

The Impact of ‘Life’ Behind Bars: Understanding Space, Impression Management
and Masculinity through Former Inmate Narratives

by

James Gacek

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of
The University of Manitoba
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg

Copyright © 2015 by James Gacek

Abstract

Focusing on the architecture of carceral space, ‘impression management’ strategies, and masculinity performances within incarceration, this study examines the extent to which carceral space impacts the identity and behaviour of inmates throughout their interactions, both within the prison system and the inner-city. Qualitative, semi-structured interviews were conducted with ten men who experienced periods of incarceration in Manitoba. Their narratives indicate that alternative spatial theorizing is needed to conceptualize the prison space—in terms of the prison as a ‘place,’ as well as ‘social,’ and ‘carceral’ space—and that there is a significant amount of impression and emotional management needed when interacting with other inmates. Recidivism, finding meaningful employment, and building positive social networks with family and friends on the outside remain persistent obstacles for community reintegration. Examining the intersections of spatiality, masculinity, and identity allows us to explore alternative processes to restore (former) inmates into their communities moving forward.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincerest and deepest thanks to my advisor, Dr. Elizabeth Comack. Her guidance and mentorship have been invaluable throughout each stage of the project. She worked tirelessly to obtain financial support for the project, allowed me to work as her research assistant on several of her projects, and provided exceptional advice on the drafts of the chapters. In effect, I cannot express how appreciative I am of her hard work, support, and guidance.

Additionally, I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Andrew Woolford and Dr. Peter Kulchyski, for all of their hard work and support they have given to this project. I would like to thank the administrative staff in the Department of Sociology—Dianne Bulback, Donna Alexiuk, and Margaret Currie—for the support they have given me and their efforts to keep my spirits high as I engaged with this project. Moreover, I would like to thank my friends, family, and department colleagues for all the support they have given me, for which there are no words to express my gratitude. I would especially like to thank the men who participated in the study—Adrian, Brandon, Chris, Dave, Eric, Frank, Gary, Henry, Isaac, and Jacob—for their generous insight and experiences. This study could not have been accomplished without all of you, and for that I am truly grateful. Finally, I am pleased to acknowledge the generous financial support of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC), through the Manitoba Research Alliance grant, “Partnering for Change: Community-based Solutions for Aboriginal and Inner-city Poverty,” the SSHRC Master’s Scholarship grant, and the University of Manitoba Graduate Fellowship (UMGF).

Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Introduction	1
The Outline of the Study	3
Chapter One: Prison Sociology, Identity, Masculinity	6
Corrections in Canada and Canadian Research Contributions	12
Identity: Role Concepts and Performance	18
Masculinity	23
Concluding Remarks	26
Chapter Two: Space and Place in the Prison and Community	28
Prison as ‘place space’	29
Prison as ‘social space’	30
Prison as ‘carceral space’	32
Inmate Re-entry and Community Reintegration	37
The Needs for Reintegration	40
Concluding Remarks	43
Chapter Three: Methodology	45
Demographic Characteristics	46
Narrative Identity Analysis	49
Data Analysis	50
The Researcher’s Standpoint	52
Chapter Four: Experiencing Prison Spaces: Letting the ‘Narrated Subjects’ Speak	54
Prison-as-Place Space	55
Prison-as-Social Space	58
Prison-as-Carceral Space	62

Masculinity and Hypermasculinity	67
Emotionality within Interactional Spaces	73
Spirituality and Sacred Space	77
Solitary Confinement: Peaceful, ‘Quiet’ Space?	80
Concluding Remarks	84
Chapter Five: Community Reintegration, Current Issues and Narratives	87
Foucault versus Wacquant: The Problem with ‘Reintegration’	88
The Plausibility of ‘Re-entry’ Programs	92
Inmate Reintegration: What the Narratives Tell Us	98
Concluding Remarks	111
Conclusion: Moving Forward	114
Engagements with Specific Literatures	114
Moving Forward: A Restorative Justice Approach	118
Limitations and Implications of the Study	123
Concluding Remarks	127
References	128
Appendix A: Informed Consent Form	142
Appendix B: Demographic Information	146
Appendix C: Interview Schedule	147
Appendix D: Counselling Services	149

Introduction

Contemporary prison research has laid the groundwork for understanding how a male inmate constructs a sense of self within penal settings (Davidson and Milligan 2004; Kupers 2005; Gear 2007; Evans and Wallace 2008; Crewe et al. 2014). However, there exists a gap in the literature regarding the prison as a *space* that influences inmate identity and prison culture, and as a *place* where human agency becomes (re)constructed and (re)shaped. In turn, the creation of inmate identities affects the prison space itself, modifying its structure to assist and subsequently manage identity (re)creations. As a result, this process influences the inmates' ability to: (1) perform "hypermasculinity" within the prison, which is signified by men who "often associate being male with the external aspects of performance—physical size, willingness and ability to fight, power, and dominance" (Evans and Wallace 2008: 486); (2) abide by the 'inmate code'; and (3) regulate their body and sense of self to specific emotional zones that either prohibit or reduce certain emotive inmate behaviour. In short, there exists a reciprocal relationship between prison spaces and prison identities that requires further exploration.

