendant', 'offender', and 'delinquent' ... remain masculine. If this is so, what follows for the understanding of the positions of crime and law enforcement in popular culture from the initial realisation that the unmarked case of all the following terms is masculine: 'hero', 'villain', 'cop', 'killer', 'psycho', 'hood', 'private eye', 'con', 'gangster'? And surely more abstract terms are also gendered in their unmarked forms: 'heroism', 'violence', 'action'? (Sparks, 1996: 348)

This focus on the gendered nature of language itself exemplifies the move away from reductionist and essentialist notions of masculinity which characterised earlier scholarship about gender. A focus on the social and cultural construction of different forms of masculinity has informed much of the recent literature on male criminality and deviance (Adler & Polk, 1996; Bourgois, 1996; Collison, 1996; Sim, 1994; Scratton et al., 1991). As feminist scholar Victoria Robinson writes: 'generally, there has been an acceptance of masculinity as a social construction which, as such, sees masculinity as fluid and open to both contestation and change' (1996: 118). The notion of masculinity being fluid is one that I will explore in relation to men in prison. Specifically, I will interrogate the meaning of masculinity for criminality, and how this specific form of masculinity is inscribed in our language and understandings of what

constitutes an authentic criminal. Additionally, I am interested in how the masculinity of criminality is sustained, especially in the face of increasing female imprisonment. The literature which seeks to explain men's criminality pays less attention to normative hetero masculinity than it does to social and family background.

Causes of men's crime

There is research which suggests that a variety of early 'family' experiences may put children at risk and leave them vulnerable to delinquent behaviour and later criminality (Stern & Smith, 1995: 1-37; Eastman, 1989: 1-39). In their Rochester Youth Study of 864 male and female adolescents and their parents, Stern and Smith found that a lack of parent-child attachment and involvement, and parental control are linked with delinquency, as is life distress, including parental depression, negative life events, overload and lack of partner support (1995: 17).

Criminologists Gottfredson and Hirschi in their 1990 book entitled *A General Theory of Crime* argue that single or limited factors (for example family backgrounds) can be used to explain crime. Criminologists Raymond Paternoster and Robert Brame suggest that past offending and life experiences are important factors in predicting future criminality (1997: 49). Although social determinist explanations for male criminality predominate as they do for female criminality, there are counter claims made by scholars promoting a biological explanation. For example, British scholars David Rowe and David Farrington assert that evidence exists to support the notion that 'criminal behaviour is partly heritable', and that 'a set of genes may predispose a child towards a greater likelihood of criminal convictions' (1997, 196-7). They make the claim that a particular gene or set of genes (for example. the 'criminal gene') in a parent 'could predispose toward both criminality and irresponsible parenting behaviour (i.e. poor supervision)' (Rowe & Farrington, 1997: 197). Rowe's and Farrington's conclusions suggest that individuals have very little control over their actions and therefore have diminished responsibility. Indeed, given the far higher rate

of offending by men, one would have to conjecture that such a gene was sex linked, making it unlikely for it to explain women's crimes, a problem that Rowe's and Farrington's analysis of crime completely ignores.

Canadian psychologist David J. Simourd's research on male criminal attitudes identifies six risk factors which he asserts may influence adult offenders' capacity to commit crime. These are social class, personal distress, educational and vocational achievement or under achievement, parent/family factors, temperament, and antisocial peers and/or attitudes (Simourd, 1997: 54). He suggests that learning the techniques of crime and being criminal requires one to have 'specific motives, drives, rationalisations and attitudes inherent in deviant behaviour' (Simourd, 1997: 53-4). For Simourd 'criminal attitudes represent a combination of an individual's favourable or unfavourable evaluation of performing a specific criminal act and his or her perception of relevant social pressures to perform or not perform the act' (1997: 53). Simourd's argument is problematic for several reasons. First he assumes that a rational evaluation is undertaken by an individual in consciously deciding to commit crime. Secondly, he has such a smorgasbord of 'risk factors' that it is not clear which 'factors' are more likely to lead a person to commit crime. Thirdly, he conflates two contradictory forms of masculinity: man the risk-taking adventurer is fundamentally different from man the rational actor.

Michael Kauffman's work on men's contradictory experiences of power suggests that in popular parlance the terms masculinity and power are interchangeable. He writes: 'the common feature of the dominant forms of contemporary masculinity is that manhood is equated with having some sort of power' (Kauffman, 1994: 145). As Kauffman explains it, the equation of masculinity with power is internalised by individual men in their developing personalities because 'men learn to accept and exercise power this way because it gives us privileges and advantages that women or children do not enjoy' (1994: 146). Or put simply: masculinity is power.

There are those who argue that it is inaccurate to conceive of hegemonic masculinity as a unified or static phenomenon. German sociologist Joachim Kersten accuses criminologists of perceiving masculinity as a 'taken for granted, essential category that needs no further deconstruction' (1996: 382). His point is that masculinity is 'neither a monolithic entity nor part of the male sex role' (1996: 381–2). Others, such as feminist scholars Andrea Cornwall and Nancy Lindisfarne, provide a critique of writings on masculinity in order to 'disrupt the premises which underlie much recent writing on and by men' (1994: 2). They argue that relations of inequality are framed by hegemonic versions of masculinity and go on to accuse writers on masculinity of using terms such as 'masculinity' and 'femininity' in unproblematic and unreflexive ways, thus ignoring the ambiguities and contradictions (Cornwall & Lindisfarne, 1994: 5; also cited in Robinson, 1996: 111). They assert that:

Hegemonic forms are never totally comprehensive, nor do they ever completely control subordinates. That is, there is always some space for subordinate versions of masculinity - as alternative gendered identities which validate self-worth and encourage resistance. (Cornwall & Lindisfarne, 1994: 5)

While they do not refer specifically to criminals, Cornwall's and Lindisfarne's work would suggest that within the prison as elsewhere there are a variety of masculinities. Their work disputes the notion of a fixed, all-controlling masculinity, and raises questions about the way in which other masculinities exist and are able to challenge and modify dominant forms.

Many other recent theorists on masculinity have moved beyond the idea of a single, coherent, homogenised masculinity. For example, anthropologist Philippe Bourgois who has conducted research on Puerto Rican crack dealers in East Harlem, demonstrates that the men in his study have different ways of expressing masculinity. Bourgois refers to men 'doing' masculinity. He explains that the 'escalation of social marginalisation in the United States has had grave consequences for how poor men

"do" masculinity' (Bourgois, 1996: 413). He argues that 'a growing cohort of marginalised men ... takes refuge in the drug economy and celebrates a misogynist, predatory street culture which normalises gang rape, sexual conquest, and paternal abandonment' (Bourgois, 1996: 412). In my exploration of the multiple forms of masculinity that the prison makes possible, I will explore with male prisoners the extent to which predatory, misogynist masculinity is legitimated within the prison culture.

In their sociological writings Australian theorists of masculinity Carrigan, Connell and Lee go further than Bourgois, and suggest that 'relations between heterosexual and homosexual men have to be studied to understand the constitution of masculinity as a political order, and the question of what forms of masculinity are socially dominant or hegemonic has to be explored' (1987: 140). Their work is useful to my thesis, which explores the ways in which the performance of the most extreme form of masculinity required of criminal men has both heterosexual and homophobic demands.

Several aspects of Australian sociologist Bob Connell's recent work on the construction and maintenance of masculinity are useful to this thesis. His work provides an understanding of particular forms of masculinity which are part of the male prison culture. Of relevance is his analysis of hegemonic masculinity, which he describes as 'the configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy which guarantees the dominant position of men and the subordination of women' (1995: 77). I will analyse the prison experiences of those whose masculinity is judged 'Other' to hegemonic criminal masculinity, for example homosexuals and 'undesirable' men such as sexual offenders and informants.

In the foreword of sociologist James W Messerschmidt's book *Masculinities and Crime*, Connell asserts that 'masculinity is not something that is preformed or settled. It is something that has to be made, and criminal behaviour is one of the means for its

making' (1993: xi). In this research I am interested in the ideology and structure of the criminal brotherhood, and the way in which it constructs what is an 'authentic' crime and expunges 'unmanly' crime, thus positioning some people as 'pseudo' criminals. Specifically, I will explore the effects that this differentiation has on the construction and reproduction of masculinity.

Many studies have shaped the debate around the construction and development of a criminal masculinity (Collison, 1996; Bourgois, 1996; Buckley, 1996; Badinter, 1995; Connell, 1995; Polk, 1994; Tomsen, 1994; Gelsthorpe, 1986, 1987). Lorraine Gelsthorpe writes that 'male offenders have been described both as inherently more criminally inclined and as rational adventurous beings who sometimes stray beyond the confines of the criminal law to fulfil their own needs and desires' (1986: 125). Gelsthorpe's work provides the basis for drawing a contrast between male criminals who are seen as rational agents, and women criminals who are depicted as irrational, and needing management and control.

Joachim Kersten's work on violence in juvenile institutions and, in particular, his discussion of the way in which male adolescents act out their criminal masculinity, is of use to my thesis in several ways. He suggests that the initiation into a specific form of criminal masculinity is learned before one enters the adult prison system. He argues that as early as the juvenile detention years, symbols of masculine strength are widely promoted and encouraged (Kersten, 1990: 475). He provides examples of crucial norms and attitudes in the discourse of power and sexuality being shared by juvenile inmates and staff. These include the notion of a 'fair fight', activities such as viewing violent videos, the production of handicrafts such as studded belts and wristbands, and computer war games; all serve to reinforce and legitimate a specific combative and aggressive masculinity (Kersten, 1990: 477-9). While I too will analyse the process by which young male offenders are prepared for prison, I will also explore the ways in which this preparation makes possible a particular form of criminal masculinity.

In his introduction to the *British Journal of Criminology's* special issue on masculinity, social relations and crime, criminologist Tony Jefferson argues that for men crime is a 'structured action', and a way of 'doing gender' which 'simultaneously accomplishes (or does) class and race' (1996: 340). He writes: 'where class and race relations combine to reduce conventional opportunities for the accomplishment of hegemonic masculinity, crime often offers a ready replacement' (1996: 340). Others, such as British criminologist Mike Collison, concur that engaging in criminal activities is viewed by male peers as risk taking, achieving and displaying independence, identity and maturity (1996: 433–4). Jefferson's and Collison's arguments are useful to my thesis that gender is not something that is inherent or abstract, but rather it has to be performed. In the chapter on men's experience of prison (Chapter 4), I will investigate the ways in which crime is a physical manifestation of masculinity in that it allows men a particular way of doing gender as risk taker and 'man of action or 'ruthless man'.

In their research on male prisoners in Britain, scholars Scratton, Sim and Skidmore argue that violent acts by men in prison are sustained and legitimated by a culture of masculinity which equates personal power with physical violence (1991: 67). They argue that 'prisoner violence is part of the symbol, ritual and reality of a hostile male environment' (Scratton et al., 1991: 67). Their work is useful in that it provides an analysis of how the social order of the prison is sustained and reproduced through the deeply embedded discourses around masculinity and femininity. My thesis is that the prison reinforces and facilitates a form of masculinity based on respect for physical violence and domination. While I will analyse the ways in which this form of masculinity is entrenched, celebrated and legitimated within the prisoners' and prison officers' hierarchies, I will also analyse how male prisoners 'do' prison if they either refuse to be involved in the accepted rituals of criminal masculinity or are rejected by the dominant prisoner group because of the unmanly nature of their crimes.

Within criminal masculinity there is great weight placed on being prepared to defend male honour. Steve Tomsen's work on male honour in homophobic murders of gay men is useful in developing understandings about how this particular element of masculinity is maintained. He argues that male honour is about preserving masculine heterosexual identity (Tomsen, 1994: 5). He writes that male heterosexual identity is 'built around ensuring the sanctity of the body, with rigid limits imposed on the circumstances and socially admitted forms of male physical contact' (Tomsen, 1994: 5).

The heterosexual presumption within criminal masculinity is also explored by poet and writer Eve Kosofsky-Sedgwick who provides understandings of the ways in which male bonding reinforces heterosexuality. Specifically, Kosofsky-Sedgwick uses the term 'male homosocial desire' to explain the 'social bonds between persons of the same sex' (1985: 1). She distinguishes homosocial desire from homosexuality, arguing that the former is deeply dependent on the rituals of heterosexuality performed by men. That is, 'male bonding' is a form of homosocial desire which is also characterised by 'intense homophobia, fear and hatred of homosexuality' (Kosofsky-Sedgwick, 1985: 1). Kosofsky-Sedgwick's argument also works to explain what I will argue is the performance of heterosexuality within male prisons.

Sociologist Michael S. Kimmel uses the term homosocial desire in a similar way to Kosofsky Sedgwick. He argues that masculinity is a 'homosocial enactment', and that men test themselves by performing heroic feats, or by taking enormous risks because men require other men to grant them their manhood (Kimmel, 1994: 129). I too will argue that homosocial desire is a crucial element of masculine criminality in that men require other men to validate and approve their criminality. However, I am also interested in the process by which some men are 'approved' while others are deemed 'failures', and how this desired criminal masculinity shapes the whole order of gender relations within the prison and in doing so reinforces the invisibility of women prisoners as well as refusing femininity within male prisons.

The concept of the dominating body which separates men from women and binds men to men is a predominant theme in the literature written about prison by male criminals. Mark Read (also known as Chopper), convicted murderer and former inmate of the punishment unit of Melbourne's Pentridge Prison and Tasmania's³ Risdon Prison, has written six books about his experiences of prison life. The books' titles are *Chopper: From the Inside* (1991); *Chopper Two: Hits and Memories* (1992); *Chopper Three: How to Shoot Friends and Influence People* (1993); *Chopper 4: For the Term of His Unnatural Life* (1994); *Chopper Five: Pulp Faction* (1995); and *Chopper 6: No Tears for a Tough Guy* (1996). As the subtitles suggest, the books detail Read's manly and presumably 'heroic' adventures as a member of the male criminal fraternity. The telling of his various prison stories seeks to legitimise and romanticise a specific type of masculinity, one based on force and physical violence. While Read's work is an attempt to authenticate himself as a success within the prison environment, it also relates to (as the subtitles suggest) an area of popular culture that underpins and endorses a specific type of masculinity.

Similarly criminal justice scholar Hans Toch, in his article on prisoners' perceptions of prison in the past, discusses the way in which older male criminals (women are not mentioned) reminisce about the 'good old days' in prison (1990: 1). Toch's records of older male prisoners' accounts of the old days when prisoners respected each other, 'kept their hands out of your pockets and did their time with discretion' (1990: 1) provide further examples of the ways in which the boundaries of the dominant form of criminal masculinity are patrolled and maintained. In the chapter on men's experiences of prison I will explore the ways in which these rules of the brotherhood are learnt and fiercely patrolled.

³ Tasmania is a State in Australia.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

The research method and tools

This chapter outlines my approach to the research and the methods used to generate the material on which the following chapters are based. Since the study sought to investigate and develop an understanding of the prison culture and the various experiences of men and women prisoners, qualitative research methods, which allow the collection of information in the form of detailed descriptions, were considered most appropriate. Patton's description of qualitative research, and in particular the benefits he raises, demonstrates the appropriateness of this approach:

A qualitative approach to measurement seeks to capture what people have to say in their own words. Qualitative measures describe the experiences of people in depth. The data are open-ended in order to find out what people's lives, experiences and interactions mean to them in their own terms and in their natural settings. Qualitative measures permit the researcher to record and understand people in their own terms. (1980: 22)

The particular method I chose involved conducting in-depth interviews and undertaking participant observation because this combination is flexible, and has the potential to obtain detailed and personal information from participants in a sensitive manner. Secondly, interviews allow the researcher access to people's ideas, thoughts and feelings in their own words rather than in the words of the researcher.

According to Minichiello et al. qualitative research 'attempts to capture people's meanings, definitions and descriptions of events' (1990: 5). They go on to state that the research design in qualitative research rarely follows the path laid down in traditional texts, and that it is common in in-depth interviews for the researchers and

the researched to be involved in a process of negotiation and renegotiation about methodology and design (Minichiello et al., 1990: 193–4).

The research design in qualitative approaches needs to be flexible, and as Burgess counsels, it has to 'act as a base against which modifications [could] be made as the research continued' (1980: 38). Hence the *modus operandi* of this research was governed by a set of principles and ethics which were discussed and agreed in negotiation with the participants. Specifically, I took note of researchers Stanley and Wise's advice about conducting feminist research, to ensure that I avoided acting as the 'theorizing researching elite' who was doing research on 'them', the 'researched' (Stanley & Wise, 1993: 7).

The emphasis in this study is on doing research with and for, rather than on the participants. The research is designed to be a process which occurs through the medium of personal interaction and I accept that it is inevitable that I am as Stanley and Wise describe it 'always and inevitably present *in* the research' (1993: 175, their emphasis).

Additionally, I sought a research method which would provide the participants with a voice in which they could express their personal experiences of prison. As Stanley and Wise also point out, 'feminist social science should begin with the recognition that "the personal", direct experience, underlies all behaviours and actions' (1993: 164). In keeping with a collaborative model of research and heeding the advice of Taylor and Bogdan (1984: 150–2), Goetz and Le Compte (1984: 233) and Woods (1986: 113), I discussed with the participants the research aims and methodology, time and length of the study, nature and number of contacts, my relationship with the respondents, issues of confidentiality and their opportunity to check the data.

Throughout the study I was committed to ensuring that prisoners' accounts of their experience of prison were recorded fully and accurately. Having worked in men's and

women's prisons I suspected that there was something about the gendered nature of the prison environment that was a contributing factor to what seemed to be the very different prison experiences of men and women prisoners. Specifically, I wanted to investigate whether my impression that men and women experience prison differently was correct. In order to understand the unspoken and to 'read' the culture of the prison, I located myself within the prison⁴ for 18 months, which was the duration of the interview phase of the study.

While these face-to-face interviews were the main method used to obtain material, being a staff member at the men's prison also allowed me to observe events, conversations and situations within that environment which I would not have been privy to had I simply been a visiting researcher. From this privileged insider standpoint I kept detailed field notes and recorded observations and informal conversations with officers, prisoners and civilian staff. These entries and observations later helped to clarify issues relating to the prison culture and daily routines. The field notes were a crucial element of the 'data' produced in the study.

Participant observation was particularly useful to the overall success of the study. Indeed one of the core reasons I spent the first four months of the research project observing and immersing myself within the prison culture was to eliminate any notion that I was a naive 'outsider', a 'trouble maker' or a 'blow-through'. The advice by Judy Anne Jones, who conducted her PhD research at Pentridge Prison on prisoners and their families in 1983, proved most beneficial. Jones stated that it was necessary for her 'constantly [to] remember that the slightest untoward behaviour might result in the exclusion of the researcher from the prison 'for her own protection', and thus an aborted project' (1983: 111). Like Jones, I was constantly aware that my position within the prison was tenuous and that I was always under surveillance, with my credentials and credibility being judged by both staff and inmates. Given this, I was

⁴ In 1996 I worked-part time as a counsellor at Yatala Labour Prison. During this time, I interviewed the men and women prisoners involved in this study.

always attentive and avoided any situation which might attract attention to myself or give anyone within the prison cause to complain.

Another reason I spent a considerable time within the prisons before commencing the research was in order to develop an understanding of the culture at both Adelaide Women's Prison and Yatala Labour Prison. During the period in which I was conducting the research a violent riot took place, at Yatala Labour Prison which evolved around mainstream prisoners' grievances about protectees being employed in the prison kitchen. It probably was the case that at this time the divide between protectees and mainstream male prisoners was much more sharply drawn than at any other time in the history of Yatala Labour Prison. This heightened divide between protectees and mainstreamers provided the opportunity to explore current as well as historical reasons for this tension. Additionally, this situation enabled me to explore with the women prisoners their perception of the Yatala riot, and in particular their understandings of the difference between the way they 'do' criminality and prison compared to male prisoners.

There were a number of questions I had to address before proceeding with the interviews. While the problem of access to the research site is obviously crucial to qualitative field work, this was generally not a problem, as I was known in the Department of Corrective Services for my work with the South Australian Health Commission as a Senior Education Officer with the Sex Offender Treatment and Assessment Program. Prior to approaching the Department of Corrective Services for access to prisons, I had been offered a part-time counselling position at Yatala Labour Prison. However, having a professional association with the Department of Corrective Services did not solve the issue of access completely, as practical and ethical issues needed to be addressed prior to approval.

The research proposal had been approved by The University of Adelaide's Human Ethics Committee which provided me with clear ethical guidelines, but there were other

issues that required consideration before the research could commence. The first was that approval needed to be sought from the South Australian Chief Executive Officer of Correctional Services, and from the Managers of Yatala Labour Prison and Adelaide Women's Prison (see Appendix E).

Another issue that I had to address was the extent to which my role as a member of the professional staff in the Department of Correctional Services might affect the extent to which participants were frank and open with me and therefore the validity of the findings. This issue was important, as the research's success depended on acceptance by the participants and in particular the prisoners and staff who were to be participants in the study. General acceptance was fostered in a number of ways. They included discussing the study privately and in small informal groups with prisoners and staff. At Adelaide Women's Prison I spent the first four months of the project getting to know the staff and the women. During this time no interviews were conducted as it was necessary that I had the trust and confidence of those who I was seeking to involve in the study.

Most of the officers at Yatala, like their colleagues at Adelaide Women's Prison, expressed the view that research of the kind being proposed was valuable and sorely needed. However, some had reservations about relying on prisoners' accounts because they may not be 'reliable' and because prisoners were 'untrustworthy'. Therefore the officers were insistent that I interview both prisoners and officers in order to have 'the two sides of the story'. The fact that a majority of both prisoners and staff expressed interest in the research and continually inquired as to its progress was beneficial in that it legitimated my position and enabled easy access to interview participants. This bi-partisan support was achieved partly because I was particularly careful to stress that the project was independent of the Department of Correctional Services. This also ensured that both staff and prisoners were encouraged to talk about their personal experiences without being influenced by what they thought that the Department should (and should not) be told.

At Adelaide Women's Prison the women were at first wary of engaging me in conversation. I did not impose or attempt to market myself as 'trustworthy' knowing that this would have been read by the women as evidence of me being false and 'shifty'. My access was granted gradually through the range of overlapping networks that I had with the prison community, including through previous sites where I had worked. For example, at Adelaide Women's Prison I knew one of the women who was a prisoner when I worked at Tarrengower Women's Prison in Victoria and another from a mutual friend within the local Adelaide Aboriginal community. Having established a good rapport with both these women my credibility was increased not only because these women were respected by the other inmates and officers as 'good prisoners', but also because they promoted the research to the wider prison community and made special efforts to introduce me to their friends. I remained alert to Reinharz's caution that 'even though feminists try to study women from the standpoint of women and generally have access to women's settings, the women they study do not always trust them' (1992: 65). Her conclusion was that 'a bond of sisterhood must be earned. Differences exist in socioeconomic status, lifestyle, sexual identity, marital status, and more, and must be overcome to gain access to the views of a diverse range of women' (Reinharz, 1992: 65). Eventually I became known among the officers and the women prisoners as one of the regular visitors and confidantes at Adelaide Women's Prison.

It was obvious that if the research was going to 'work', I had to 'prove' to the participants that I was 'trustworthy'. My trustworthiness was 'tested' in my first interview at Adelaide Women's Prison in which the woman divulged some extremely sensitive information. She did not ask me to keep the information confidential, but three weeks later she contacted me to request that she do another interview. When I explained that I was expecting to interview people only once and implied that I might not re-interview her, she explained that the first interview was a 'set up' where she had disclosed specific information as a way of testing whether I would maintain silence and therefore could be trusted. She reported that because I had not divulged any information, most of the women she knew now wanted to participate in the research

project. She also advised me to continue my regular visits to the prison as they were not only an indication of commitment to and interest in the women, but were also a way of getting known.

I continued to visit the women's prison and have a presence there. Some of the prison officers and social workers who were popular with and trusted by the women encouraged them to ask questions about the research. After seven months of visiting the prison, talking with women and doing the occasional interview, I was invited to lunch and dinner by the prisoners, all of whom had originally been guarded and suspicious of me. Until this invitation I had interviewed only three women prisoners. The invitation to lunch and dinner proved to be a very important approval point in the research, after which I was approached by several women asking if I would interview them, a process that gained momentum as I continued to visit the prison and maintain contact with the women who had already been interviewed. Information about the study began to be passed by word of mouth in a process commonly known as the 'jail telegraph'.

At Yatala Labour Prison a very different process of gaining the men's acceptance for the research occurred. Being known by some of the prisoners from my work within the Victorian Prison System and Youth Training Centres was generally an advantage; it enabled me to gain acceptance quickly as those who knew me from Victoria 'vouched' for my trustworthiness. The role of these men in fostering general acceptance of the study was crucial. Had I not had existing and 'approved' contacts, I would not have so easily had access to some of the older timers⁵ or Aboriginal prisoners at Yatala and Adelaide Women's Prison. I was also aware that no matter how strong my contacts were, I still had to continually 'prove' that I could be trusted.

The network between male prisoners in particular is extensive and not limited to those currently imprisoned. For example, I interviewed six men who were ex-prisoners from

⁵ Refers to a person who has served several prison sentences.

Victoria. Four of the six interstate ex-prisoners contacted me at The University of Adelaide seeking to be included in the research which they had heard about 'on the grapevine'. Four of them travelled to Adelaide to be interviewed. These 6 interviews were valuable in that they allowed me to compare that information with the 54 interviews that I had conducted with men currently imprisoned at Yatala Labour Prison.

My part-time work at Yatala meant that I was better known there than in the women's prison. Those men with whom I had worked in a counselling context were generally willing to participate in the study. However, like the women, male prisoners checked my credentials by contacting people they knew in Yatala, in interstate prisons or within the Aboriginal communities. These contacts proved to be important. For example, I later learned that a 'well respected' male prisoner whom I knew from an interstate prison had encouraged some older prisoners at Yatala to participate in the interviews. It was on his reference that some older, long-term recidivist prisoners decided that I was a 'good square head'⁶ and agreed to be interviewed.

Difficulties conducting the research

The interviews did not pass without a number of incidents. For example, while 'being known' among male prisoners was clearly advantageous in terms of gaining a large number to participate in the study, I nevertheless experienced problems in getting acceptance for the study among some sub-sections of the men's prison. Specifically, child sex offenders and rapists of adult women were generally not interested in being in the study. One reason for this was that some of them had been my clients in a community-based Sexual Offenders' Treatment and Assessment Program (SOTAP). Also at the time when the interviews were conducted, I was working part-time setting up the sexual offender program at Yatala. While this sexual offender program was generally supported by mainstream prisoners because it was perceived as another way

⁶ Refers to a person who is not a criminal.

of harassing a group of prisoners whom they abhorred, it was not welcomed by the sex offenders. This acted as a strong deterrent against those involved in sexual offender treatment programs being involved in the research interviews as they did not want to support anything in which I was involved.

Another factor that affected the study was that it was known by some prisoners who had attended SOTAP that I had worked with the South Australian Police on issues concerning police questioning of sexual offenders. My appearance on behalf of the South Australian Police on a 1996 Crime Stopper program about rape and sexual assault also meant that I was deemed unreliable by some prisoners for having worked for 'the enemy'. Some of the mainstream male prisoners quizzed me about my role with the police before committing themselves to be interviewed. Most accepted my explanation, with the majority of mainstream prisoners expressing support. However, 12 male prisoners from both the protection and mainstream sections of the prison who had previously indicated that they were interested in being interviewed later declined because of my 'police connections'. One of these included a male protectee who had originally organised to be interviewed but changed his mind after seeing me on the Crime Stopper program as he did not want to associate with a person who was a 'police informant'. The sensitivities about loyalty to the brotherhood of criminal mates and against authority pervaded the men's prison. My links with police were interpreted as untrustworthiness.

In another incident I was denied access to a prisoner with whom I had organised an interview. The scheduled date of the interview was May 28. The prisoner concerned had organised the interview prior to his involvement in the May 6 riot. Following the riot on May 28, he was accommodated in the prison's highest security section, G Division. When I arrived at G Division, a male prison officer refused me entry on the grounds that the prisoner was 'dangerous' and there were not enough staff rostered on duty to guarantee my security. I did not challenge this at the time, but six months later I spoke with a senior officer about my restricted access to prisoners in G Division. His

intervention ensured my access and overall 10 prisoners were interviewed from G Division.

The interviews

All except two of the interviews were tape recorded. The participants were 60 male and 40 female prisoners, and 53 prison workers, of whom 40 were prison officers. All the prison workers were employed by the South Australian Department of Correctional Services. Thirty-eight women prisoners were interviewed from Adelaide Women's Prison, in South Australia. The remaining two interviews were with women ex-prisoners from Adelaide Women's Prison. All 40 of the women had their interviews recorded. Fifty-four of the males interviewed were located at Yatala Labour Prison in South Australia. Of the six male ex-prisoners involved in the study, two of the interviews involved me taking notes of their answers to the same questions asked of all other prisoners.

All the interviews were transcribed. Participants were offered the opportunity to read their transcripts. None of the prison staff asked to read their transcripts. Thirteen prisoners took advantage of the opportunity to read theirs. One asked to keep a copy of her interview.

To protect the privacy of those interviewed, pseudonyms are used and details in their story which could identify the person have been omitted. Many of the interviews lasted two or more hours, hence the quotations represent a tiny proportion of the full conversation. Many interviewees are not quoted directly in the text but all material is presented to the extent that it informed my overall picture of the prison. In the quotations presented I have endeavoured to recount the comments as accurately as possible. In some cases I have added bracketed words to assist comprehension.

The interviews were carried out between November 1995 and April 1997. All the participants were involved voluntarily. I initially posted information about the study in

the education centres and in main common areas within the prisons. With the assistance of the institutions' social workers, leaflets were placed under the doors of all the prison cells at Yatala and Adelaide Women's Prison. At Yatala, the interviews with both staff and prisoners were conducted either in my social work office in the education and programs area, or in the social work interview rooms located within each wing of the prison.

At the women's prison, all the interviews with high security prisoners were conducted in the Manager's office situated only two metres from the observation circle. In the low security section of the prison called the Living Skills Units, the interviews were conducted either in the woman's unit or in the common room. The interviews with staff were conducted in their offices or in the social work rooms.

There were several disadvantages with the interviewing rooms. At Yatala not all prisoners had access to the area where my office was located. Those who were in solitary confinement or in high security sections (G Division) were restricted to those areas of the prison. Men who were employed in prison industries were not available to be interviewed between the hours of 8.30 am and 4.30 pm. I was generally in the prison only during those hours, so special arrangements were needed in order to interview those men. Prisoners who were involved in education programs also found it difficult to arrange an interview time because of the difficulty in organising prison staff to escort them from the education centre to and from my office. Escorts had been available prior to the May 6 riot at Yatala. After the riot, officers felt that there was a need to have tighter security and that they were too under-staffed to carry out escorting functions. This situation made the interview process very difficult, as movement around the prison was slow and unreliable. Other impediments included not being permitted to interview mainstream prisoners when protection prisoners were in the education building, because intermixing between protection and mainstream prisoners was considered to be a security risk.

Interviews that could not be conducted in my office at Yatala were conducted in one of the small glass observation rooms located in each wing of the prison. In the B Division, the interview room was also used as a storage area, as well as for social work, education, and legal aid interviews, and for prisoner hair cuts once a fortnight. On a number of occasions when the room had been 'double booked' interviews had to be rescheduled. The glass observation rooms are by definition on view to staff and prisoners. Sometimes the conversation could also be heard by prisoners and staff nearby. In G Division (the punishment unit) the room was monitored by cameras and the interviews could be overheard by the intercom. These issues were of concern to me but my efforts to obtain a more private location were refused because (1) space was not available for this to occur, and (2) my security was said to be best preserved by using the observation room.

For the participants in Adelaide Women's Prison high security section, the interview room presented a number of similar problems. At times the interview could be heard by people passing or standing outside. There was a very high window in the interview room, and on occasions the interviewees alerted me to people standing outside the window and listening. Additionally, the interview room was used as their office by prison staff. While the Manager and officers were very supportive of the study, they were unable to meet my request for a more appropriate interview space for similar reasons as given at Yatala about lack of space, but not fears about my safety.

Being located in the officers' room caused a number of difficulties. For example, on several occasions I visited the prison to conduct interviews only to be advised that the room was being used by staff and that I would have to reschedule interviews for the following week. On one occasion when this occurred, I returned the next week to find that the woman I had organised to interview had been released from prison. One woman was clearly annoyed when her interview was rescheduled for the third time and she withdrew from the study. Another problem that occurred was that the officers needed to have access to the interview room because files and other information were

housed there. This meant that at times officers interrupted the interview process. Some of the officers also resented the women being in 'their office', and asked me to ensure that the women did not touch files or read anything that was left on the desk. I felt uncomfortable about this role and avoided it by attempting to clear any information from the desk prior to the interviews.

Prisoners in both prisons were alert to the intercom being activated. On one occasion when interviewing a woman from the Living Skills Units at Adelaide Women's Prison, I was passed a note by the woman I was interviewing which read *I'm talking crap because they are listening*. I turned off the tape recorder and proceeded with the interview only when given cues to do so by the woman being interviewed. The difficulty in finding a place where a confidential conversation could be held illustrates the pervasiveness in the prison of surveillance of inmates and staff alike.

The interview schedule

The interview schedule was designed to proceed from formal factual questions to a semi-structured interview with more open-ended questions (see Appendix A). This provided information about the participant and also allowed as free as possible a narrative from the interviewee on the issues that I wished to discuss. This section of the interview was purposely flexible to take account of Denzin's insights that:

No fixed series of questions would be satisfactory for all those interviewed and that some participants would raise issues of importance which were not in the interview schedule or they would cover a number of issues all at once. (Denzin, 1978: 1150)

In the structured section of the interviews, prisoners were asked about their personal and prison history including their age, ethnic background, whether they were a protection or mainstream prisoner, and if they were eligible for contact or non-contact visits (see appendix). Additionally I asked about their employment status prior to

imprisonment and within prison, formal education, age of first offence, whether they had ever been detained in a Youth Training Centre or not, and if so, where and for how long. I also asked questions about the prisoner's current as well as previous crime, current and previous length of sentence, illegal drug use, if they had used illegal drugs in prison, when they last used illegal drugs, what their preferred drug(s) were, medication, the number of children (if any) they had, and if they had children, whether their children were in their care prior to imprisonment and who the current care-taker was. The interviews with prison officers and civilian staff included questions about their previous employment, education level, how long they had been working as a prison officer and where they had worked within the prison.

In the semi-structured section of the interview I asked prisoners about their experience of prison, inviting them to provide a description and evaluation of their support networks within and outside the prison. One of the reasons for making this part of the interview semi-structured was to enable the participant to decide what information they wanted to disclose. All the prisoners were asked to describe their relationships with other inmates and prison officers, whether they had experienced or seen any violence in prison, if medication had been prescribed for them and what side effects if any they had noticed, whether they had been involved in confrontation with prison officers or management and if so, how they resolved the problems. Other questions were asked about their use of drugs inside the prison. Those prisoners who had children were asked to describe their relationship with their children. They were also asked if prison had impacted on their relationship with their children. Many of the women who were mothers became very upset when speaking about their children. Five women asked me not to return to the question about their children because they found it too difficult to talk about without getting very upset. In 15 interviews the tape was turned off until the participant felt comfortable speaking. Several times while in both the men's and women's prisons, I diverted from my role as 'the researcher' to comfort the participant.

In the interviews with prison officers and civilian staff I asked what the reasons were for them working in the prison, why they had chosen to work at Adelaide Women's Prison or Yatala Labour Prison, what aspects of their job they enjoyed or disliked, how they would describe their relationship with prisoners and other prison officers, and what they saw were some of the main difficulties that men and women prisoners may experience in prison.

Several of the participants, including prison officers, became visibly upset during and after the interviews. After all the interviews I provided an opportunity for the participants to debrief and discuss issues. This debriefing was an important part of the project in that for many the interview was the first time they had felt safe to speak about some painful issues. When the dialogue aroused deep emotion or unexpected insights, I also made sure that the participants had someone whom they trusted and could talk with in the prison. On my subsequent visit to the prison after the interview I would whenever possible make contact with the participant and on several occasions I provided more time for discussion. On five occasions I was asked by the participant to inform the prison social worker of their distress. On one occasion the participant said she felt suicidal. After a long discussion in which I explained what I felt to be my moral and professional responsibility to tell the officers of her suicidal ideas, she agreed that she would tell them.

Validity of the research

While interviewing was the central research method used in this thesis, validity and reliability was enhanced by the use of observation, and cross-checking of information. For information on issues concerning crime and sentencing I cross-checked on the Department of Correctional Services' Justice Information System (JIS). The JIS holds information about the prisoner's age, crime, sentence and previous crimes and sentences. The prisoners were aware that I was able to cross-reference information presented by different interviewees and they also knew that I had access to information

recorded on the JIS. In only one instance did I suspect that the interviewee was deliberately providing a fabricated story. After cross-checking other interviews and checking with the JIS and social work and education reports, it was confirmed that the interviewee had created a story of his criminal history and prison occupation which bore little relationship to the records. While the interview itself is not included in the study, the story that he constructed provided an instance of the sort of personal and criminal career that at least one prisoner aspired to.

In investigating the experiences of prisoners the study aimed to find out how men and women 'do' prison. The research technique needed, therefore, to go beyond the simple collating of accounts of prison. That is, I wanted to generate material which would be useful in understanding the complexities and the multiple meanings of imprisonment. The richness as well as the extent of insights that the interview material has provided about the prison culture and the different gendered meanings of prison are evident in the following chapters.

CHAPTER 4: THE MEN'S PRISON

In this chapter there are two sections. In the first section 'Learning to be a real criminal', I will explore the ways in which male prisoners became criminalised and introduced into the criminal brotherhood. I will use the term 'brotherhood' which is a term frequently used by male prisoners to describe the male criminal fraternity. I will argue that inclusion within the brotherhood is best (or almost always) achieved through serving an apprenticeship in the juvenile detention centres and becoming known to other brothers as having worthy criminal qualities. This admission into the family of the brotherhood is earned by engaging in homosocial activities, practising self-surveillance, and being secretive about and loyal to other manly criminals. I will suggest that this form of criminal masculinity, which also separates and segregates those who are seen as weak and unmanly from those who have bodies which are 'hard', is practised and maintained by both the prison officers and the prisoners. Furthermore I will argue that the drug-addicted prisoner challenges The Code,⁷ or the rules of the brotherhood. That is, the drug-addicted prisoner undermines the image of the tough, hard, self-actualising male criminal.

In the second section 'Policing boundaries between protection and mainstream', I will argue that the dominant masculine criminal persona is maintained via the exclusion of those whom the brotherhood deems as unworthy, weak, gutless and not 'real' criminals. Specifically, this latter group comprises those who have failed to conform to what I refer to as a particular form of hard criminal masculinity. Hence there is no space within the mainstream section for non-manly men, homosexuals, women, police informants and some child sex offenders. Those who are excluded are therefore relegated to a space outside the mainstream, which is known as 'protection'. Protection is a section within the male prison where prisoners who have informed on

⁷ Throughout this thesis I will be referring to The Code. The Code is a term particularly used by male prisoners when referring to the rules of prisoner behaviour.

a mainstream prisoner or who have committed crimes considered by the criminal brotherhood to be 'undesirable' are accommodated.

In addition I will argue that the male prison culture is one that reinforces and facilitates a form of masculinity which is based on respect for physical violence and domination. Prisoners who either refuse to participate in the accepted rituals of dominant criminal masculinity or are judged as Other to the brotherhood are subject to various forms of punishment. These include the physical separation of the unmanly 'protected' prisoner from mainstream prisoners. Within this culture protection is seen by mainstream prisoners and some prison officers as punishment. Other techniques of punishment include verbal abuse and physical violence to the body, which many in the protection section experience. That is, these men are punished by both the prison and the brotherhood because they are judged as having failed to adhere to the brotherhood's criteria of the desirable 'hard man' criminal.

Section 1: Learning to be a real criminal

Youth training centres

The interviews with male prisoners show that the rules of criminal behaviour are learnt at an early age from friends in one's suburb and in the Youth Training Centres (or Juvenile Detention Centres as they are also known): places where the young teenager mixes with other offenders. At the Youth Training Centres (YTCs) the young offender often meets and connects for the first time with others who will become lifetime associates in crime. Men described their boyhood in the YTCs as being times of preparation, or, as the name implies, 'training' for entry into the adult prison. In this sense, crime was for many of these men inextricably linked to their sense of identity.

Of the 60 male prisoners who were interviewed for this study, 43 had been through the YTCs with the majority (30) having first entered custody by their fourteenth birthday. Three had been imprisoned at the age of seven. Seven of the men interviewed said their first association with YTCs was not because they had committed crime, but because they were removed from their biological families by the State because they had been physically, sexually or emotionally abused. These men referred to themselves as wards of the State. All seven said that through being accommodated in YTCs they learnt how to commit crime.

All 43 who had been convicted as juveniles reported that they had committed property offences, with the most common offence being that of stealing cars. What is evident in most of the stories of those men who started their institutional life in the YTCs is that they are very important places for one's criminal development. Out of the 43 who had been through the YTCs, 37 stated that the friendships they made as a juvenile were so important that they were 'like family'. Thirty-eight out of the sixty men interviewed stated that they started offending at about the age of twelve.

Those prisoners who do not enter prison through the YTCs have a very different criminal profile from those who do. For example, of the 43 who had been in YTCs, 32 were serving sentences for property and drug-related offences, 4 for grievous bodily harm, 4 for murder, and 3 for manslaughter. Of the 17 interviewees who had not been imprisoned as juveniles, 11 were serving their first sentence. One was serving a 15-day sentence for not paying a series of traffic fines, two were serving life sentences for the murder of their female partners, and eight had been convicted of sexual offences against children under the age of twelve. A total of 11 of the prisoners interviewed had been convicted of sexual offences against children; 7 of these admitted to offending in their mid-teens, but on average they were not convicted until 10 years later. Three of the eleven convicted of sexual offences against children denied committing the offences for which they were convicted. There are a number of reasons why those who sexually offended against children were less likely to have

been convicted when they first started offending, partly because this type of crime usually involves victims who are family members or others close to the family. Secondly these crimes are often not reported because there is a widely held misconception that those who do offend in adolescence are only 'experimenting' or 'expressing their sexuality', and therefore not really offending. Sexual offences involve extreme levels of secrecy and deception, and such crimes are often difficult to detect as victims are usually very young and are not considered credible witnesses. These factors explain why very few of those who have developed a criminal career as a sexual offender against children have been through the YTCs, even though their pattern of offending, like that of many non-sex offending prisoners, may have begun in childhood.

It seems that for a majority of men, committing crime at a young age and going on to the YTCs were necessary in their preparation and training for both the adult system of prison and for criminal masculinity. The boy's arrival in the YTC marks a formal beginning, an initiation into a brotherhood of apprentice criminals. This first initiation is a lesson in the core values of the criminal brotherhood: loyalty and obedience. If a young boy is to continue his vocation successfully as a 'real', 'hard' criminal, he will need to be taught to understand and adhere to the brotherhood's rules and principles as to what constitutes criminal masculinity. That is, the boy must keep secrets, not tell on his friends, be willing to take risks, and test out his new skills by committing only what are seen by other brothers as acceptable crimes. Acceptable crimes reinforce heterosexual masculinity and specifically exclude sexual offences against children. Later, when the boy reaches the adult institution and is eligible to commit bigger and more manly crimes, he will have other initiations to contend with.

Doing crime

The majority of the men I interviewed who had been through the YTCs remembered that period of their lives sentimentally. One interviewee who illustrates this is Rick. He

grew up in a violent culture of criminality, where he was separated from his parents and siblings and 'brought up' within YTCs from the age of nine. He describes his childhood sentimentally and chose only to remember the heroic aspects of being a juvenile and later, a well-known and feared adult criminal. It is strikingly obvious from Rick's story that he is proud of his own, and his associates' achievements in the criminal world:

At the boys' homes I had swimming pools, trampolines and I met other people, who I later went on to know for years. I hung around with those people, and every one was like me even if they were Italians, Greeks and Aboriginals and that, all of us who went to boys' homes then ended up in Pentridge. We were taught by the best of them. We was all big shoppers [shoplifters]. And some of us, well we went on to do good crimes, big crimes. There were heaps of boys there in jail, having the jacks [police] running, doing drugs, armed robberies ... Some are dead and that. All that [death, drugs and crime] it just happened to be part of us.

Rick's story is a representation of a criminal childhood. While the over-representation of Aboriginal people (both men and women) in prison is no doubt in large part due to dispossession and increased police surveillance, it appears that there is little difference between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal men in their 'training' for criminality. Of the 60 men interviewed 10 were Aboriginal. All 10 were accommodated in the mainstream section of the prison. A majority (eight of the ten) had as juveniles spent time in the YTCs. Secondly, all eight who had been accommodated in the YTCs said that they teamed up with others from there who became lifetime associates in crime. As Robert explained:

I was bought up with a generation of the family who was doing crime. It was a generation after generation. But my father didn't go to jail. My father was a hard working man. It's the peers, the people around you, the boys we met from the missions, from the homes, from the streets. We

*Nungas*⁸ come in [to the city] from the country. In the country when we was on the mission we use to knock the tractors off in the sheds and drive them onto the farm. When we moved from Point Pearce [Aboriginal mission] and came to Adelaide and it was bigger we got to know the streets and the other young Nungas and white people who was doing crime. We started wagging school and came to Hindley Street [in the city centre in Adelaide] and seen everyone [other young people] there. When we mission boys come into town, we would stay in our little groups and do breaks [burglaries] and whatever and knocking [stealing] cars off. We are all different tribes of Aboriginals, you had the Butterfish people from the sea water, [Point Pearce, York Peninsula], the Mud Monkey people from the Riverland [Berri and Renmark], and the Lizard people [Kunniba, northern South Australia] coming over to Adelaide and we was into drinking and burls [burglaries] and teaming up to do crime. We was 14 and 15 year olds drinking Moselle and Riesling, doing crime and meeting up with other kids who were Nungas or whites to do crime with. Then we started smoking marijuana and you need money to buy that so it [committing crime] just grew and grew. We all eventually went to the boy's homes or to prison, teamed up with other kids in the homes, learnt what's the go and what's not and became better crooks.

Within the criminal apprenticeship system, the need to fit in with the right people is paramount and evident in many of the male prisoners' stories. Both Rick's and Robert's stories highlight the way in which the bonds of criminality and mateship are formed in the YTCs, and that this period is a boy's formal beginning in criminality, which is linked to adventurous risk-taking masculinity. Specifically, late adolescence is a time when many begin to adopt the physical markings of a criminal. For example, a majority of the men received their first tattoos while in the YTCs and learnt the lessons of how to 'perform' real men's crime. It seems that the young men's bodies

⁸ Aborigines from the Adelaide South Australian plains.

are physically prepared for the adult prison and marked in ways that enable both the criminal and non-criminal world to identify them as having the physical characteristics of 'hard' criminal men. In addition almost all of those interviewed shared Rick's view that the YTCs are holding bays where delinquent boys are kept until they are old enough to be transferred to the adult prison system. Ironically Rick's reference to the early and violent death of most of his acquaintances does not dampen his nostalgic reverie about his childhood spent in custody:

I went to Baltara, Turana, Bayswater, Morningstar, Poplar House⁹ then on to Pentridge. I started at Baltara when I was 12 and went to Pentridge when I was 17. I liked Poplar House. It was maximum security for those on punishment and I done all right there. I knew a lot of people in Poplar House and I spent a lot of time there. Some of us got boob¹⁰ tatts [tattoos], number ones [short hair cuts] which I had since then, and from then on I only hung around with crims. From Poplar everyone goes to Pen [Pentridge Prison, Victoria], it's like a holding bay where you learn [crime] and then get off to Pen when you're old enough 'cos you learnt how to do a few jobs [crime]. They [the young boys] go from there [YTCs] to Pen.

You know most of them I knew back then and taught me are now dead. They were shot by the Jacks [police] some of them, but they all done some big jobs, and were pretty heavy guys. They were never beaten, we was always on top. I learnt a lot [about crime] and made a lot of friends in Turana and in Poplar, and 'cos we are all institutionalised, all I ended up knowing at Turana was how to do more crime and havin' a few other staunch blokes to help out.

⁹ Baltara, Turana, Bayswater and Morningstar were all YTCs in Melbourne, Victoria. They have all closed down. Baltara and Bayswater accommodated children from the ages of seven to fourteen years. The last of these YTCs to close was Turana Youth Training Centre. In 1994 the Melbourne Juvenile Justice Centre was built to replace Turana. Poplar House was the high security section of Turana. YTCs accommodate boys from the ages of 14 to 21 years. Most youth, however, are transferred to the adult prisons at the age of 18.

¹⁰ Boob means jail.

If you've got it in you, after Turana you'd go on to do some big crimes, which most of us done. We talk the same language 'cos we are crims. You can come from anywhere, even blokes that done time in overseas jails or up North or wherever, I seen over the years that we all speak the same way, that a straight [law abiding person] wouldn't understand. I find it really hard to be with straight people 'cos I can't kind of relate to straights because it's a different language in a way. They don't know our language, the way we do things. But some of the cunts ... sorry, sorry, oh sorry ... did I offend you, sorry I shouldn't use that word in front of a lady ... but some of them [other prisoners] in here don't know [the criminal language] either.

Rick's story highlights one of the ways in which language is a marker of one's identity. For him those who speak the 'secret' criminal language of the 'secret society' are 'inside' the brotherhood. Additionally his use of the word 'cunt' incites an immediate apology to me. The word 'cunt' is, as he suggests, the language of men and not of 'ladies'. Furthermore I am marked as 'straight'. That is, those who are marked 'straight' do not speak the criminal dialect and do not understand the bonds that these men have with one another. They are 'outside' and 'the Other' to real male criminality.

In addition, Rick's story suggests that one of the effects of male criminals observing loyalty to The Code is that it reinforces that key notion within masculinity of loyalty to the brotherhood of mates. It is not a deviation from 'typical' Australian masculinity, but rather an affirmation of the mateship ethos. The myth of the 'bushman' and the 'digger' stipulated an absolute commitment to one's 'mates', and a resistance to 'authority'. While the criminal is deemed deviant in many respects, in other respects the masculine criminal performs an exaggerated, but not different, form of Australian masculinity in that it is intensely homosocial.

Rick's story also indicates that to be accepted into the criminal brotherhood, one has to be initiated by the brothers as well as demonstrating a preparedness to progress from student to master. That is, each aspiring criminal must learn the skills of criminality. While each craft within the criminal trade requires particular skills, the fundamental test for all the crafts is the same, that of keeping silence. This test has to be passed with distinction, and there are no exceptions to that rule. For a brother to be privy to secret information means that he is respected and has earned a reputation for respecting The Code of silence. Indeed one of the effects of male criminals practising loyalty to The Code is that it reinforces that key notion within masculinity of loyalty.

Silence is one of the most important forms of power operating within the men's jail. Those who cannot keep secrets and who 'talk' are branded permanently. They are known as 'dogs'¹¹ and because they haven't maintained the code of silence they are often violently punished by the criminal brotherhood. However, within each trade, there are other specialised skills that ambitious and enterprising criminals need to perfect. For example, Ross, who aspired to be a bank robber, had to pass the elementary bank robbery tests which included supplying weapons and later driving the get-away car. After successfully performing the practical component of his apprenticeship he gradually moved up the ranks until he was selected by his masters to team up and perform the ultimate act: going into banks and carrying out the hold ups. The man who commits a bank robbery is seen by the brotherhood as a real example of the essential, criminal man who 'has the balls', courage and nerve to perform risky or audacious acts. That is, bank robbery is about hard men courting danger, taking risks and 'doing gender' in a very public way. As Ross explained:

I used to have guns but I didn't do bank robberies. I was using smack and selling it. A friend come round and asked if he could get one [gun] off me and said he would return it. I lent it to them and they paid me money for it on about three occasions. I went out with them a couple of

¹¹ Dog relates to 'yapping'. To call a prisoner a 'dog' means they cannot be trusted to keep secrets.

times and me mate said he needed a hot car. I knew how to pinch cars. And then they needed a driver. I had met two other people who were doing it [stealing cars for bank robberies] with him and one of them were going to jail. I run into them three weeks later and he [the friend] said 'I need a driver and do you want to drive for one' [bank robbery]. He'd say 'all you have to do is drive', and I understood the go [language] and the way of doing crime.

So they went in and out [of the bank] ... We planned the stick up [bank robbery] and all. After the stick up me mate said I had a bit of guts and then asked if I wanted to go in with him in some more stick ups and that he would get a driver. So we did that and got away with the first one. We done some good business.

'Doing' crime is a physical manifestation of 'doing' masculinity. That is, 'doing' crime allows men to 'do' gender. For example, Ross's description of the master and apprentice fits a particularly masculine occupational area and hierarchy. Also this imagery of the master and apprentice, which serves to exclude the 'feminine', affirms criminal activity as a masculine pursuit. Specifically, the apprenticed criminal has to prove to the master that he is talented, trustworthy and able to respect and operate within the network of the brotherhood. In addition, all students require a master of the trade whose role is to teach, and at the same time to monitor and observe the student's progress. Indeed Ross's story demonstrates the extent to which masculinity is 'learned' and 'achieved'. He had to work for and prove his credentials to others within the criminal brotherhood. That is, he had to 'do' crime which in turn allowed him to 'do' a form of masculinity that would show to other brothers his qualities of being a risk taker who was gutsy, manly and staunch. In addition, he had to show to those who occupy the top ranks of the criminal hierarchy that he was prepared to learn the skills of bank robbery and, in doing so, remain steadfastly committed to The Code.

In addition to Ross, many of the other men I interviewed referred to their crimes as their 'business' where they made 'deals' and performed 'contracts'. The language used to describe their illegal activities fits into the type of masculinity seen operating in the business world of wheeling, dealing and making secret contracts. They used words such as promotion, networking, 'go getter', expenses, markets, profits, margins, strategies, planning and image to describe their 'business activities'. However, when asked to explain the type of contracts or deals they were referring to, the majority of the men, and in particular those who had served several sentences and were considered to be 'old timers', were not prepared to elaborate or provide me, a woman and a 'square head',¹² with information. To do so would offend against The Code. Others requested that the tape recorder be turned off so they could give an 'off the record' explanation. I was politely told on several occasions that criminal deals and contracts are extremely secret, and only those brothers who have earned a reputation within this very closed group are privy to such information.

Making 'business deals' within the brotherhood carries with it an element of risk. If one is caught by the police for illegal activities, then it is expected that the person who is caught takes the entire blame without implicating or involving anyone else. This lesson was learnt the hard way by some prisoners who had not been brought up through the YTCs. Tran, a recent recruit to the criminal family who has not experienced the 'training' that the YTCs provide, described how he learnt the behaviour expected of him by other criminals. Although Tran had not been trained in the YTCs, his loyalty to The Code was strong through cultural identification. An example of this is when Tran was apprehended by the police, he maintained the code of silence to protect his friend who, along with Tran, had been involved in selling large quantities of heroin:

[I] come to Australia first time not know anything. Vietnamese people met [in] shop and ask '[you] want have a money?' He give [me] heroin

¹² Someone who does not commit crime.

and [I] go give [it to] other people. I got twenty per cent money. I know heroin, but [I] not know it wrong, didn't know.

[I] get jail. About after six months [after I] come [to] Australia [I] get caught. [The police] charge me [for] sell heroin. [Police] tell [me] 'who get me heroin?' But [I] didn't tell. Nah. If you do wrong and go jail ... [I] don't tell. And before [my arrest] my friend [heroin dealer] say [you] don't tell me [to] police, and you go to jail me come visit. I give you money, I give you TV, I give you anything'. He bad boy, he lie [to] me.

The interviews with male prisoners also indicate that the brotherhood has high expectations of its members. The extent of loyalty to the brotherhood is emphasised in a variety of ways. For example, looking after one another to the extent of doing time for a friend was mentioned mainly by prisoners who had served several sentences. Almost all those interviewed, and in particular those that came through the YTCs, stated that the friends they had had since they were in the YTCs were not only criminals but also 'family' to them. Others described how they have on occasions tried to end their contact with the criminal world, but by chance had met up with an old 'friends' from jail and subsequently teamed up and committed further crime with them.

The all-male criminal family

The interviews suggest that to be a successful criminal, there is a need to learn how to develop and maintain supportive networks. Almost all the men interviewed (except those convicted of child sexual offences) stated that networking was a crucial component of the criminal world. For Chich, who migrated with his family from Italy in the 1950s and grew up in Melbourne, learning the criminal code and being accepted by the criminal family started at primary school. This networking prepared him for the YTCs which he first entered at the age of 16.

Chich described the way in which he started networking the criminal world as a child. While the surface of his story is about the ethnic and religious slur that he and others were subject to, on a deeper level it is about how he was associated with, and was able to use, his already developed network within his suburb to seek the support of older males to assist him. It was these men who taught Chich 'survival skills', and who later initiated him into the criminal world of drugs, bank robbery and jail. As Chich explained:

At the age of 11 I was living in Brunswick. I went to a Catholic school from the age of 6 until about 12 years old. During that time I was even an altar boy at the local church. I was deeply religious, believed in God and went to church every Sunday. Anyway being a Catholic and a wog [Southern European migrant] was a continuous battle back then, on the street and at home. To get from school to home I had to go past a State-run school which was pretty terrifying. It was like running a gauntlet every night. I had to get past a dozen or so Aussie kids armed with pieces of wood, cricket wickets. Believe me they hated the Catholics and, if you had the misfortune of being born Italian or Greek, they hated you twice as much. On numerous occasions I got home bruised, cut and my uniform almost ripped from my back. Every time I came home like that my father started on me and more often than not I would also get a beating from him because for some strange reason he did not believe me, and was under the impression that I was causing the trouble with the Aussies.

To overcome the problems I was having with the State school kids, I started hanging around the cafe billiard rooms in Sydney Road [Melbourne] and started playing billiards with some older guys that I'd met in there. I wouldn't go home until about 5.30 to 6 pm. I knew it was safe to go home then because the Aussie kids would be home.

One day I decided to do something about it so I went to the billiard room and told some of the older guys what was happening to me. They decided to walk me home straight past the State school and all those mother fucking Aussies that were giving me hell. The plan was that I would walk on the same side of the road as the school and the five older guys would walk on the other side of the street and when the Aussies tried to start on me, my new-found older friends would run across the road and kick the shit out of them. Everything went to plan and the Aussies got the best belt they'd ever had.

The next day at school I was treated like a hero, drinks and lollies being bought for me from all the other kids. From that day onwards we struck back at anyone that ever gave us a hard time. We formed a gang which grew to about 30 kids. We called ourselves the Minnie Street Giants. From that day onwards I said to myself that I wasn't going to take shit from anybody and I never have. So I guess I owe those guys my life in a way because they taught me a lot of survival skills that got me to the 41 years of age that I am now. It's a shame that I didn't do as much for those guys, as we all became pretty good friends and they became my family really. By the way, four of those five guys are now dead. One literally got his head blown off by a shotgun at a party most of us were at in 1974, another one was shot in a laneway in Fitzroy [Melbourne] in 1980, two more overdosed on smack [heroin] in 1984 and 1987. The one that's still living has since become a millionaire and deserves every cent of it. The gang fights continued between us [the immigrants and the Australians] up until 1968. Some we lost, but mostly we won.

While the ability to network is crucial for learning the criminal trade and being accepted among the all-male criminal brotherhood which Chich referred to as his 'family', there are considerable risks involved in establishing a place within the criminal brother's

network. For example, one of the ever-present themes is the likelihood and acceptance of death. Within the brotherhood, death is viewed as a risk of the trade. Except sexual offenders, almost every male prisoner referred to criminal 'brothers' having died. Most stated that networking and associating with particular brothers meant that the hazardous and 'manly' activities they undertook (bank robberies, shootings, drug taking) had the inevitable risk of death. For example, Arnold described the type of brother he associates with. He considered that these relationships are, and have been, the most important and meaningful associations in his life. The image of the family is clearly evoked in Arnold's reference to 'your own'. That is, those who are not 'your own' are Other to this dominant form of criminal masculinity. As Arnold explained:

You trust some people and you sort out the others. It's like water, it finds its own level. You associate with your own. Your own are those who do stick ups like your armed robbers and the blokes who are charged with shootings. Friends over the years you know the people, come from the system together and go from boys to men. Over the years and years in jail you sort of know people and the jail system and you know them. You have to come through the ropes. It's like going to school. You have to associate with the right people, and get educated in the right way if they want to be like us crooks. You have to talk to people who have done things and know how to go about it.

Being a criminal came my way of life. I've missed out on a lot of things on the outside, but I just had to cope with the sentences I got and that was it. I think I coped all right and I've always had mates who have been my family in a way. They've been there to help me out. Jail's an occupational hazard. If you do the crime, you do the time if you get caught. If you get away with it, then good.

The apparent irony is that throughout these men's lives they have prided themselves on having 'broken all the rules' of society, on being non-conformist, rebellious and

opposed to authority. Yet, the brotherhood's expected code of behaviour is enforced and operated in an extremely coercive and authoritarian fashion, which demands conformity, and relies on extraordinary levels of loyalty and trust. Foucault's comment that the prison has a 'strict hierarchical framework' (1977a: 238) is useful; however, it seems that the criminal brotherhood even beyond prison is bound by, and operates through an even stricter hierarchical framework. In fact the criminal brotherhood has established a set of rules and behaviours which are as hegemonic as the prison system and the social mores that criminals are flaunting.

Again, like many other male prisoners I interviewed, Arnold used the word 'family' to refer to his 'brothers' in crime. Like most of the men that I interviewed, he described his blood family as fractured and dysfunctional. It seems that there is a compelling need for these men to form family-like relationships with other men who have had similar life experiences. Thirty-eight of the forty three men who had been brought up through the YTCs said other criminal men were more of a family to them than their blood relatives. Additionally, in this study 15 men were wards of the State by their fourteenth birthday. All 15 said other men in jail had become their family. Indeed these 'family' bonds provide many for the first time with a sense of identity, security and community that they have not experienced in their biological relationships or in society generally.

Consistent with the idea of a 'family' of brothers in crime is that for many the jail is their home. This image of the jail as home is clearly evoked by Vic. In describing the physical environment of the prison, Vic referred to people's cells as their houses. He described people visiting his 'house' and going to each another's 'places' and being entertained and provided with food, drinks, music and drugs. The image Vic provides of the prison is of a men's lodge for brothers who share the same values and lifestyles. He explained the rewards of being a member of the criminal family, and in particular, spoke of the Italian 'criminal family' with which he most identified.

When you go to jail if you needed something and Mick [a friend of Vic's] had it, he'd give it to you, cigarettes, coffee, gear [drugs] he'd give it to you. He had tapes of Van Morrison, the lot, and everyone would come around to Mick's place [cell] and ask for some music. If you were a dog you would not go there. We was living with 15 Italians, we were all Italians. An Italian group, like a family we were. Italian people are good people, they are generous of course they are like our friend Mario he got 10 years, but he was a very generous man towards me and Mick and helped us out like family. And there's Tom, old Tom an old Italian man, he is OK. Tom he was 70 years old, he gave his wife a bit of hard time, but that's not our business really. He might of bashed his wife, but he is old. He drove taxis for years and he locked her in the cupboard, but he's a good bloke. Yeah, he, he done the wrong thing, but he's an old Italian bloke, and he's OK. He wasn't a smack [heroin] user [laughs], he was just an old traditional Italian. He was a taxi driver, an old man and we looked after him, we'd let him come around [to the cell] because he was an old man and he was Italian. Only if they are Italian, if they are Anglo they got their own people there to help them out.

Vic's story reflects the overlay of ethnic identification within the brotherhood which is similar to that which Robert described among Aboriginal prisoners. Vic also invokes the wider societal 'code of silence' about domestic violence in his reference to Tom's violence towards his wife being considered a private matter and therefore not 'our business'. That is, one does not pry into another man's, and particularly an old 'traditional' man's, domestic affairs. These matters are 'off limits'. Being a 'traditional' man is not read as 'the violent patriarch', but rather his age and cultural background are factors which are read by other Italian prisoners as evidence of Tom deserving to be looked after.

When a person first enters an adult prison he will very rarely have any possessions. They will rely on others they know to help them out with a television set, toaster, coffee, tea, cigarettes, and even to organise paid work for them within the prison. Arnold provided a detailed description of the jail as a 'home' which is kept furnished for other family members. That is, resources such as television sets and electrical goods are rarely taken out of the jail upon release, rather, they are passed on among trusted brothers. When released, outside members of the 'family' will return favours by providing money and material goods to help one get established:

When you leave jail, Pentridge or Yatala or Long Bay or wherever, you always leave someone your TV set or something for your mates who haven't got one or for someone coming through [to prison]. I'd never take anything out of the jail, I leave it there. When you get released you know people from Pentridge that you know and you do some more crime and so you come undone and you go back to jail. You've got people who are making money outside who will always help you when you get out of the nick [prison]. When you walk out the gate they'll say 'you're home Arnold, here's some monkeys¹³ for you'.

The all-male 'families' that most of the men referred to appeared to be functional. Like most families, the rules of what constitutes acceptable and unacceptable behaviour are etched into each member's psyche. In the criminal family, if someone does not respect the established rules, then he is quickly dealt with by those brothers who are respected within the group. Women are strikingly absent from the 'family'. The absence of women from the criminal 'family' serves to further reinforce both the metaphorical and physical spatial differences between men and women criminals. Specifically, women, whether criminal or 'square head', are always positioned as 'different' from male prisoners, and only 'hard' criminal men can approve and validate 'real' criminality. For the majority of male prisoners, the brotherhood becomes their first and primary loyalty with 'other' relationships (with women and

¹³ A monkey is five hundred dollars.

children) being of secondary importance and identification. The homosocial character of the prison is clearly evident in the concern expressed about the presence of women in men's prisons.

Women prison officers

The view that the employment of women prison officers had had a negative impact on the prison was expressed by both old timer prisoners who had served several sentences and also by a number of long-term male prison officers. In contrast, younger male prisoners and first timers were more approving of women prison officers, with the majority reporting that they found them to be less aggressive and intimidating than male prison officers. Several male prison officers stated that women prison officers were ineffective when 'real' pressure was applied. For example, women prison officers were considered to be a 'liability' when male prisoners were rioting or violent. The majority of older male prisoners also supported this assessment of women prison officers. Shane, an old timer who had served several sentences, reported that women prison officers were unwelcome in men's prisons:

Women prison officers shouldn't be here. They are doing a man's job, and they can't strip search you, and when there's a riot they can't come into the riot and they are babied [by male prison officers]. Look, we are in a men's environment. It's not that we've invaded them, women in here have invaded us, they [have] come into our territory. I'm not about to not stop saying 'get fucked' just because she doesn't like it just because she's a woman. If she's going to do this job, she has to cop everything that goes with it. Which I think it is fair enough. I'm not going to stop doing what I am doing or saying because a woman is walking past.

Shane's views suggest that women prison officers' difference from men is also read as them invading men's space and territory. Shane, like many other prisoners and male

prison officers, spoke of women's unsuitability to work as an officer in men's prisons and supported this by stating that they were physically and mentally 'weaker' than men. Furthermore, many questioned why a 'real' woman would want to work in a men's prison, with some suggesting that women officers either had ulterior motives such as sexual desire, or were trying to prove their equality with men by trying to do 'men's work'. Almost all the prisoners and male prison officers who expressed disapproval of women officers working in men's prisons expressed the view that a 'good' woman would not want to work in a male prison, with a high number stating that women prison officers were not 'real' women.

This view is consistent with other research on women prison officers. Canadian criminologist Maeve McMahon in her book *Women on Guard* argues that women working in men's prisons are often subject to discriminatory and harassing behaviour by some of their male colleagues (1999: 56). In her discussion on Wakefield Jail, a Canadian men's prison in Ontario, McMahon claims that 'gender based discrimination and harassment can become taken for granted among male staff' (1999: 56). Additionally, McMahon reports that male prison officers at Wakefield Jail have told women that they 'would not provide support for them in dangerous situations' (1999: 64).

At the time of my research there were no women prison officers employed in Yatala's high security section, G Division. For June, a woman with 11 years experience as a prison officer, the exclusion of women from G Division is a reflection of the real culture of the prison. Speaking about management in G Division she reported:

They [management in G Division] once said to me eight years ago that if they ever got a vacancy they would give it to me, because I have good crisis management skills. They don't want me in G Division, because I'm a girl ... I have boobs ...

It's [G Division] very oppressive and the only time I have really been in G Division is when they had a female prisoner over there. I was allowed

to go in there only because she was a female. I did 15 minutes obs [observation] on a female who had a gutful of drugs [overdosed].

G Division, I wouldn't even ask [to work there], because the answer is no before I even ask. So it's a waste of my time. The [type of] people [who work in G Division] have cantaloupes [rock melons] under each arm and walk sideways through a door. It's for the real tough [men], the crayfish with the body full of meat and head full of shit. It's an overwhelming force of power bulk and has nothing to do with skills, it's to do with power. They [male officers] walk in and strut and I don't fit that image. Even when I have gone over there to pick up a prisoner, they [male officers] will say leave the stuff there [at the entrance of G Division] and we'll bring him out to you. They do this because they don't want the female presence there. They don't want us.

I have worn perfume all my life. They [G Division staff] say if the prisoners can smell you ... They smell that it's a female there. They believe that if you go there and display that female presence it will gee [stir] up the prisoners and there's going to be all sorts of hassles which they will have to fix as they are the only ones that can do it.

June's story illustrates some of the ways in which women are positioned as a disruption to the masculine order of the prison. That is, women's difference is seen and subsequently treated as a 'threat' to a particular form of masculinity which dominates both male prison officers and prisoners. Furthermore, while the performance of criminal masculinity has both heterosexual and homophobic demands it also, as June's story illustrates, requires a physical space or site which is 'woman free'. In Connell's terms this form of masculinity requires other men's approval and validation (1995: 77). In order to prevent disruptions, women must be restricted from particular spaces and sites of 'real' and 'hard' masculinity. The prison administration

actively reinforces the notion that women are not compatible with some areas in men's prisons by creating spaces which are woman free. Both male prisoners and male prison officers actively promote the physical dangerousness of men's prisons and, in particular, the attributes of particular male prisoners, in order to reinforce and legitimate the policy of restricting women from 'men's' spaces. That is, 'dangerous', 'hard' criminal men require other men, namely male prison officers, who can equal their manliness and hardness to control them. Sites such as G Division at Yatala Labour Prison therefore are used by both prisoners and male prison officers to reinforce the notion that the identities of the 'real' criminal and the 'real' prison officer are masculine.

June's challenge is not only to the homosocial nature of the total prison environment. Specifically, her reference to her own 'conflict resolution skills' being superior to the male officers' reliance on brawn offers a challenge to the way that prison discipline operates. This challenge is resisted by both male prisoners and male prison officers.

Young men's initiation into prison

While women prison officers were considered 'a problem' by older inmates, these same men also considered the new, young inmates to be disrespectful to The Code and to deserve physical punishment from both prisoners and prison officers. There was a general consensus among older prisoners and most prison officers that there were two influences that had permanently changed the culture of the prison. One was drugs and the other was the disrespectful attitude by young first timers to The Code. Specifically, young men are generally positioned by prison officers and old timers as fearless and wanting to make a reputation for themselves. Aggressive or 'mouthy'¹⁴ young men are not only considered a physical threat to prison officers and old timers, but also are considered to pose a threat to the existing prison hierarchy which is based on

¹⁴ A term used to refer to young prisoners who backchat the authority of prison officers or the brotherhood.

respecting the line of authority of the brotherhood. Given this, among the older prisoners there was a reluctance to help young first timers because of a perception that they are not prepared to listen or accept advice. Almost all those who identified as being 'old timers' stated that many of the difficulties first timers experience are self-inflicted and are brought on by an eagerness to develop a reputation as aggressive and fearless. Ironically, it is precisely these characteristics that are revered by the brotherhood, but only when combined with loyalty, and not self-interest.

Most younger prisoners who had been through the YTCs in more recent times recalled that their transition into the adult prison was traumatic and exacerbated by the harder line and uncaring approach adopted by prison officers. Also, younger prisoners were often not welcomed by older, experienced prisoners because of what the latter perceived to be a lack of respect among the younger prisoners in relation to them and to The Code. The majority of young, inexperienced prisoners said that the divide between the prison officer and inmate is more pronounced in the adult prison system. For example, the YTCs were described by most interviewees as a place where staff acted more like parents, with inmates as their 'children'. Many said they had expected that officers in adult prisons would be similar to the staff in the YTCs. Also, the young 'first-timer' prisoners¹⁵ said they felt disadvantaged by their age. That is, in the YTCs they were living with other boys of similar age with most being jailed for property offences, whereas in the adult prisons they were accommodated with older men serving sentences for more serious crimes. A majority of those interviewed felt that a section accommodating young first-timer prisoners would be one way of gradually initiating them into the adult prison. Additionally, it was reported by almost all prisoners interviewed that some officers like to display their physical ability when met with the challenge of younger prisoners. Shane's account of his first experience in prison is typical of reports of being humiliated by prison officers:

¹⁵ I am using the term 'first timer' to include anyone who is currently serving their first sentence as an adult. Some of these 'first timers' may have previously been imprisoned in YTCs.

The first day I came to jail I was on me own. I went to the magistrate's court and I wasn't expecting jail. I got it and went to the old Adelaide Jail. I was placed in a yard called six yard, really ancient and Gothic and it really scared me. A few blokes came up to me and offered me cigarettes and coffee. I didn't know if there was a catch to what they were offering me. I was really lost so I walked up to an officer and said 'Excuse me, mate'. And he came down real heavy on me and said 'Call me boss or sir'. I jerried [understood] from then on. I knew that I ask them for nothing. I was shattered by his treatment of me. But I knew exactly who the enemy was. I was shitting myself but I wasn't going to ask the screws for anything. A couple of older blokes came up to me and helped me out. It was very different from what I came from. The boy's homes were much better to us, because the staff there you could call by name, no uniforms and they looked after us like we were kids and that. In the adult jail there was none of that caring stuff by the screws.

Shane's experience suggests that prison officers too engaged in what Connell describes as acting out their 'collective practice of masculinity' (1995: 116). In the men's prison, the performance of a particular form of criminal masculinity is undertaken in a variety of ways. For example, new inmates are often keen to gain recognition for toughness within the prison community, and to develop a reputation as being feared and fearless. Similarly, some prison officers go to great lengths to make it known to prisoners that they are both tough and in charge. The seamlessness between officers and prisoners of the dominant form of masculinity is evident in their 'agreement' that physical prowess is the currency of power. Patrick's story of a New South Wales maximum security prison (Long Bay in Sydney) demonstrates the shared currency between officers and prisoners in terms of what constitutes physical prowess and a 'fair fight':

In Sydney [Long Bay] you can have a run-in with an officer and even if you do have a fight [with an officer] and it's one on one and it's not a problem. I've seen an old officer up in Sydney, he's about 48 and instead of putting you or one of the young kids on a report, he would say 'Right-o, out the back', and he'd be off with his uniform and you'd go a couple of rounds with him and that was it.

The physical contest of boxing is considered acceptable by officers and prisoners as well as by the architects of modern prisons. At the Melbourne Remand Centre, a boxing ring is located in the centre of the prison. The boxing ring is at the centre of the panopticon as a tribute to a particular form of masculinity. All the prison cells look out onto the boxing ring, and there is always plenty of activity around the ring as prisoners prepare themselves for the 'big' fights with outside boxers. Outside boxers are regularly invited into the prison to 'fight the boys'.

Indeed, the equating of personal power with physical dominance in the 'criminal' masculine subject is not, of course, inherently different from one form of masculinity valorised in Australian society at large. The men's prison is a crystallisation of the wider society where physical prowess in men – on the football field, in the bar, on the work site, in the boardroom and as the 'protectors' of 'their' women – is a core component of a particular form of masculinity. Being physically assertive, as opposed to other less physical forms of expression, is valued as a positive masculine trait in Australian society – both within and outside the prison walls.

Young first timers were the most common targets of prison officer violence. That is, there is competitive posturing between young 'fearless' men and prison officers. Violence is used as a way of 'initiating' young men into the prison culture, and both the prison officers and the brotherhood participate in the same form of masculinity, sharing many of the same philosophies about 'real men', and employing similar techniques for settling conflict. They both have a dislike for unmanly men, or those

who have no connections within the brotherhood and who therefore have no-one trustworthy to vouch for them, but who show off in an attempt to gain status. Within this structure of masculinity, to be feared is the only protection against being a victim of attack. Both the brotherhood and some prison officers target those who fit this description, who, in the main, are young first timers.

One prisoner spoke of winning a civil action against officers who had physically assaulted him. He was awarded several thousand dollars in compensation; however, he reported that none of the officers were suspended or dismissed from duty for assaulting him. Others like Robert, an Aboriginal man who 'graduated' to adult prison at 17, described prison officers using violence and intimidation to resolve conflict. He described his initiation into prison in the following way:

When I first started coming to jail I was in the [Adelaide] Remand Centre and I got taken out of the unit and handcuffed. There were about five people [prison officers] around me in the elevator in the Remand Centre and I was getting bashed [by prison officers]. I was in Unit 7 [the punishment unit] and handcuffed naked to the pole where the TV goes and they [prison officers] started punching me around because they reckon I was an instigator and a troublemaker. I was only seventeen.

The use of physical punishment by the officers against Robert suggests that physical techniques of display and attack are used to promote the desired outcome: docility, obedience and compliance. That is, publicly displaying the young, stripped, bound-up and physically beaten body tied to the pole in the communal television room sends a message to other young prisoners about the hardness of prison and the form of punishment they may receive should they be disruptive or 'mouthy'. Additionally, Robert's story can also be read as indicating ways in which the prisoner is marked out not only by his youth but also by his race. While Robert's punishment takes the form of a public exposure of his naked body, this denigration is not only an exposure of the 'punishable' body, but also of a black body. Robert's punishment, then, not only

takes the form of physical violence but might also be considered evidence of a colonial violence of objectification. Historically, Aboriginal people in Australia have been sexualised within white colonial discourse.¹⁶ Robert's story shows that there is a continuity in this sexualisation of the Aboriginal male body by the white male gaze.

Physical punishment was not confined to Aboriginal men. For example Tony, a non-Aboriginal man described his introduction to Pentridge Prison's punishment unit, known as H Division, in the following way:

[It is now] 14 years later and it still makes my stomach turn over when I was asked to think about my H Division days. My second day in jail I was sent to hell for smashing a tamper [child sexual offender]. And if I had of known what laid in front of me I would of let him [sex offender] fuck me! Why? I was waiting to be transferred to H Division in D Division.¹⁷ The cell door opened and in walked four prison officers dressed in white overalls, all over six foot tall. They took me out the division placed me in a four-seater van in the middle of two of them and as the van turned the corner my head turned and that's all I remember of the van ride. I came to [regained consciousness] outside H Division being dragged out of the van. Then I walked in my new division where at a very quick count of there were another eight officers, with one of them screaming 'Get on the cross. You will call me sir. You will take your clothes off by your left hand. You will carry everything in your left hand. You'll turn by your left'. I said 'You can't do this, I'm a remand prisoner'. Punches came from everywhere. I soon started taking off my clothes by my left hand very quickly. Once I was undressed fully, punches came from everywhere. I came to a cell with just a bed and toilet, and these four nicely stacked blankets. Boy, was I to learn about those

¹⁶ I use the term colonial discourse as cultural theorist Homi Bhabha does when he says: 'It is a form of discourse crucial to the binding of a range of differences and discriminations that inform the discursive and political practices of racial and cultural hierarchization' (1994, 67).

¹⁷ D division is located at the Metropolitan Reception Prison, and is next door to Pentridge Prison. It is where remanded prisoners and protectees are accommodated.

nicely stacked blankets for in the morning on cell inspection, because they had to be folded in a special way. I'd never been in any jail before [and] I didn't have a clue, but I was learning quick 'cos everything you do wrong you get a smack in the face.

I know I'll seem weak in other people's eyes, but when you're placed in a cell for 23 hours a day with just a toilet and bed in it, plus waiting for the screws to run in at any moment and listening for the key to turn in the cell door, it does have its lasting effects on a young man's mind.

Controlling prisoners is an important feature of the prison's power to punish. One of the significant issues in Tony's case was that his was the only story of prison officers punishing a prisoner for violence towards a sexual offender. Obviously Tony too expected that this action would be acceptable and seemed surprised by the officers' reaction to him 'smashing a tamperer'. Indeed it may be that it was not necessarily the bashing of the sexual offender that prompted the prison officers to react, but rather that Tony's behaviour provided the officers with an opportunity to demonstrate their masculinity which, as in the criminal brotherhood, is based on respect for physical violence and authority and 'hardness'.

Almost all the young first timers said their difficulties were exacerbated by the behaviour of a few male officers who deliberately and consistently tried to upset them. In this study six young first-time prisoners said that they had already developed a reputation for being violent or inciting trouble in the YTCs and that these labels followed them to the adult prisons. Some of the officers' tactics for taunting prisoners were illustrated by Allan, who at the time of the interview was serving a sentence for murder, and was considered dangerous and in need of high security imprisonment:

They [prison officers] put me on one of them [segregation orders] so they [Adelaide Remand Centre] could send me down here [Yatala Labour Prison] a bit earlier. I was put in G Division [punishment unit]. They

were coming up to me and standing over me and four or five of them [officers] would walk into the cell and just try and intimidate me all the time. They would walk up to you real fast and more or less put their chest up next to yours and try and stare you down, and try and get you to fire up so if you took a swing at them they'd be justified in knocking you out.