Corrections literature highlights the impact of prison architectural conditions on inmate intra-violence and mental health (Bieri, 2012; Ezzell 2012; Griffin and Hepburn 2012), on the nature of hierarchical masculinities within prison social structures (Ricciardelli 2013, 2014; Ricciardelli et al. 2015), and on identity and inequality (Gieryn 2000). Especially within the Canadian context, it becomes essential to examine how Indigenous peoples are (over)represented in the correctional system (Waldram 1997; Comack 2008), aligning the notions of Indigeneity and incarceration closer and closer together. Building on this literature, this project focuses on how carceral spaces impact identity (re)constructions for inmates, exploring how the design of

carceral spaces interplays with inmate impression management strategies and the masculine performance culture within Manitoba jails and prisons. This project forges a connection between sociology and architecture (i.e. space and place) that, as Borch (2008: 557) asserts, remains an “unexplored topic” and will provide a valuable investigation into how “identities are represented architecturally” both within the prison setting and outside in the community. In essence, this project contributes to a critical understanding of how inmates within penal institutions operate and interact in relation to space and place.

Furthermore, this project contributes to the literature concerning inmate reintegration into the community. The experience of incarceration has been shown to impact the identity formation of inmates upon release (Westervelt and Cook 2012; Moore et al. 2013; Garcia Jiménez and Lorente García 2014). Examples include when the inmate attempts to understand himself as an ‘ex-con’ and how he perceives his chances of acceptance in the everyday world post-release (Winnick and Bodkin 2008), or when an inmate formulates his sense of self in relation to anticipated perceptions of stigma by the public (LeBel 2012; Moore et al. 2013). Additional examples include when an inmate conceptualizes his sense of self through the embodied experience of ‘doing time’ on his body, or when an inmate attempts to ‘erase’ his ‘incarcerated self’ from the scrutiny of the public eye. Moran’s (2012b) study of Russian prisoners suggests that once they are released, ex-inmates attempt to erase “the stigma of prison time inscribed on the body” by covering up the physical indications of ‘doing time’—such as tattoos and poor dental care—as well as managing their speech and the ‘bad habits’ of slang they acquired while incarcerated (p. 564). All of these instances provide insight into how the impact of incarceration and carceral space alters the identity formations within an inmate’s life-course when he is released back into the community.

By conducting qualitative interviews with ten men who have experienced incarceration in Manitoba jails and prisons, the aim of this thesis project is to contribute to our understanding of the relationship between space, masculinity, and identity. As such, the key question that informs this project is: how does carceral spatiality impact on ‘doing’ masculinity within prison, inmates’ impression management strategies, and, in turn, their subsequent identity constructions post-release?

The Outline of the Study

Chapter one examines the history of prison sociology as well as research that addresses men’s experiences of incarceration in the Canadian prison system. Historically, several significant studies have paved the way for the contemporary literature presented here. Nonetheless, understanding the complex relationship between identity and masculinity is essential in order to fully appreciate the impact of incarceration. The discussion will therefore clarify how incarceration impacts men’s identity and construction of masculinity, and under what conditions inmates perform ‘hypermasculine’ behaviours while incarcerated.

Chapter two investigates the distinction between the notions of place and space, and provides a discussion of the contemporary literature that has been developing around offender rehabilitation and community reintegration. While some scholarship appears to conflate the two terms, place differs from space insofar as while the latter can be configured within physical, temporal, geographical, and social settings, the former depicts the embodiments, senses, and emotions that only humans can exude when they come into contact and interact with spaces. Drawing on the works of Henri Lefebvre (1974/1991), Erving Goffman (1961), Michel Foucault (1995), and Dominique Moran (2012a, 2013a, 2013b), the formulation and impact of place and space upon human agency become distinctively unique processes that require investigation.

Chapter three outlines the methodology employed in the research. Data were collected during in-depth, semi-structured qualitative interviews with ten men that were both former inmates within the Manitoba correctional system and had experienced significant lengths of incarceration. The men's narratives provide important insights regarding their own incarceration experience and its impact on their identities, their observations of other men's behaviour and spaces within prison, and the impact of their incarceration experience once released back into the community.