For Jamie the transition to the adult system was very traumatic. He quickly developed a reputation with prison officers for being a difficult prisoner, and, like Allan, at 17 was accommodated in G Division. His story is an example of the way in which some prison officers use the same tactics as the brotherhood to intimidate and taunt those whom they consider to be either unmanly, or, on the other hand, too confident. In addition to taunts, the officers wielded their power to withhold 'privileges' that are important to the prisoner, in this case the opportunity for Jamie to have a contact visit¹⁸ from his girlfriend:

I was 17 and had a girlfriend out there and she came in for a visit in G Division and I [had been] told that I was on contact visits [but] they [prison officers] led me to the non-contact room and I heard an officer say 'she's got nice titties'. My girlfriend was the only female there at the time. She had a low cut dress on, it was pretty warm, summertime. I let their remarks go. I said to them 'What's going on I've been here more than two weeks, shouldn't I be getting contact visits?' And they said 'You're going there and that's all there is to it'. I had my visit and the same officer said something similar to what he said before, 'She's got nice titties'. I just lost it. I said 'you are talking about my girl'. They were smiling and having a joke with the other officers.

¹⁸ Contact visits are when visitors are escorted to a room where they sit with the prisoner at a table. Not every prisoner is allowed contact visits. If a prisoner has tested positive to drugs or has had their visiting rights taken away from them because they have broken the rules of the prison, they are given non-contact visits. That is, they are allowed visits but they are physically separated from their visitors by a glass partition. G division is a punishment unit where contact visits are granted after a period of time, depending on the decision of the manager of the division.



As they were locking me back into my cell another officer said 'She has nice tits', and I just kicked the door as soon as they shut it. And they said 'If you keep that up you will see what happens to real men. You little boy are just a little fish in a big pond here'. I continued kicking the door and abusing them. They came in five or six of them into my cell. And they said 'Hands by your side' and they continually stayed in my cell. They wanted me to say something which gives them an excuse to jump on me and drag me out. And they continued to say 'You are just a little boy here, you are not a man'. I said 'Get fucked you dogs'. The next minute I had one on one arm and another and they all jumped on me and dragged me out and cut my clothes off. First they said 'Are you going to comply with a strip search?' I was going off my head, crying and that. They came in with scissors and cut my jeans, shirt and jocks off and that. I was in the fridge¹⁹ when they did that. That's the cell where you go where there's nothing. They shut the door and I lost the plot and started kicking the door. And this old officer came up to the door and sticking his finger up at me and poking his tongue out at me. He was basically geeing²⁰ me up to go off my head. And they just come in, shackled and chained me up, and I was still naked. They put handcuffs around the ankles, a chain between your legs and handcuffs to your hands and a chain from your hands to your ankles. The same officer that said my girl got nice titties was kicking me in the ribs while the one that said 'Yeah she has nice titties' was slapping me in the back of the head.

Part of the test of being a manly prisoner involves proving to both the prison officers and the brotherhood that one can survive in a culture of hardness and deprivation. Like the criminal brotherhood, the officer 'brotherhood' perform a variety of rituals and

¹⁹ Isolation cell in G division, Yatala Labour Prison

²⁰ Encouraging a person to get upset.

ceremonies on the bodies of young male prisoners. It is clear, then, that male prison officers also subscribe to a form of masculinity which reinforces and maintains understandings of criminal masculinity held within and outside the prison. That is, one of the effects of these rituals and ceremonies (for example officers sticking out their chests and using physical violence) is to shape the young male prisoner and, in doing so, maintain a particular type of masculinity.

In addition, the stories of Jamie and Allan make reference to a variety of techniques used by officers to test the 'hardness' of young male prisoners. Some of these techniques included the use of officers' bodies to intimidate, the ridicule of emotions such as crying, the use of humiliation through displaying a prisoner naked and immobilised, and the provision of an environment which is as physically difficult as it is emotionally. These techniques are used by officers and prisoners to shape 'real hard men'. That is, the archetypal man in prison is one whose body is able to sustain and administer considerable physical violence, who is identified with other men and who speaks and understands the language of objectifying and excluding women.

Changes in prison: Drugs and disloyalty to The Code

Most older prisoners stated that when they were young they too had difficulties with prison officers, but for various reasons had come to the conclusion that it was easier to be a compliant model prisoner than one who was constantly fighting and being sent to the punishment unit of G Division. The interviews suggest that officers and 'true' old school prisoners share the belief that it is necessary to 'break in' young prisoners. Geoff had served several sentences and, while he admitted to having had a few physical fights in his earlier years in prison, he expressed a lack of empathy for young prisoners, claiming that they have not been educated in the old school of criminal and jail conduct, and therefore often acted inappropriately:

The prisoners are different these days. The 18 or 19 year olds in jail are all out trying to get a reputation the easy way, by shiving²¹ a bloke and that. They need a good kicking.

Geoff's comments demonstrate that there is a belief among older prisoners that some of the young first timers breach the criminal moral code, and in this case, a 'good kicking' is advocated to curtail unwarranted reliance on stabbing. There was general support among older prisoners who had served several sentences for the idea that it was their role to 'teach' young prisoners how to obey the rules of the prison. This role of initiator was made difficult by what 'old timers' saw as the breakdown of the moral code because of drugs. The older men generally blamed younger prisoners for the breakdown of The Code through the widespread use of drugs in prison. However, it is not entirely true that the younger generation are responsible for what the older prisoners claim is the breakdown in the jail's informal rules; nor are they entirely responsible for what is the biggest problem in all prisons: drugs. In this study 50 out of the 60 men interviewed said they had used illegal drugs, with 34 reporting that they had an addiction to heroin. The majority (42) said they committed crime to pay for their drug addiction. Given that drugs are the motivating factor for most crime, this alone undermines the myth of the self-actualising, risk-taking, 'hard' criminal male, who has determined for himself that a 'career' as a criminal is an exciting and rational alternative to the 'straight' life.

The widespread use of drugs among the prison population contributes to the sense that the 'real' criminal has disappeared. Yet most of the men still aspired to the image of this mythologised 'career criminal'. Only 4 out of the 60 men I interviewed felt that the real criminal as constructed through The Code is a fantasy sustained by both the brotherhood and male prison officers. The image of crime as adventure is sustained despite the reality that the majority of prisoners are drug dependent, somewhat desperate, and therefore lack real agency.

²¹ A shiv is a knife. Shiving refers to stabbing a person.

Additionally the majority of the men interviewed felt that 'nowadays' most prisoners' preoccupation was not with maintaining The Code, but with obtaining and using drugs. Almost all agreed that the main cause of violence in prison was disputes over drugs. While The Code is often referred to by the brotherhood as the core constitution of the criminal world, there are very few who are able to maintain its principles. Specifically, it appears that the very nature of being addicted to drugs overrides all other needs and therefore weakens one's ability to maintain loyalty to practise The Code.

Three prisoners who referred to themselves as drug free 'career' criminals were scathing in their comments about 'junkies' and the impact they believe they have had on the prison system. All three had criminal records dating back to the 1950s. They claimed that drug addicts had changed the culture of the prison forever, because drug-addicted prisoners could not be trusted. Even among those prisoners who reported being addicted to drugs, there was a general belief that The Code had been eroded due to prisoners' desperation to maintain their drug addictions.

Fifty-year-old Sam referred to himself as a 'real career criminal' and defined this by listing his credentials: he is anti drugs and drug users, a non-smoker, and a cat burglar and safe cracker who has only recently taken up armed robbery because the gas bottles used for cracking safes were getting too heavy for him to carry. The point about Sam's criminal career is that, like many others, he has changed techniques and has been introduced to, and eventually taken up, new methods of getting money: in his case the gun replaced the gas bottle. The difference between Sam and the majority of the brotherhood is that he is opposed to drugs and his criminal activities are not driven by the need to obtain drug money.

Like Sam, Brett described himself as an 'old timer', whose main way of acquiring money was embezzlement, fraud and occasionally breaking into houses. He claims that when he first started going to jail he was anti drugs; however, after spending most of

his twenties and thirties in jail he is no longer as evangelical about drugs. Brett portrays himself as a rational agent who has his drug taking under control. He does this in order to distinguish himself from those who are known as 'junkies' and depicted as lacking agency and being weak. 'Junkies' therefore are 'irrational', pathetic men who are not only feminised but also seen as an affront to 'real' and 'hard' criminal masculinity. Brett's testimony provided a detailed account of drug use at Yatala Labour Prison, and in particular the way in which drugs have marked his body:

I started using [drugs], and yes now I only done crime to pay for them, but I'm not a junkie. Sure, I use drugs, but I got it under control ... I could stop. Anyway, if I can get it I use Hexatol to clean out my syringe. There's no bleach here. A lot of young boys in here clock up huge drug debts, then go on protection. And that's a bit rough and unfair for them. When they dabble a bit [in drug use] on the outside they come in here and start using and they have big drug debts and have Hep C. Most people have Hep C. I got terrible tracking²² you look here [shows the needle marks on his arm]. I [have] had a few health problems 'cos of me drug taking. I got Hep C, and the old liver doesn't function too good these days, and me veins here [points to both arms] [are] fucked. Anyway most people in here regard it that everyone in here has Hep C, it doesn't matter we'll all share. A fit goes for \$50–75. They are cut-offs.²³ Heroin is still \$50 a cap, the same as the outside but it's probably about a third of the quality. Some good stuff comes in. White rock and occasionally beige and a lot of grass. I haven't seen any speed in here. Who wants to stay awake in your cell? The going rate is about \$5 for one rocker [Rohypnol].

For some, their first experience of using hard drugs was in prison. For example, Chich, who first went to prison at the age of 18, recalled that he did not use heroin

²² Marks left by needle punctures on a person's arm.

²³ Syringe that has been cut. They are cut so they are able to be inserted into the anus and not be detected during a strip search.

until he was 25 and serving a 9 year sentence for armed robbery. Like others, he told stories about his attempts to smuggle drugs into the prison and admitted to spending most of his time plotting and planning new and inventive ways to bring them in. He told a story of bringing drugs back into a country prison after he had been out on overnight leave to Melbourne. He had heroin, speed and cocaine in the lining of his underpants, marijuana in the sleeves of his shirt, hash in the inner soles of his runners, and pills in the lining of his leather jacket. Prior to returning to the prison, he had bought four toffee apples for his friends with whom he was sharing a cell. When he arrived at the prison, four security officers were waiting for him and requested that he put all his belongings on a chair so he could be strip searched. He refused to put the brown paper bag containing the toffee apples on the chair. Chich described himself as having successfully smuggled in the drugs in the following way:

One of the screws asked me what was in the brown paper bag and I replied 'Toffee apples'. He gave me a weird look and tried to snatch the bag from me. I turned my back and held onto the bag. He gave me a direct order to give him the bag, but I told him I wouldn't because he would destroy my toffee apples. The more adamant he was about me giving him the bag, the more argumentative I became. With the frustration of him trying to get the bag from me, I became loud and aggressive. With that, the chief prison officer came out of his office and asked what was going on. He came out just at the right time because the security screws were going to grab me and take the bag and force me to strip. I said to the chief that they wanted to take my toffee apples from me and he replied 'What the fuck are you talking about?' I told him exactly what was going on and he asked me, not told me, if I would give them to the security screw and save all the hassles. I said no, because they would destroy them. The chief [senior prison officer] said 'Look why all this drama over some toffee apples, I'll give you my personal assurance that they won't be destroyed and you'll have them back as soon as they're finished with them'. He then said 'Give the bag to them

and go to your cell'. Beautiful, just what I wanted to hear, the fucking idiots made such a big deal over the bag of toffee apples that they completely forgot to strip search me. I got back to the cell and we rolled some joints and started smoking and I said to myself, 'What a bunch of fucking fools', and laughed again.

In Chich's account, his desperation to have drugs is reframed as cleverness in outsmarting the prison authorities. Chich's 'cleverness' and indeed willingness to risk bringing drugs into the prison is applauded and heroised, which in turn allows him to successfully avoid any suggestion that he is a 'desperate junkie'. Thus masculinity as intelligence is emphasised and femininity as dependence (on drugs) is disguised. While the Department of Correctional Services has attempted to stop drugs entering the prison system, the various procedures, which include strip searching, have largely been ineffective. Most prisoners said that they had access to any type of drug they wanted in prison, and the risks associated with getting drugs into the jail were viewed as being part of the life and occupation of a prisoner, just as death is accepted as an 'occupational hazard' of crime. While it is not the only means, it appears that the most common means whereby drugs enter the prison is through prisoners' visitors.

The increase in the number of prisoners who are addicted to drugs has also changed the type of conflict and violence between inmates. Those 'old timer' prisoners who had experienced prison before drugs were widespread recalled that conflict occurred as a payback for breaking The Code by informing on others. The conflict these days, however, predominantly concerns non-payment for drugs. As a consequence it has been necessary for prison authorities to provide two forms of accommodation: mainstream and protection. While the protection section accommodates the most disavowed of all male prisoners, its existence is nevertheless an important site for the reproduction of dominant criminal masculinity.

Section 2: Policing boundaries between protection and mainstream

Protection from fellow prisoners is necessary for three categories of male prisoners, all of whom in one way or another challenge the norms of criminal masculinity which are so fiercely patrolled in the all-male prison environment. The first category who seek protection are those prisoners who have committed 'unmanly' crimes, such as child sexual abuse, bashings of elderly men and women or the murder of children. Some, but not all, rapists of adult women will also be in this category. There was a common view among the 60 men I interviewed that raping a child under the age of 15 or a woman over the age of 50 was unacceptable. However, a majority (34 out of the 60 men interviewed) said that the rape of a woman between the ages of 15 and 50 was not always 'rape' because it may have resulted from the man being 'prick teased'. In this section I will discuss sex crimes in more detail, and in particular I will analyse the way in which the treatment of child sex offenders, whose masculinity is judged to be Other to the brotherhood, contributes to the establishment of normative heterosexuality affirmed within the prison culture by prisoners and officers alike.

Secondly, protection is also sought for other 'unmanly' men. This group comprises homosexuals, young men vulnerable to rape, those who are seen by mainstream prisoners to be physically or mentally weak, sensitive men and those vulnerable to homophobic or heterosexist attacks, and those who have been raped in mainstream.

The third category of protected prisoner encompasses those who have offended against the brotherhood's code of silence and thereby are thought to be unmanly and untrustworthy brothers. Those who have informed on a brother, or are former police or prison officers, are all judged as traitors to prisoner lore and etiquette and require protection. Also within this group of 'traitors' are those who have been proved untrustworthy by reneging on drug debts built up in the prison.

Of the 60 men interviewed, 28 were protectees. All were asked why they sought protection. Overwhelmingly all had broken the rules of the brotherhood. Three reported that they went to protection simply because they did not have the physical strength to fight stronger prisoners in the mainstream section. Eight said they owed money (usually for drugs purchased within the prison) to prisoners in the mainstream. Some stated they were on protection because they did not know people in the system and therefore did not have others to guarantee that they were not informants. Seven of the 28 protectees admitted to being police informants. Five of the seven police informants had informed on another criminal over drugs. Only three of the seven saw their behaviour as breaking the norms of the criminal brotherhood. Among the 60 men interviewed were 11 prisoners convicted of unlawful sexual intercourse with a child under 12. Ten were housed in the protection section of the prison. For 7 of the 11 this was the first time they had been in prison.

Protected men: The Other to criminal masculinity

Protection prisoners are both physically and metaphorically positioned as the 'Other' to criminal masculinity. The existence of a protection section in the prison is resented by the mainstream brotherhood as it is seen as subverting the proper retaliatory way in which the brotherhood manages those who breach The Code. To seek protection is considered to be the ultimate cowardice. When a prisoner seeks protection he not only relinquishes his mainstream connections, but also his membership of the brotherhood. Being on protection he cannot be trusted and therefore he cannot be part of the brotherhood. Most of the prisoners who had spent more than 10 years in prison, and in particular those who had been in jail during the 1970s when protection did not exist, were scathing about men who seek protection. Chich gave an historical account of prison life in Victoria prior to protection:

The only ones that were stabbed or bashed were offenders that lagged,²⁴ crown witnesses and child molesters. There was no such thing as protection. Then it was all mainstream, so people had second thoughts about dobbing their co-accused. Those sort of people who confess to theirs and others' crimes get one slap to get them started and ten slaps to stop them. Once a weak scumbag, always a weak scumbag.

The old timer's resentment about the introduction of protection is also about reducing their circle of influence in the control of prisoners' behaviour. The derision of the protectee is a strategy which masks the fact that the existence of protection undermines the power of the brotherhood by providing an alternative for those who refuse to conform. For example, when Arnold was first sent to jail in 1958, protection did not exist. In his story it is clear that the role of surveillance, punishment and control of prisoners was felt to rightly belong to fellow inmates, and that the introduction of protection has eroded this. Arnold told his story in the following way:

A man had to fight if he was called a dog; he had to fight to prove he wasn't a dog. If someone showed you his [police] statement that he signed, he was a dog. But nowadays they [the prison staff] put him in a unit by himself. They [protectees] get the best of everything. They got bashed in the old days. They knew what side of the fence they were on and they had to stay that side of the fence. You know what side of the fence you are on by your principles. Well you don't make statements to the police, you don't tell on your friends, you help your friends, not like a dog or a rat [informant]. A dog will lag you. If you are a dog you've got the dog in you at the time you're born.

The interviews suggest that the model of the 'real criminal' is created through the stereotyping of the 'abnormal' or deviant criminal. Those prisoners who are 'abnormal' either refuse or are physically too weak to perform the accepted rituals and

²⁴ Informed on another prisoner to the authorities.

displays of criminal masculinity, or are 'disqualified' from masculinity because of their crimes. These 'abnormal' prisoners experience prison differently from those who are 'mainstream'. Specifically, a prisoner's mainstream status provides him with a stage on which he can perform his manliness and 'hardness', whereas the protectee and in particular those protectees who are child sex offenders can never be 'real' men, much less 'hard' criminal men.

The brotherhood uses the distinctions and boundaries between the mainstream and the protection sections of the prison to mark differences in the character traits and behaviours of 'their own' and others' criminality. This distinction succeeds in creating an illusion of communality among the 'normal' prisoners through their contrast with the 'deviant' child sexual offender and police informant. Formulating the boundaries of criminal normality also equips the brotherhood to make judgements about the worthiness of others to join its ranks. That is, the marked boundaries of normality allow the brotherhood the power of naming by demanding that those who occupy the margins 'explain' their situation to the satisfaction of the brotherhood.

Peter's experience illustrates the power of the mainstream prisoners' culture. He tried to prove his credentials as a worthy mainstream prisoner by trafficking drugs. He had his grandmother put money into the TAB accounts which were used by prisoners to pay for drugs. When she eventually refused to continue doing this, Peter was bashed. He was frightened, and felt pressured to get money for the three popular and well-connected mainstream prisoners who orchestrated the drug deals. Not having the criminal connections nor the physical strength to fight those who were making the demands, Peter sought protective custody:

For a long time I copped it sweet,²⁵ because those blokes that bashed me had a lot of power and were well-known and respected in here. After they bashed me other mainstreamers started giving me heaps of problems

²⁵ Accepted physical bashings without complaint.

'cos my nan was getting upset with me about all the money, so I had to say no. I copped a big belting and I wasn't able to fight all of them, and when a prison officer asked me why I got a black eye and I told him. After I done that I then had to go on protection, 'cos those blokes was after me.

In the brotherhood's rules, informing on another brother is an impropriety which is simply not tolerated. Therefore, when a member of the brotherhood breaks the code of silence, he will often be subjected to severe and brutal punishment. The techniques of punishment used in the prison vary; however, they are most often physical. For example, if a person testifies against a co-offender or supplies information to police or prison officers, or lays charges against a fellow inmate who has raped or bashed him, he is classified as a 'dead man walking' and will usually end up in the protection section of the prison. The term 'dead man walking' evokes the threat that it is only a matter of time before the disloyal brother will be killed. That is, the informer is aware that he will be punished for going against The Code, although he usually does not know the type of punishment the brotherhood will use against him.

The gaze: The panopticon and masculinity

Among the protection prisoners there is a fundamental divide between those who have sexually offended against children and other protectees. Those protectees who are not child sex offenders have most often formerly been mainstreamers. For example, Mark had spent almost all his 17 years of prison life in the mainstream section of the prison, but at the time of the interview he was accommodated in the protection section of the prison. Prior to his arrest Mark had been on the police protection program for five years. He described the police protection program as him being physically protected by the police after having provided them with vital information which led to the arrest of several drug dealers and armed robbers. He confirmed that he deliberately kept a low profile in prison as he did not want to alert mainstream prisoners that he was back in

prison. He said that the reason for doing this was that he was concerned for his physical safety as his life had been threatened by those he had informed on. While Mark's testimony illustrates the way in which the prison is a combination of the most extreme forms of external surveillance and self-surveillance, it is also evident that his self-surveillance is not due to the invisible gaze of the panopticon, but rather, the gaze of other men within the prison. My research clearly indicates that in the men's prison the gaze of other men is as debilitating as that of the panopticon.

Despite Mark's status as a 'dog', he referred to himself as being from the 'old school',²⁶ and distanced himself from other protectees; especially child sex offenders. Like many others who had no conviction for sexual offending, he asserted that there was a clear difference between moral and immoral crimes. Mark felt that although he has been a police informant, he is nevertheless morally superior to child sex offenders as he 'still has ethics'. This claim is overwhelmingly rejected by the mainstream criminal brotherhood who see disloyalty as unforgivable. Despite Mark's outward confidence, his story suggests that he had internalised the shame associated with being a 'lager'. He was also concerned about his physical safety should he be revealed to be a police informant. Additionally, he was concerned that his girlfriend may reject him if she learned that he was a police informant:

I don't go around and tell anyone in the unit about being a police informant and that I gave evidence in court and several people got jail out of my testimony. So for the last five or six years I have been worried about my past catching up. I have changed my name by deed poll and the past hasn't caught up to me.

If I had to do it again I probably would too. I gave evidence, so the majority of people in this system would classify me as a police informant, a dog. You never know if they [the brotherhood] are going to get at my family before they get you or if they are friends with the person

you gave evidence against and they can pass on information and addresses that you don't want out. My girl didn't know about it [being on the police protection scheme] ... I have had to tell her since I came to jail.

While Mark had internalised the control by the brotherhood, others are controlled by direct physical violence. All the male prisoners were able to provide examples of violence being used by prisoners to silence or punish those who have not adhered to The Code. Shane chose to speak, as did several others, about an incident at Yatala where a mainstream inmate who had allegedly informed on others was stabbed to death in an exercise yard:

In 1990 me and my friend were in B Division and we were walking on the walking track in the yard and there was a meeting that day for us; we had a committee. We were meeting about [the prison] taking our hot breakfast off us. So we were all out in the yard debating whether the kitchen workers should go back to work because we were on a hunger strike for two weeks. We didn't get our hot brekkies [and] we got pretty hungry on packets of cereal and that's all. We were all gathered around, about 50 to 60 crims huddled around and this particular bloke was walking into the circle and then a few seconds later he was walking backwards with a big kitchen knife sticking out of his chest. None of the screws could see what was going on and no-one has been charged over that. We were all interviewed by the cops, but no-one said anything. We were all locked down for about four days over that. I just said what everyone else said: 'I didn't see a thing'. I'm not dirty with the bloke that did it. He was killed because he was a fucking dog. A real dog. I saw him die. I was just in shock, it blew me out. It is something you have to witness to understand it.

I saw him die, and just turned around and walked the other way with my mate. Some of us had to step over his body and walk on and act as if nothing had happened. That's the way we have to do it in here. He was dead before he hit the ground, a 10 inch blade from the kitchen right through him. In those days the kitchen was right adjacent to the rec [recreational] yard and it was pretty easy to smuggle a knife. Anyone who would speak about that wouldn't be here for long. To this day no-one has spoke, and they won't. That's good that no-one talks, it shows we have some solidarity among us. The screws have their ideas who done it and I'd never tell them anything. As far as I'm concerned they will be only told 'I didn't see it'.

The detached manner in which this story is told suggests that disengagement from emotions is necessary to practise and maintain the code of silence. Shane's story also illustrates that the panopticon gaze of the camera is not infallible. In this example the camera was ineffective in detecting who killed the man. Additionally, Shane's story highlights the way in which the mainstream brotherhood normalises the rule, 'keep silent or there are pay backs'. Specifically, Shane is operating within the normal boundaries of criminal behaviour, whereas the inmate who was stabbed to death had deviated from those norms and therefore the punishment he received was seen by the brotherhood as justified.

Most of the mainstream prisoners whom I interviewed referred to protection as a form of punishment. Protection is second in severity only to total isolation. Those prisoners who serve their sentences on protection and in total isolation have been assessed by the prison classification committee as being at high risk of physical attack from mainstream and protection prisoners. At the time of the interviews, two prisoners were in total isolation for their own protection. One of them, named Simon, whose evidence as a crown witness helped in the conviction of some of the 'most wanted' criminals, agreed that his punishment comprised not only two life sentences for murder, but also

the fact that he had spent all of his prison term in isolation. Simon did not have any contact with other prisoners, he was not permitted entry to any other section of the prison and when interviewed had served nearly 10 years in absolute isolation. Simon described his life in prison in the following way:

I don't ever look like being released. Look at me after nine or ten years in isolation. How do I describe it? It's turned my head into jelly. I am into my tenth year of isolation. I've never been out of my unit with a whole lot of people for a whole day. I've never been in mainstream activities doing programs. There's no contact with other prisoners in G Division [high security]. I can't even get the door left open. The laundry [room] is across from me cell and I could talk during the day with the other guy doing the laundry. But there's no interaction. There's no differentiating between protection and full-on punishment.

My sanity is kept together by my music. I don't have my guitar here. I was allowed to have it in Pentridge and Barwon²⁷ but when I came here, the regime in G Division is that it is a strictly isolated punishment unit where you have no property. It is total isolation, and total punishment. There's no interaction between prisoners, there's only one prisoner moved at any time. They can't change the rules. There's no exception. If they did give it [guitar] to me that would create a precedence [sic]. I spend 23 hours a day in my cell. I talk to nobody and I have no social interaction whatsoever. The only thing I have is my chess which I play with myself and my music. It is my only creative outlet I have.

There were a number of contradictions in the way that protection and mainstream were differentiated. A specific example of this is that occasionally some prisoners who have not broken the rules of the brotherhood are accommodated in protection because they

²⁷ A maximum security men's prison near Geelong, Victoria.

have been raped or are frightened. According to Len, who described himself as a 'recidivist burglar', to be placed in protection:

Is pretty common in prison where people [have] been bashed senseless. It is usually over the fact that they [are] obviously give ups [informant] or dogs. I [have] not seen them get bashed for drugs really, but there's the odd standover for runners [jogging shoes] or drugs. But I have to say, those that do that standover stuff are weak. They pick their marks. Those that get bashed either get shifted to another part of the jail, or go to another jail or they go on protection. Some in protection are not dogs, they are just scared or whatever and really shouldn't be there. If you are a dog then that's where you belong, in there with the rest of them, and the cats [homosexuals] and the kid fuckers and rock spiders [child sexual offenders].

Heterosexual masculinity is central to the notion of the 'real' man and it is this form of masculinity which all prisoners know is essential to the identity of an authentic criminal. Hence, all prisoners are aware that their masculinity is always being assessed by others. In the men's prison the panopticon gaze does not cause self-regulation to the same extent as does surveillance by other prisoners. It is the gaze of other men, all of whom are watching and assessing one's masculinity and 'hardness', which produces what Foucault refers to as practised bodies (1977a: 138).

Child sex offenders: The Other to dominant heterosexual masculinity

To develop understandings about why child sex offenders are the most despised group within the prison requires an analysis of the characteristics of the 'real criminal'. The brotherhood's notion of the 'real' criminal requires particular characteristics which differentiate him from those who are considered deviant to criminal masculinity. Sex crimes against children are seen by the brotherhood as being incompatible with 'true'

masculine criminality, because the sexual nature of the crime is an offence to masculine heterosexuality. That is, committing manly crimes implies that the crime involved 'fair fight'. Given this, sexual offences against children are neither manly nor a 'fair fight'.

The majority of non-sexual offenders stated that sexual abuse scars a child's life forever. Additionally, when a man sexually abuses a child, he is seen to have broken the rule of attacking only someone who is a 'fair victim'. Those who sexually offend against children or 'grannies'²⁸ and others who can't put up a physical fight, such as disabled or older people, are seen to be victimising the innocent and the weak. That is, they have not fought like a real man.

Criminal masculinity has both heterosexual and homophobic demands, and therefore requires 'real men' to perform and display what is considered by the brotherhood as 'desirable' and 'authentic' manliness. Indeed, 'hard' criminal masculinity shapes the whole order of gender relations within the prison. Specifically, the shaming and 'outing' of sex offenders creates opportunities for the brotherhood to demonstrate their 'hardness'. These 'ceremonies' are not staged to encourage the 'deviant' to reform, but rather they have the effect of reinforcing the boundaries and territory of the mainstream brothers. Indeed, humiliation through verbal abuse and creating uncertainty as to whether they will be subject to violence are two of the ways in which control is maintained by other prisoners over those who have deviated from the norms of this form of masculinity. For example, the brotherhood conducts regular public ceremonies such as the verbal shaming and physical abuse of 'others' outside their group, for the purpose of allocating to particular offenders a distinctive 'deviant' role.

There is very little evidence to suggest that mainstream men are made docile by the prison experience. My research indicates that sex offenders are the only group within the male prison to fit Foucault's notion of the docile prisoner (1977a: 138). Specifically, sex offenders are the least 'hard' men, which means they are also the

²⁸ Women over 50 years are referred to as 'grannies'.

targets of abuse. All the sexual offenders interviewed resented the verbal and physical abuse they received from other prisoners and some prison officers. Of those I interviewed from the protection section, all 10 who had been convicted of sexual offences against children had encountered some form of verbal abuse. Two had been physically assaulted while in prison. All had been briefed by other sexual offenders in jail about the danger of being physically attacked if they were to go out to the exercise yards.

While their masculinity is considered by the brotherhood and others within the prison as irreparably damaged, and the gaze and often violent actions of other men outside the sex offender unit provides the greatest amount of distress to sex offenders, the interviews suggest that this group have a number of ways in which they are able to protect themselves from the rest of the prison population. One of these involves forming close and physically safe relationships with one another. That is, child sex offenders have created their own brotherhood. What is particularly significant is that this 'mini brotherhood' of child sex offenders is based on the same principles as the mainstream brotherhood. It relies on extreme levels of loyalty to one's own group, secretiveness and being 'woman free'. As Don, who is serving a 14-month sentence for unlawful sexual intercourse with a child under 12 explained:

I only hang around guys from this [sex offender] unit. We are all similar in a way because we are always aware of how much we are hated by them [other prisoners]. In the unit I have [made] good friends with the other guys in here and we understand each other and we all look after the new ones that come in here and I can trust them. Like when I come here I was looked after by some guys in this unit. I got told what the go was. Like, I don't go out in the yard because I don't really want my head taken from my body. I've heard the stories from around the place. Someone who was a sex offender went down to the brickyard and ended up with a pick axe in his back. Now I don't want that so I don't want work in the brickyard. You could be beaten up. People have been beaten

up and gone to the infirmary until they are well enough. Only one goes out into the yard from my wing. The officers will tell us to go out into the yard, but we don't go. Others in here said to me 'We don't go out into the yard because we could be beaten up', so I took that as gospel and when they [prison officers] tell us to go out into the yard, I don't go.

One of the ways in which dominant criminal masculinity is sustained and reproduced within the prison involves the help of male prison staff. Male prison officers generally share the criminal brotherhood's masculine ethic of solidarity despite the occupational divide between them. That is possible because there is agreement between them about what constitutes an 'acceptable' crime and criminal. For example, prison officers work with the brotherhood to construct and maintain the marginalisation of sex offenders, informants and 'weak' prisoners. The code of practice is enforced through the same means of coercion and surveillance, and as a result there is great fluidity between the two groups in terms of their values and behaviours. For instance, prison officers may assist mainstream prisoners wanting information about particular inmates in protection, or they may threaten the protectee that information about them will be divulged to the mainstream prisoners if they are not compliant and well-behaved. The protectees' fear of other prisoners finding out about who they have informed on, or what crime they have committed, is used by staff to exercise control. The protectee knows that his safety is dependent upon the goodwill of the prison officers.

Most protected prisoners are under surveillance by the mainstream prisoners; however, some are able to maintain contact with the mainstream prisoners because they are considered not to be quite as pathetic or unmanly as others. These protectees, along with some prison officers, are used by the mainstream prisoners to acquire information about other protectees. The more 'trusted' protectees will keep the mainstream prisoners informed about where a particular person is in the prison, if and when he is being transferred to another prison, and who and where his relatives and

contacts are on the outside. The 'trusted' protectee may be asked by key mainstream prisoners to befriend the person and in turn pass on information about them. This information is used by the brotherhood to increase the effectiveness of their threats against protectees.

The majority of those interviewed claimed that prison officers were a dependable and reliable source of information about both mainstream and protection prisoners, with some prisoners reporting having been shown other prisoners' files by prison officers. In my interview with Des, who had a reputation for violence, I was informed about prison officers offering 'rewards' to prisoners for physically abusing 'undesirable' prisoners. The fluidity and similarities between prison officers and prisoners is clearly illustrated in Des's story:

I was going to stab on²⁹ with this guy [child sex offender], but he wasn't out in the yard. Anyway the officers got wind of it and said: 'I'll give you six cans of coke if you do'.

Gavin, who was serving a sentence for murder said he had 'seen and heard a lot of things' while working as a storeperson in one of the high security sections of Yatala known as B Division. He described several incidents where prison officers were instrumental in assisting mainstream prisoners to gain access to protectees. Gavin's story clearly shows the preparedness of some prison officers to be 'brothers in arms' with 'heroic' mainstream prisoners. That is, both prisoners and prison staff are an integral part of the brotherhood's culture in that they work together physically to condemn prisoners who are weak or 'unmanly'. As Gavin explains:

There was another time when a tamperer³⁰ come in to the jail and he had been there about two weeks and the screws said to him 'It's about time you got a bit of fresh air, isn't it?' There were a few blokes waiting out in the yard for him and he ended up with a broken arm. First of all it was

²⁹ Fight and stab a person.

³⁰ Someone convicted of child sexual abuse ie having 'tampered' with children sexually.

sprained and then they did X-rays and it ended up broken. A hiding isn't that severe, it's usually a few punches in the head and a kick in the guts and they always manage to walk away from it. But a broken arm? The cameras didn't pick it up. They were turned off. They get turned off from time to time. If something is going to happen that the screws don't want to get into the shit for, it's just convenient that the cameras are facing the other way or they are off. And they do that because the bloke [prison officer] who's in the bunker who operates the camera is in cahoots [agreement] with them. They [prison officers] don't like kid fuckers either.

Nick described the prison cameras being turned away when he was assaulted by prison officers. He reported:

They slapped me around and played tennis [hit him as if he was a tennis ball] with me. They stand there and you are handcuffed and they push you two metres and then another officer will push you back, and one of them will trip you over and you'll land on the ground. This has happened to me many a times. Up in the remand centre I got bashed full on in the mouth. They take you there [to the punishment unit] and what they do [is] they ring up to their mates in the bunker and they get them to move the centre camera so they can hit you.

Nick went on to comment on the futility of objecting when the incident would be investigated by other prison officers:

If you complain, it's just other officers investigating other officers; they're drinking partners at the pub.

There were several other examples of the panopticon gaze being made dysfunctional in the performance of criminal masculinity. Jamie, a young protection prisoner who had a fervent and violent hatred of those who sexually abused children, reported that he had

been set up by prison officers to 'punish' sex offenders. Jamie revealed that he was approached by a unit manager, an internal investigator and the General Manager to make a statement against officers who had shown him other prisoners' files to encourage him to 'punish' them. According to Jamie, these officers arranged for him and other protectees to bash sexual offenders. His experience illustrates the way prison officers' collusion in dominant masculinity is crucial to the maintenance of the brotherhood. Additionally, Jamie's story highlights the shared values of the criminal brotherhood and the prison officers, particularly in the despising of sexual offenders and informants and the consequent intimidation of specific prisoners:

The [internal Department] investigator said to me 'I know there have been some assaults in B3' [recalcitrant unit].³¹ He said to me, 'We know that there's been some assaults on sex offenders, and officers have been setting you up to assault these people'. And I said 'That's true'. I told him everything I know. Officers setting me up to bash sex offenders – how they would show me the computer, show me the file, turn the camera the other way. There's three cameras that face the yard in B3 and there's two cameras that can only see the first yard and the highest camera can only see the second yard in B3 and that's the yard I was in, and that's the camera that kept getting turned around. Officers said [to other prison officers] 'Can you turn the camera away this afternoon' and when it was away, the assaults took place. Whoever I wanted to bash, I could. I was doing a lot of favours for mainstream prisoners.

All these stories provide an understanding of the complexity of surveillance which raise issues about Foucault's notion of the centrality of the panopticon. The inhibiting effect of this invisible gaze was not uniformly evident in the male prison. Specifically, the removal of the camera or the crucial 'eye' of the prison creates the opportunity for

³¹ The recalcitrant unit also known as 'recal' and B3 is where prisoners are transferred after they have been in the highest security section of the prison, G division. They may also be there if there is inadequate room in G division and they require 24-hour monitoring, or if they have been transferred back to Yatala from another prison for a serious breach (for example, drug use).

the young man to act out his rage against sex offenders and for the prison officers' violence to be enacted and remain unrecorded. Indeed, the rendering of the crucial 'eye' of the prison dysfunctional clearly illustrates that 'the gaze' is not that of the panopticon, but that of masculinity. That is, these stories clearly illustrate the importance to both prisoners and prison officers of maintaining and reproducing a particular form of masculinity even to the extent that the 'eye' of the prison is turned away and made irrelevant. Furthermore, these prisoners' stories also highlight how entrenched the performance of criminal masculinity is, and in particular how blurred are the boundaries between officer and prisoner.

So strong is the disapproval of child sexual abuse and of informing that inmates convicted of such crimes attempt to conceal their crime either by lying about their offences or by 'down playing' the reality of their offences. For example, when I asked what offence(s) they were convicted for, several men minimised these types of crimes, whereas 'heroic' crimes such as armed robbery were exaggerated by the other prisoners. When questioned, three out of the eleven men convicted for child sexual offending substituted other crimes (fraud, traffic offences and illegal use, break and enter), rather than admitting to their conviction for child sexual offences. Of the eight who admitted they had been convicted of child sexual offending, the majority falsified the age of the child/ren against whom they had offended. Significantly increasing the age of the child functions to reduce the innocence of the victim by introducing the possibility of consent and other factors such as seduction or being 'lead on' and therefore the offender having little control over their actions or desires. Minimising the 'severity' of the sexual offence was achieved by the use of phrases such as 'I only ...', 'I just ...', 'I accidentally touched the victim ...' Some maintained their innocence and blamed their conviction on others such as the police, vengeful women or the child victim him/herself.

When admitted to the prison, Phillip attempted to conceal his crime of sexually offending against children under the age of twelve. He let it be known that he had been

convicted for traffic offences and the illegal use of a motor car. He was not believed by the majority of prisoners because details of his case had been reported in the newspapers and on television. Phillip described his initiation into prison in the following way:

When I first come in here [Yatala] they [prison officers] put me into non-sex offender unit and I was completely not accepted. I had fruit and everything thrown at me. They [prisoners] also threw things at me in my cell. I had coffee thrown at me and after I cleaned the mess up, I went to the gate and I said to the prison officer: 'Sir they don't want me in here anymore'. They took me out and put me into another division in B3 [recalcitrant unit]. I was not accepted by the other prisoners there either. They thought I had raped a very young person, but I said to someone I did not.

It is a belief among prisoners who have not been convicted for sexual offences that society punishes those who commit 'fair' crimes such as property offences and 'man to man' assaults more severely than it does crimes against innocent people, even though these crimes are seen as 'unfair'. This belief is supported by the fact that all of the 15 interviewed who were serving convictions for armed robbery were serving longer sentences than those convicted of child sexual offending. The average sentence for armed robbery was four years with the longest being twenty-eight. The average sentence for child sexual offending was eighteen months with the longest being four years. Apart from those who had sexually offended against children, all those interviewed shared the view that society, and the courts in particular, are too lenient with sexual offenders. For Max, who prides himself on committing only 'acceptable' crime, his main dissatisfaction is with what he perceives to be the lenient sentences given to those who sexually offend against children. Max's comments illustrate the punitive attitude the brotherhood has towards those who sexually offend against children:

I don't like paedophiles for the same reason why everyone doesn't like them. They do things to children that's not right. I just can't handle them. Child molesters get less time than others. The system is fucked. Someone who steals a car they get 12 months or something, but someone who tampers with a child, they get suspended sentences all the time. That's not right, where's the logic in that? They should get the death penalty for that. They've wrecked someone for life and that's not on.

Last night there was one [sex offender] in here [recalcitrant unit] and everyone was yelling out 'dog', and screaming at him that he was a 'piece of shit' and yelling out at him. He was coughing last night and everyone said 'If you don't shut up we will knock you out'. Everyone was calling him 'tamperer', 'rock spider' and saying "Slit your throat and hang yourself". They don't like him 'cos he's a tamperer.

We find out they are tamps by the news, by newspaper and we read and get their names, and when we see their names on the door we then start abusing them. The tamp we abused last night is still there in his cell. He won't come out of his cell, 'cos we'll put a baseball [bat] to his head. He just stays in his cell and watches TV.

What is particularly obvious from the interviews with the majority of prisoners who did not have sexual offending in their criminal records was the importance they placed on distinguishing between 'moral' and 'immoral' crime. Their concept of morality is centred around notions of the right type of masculine sexuality. The raping of a child or an elderly woman is not a manly crime, and therefore is morally unacceptable as well as being 'unmasculine'. Max's story provides a clear example of what is considered immoral behaviour. His story shows the ways in which those like Max seek to punish those who they consider to be 'immoral'. Furthermore, Max considers

that most members of society would agree with and support his abuse of child sex offenders.

The belief that a man who rapes children or elderly women is sexually desperate or mentally ill was commonly held by male prisoners. That is, unlike other prisoners, those who sexually offend against children are depicted as desperate and deranged people who have committed weak, pathetic acts. Labelling the sexual offender as 'sick', or 'desperate' for sex, also enables those who do not commit these crimes to feel morally superior and sexually 'normal'. The manly, risk-taking criminal is not 'desperate' or 'sick' but rather he is committing what is seen by the criminal fraternity as a decent, moral and real man's crime.

The role of the brotherhood in policing the boundaries of 'normal' masculine heterosexuality is illustrated by the fact that not all sexual offences are deemed deviant and punished in the way that attacks on the young and elderly are. It is not a universal law that men who rape are in protection. Only two out of the seven men interviewed who had convictions for rape were in protection. For example, Rowan, who murdered and raped an elderly woman, was able to retain his status as a powerful and persuasive character within the mainstream prison population, and was not seen as sexually 'desperate'. This was partly to do with the fact that he was well known for trafficking drugs within the prison and was 'well connected' within the prison. Others like Malcolm, who also has a conviction for raping an adult woman, said he had never considered protection to be necessary:

There were a few problems for a couple of blokes. They didn't like it [rape] so we sorted it out. It got sorted out with a bit of physiotherapy [physical violence]. After this I had no problem in mainstream. I've been here for all my sentences which is over 11 years.

The majority (37 of 60) of the male prisoners that I interviewed believed that men who rape adult women are 'just getting sex'. Of the 29 prisoners who had never been

convicted of sexual offences, 23 stated that they did not understand why a person rapes, and 15 stated that all rapes could be avoided if rapists had the 'guts' to go to sex workers to 'get' sex. For Mark, who holds the view that rape is immoral but is more likely to occur when men do not have access to enough sex, rape is what he considers a 'pathetic crime' because it is a crime that could be avoided if one pays rather than rapes for sex. In this construction of masculine sexuality, 'getting' sex is a necessity and adult women are seen as the inevitable (and appropriate) 'providers' of sex, whether they do so willingly or not. Max explained that sex is 'always available' and that the rape of particular people in the community was unacceptable. He stated:

Raping grannie is also out [of The Code]. That's why people go to protection. What sort of low mongrel would rape an old lady? An old defenceless lady? She's old. How can a bloke smack around an 80-year-old woman and take her hundred dollars off her and have sex with her? It's not on. That's why they get bashed when they come here. That's why they usually go straight to protection. They're just pathetic.

Here sex with adult women is imagined as a physical contest between equals, but the implication of Max's comments is that the rape of able-bodied women is not immoral even if it is 'pathetic'. This group of people are seen by the brotherhood as not being able to legitimately participate in the exchange of physical aggression (Connell, 1995: 100). A majority of prisoners said that women between the ages of 15 to 50 were not 'off limits', and in fact displayed considerable sympathy towards those men who had been convicted of raping women in this age group. Max attempted to explain this apparent contradiction and provided what he considered to be 'reasons' for a man having to rape. One reason he gave was that 'they [the rapist] could have been prick teased' to the extent where he had no control over his consequent desire, and so responsibility for the consequences is shifted to the woman. As Max went on to say:

There's [a] raper and there's a rapist. A rapist is someone who rapes an innocent woman, but a raper has sex with a girl and she's been prick teasing him and he is not a rapist. You can see a girl and she'll flirt

around with you and you think she wants it, and she's prick teasing you. So things go on and she says you raped her, but you didn't. But if you get some bloke that goes preying on innocent women and they haven't done nothing wrong, then the bloke deserves what they get.

What is evident in Max's view is that there are two types of women who are raped and there are two types of men who 'do' the raping. The women who are the undeserving but real victims of rape are those who are innocent, chaste and a stranger to the rapist. The type of man who is a rapist is an undesirable character who clearly has tested the boundaries of 'real' manhood by raping a good, chaste woman. In the second category is a woman who is seen as conniving and unchaste, who conspires and schemes to create a situation where sex occurs and then later names the incident as rape. The second type of rapist, according to Max and the majority of prisoners interviewed, is not a sex offender, but rather, he is a victim who has fallen into the trap that the conniving, scheming, unchaste woman has laid out for him. As Patrick stated, 'in certain circumstances' the rape of an adult is justified. Patrick went on to detail those 'certain circumstances':

If it's a 'no' that meant 'yes' or if it was in the middle of a robbery or something, yeah it's not so bad. It's not so bad as a child molester. Doing a break [burglary] and a bloke commits a rape in the middle of robbing it [the house], well there's a lot of difference between that and a molester.

Patrick's scenario suggests different 'biological' forces at work – once the adrenalin is activated in the act of robbery there's no stopping it. This suggestion that there is a biological or bio-chemical drive in the activity of doing crime and in having sex, positions both as contests in which heterosexual masculinity is inherently predatory and opportunistic, rather than deceptive and scheming as child sex offenders are seen to be. In the scenario that Patrick describes, the intention of the man is to rob not rape.

That is, he is primarily a robber not a rapist and therefore is given a level of acceptability and understanding of the 'circumstances' that led up to the rape. The victim is allocated some responsibility as she interrupted the business of the robbery and therefore suffered the consequences by being raped.

Kevin, who described himself as an armed robber and drug user, stated that he did not like people who sexually offend against children. Despite Kevin's dislike for people who commit such crimes, he defended inmates who had been charged with the rape of adult women, claiming that some of his friends had been wrongfully convicted. His view suggests that most adult women cannot be trusted to tell the truth about sex, and are therefore 'fair game':

I've met a few rapists. Years ago you never use to talk to them and people [other prisoners] use to be dirty³² on them. But I do know one who picked up this sheila [woman] and she was flirting with him. He ended up sleeping with her and she put him up for rape. I left that night because I thought she was trouble. She brought that on herself. I also met a guy in jail and he went down [was convicted] on one rape and he said he ended up sleeping with her and that she was all for it at first.

Rape in the men's prison

Rape has a particular and meaningful place in the prison culture. Thirty-five of the sixty men whom I interviewed stated that the biggest fear they had, when they first came to prison, was of being raped. I did not specifically ask if they had experienced sexual abuse within the prison; however, when asked about their first experience of prison, some chose to speak about having been raped or their fear of being raped. Three out of the sixty prisoners interviewed disclosed they had been raped in prison. Fifteen spoke about being harassed by inmates for sexual favours which included oral sex and intercourse. Young prisoners were most vulnerable to sexual attacks, with all

³² To denigrate and disapprove of someone.

those reporting having experienced sexual harassment being under 22. Other common characteristics among those who had been raped, or had experienced some form of sexual abuse or sexual harassment, included: they did not know very many people within the system; they were serving their first prison sentence; they were usually accommodated in the mainstream section of the prison; they had not been convicted for sexual offences; and the assaults occurred within the first six months of their sentence.

Neville was 18 when he first went to prison in Victoria. He stated that he was approached by a prisoner for oral sex. He said his first reaction was to hit the person for being 'sick'. What is interesting about Neville's story is that while he was adamant that within the men's prison homosexuality in general is viewed as completely taboo, he did not feel the same rage at those who, within the constraints of prison, rape other inmates.

Poofs [homosexuals] and those that do that type of thing are just sick. They need help to cure them ... Yes I know that some of those blokes in here have been raped or whatever by a bloke in here, but you can't say that the bloke that done that to them is the same in sickness as the poofs and kid fuckers. You have to understand the difference. Those fags [homosexuals] are trouble ... I hate 'em, we all hate them. You've got to get it right. Those fags are bigger problems than the one or two in here who might have raided [raped] those young blokes just for a bit of [sexual] release.

Others, such as John, also reported having to defend themselves against being raped. He described the incident in the following way:

I didn't know too many people, 'eh, and I was just reading a book in the yards and this fella kept coming up to me and that, and I found out by some old timers [that] he was going to rape me. Yeah he was going to rape me. This bloke, who is now dead, and who ended up being my

friend, said to me 'What are you going to do about it?' I grabbed an iron bar and I waited for him in the shower and I whacked him with this iron bar. I didn't have much trouble after that, 'eh.

The first few weeks of imprisonment in an adult jail were described by an overwhelming majority (51 of the 60) as the most stressful. The stress obviously compounded concerns about the possibility of being raped. A majority of prisoners (57 of the 60) stated that the most vulnerable group at risk of rape in prison were those who were first timers, who had no connections with other prisoners, who were not familiar with The Code and were aged between 18 and 22. In addition, a considerable majority of those interviewed (40 of the 60) said that most men who were raped in prison were usually 'physically weak', 'acted like girls' and were 'probably gutless'. Given that physical weakness is derided in prison, it is not surprising that only 10 of the 60 interviewed said they would be willing to protect the victims of rape in prison.

Given the pressure to remain silent and not make reports, it is not surprising that very few prisoners have reported rape. A majority stated they had known of, or heard about people who had been raped in prison. Twenty-two out of the sixty interviewed denied that rape occurs in prison. All the prisoners interviewed stated that rape shouldn't happen, however very few (17 out of 60) approved of victims laying charges against the perpetrator. If one has been raped in prison, making a report to officers or others, such as the medical staff or social workers, is derided with the same fervour as any other informing. The laying of charges against the perpetrator was considered by the majority as unethical and going against The Code. The perspective of the great majority of respondents was that there is no need to involve the law, as more 'effective' punishment can be organised within the brotherhood. As Shane outlines:

There's been some rapes in here. In E Division³³ there was one where a young bloke had it put upon him in a two outer.³⁴ He got punched in the face and raped. I think that's fucked. I feel real sorry for that young kid. My heart bleeds for him. He went to the screws. I wouldn't of done that, I've got more dash than that. But he did that and the other bloke was charged. So there's a fine line there. Giving someone up isn't really on. I know the kid that got raped and he's on protection now in another jail. I wouldn't of gone to the screws. The fit punishment for the prick that raped the kid would be him getting raped and then see how he likes it.

Rape between men is clearly seen as an exercise of power and punishment; it is not connected with sexual desire, in the way the rape of women is, and sex with children is seen as deviant sexuality. That is, rape between men is seen as punishment that also achieves sexual relief. Rape represents one of the ways in which predatory masculinity is performed in prison. The most common scenario of rape victims is that the prisoner is a remandee facing charges that may require him to serve a long period in prison. All three who reported having been raped in prison were, at the time of the rape, on remand and facing charges ranging from murder and armed robbery to a series of car thefts. All had been raped within the first four weeks of entering the prison. All three were first timers to South Australian adult prisons, with one having spent a short period of time (six months) in Pentridge, where he had several uncles and knew people from the YTCs who provided him with protection and support. For young first-time offenders it appears to be beneficial if they are already acquainted with prisoners who are respected and are willing to protect them against sexual attacks.

All three men who reported having been raped in prison were raped in the mainstream section. At the time of the interview, all were accommodated in protection, while those

³³ E division accommodates those prisoners who are on remand or have just been sentenced.

³⁴ Prisoners use the word two outed or two outer which means a cell with two beds in it. Two outed can also refer to being bashed by two people, hence the term "I was two outed".

who raped them remained in the mainstream. Two of the men who had been raped had pressed charges against the perpetrators, both of whom were found guilty of rape. The third person, Jeremy, was considering pressing charges, but admitted to being frightened of the consequences. He reported threats being made to his family by the perpetrator. He also had flashbacks and severe migraines as a result of being bashed unconscious with an iron bar during the rape. Jeremy described himself in the following way:

It [talking about his rape] depresses me for days. Rape does occur in prison and I'm a victim of this system since I started coming to jail. The prison officers, I don't know where they were when I was bashed and raped. They should have been sitting in the office, but they weren't. I was put in boys' homes early [and] I was raped in boys' homes and now in here.

One of the two who did report their rape was Joseph who, at the time of the rape, was a new admission and on remand for murder. Joseph, who was raped at the old Adelaide Prison,³⁵ said the lack of support from prisoners and staff exacerbated the trauma of rape:

I've never been raped in my whole life before and when I come to prison I was raped. I was serving my first time when it happened and I took the bloke to court for raping me. I put him into the police. I was locked up in a cell with this bloke. I tried to scream, but he held me down. I told the officers next morning what happened. No one [prisoners] supported me doing that. I got no support. I told an officer and they didn't believe me. I went to the hospital and one of the nurses said I was raped. I got a couple of bashings for it [for reporting the rape, from prisoners]. Most of them [prisoners and officers] here know I was raped.

35

Adelaide Prison was a maximum security men's prison. It is now closed.

Joseph goes on to describe the ongoing punishment that he receives for having informed about the rape:

He [perpetrator] got three and a half years for it. I can't handle it in mainstream. I've tried it. I tried in the Remand Centre to stay in mainstream and I was getting bashed there. I've had quite a few bashings. On protection you don't have any bashings.

For Matthew, who was raped at the Adelaide Remand Centre, the cruelty of some prison staff and the constant harassment by the perpetrator has left him believing that he would have been better off not reporting the rape:

I got two outed [accommodated in a double cell] with a bloke and he was sick and he raped me. It was as simple as that. It's just the way it went. I couldn't beat him.

I wish I never testified against him, because I now have to look over my shoulder forever. Going to court, it wasn't worth it. I ended up on protection, and he got a few years extra. It is not the end of it. If I hadn't said anything I would of still been in mainstream. I would've been raped a couple of more times, but I would of been in mainstream.

At the ARC [Adelaide Remand Centre] I was in the infirmary, and I was only allowed to have three cigarettes a day because I had just been raped. I spat the dummy [got upset] and said take me to Unit 7³⁶ or I'll smash the infirmary up. I went up to Unit 7, which is like G Division. The Manager came up and gave me my cigarettes, because he could see what the story was. The next morning the screws who were on obviously didn't read why I was in Unit 7 and they thought I was in for mucking

³⁶

Unit 7 at the Adelaide Remand Centre is the punishment unit for those who have been involved in an incident within the prison which the prison considers unacceptable or a threat to the good order of the prison. Sometimes people are accommodated in Unit 7 if they are suicidal or require extensive protection. The regime is similar to that of G division at Yatala Labour Prison.

up. They said 'Get out of bed'. I said 'No, get fucked'. They came in and one of them gave me an elbow to the head. That was all right. I understand as he actually came back and talked to me after and said: 'Jesus I just thought you were being a smart arse, I didn't realise what had gone on before'. I could cop that because he was a fair man. Some of the people in here you have to deal with like that. The only thing they can understand is violence. I came down to protection. The rapist, he's still in mainstream.

Staff [in his present unit] are the best staff I have ever had to deal with. They have gone out of their way. But there's an officer in here [Yatala] who kept saying to me 'You know what it's like to be raided [raped] by a bloke'. He'd come up to me with a form you fill out for sexual harassment in the workplace, saying 'You're getting sexually harassed here'. He said 'How would you like this one?' He had a picture of a black man with a big dick down to his feet. They were savage comments.

Both Joseph's and Matthew's stories provide an insight into why prisoners are reluctant to report rape. First, reporting rape is considered weak by mainstream prisoners and some prison officers. Second, reporting a rape to prison authorities and laying charges against the perpetrator means that the victim of rape automatically goes to protection, while the perpetrator usually remains in the mainstream. This is not to say there are no prison rapists in the protection section of the prison. There were two protection prisoners who said they moved cells because they feared they would be raped by another protectee. However, those people who have raped other inmates within protection are not on protection because they have raped, but rather because they have had other problems within the mainstream.

Men's prison summary

One of the recurring themes to emerge from the interviews with male prisoners is the way in which their bodies are marked by themselves, other criminals and the prison. The YTCs are institutions where young boys formally begin their career in criminality. The transition to the adult prison is also marked by initiations of the body, for example it may include rape, bashings by other prisoners or prison officers, or introduction to and later addiction to hard drugs.

The research suggests that there is a need among all prisoners to be seen by both the brotherhood and prison officers as 'authentic' and 'hard'. Part of the act of being seen as 'hard' and invincible is to speak the dialect of the criminal family and to mark the body physically in ways that provide one with a distinctive criminal masculine identity. This is done in various ways, including adopting a particular physical appearance by tattooing the body and shaving the head, and actively seeking out situations in which to demonstrate physical prowess to other criminal men.

The research suggests that the physical hardness of doing jail is reinforced by both the brotherhood and prison officers. Both work to create and maintain the mythology of what is 'real', 'authentic' criminal masculinity. As part of this, the 'undesirable' criminal, who is depicted as weak, unmanly and therefore 'uncriminal', is marked metaphorically as Other and usually accommodated in the Other space of protection. The surveillance of those marked out by the brotherhood as undesirable for having broken The Code is undertaken by both prison officers and prisoners who patrol and enforce the boundaries between mainstream and protection. The relevance of that for this thesis, which I will address in the concluding chapter, relates to the way in which the space of protection is used by the prison and prisoners as a way of marginalising some prisoners, thereby maintaining an archetypal criminal masculinity.

The prison system maintains a particular form of masculinity where the boundaries of 'normal' and deviant male sexuality are fiercely patrolled. The homosocial practices

which sustain this heterosexual dominance include the exclusion of women and 'the feminine'. These homosocial practices rely on the establishment and maintenance of a fiercely defended loyalty and trust between men. However, the fragility of this system is brought into sharp relief by the challenge that drug dependence brings to the prison culture. The desperation of drug dependency challenges hegemonic criminal masculinity at both conceptual and practical levels. At the conceptual level, dependence represents femininity and weakness, and undermines the myth of the 'hard', rational man of action who controls and determines his own life of crime. At a practical level, the need for drugs leads these men to become informants and to renegeing on debts and responsibilities to other prisoners.

In the following chapter, 'The Women's Prison', I will analyse the 40 interviews with women prisoners from Adelaide Women's Prison. In particular I will contrast the women's experiences of prison with those of male prisoners. In doing so I will develop new understandings about the gendered effect of 'the prison' experience.

CHAPTER 5: THE WOMEN'S PRISON

The female criminal

In the main, it has been the theories that have emerged from studies about male prisons and criminality that have been used to explain women's experience of prison. Canadian lawyers and criminologists Bonta et al. write: 'theories of criminal behaviour are largely based on observations of male offenders. The major theories in criminology – subcultural, control and differential association – have been almost exclusively based upon male delinquency' (1995: 278). Such studies have failed to take into account any other knowledges – such as that of women's experience of prison, their prison subculture or what McNay refers to as the customs inherited from the past (1992: 39). Nor have they explored the effect of the prison's disciplinary techniques on women's bodies. This chapter will present the data from 40 interviews with women prisoners from Adelaide Women's Prison in South Australia. In particular, this chapter will explore the way in which women describe their lived experience of jail and contrast this with the experience of male prisoners.

On average the participants were younger than men (average age 25 years) with only 15 aged over 30. Most were repeat offenders. Twelve were serving or had been remanded for their first sentence. Thirteen of the forty were currently serving their second sentence, with fifteen having served three or more sentences. The majority were serving sentences of less than two years. Five were on remand, eight had sentences between two weeks and one year, ten were serving sentences between one to two years and seventeen were serving sentences between two and eighteen years. The women were serving sentences or had been remanded for a variety of offences. The main offences were property related (larceny, fraud, break and enter, robbery). Of the 40 prisoners, 27 women were on remand or serving sentences for property-related crimes, 6 were on remand or serving sentences for armed robbery, 2 had been

sentenced for murder and 1 for manslaughter, and 4 were serving sentences for trafficking in drugs. Thirty-two of the forty women interviewed (80%) said they had committed crime to support drug habits. This is somewhat higher than the 70% of male interviewees.

Both male and female prisoners overwhelmingly identified men as being a major influence in their introduction to crime. For male prisoners, 53 out of 60, and for women, 30 out of the 40, stated that they were introduced to crime by men. On average the women's first association with crime took place at a higher age (17 years) than men's (12 years). While men were mostly introduced to crime via associates whom they met in their neighbourhood, YTCs or in prison, women's their first experience with crime was most often associated with a man with whom they were intimately involved. It appears that women's acceptance into the criminal world is primarily through their male intimates. For example, 11 of the women prisoners were introduced to crime by brothers or male acquaintances in their neighbourhood, and 19 by husbands or boyfriends. When asked why they became involved in crime, 32 women stated that drugs were the main reason for their involvement. A majority (25) stated they were first introduced to drugs by their male intimates. Additionally, 15 women had at some period been involved in prostitution, with 11 stating they began working in the sex industry in their teens to support their drug addictions. All 15 who had worked in the sex industry reported that they developed criminal contacts via their work.³⁷

Fewer women than men had been incarcerated in Youth Training Centres (YTCs). Only 11 of the 40 women had spent time in YTCs compared with 43 of the 60 men. Only three women stated that their experience in the YTCs prepared them for a life of crime. However, there were some distinct differences between those women who had been through the YTCs and those who had entered the criminal justice system as adults. For example, all the women who went through the YTCs had committed crimes

³⁷ Prostitution in South Australia is illegal.

which in the male criminal world were seen to be the top of the hierarchy. These women's crimes were armed robbery, robbery with violence, drug trafficking, manslaughter and murder. A majority of them (eight) said they had very little or no contact with their biological families and that their only support networks involved other women and men who were criminals. All the women from this group identified with the male criminal culture (The Code) in ways that the majority of other women who had not been through the YTCs did not. For example, they all referred to themselves as being 'crims', a term that other women did not use. Additionally, all of them said they came from the 'old school', and that they 'did' crime according to the masculine criminal code.

While male prisoners described their juvenile years within the criminal justice system as their 'apprenticeship', women prisoners were less likely to go through the same initiations and rituals that characterise the male criminal world. Unlike male prisoners, none of the women spoke of a 'training period' in which they learnt to be criminal. For the 10 who did refer to being 'trained in the old school', it was their training in The Code, in terms of not informing on associates to police and other authorities, that they elaborated. The criminal culture the women from the 'old school' refer to is akin to that of the brotherhood. However, women's inclusion in the male brotherhood is conditional, as Wendy, who was introduced to crime by her boyfriend at the age of 15, explained:

I was hanging around with a group of older guys who were all doing crime. I was taught by them in that I was part of the group, but in some ways I wasn't. At the time the guy who was doing some big crime was my boyfriend and I ended up having a kid with him. I was trusted and I knew most of what was going down, but because I was a girl I wasn't ever really part of it. Those guys went on to do some big crime, like banks and that, and I was always friends with them, but I never got asked to join them, especially on big things. They protected me and looked after me and I was part of it and not part of it, if you know what I

mean. I've always lived by The Code, even though the crime I'm in for is only racking.³⁸ I come from the old school and was trained, I suppose you could say, by the best of them.

As Wendy's testimony affirms, women can never be completely 'in' the centre of criminal activity. Because women are 'marked' as different by gender, they are always marginal. Wendy occupies a space 'in between'; she is not completely within (the masculine) criminal space, nor does she occupy the usual acceptable 'feminine' spaces, her criminal activities marking her as deviant. As Wendy herself tells it, she is very aware of her own marginality. This marginality is both gendered and sexualised. Wendy is the girl, the girlfriend and the mother. It is on the basis of these relationships that she was conditionally included in 'the gang'; and it is on this basis that she is also excluded from 'big' crime, crime of a particularly 'heroic' and violent masculine nature.

The interviews with female prisoners show that just as for male prisoners, the rules of The Code are considered important. However, it seems that The Code is practised in gender-specific ways, with male prisoners being more likely than women to subject another to violence if they deviate from the rules of acceptable criminal behaviour. For example, when asked to explain The Code, both men and women referred to loyalty, not being an informant, not stealing from other prisoners, not sexually offending against children, and not harming old people. However, while all the women interviewed agreed that it is important to be familiar with and abide by The Code in order to avoid conflict with other inmates, unlike the male prisoners, they did not hold the rule of silence to be paramount. In general The Code and the notion of a criminal 'family' are not given the same importance by women as they are by men. Most of the women said that other connections, namely children, intimate relationships and relatives, take precedence over loyalty to The Code or to other prisoners.

³⁸ Racking refers to organised teams of shoplifters who steal large amounts of goods.

First experience in prison

Those women who referred to themselves as 'old timers' had a number of similarities to those men who referred to themselves in the same way. They used much of the same language as the men to describe what they perceived to be the younger prisoners' disrespect for The Code (for example, younger women were frequently referred to by old timers as 'dogs', 'scum', 'granny bashers' and 'junkies'). However, the old timer women were also clear in their belief that the repercussions for women ignoring The Code were generally not as serious as they were for men. All the women interviewed stated that, while violence was a problem in women's prisons, they felt that it was more of a problem in men's prisons, where murders and other extreme forms of violence were carried out to punish those who broke The Code. Part of the persona of being a 'real' male criminal is to perform and demonstrate one's hardness, with other men providing validation and approval. In this respect, as Kay's story reflects, women's prisons are different from men's prisons.

When I came in here in 1979 it was very different. It was full of old heavy crims. Women never came to jail unless they did something pretty bad, pretty drastic, like killing their bloke because he was an arsehole and he deserved it. But today they do all types of things and some are just pathetic and disgusting. It's [the prison is] full of down-and-outs, young kids who [would] steal from their grandmothers and knock her, type of stuff.

Q: So how do you deal with these people?

A: *Most of us just ignore them, some might get a bit of a slap to let them know we don't approve of their behaviour, but that's as far as it goes. Most of us are pretty tolerant and have other things to think about than what some young upstart is doing. Those type of girls usually go to*

protection for a while until they have learnt their lesson. Women prisoners are different, and we don't get into all that rules [The Code] stuff so much. It's very different here to the men's prisons where dogs are usually watching their backs. Dogs often get killed there, but in the women's prison killing someone for being a dog would probably never happen.

Familiarity with the prisoners' rules as to what constitutes acceptable/unacceptable behaviour was acknowledged by almost all the women as a prerequisite for getting on in prison. Seventeen women stated they knew the rules before they entered prison, although despite this knowledge, most felt frightened and nervous when they were first sentenced. My request that they describe their first day in prison was overwhelmingly answered in terms of anxiety. The causes of anxiety included: withdrawing from drugs (31), not knowing what to expect (29), concern about being strip-searched (29), concern about children (23), fear of violence (21), worry about length of sentence (17), not knowing anyone (16), shock of being sentenced to prison (13), shame (10). Only nine women stated they were not anxious when first sentenced. They explained this as being due to having connections within the criminal network. As Liz said:

When I first come in here I was surprised about how many of the girls I knew. My fella was in at Yatala and I knew a lot of the girls from him 'cos they had fellas hanging around with us. Knowing people in here was the best thing for me. I didn't find being in prison easy. I was hanging out [withdrawing from drugs] and my child was only two, I was on remand and I was missing my fella, and all those things were getting to me. But because I knew girls in here from the outside, those girls helped me out from day one and I just fitted in, probably because my fella is well known and respected. I see other girls who come in and they look scared and they know no-one. They usually have to prove themselves before anyone accepts them into the group.

Fifteen women and thirteen men reported that they were withdrawing from heroin when first imprisoned. Both men and women prisoners reported feeling sick and experiencing considerable pain as a result of the withdrawal process. In South Australia a person who has been on a Methadone program is given 90 days from the time of his or her imprisonment to withdraw from Methadone. If a person is not on a Methadone program prior to imprisonment, but is a heroin user, they are not eligible for Methadone. This means that many drug-dependent prisoners spend their first weeks in prison withdrawing from heroin. In this study, 23 women reported having been addicted to heroin or Methadone, and all except 6 of the 40 women that I interviewed admitted to having used illicit drugs within the past 5 years. As Katherine explained, for her the main difficulty with prison was not the environment, but rather coping with the pain and discomfort of withdrawing from drugs:

I was very, very sick when I got here from withdrawing. The first night [I] was in the police lock-up cells, I was refused bail and brought here. I knew people here, and I never had any problems [with adjustment]. They [prison officers] wanted me to go to the Yatala infirmary, the jail hospital, but I didn't want to go because there's more heroin here in mainstream than I would ever get at the infirmary. I got heroin here. I didn't get it straight away – I had to wait for a visit which was a couple of days. It was shocking, even the screws here still remember me being one of the worst cases they've ever seen.

I had a peptic ulcer as well, and I had really low blood pressure and I just felt terrible. I felt like I was dead. They couldn't put me on what they [usually] put people on when they come in to lower your blood pressure. When you withdraw normally your blood pressure goes up, but mine was down anyway and there wasn't much they could do. All they could do was give me a shot of anti-nausea stuff to stop me vomiting. I was vomiting all the time. I couldn't eat, couldn't sleep, and they said it was anxiety. All my fingers and toes were going numb and all around my

mouth was numb, and my stomach started going numb and I thought I was dying. It was horrible. I have never in my years of using heroin felt this way. I have used heroin on and off since I was 21, which is nine years, and I have had habits before and hung out, but I have never hung out like I did this time in my life.

A further trauma of entry to prison was created by the physical examination. Several women who had been imprisoned in the late 70s and early 80s referred to their induction into prison as one where they were 'disinfected'. The disinfectant baths suggest to the women that as criminals they are dirty, 'unfeminine' and require particular treatments to correct their smelly leaky bodies. The women's constant reference to the 'dehumanising' element of strip-searches and disinfectant baths also suggests that these two practices are either more humiliating for them than they are for men, or more of an affront to femininity than they are to masculinity. None of the male prisoners referred to being disinfected. Those men who entered Pentridge Prison in the 1970s described in a joking manner what they called a 'short arm inspection' by prison officers and the medical doctor. This examination of the genitals for signs of sexually transmitted diseases evokes nothing of the shame and anger that is caused by strip searches or disinfection for women. Kay describes her arrival at Adelaide Women's Prison in 1979 as humiliating and frightening:

In those days I was scared like shit. It was really abrupt, none of this 'It'll be right mate'. It was strip off, do this, do that. And I had never been told in my life to strip off. They were not gentle with you at all. I was handed a dressing gown and walked through to D Wing [high security section] [and] had to take a bath. A huge bath it was in there. They filled the bath up, don't tell you what is going on and they put you in a disinfectant bath for head lice and for unhygienic things. We were dunked in that. We were disinfected. Two hefty women screws were standing there watching me wash and making sure I did what I was to do. I was bawling my eyes out, and they were telling me to stop it. I'd

been raped by three blokes before coming in and that was well known. Raped by bikies and it came up in court. Nothing happened to them. I was also raped in Scotland when I was five by a dirty old man. So I was going through all these things and the screws had got me to take me clothes off. An old matronly woman screw said 'Don't discuss the rape when girls ask you'. I did not even know what to expect. I was really scared.

Kay's distress at the examination and bathing procedure led the authorities to be concerned that she would try and suicide. Initially placed in an isolated 'observation cell', Kay's fear only subsided when she was befriended by an old timer.

I was in D Wing for three days to make sure that I didn't nick [self mutilate] meself. It's the honeymoon ensuite. Anyway, I am thrown in a room smaller than a bathroom. Given a school uniform to wear, brown school shoes, bobby socks, a dress to the knees. It was green check. I remember it well. I was shitting myself and did not speak to anyone. No one hassled me. One of them took me under her wing and looked after me. She was an older woman. She talked to me, that's as much as she could do for anyone. Like a surrogate mother she was.

A number of women whose first experience of prison was in their teenage years described older women prisoners and prison officers as being motherly. They went on to describe these women as being 'helpful', 'caring', a 'shoulder to cry on' and 'mother like'. For example, Maree first entered prison in Melbourne in 1986 at the age of eighteen. At the time, a fire had destroyed part of Fairlea Women's Prison, and women were housed at Pentridge Prison, a maximum security male prison. Maree described her induction in the following way:

They [prison officers] made you strip off for a bath, and they give me a bath to get youse clean. And they gave us some stuff, I don't know what it was, but you were s'pose to wash all your body in it. And they gave us

some nit lotion for your hair, but I didn't put it in me hair right? So they stood and supervised and watched us while we was in there.

I know the guys didn't get the bath like us was. I was taken out of the room and another old timer crim, she was issuing clothes, blue tracksuits, white T-shirt and blue jumper and cheap as shit runners. A small comb and a toothbrush and toothpaste. I was given a slot [cell] in B Annex and I had a kettle in there and a chest of drawers, a bed and another older girl looked after me and helped me out and went and told them [prison officers] I wanted a TV and I got one. And some other older women who I knew mothered me a bit and got an interim canteen³⁹ for me. The screws gave one of them [canteen slip to buy goods at the prison shop] to me and I got me buy⁴⁰ the next day. It [Pentridge] was like any prison, it's what you make of it. Pentridge was different to here; they had chicken wire stuff between the rails of the tiers so no-one could be thrown off the top tier.

Raelene described her induction at Fairlea Women's Prison in Melbourne in the following way:

The first time I went to Fairlea was in 1991 and I was petrified. I was stripped right off, put in the showers. They put all this stuff through my hair, a lotion and that for nits and lice and that. I hated the medical at Fairlea and refused to let the old guy do it to me. They give you a full physical and I said to him, 'If you put your hands anywhere near me I'll scream'. And I said to the nurse 'He's not touching me'. It's not right having a man do that to women. I didn't want him to put his hand up me. It was really traumatic for me. If he did it [examined me] I would of

³⁹ Canteen and 'buy up' are both terms used by prisoners to describe the purchase of personal items from the prison store.

⁴⁰ When prisoners purchase goods at the prison canteen it is referred to as 'a buy'.

snotted [hit] the bastard. I would of felt that he would be taking away from me a part of me. I didn't agree to the medical or anything, and the nurse still done it to me. Every woman had to have it done to them, no choice at all. It [gynaecological examination] was done to them and usually by this doctor who was a guy.

They didn't do it [medical examination] here [Adelaide Women's Prison] and that was a relief. I was very surprised. Here all they do [is] what they do when you have just a visit at Fairlea. You get stripped before the visit and after the visit [when arriving at Adelaide Women's Prison], and I just got stripped down and then put my underwear back on and bra. Then you get your prison issue clothes, and you cough and squat.⁴¹ And that was it. And I thought 'OK, this is nothing to what I had to do at Fairlea'. You don't go and see the doctor at all. But then if you get girls in here that are not hygienic and then the first thing you want to do is give them a shower and get them cleaned up. They're chats [dirty]. They smell and they should be fixed up with a shower and made hygienic.

Raelene's story is indicative of several attitudes common among 'old timers', but not shared by other women. For example, her opinion that the current practice of strip-searches is unproblematic was not shared by the majority of women; 28 women reported that the strip-searches were shaming and embarrassing for them. Additionally, all 12 women who were completing their first sentences stated that strip-searches and urine tests⁴² were among the most humiliating experiences of prison. Furthermore, the way in which the majority of women described being strip-searched and 'disinfected'

⁴¹ When being stripped searched prisoners are instructed by the officers to 'squat and cough'. The squatting and coughing is supposed to cause drugs or any other prison contraband falling out of the prisoners' anus or vagina onto the floor.

⁴² Urine tests are conducted to test for the use of illegal drugs. They are randomly conducted in the prison. If a prison officer suspects a prisoner has used illegal drugs, the officer can order a prisoner to undertake a urine test. If a prisoner refuses a urine test then he/she automatically loses privileges such as contact visits for a period of 30 days.

suggests that this aspect of prison experience is different for women and men. For example, very few men referred to strip-searches as being humiliating or embarrassing. Instead, the men referred to them as being 'part of prison', and reported that they were only a problem when they were caught with drugs in orifices.

Violence in the women's prison

All 12 women who were serving their first sentence reported that the transition had been difficult. Two had been victims of prisoner violence. Both attributed their assaults to them not understanding the prison lore and etiquette and being a first timer. Mary-Lou said she mistakenly thought prison would be similar to the YTC where she had spent 14 months as a child and which she described as less threatening and more supportive than jail. Others, such as Geraldine, who at the time of the interview was a remand prisoner, said there are some conventions that newcomers (known as 'new admits') are wise to adhere to in the first few weeks of prison. She described the strategy she used during her initiation period in the following way:

I was strip-searched and I felt really humiliated. I am a remand prisoner and there's a 50 per cent chance that a prisoner [on remand] is not guilty and yet you are treated the same as the others as if you were guilty. I had special rings taken from me, I wasn't allowed to have them. The things that I could 'touch base' with, they were taken away from me. I sat in the yard by myself and for a few weeks I sussed everyone out and worked out who was who, and I found my way in here. People get put on the new admit list and people are sussing you out as much as you [are] to them. The officers are also checking you out. Everyone is wondering about what you've done, who you are. I got through all that and didn't get bashed. I didn't get confronted, because I kept to myself and didn't big mouth. Most new admits do get stood over, but I didn't because I kept to myself and kept quite. I played it very safe for the first two weeks.

While all the women claimed that men's prisons were far more extreme in their violence than women's prisons, 33 felt that violence in the women's prison was a part of everyday experience. Yet most of the women (25 out of the 40) had not had personal experience of any form of violence in jail. This contrasts with the male prisoners' experience where almost two thirds had experienced violence (39 out of 60). The women's and men's definition of violence was physical force. There may be several reasons why the women describe the prison as violent. The first may relate to a sense of violence stemming from the popular discourse based on male prisons as violent. That is, the male prisons are the yardstick for defining activity within all prisons, and because there are reports of violence within men's prisons, then all prisons, women's included, acquire the label of being violent places. Another explanation is that the environment of the women's and men's prisons is one where the continual threat of punishment and surveillance by prison officers and prisoners in relation to the rules and the unspoken Code of conduct, all imply violence. Hence, the prison is *felt* to be violent.

Eight of the women I interviewed admitted to being violent towards another inmate. Of those who had been violated, only 15 would talk about their experiences. Three said they were accused of being an informant, six reported they did not know why they were attacked, and six felt drugs were the main reason why they had been physically assaulted. According to Geraldine, bashings are usually related to drugs. However, she pointed out that most women disapproved of extreme violence:

Most of the violence in here is over drugs. One girl here got picked on really badly and she got bashed up by three people over nothing. She had black eyes and she had had a back operation and that put her out and made it worse after she got bashed. A lot of people are really dirty on [angry with] these people for what they did to her.

Geraldine's story is an interesting contrast to those told in men's prisons where little sympathy was expressed about even the most brutal attacks. However, there are

similarities between the two prisons in the way in which the victims, and not the perpetrators of the violence, are removed from the mainstream. Of the 15 women who reported being subjected to violence, 8 signed up for protection. One remained on protection for her entire sentence, which was unusual. Unlike the men's prisons, where a person who signs up on protection remains there for their entire sentence, protection at Adelaide Women's Prison is usually short term. This suggests that there is a less categorical divide between mainstream and protection in women's prisons. It also suggests that the rules made by the women prisoners at Adelaide Women's Prison, in contrast to what happens in male prisons where the male protectee is a 'marked person', are not fiercely patrolled. However, despite the difference in the way in which protection is enforced, this does not mean that women prisoners avoid self-surveillance. My research indicates that both men and women practise self-surveillance, with a majority reporting that all prisoners must be seen by others to be living by The Code of loyalty, and those who end up in protection have failed to do so.

The interviews with male prisoners clearly reveal the extent and nature of prisoner surveillance of one another, with the majority agreeing that violence is a fair retribution for those who deviate from The Code. For example, none of the male prisoners, including those who were known to have informed on another prisoner, said it was acceptable to break The Code. Similarly, all the women prisoners interviewed were able to identify key elements of 'acceptable' criminality and, like the male prisoners, were clear about the boundaries of criminal normality. While criminals are not expected to share community values because they (as criminals) have demonstrated their rejection of community standards, my research indicates that there is some overlap between some of the key values of The Code and those of the wider community. For example, all 40 of the women and a majority of men were no different from the wider community in their views that sexual offences against children were unacceptable. Similarly, almost all the prisoners interviewed said that abusing old people was unacceptable to The Code. When asked why these crimes were viewed by almost all within the criminal community as unacceptable, the overwhelming response from both

men and women was that children and older people were not able to defend themselves. As I argued in the previous chapter, the notion of what is a fair fight (and sexual offences against children and the elderly are not fair fights) is bound up with the identity of a 'real criminal'. Both men and women felt that crimes against property were fair and acceptable. As Martha, who described herself as a drug user and thief, explained:

I've committed crimes because I'm a drug user. I've never committed a crime against a person. I don't go for those types of crimes. Those other crimes, like sex offenders or bashing an old person, are not things I would ever do. Those who do those crimes are sick.

Rape in the women's prison

While informing on another inmate was considered by a majority of women (27) to be an unacceptable breach of The Code, 13 said that in certain circumstances informing was justifiable. They identified those circumstances as being when a person's life was in danger or if a person had been raped. Three stated that it was acceptable to inform on another inmate to clear their own name of false accusation. Indeed, their identifying situation in which it was 'appropriate' to inform was in sharp contrast to the men who claimed it was never acceptable to inform. One of the reasons for women prisoners having an apparently 'softer line' on informing may well be linked to the less rigid divide in women's prisons between officers and prisoners. That is, some officers in the women's prison are also confidantes, a situation which is utterly foreign to male prisoners. However, this is not to say that all women accept informants, or that those women who have informed do not face repercussions. For example, Janet, who at the time of the interview was accommodated in the protection section of the prison, had informed on three inmates whom she reports raped her friend in the mainstream section of the prison. Janet explained:

I'm in protection because my friend got raped and I gave a statement about what they done to her. I stood up for her and I got canned for it. I

gave a police statement. It is the first time I have ever given a statement and I got a real hard time for giving up⁴³ someone. I did it because I know what it would have been like for that girl.

Being raped, I know all about that, and I would want someone to stick up for me. I would not want people to walk away from me if I had been raped. She was terrified and in deep shock.

It [rape] has happened before, another girl was raped in here. They beat her up in the shower and they put gloves on. They done it because they thought she had drugs so they held her down and then stuck their fingers up her vagina. They beat her so bad that she was in the shower and when she collapsed she covered up the drain in the shower and blocked over the drain where the water goes down and just about drowned in the shower. This happens in women's jails. That time I shut it out and did not get involved. This time I spoke up.

Of the 27 women who said it was never acceptable to inform on another inmate, all provided examples of women being subjected to violence by other prisoners. However, despite having witnessed what some defined as 'unacceptable behaviour', only five admitted to ever having informed authorities. For example, during her first prison sentence in 1993 Vanessa witnessed a rape, and while she admitted to being 'terrified' by the rape, she chose not to get involved. Similarly, Leanne described the experience of a friend who, in 1995, was raped in prison and did not report it:

A close friend of mine had a pillow held over her head and someone stuck their hand up her to get drugs out of her. This was 1995. She was too scared to have anything done about it, which I can understand

⁴³ 'Giving up' someone is informing on them. Informants are often referred to as 'give ups'.

because she is the sort of person who is likely to come back in here and likely to bump into the people that did it to her when she's on the outside. The people that did that haven't been charged. She said nothing. I used to be there for her.

Others referred to rapes that they did not personally witness, but were aware of taking place close by. Betty illustrates this:

The door was shut and I knew and could tell from the screaming and what not, what was going on. I, to this day, have a little bit of guilt that I didn't intervene, but it was a four-to-one ratio. That doesn't excuse it I s'pose, but I was at the stage where I wasn't wanting any involvement in what was happening around me.

Most of the women and prison officers interviewed at Adelaide Women's Prison said that rapes in women's prisons were different from those that occurred in the men's prisons. They acknowledged that female prisoners were raped; however, they insisted that these were not 'real rapes'. That is, these 'rapes' were usually an attack where other inmates were looking for drugs they suspected someone to be hiding vaginally or anally. Indeed, it is almost as if the sexual character of the orifice being searched is incidental, yet the consistent reference by women to these punishing attacks as rapes does recognise the humiliating effect of this violence. As Jay explained:

It's not rape for pleasure. I've never heard of that in a women's prison. I s'pose it's called rape, but it's going for their drugs. If they did it, they were looking for drugs, not raping her. Rape only really happens in the men's [prisons] where it's about sex.

These comments clearly suggest that rape in the men's prison is defined as an act where sexual pleasure is gained, whereas rape in women's prison is seen as pragmatic, being performed for the purpose of extracting drugs from a person's orifices. According to this definition, 'true' rape not only involves power over another, but in

addition the sexual desire entailed in the act is of primary importance. According to this interpretation, if a woman suspected another woman of having drugs in her vagina, and if she were to put her fingers into the victim's vagina without her consent to find the drugs, the insertion of her fingers into the victim's vagina would not be a sexual act and therefore would not constitute 'real' rape. Clearly at one level all rape is both sexual and involves exercising power over another person; however, the way in which rape is constituted is different in the men's and women's prisons. Homosexual rape in the men's prison is referred to as a sexual 'release', despite most rapists not identifying as gay or acknowledging desire. Women who have, by the legal definition, raped another inmate, are able to resist the label of 'rapist' by renaming the act as 'looking for drugs'. There is consensus among staff and prisoners about this renaming.

The interviews with male and female prisoners suggest that victims of rape are judged by other prisoners as either deserving it or being innocent. While all the women interviewed stated they did not approve of rape, five claimed that the way in which some women act in prison means they deserve being raped. The notion of the 'deserving' victim functions to justify and diminish the rapist's actions. For example, Maude, a long-term repeat prisoner, reported that those who rape are 'uncriminal'; however, she also said that in some instances the perpetrator's actions could be justified. She suggested that in the case of women in prison being raped, the victim's behaviour was often a 'contributing factor'. That is, the victim's behaviour was seen by Maude to be 'unjail like' and to require rape as a form of punishment and a lesson in how to behave when in jail.

Reforming the wayward

While men's prisons are sites for the construction of a particular form of masculinity, in contrast, women's prisons could be described as training schools for wayward girls to be taught femininity. Men who commit crime do *not* offend against dominant masculinity as their criminality is read as a successful performance of a particular risk-

taking masculinity. By contrast, 'criminal women' fundamentally offend dominant femininity by not adhering to the expectations of what a 'proper' and 'good' woman is and should be. Therefore the women's prison is a site for the 'reconstruction' and training of women prisoners to be 'good' women. This reform agenda is particularly evident when one compares the type of employment and training opportunities available to men and women prisoners. For example, several women stated that the work opportunities available to mainstream men were 'real' jobs, involving real skills and training such as woodwork and welding, whereas women were only trained to be domestic servants. At the time of the interviews the only jobs available to the women were sewing, cleaning and making ties for grape vines. Similarly, for protected male prisoners the main employment was in the feminised domestic areas of the prison laundry and the kitchen with a small number of protectees working in the brickyard. By contrast, mainstream men working in prison manufacturing industries undertook work relating to engineering. For Raelene, who had previously been imprisoned interstate, women's prisons are 'pretend' prisons, with men's prisons being the yardstick to measure a 'real' prison. Her description of women's prisons was phrased to accentuate the similarity to girl's reformatory schools:

Women prisons, they are pretends. We get told 'Why haven't you got your shoes on?' Like little school kids. 'Why haven't you cleaned the laundry out properly?' 'I told you that you have to have your medication at this time, why haven't you come when I told you?' I think to myself I am not in a girl's home. I'm not in a school, and you are not my parents. You are an officer, you are a screw and it is not your job to tell me what I should wear, how I should brush my hair, what I should do, how I should wash my clothes. If you don't brush your hair they will say to you 'I think you should brush your hair, don't you think?' It's none of their fucking business. It's so boring here – there's no work except with a mop and a bucket or if you are lucky a job in the sewing room. At Yatala, where it's a different game, they do good jobs.

It seems that women prisoners are managed by replicating key elements of the domestic sphere. For example, women prisoners experience more personalised relationships with officers, domestic tasks replace 'real' work, and attention is placed on the relational aspects of prisoners' lives which extend beyond the institution and in particular include mothering responsibilities.

Furthermore, the perceived difference between men and women prisoners is partly a consequence of women being positioned within the prison as 'reformable', whereas men are not. That is, women prisoners are generally not considered delinquent or dangerous but rather wayward, naughty, misled or wilful. Therefore, the key purpose of the women's prison is not to control and punish 'dangerous', 'rational' subjects, but rather to reform and re-socialise 'the wayward'. Women prisoners are mostly not seen by prison officers and the general community as being so hardened as to be impervious to the good influence of productive relationships with caring officers or 'reformed' fellow prisoners.

A majority of women prisoners expressed the view that women's prisons are like girls' reformatory schools accommodating women who have not conformed to the ideals of womanhood. None of the male prisoners suggested that the prison was a place where they had to learn to be 'responsible men', although there was an underlying assumption that 'graduating' from the YTCs to the adult men's prison was recognition that they had achieved a certain type of manhood. Several male prisoners referred to reform as being difficult or even impossible to achieve because the entrenched habits that make a 'real' male criminal are difficult to break. That is, it seems that 'non-criminality' is harder for male than for female prisoners to achieve. As Ted, a long-term repeat male prisoner reported:

I have had enough of being in jail and of living this life. I have had some exciting times, believe me, but now I want to leave it, maybe even try the straight life of a missus [wife] and kids. But to break away from what I have been doing and go straight has been almost impossible. It is not

easy to walk away from the criminal world. People out there don't understand, to walk away is a statement which is usually interpreted by them [the brotherhood] as you having something to hide. And if they [the brotherhood] think you have something to hide, then it's dangerous. Not even having a good woman by your side is enough reason to them that you should go straight. In fact them blokes wouldn't believe that my woman could be more interesting than them! Most of them blokes in here only have each other and crime in their lives The girls up there [Adelaide Women's Prison] keep up [contact] with their kids and that and for them this [is] a family in that sense It's well known they also have relationships with one another in jail.

One of the striking differences between the male and female prisoners is the way in which they describe their relationships with other inmates. For example, women were more likely than male prisoners to talk about their close, and often intimate, relationships, with other prisoners. A total of 19 of the 40 women interviewed stated they had been involved in sexual relationships with women in prison. Only 4 of the 60 men interviewed said they had engaged in consenting sexual relationships with men in prison. The majority of women who were involved in intimate relationships with other women were from the group serving longer sentences (between 2 and 18 years). Sexual relationships in prison are illegal and there have been instances of women being charged and facing the prison court. For example, at the time of their interviews, Betty and Jay were in a relationship and had been charged with one count of cunnilingus. Betty told her story in the following way:

It is the first time in 11 years [of imprisonment] that I've been involved with a woman. We share a unit together. They [officers] know about us. Sexual relationships are illegal in the jail. That's only if you get caught. You've got to get caught in the sexual act, which we have been. We were charged. When we got caught in the act of cunnilingus, we were both put into D Wing which is solitary. What we did was between us and

absolutely none of their business. We were charged with indulging in sexual intercourse by engaging in the act of cunnilingus. We were charged by the Manager and us [had to] front the Manager's inquiry. I went into the Manager's inquiry and they asked how we plead and I said 'not guilty'. I wasn't actually caught in the act of [performing] cunnilingus and because I pleaded not guilty it would have had to go to some sort of trial and they would have had to bring in all the staff, and they couldn't be bothered, so they dropped the charges. And it was actually the first time in this prison's history that two females have been charged with any sexual act. I haven't reformed my ways, it's legal and normal outside. In here if I was caught again I'd be in big trouble.

Her partner Jay reported:

When they charged me, and we had to go and say whether we were guilty to having sexual intercourse and cunnilingus. I wasn't guilty of anything wrong, it was our business what we were doing. Even though I knew what it was, I said 'I don't know what you mean by cunnilingus, I want the definition for it'. And I got them to tell me exactly what it meant. They went through the dictionary and read it word to word. I smiled, I couldn't help it. Then I said, 'I don't think that definition is what I was doing'.

While both Jay and Betty resist any notion that they have committed an offence and need to be reformed, their stories are an interesting example of the limits to the panoptic gaze. Jay makes it clear that only she and Betty knew what was actually happening between them and that the Manager's court was reliant on her agreement to the definition in order to prosecute. The prospect of having to describe what Betty and Jay were doing appears to have been too daunting a prospect for prison staff to contemplate. Betty's and Jay's resistance to the panopticon gaze into their private sexual relations is successful because they draw upon the wider community notion that

there is a private space in which even the prison gaze does not have a legitimate right. Jay and Betty are able to call on the existing public discourse of consenting sexual relations between adults to curb the investigation into their activities. There is research which suggests that relationships in women's prisons mirror family life (Gray et al., 1995; Jackson & Stearns, 1995; Mawby, 1987). There are several ways in which the family metaphor makes sense in the women's prison. In my study the women reported that their relationships with other inmates were important, and while none used the word 'family' to describe these relationships, many were involved in relationships which mirrored family life. For example, they described their relationships with other inmates as intimate, loving and offering protection and security. Some referred to other inmates as confidantes and being like their 'mum'. Others spoke about having subsequently set up house with lovers they had met in prison and of sharing child rearing and other domestic chores. However, the 'family' type relationships the women were involved in were fundamentally different from the 'family' the male prisoners referred to. That is, the family in the women's prison is not that of the brotherhood; instead it mirrors some of the most conventional aspects of family life, namely setting up a house, raising children, and working together to provide for and support one another. In comparison the brotherhood has very little in common with conventional notions of the family, as it is primarily a 'club' of male criminals, existing both inside and outside the prison.

Inside and outside support

When asked to describe the support they received from people outside the prison, half the women stated that their mothers or grandmothers provided them with the most support. Only 2 of the 40 women interviewed said their fathers were their main source of support. While 23 women were involved in relationships with men prior to being imprisoned, only 10 said their male partners were their main support while in prison. Of these 10 supportive men, 6 were currently also serving prison sentences. The male

partners of only 2 women visited them regularly. Eight women said that prison staff, namely prison officers, social workers and the Catholic chaplain were their only or primary support. As Raelene explained:

The hardest thing I have had to face in prison is not having family or support. No one gives me any support in my family except my sister and she's in Tarrengower⁴⁴ and she writes now and then. Everyone needs support to get through this place. I've had a hard life, but no more than any other woman in here. Everyone has had a different tragedy. But it's still real hard not having anyone here to get me through. I've got Kelly [her lover], and some of the officers, the social workers and Sister Marita are just so supportive, and they help get me through most days.

When asked about the support from within the prison, all 40 women said the support they received from other inmates was important to them. This point is particularly interesting in that it contrasts with the sense of impending violence that they associated with prison. It highlights the fact that within this violent culture there exists a supportive core, where deep friendships are formed.

There is also a distinct difference between women's reports and the way in which male prisoners describe their support networks. None of the male prisoners spoke about prison officers, chaplains or social workers as being their primary support; however, all of the Aboriginal men said the support they received from Aboriginal Support Workers was important. While the majority of women claimed that other women in prison provided crucial support, none of the men considered other inmates in that way. That is, despite the male prisoners' references to the criminal brotherhood being 'like family', their emotional and intimate involvement with other inmates is generally limited to criminal and prisoner 'business'. One of the reasons why male prisoners are less likely to form close, supportive relationships with other inmates is that if they were to reveal that they had intimate sexual relationships with other men they would be

⁴⁴ Low security prison farm for Women prisoners in Victoria.

positioned by the brotherhood as weak and abject to heterosexual masculinity. In contrast, women were more likely than male prisoners to identify with multiple subjectivities, which included being heterosexual and lesbian simultaneously.

Another reason why male prisoners did not form close and intimate relationships within the prison may be because they were more likely than women prisoners to have received reliable and ongoing emotional support from outside. This support was almost exclusively provided by women. Male prisoners were more often able to maintain relationships with their women partners on the outside than women prisoners were with their male partners. For example, more than half of the men (37) had women partners visiting them every weekend, compared to only 3 of the women having male partners doing so.

Only four men reported that the prison culture and regime remained foreign after a transition period. Three of these men identified as homosexual, which suggests that the male prison culture is one that is particularly foreign to those who do not perform heterosexual masculinity. The interviews with the women suggest that the lack of outside support for women is exacerbated by an extra level of unfamiliarity with the prison culture and regime. Almost all the women said they felt 'out of place' when they first entered prison. Further, they claimed that the support networks they had developed among inmates and the staff within prison were important, particularly in the transition period from the community to prison. As Margaret, a woman in her early fifties who was serving her first sentence, explained:

You come to prison for the first time and you think 'I can't relate to this', because women are different. The blokes at Yatala or wherever are more likely to be able to relate to prison because they are use to going to the loo and pissing in front of a whole lot of other blokes, and they are used to living like they do because that's how little boys and men are brought up. I think prisons are just like big scout's and army barracks, and men don't mind that sort of thing. When I came here for the first time, I didn't

relate to it at all. Prison or that boy's army stuff, well it's not part of a girl's or lady's upbringing, so as you could imagine I was completely lost until some of the other girls helped me cope with it. They were just fantastic to me, and so were some of the prison officers, the social worker and Sister Marita. It may be a women's prison and it may be different to the men's in that everyone says it's less hard and we can have our children here, but as most of the girls in here will say, it's still run by the same attitude that run men's prison.

Both men and women prisoners and prison officers said that women prisoners were different from men. This difference was, according to the women and the majority of the prison officers at Adelaide Women's Prison, a major factor in explaining why women generally find the prison experience traumatic. When asked to elaborate on what the differences were and why they impact on women's experiences of prison, 38 out of the 40 women interviewed said that women prisoners have different responsibilities from male prisoners: they continue to maintain their relationships and mothering responsibilities with their children while in prison. In addition, several women and prison staff stated that committing crime was not considered an acceptable 'female' activity. They qualified this statement by saying that women who commit crime are positioned as lacking responsibility and neglecting their children, which in turn results in them having particularly low self-esteem and experiencing guilt. Mary-Lou described herself as an 'irresponsible woman'. She went on to explain that she feels both internal and externally-imposed criticism that she does not think operates for men:

The girls in here are different to the guys. When I came to prison, I was the worst. I was looked upon by those out there [the public] as a bad mother, so irresponsible, the junkie, the slut and no good. How am I suppose to feel? For the guys it can be different. Doing crime is different for them, it's not as bad as it is for a girl. I feel terrible for what I done ... most girls do. You have to have good support in here with the other

girls and the officers, otherwise we'd be all nut cases thinking about how irresponsible we are.

Support for Nunga prisoners

For most women, support is generated within the prison; however, there was a major difference in the way in which the 10 Aboriginal women involved in this study spoke about support from outside the prison. While 3 had regular contact with their biological families, all 10 referred to the ongoing support of the Aboriginal communities. Both Aboriginal men and women referred to members from the community as being like 'family'. However, their use of the word 'family' had a significantly different meaning from the way in which non-Aboriginal prisoners used the term. That is, their communities were families in a non-literal sense, and references to people who were not related by blood as Mum, Dad, Aunty and Uncle were common. Nina described the support she received from other Aboriginal women and from the community in the following way:

The Nunga women stick together because we are different from the others [non-Aboriginal women] even though we are friends with them. We have a Nunga corner. We sit in one corner after meals and sit and gossip and laugh. You see it's mainly the women in our community that come in and see us and check that we doing all right. In my case I have me people and me Mum who sees me. She sees me, she sees me brothers and other Nungas. We're all family. So many Nungas go to jail, but its no big deal if you've done jail, 'cos when we get out we go back home and we aren't made to feel an outcast for doing jail, 'cos Nungas understand jails and that. My Mum is there with us in jail all the way, always.

Prison was not described as a stigmatising experience by Aboriginal men and women. Some of the reasons for this are that it is widely understood that Aboriginal people are disadvantaged by the legal system as well as by the legacy of dispossession and that they are massively over-represented in the jail populations. These facts were acknowledged, for example, in 'The National Report of the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody', which was tabled in the Australian Federal Parliament on 9 May 1991. Many of the 339 recommendations of the Royal Commission are directed not so much at minimising the number of custodial deaths, but rather at minimising the number of Aboriginal people in custody, whether in prisons, police lock-ups, or juvenile detention centres. Nationally, Aboriginal people are placed in police custody at a rate 27 times that of non-Aboriginal people, the rates being 18 times more for imprisonment and 21 times more for juvenile detention centres (Cunneen & McDonald, 1997: 14). As Fay Gale, Rebecca Bailey-Harris and Joy Wundersitz state at the beginning of their study into Aboriginal youth and the criminal justice system:

Aboriginal people have no reason to believe in the capacity of our legal systems to provide protection or justice, nor the willingness or ability of the administrators of justice to act in an even-handed manner. (Gale et al., 1990: 1)

Given this, within the Aboriginal community, extensive Nunga support systems have developed which provide a crucial role in sustaining both women and men in prison. It is evident that, like their non-Aboriginal counterparts, it is Aboriginal women who provide the mainstay of this support for prisoners. For Leah, who has been in both juvenile and adult custodial institutions since she was 15, the support from Aboriginal organisations and from the Nunga women in prison is deeply appreciated. Like Nina, she felt part of a Nunga jail community and relied upon the group's support:

The support is all right for black fellas in here, the Nungas outside and inside all support each other. The Aboriginal League of Rights do a very good job. They are always on call for us. The other blackfellas in here help each other. Blackfellas are pretty close, but they are closer in here

anyway. We've got morals. We just stick together [and] if there's a problem we sort it out. If a blackfella comes in [and] if there's another blackfella they don't like, they leave it [antipathy] at the gate. They don't bring it in here with them. When you're in jail your problems stay out there. Once you're here, you're one.

Building a community: The Living Skills Unit

There were other contexts within the women's prison where community-like relationships developed and were a valuable component of prisoner support and survival. Fifteen women were interviewed from the low security Living Skills Units (LSU). All spoke about that section of the prison being like a community. Many felt sad when their friends were released, sent back to the high security section for using drugs or transferred to another prison. The majority of the women interviewed reported that it was more difficult to develop close relationships with other inmates and prison officers when accommodated in the high security section.

All 15 women from the LSU described their relationships with other inmates and prison officers from the LSU as more trusting and genuine than those they had developed in the high security section of the prison. They gave two main reasons for this. Firstly, the LSU accommodates women who have completed most of their sentence, and therefore they know the system and are generally more relaxed and settled than the high security prisoners. Secondly, the LSU is designed to encourage a more communal environment; for example the women share units, are responsible for their own cooking, are provided with some work and can attend education programs outside the prison.

Finding support in high security

The majority of women from both the LSU and the high security section of the prison reported that most of the high security prisoners were either on remand or serving long sentences, and that this created tensions between prisoners and staff. As newcomers, remand prisoners were more likely to be distressed, either through drug withdrawal and or through concern about separation from their children. They are said to be too distracted by this and by their impending court cases to develop relationships. Additionally, almost all the women interviewed felt that the drug culture of the high security section limited the possibility of developing close relationships like those described by LSU inmates. For example the majority of women (31) said they were affected by drugs or alcohol in their first days in prison and that obtaining drugs from other inmates was their first priority. While all the women said they had developed close relationships with other inmates, 34 said they were less likely to develop trusting relationships with other women in the high security section because the main preoccupation and culture of the section revolved around obtaining illegal drugs.

Relationships with prison officers

One of the significant differences between the men's and women's stories is the way in which the women described their criminality. It seems that women who commit crime are positioned as bad and undeserving whereas men are more likely to be heroised for being 'hard' and a force to be reckoned with. This difference is particularly evident in the ways in which women prisoners are treated and spoken to by officers. For example, a majority of women agreed with Raelene that they were treated like children by officers. Most of the women resented this treatment and objected to the emphasis on being polite, and on not backchatting, being rude or being too demanding. In addition, while some of the male prisoners, and in particular younger first timers, also said that they disliked the treatment they received from prison officers, there was a distinct

difference in the way in which they described their treatment. The male prisoners referred to prison officers aggravating and inciting them to engage in physical violence. While some of the women said the officers insulted and upset them, none suggested that the officers provoked and encouraged violent reactions. None of the men said they were treated like 'naughty children', yet this was a common complaint on the part of women. The majority of the women believed that prison officers would not treat male prisoners like naughty children.

A reason for this difference is the officers' respect for the male prisoners' potential and capacity to be more physically dangerous than women. Also, women's gender restricts them from achieving 'full' criminality and their criminality disqualifies them from full femininity. Women prisoners are therefore truly deviant because 'real' criminality is a position that only men can legitimately assume. While women who commit crime reject dominant femininity, in doing so, they are also denied other subjectivities. That is, women who commit crime are denied an identity as 'real women', and as the interviews with women prisoners suggest, they are often infantilised. As Sharon, a first-timer serving a six month sentence, explained:

I got threatened [by an officer] with being shanghaied⁴⁵ the other day because I didn't have my shoes on. The officer said to me 'Where's your shoes?' She said it just like you would to a baby or a kid who's real naughty. They can do this to women.

Caroline also reported:

The biggest thing I hate about this place is there's a lot of instability and there's different rules for different people. They wouldn't get away with treating guys like that, they'd have another riot. But they [prison officers] can treat us like children. Can you imagine them doing the same to the guys at Yatala, treating them like naughty boys?

⁴⁵ Sent to a higher security section of the prison.

The interviews highlight some major differences in the way officers work with men and women prisoners. In the men's prison, male officers are a crucial ally to the mainstream criminal brotherhood. While there is a perception that prison officers and the brotherhood occupy very different spaces within the prison, it is clear that each is central to the creation and maintenance of the masculine culture of the prison. They share an implicit agreement to police deviant masculinities and to despise femininity and maintain the values of criminal masculinity. That is, there is a real fluidity between the prison officers and the mainstream prisoners. This fluidity between the two groups is evident in the way in which prison officers cooperate with the criminal brotherhood and provide various situations in which the physical abuse of unmanly prisoners occurs away from the view of prison security cameras.

Women prisoners reported more interaction with prison officers than did male prisoners, with 28 women saying they discuss personal issues with officers. None of the women objected to male officers working in women's prisons; however, all 40 said that there were particular qualities and skills all prison officers should have. All felt that prison officers should be able to understand the particular issues facing women in prison. Thirty-five said that prison officers should be able to communicate with women and maintain confidentiality; thirty-two women felt that listening without being judgemental was a skill all prison officers should have; and thirty felt that prison officers ought to be consistent at all times. However, what is also evident from the interviews is that the prison culture of mistrust is firmly entrenched, and that attempts by officers or prisoners to move beyond their traditional roles is usually met with suspicion. For instance, while a majority of women said there were some officers who had the above skills, almost all were wary of prison officers whom they described as 'half social worker and half screw'. For Melissa, who had previously served sentences in New South Wales prisons, her first encounter with officers and prisoners at Adelaide Women's Prison challenged her sense of an appropriate distance between the two groups. Her comments indicate the way in which some women, particularly those

who identify with the 'old school', try to construct the same type of boundaries that exist within male prisons between officers and inmates:

The first day I was in here I was shocked. I walked in here and I had to get some tea, and the first thing I saw was two crims sitting down playing cards with two screws. I thought 'Oh my God, what is this place? Am I in the right place?' Everywhere I went to there was always a certain handful of crims having full on conversations with screws, and I wondered what they had to tell them. This wouldn't happen in Mulawa,⁴⁶ you'd get bashed [for talking with officers].

Many of the prisoners I interviewed had stories to tell about the difficulties they had encountered with prison officers. However, there were differences between the men's and women's experience of prison officers. Among the men mostly the young (18–25 year old) and first-timer prisoners reported having difficulties with prison officers. The most common complaint from this group was about the physical violence and intimidation they had experienced from male prison officers. The majority of older, long-term, repeat offenders reported that they had experienced difficulties with prison officers when they were young and first entered the prison. However, they also reported that as they had become known they had not experienced any significant problems with prison officers. Most of the men from this group (over 25 years) were able to identify prison officers with whom they got along well and respected. By contrast, nearly every woman interviewed had a story about what she perceived to be the unprofessional behaviour of prison officers. Their main complaint was about what they perceived to be the derisive or otherwise inappropriate comments and behaviour by prison officers. Several women reported their anger at officers making comments about the weight they had gained in prison, while others objected to what they referred to as the macho behaviour of some male officers. Geraldine, a first-timer, spoke about some of the difficulties she had encountered with male prison officers. In particular she referred to some officers providing unwanted assessments of her body and her moods.

⁴⁶ A maximum security women's prison in Sydney, New South Wales.

Male officers like to power trip. They are all very tall, they stand very close to you, and speak to you very loud. They have a very military attitude towards you. They are very arrogant. The female officers are very different. A lot of males have worked in male jails, and they have this attitude that females are delicate creatures, very emotional and need to be talked to in a certain way. It does hurt when they comment about your weight like [they say] 'A wide load coming through', and 'You have put on heaps of weight', 'You look ugly without make-up'. About my T-Shirt, they said 'Your T-Shirt is too tight'. It just makes you feel real bad.

Also there's an older guy here who bought in a photo of himself when he was 15. He is sleazy and bought in chocolates, [and would say] 'You're a pretty young girl'. It would make my skin crawl. He would follow me around everywhere, to the library, everywhere. He was to change his shifts, but he wouldn't because he wanted to be around me, which was very annoying. He would tell me not to speak to him when other officers and prisoners were around so they wouldn't get the wrong idea, whatever that was! I continue to be very rude to him.

There are times when you have to ask male officers for underwear, or a tampon or something like that and that can be embarrassing. They'll make comments like 'Oh it's that time of the month and that's why you are a grumpy thing'. You will buzz up on the intercom and say [that] you want something and they will say 'Is it tampons you want?' ... and you haven't even indicated that's what you want.

The view was widely held by both male and female prisoners and prison officers alike that the management of male prisoners is *different from* that of women. One of the key

differences is that the use of physical force by officers was at times considered 'necessary' in men's prisons, but generally unacceptable in women's prisons. In men's prisons this is partly explained by the way in which both prisoners and male prison officers share a similar masculinity which is built around respect for physical violence and power. However, there are other important dimensions of this different management including male prisoners being managed by replicating the key elements of the public sphere and women the private. In male prisons there is an appeal to self-interest, rationality and work. These values are evoked even in the very name of the men's prison: Yatala *Labour* Prison. The word labour is the descriptive term that for the women's prison is replaced by the gender of the inmates: Adelaide *Women's* Prison. Furthermore, the name 'The Living Skills Units', for the low security section at Adelaide Women's Prison, assumes that women prisoners need to be taught living or home-making skills. Other significant differences between men's and women's prisons are explained in part by Marge, who at the time of the interview had worked as a prison officer at Adelaide Women's Prison for seven years:

The officers will all tell you that the women are different to the men. The women will tell you that too. I think it is explained by the fact that they are willing to talk and they don't have all that macho image stuff to defend like so many of those guys do. Women usually don't commit the crimes that men commit, I'm not sure if that's why they are different. I'd like to think that we [officers] are also different to those at Yatala ... We don't need to use physical force, for example, and we talk with the women. I think another difference is that the women in here have other concerns than trying to be like the guys at Yatala and maybe that's why they are also different. They are just like other women you and I know ... They come to prison but they are still all the things they were outside. I don't think many male prisoners have this responsibility ... It's such a pity that all these women end up in here. When I stop and think about it, it's all so very tragic and sad.

While both male and female prisoners admitted to provoking officers deliberately, fewer women than men reported having been involved in physical violence with officers. Of those women who were involved in violent confrontations, most said they were either affected by illegal drugs at the time of the incident or had harboured a long-term dislike for the officer involved. All the prison officer violence reported by both the men and women prisoners involved male officers. Additionally, most of the male and female prisoners said the male officers were more authoritarian in their discipline. That is, some male officers take on the traditional 'father' role as disciplinarian in reforming wayward girls. Leanne described an incident in which she was removed from her unit because she had been taking pills. Her story is an example of the authoritarian and provocative treatment by officers, as well as being a story that highlights the way in which some prisoners deliberately provoke officers:

In 1993 I was out of it on pills. Two male staff carried me out of the unit. I was naked. They had to carry me out of the unit because I was so out of it. They saw me as a threat I s'pose. I took my clothes off, I was already naked when they came down. They wanted to put me into the solitary unit, [so] they just grabbed me and carried [me] out.

One of them was saying 'You're nothing but a habitual criminal, a drug user'. I said I was going to fuck his wife and he didn't like that, so he slapped me across the back of the head. And the next day when I was straight I said I wanted to press charges and they said it was in my best interest that I don't because 'You're here for a long time'. He use to walk around the yard and say 'You fucking criminal' and he'd spit and he treated us like dirt. He's now at Yatala. There were women [officers] on that night. Maybe they thought I was going to get violent or something. But I'm not a violent person.

Leanne's experience suggests that there is a high level of provocation by prisoners leading to unprofessional behaviour among some male officers. However, it is also

evident from this story (and others) that the interaction between the women prisoners and the officers is one which often reflects a stereotypical teenager/parent relationship. That is, the role of the officers is to be the authoritarian parents who set the rules (for example, no drug taking in the 'home', and respect for parental authority); while the teenager's role (the woman prisoner's) is to challenge the authority with maximum provocation. Indeed most of the women interviewed recognised and resented the way in which some officers assumed the role of the parent, and disliked positioning themselves and being positioned as rebellious teenagers. As Sarah explained:

I'm not liked because I'm loud and if I want something, I will say I want it. They [prison officers] think I intimidate people, that I'm rude, that I manipulate other women by telling them not to talk to screws if they need something. [I tell the women] if you want to know something come and ask us and we will tell you. I look after the young ones. They are usually frightened, and if they have any problems I tell them to come and tell us. The worst thing they can do is go to the screws and be a screw suck [friendly to prison officers] ... And the screws should leave them alone and let the women do their jail. [Prison officers should] stop interfering and telling people how to live their lives, who to be friends with, what to say and all that.

In the women's prison, some of the officers who pride themselves as being supportive and empathic custodians, develop the confidence and friendship of some of the long term prisoners. Those officers who present themselves as caring and supportive are often described within both men's and women's prisons as 'half screw and half social worker'. The tension that this hybrid causes is evident not only in the resentment by prisoners of 'screw sucks', but also in the fact that some officers resent the close relationship that can develop between prisoners. Several women spoke about the difficulties they had encountered from unsympathetic prison staff whom they claimed did not tolerate women prisoners forming close bonds with each other. According to Terri, who had had a partial gender reassignment, victimisation by officers is common

in prison. Terri said she valued the support and alliances she had with other women in prison; however, she also claimed that the officers had difficulty accepting her desire to be male, and therefore deliberately sabotaged relationships in which she was involved. She went on to explain:

Because of the way I am, a partial sex change from female to male, for me a lot of male officers in here feel threatened by me so any little thing I do they'll jump on [reprimand] me straight away. One of the girls was upset and we were in the laundry and she was telling me about it. And all I did I gave her a hug. I said 'It's O.K. don't worry about it'. There was an officer in there at the time. And another particular officer was looking through the window and he called over that fellow officer and said 'Look at them two'. Then [he] called fellow prisoners over and said 'How sick is that?'

He came out of the dining room and said to me 'Excuse me'. And I looked up and said 'Excuse you why, what's wrong?' And he turned around and said 'What do you think you were doing?' And I said she was upset [and that] I was just comforting her. And he said 'There's consoling and there's consoling'. He was underlining the consoling. And I turned around and said 'Could you get your mind out of the gutter, will you?'

Terri's status as a prisoner in a women's prison presents many challenges for officers. Indeed, her insistence on her male desire and identity, along with her bonds with other women, raises the spectre of Terri having sexualised friendships and desires towards other women prisoners. Furthermore, Terri's sexuality ruptures the embedded discourse of women prisoners being reformable. The transformation that is sought after for women prisoners is both physical and psychological and absolutely adheres to dominant femininity. Therefore Terri's ambiguous sexuality positions her at the interstices of the gender categories where she is neither 'reformable' nor acceptably

'feminine'. Additionally, her ambiguous sexual status serves, as shown in this example, to highlight the tensions that the male officers feel about the 'appropriate' limits to comforting and becoming a confidante to other women prisoners. This tension is further seen in the conclusion of Terri's story where she is moved from one section of the prison following this incident:

I was out there in the Aust Cells [units in the prison] because I was a model prisoner. That same officer turned round and said 'Get your gear out of the Aust Cells, you are moving'. And I said 'Why, what have I done for you to move me out of the Aust Cells?' He turned around and said 'Put it down to unacceptable behaviour'. I said, 'I wasn't doing anything at all'. And he turned around and looked at me and said 'Bullshit'. I said 'What bullshit, mate, I wasn't doing a thing, there was another officer present'. I mentioned it to the other officer and she turned around and said 'Did you do anything after I left?' And I said 'No, there must have been four people around, and I'm not like that'. He shafted [removed] me from out there [Aust Cells] into B Wing, and he kept at me and at me. Then next minute I hear from fellow prisoners [that he had said] 'Terri wants to get this,' and he pointed to his crutch. Because I haven't had the bottom half done he said this. He also said 'I believe that it [Terri] is sick and disgusting and shouldn't be trusted'. And he was talking about my personal life and my personal sexual preference to other prisoners. But he always says 'It's off the record'.

A tension exists within the role of officer which is particularly marked in women's prisons. The tension is between the roles of confidante and custodian, reformer and controller, or more colloquially between 'social worker and screw'. The core elements of the custodial relationship undermine the possibilities of empathy between officers and prisoners, as one of the key roles of the officer requires that they maintain constant surveillance of prisoners. Only Sister Marita was an exception largely because she was not a custodian and was utterly trustworthy. It is clearly impossible for officers to be

both supportive and suspicious of prisoners. As the following comments from Rita indicate, some officers use a variety of surveillance techniques to get information about illegal use of drugs in the prison. Many, like Rita, said they resented the feeling of always being watched by officers and other inmates, of having officers listening into their private conversations, reading their mail, having access to their rooms at all times, knowing their family situations, and having the authority to report, document and file information about them. Most said that once a person goes to prison their privacy is stripped, which in a literal sense begins with the strip-search and is metaphorically continued with the constant presence of the unceasing gaze. As Rita said:

One officer, she's always looking at us, never stops and she walks past us and looks at our eyes all the time. I haven't got nothing bad on my record or that, apart from the other day when a girl pinched some of our tobacco and I got sick of it. You don't steal off each other – we are all fellow prisoners – and I just belted her. The officer stares and looks at us and always says 'I love doing drug busts'. She's snooping us all the time to see if we're high and that. She looks, listens and stares [at] us. She comes up and we're all talking and that, and listens, always listening. As soon as she comes up we just go quiet and she says 'Carry on', but we don't want to talk around her. She sees and knows a lot.

Others like Kaz, an Aboriginal woman, commented that it is not just officers but also other inmates who maintain a constant watch on Aboriginal prisoners. She says that there is a perception that Aborigines receive better treatment and have access to more resources than other inmates. According to Kaz this perception has caused some resentment in the prison:

The officers do think that Aboriginals get a lot more than other people. But I think that's pretty stupid. We have to ask and ask and ask and ask to get what we get. And the officers complain that we get more and they treat us like cunts because we get more. It's the stupid things that don't mean nothing, but you know what they are biting at. They take things

from you that you know you shouldn't really have, but other girls have them. They'll say little smart remarks now and then like when we have art classes, they'll say 'What are you going to your Aboriginal class now are you?' I just walk away from them.

Lately even the inmates [have] been getting like them [officers]. I had a fight over it [racist comments] last night. They were saying that a lot of Aboriginals come in and they go to B Wing and they go to A Wing 'cos they are the two good units. One white girl came in two weeks ago and she's in the kitchen. I heard her say 'What you have to be coon to be in the A and B Wing?' I just lost it and said 'What do you mean, coon?' And she said 'You have to be coon to be in A Wing, do you?' I just hit her.

Kaz's story indicates that both prisoners and officers have become suspicious of anything that looks like 'special treatment' or not abiding by what they perceive to be 'the rules'. Additionally, the existence of a strong support network among the Nunga community, plus the political context of deaths in custody, leads non-Aboriginal prisoners to watch and resent anything that seems to be special treatment. The irony is that within the prison there is an insistence on fair play and abiding by non-particularistic rules; yet at the very core of being 'criminal' is a rejection of what the wider community believes constitutes 'fair play'. The surveillance by prisoners of individuals or groups within the prison who are seen to be not acting 'fairly' was also extended to monitoring the way in which prison officers operate. One of the main complaints made by women was that prison officers are inconsistent. All 40 women said officers changed the rules as it suited them. As Jenny explained:

There are no rules in jail. There's s'pose to be rules. The screws just make them up as they go along. They change from day to day, from officer to officer to shift to shift to girls to girls. If a particular officer likes you they might think you are funny, you might be really obedient,

you might give them information, they could be attracted to you and if they like you they will bend the rules for you. I twisted them around my finger, I played the game. You've got to be seen to be doing the right thing, behave yourself, work hard and when you want something you can go and ask for it because you are doing the right thing. But you always have to be careful because you don't want to be seen as a screw suck or anything. I have always been very civil to them. A lot of them won't do a lot of things for me because I have a mind, I can think for myself. Some [prisoners] do what they are told when they are told and don't argue with anything, and don't ask for anything and the screws like them because they are easy to control.

Despite the general perception that some prison officers are arbitrary and untrustworthy, 36 of the women felt that they had reasonable relationships with the officers, some of whom they found to be caring and genuinely supportive. According to Maree:

There's some that really give a fuck. There are some that care about us. They'll come in and are always cheery and if you've got a hassle you can go and talk to them and they will sort it out as best they can. And some will keep what we say confidential, and they doesn't treat you like a junkie or a sex worker or a low life. They doesn't talk about each of us, or someone else to us or that. It's usually better in the LSU [Living Skills Unit], because the atmosphere is different. But there are some really good officers up there too [in the high security section of the prison].

The interviews reveal another difference in the role of the prison officer in the men's and women's prisons. Patricia Eastaál's metaphor of the women's prison being a dysfunctional family (1994: 7), where the prison officers occupy the space of 'parents', is one that was confirmed in the interviews with women prisoners. On the

other hand the majority of the women said prison officers were like parents, with most disliking the officers taking a paternalistic role. On the other hand, for many the care associated with a 'mothering' role was acceptable, with some referring to a particular officer as like a 'Mum'. However, in the men's prison there was no evidence of the authoritarian father position being taken by officers. Instead the officers and prisoners relate 'man to man' with respect being accorded to officers who are tough but fair. The relationship is more one of mateship or competition between equals than a family relationship.

In addition it seems that there are two reasons why this dimension of 'family' is absent in the men's prisons. Firstly, the role of the officer as parent is unnecessary in the male prison where the brotherhood of criminals is the 'family'. Secondly, the 'real' prison culture in the men's prisons is one that is incompatible with femininity, and therefore the caring, particularistic relationships that attach to 'mother' or to 'father' are absent. The exclusion of women and all feminine roles from this 'men's lodge' is an essential ingredient in maintaining and reinforcing the prison as a masculine concept and culture. As Scratton et al. explain in their work on British prisons:

The prison is sustained by a culture of masculinity, which idealises and equates personal power with physical dominance ... It is concentrated within a totality of masculinity, the ground-rules heavily underlined by official male authority. Prisoners' violence is often part of the symbol, ritual and reality of a hostile male environment. (1991: 67)

The gaze on women prisoners

The interviews show that both men and women were aware that their movements were being monitored by electronic surveillance. However, there were significant differences in the ways in which these techniques of surveillance, such as the unseen gaze of the camera or the intercom, impacted on men and women prisoners.

Mainstream male prisoners who described themselves as being 'in' the brotherhood reported being unfazed by the eye of the panopticon. Foucault's notion of the docile prisoner was not borne out by a majority of mainstream male prisoners. Instead, mainstream male prisoners' lack of fear or intimidation in response to knowing they were being watched is compatible with a particular type of masculinity which is based on fearlessness and a willingness to take risks. The interviews with both men and women clearly illustrate that mainstream male prisoners were less likely than any other group within the prison to practise self-surveillance out of fear of being observed by a camera. Additionally, they were also more likely than any other group to report that they deliberately disobeyed prison rules while knowing that they were being monitored by the security cameras. That is they 'perform' their masculinity for the benefit of the gaze. As Steve stated:

I live under two cameras, always being watched and looked at. I'm under constant surveillance every day all day. There's no privacy in here at all, but I don't give a shit. I do it and I know they are looking and the camera is filming away at me. As you walk into the unit, above the left hand side of the doorway there's two video cameras and there's an intercom for them [prison officers] to listen in.

You are not s'pose to smoke in the unit but I do. I smoke and I know they [prison staff] are watching the camera ... A few minutes later the screws come down and I got it [into trouble]. They seen it on the camera. Big brother is watching me all the time ... I don't give a fuck about their cameras 'cos I don't have to watch me back, and what can they do to me? The camera or anything else [other forms of surveillance] they've got doesn't bother me. I've no reason to have to watch my back and I'm definitely not scared of screws ... I'm not a give up or a dog. But some people [protectees or informants], they have to watch their backs and they have the screws always watching them too. It would be a fucked

deal to say the least being in that situation – being watched all the time and being a tad para [paranoid].

In contrast to the men, many women referred to the intercom and the camera as 'the enemy'. This unseen or desubjectified gaze has a very different impact on women prisoners. There were several examples of women practising self-surveillance as a consequence of always being watched by the prison eye. The majority of women prisoners reported that knowing that they were being watched by the prison camera or the intercom caused them stress. During my interview with Debbie several clicking noises emanated from the intercom. She alerted me to the fact that the clicking indicated that the prison staff were listening in to our interview. As a consequence, Debbie concluded the interview with the following:

They [prison staff] are listening to our conversation. They're listening into my conversation. There it goes again [click of the intercom]. Hear it? They are listening in. Be quiet, don't talk. I'm not talking to you any more. I can't say anything, I can't even do an interview. I'm stopping now. I hope they've got all the information they needed for the day ... Bad luck if they didn't because I'm stopping now ... There's camera and intercom all around, and there's micro sensors and if you walk past, it goes off. I live with this everyday, and I'm always looking out for them [cameras, electronic surveillance]. I'm always looking out for this stuff. You [have] got to be careful the way you act and always not talk 'cos they [prison staff] could be listening or sitting back and watching you ... You never know if they are watching or listening ...

The presence of electronic surveillance obviously impacted on many of the women to the extent that they were more likely than mainstream male prisoners to monitor and restrict their behaviour and conversation. Patricia Easteal's explanation of this is that in women's prisons, officers are 'in control and the inmate is powerless' (Easteal, 1994: 8). In this study 25 women believed they had less power and control within the prison

than did male prisoners. In addition, the majority (35) also felt they were not taken as seriously as male prisoners, and that they were ignored and considered 'second rate' by the Department of Correctional Services. When questioned about why they believed they had less power and were not taken as seriously as male prisoners, several made reference to the physical power male prisoners have to make demands for better conditions and rewards.

The experiences of women at Adelaide Women's Prison do not, however support Eastaill's contention that women prisoners are totally powerless. While my research shows that women are less inclined than men to riot and take physical action to change their environment, it also illustrates the fact that women do engage in other forms of action and resistance, and that in some instances they are more successful in achieving their objectives than male prisoners. It is the ways in which women lobby for change that I will now address.

Styles of conflict resolution

Most of the interviews with the women prisoners were conducted between April and September of 1996. In May 1996 a violent riot occurred at Yatala Labour Prison in which four prison officers were taken hostage and savagely beaten by the prisoners. Police declared the riot to be a major crime, and television, radio and newspaper reports on the male prisoners' demands and the damage and violence that they caused were broadcast nationally. When interviewing the women, most made admiring reference to the way in which the men at Yatala were able to get their voices heard and be taken seriously. Several women described male prisoners as 'going all the way' and 'having guts to stage a riot'. Despite the admiration of the men's confrontational style these are not methods that the women utilised to contest their rights and stand up to prison authority. As Mandy explained:

A riot like Yatala could never happen [in the women's prison]. We just have sit-ins and we usually try and negotiate with staff. It might be only

just a sit-in, or a talk with the officers or management, but that's all we can do here.

Questions arise as to why women refer to their protests as 'just' sit-ins and therefore not apparently as impressive as men's riots? Are sit-ins more or less effective than riots? Do women in prison refrain from using violence because they have in the past successfully employed other skills such as negotiation to achieve their aims? And do most women in prison avoid being involved in jail politics, because such involvement means they run the risk of losing 'privileges' that matter to them, most notably their 'child visits'? Indeed the issue of losing one's child visits was a dominating factor in deterring disobedience. Of the 40 women interviewed, 30 had children, with 21 having had the children in their care prior to imprisonment. Of the 30 women with children, 23 stated that fear of losing access visits with their children was a major reason why they did not engage in disruptive activities within the prison, although 17 said it was not the only reason. As Susie stated:

We don't go on like the guys over in Yatala 'cos a lot of us girls have kids and we got to think of them too. I would not get involved in a riot 'cos it means I wouldn't see me boy and he's all I got, and they [prison authorities] let me have him here [LSU] with me every two weeks, over night. I let a lot of things go and I don't get involved in nothing 'cos I wouldn't do nothing to fuck that up.

Although men also lose privileges, including visiting rights, when they riot, the meaning of the loss of access visits with children is different for men (even men who lived with their children prior to their imprisonment) than it is for women. The gendered meaning of this loss is taken up more fully in a later section on mothering from prison.

For whatever reason, it is clear that women prisoners negotiate with staff in very different ways from men. There are numerous examples where officers, management

and the women have 'just talked' and by doing so have found resolutions to problems. One example was the re-opening of the prison kitchen. It had been closed in 1995 and subsequently a number of months of talking and negotiating with staff was successful in overturning the closure. Prior to the kitchen closure the women produced all their own meals. The kitchen provided paid work and alleviated boredom. Following the closure, food was prepared by an institution accommodating intellectually disabled people. The food was cooked and delivered in cardboard boxes to the women's prison. Twenty-five women stated that they considered the kitchen closure to be an unfair and an unpopular decision of management. All 25 discussed the way in which they negotiated with staff to have their kitchen re-opened. Sarah described what she believed to be the reasons why the kitchen campaign was successful:

We all just talked about it to the officers and the officers helped us too. They knew we could run our kitchen, that we have the experience to do it, and have some excellent cooks among the women. We didn't need someone else cooking our food, and we politely told them [managers] so. The officers worked with us and told her [Manager] about how bad the food we was [sic] getting. We just talked and talked and talked about it with her [Manager] and this meant we was able to inform her about the poor quality of food, and how we could get the kitchen running at budget. They know most of us have kids and [we] know how to cook budget meals. And now we have our kitchen back. We didn't get violent; what would that achieve for us? All we just did was just talked and tried to get her to understand the problem, which she did. In comparison the guys at Yatala rioted and what did they achieve? Sweet F.A. [fuck all]. Nothing's changed for them.

Here Sarah is referring to the riot at Yatala which was provoked by mainstream prisoners' objection to protectees, particularly child sex offenders, being allowed to work in the prison kitchen preparing meals. The women pointed out that in their bid to get their kitchen back, rioting was not an option that they considered. Almost all the

women interviewed said that their method of negotiating with the Manager was more successful than rioting was for the male prisoners. The protectees were not removed from the kitchen at Yatala, whereas at Adelaide Women's Prison the kitchen was returned to the prisoners.

Despite citing a number of successful campaigns and deals they had made with prison staff and management, a majority of women referred to male prisoners' 'tactics' as the benchmark of 'real' prisoner behaviour. In doing this they disavowed the 'feminine' tactic of talking as being ineffective, despite evidence of its effectiveness in achieving goals. One of the effects of disavowing the 'feminine' tactic of negotiation is that the essential masculinity of the criminal/prisoner is reproduced in the language and understandings of the women. In fact, negotiating, mediating and disseminating information requires planning and a high level of communication; however, the women did not view their tactics as particularly skilful or clever, but rather as the only realistic option that they had available to them. In general they dismissively referred to the way in which they negotiated and mediated with management as 'just talking'. None of the women were prepared to recognise their talking as a highly developed and effective way to achieve change. Instead most claimed that women prisoners were 'gutless' when it came to political issues in the prison. None of them saw discussions with prison staff or the staging of a non-violent sit-in as significant, important or better than employing violence and rioting. The staging of sit-ins was referred to as being a 'weak option', and 'less gutsy' than rioting.

There have been incidents at Adelaide Women's Prison where prisoners have been prepared to challenge officers, and as a result the Emergency Response Group, a special prison officer riot squad equipped with batons and riot equipment, have been called in to restore order. Marilyn, an inmate who at the time of interview was residing in C Wing (a unit accommodating inmates who have tested positive for drugs), described her involvement in a sit-in, and the reasons it occurred. She explained that the Manager agreed that cell doors could be left open until eleven in the evening if the

temperature exceeded 30 degrees Celsius. On one occasion officers refused to abide by this agreement and threatened to use the Emergency Response Group if the women did not return to their cells. In their negotiations with the women, the prison officers gave them a five minute 'breathing space' before sending the Emergency Response Group into the unit to forcibly remove the women and put them back in their cells.

The women took up the offer of a 'breathing space' to discuss their options among themselves. The threat of violence and the fear of being bashed and left with broken legs and bruises from the Emergency Response Group meant that the women ended their sit-in. They returned to their cells after extracting an agreement that they could negotiate with the Manager in the morning. The Emergency Response Group's presence was enough to force the women back to their cells, and to abandon their sit-in. Refusing to go back to their cells would have meant being confronted with a more powerful force than they: 12 men with shields and helmets, and armed with batons. As Marilyn explained:

Eventually we thought the right thing to do was to talk to the Manager in the morning and we said to them, 'We are willing to go into our rooms if we can speak to the Manager tomorrow and go over the agreement we had about the rooms being unlocked until eleven if it was too hot'. We left it, went into our rooms while the goonies⁴⁷ were just out there waiting to come and get us. We spoke to the Manager the next day and got the O.K. that we could have our doors open if it was too hot. But we shouldn't have had to go through all that, and now it is cold so who gives a fuck! They had it on paper that if it was too hot we could have the doors open. The goons didn't come in.

There are several points that stand out in Marilyn's story. Firstly, the way in which rules can be changed by prison officers despite the Manager's agreement with the

⁴⁷ The Emergency Response Group (ERG) are referred to by prisoners as 'the Goon Squad'. Until recently the ERG were a group of male prison officers trained to combat rioting prisoners. Women prison officers have recently been able to join the ERG.

prisoners, supports claims made by a majority of women that officers are often inconsistent, with some changing the rules as they please. Secondly, the decision by the women to go to their rooms is also significant. They reached this decision after talking among themselves in the five minutes allotted to them by prison staff. And thirdly, the women in this situation rationally and carefully thought through the process of taking their complaint to the Manager. The sit-in was only one of the strategies the women used to lobby with the prison officers. When the officers threatened to use the Emergency Response Group, the women moved on to their next strategy. The women's behaviour goes beyond what would be predicted from Foucault's analysis of the 'delinquent prisoner' (1977b: 266). That is, the women's careful planning and use of specific strategies is contrary to Foucault's suggestion that the injustices of the prison make the prisoner 'untameable' or 'delinquent'. As Foucault writes:

The prison also produces delinquents by imposing violent constraints on its inmates; it is supposed to apply the law, and to teach respect for it; but all its functioning operates in the form of an abuse of power. The feeling of injustice that a prisoner has is one of the causes that may make his character untameable. When he sees himself exposed in this way to suffering, which the law has neither ordered nor envisaged, he becomes habitually angry against everything around him; he sees every agent of authority as an executioner; he no longer thinks that he was guilty; he accuses justice itself. (1977b: 266)

Foucault's image of 'prisoner' is male. The Yatala riots exemplify prisoners being filled with habitual anger and breaking loose with an untameable fury over a single issue. However, Foucault's description does not fit with the women's style of 'being' a criminal or a prisoner. For Jenny, who has been involved in successful sit-ins and protests, there are a variety of reasons why direct confrontation is a rare occurrence at Adelaide Women's Prison. One reason she gives is the widespread use of psychotropic medication, which renders the women physically incapable and mentally uninterested in agitating for change in their circumstances. Another is the fear of

violence being used against the women by officers and the Emergency Response Group should they stage a protest. But the threat of losing child visits is arguably the biggest deterrent to delinquency. However, Jenny also suggests that women rationally select the issues that they consider worth fighting over. Her comments do not imply that women in prison are always politically inactive or that their action through sit-ins have not been effective. For example, the dispute about an 11 pm lock down on hot nights was significant to the women on two levels: firstly, the practical benefit of having the doors to their small (and non air-conditioned cells) open; and secondly, it matters that the officers are consistent and honour their agreements with the women.

Sarah and Caroline, who at the time of the interview were both serving sentences of more than three years, were adamant that some women in prison do take risks to create change. They also pointed out, as did the majority of women interviewed, that women prisoners engage in resistance in different and less confrontational ways than male prisoners.

An example of this difference was the way in which women sought to change a 1995 management decision to put external locks on the cell doors of C Wing – a section of the prison where troublemakers were accommodated. In order to understand this dispute it is necessary to describe the physical layout of C Wing. The wing accommodates 22 women in single cells, 11 on each side of a central corridor. A communal toilet and shower block is located at the end of the corridor and is therefore accessible to the women as needed. The whole wing is secured by a locked weldmesh barricade beyond which the officers' surveillance area is situated.

The prison management made a decision to place locks on individual cell doors so that at night women would be secure within their individual cells. However, placing locks on the cell doors would mean that the women were without access to toilet facilities. In order to visit the bathroom, a woman would need to call up an officer who would then open the locked barricade and the locked cell door, escort the woman to the bathroom,

wait for the woman to finish in the bathroom, escort her back to her cell, lock the cell door and exit and lock the barricade.

The women were angry about the increased surveillance, especially in such a personal activity as using the bathroom. They also resented the prison management's lack of consultation with them. Additionally they resented the fact that this change would mean that once again they would have fewer facilities than male prisoners who each have a toilet and wash basin in their cells. And finally, they were wary that prison officers could use the situation to punish or humiliate women who were dependent on the officers to give them access to toilets without undue delay.

While research shows that women prisoners are less likely than males to cause property damage or attempt to escape (Davis, 1992: 8), according to the women, the prison management believed there was a need to install the locks because of a reported rape and an escalating number of standovers. Indeed, these acts of violence are serious and should be treated as such. However, the women felt it was unfair that they were all punished and locked in their cells because the prison did not have alternative accommodation to house the few people involved in these incidents. As Jenny stated:

Management had this crazy belief that the extra locks on the doors would stop violence and standovers. Their logic was nonsense. Putting on the extra locks suggested that any act of violence would only occur at night when the women were in their units. The fact is an assault can happen at any time of the day, and it is not a golden rule that from eleven at night to eight in the morning when we are locked in the unit, that an assault will happen. It [the introduction of locks] was just another method of controlling us.

In response to the management's decision to put locks on the women's cell doors, the women's initial reaction was to dismantle them. According to Jenny, the next day management responded by putting new and more sophisticated locks on the cell doors.

The women retaliated by refusing to go to their cells. The officers gave the women a direct order to return to their cells, otherwise they would be forcefully removed by the Emergency Response Group. The women went to their cells, but their protest was not finished. As Jenny stated:

That night the girls took the whole door handle off and there was just holes in the doors. They put all the locks in a big washing bag and when the officers came down to do the count, that's when they noticed there was no handles on the doors.

According to Jenny, the next morning the General Manager responded to the women's actions by stating:

'The kids at Magill (Youth Training Centre) are locked in at night and so are you going to be'. She was treating us like children. Then she said 'The men at Yatala are locked in at night and the prisoners at Port Augusta are locked in at night.' We just laughed at her and said 'Yes, but they have showers, sinks, kettles, toilets, power points and they are bigger cells'. We didn't even have power points. In the end, we were all fined \$50 for destroying Government property.⁴⁸ The locks were put on again and are still there.

While there was a general belief that sit-ins and protests are gutless in comparison to male riots, there were a number of incidents where the women believed this approach was more effective than those of the rioting men at Yatala Labour Prison. Seven of the women interviewed chose to speak about their involvement in the 1986 sit-ins that began at Adelaide Women's Prison over a Bill in South Australia's State Parliament which would have permitted male officers to strip-search female prisoners and female officers to strip-search male prisoners. The seven women who discussed this issue spoke about their resistance to the Bill and the non-violent political tactics that they used to stop the government from implementing it.

⁴⁸ Fifty dollars is nearly a month's wage in prison. The weekly wage is \$11.00.

The prisoners networked with women's organisations, politicians and the media to build their campaign against the Bill's introduction. Jenny, who at the time was out on parole, decided to take the issue to the media, where she agreed to be interviewed and have her name and photograph appear in the newspapers. She also made attempts to speak with the then Minister for Correctional Services about the Bill but was denied an interview as he was 'too busy'. Following a newspaper interview in which she mentioned that the Correctional Services Minister was too busy to speak to her, Jenny received a telephone call from the Minister demanding that she speak to him immediately. She explained her reaction in the following way:

I thought 'shove it'. I said to him 'I'm not speaking to you now. We gave you the opportunity to speak to us and were told you were too busy'. Because I wouldn't speak to him, he threatened to have my parole pulled. He said I wasn't a free person, that I had no right to speak to the media and that he would put me back in jail. He thought by threatening me with my parole that I would shut up and stop speaking to the media. I hadn't committed a crime. The protest went for about a week and the Bill got squashed in parliament. I was getting harassed by the police. In the end they [the police] found a fine that went back about seven years and they locked me up on that.

These women show themselves to be far from passive about prison conditions, and far from delinquent in their strategies to effect change. The interviews suggest that women do agitate for change despite the potentially high costs, the most significant of which is the threat of losing contact visits. For many women, contact visits are crucial forms of support, be they from mothers, grandmothers, sisters or the few male partners who visit each weekend. However, for those women who are mothers, contact visits are vital in maintaining relationships with their children. The majority of women had children. It is women's experience of mothering and the difficulty of maintaining subject positions as both mother and prisoner that I will now address.

Mothering from prison

One of the reasons that women find the prison experience so traumatic is that it involves more fracturing of the available subject positions available to them than it does for men. When asked to describe the most difficult aspect of prison, the women, most of whom were mothers, said separation from their children was the most painful factor of prison life. All said they tried not to dwell on the loss of their role of mothering, claiming that if they were to focus on it, prison life would be even more difficult for them. In this study 30 women had children. Twenty-one had children who were in their care prior to imprisonment. Twenty-five women had children under the age of ten, and five had teenage children. Seventeen women had more than one child. Of the women who had more than one child, their children were usually separated from one another. Fifteen saw their children most weekends; however, at the time of the interviews, seven were on Program B, which meant they had tested positive to illicit drugs and as a consequence were not eligible for contact visits for thirty days.

Of the males interviewed, 43 of 60 had children with none being solely responsible for them prior to imprisonment. While male prisoners stated that they missed their children, only 15 out of 60 stated that being separated from their children was the most painful aspect of their imprisonment. It seems that the roles of fathering and mothering have vastly different meanings. Women who have children are mothers (noun) and are expected to mother (verb). The act of mothering one's children requires being there with and for them. By contrast men with children are fathers (noun) but the verb 'to father' connotes insemination rather than active parenting. Women prisoners therefore continue to 'mother' even when there are physical restraints on them doing so, whereas male prisoners very rarely actively 'father' from prison. The act of continuing to mother from prison is a major factor making women's experience of prison significantly different from and in many ways harder than men's.

At the time of the interviews three women had a child living with them in prison. Nine other women had had a child living with them during this or a previous prison sentence. Thirteen had one or more children in foster care. Sixteen women had children living with their mother, grandmother or other close family relatives or friends. Three were living with their partners. Virtually all the women managed to maintain some contact with their children. Significantly, only four women who were living with their children prior to their imprisonment had not seen their children during their prison sentences, which defies the stereotype of women prisoners being 'uncaring' mothers.

The majority of women said their criminal lifestyles, as well as their subsequent imprisonment, had reduced their ability to be 'good' mothers. All the women who had children in their care prior to their imprisonment expressed enormous conflict between their desire to be 'good' mothers and their criminal activities. Only one of the men interviewed said he experienced any conflict between the role of being a 'good' father and his criminal identity. For women, the desire to be a 'good' mother is often the main reason for their reform. As Kylie explained:

I haven't been a good Mum. The last four years the main love in my life has been drugs. I only worried about heroin, heroin, heroin. I haven't been there for my boys. My boy started school last year and I wasn't there. And my other boy started kindy and I wasn't there. I will never have that time again and I don't want to waste any more time. I want to take the children to school. I have seen them on visits. I should have spent my time with my boys and I didn't. I am to blame. I don't want any more relationships. I have had bad experiences with men; the last one was a heroin dealer and he just drag me down. He is now in jail and got 4 years in jail. He wrote to me. I told them to leave me alone. I want to be alone with my babies for a while. I lost too much time. I've been a bad mother for long enough.

For those women who did have care and custody of their children prior to imprisonment the loss of motherhood continued to be very painful. Raelene described her loss in the following way:

It's always remembered and it's a silent like pain, because it is seen as sort of being your fault and you can't ever see them again because you're a druggie and prostitute. On mother's day I just cried a lot. They [officers] did nothing here for mother's day and most of us are mothers.

While all the women who had had their child living with them in prison during this or a previous sentence said it was beneficial, they also reported a number of difficulties. In this study four of the women had given birth while in prison. All four at some time had their babies living with them in prison. A commonly reported complaint was of prison officers and inmates interfering and offering unwanted advice on mothering. In particular some prison officers assumed the role of 'mother' to the women, giving them advice on child rearing. Many said they resented prison officers acting as if they had a right to tell them how to mother, with some reporting they felt that their mothering skills were constantly being judged and assessed by staff and inmates. While many women in the wider community experience being the target of unwanted advice on how to mother, in a prison context where there is perpetual surveillance and communal living, there are many more opportunities for interference. The prisoners' dependent status in relation to the prison officers makes it difficult for them to ignore the officers' advice or to reject it overtly.

Some women felt more contained and imprisoned when they had their children in custody with them. In particular they referred to the constraining effect of the prison rules that they confine their child to a pram or sling when out of their rooms, and the requirement that women with children be locked up at 8.30, two hours before other inmates. The pressures that many women feel from too close and unrelenting contact with and responsibility for a newborn infant are thus exacerbated in the prison environment. The higher level of drug dependence in the prison population also

contributes to difficulties in the mothering relationship. For example, Katie's child was born heroin-dependent. She described her experience of having her child living with her in prison in the following way:

In '94 when my son was born, because of my heroin problem, he was in hospital for two weeks. They had to wean him off the heroin. After that I had him here over in the room for a couple of months. But I felt really isolated and I could only mix with the other women from 5.30 to 8.30 at night. I had 8.30 lock up, even though the other unit was out [until] 10.30. I had to eat by myself over there, and it got to the stage that if I walked out of that room, I couldn't hold Henry in my arms – he had to be in the pram or in a baby sling in front of me, and everything was getting on top of me. I was having a bit of trouble with one officer, she was always on my back about something. She'd get me for walking out of the room, and was coming in and checking on me all the time. She acted like I'd never had a kid before and I had a big son. I also had charges coming up and I didn't know what was going to happen so I ended up sending him out to my Mum about three months later.

Similarly Leah found that her age and race added to her difficulties. Leah was an 18-year-old Aboriginal mother who, at the time of the interview, had decided to send her young baby out to her mother. She experienced difficulties with both the staff and other prisoners, whom she felt were interfering, unsupportive and judgmental about her mothering skills. While Leah's story illustrates an active resistance to the dominant forms of what is a 'real' and 'good' mother, she nevertheless encountered a number of difficulties with being a young, first-time mother in prison. She described some of those difficulties as follows:

No one talked to me about the birth, not the doctors, no-one. I didn't know what to do and I ended up having a caesarean after 26 hours in labour. An officer was with me when I had the baby. I didn't chose them, she was someone who was there ... The officer that was there [at

the birth] *makes me sick. She tries to mother me ... I don't like having anything to do with screws. I don't even feel like a mother. It's a terrible thing to say. I just ended up sending her [the baby] out because I couldn't cope.*

They [prison officers] were making a big fuss about my Mum ... she's been an alcoholic since she was really young. She comes up here [to the prison] intoxicated, but I know my Mum ... I needed respite and they [prison officers] stopped my respite. They stopped my Mum from having her because they said she [Leah's mother] was an alcoholic ... My mother is very responsible and my daughter used to come back beautiful and nothing wrong with her, so clean. They [prison officers] said 'You either have your child in here or you have nothing'. I couldn't cope with that, and I was getting really stressed with first baby and everything. It was really hard ...

Danielle, an Aboriginal woman from rural South Australia, was heroin-dependent and pregnant. On her first day in prison she went into labour. She reported that the women prisoners had to convince both the prison doctor and the officers that she was in labour. She described her experience in the following way:

I had my son when I was in prison. The day I got locked up I got refused bail and bought up here. I was in labour, but they didn't believe me. The medical, the officers, they didn't believe I was in labour. They said 'You'll be right. Take it easy, you'll be all right. You can see the doctor tomorrow'. They thought I wanted something [drugs] 'cos I was hanging out, [and] 'cos I used [heroin] all the way through my pregnancy. They thought 'Nah you'll be right'. I was eight-and-a-half-months pregnant. All the women kicked up a stink 'cos I was in pain. They [prison staff] ended up taking me to Modbury hospital and I had him in 15 minutes flat from when I got there. Two officers were with me

in the room when I gave birth. I was pissed off about that. I had a heroin problem and if I had him in here [the prison] there was a good chance something could have been wrong with him. I hadn't had a checkup for a couple of months. They just don't have the facilities here for babies. If something went wrong, what could they do? They didn't even think I was in labour let alone anything else ...

Indigenous people have a long tradition of women's health issues, such as pregnancy and birthing, being women's business (Watson, 1994: 92–8). Further to this, the National Women's Health Programme in South Australia suggests that to be effective the provision of services to indigenous women needs to be 'culturally sensitive and culturally inclusive in approaches to service delivery, coupled with a willingness and ability to work collaboratively with other agencies or individuals who are trusted in the community' (Watson, 1994: 91). These cultural traditions and recommendations clearly have not informed the care provided for Danielle and Leah. Instead, Danielle's and Leah's stories are evidence of the discourse of welfare that is applied by State bodies to Aboriginal people. Leah clearly felt the pressure of being a young mother in prison, and although the surveillance that she reported is not exclusive to Aboriginal women, the history of surveillance of Aboriginal mothers does bring its own particular meaning to this experience. In fact, the control and surveillance of Aboriginal mothers has a long history in Australia. Since early colonisation Aboriginal mothers have been marked out for particular treatment. Indeed the history of colonisation in this country has been one of separating the Aboriginal mother and child, with Aboriginal children today still being 'removed' from their family of origin (Watson, 1994: 92). The prison staff may have been well meaning and wanting to assist both Leah and Danielle; however, it is clear that both the women have interpreted their 'help' as another form of surveillance. In Leah's case, her mothering skills were constantly being reviewed and assessed by prison staff. Danielle's assessment of her own body being in labour was dismissed and 'diagnosed' as her requesting drugs to alleviate her heroin-withdrawal pains.

All the women who were mothers said that one of the most difficult aspects of being in prison was not being able physically to 'perform' mothering. Being physically separated from their children and not assisting them with their day-to-day needs was traumatic. A number said that when they were arrested they were not immediately able to make contact with their children and this, along with the shock of being imprisoned, was particularly painful for them.

While a majority of the officers said they listened to and comforted the women when they were upset, it was mainly the women officers who empathised with the pain most women prisoners experienced when separated from their children. Some said they made contact with outside child support agencies on behalf of the women and organised child visits to the prison. There were, however, some officers who argued that the women usually forgot their children once they were imprisoned. According to Janine, a prison officer in the high security section of the prison:

You see a lot of women upset because they don't see their children, but it's surprising how many of them forget and get over it. And there are more important things in here that they seem to worry about than their kids. Well, it seems that way.

Similarly Steve, a prison officer in the high security section, stated:

When women have kids they will at first miss their kids, but it's not too bad because we have child visits every Wednesday and every second Saturday morning, and every other Saturday and Sunday they can bring their kids in to visit.

None of the women's stories supported the claims made by Janine and Steve that they 'forgot' their children or 'got over' them. The majority said it was a fact of survival in prison to hide behind a facade, and that most officers were not privy to their pain. For example, Katherine, who at the time of the interview was not permitted any contact visits with her child, said she coped with her loss by not talking about it. She said she

did not talk to officers about her personal life because to do so would mean less privacy and she would be seen by them and other prisoners as being weak. Katherine's only statement about being a mother was:

He is six now, he was a baby when I got locked up. He [had] just turned three. I can't describe the pain, I don't even want to go into that, it's too hard ... [pause, very distressed]. It's weird because you have to try and be a mother for an hour a week. And bang, you have to be a mother. And that's very hard, and that hurts you on its own. What sort of conversation do you have with a six-year-old who is a busy six year old boy who wants to go off and play and that? Because I have been in jail so long, a major part of his life has passed and he has come to accept it that is where I am. It's too painful to talk about because I might not be able to control it [emotions].

Like Katherine, several women made comments about the importance of being seen by the prison officers and other inmates to be in control of their emotions. Most said it was a sign of vulnerability to show emotion in prison, and as a consequence, they used a variety of techniques to block out any sign of inner pain. Some referred to 'shutting down' and not talking about their losses, while others said they masked their feelings through continued use of illegal drugs, including heroin and amphetamines. Eleven women and five men said they had self-mutilated. Those men who had self-mutilated were from the protection section of the prison. All said they were immediately diagnosed by the prison officers as suicidal and placed under 24-hour surveillance in G Division, a section which usually accommodates those prisoners who are considered to be a 'risk to security' or difficult to manage. One of the women, Julia, said she had self-mutilated after the second time she tested positive to illegal drug use and her contact child visits were further denied. She went on to explain:

I didn't really want to die, and I couldn't have with that slash up ... I probably just wanted some attention, to see my child. She's all I've got ... I have fucked up enough. I've done crime, drugs and now my child

has gone. I've lost everything I loved because of drugs ... I didn't even slash up very much, the cut was quite pathetic really. But I was feeling really low and I slashed up and hurt myself again. I didn't achieve much out of it, but the prison officers and the girls were good after I done it.

Marking the body

In writings by Australian feminist philosopher Elizabeth Grosz on the body as an inscriptive surface, she argues that 'the body is more or less marked, constituted as an appropriate, or, as the case may be, an inappropriate body, for its cultural requirements' (1994: 142). My interviews with men and women prisoners suggest that there is a difference in the way in which the prison marks itself in and on the bodies of prisoners. That is, the prison marks the bodies of men in ways which are culturally appropriate to extreme versions of masculinity. Women's bodies are marked by the prison in ways which are culturally appropriate to dominant femininity. For example, ten of the male prisoners spoke about the tattoos they had acquired while in prison. For Harry, who spent almost all of his six year-prison sentence at Pentridge, tattooing was described as a way of relieving boredom and sending a message to others about himself. He gave details about the tattoo guns he had made and the new 'boob'⁴⁹ tattoos he had had inscribed since being in prison. He made a point of showing me the tattoos on his legs, and pointed out one where he requested a tattoo of a devil and the word 'Satan' under it. Instead the tattooist misspelt the word 'Satan' and wrote 'Satin'. While tattoos are an external marking of the body, they also represent an identity of inclusion or membership within the male criminal world. As Harry explained:

Most blokes in prison are either tattooed when they come in or get tattooed. The tatts give a message about you, and because everyone else was doing it, I did it. I got a number one [shaved hair cut], started going to the gym and got tattoos that square heads didn't have.

⁴⁹

'Boob' refers to prison. A boob tattoo is a tattoo done in prison.

Harry's comments bear out Foucault's suggestion that the body is a surface upon which the rules and hierarchies of a culture are inscribed. That is, Harry deliberately sought to have the culture of the prison inscribed on his body. The tattoos, the short hair cut and working out at the gym give him a physical appearance compatible with the masculine prison culture. Further, being in total charge of the shape of their bodies was a comment generally supported in the interviews I conducted with mainstream male prisoners. As Trent explained:

There's nothing better than a good work out and building up the muscle bulk. There's a group of guys I train with and we just love it. We compete with each other, I love working on my body and shaping it. I think it's a jail thing to bulk up. Like a lot of guys in here, I always take the opportunity to do this when I'm in prison.

A majority of the 60 men interviewed from the mainstream section of Yatala said they were fitter in prison than they had been when they were on the outside, with 30 having participated in sporting activities or used the gym equipment on a regular basis since being in prison. Twenty-five said they undertake some form of physical activity most days, with ten reporting they were committed to body building. None of the women interviewed said they were fit, nor were they involved in regular exercise or body building. There are no gym facilities in the women's prison and no programs of physical activity. While 30 women said they liked tattoos, only 4 women said they wanted to tattoo their bodies, with a majority saying that tattoos on women were 'unfeminine', 'marked you for life' and 'stand out to the police and society that you are a criminal or a drug user'. That is, the women overwhelmingly rejected the very thing that the men embrace: being physically marked as a criminal.

The use of illegal drugs provides a surface inscription as well as a deeper internal mark on the body. Weight loss and hypoactivity, as well as the visible signs of tracking caused by the needle's puncturing of the skin or the physical withdrawal from the drugs, are all indicators of the way in which the culture of the drug world has inscribed

itself within prisoner bodies. As discussed previously, illegal drugs were used by a majority of both men and women, and for those who were addicted when first imprisoned, the physical withdrawal was one of the most difficult aspects of their prison experience. For others like Leah, heroin was used for the first time in prison. Her story provides another insight into the way in which the prison experience leaves its mark on women's bodies. At the time of the interview Leah said she was addicted to heroin, claiming that her reasons for using heroin were related to the pressure of having her child in prison:

I never used heroin before I come to jail. I used for the first time in jail five months ago. I had my daughter in the jail with me and that was the night I sent her out. I can't cope with this [the pressures of mothering from jail] and I ended up sending her out. They wasn't saying it to me but I knew everyone was saying 'How can she use when she's got a baby in here?' All the mothers want their kids in here. It's easier said than done. They think it would be so good to have their child in here but it's not. It's hard. You have fifty odd women who are all mothers around you and all of them have different opinions on how to bring up the child. I felt I was being judged a lot. I was always looked on. They always expect you to be a little bit better than you can be, when you just can't be.

While illegal drugs were commonly used in both the men's and women's prisons, it was in the women's prison and the protection section at Yatala that the use of psychotropic medication was most prevalent. Most of the women said they sought psychotropic medication because it was accessible, it numbed their bodies and minds, and disguised the pain of their imprisonment. It is through the use of psychotropic medication that women's experience of prison becomes marked in their bodies in ways which contrast dramatically with men's experience. From their interview responses, the use of psychotropic medication was the most frequent way in which their prison experience was inscribed on women's bodies. For most women, psychotropic anti-

depressant medication was prescribed to help them with the emotional pain of prison, in particular the loss of their role as mother. For some women medication was prescribed because they had experienced a range of traumas in their childhood. For others medication was used to help with their physical and psychological addiction to drugs such as heroin and Methadone.

Doxepin was the main anti-depressant psychotropic drug prescribed and used⁵⁰ at both Adelaide Women's Prison and Yatala Labour Prison. According to *Harrison's Principles of Internal Medicine*, Doxepin is one of the 'most effective drugs for the treatment of patients with depressive illnesses, particularly those with retarded depressions that are associated with insomnia, decreased appetite, weight loss and decreased libido' (Isselbacher et al., 1994: 988). Of the 40 women interviewed, 36 had been prescribed or had access to psychotropic medication at some time during this or a previous sentence. At the time of interview 27 were taking a range of psychotropic drugs. Of the 27 who were taking medication at the time of the interview, 18 were prescribed or had access to Doxepin. Fifteen of the forty women said they had been prescribed psychotropic medication outside prison. By contrast, of the 60 male prisoners interviewed, less than a third (19) reported having been prescribed or having access to Doxepin during this or a previous sentence. A majority of these men (15) were from the protection section of the prison. Out of the 19 men who had used psychotropic medication, 4 were under the age of 21 and had reputations within the prison as being difficult to manage. Only 5 of the 60 men said they had been prescribed psychotropic medication outside prison.

Of the 20 women who had children in their custody prior to imprisonment, 18 had been prescribed or had access to psychotropic medication at some time during their sentence. A majority of the women who were mothers said they had asked for psychotropic medication to relieve the pain of separation from their children. For

⁵⁰ While a high number of women said they had used psychotropic drugs in prison, some reported that they had not been formally prescribed the medication and that they had obtained it from other women. Four women reported giving their medication to other inmates.

example, Tina had three of her children in her care prior to imprisonment. She reported having been prescribed psychotropic medication for the first six months of her two-year sentence because she was suffering from depression. Tina went on to say that she felt enormous guilt for committing crime and abandoning her children, and that the medication helped her cope with the pain:

I had to go to medical and get something [medication] 'cos I couldn't cope with what I had done. I had done exactly the same to my kids as my parents had done to me. They [children] are now with foster care. I always said nothing would take my kids away from me. I've had huge guilt trips over that. The medication was the only thing that helped me cope.

The interviews with men and women prisoners suggest that while psychotropic medication is generally prescribed to work on the prisoner's state of mind, it also marks and penetrates their bodies and, in doing so, changes and rearranges the flesh through substantial weight gain, nausea, tiredness, lethargy, blurred vision and a dry mouth.

Of the men and women prisoners who had been prescribed medication, all said that their problems were related to the stress of prison. As discussed previously, those men who are in protection have offended against The Code and are seen as outcasts by the mainstream 'brothers' from whom they are protected. For this group, the medication is often sought to numb and block out the difficulties associated with them being outside the mainstream brotherhood. They are the Other to dominant criminal masculinity.

More women than men reported external bodily effects. Unlike the women, none of the men reported any significant weight gain. Many of the women admitted with despair and shame that since they had been taking psychotropic medication one of the side effects was that they had gained considerable weight. Nearly every woman who had taken psychotropic medication talked about 'hating their bodies' and wanting to

lose weight. What American feminist Sandra Bartky refers to as the 'ideal body of femininity' (1988: 71) was a goal for many. Erica, who in her last jail sentence gained three stone when on psychotropic medication, reported that she went back to using heroin when released from prison in order to lose weight. While there may be other reasons for Erica's use of heroin, what is obvious in this and other women's stories is the extent of self-surveillance and the lengths to which individuals will go to achieve the 'right body size'. Bartky stresses that 'the disciplinary project of femininity is a "set up": it requires such radical and extensive measures of bodily transformations that virtually every woman who gives herself to it is destined in some degree to fail' (1988: 71). Using heroin allows Erica to achieve the 'culturally appropriate' slim feminine body, but in order to do that she has to commit 'unfeminine' activities such as crime to pay for her habit, which eventually leads her back to prison (which is unfeminine) where she increases her weight. Once in prison Erica says she requests psychotropic medication so she can forget her problems and alleviate her depression. Erica went on to report:

The psyche drugs help you to forget about the depression for a little while but they make you eat and eat and you put the weight on, and then you get back to the start: fat and more depressed about more things.

Most of the women interviewed considered it to be a normal factor of prison life to be medicated. Their belief supports claims by criminologist Patricia Easteal that medication is a necessary component of life inside for many, and in particular for women prisoners, whom she says are subject to an 'indiscriminate use of prescription drugs' (Easteal, 1994: 10). Betty, who in previous sentences has been prescribed psychotropic medication, stressed that the process of medicating also involves labelling:

Everybody is medicated at some time. It seems the golden rule: you can't survive jail unless you get medicated. If you don't get labelled and medicated in jail there's something wrong with you. Everybody in jail gets medicated and everybody in jail gets labelled. You're either a manic

depressive or a border-line depressant. If you're not a depressant, you're aggressive and if you're not aggressive you're suicidal. There's nothing wrong with them [the prisoners] at all. They [the prison] medicate to keep us under control. You are zonked out and just a walking zombie. They [prisoners] don't fight, they don't have opinions, they don't express distaste, they don't do anything but exist in this little psychotropic world of haziness – and the officers' jobs are so much easier!

While mainstream male prisoners described very active forms of marking their bodies (for example tattoos, body building and shaving their heads) women prisoners' bodies are most often marked by a passivity brought on through psychotropic medication. This 'passivity' of women, encouraged by the psycho-medical approach, enforces a more 'acceptable' form of femininity. Women not only become pacified through this medical approach, they also become labelled; and as Betty described, in this process women's bodies are marked for greater surveillance and control.

There were a number of examples of medication being prescribed to help control the anger and deviant behaviour of some prisoners. For example, Sarah, who has a long history of heroin addiction, said that in previous sentences psychotropic medication had been prescribed as a means of controlling her mood swings. Sarah's reputation for bullying other women prisoners and planning ways to bring drugs into the prison has meant that she has spent considerable periods of time in C Wing at Adelaide Women's Prison. She claims that she has been labelled by prison staff as an aggressive prisoner. In 1995 Sarah was transferred to the men's prison and placed in G Division, the maximum security section of Yatala Labour Prison's punishment unit, because she was seen to be a 'threat to good order and safety of the institution'. Her story clearly illustrates the way in which medical knowledge, and in particular psychiatry, can be used in invasive ways to police deviance and, in doing so, to produce docile or delinquent prisoners:

I've had these mood swings all my life. And they [the pills] don't work, I was on six a day. The women who are on them end up fucking stupid. They [women prisoners] come in fine [healthy] and they walk out fucked up in the head. They shake if they don't take these pills and they fit. Once you get used to the pill, if they see you are starting to show some emotions, they double the dose. They [the prison officers] do it so they can control you.

There were similar stories from a number of young men about the use of medication being used to render prisoners docile. For example, Geoffrey, who was generally known in the prison as a 'difficult prisoner', was interviewed two weeks after he was transferred from South Australia's first and only private men's prison in Mount Gambier. He was returned to Yatala after being accused of threatening a prisoner with a knife, a charge he denied. What is significant about Geoffrey's story is that it is an extreme example of drugs being used by prison authorities to control prisoners. Geoffrey refused to go in the prison escort van, colloquially known by prisoners as 'the ice cream truck' because it is cold and extremely cramped. He reported that he was medicated first with 30 mls of Valium and was later injected with a stronger form of medication. He spoke about his experience in the following way:

They chucked me in this van and I didn't want to be there and I started bashing my head around and they brought me out. Then when they got me out of the van, they grabbed me and one of them grabbed me around the throat and I said 'Don't grab my throat'. They were trying to lead me back to the padded cell. And they said 'Get him on the ground'. They threw me on the ground, jumped on me and they tied my legs up together around the ankles, which cut the circulation off and I couldn't feel my feet. My hands are still numb. I've still got marks all over me ... a week and a half ago this happened. They pulled my pants down and stuck an injection in my backside. A nurse did it I think. They didn't tell me nothing. They just said 'We are giving you an injection'. They give me an

injection and then half an hour later they said 'We are giving you another injection'. They pulled my pants down and bang. I lost two or three days after that. I can't remember coming back to Adelaide.

Like Geoffrey, Jesse has a reputation amongst prison staff as being 'difficult to manage'. He was prescribed psychotropic medication for epilepsy, a condition he reported he did not suffer from. He experienced several side effects from the drugs and asked the prison doctor who had prescribed the drugs to explain the side effects to him:

I went to the doctor here and he said I had attention deficit disorder, then he said epilepsy and then he said compulsive aggressive behaviour, then he said I was manic. He reckons I am manic. He doesn't know what's going on. I said to him 'I don't want your drugs'. He said 'This one here won't affect you and it won't get you stoned and all that'. I don't want to get stoned. I want to get my head together and stay out of jail. And then he said 'This one here, you might be a little bit funny at first, but after a while it will kick in'. I said 'I'll give it a go'.

It has been making me real funny and my hands shake and I've a totally different pattern of thinking and I'm tired all the time. My arm has been shaking. It's Tregatoll, and he's put me on 800 mls a day, 400 at night and 400 in the day. I asked him what it's for and he said epilepsy. I said 'I am not epileptic'. He said 'I know but this pill might help you'. I asked for a copy from the MIMS [Medical Information Manual] book about this Tregatoll and what it does to you. I want it so I can read it 'cos the last time they put me on drugs (I was on Mellopan, Prozac and Doxepin), when I read and found out what all these drugs do, I just spun out. I wanted a copy of what it does to my body and he started firing up and [saying] 'We aren't allowed to give you copies of that' [MIMS]. I said 'This is my body and my head – who are you? You can't just give me pills and not tell me about them'. And he said, 'We tell you about

[what] they do and that'. I said 'Well obviously you're telling me a load of shit, because my arms are shaking and you said it wouldn't do stuff like that. You think I'm just a guinea pig and you can lie to me'. Then he said, 'I'm telling you this is what it does, but at first it might make you tired and that but it's going to do real good things for you'. I said 'How do I know this, give me a copy of your MIMs'. He said, 'No we aren't allowed to do that, that's illegal'. And I said 'How do I know that this is all right for me?' And he said 'I'm telling you'. Well I said, 'Who are you, you are just the jail doctor, how do I know if I can trust you?' He got real angry and just walked off. I have never had any tests for epilepsy.

In the women's prison there were some similar stories of medication being prescribed and causing side effects. For example, Sally, who committed crime mainly to pay for her heroin addiction and had been in and out of youth and adult institutions for 10 years, explained that during a previous sentence she started to work on issues about her childhood sexual abuse. However, unlike Jesse, she requested psychotropic medication as a means of dealing with her emotional pain. She described the side effects in the following way:

All my vision went crazy and I couldn't read or write or nothing. And they had me at the same time on other things too. I had one pill for anxiety because I was having major anxiety attacks. And they gave me another pill to calm the nerves, a muscle relaxing and I had these two pills three times a day. I was a zombie, a walking zombie.

The majority of women who were prescribed medication said they had asked for it as a means of 'controlling the pain' of imprisonment. According to Anna, a prison nurse at Adelaide Women's Prison, the problem of medication is a complex issue which is exacerbated by the fact that many of the women have psychiatric illnesses. She claims that when women first enter the prison system many are self-medicated on a range of

substances including prescription medication, heroin and speed. Anna argued that the problem is not one of the medical staff over-prescribing psychotropic medication, but rather she attributes the high rates of medication to the women's conditioning and lifestyles prior to imprisonment. She reported that:

A lot [of prisoners] beg for medication, with many viewing medication as a way of dealing with their problems. If they feel angry, they request a pill that stops that anger.

Indeed there were numerous examples given by the women of them seeking medication as a means of dealing with their problems. For example, when Amanda entered prison she was coming off a daily dose of 85 mls of Methadone. She requested psychotropic medication because she was experiencing difficulties withdrawing from Methadone and being in prison. All 23 women who said they had an addiction to heroin or Methadone had used psychotropic medication during this or a previous sentence.

Narelle stated that when she entered prison she was withdrawing from Methadone. She said the prison doctor prescribed Doxepin to help her sleep and get through the withdrawal stage, and requested that she return to the medical centre in two weeks time to have her prescription renewed. Narelle didn't return to see the prison doctor; despite this she reported that her medication was continued for most of her 18 month sentence. She described the side effects of using Doxepin in the following way:

They [medical centre] just told me I'd be all right and they put me on 25 mls of Doxepin in the morning and 75 mls of Doxepin at night. They left me on that medication and I put on heaps of weight. Just before I got out [of prison] I brang myself off it because I read somewhere that it puts weight on. I lost half a stone instantly. I hung out a bit from that. I got up to ten stone. I was seven stone when I came in. I'm five foot one.

The interviews suggest that psychotropic medication is one of the most common and effective methods used by women to numb the pain of prison. While using psychotropic medication does have benefits for the women, in that their pain is temporarily erased or numbed, it is also an intervention which advantages the prison. The reported side effects from psychotropic medication, such as massive weight gain, blurred vision, lethargy and the dulling of the senses, not only shape the women's bodies into 'inappropriate' representations of femininity, but also facilitate the Foucauldian notion of the internalised gaze (1977a: 249). For women the prison gaze has the capacity to investigate how women prisoners are feeling about themselves, as well as penetrating and investigating their bodies in invasive ways. This level of surveillance was not as evident in men's prisons.

Women's prison summary

A number of substantive and formal theoretical implications emerge from the interviews with men and women prisoners. It seems that the prison gaze is experienced differently by men and women. That is, Foucault's notion of normalisation produces self-surveillance in men; however, in women the invisible gaze has a bigger part to play in the creation of docility through self-control, monitoring and restraint. Additionally, it seems that while the physical design and structure of the male prison is a significant influence in the women's prison, women prisoners themselves fail to fit the dominant (male) prisoner model, and this in part explains the *different* experience of prison for men and women. For most of the women interviewed, the prison experience is one that is different from any previous lifestyle and from the femininity to which many aspire and all are assigned. For the male prisoners, on the other hand, and in particular those who had been incarcerated as juveniles, the culture of the prison was one to which they more easily related. Several factors appear to have given rise to this difference, including the strong network of the criminal brotherhood inside and outside the prison, the long association many of the men had with the criminal world prior to

imprisonment, and the compatibility of the structure and culture of prison with a particular form of masculinity.

Furthermore, the interviews indicate that there are differences in the extent to which The Code is adhered to in men's and women's prisons. The Code embodies the rules for criminal masculinity, and at best the position some women prisoners occupy is a 'de facto' membership of the brotherhood. In addition, while women negotiate their relationships within the prison in ways which are more consistent with femininity, their involvement in crime goes against the characteristics of femininity. Women prisoners are marginalised, disavowed and always on the margins of dominant femininity, because their status as criminals is an affront to femininity. In particular, women prisoners have offended against dominant femininity because they have committed crime and abandoned their children.

Women prisoners' physical and metaphorical positioning also provides them with some advantages in that it allows, at least in comparison to the situation in the men's prison, for a softening of the boundaries between prison officer and prisoner, and mainstream and protection. Additionally, women prisoners' attempts to continue 'doing' mothering allows them access to other subjectivities which male criminals do not have. It seems that access to subjectivities other than 'wayward woman' are a key motivation in women prisoners' reform. However, women prisoners' *difference* reinforces and legitimises male prisoners as authentic and therefore 'real' criminals.

Further to this, the question of space within the prison is one of the complex issues arising from the interviews with all prisoners. It is clear that there are many different physical and metaphorical spaces within the prison. The findings of the interviews strongly support the notion that the 'centre' space is always occupied by the mainstream brotherhood. It seems that the brotherhood is the core, the model and the norm against which all others are judged. However, it also seems that while some male criminals, namely police informants, are deemed 'unacceptable', they nevertheless are

still part of the brotherhood in that they, like the mainstream prisoners, are able to stake out their difference from, or Other to, those who are absolutely different to them. It is this staking out of space within the prison that requires further analysis in the final chapter.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS – GENDER AND TECHNIQUES OF POWER

This concluding chapter is divided into four parts. In the first three parts I will discuss the ways in which various disciplinary techniques of power impact on the prison experience of men and women prisoners. In the first part 'Gender: The invisible technique of power', I will argue that there are a number of techniques of power, with medication and surveillance being core technologies used in both men's and women's prisons.

In the second part titled 'Masculinity: A technique of power', I will argue that a key exception to Foucault's thesis concerning power in prisons is that criminal masculinity is a central technique of power. In the third part titled 'Women prisoners' difference', I will argue that women prisoners' deviance from the normative (male) prisoner, and their *Otherness* to dominant femininity, fundamentally impacts on their experience of prison.

In the final part 'Conclusions: Implications and challenges', I will discuss the challenges this research presents for both prison reform and feminist criminology.

Gender: The invisible technique of power

Medication and gender

This study clearly demonstrates that there are a variety of disciplinary techniques operating in men's and women's prisons. One of the most invasive disciplinary techniques is that of the clinical gaze. In particular this technology of power has the capacity to investigate and penetrate the bodies of prisoners in invasive ways. Prisoners' internalisation of the gaze produces a number of significant effects on their bodies. To be explicit, the clinical gaze in the prison is a technique of power which

targets particular prisoner bodies. That is, it targets all female prisoner bodies as well as young men who are considered by the prison officers and 'old timers' to be 'difficult to manage', and men who are gendered 'female' such as protectees and in particular child sex offenders. One of the core ways in which control is established amongst this group of prisoners is via the medical gaze and, in particular, the use of medication. For example, women prisoners' use of and reliance on psychotropic medication as a means of coping with 'the prison experience' also produces a number of other side effects, including docility and compliance.

Foucault's work on the ways in which psychiatry has positioned itself to label, medicalise and render docile prisoners has informed this thesis. Specifically, I employ his notion that medical disciplines create knowledges which consolidate social relations of dominance. Indeed the dominant discourses of sexuality and criminality are reflected in the knowledges created by psychiatry. For example, the problematic nature of these 'truths' is that they create 'knowledge' about 'dangerousness' and those *needing* to be medicalised. This is particularly evident in the fact that young men who are considered by prison staff to be 'difficult to manage' do not read their own symptoms as requiring medication. Instead these young men experience the operation of a more coercive power, through the prison officers and/or the medicos either advising or in extreme cases physically forcing them to take medication. Indeed one of the core and desired effects this has is the making of these men's bodies compliant and therefore easier for prison staff to manage.

A significant finding of this research is that women prisoners and male child sex offenders generally seek psychotropic medication as a means of blocking out the reality of being in prison as well as their pain. The fact that these groups of prisoners seek medication is important. It is they, and not the medicos or the prison officers, who read their symptoms and present their diagnoses as evidence of what they need. This seeking of medication means that they actively and very deliberately take up the medical gaze on and through their bodies. Furthermore, this internalisation of the

medical gaze not only produces the effect of the medication physically changing their bodies, but also the prisoners achieve their objective of numbing their minds and therefore temporarily alleviating the pain of their imprisonment. Another physical effect of medication on the women prisoners is that the reasons for them seeking medication, for example, the loss of the mothering role, become engraved into their flesh.

It seems that the loss of the opportunity to 'do' fathering does not have the same effects for men as the loss of mothering does for women. One of the reasons for this is that while 'father' is an identity that many male prisoners have, the active 'doing' of fathering is not a core identity that male prisoners maintain while in prison. By contrast, one of the main reasons for women prisoners who are mothers seeking psychotropic medication is that their subject position of being a mother is dependent on them being able to actively 'do' mothering, and it is this which is ruptured by their imprisonment. That is, while being a mother is a core identity of women prisoners, it is their inability to 'be there' for their children and to actively 'do' the mothering which exacerbates for many the trauma of the losses caused by their imprisonment. Therefore, one of the effects of this loss of the role to 'do' mothering is that women prisoners actively and deliberately seek psychotropic medication as a means of blocking out their pain and grief.

The multiple gazes

All prisoners experience and in various ways internalise the multiple gazes within the prison. Of particular importance is the way in which the criminal brotherhood's gaze is internalised by mainstream male prisoners, thus making available to this group a very narrow range of subject positions. That is, the way in which the gaze is internalised reinforces a particular form of heterosexual 'hard' masculinity. Indeed the particular gazes, along with the meanings of what it is to be a mainstream male prisoner, a protectee, a child sexual offender or a woman prisoner, are both internalised and inscribed on and in the prisoners' bodies. Another effect is that prisoner bodies are

marked as a means of absolutely crystallising gender in the flesh. For example, mainstream male prisoners' bodies are physically and metaphorically marked as 'hard' and muscled, which is essential to the particular form of masculinity compatible with criminality; male protectees are marked as 'unmanly' and 'weak'; and women prisoners are marked as 'fleshy' and in need of external control. That is, all prisoners internalise the gaze and the meaning of what it is to be a woman or a man in prison, and these meanings are inscribed on and in their bodies.

Foucault suggested that one of the ways in which control in prison is established is through surveillance. Indeed one of the key ways in which the internalisation of the gaze is achieved in Australian prisons today is via electronic surveillance. From the interviews it seems that prisoners are aware of experiencing electronic surveillance, and this produces a number of gendered effects on prisoner bodies.

In the prison the panopticon eye is very much external to and directed upon the malleable body of the prisoner and produces the desired effect of the subject internalising the gaze and modifying behaviour accordingly. The significant point is that in the women's prison the panopticon eye is never made redundant which therefore enables the full effect of this technique to be experienced by the subject. One of the desired effects of unceasing electronic surveillance is that the women prisoners internalise the gaze of the panopticon and practise self-surveillance. In addition to this, there are a number of negative consequences for women if they do not practise self-surveillance. Specifically, one of the most cherished privileges available to women prisoners are contact visits with their children. Given this, women prisoners usually comply with the rules of the prison, because in doing so, they maintain their contact visits with their children. Furthermore, this compliance makes available to women prisoners the subject positions of rational negotiator and good mother, both of which are denied them by criminality.

While a core technique of power within the women's prison is that of electronic surveillance, this same technique is less effective in men's prisons. This difference is partly explained by the fact that in the men's prison there is an active resistance to and flaunting of the panoptical eye in the name of risk-taking masculinity. Furthermore, it appears that the application of the panopticon gaze as a technique of power produces fewer effects in men's bodies than it does in women's. One of the reasons for this is that there seems to be less importance placed by male prisoners than by women on the punishment they receive if they are observed to be breaking the prison rules. However, it also seems that one of the most significant reasons for this difference is that in the men's prison the panoptical gaze can be regulated, or at critical times made redundant, through agreement with other men, namely prison officers. Indeed, the rendering of the panoptical gaze redundant is clearly advantageous for some men in the prison, and for aggressive, retaliatory masculinity. Specifically, a key advantage for mainstream male prisoners in having the panoptical gaze diverted or made redundant is that this technique of power is made less effective and therefore does not incite states of docility in them as it does in women prisoners. The particular significance is not so much that the eye of the prison is made ineffective, but that in the men's prison there is this another more productive force or technology of power operating: that of criminal masculinity. Making the panopticon redundant advantages particular 'manly' men in so far as it assists them to perform extreme and violent demonstrations of masculinity which confirm their criminal identity.

A serious omission in Foucault's thesis concerning power in prison is the analysis of gender. It seems that the most significant disciplinary force operating in both men's and women's prisons is that of gender. Gender consists of a set of practices and in the men's prison one of these particular practices is that of risk-taking, physically aggressive, heterosexual criminal masculinity. In the men's prison, criminal masculinity is the key technique of power that is operating. Further to this, and of particular significance, is the finding that the panoptical gaze does not produce in men disciplined and practised bodies in the same way that their adherence to criminal

masculinity does. Therefore, while a Foucauldian analysis of the prison is useful in understanding particular fragments of power, it is not useful in understanding the way in which gender works. That is, Foucault's work is not useful in explaining the ways in which gender operates in either the men's or women's prisons.

Furthermore, and of particular importance, are the metaphorical and physical effects produced as a result of the active 'doing' and policing of gender norms. It seems that the performance of gender by both male prisoners and prison officers is absolutely fundamental to the ways in which control and power is established in the prison. Thus an analysis of the power of gender, particularly criminal masculinity and normative femininity, is crucial in understanding both the effects of the prison experience for men and women, and the differences between these effects.

Criminal masculinity: A technique of power

Bob Connell's assertion that 'a great deal of crime makes sense only when it is seen as a resource for the making of gender' (1993: xi) is particularly borne out in the ways in which male criminals speak about their loyalty to the brotherhood, and their heroic criminal exploits and bravery. Further to this, while there is considerable evidence to suggest that crime committed by men is a strategy of masculinity, at the core of this form of masculinity is heterosexuality.

In the men's prison a variety of masculinities exist; however, the dominant form is that of a particular risk-taking, physically powerful, violent, heterosexual masculinity. Therefore, while this 'hegemonic' criminal masculinity shares and reproduces a form of masculinity which is closely linked to a particular criminal identity, it nevertheless relies on, and is sustained by, a coalition of interest between men. More specifically, this coalition of interest is only between what the mainstream brotherhood deem to be 'real' and 'authentic' men. Furthermore, this coalition of interest provides mainstream male prisoners and some 'manly' prison officers with opportunities to 'do' their

masculinity according to the approval of others who are 'manly'. That is, the male prison is a site in which dominant criminal masculinity is reproduced by the surveillance of others.

The active 'doing' of dominant criminal masculinity is an essential requirement for all mainstream prisoners. The 'doing' of masculinity is enacted and accomplished through physical violence and intimidation. While dominant criminal masculinity requires particular and regular displays and performances of 'hard' and 'manly' activities by mainstream prisoners and some prison officers, it also demands that these 'real' men police other undesirable masculinities within the prison. In particular, it allows those men who are the performers and the models of hegemonic criminal masculinity to use their 'hardness' to mark all those outside the central mainstream space as 'deviant'. Protection men are not considered by the mainstream to be 'hard' and therefore are marked as deviant and 'Other' to dominant masculinity. They are positioned as being 'de-masculinised' and therefore marked as weak and 'uncriminal'.

Those who are positioned as Other to dominant criminal masculinity have committed particular crimes, such as child sexual offending, are police informants or are known as 'junkies' and usually owe money to mainstream prisoners for drugs. Of particular significance is the ways in which drug usage has the potential to problematise particular prisoners as 'pathetic' and 'dependent' '*junkies*' who are therefore feminised, while others are risk-taking but rational (manly) '*drug users*'. The 'junkie' is not only positioned by the mainstream as having no control over his addiction, but he is also positioned as 'weak' and 'unmanly' and absolutely 'the Other' to criminal masculinity. One of the practical manifestations of this is that he is usually physically accommodated in the protection section of the men's prison. Within dominant masculinity those positioned to be in need of protection of (and from) men are feminised.

The marginalisation of Other male prisoners by the 'hard' and manly mainstream men involves both a physical and metaphorical separation. That is, mainstream male prisoners both physically and metaphorically separate out those Other prisoner bodies from the bodies of those who, like them, are able to demonstrate and perform dominant masculinity. Space is not neutral or passive and protection has the stigma of being a marginalised 'unmanly' space. While other men's protection status metaphorically marks them as being utterly inferior to 'real' manhood and 'real' criminality, it also has the effect of physically restricting them from moving out of this space because they always require protection from those occupying the mainstream centre space. One of the effects this has on the protection prisoner's body is that he has minimal autonomy or possibility for movement within the prison. He loses access to the gym and other activities, is afraid to 'go out' into the outside world of the exercise yard and becomes housebound and unfit. Additionally, the protectee's claim to be an 'authentic' criminal is forever withheld.

The mainstream's 'Othering' through the physical and metaphorical marginalisation of protectees produces some significant effects on particular male prisoners. One of these is that some men who are accommodated in the protection section actively create opportunities in which they can act out their 'manliness' against those who are the most disliked in the prison, the child sex offenders. That is, these men attempt to demonstrate to the mainstream not their difference from them, but their equality and 'sameness'. For this demonstration of 'sameness' to occur, there needs to be an arena in which these men can perform. Therefore the protection section in the men's prison is *the* crystallised site for the construction of heterosexual masculinity. Specifically, it is in the protection section of the prison that the rituals of physical abuse of child sex offenders occur. It is in protection that those who are not child sex offenders display and act out their 'sameness' to the mainstream and to normative heterosexual masculinity. That is, these men take up subject positions within protection not as 'incidental' or 'Other' to, but as the 'same' as the mainstream prisoners. Hence the verbal and physical abuse of child sex offenders is not done to punish the sex offender

for his crime, but rather it is a performance of heterosexual masculinity by protection men in an attempt to resist the brotherhood's marking of them as 'unmanly' and weak. Therefore the objective of rituals of physical and verbal abuse of child sex offenders is used to display to mainstream men credentials of heterosexual masculinity which validate the protectee as a 'real', 'hard' and 'gutsy' man.

One of the outcomes of this vicious policing by non sex offender protectees is that they have physically divided the protection space into those whom they consider to be 'desirable' protectees and those who are not. As a result, child sex offenders are both physically and psychically marked, not only as 'undesirable' and absolutely inferior to dominant heterosexual masculinity, but also as absolutely the Other to 'real' criminality. The 'badge' of criminality is a reward for masculinity, and child sex offenders' deviancy is neither 'real' criminality nor 'real' masculinity. Therefore child sex offenders' Othering absolutely positions them as both physically and metaphorically outside criminal masculinity.

There are a number of effects that this separation and marking as 'unmanly' and 'uncriminal' has on the child sexual offender's body. Child sex offenders are the most physically confined of all prisoners and therefore they have very little autonomy and fewer opportunities available to them to move out of this space than do other inmates. However, the child sex offenders' separation and isolation from the rest of the prison population also produces close and loyal relationships between them. They form what could be called a 'mini' brotherhood. This mini brotherhood reflects many of the values of the mainstream brotherhood in that it is highly secretive, homosocial, woman-free, and demands absolute loyalty from its members. Like the mainstream prisoners' membership of the brotherhood, one of the advantages to child sex offenders of being associated with their own mini brotherhood is that other members confirm their masculinity and credibility as 'real' men.

It would seem that race also complicates an 'easy' reading of the prison in that Aboriginal people in particular are the most highly represented group per head of population in Australian prisons. Aborigines' over-representation can be read not only as a matter of material disadvantage, but also as a consequence of the continuity of the colonial discourse of the Other. However, while I acknowledge the many ways in which race is a marker of one's identity and also the particular place that Aborigines have had in the Australian criminal justice system, in this study race was generally not as significant an organising factor as was one's crime or gender. In another study race may be connected with techniques of power, and it is recommended that future research investigate whether this is so.

One of the reasons why there was no evidence from the interviews with male prisoners that race is a predominant technique of power is that they were conducted at Yatala Labour Prison. Yatala Labour Prison does not accommodate high numbers of Aborigines in contrast to the State's other prisons, such as Port Augusta and Mobilong in Murray Bridge, and therefore, race as a technique of power was not evident. In the women's prison there were tensions associated with a perception that Aboriginal women received more privileges and opportunities than others. However, as in the data from the men's prison, it seems that gender, rather than race, has shown itself to be the major mechanism in the distribution of power.

Women Prisoners - Different rather than The Other

Apart from in feminist research, women have largely been ignored in previous studies of 'the prison' or have been added on as an auxiliary to be discussed in stereotyped ways. In this study it was seen as important to investigate the different experiences of men and women prisoners. Furthermore, inasmuch as the men's prison is an institution which is both predatory and heterosexual and one where dominant criminal

masculinity is the core technology of power, the transposing of this culture onto the women's prison produces significantly different effects for women prisoners.

There are a number of explanations for why women prisoners' experience of prison is vastly different from and in many ways 'harder' than men's. In part this can be explained in terms of women's criminality being an affront to femininity. That is, criminal women (prisoners) are the Other to dominant femininity. And indeed Simone de Beauvoir's conception of the human type as masculine and woman as 'the Other' and therefore non-central is evident in the physical and metaphorical positioning of women prisoners (1975: 16). But it is women's difference from all male prisoners and from true criminality, and their Othering to dominant femininity, which fundamentally impacts on their prison experience. In fact, the positioning as 'the Other' to the mainstream male prisoner applies more precisely to those men in protection than it does to women prisoners. Additionally, while child sex offenders are positioned as different from all other male offenders, they are only 'different' from criminal masculinity because of their unmanly crime.

The crimes that women commit do not mark them as different from male prisoners, but rather the prison culture is one that is masculine with 'woman' always its constitutive outsider. That is, women's gender is the fundamental marker of their difference from male prisoners, and the abstract and real 'criminal' and 'prisoner' body for whom the prison is designed and functions is always and absolutely male. Therefore it is not the Beauvoirian objective of women being 'equal' with men that is relevant, but rather what is needed is to recognise that women prisoners are different and the ways in which this difference fundamentally impacts on their experience as criminal, prisoner and woman. Specifically, women prisoners are not the Other to men, but rather they are different. That is, they need to be defined in their own terms that in relation to male prisoners.

Inasmuch as some of the older, recidivist women prisoners adhere to The Code, and in doing so take up 'masculine' positions on what constitutes a 'real' criminal, this

positioning is not valued in the women's prisons in the way that an equivalent sort of positioning on the part of a 'staunch crim' is in the men's prison. One of the explanations for this is that the cultural values of the masculine code have less relevance and importance in the lives of women prisoners because the competing feminine values to negotiate and be accommodating are at odds with the core values of The Code. However, the most compelling explanation is that unlike male prisoners, women do not have an 'authentic' identity as 'real' criminals and 'real' prisoners. Even the 'best' women candidates cannot really succeed in gaining 'real' criminal status, even in the eyes of other women prisoners. Instead, women prisoners are positioned within the prison and the wider community as being outside 'real' criminality and beyond 'real' femininity. Women prisoners' criminality challenges and fractures notions about what it is to be a 'real' 'feminine' woman. While this positioning effectively denies women coherent subjectivities as 'authentic' criminals, prisoners or women, its main practical effect is that it exacerbates their psychic pain and the many losses of being in prison.

While I have argued that women prisoners are not *Other* but *different* from male prisoners, they are as I have suggested positioned as *the Other* to dominant femininity. Specifically, their criminality and perceived abandonment of their responsibilities as mothers to their children, positions them as Other to 'real' women and 'good' mothers. One of the key results of women prisoners' Othering to 'real' women is that their 'lack' of femininity is utilised in a core disciplinary technique of power. In fact, most women prisoners want to continue mothering their children; however, the absolute incompatibility of the notion of criminality with that of 'good' mothering means that they must relinquish the former identity if they want the latter.

Women prisoners seek to adhere to the wider cultural ideals of what it is to be a 'good' and therefore 'real' woman. Being a criminal and prisoner is not part of the accepted cultural ideal for women, and this is particularly the case for those who are mothers wanting to 'do' mothering. Therefore, adherence to these cultural norms of femininity

has the effect of providing women prisoners with other 'real' and 'achievable' subjectivities as 'real' and 'good' mothers.

One of the traditional and continuing functions of women's prisons is to reform 'wayward' women and provide them with the opportunities to achieve some of the core values and expectations of dominant femininity. These include the subject positions of the 'good' mother and the 'reformed' and 'responsible' woman. However, women prisoners are only 'reformable' in terms of their femininity which they must demonstrate and perform. That is, if a woman is to take up the subject position of being a 'reformed' and responsible mother and woman, she must also be obedient and compliant to prison rules. Disobedience by women prisoners is read by the general community and within the prison as 'unfeminine', and a sign of them not being genuinely repentant. Indeed it is women prisoners' need to be seen as both 'reformable' and 'responsible' and therefore 'worthy to mother' their children which explains why they are less dissenting than male prisoners.

In addition there are particular forms of behaviour that are consistent with the culture of men's prisons and dominant heterosexual masculinity but which are considered an anathema in women's prisons. For example, in women's prisons, rape is conceptualised as being utterly and absolutely incompatible with dominant femininity. One of the effects of this is that in the women's prison the act in which other women prisoners penetrate the vagina or anus of a woman without her consent is renamed as something other than rape. Of particular importance is not so much the renaming of the act but the implications that renaming has for both gender and sexuality. The renaming provides a definition about *who* can and *what* does rape. In particular the renaming of the act reasserts the centrality of the penis and most notably that of the erect penis in rape, and also positions men at the centre of predatory sexuality. The acceptance by the women of the view that the act was not rape but 'looking for drugs' supports the notion in the popular imagination that penetration by an erect penis is a key element in rape. The erection signifies sexual desire, therefore implicating the rapist in a

sexualised assault. This popular view of rape is borne out in the men's prison, where rape involves the erect penis. By contrast, in the women's prison the absence of the penis and therefore of desire symbolised by its erection allows the renaming of the act as 'looking for drugs'. This renaming of the act leaves intact the heterosexuality of women prisoners. It also further reinforces and crystallises the general community perspective that erect penile penetration is a central element of rape.

The absence of the erect penis also negates any suggestion of sexual desire or arousal being present. The absence of the erect and therefore sexually aroused penis allows the renaming of the act to occur and, with this, permits all involved to take up other subject positions more compatible with femininity. These other subject positions do not include 'rapist', as the subject position of a female sexual predator is utterly and absolutely contrary to dominant femininity. Furthermore, these subject positions do not include 'victim' of rape although the violated woman is clearly a victim of an attack. Indeed, the positive effects of renaming the act are that it allows the women involved to take up subject positions which would not be available to them if they were named 'rapists' or 'victims'. Additionally, the renaming also allows both parties to take up subject positions in which heterosexuality is not questioned. Of particular importance is that the renaming of the act stops those who committed it from being named as sexual predators and also allows them to be positioned as having the credentials to be rehabilitated.

Implications and challenges

One of the fundamental findings emerging from this research on the experiences of men and women in prison is the understanding that technologies of power include gender. Indeed there is considerable evidence to suggest that the prison is a resource for the reproduction of gender. My research clearly demonstrates that gender is the most effective way in which disciplinary power is established in both the men's and women's prisons. That is, the performance of predatory heterosexuality by male criminals and prison officers is not only a strategy for performing criminal masculinity,

but also a key technology of power. Therefore a great deal of crime and indeed behaviour within the men's prison makes sense as a strategy for performing masculinity.

The hierarchical organisation and the reward system within 'the prison' is represented as masculine and fundamentally disavows femininity. Therefore one of the most challenging tasks for prison reformers is that of making redundant the masculine culture of the men's prison. However, changing the culture of the men's prison is a task which requires more than cosmetic changes, as the culture of hegemonic masculinity is one that I have shown to be fundamentally part of the identity of male prisoners and male prison officers.

One of the key objectives of the Department of Correctional Services is to reform prisoners. By contrast, however, as I have demonstrated, the current prison culture is one that rewards and reproduces dominant criminal masculinity. Maintaining a prison culture in which this form of masculinity is reproduced is not providing a service of reform. In order to achieve reform, it is not enough to address the 'man' question, but rather the dominant criminal masculine culture of the prison needs to be dismantled and made redundant. That is, real reform of the prison system requires an absolute refusal on the behalf of all prison officers to affirm hegemonic criminal masculinity. It seems that changing the culture of prison officers is the first requirement.

Further to this, one of the ramifications of crime being a strategy for 'doing' masculinity is that women prisoners are always positioned outside what constitutes a 'real' criminal and 'real' woman. For women prisoners, committing crime is not a 'strategy' for 'doing' femininity, as 'real' crime requires one to be male and to perform a particular heterosexual form of masculinity. More explicitly, 'authentic' criminal mother is not a subject position available to women prisoners.

In addition, the notion that all women criminals are victims is belied by the findings of this study. It has previously been observed that the prison experience is one in which women have no control over their lives (Sobel, 1982: 108), that they do not feel cared about and are treated as 'less than human' (Easteal, 1994: 8). In this study there was considerable evidence to support the claim that women prisoners do experience considerable trauma; however, this does not and should not position them as victims. Indeed one of the challenges this thesis raises for feminist criminology is a need to address what has been an ongoing dilemma for many, namely, the need to look beyond women prisoners as victims. Specifically, two of the challenges for feminist criminology, and indeed criminology in general, are to move beyond positioning all women prisoners as victims, and to dispel the myths about the heroic 'hard' criminal man.

The key reform challenge

Real reform of the prison must address the ways in which all women, be they prison officers or prisoners, are fundamentally disavowed. The challenges for prison reformers is not to investigate why all women in prison are disavowed, as I have already done this, but rather the challenge is to make redundant the structure which maintains and continues to make possible the reproduction of dominant masculinity and the disavowal of all women. This is indeed a formidable challenge, particularly given the training and entrenched notions of what it is to be a 'real' criminal and a 'real' prison officer, and a 'real' man and a 'real' woman.

Appendix A: Interview schedules for prisoners

What follows is a guide to the areas covered in the interviews. The questions were not necessarily put in the language or order indicated below.

Section 1: Structured interviews

Name, sex, age, ethnic background, current offence, prisoner status, mainstream, protection, low or medium security, first timer or repeat offender, sentence, previous convictions, total number of years spent in prison, age of first offence.

What was your first offence? How and who introduced you to crime? Have you been detained in a Youth Training Centre? If so, where were you detained?

Did you have a co-offender? If so, are you still friends? If not, why not? Where is he or she?

Are you a drug user, if so, what is your preferred drug? Do you take medication in prison? If so, what is the name of the medication? What are the reasons for taking medication? Have you used psychotropic medication in this or previous sentence?

What is your previous employment? What year level at school/university did you achieve? Are you involved in any education at the moment?

Do you have children? If so, how many? Were your children living with you prior to imprisonment, current care-taker of children, has child resided in prison with mother, who supports you while in prison? Do you have visits from family? Are the visits weekly, monthly, sometimes. How often do you see your children?

Section 2: Prisoner semi structured interviews

How would you describe your experience of being in prison?

How would you describe your relationship with prison officers?

How would you describe a good prison officer?

Describe your relationship with other inmates.

How would you describe a good prisoner?

What factors influence your decision as to whether you will associate with a particular prisoner?

Are there any differences between prisoners? If so, what are they?

Do you like all prisoners? If not, explain why you don't like particular prisoners.

What are the difficulties if any that you have experienced in prison?

Tell me, what are the things that you like about prison?

Is there anything that you dislike about prison?

Describe your first day in prison.

Tell me how you have adjusted to being in prison.

What do you think are some of the problems that young offenders may experience?

Do you think prisons are violent places?

Have you seen or been subject to any violence?

Describe any violence that you have seen, been involved in.

Do you think there is a pecking order in the prison, and if so where do you place yourself in this order?

What do you think are the main reasons why some prisoners experience conflict with other inmates?

How would you describe the support you have inside the prison and from people outside the prison?

Do you associate with all the prisoners in your division?

If you don't, why don't you?

How do you feel about being separated from your children?

What do you think would be some of the difficulties women and men prisoners may experience when first incarcerated?

Why do you think some prisoners continually return to prison?

What factors contribute to some prisoners not returning to prison?

Tell me, are there differences between the Nunga and non-Aboriginal inmates?

If there are, what are they?

Appendix B: Interview schedules for all prison officers & staff

Section 1: Structured interview

Name, sex, age, ethnic background, current position, education and previous occupation, total number of years employed as a prison officer. Total number of years employed as a prison officer at Yatala or Adelaide Women's Prison, previous prison officer positions.

Section 2: Semi structured interview

Tell me what were the reasons why you join the prison service?

Describe what you think is a good prison officer?

How would you describe your relationship with prisoners?

Do you enjoy working with some sections of the prison population more than others?
If so, why?

How would you describe your relationship with other officers/workers?

Tell me, are there any differences in the roles of men and women officers?

Tell me, what are the enjoyable aspects of your work?

At present women officers are not employed in G Division, why do you think this is so?

Do you think women should be working in G Division?

Do you think there are any differences in the way men and women officers work?

Have you ever witnessed any violence at Yatala/Adelaide Women's Prison between inmates, or between officers and inmates?

If you have, what were the reasons for the violence?

Did you choose to work at Yatala or Adelaide Women's Prison?

What were the reasons you wanted to work with men/women?

Would you choose to work with men/women?

Why, why not?

Are there differences in the type of prisoners at Yatala in the protection and mainstream sections; and at Adelaide Women's Prison between the LSU or high security?

What do you think would be some of the difficulties women and men prisoners may experience when first incarcerated?

Why do you think some prisoners continually return to prison?

What factors contribute to some prisoners not returning to prison?

Tell me, are there differences between the Nunga and non-Aboriginal inmates?

If there are, what are they?

Appendix C: Professional staff interviews

Section 1: Structured interview

Name, sex, age, ethnic background, current position, education and previous occupation, total number of years employed as a social worker, psychologist, medical officer, nurse, etc ... Total number of years employed at Yatala or Adelaide Women's Prison (AWP), previous location within Department of Correctional Services.

Section 2: Semi structured interviews

What are the main roles of a prison social worker, psychologist, medical officer, nurse, etc ...

Describe the main issues you are confronted with in your work with inmates (on a daily/regular basis)?

What is the main reason you have chosen to work in the prison?

Why did you choose to work with male/female prisoners?

Would you work in a men's/women's prison? Why/why not?

Tell me, do you think there any differences between men and women's prisons? What are some of these differences?

Describe your relationship with prisoners.

Do you enjoy working with some sections of the prison population more than others?

If so, why?

Describe your relationship with officers/other staff/management.

Tell me, what do you think are the main issues for the following groups of:

First timers

When they enter prison

When facing long sentences

Mothers

Drug users

Young women

What help do the prisoners receive from your department when first admitted to prison?

What programs are you currently offering to men/women in prison?

What other programs do you think should be offered?

Have you known of or seen any violence, rape or assault that has occurred in the prison?

What help has been offered to the victims?

What do you think are the main issues for women with children?

Do you think the facilities are adequate at AWP/Yatala Labour Prison?

Are the prison officers involved in your programs?

What preparations are provided for prisoners prior to their release?

Do you follow up with prisoners after their release?

What satisfaction do you receive from your work?

What are the difficulties of your job?

Why do you think some prisoners continually return to prison?

What influences some prisoners not to return to prison?

Are there differences between the Nunga and non-Aboriginal inmates?

If there are, what are they?

What changes would you make to the prison if you were a Manager?

APPENDIX D: Glossary of terms

Adelaide Prison: Adelaide Prison was a maximum security men's prison in South Australia. It is now closed.

Admit: A new prisoner.

Baltara, Turana, Bayswater and Morningstar: These institutions were all Youth Training Centres in Melbourne, Victoria. They have all closed down. Baltara and Bayswater accommodated children from the ages of seven to fourteen years. The last of these Youth Training Centres to close was Turana. In 1994 the Melbourne Juvenile Justice Centre was built to replace the Turana Youth Training Centre.

Barwon: A maximum security men's prison near Geelong, Victoria.

Boob, Doing boob: Boob is another word for jail. A boob tattoo is a tattoo made in prison.

Bunker: An area in the prison occupied by the prison officers where they monitor and control the electronic surveillance.

Burgs, doing a break: These terms refer to burglary.

Canteen, Buy up: Two terms used by prisoners to describe the purchase of personal items from the prison store. For example, when prisoners purchase goods at the prison canteen it is referred to as 'a buy'.

Cat: A cat is a male homosexual.

Chat: Chat is a prison word for a person who is dirty. For example: 'He is a chat'.

Classo: Refers to the Classification Committee. This committee decides where prisoners should be placed within the prison.

Contact visits: During contact visits the prisoners' outside visitors are escorted to a room known as the visit centre. The visitor sits with the prisoner at a table, hence the phrase 'contact visits'.

Cop it sweet: Sweet is used to refer to accepting punishment or a particular situation without complaint. For example: 'I copped it sweet'. Sweet can also be used as another word for OK. For example: 'I'm doing jail sweet'.

Cough and squat: When being strip-searched, prisoners are instructed by the officers to 'squat and cough'. The squatting and coughing is supposed to have the effect of drugs or any other prison contraband falling out of the prisoners' anus or vagina onto the floor.

Crook: Another word for criminal.

Cut-down: A cut-down is a syringe that has been cut. They are cut so they can be inserted into the anus and not be detected during a strip-search.

C Wing: Section at Adelaide Women's Prison accommodating women who have tested positive to illegal drug use in prison and who are therefore not eligible for contact visits.

D Division: D Division was part of the Metropolitan Reception Prison in Melbourne, Victoria. It is where remanded prisoners and protectees were accommodated. It was next door to Pentridge Prison. Both prisons are now closed.

Dead Man Walking: A term used to refer to a prisoner who has informed and will be violently dealt with at some time in the future.

Dirty: To be angry or disapproving. For example: 'He was dirty with him'.

Dog: If a prisoner is called a 'dog' that means they cannot be trusted to keep secrets. The term 'dog' is considered most derogatory.

D Wing: High security section at Adelaide Women's Prison.

E Division: E Division at Yatala Labour Prison accommodates those prisoners who are on remand or have just been sentenced and are waiting to be classified.

Fairlea: Fairlea Women's Prison was a maximum security women's prison in Melbourne, Victoria. It is now closed.

First timer: A 'first timer' is a prisoner serving their first sentence in an adult institution

Fit: Syringe

Fridge: The isolation cell in G Division at Yatala Labour Prison.

G Division: The punishment unit at Yatala Labour Prison.

Geeing, Winding up: Refers to the act of encouraging a person to get upset.

Give up: A give up is another term used to describe a person who is an informant. For example: 'She is a give up'.

Go down on: Refers to being convicted of a crime. For example: 'He went down on four charges'.

Going shopping, Shoppers: These terms are used to describe the activity of shop lifters 'going shopping'; 'shopper' is a person who steals from shops.

Goonies, Goon Squad, Emergency Response Group (ERG): Until recently the ERG were a male-only group of prison officers trained to combat rioting prisoners. They are officially known as the Emergency Response Group or ERG. Women prison officers have recently been able to join the ERG.

Grannies, Grannie Basher: Women over 50 years are referred to as 'grannies'. Therefore a person who violates a woman over 50 is referred to as a 'grannie basher'; these prisoners are usually accommodated in the protection section of the prison.

H Division: The punishment section at Pentridge prison in Victoria.

Jack, Jack shop: A Jack is a police officer. A jack shop is a police station.

Jerry, Jerried: To jerry is to understand, for example 'He didn't jerry', or 'He jerried'.

Junkie: A drug user.

Lag, Lagger: To lag on someone means to inform/tell on them to the police, prison officer. A lagger is someone who cannot be trusted because he/she is known to be an informant.

Lashing: Prisoners refer to being lashed when their outside support tell them they are going to visit them and don't. Therefore they have been 'lashed', or 'He gave me a lashing'.

Long Bay: Long Bay is a maximum security men's prison in Sydney, in New South Wales.

Mainstream, Mainstreamer: The main section of the prison: A mainstreamer is a prisoner who does not require protection.

Missus: Term used for wife.

Monkey: A monkey is \$500.

Mulawa: Mulawa is a maximum security prison women's prison in Sydney, New South Wales.

Non contact visits: If a prisoner has tested positive to drugs or has had their visiting rights taken away from them because they have broken the rules of the prison, they are given non-contact visits. That is, they are allowed visits but they are physically separated from their visitors by a glass partition.

Nungas: Aborigines from the Adelaide South Australian plains are referred to as Nungas.

Old School: Refers to those prisoners who live and operate by The Code.

Old Timer: Older, experienced criminal who has served several prison sentences.

Payback: When a person is violently abused or bashed for informing.

Pentridge, Pen: Both terms used for Pentridge Prison, a former maximum security men's prison in Melbourne, Victoria. Pentridge was closed down in 1996.

Poplar House: Poplar House also referred to as 'Poplar', was the high security section of Turana Youth Training Centre in Melbourne, Victoria, which closed in 1993-4.

Protection, Protectee: A section of the prison separate from the mainstream area. A protectee is a prisoner who is accommodated in the protection section.

Racking: Racking is a term used to describe organised teams of shoplifters.

Raided: To be raped.

Rat: Informant.

Recalcitrant unit, Recal, B3: The Recalcitrant Unit at Yatala Labour Prison is also known as 'recal' and B3. This unit accommodates prisoners who have been transferred after they have served time in G Division, the highest security section of the prison. Prisoners may also be in the Recalcitrant Unit if there is inadequate room in G Division and the prisoner concerned requires 24-hour monitoring, or if they have been transferred back to Yatala from another prison due to a serious breach of prison rules (violence for example).

Rock spider, Kid Fucker, Tamp, Tamper, Sexo: These terms are used in the prison to refer to child sex offenders.

Rocker: Slang word for the drug Rhohypnol.

Screw, Turn Key, Officer: These terms are used in the prison when referring to prison officers.

Shanghaied: Refers to a prisoner being sent to a higher security section of the prison because they have breached prison rules.

Sheila: Sheila is slang for woman.

Shiv: A shiv is a knife. Prisoners refer to 'shivings'. This activity involves stabbing a person.

Slash-up: Refers to self mutilation.

Smack: Another word for heroin.

Spat the dummy: To get upset.

Square Head: A 'square head' is a person who is not involved in crime.

Stab on: Refers to fighting and stabbing a person. For example: 'He stabbed on'.

Standover: When a person is being violated by other prisoners this is referred to as a 'standover'.

Stick up: An armed robbery.

Tarrengower: Tarrengower is a low security prison farm for women prisoners in Victoria.

The Code: The Code is a term used mainly by male prisoners when referring to the criminal rules of behaviour.

Tamperer, Tamp: Another term used to describe a child sexual offender. Someone convicted of child sexual abuse is said to have 'tampered' with children sexually.

Tracking: Tracking refers to the mark the needle makes on a person's arm.

Two Outer: Prisoners commonly use the phrase 'two outed' or 'two outer'. It refers to a cell with two beds in it. Two outed can also refer to being bashed by two people, hence the term 'I was two outed'.

Unit 7: Unit 7 at the Adelaide Remand Centre is the punishment unit for those who have been involved in an incident within the prison which the prison considers unacceptable or a threat to the good order of the prison. Sometimes people are accommodated in Unit 7 if they are suicidal or require extensive protection. The regime is similar to that of G Division at Yatala Labour Prison.

Urined: Refers to having a urine test done; they are conducted to test for use of illegal drugs.

Youth Training Centres: Also known as Boy's or Girl's Homes, or YTCs, accommodate boys and girls from the ages of 14 – 21 years. Most youth, however, are transferred to the adult prisons at the age of 18.

APPENDIX E: Letter to prison

Ms M Bordoni
Manager Northfield Prison
Private Bag 4
Blair Athol 5084

13 September 1995

Dear Ms Bordoni

I write to seek your permission for Francine Pinnuck a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Women's Studies to conduct her research at Adelaide Women's Prison. The purpose of the research is to test the hypothesis that women's and men's experiences of prison are different.

Ms Pinnuck's thesis topic is 'Women's and Men's Experience of Prison'. She submitted a proposal to the University of Adelaide's Ethics Committee, which outlined a description of the research project, research methodology, ethical implications and possible benefits the research may have for Corrective Services. A Consent Form and an Information Sheet (enclosed) explaining to potential participants the research was also included in her submission to the Ethics Committee. Her submission was approved by the Committee.

Through her current employment with the Sexual Offenders Treatment and Assessment Programme, Ms Pinnuck has contact with Social Workers from both Yatala and Adelaide Women's Prisons. She has conducted preliminary discussions about her research with Ms Chris Weir, a Social Worker from Adelaide Women's Prison. Ms Weir expressed an interest in the project and indicated that if Management were to approve Ms Pinnuck's request she would be willing to inform prisoners of the research.

I believe Ms Pinnuck's Ph.D. research will be beneficial to Corrective Services. I would be grateful if you could indicate your acceptance of the proposal, or any queries you might have, to me in writing by 29 September. This would be necessary to enable Ms. Pinnuck to proceed with her proposal.

Should you require any additional information please feel free to contact me.

Yours faithfully,

Kay Schaffer Ph.D.
Associate Professor.

Mr B Willoughby
General Manager
Yatala Labour Prison
1 Peter Brown Drive
Northfield 5084

13 September 1995

Dear Mr Willoughby

I write to seek your permission for Francine Pinnuck a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Women's Studies to conduct her research at Adelaide Women's Prison. The purpose of the research is to test the hypothesis that women's and men's experiences of prison are different.

Ms Pinnuck's thesis topic is 'Women's and Men's Experience of Prison'. She submitted a proposal to the University of Adelaide's Ethics Committee, which outlined a description of the research project, research methodology, ethical implications and possible benefits the research may have for Corrective Services. A Consent Form and an Information Sheet (enclosed) explaining to potential participants the research was also included in her submission to the Ethics Committee. Her submission was approved by the Committee.

Through her current employment with the Sexual Offenders Treatment and Assessment Programme, Ms Pinnuck has contact with Social Workers from both Yatala and Adelaide Women's Prisons. She has conducted preliminary discussions about her research with Ms Chris Weir, a Social Worker from Adelaide Women's Prison. Ms Weir expressed an interest in the project and indicated that if Management were to approve Ms Pinnuck's request she would be willing to inform prisoners of the research.

I believe Ms Pinnuck's Ph.D. research will be beneficial to Corrective Services. I would be grateful if you could indicate your acceptance of the proposal, or any queries you might have, to me in writing by 29 September. This would be necessary to enable Ms. Pinnuck to proceed with her proposal.

Should you require any additional information please feel free to contact me.

Yours faithfully,

Kay Schaffer Ph.D.
Associate Professor.

APPENDIX F

The University of Adelaide Consent Form

1. I _____ (please print) hereby consent to take part in the research project entitled

Men's and Women's Experience of Prison.

2. I acknowledge that I have read the Information Sheet entitled

Men's and Women's Experience of Prison: Participant Information Sheet

3. I have had the project, so far as it affects me, fully explained to my satisfaction by the research worker, Francine Pinnuck. My consent is given freely.

4. I have been informed that, while information gained during the study may be published, I will not be identified and my personal results will not be divulged.

5. I understand that I am free to withdraw from the project at any time and that this will not affect me now or in the future.

6. I am aware that I should retain a copy of this Consent Form, when completed, and the relevant Participant Information Sheet.

SIGNED _____

Date _____

Name of Witness _____
(Please print)

SIGNED _____

I, _____
(Please print)

have described to _____

the nature of the procedures to be carried out. In my opinion she/he understood the explanation.

SIGNED _____

Date _____

STATUS IN PROJECT _____

Appendix G: Men's and women's experience of prison

Participant Information Sheet

My name is Francine Pinnuck. I am a Ph.D. student from the University of Adelaide. My research is focused on the prison experience of men and women.

I believe there are many benefits in conducting this study. Firstly, the voice of prisoners about life behind the wall can only be accurately recorded and spoken by those who lived it. Secondly, if there are differences between men's and women's experiences of prison life and the literature has not accurately recorded these differences, then it is hoped that this research will provide an opportunity for these differences and similarities to be acknowledged and addressed. My research method is to represent your experiences and opinions.

I am interested in interviewing men and women who are currently serving, have served a prison sentence or are employed at Adelaide Women's Prison and Yatala Labour Prison. You are invited to participate in my study which would involve the following.

The study will focus on your experiences of prison. There will be interviews of approximately 1 to 2 hours in duration. Interviews will be taped and later transcribed. You will be given a transcription of the interview and, should you wish to change or delete aspects of it, you may do so. You may also decide at any time during the study that the interview not be used, that it be destroyed or returned to you. It is your right to withdraw from the research without needing to explain.

To ensure privacy and confidentiality, pseudonyms will always be used. Reference to prison locations may also be changed to ensure that you will not be identified by other prisoners, or by those working in the system, the community or family and friends.

I can be contacted at the University of Adelaide, Faculty of Arts, Department of Social Inquiry. My contact telephone number is 303 3675.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Francine Pinnuck.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner (1996) *Indigenous Deaths in Custody 1989 to 1996*, ATSIC, Canberra.
- Aldridge, S. (1993) 'The Children of Women Prisoners', *Health Issues*, no. 34, March (32–4).
- Allen, J. (1988) 'The Masculinity of Criminality and Criminology: Interrogating Some Impasses', in M. Findlay & R. Hogg (eds) *Understanding Crime and Criminal Justice*, Law Book Company, Sydney (1–23).
- Armstrong, G. (1977) 'Females Under the Law, 'Protected' but Unequal', *Crime and Delinquency*, vol. 23, no. 2, April (109–120).
- Arnold, R. (1990) 'Processes of Victimization and Criminalization of Black Women', *Social Justice*, vol. 17, no. 3, Fall (153–66).
- Badinter, E. (1995) *XY On Masculine Identity*, Columbia University Press, New York.
- Bartky, S. (1988) 'Foucault, Femininity and the Modernisation of Patriarchal Power' in I. Diamond & L. Quinby (eds) *Feminism and Foucault: Reflections on Resistance*, Northeastern University Press, Boston (61–86).
- Barstow, C. (1994) 'Whose Life is it Anyway?', *Criminal Justice*, vol. 12, no. 2, May (7–10).
- Becker, H. (1963) *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*, Free Press, New York.
- Beckerman, A. (1991) 'Women in Prison: The Conflict Between Confinement and Parental Rights', *Social Justice*, vol. 18, no. 3, Fall (171–83).
- Bhabha, H. (1994) *The Location of Culture*, Routledge, New York.
- Bonta, J., Pang, B. & Wallace-Capretta, S. (1995) 'Predictors of Recidivism Among Incarcerated Female Offenders', *The Prison Journal*, vol. 75, no. 3., September (277–93).
- Bourgeois, P. (1996) 'In Search of Masculinity', *British Journal of Criminology*, vol. 36, no. 3 (142–427).
- Bloom, B. (1992) 'Incarcerated Mothers and their Children: Maintaining Family Ties', in American Correctional Association (ed.) *Female Offenders: Meeting the Needs of a Neglected Population*, United Book Press Inc., Baltimore (60–8).
- Bordo, S. (1993) 'Feminism, Foucault and the Politics of the Body', in C. Ramazanoglu (ed.) *Up Against Foucault*, Routledge, London (179–202).
- Bordo, S. (1995) *Unbearable Weight: Feminism, Western Culture and the Body*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Bozovic, M. (1995) *The Panopticon Writings: Jeremy Bentham*, Verso, London.
- Braithwaite, J. (1989) *Crime, Shame and Reintegration*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

- Brown, B. (1990) 'Reassessing the Critique of Biologism' in L. Gelsthorpe & A. Morris (eds) *Feminist Perspectives in Criminology*, Open University Press, Milton Keynes, London (41–56).
- Brown, D. & Quinn M. (1986) 'Review of NSW Task Force Report on Women in Prison', *Legal Service Bulletin*, vol. 10, no. 6, December (261–6).
- Brown, D., Kramer, H., & Quinn, M. (1988) 'Women in Prison: Task Force Reform', in M. Findlay and R. Hogg, (eds) *Understanding Crime and Criminal Justice*, Law Book Company, Sydney (273–308).
- Buckley, K. (1996) 'Masculinity, the Probation Service and the Causes of Offending Behaviour', in T. May and A.A. Vass (eds) *Working with Offenders: Issues, Contexts and Outcomes*, Sage Publications, London (96–115)
- Burgess, R.G. (1980) 'Some Fieldwork Problems in Teacher-Based Research', *British Educational Research Journal*, vol. 6, no. 2 (165–73).
- Burns, L. (1998) 'Fantasy, Memory and Reality: Psychoanalytic and Legal Perspectives on Rape', *Feminism & Psychology*, vol. 8, no. 1, February (7–23).
- Cain, M. (1990) 'Towards Transgression: New Directions in Feminist Criminology', *International Journal of the Sociology of Law*, no. 18, (1–18).
- Carlen, P. (1980) 'Radical Criminology, Penal Politics and the Rule of Law', in P. Carlen & M. Collison (eds) *Radical Issues in Criminology*, Martin Robertson, Oxford (7–24).
- Carlen, P. (1982) 'Papa's Discipline: An Analysis of Disciplinary Modes in the Scottish Women's Prison', *Sociological Review*, vol. 30 (97–124).
- Carlen, P. (1983) *Women's Imprisonment*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- Carlen, P. (1990) 'Women, Crime, Feminism, and Realism', *Social Justice*, vol. 17, no. 4 (106–21).
- Carrigan, T., Connell, B. & Lee, J. (1987) 'Hard and Heavy: Towards a New Sociology of Masculinity', in M. Kaufman (ed.) *Beyond Patriarchy: Essays by Men on Pleasure, Power and Change*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Carrington, K. (1990a) 'Aboriginal Girls and Juvenile Justice: What Justice? White Justice', *Journal for Social Justice Studies*, vol. 3. (1–18).
- Carrington, K. (1990b) 'Feminist Readings of Female Delinquency', *Law in Context*, vol. 8, no. 2 (5–31).
- Catan, L. (1989) 'When Mother Goes to Prison', *Prison Report*, issue no. 8, September (4).
- Chadwick, K. & Little, C. (1987) 'The Criminalisation of Women' in P. Garaton (ed.) *Law, Order & the Authoritarian State*, Open University Press, London (254–78).
- Chesney-Lind, M. (1989) 'Girls' Crime and Woman's Place: Towards a Feminist Model of Female Delinquency"', *Crime & Delinquency*, vol. 35, no. 1, January (5–29).
- Clemmer, D. (1958) *The Prison Community*, Holt, Rhinehart & Winston, New York.

- Clark, J. (1995) 'The Impact of the Prison Environment on Mothers', *The Prison Journal*, vol. 75, no. 3, September (306–29).
- Clark, S.R. (1979) 'Women in Prison', *Auckland University Law Review*, vol. 3, no. 4, September (401–28).
- Collier, R. (1996) 'Just (More) Boys Own Stories? Gender, Sex and the "Masculinity Turn" in Criminology', *Social & Legal Studies*, vol. 5, no. 2, June (271–8).
- Collison, M. (1996) 'In Search of the High Life', *British Journal of Criminology*, vol. 36, no. 3, (428–41).
- Connell, R.W. (1995) *Masculinities*, Allen & Unwin, Sydney.
- Connell, R.W. (1993) Foreword in J.E. Messerschmidt, *Masculinities and Crime*, Rowman & Littlefield, Maryland (vii–xv).
- Connell, R.W. (1987) *Gender and Power*, Allen & Unwin, Sydney.
- Cornwall, A. & Lindisfarne, N. (eds) (1994) *Dislocating Masculinity: Comparative Ethnographies*, Routledge, London.
- Craddock, A. (1996) 'A Comparative Study of Male and Female Prison Misconduct Careers', *The Prison Journal*, vol. 76, no.1, March (60-78).
- Culbertson, R.G. & Fortune, E.P. (1986) 'Incarcerated Women: Self-Concept and Argot Roles', *Journal of Offender Counselling Services*, vol. 10, no. 3, Spring (25–49).
- Cullen, F.T. (1984) *Rethinking Crime and Deviance Theory: The Emergence of a Structuring Tradition*, Rowman & Allanheld, Totowa, New Jersey.
- Cunneen, C. & McDonald, D. (1997) *Keeping Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People Out of Custody : An Evaluation of the Implementation of the Recommendations of the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody*, Office of Public Affairs, ATSIC, Canberra.
- Cunneen, C. & Kerley, K. (1995) 'Indigenous Women and Criminal Justice: Some Comments on the Australian Situation' in K.M. Hazlehurst (ed.) *Perceptions of Justice: Issues in Indigenous and Community Empowerment*, Ashgate, Aldershot (71–93).
- Davis, S. (1992) 'Survey: Programs and Services for the Female Offender', *Corrections Compendium*, September (7–8).
- Dawes, M.J. (1997) *Dying in Prison: A Study of Deaths in Correctional Custody in South Australia, 1980–1993*, unpublished PhD thesis, School of Social Administration and Social Work, Faculty of Social Science, The Flinders University of South Australia.
- Dean, M. (1994) *Critical and Effective Histories: Foucault's Methods and Historical Sociology*, Routledge, London.
- De Beauvoir, S. (1975) *The Second Sex*, Penguin, England.
- Denton, B. (1995) 'Psychiatric Morbidity and Substance Dependence Among Women Prisoners: An Australian Study', *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law*, vol. 2, no. 2, November (173–7).

- Denzin, N.K. (1978) *The Research Act – A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods*, McGraw-Hill, USA.
- Donnelly, R. (1984) 'Infants and Aboriginal Women in Prison', in S.E. Hatty (ed.) *Women in the Prison System: Proceedings 12–14 June*, Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra, (163–9).
- Dreyfus, H.L. & Rabinow, R. (1992) *Michel Foucault, Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, Harvester Wheatsheaf, New York.
- Easteal, P. (1992) 'Women and Crime: Imprisonment Issues', *Trends & Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice*, no.35, Australian Institute of Criminology (1–8).
- Easteal, P. (1994) 'Don't Talk, Don't Trust, Don't Feel', *Alternative Law Journal*, vol. 19, no. 2, April (7–11).
- Eastman, M. (1989) *Family: The Vital Factor, The Key to Society's Survival*, Collins Dove, Melbourne.
- El Bassel, N., Ivanoff, A., Schilling, R.F., Borne, D. & Gilbert, L. (1997) "Skills Building and Social Support Enhancement to Reduce HIV Risk Among Women in Jail", *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, vol. 24, no. 2, June (205–23).
- Finney-Hairston, C. (1991) 'Mothers in Jail: Parent-Child Separation and Jail Visitation', *Affilia*, vol. 6, no. 2, Summer (9–27).
- Fishman, L.T. (1988) 'Prisoners and Their Wives: Marital and Domestic Effects of Telephone Contacts and Home Visits', *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, vol. 32, no. 1, April (176–204).
- Fogel, C.I. (1993) 'Hard Time: The Stressful Nature of Incarceration for Women', *Issues of Mental Health Nursing*, vol. 14, no. 4, October–December (367–77).
- Foucault, M. (1977a) *Discipline and Punish*, Penguin, England.
- Foucault, M (1977b) *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice*, D.F. Bouchard & S. Simon (trans.) Ithaca, New York.
- Foucault, M (1980) *Power Knowledge*, C. Gordon (ed.) Harvester Wheatsheaf, New York.
- Foucault, M. (1982) 'Afterword: The Subject and Power', in H.L. Dreyfus & R. Rabinow *Michel Foucault, Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, Harvester Wheatsheaf, New York.
- Foucault, M. (1989) *Michel Foucault Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings 1977–1984*, L.D. Kritzman (ed.) Routledge, New York.
- Foucault, M. (1990a) *Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings 1977–1984*, Routledge, New York.
- Foucault, M. (1990b) *The History of Sexuality Vol. 1, An Introduction*, Penguin, England.
- Gale, F.R., Bailey-Harris, R. & Wundersitz, J. (1990) *Aboriginal Youth and the Criminal Justice System: The Injustice of Justice?*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- George, A. (1993) 'Sexual Assault by the State', *Alternative Law Journal*, vol. 18, no.1 (31–3).

- George, A. & Lazarus, S. (1994) 'Private Prison: The Punished, The Profiteers, and the Grand Prix of State Approval', *Australian Feminist Law Journal*, vol. 4, (153-73).
- Gelsthorpe, L. (1986) 'Towards a Sceptical Look at Sexism', *International Journal of the Sociology of Law*, vol. 14, no. 2 (125-52).
- Gelsthorpe, L. (1987) 'The Differential Treatment of Males and Females in the Criminal Justice System', in G. Horobin (ed.) *Sex, Gender and Care*, Jessica Kingsley London (15-34).
- Genders, E. & Player, E. (1986) 'Women's Imprisonment', *British Journal of Criminology*, vol. 26, no. 4, October (357-69).
- Goetz, J.P. & Le Compte, M.D. (1984) *Ethnography and Qualitative Design in Educational Research*, Academic Press, Florida.
- Goffman, E. (1961) *Asylums*, Anchor Books, New York.
- Gottfredson, M.R. & Hirschi, T. (1990) *A General Theory of Crime*, Stanford University Press, California.
- Gow, C. (1994) 'No Women in Men's Prisons! No Private Prisons!', *Australian Feminist Law Journal*, vol. 2, March (174-80).
- Gray, T., Mays, G.L. & Stohr, M.K. (1995) 'Inmate Needs and Programming in Exclusively Women's Jails', *The Prison Journal*, vol. 75, no. 2, June (186-202).
- Griffith, J. (1984) 'Evidence of Unidimensionality of Locus of Control in Women Prisoners: Implications for Prisoner Rehabilitation', *Journal of Offender Counselling Services and Rehabilitation*, vol. 9, no. 1-2, Fall/Winter (57-69).
- Grosz, E. (1994) *Volatile Bodies: Towards a Corporeal Feminism*, Allen & Unwin, St. Leonards.
- Grosz, E. (1995) *Space, Time and Perversion*, Allen & Unwin, St. Leonards.
- Hahn Rafter, N. (1993) 'Equality or Difference' in American Correctional Association (ed.) *Female Offenders: Meeting the Needs of a Neglected Population*, United Book Press, Baltimore (7-11).
- Hahn Rafter, N. & Heidensohn, F. (1995) 'Introduction: The Development of Feminist Perspectives on Crime', in N. Hahn Rafter, & F. Heidensohn (eds) *International Feminist Perspectives in Criminology*, Open University Press, Buckingham (1-14).
- Hampton, B. (1993) *Prisons and Women*, New South Wales University Press, Kensington.
- Hancock, L. (1986) 'Economic Pragmatism and the Ideology of Sexism: Prison Policy and Women', *Women's Studies International Forum*, vol. 9, no. 1 (101-7).
- Hannah-Moffat, K. (1995) 'Feminine Fortresses: Woman-Centered Prisons?' *The Prison Journal*, vol. 75, no. 2, June (135-64).
- Heidensohn, F.M. (1985) *Women and Crime: The Life of the Female Offender*, New York University Press, New York.

- Heidensohn, F.M. (1987) 'Women and Crime: Questions for Criminology', in P. Carlen & A. Worrall (eds) *Gender, Crime & Justice*, Open Uni Press, Milton Keynes London (16–28).
- Heidensohn, F.M. (1994) 'From Being to Knowing, Some Reflections on the Study of Gender in Contemporary Society', *Women and Criminal Justice*, vol. 6, no. 1 (13–37).
- Heilpern, D.M. (1998) *Fear or Favour: Sexual Assault of Young Prisoners*, Southern Cross University Press, Lismore, NSW.
- Howe, A. (1994) *Punish and Critique, Towards a Feminist Analysis of Penalty*, Routledge, London.
- Howe, A. (1996) 'Rethinking Penalty – Foucault, Feminism and Punishment', *Lilith*, no. 9, Autumn (146–66).
- Hudson, A. (1990) 'Elusive Subjects Researching Young Women in Trouble', in L. Gelsthorpe & A. Morris (eds) *Feminist Perspectives in Criminology*, Milton Keynes, Philadelphia (115–23).
- Huft, A.G., Fawkes, L. & Lawson, W.T. (1992) 'Care of the Pregnant Offender', in American Correctional Association (ed.) *Female Offenders: Meeting the Needs of a Neglected Population*, United Book Press Inc., Baltimore (54–9).
- Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (1997) *The Report of the National Inquiry into the Separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Children from Their Families, Bringing them Home*, Sterling Press, Sydney.
- Isselbacher, K.J., Adams, R.D., Braunwald, E., Petersdorf, R.G. & Wilson, J.D. (1980) *Harrison's Principles of Internal Medicine*, 9th edn, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York.
- Jackson, P.G. & Stearns, C.A. (1995) 'Gender Issues in the New Generation Jail', *The Prison Journal*, vol. 75, no. 2, June (203–21).
- Jefferson, T. (1996) 'Introduction', *The British Journal of Criminology*, (special issue), vol. 36, no. 3. (337–45).
- Jones, I.H., Marris, B. & Hornsby, H. (1995) 'Psychiatric Characteristics of Female Prisoners in Tasmania', *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, vol. 29 (671–7).
- Jones, J.A. (1983) *Prisoners and their Families*, unpublished PhD thesis, Monash University Department of Anthropology and Sociology, Melbourne.
- Just Health for Rural Women (1996) *Evaluation of Phase 2 of the National Women's Health Program in South Australia*, December.
- Kauffman, M. (1994) 'Men, Feminism, and Men's Contradictory Experiences of Power', in H. Brod & M. Kauffman (eds) *Theorizing Masculinities*, Sage Publications, London (142–163).
- Kersten, J. (1996) 'Culture, Masculinities and Violence Against Women', *British Journal of Criminology*, vol. 36, no. 3 (381–95).
- Kersten, J. (1990) 'A Gender Specific Look at Patterns of Violence in Juvenile Institutions: or Are Girls Really More Difficult to Handle?', *International Journal of the Society of Law*, vol. 18, no. 4 (473–93).

- Kimmel, M.S. (1994) 'Masculinity as Homophobia', in H. Brod & M. Kaufman (eds) *Theorizing Masculinities*, Sage Publications, London (119–41).
- Kimmel, M.S. & Kauffman, M. (1994) 'Weekend Warriors: The New Men's Movement', in H. Brod & M. Kauffman (eds) *Theorizing Masculinities*, Sage Publications, London (259–88).
- Kosofsky-Sedgwick, E. (1985) *Between Men English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*, Columbia University Press, New York.
- Larman, G. & Aungles, A. (1991) 'Children of Prisoners and their Outside Carers: The Invisible Population', in P. Eastel and S. McKillop (eds) *Women and the Law: Proceedings of a Conference*, no. 16, Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra, (263–70).
- Liebling, A. (1992) *Suicides in Prison*, Routledge, London.
- Liebling, A. (1994) 'Suicide Amongst Women Prisoners', *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, vol. 33, no. 1 (1–9).
- McMahon, M. (1999) *Women on Guard: Discrimination and Harassment in Corrections*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto.
- McNay, L. (1992) *Foucault and Feminism*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Major, C. (1993) 'Women in Prison', *Connexions*, vol. 13, no. 3 (3–7).
- Mawby, R.I. (1987) 'Women in Prison: A British Study', *Crime and Delinquency*, vol. 28, January (24–39).
- Minichiello, V., Aroni, R., Timewell, E. & Alexander, L. (1990) *In-Depth Interviewing: Researching People*, Longman & Cheshire, Melbourne.
- Miner, M. & Gorta, A. (1987) 'Heroin Use in the Lives of Women Prisoners in Australia', *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, March, vol. 20 (3–15).
- Morgan, D. (1993) 'You Too can Have a Body Like Mine', in S. Scott & D. Morgan (eds) *Body Matters*, The Falmer Press, London (69–88).
- Morris, A. & Wilkinson, C. (1995) 'Responding to Female Prisoners' Needs', *The Prison Journal*, vol. 75, no. 3, September (295–305).
- Morris, S.M., Steadman, H.J., & Veysey, B.M. (1997) 'Mental Health Services in United States Jails: A Survey of Innovative Practices', *Criminal Justice Behavior*, vol. 24, no. 1, March (3–19).
- Naffine, N. (1987) *Female Crime, The Construction of Women in Criminology*, Allen & Unwin, Sydney.
- Naffine, N. (1990) *Law and the Sexes: Explorations in Feminist Jurisprudence*, Allen & Unwin, Sydney.
- Naffine, N. (1997) *Feminism & Criminology*, Allen & Unwin, Sydney.
- National Report, 5 vols. (1991) *Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody*, vol. 1, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.

- Paternoster, R. & Brame, R. (1997) 'Multiple Routes to Delinquency? A Test of Developmental and General Theories of Crime', *Criminology*, vol. 35, no. 1 (49–84).
- Patterson, R.L. (1995) 'Criminality Among Women: A Brief Review of the Literature', *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, vol. 22 (3/4).
- Patton, M.Q. (1980) *Qualitative Evaluation Methods*, Sage Publications, London.
- Polk, K. (1994) *When Men Kill: Scenarios of Masculine Violence*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Pinnuck, F. & Kay, J. (1994) "'Yes We Are Survivors of Prison and Child Sexual Abuse', Conducting Workshops in a Women's Prison Focussing on Childhood Sexual Assault", *Australian Social Work*, March, vol 47, no.1 (43–7).
- Pinnuck, F. (1998) 'The Medication of Prisoners: A Cause for Concern', *Just Policy*, no.12, March (13–19).
- Pollak, O. (1979) 'The Masked Character of Female Crime', in F. Alder & R. Simon (eds) *The Criminology of Deviant Women*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston.
- Pritchard, D. (1988) 'Deaths at Mulawa: Women Prisoners in NSW', in M. Hogan, D. Brown & R. Hogg (eds) *Deaths in the Hands of the State*, Redfern Legal Centre Publishing, NSW (81–90).
- Rabinow, P. (1991) *The Foucault Reader*, Penguin Books, London.
- Rafter, N. (1990) 'The Social Construction of Crime and Crime Control', *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, vol. 27, no. 4 (376–89).
- Reinharz, S. (1992) *Feminist Methods in Social Research*, Oxford University Press, England.
- Read, M. (1991) *Chopper: From the Inside – The Confessions of Mark Brandon Read*, Floradale, Kilmore.
- Read, M. (1992) *Chopper Two: Hits and Memories*, Floradale, Kilmore.
- Read, M. (1993) *Chopper 3: How to Shoot Friends and Influence People*, Floradale, Kilmore.
- Read, M. (1994) *Chopper 4: For the Term of his Unnatural Life*, Floradale, Kilmore.
- Read, M. (1995) *Chopper Five: Pulp Fiction – Revenge of the Rabbit Kisser and Other Jailhouse Stories*, Floradale, Kilmore.
- Read, M. (1996) *Chopper 6: No Tears for a Tough Guy*, Floradale, Smithfield.
- Robinson, V. (1996) 'Heterosexuality and Masculinity' in D. Richardson (ed.) *Theorising Heterosexuality*, Open University Press, Buckingham (109–24).
- Rosenbaum, J.L. (1989) 'Female Dysfunction and Female Delinquency', *Crime and Delinquency*, vol. 35, no. 1, January (31–44).
- Rowe, D.C. & Farrington, D.P. (1997) 'The Familial Transmission of Criminal Convictions', *Criminology*, vol. 35, no. 1 (177–201).
- Ryan, T.A. & Grassano, J.B. (1992) 'Pregnant Offenders: Profile and Special Problems', in American Correctional Association (ed.) *Female Offenders:*

Meeting the Needs of a Neglected Population, United Book Press Inc., Baltimore (49–53).

- Sawicki, J. (1996a) *Disciplining Foucault: Feminism, Power and the Body*, Routledge, New York.
- Sawicki, J. (1996b) 'Feminism, Foucault, and "subjects" of Power and Freedom', in S.J. Hekman (ed.) *Feminist Interpretations of Michel Foucault*, The Pennsylvania State University Press, Pennsylvania (159-178).
- Savitz, L. & Rosen, L. (1988) 'The Sexuality of Prostitutes: Sexual Enjoyment Reported by "Street Walkers"', *The Journal of Sex Research*, vol. 24 (200–8).
- Scott, E.M. (1977) 'Women Criminals: Therapy with Female Offenders', *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, vol. 21, no. 3 (208–20).
- Scrutton, P., Sim, J. & Skidmore, P. (1991) *Prisons Under Protest*, Open University Press, London.
- Shaw, M. (1992) 'Issues of Power and Control', *British Journal of Criminology*, vol. 32, no. 4, Autumn (438–52).
- Sim, J. (1994) 'Tougher Than the Rest? Men in Prison', in T. Newburn & E.A. Stanko (eds) *Just Boys Doing Business*, Routledge, London (100–17).
- Simourd, D.J. (1997) 'The Criminal Sentiments Scale-Modified and Pride in Delinquency Scale', *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, vol. 24, no. 1, March (52–70).
- Sobel, S.B. (1982) 'Difficulties Experienced by Women in Prison', *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, vol. 7, no. 2 (107–18).
- Smart, C. (1977a) *Women, Crime and Criminology: A Feminist Critique*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- Smart, C. (1977b) 'Criminological Theory: Its Ideology and Implications Concerning Women', *British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 28, no. 1, March (89–100).
- Smart, C. (1995) *Law, Crime and Sexuality*, Sage Publications, London.
- Sparks, R. (1996) 'Masculinity and Heroism in the Hollywood Blockbuster', *British Journal of Criminology*, vol. 36, no. 3, special issue (384–443).
- Stanley, L. & Wise, S. (1993) *Breaking Out Again: Feminist Ontology and Epistemology*, 2nd edn, Routledge, London.
- Stern, S. & Smith, C. (1995) 'Family Processes and Delinquency in an Ecological Context', *Social Service Review*, no. 20, (382–421).
- South Australian Department of Correctional Services (1995) *Investigation into Drugs in Prison 1995*, Government Printer, Adelaide.
- South Australian Correctional Services Act 1982* (1985), Government Printer, Adelaide.
- Tannenbaum, F. (1938) *Crime and the Community*, Ginn Publishers, Boston.
- Taylor, S.J. & Bogdan, R. (1984) *Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods – The Search for Meanings*, Wiley, New York.

- Toch, H. (1990) 'The Good Old Days in the Joint', *The Prison Journal*, vol. LXXX, no. 1, Spring-Summer (1-14).
- Tomsen, S. (1994) 'Hatred, Murder & Male Honour: Gay Homicides and the "Homosexual Panic Defence"', *Criminology Australia*, vol. 6, no. 2, November (2-10).
- Wartenberg, T.E. (1990) *The Forms of Power*, Temple University Press, Philadelphia.
- Watson, L. (1994) 'Developing Women's Agencies Along Indigenous Lines', in W. Weeks (ed.) *Women Working Together - Lessons from Feminist Women's Agencies*, Longman Cheshire, Melbourne (92-8).
- Woods, P. (1986) *Inside Schools - Ethnography in Educational Research*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- Women Against Prison Collective (1990) 'Women, Prison and Law and Order', *Legal Services Bulletin*, vol. 15, no. 1, February (26-9).
- Worrall, A. (1990) *Offending Women*, Routledge, London.
- Wynne-Hughes, S. (1988) 'Women in Corrections: A Strategic Approach', in D. Biles (ed.) *Current Australian Trends in Corrections*, The Federation Press, Sydney (131-9).