Chapter four examines the themes that arose from the interviews conducted with the men. By letting the men open up and share their experiences of living within prison spaces, we see how they adapted to the inmate culture. This chapter first addresses the prison as a 'place space,' 'social space,' and 'carceral space,' and suggests that there are intricate complexities between inmates' physical and social spaces. Facilitating the inmates-as-narrated subjects to speak illuminates how social spaces between inmates had a greater impact on their perspective on spatiality than physical spaces themselves. This chapter discusses how the men were able to form specific dyads that permitted limited forms of intimacy, thus challenging the typical perception of prison as emotionally sterile. However, the physical space of the prison is significant, as the physical space assisted the men in becoming more self-aware of their spirituality and religiosity, especially in terms of showing the Indigenous inmates what it means to enact an Indigenous masculinity over a prison hypermasculinity.

Chapter five highlights the immense struggles involved in community reintegration by drawing on several of the men's narratives. This chapter examines the debate between Foucauldian and Wacquantian perspectives regarding the prison's function within society and the extent of its reach into the community. Indeed, the question of the plausibility or possibility

of full ‘reintegration’ into the community will be addressed and unpacked. The focus then shifts onto the men’s narratives and the importance of accessing programs and resources upon release. Issues surrounding the men’s struggles upon returning to the community, the available support networks of friends and family, and the extent to which the men felt that incarceration had changed their selfhoods were all raised in the interviews. In effect, the fear of release and the potential for recidivism were dominant concerns that arose from the men’s narratives, a commonality that raises concerns about the strategies utilized to realize successful reintegration.

The concluding chapter argues that former inmates’ “needs for reintegration” (Westervelt and Cook 2012: 237) must go further in terms of not just reintegrating but *restoring* inmates back into the community. Incorporating a restorative justice framework, the discussion illustrates how both the men and the communities they are returning to can benefit. Including restorative justice within a strategy of inmate restoration serves to emphasize the ‘man behind the inmate label,’ and shifts public discourse from inmate-as-community-liability to inmate-as-community-asset. The discussion then shifts to a consideration of the limitations of the thesis project and the need for further Canadian prison sociological research. In essence, the knowledge produced from this project has the ability to empower current and post-release inmates by sharing their perspectives and voicing their concerns to a larger audience. The insights that these men provide shed light on how incarceration impacts the self and alters the life-course, and may help us to develop “proactive re-entry-focused policies” (Winnick and Bodkin 2008: 298) that attempt to mitigate the transition back into their communities and engender public acceptance.

Chapter One

Prison Sociology, Identity, Masculinity

Prison sociological research has long been interested in the social relationships of prisoners, “the codes or informal rules that arise, the nature of allegiances between them, and the formation of groups” (Liebling and Arnold 2012: 414). Moreover, prison scholars tend to point out significant historical studies that have carried the prison sociology discipline forward. Studies conducted in the 1950s made a considerable impact and remain influential in contemporary prison sociology (see, for example, Crewe et al. 2004; Jewkes 2005; Crewe 2006, 2011, 2012, 2014; Crewe and Bennett 2012; Liebling and Arnold 2012; Crewe et al. 2014; Ricciardelli et al. 2015).

Understanding how the present project both supplements and contributes to prison research is possible by gaining an appreciation of the studies and literature that have contributed to prison scholarly work in Canada and abroad. Most notably, the works of Gresham Sykes (1956, 1958) and Erving Goffman (1961) are depicted in contemporary literature as the foundations upon which prison sociological inquiry stands, and as the origins of researchers’ interest in the structure of institutional settings and organizational behaviour of marginalized populations.

Studies conducted in both the United States and the United Kingdom suggest that as soon as the prisoner interacts with the penal institution—the correctional staff and the other inmates—the prisoner plunges into the social system of relationships, norms, and hierarchies that the institution reinforces. Indeed, terms such as ‘the prisoner society’ and ‘prison social life’ connote these features: the informal ‘value system’ amongst inmates, the patterns of competition and friendship amongst inmates (Corley 2001), and the distinctions they make between each other, such as through gang rivalries based on racial axes (Davis 2001; Mauer 2001).

As the “ultimate sanction of the state” (Crewe 2012: 1), imprisonment exists in nearly all Western nations, and its use in the developed world has risen considerably in recent years (Walmsley 2005). However, in some countries prisons have become less enthusiastic partners in research and academic studies. This is a shift from the early years of prison sociology, when research-based knowledge of the prison’s internal social dynamics was considered essential “for the development of a rational and effective penal system” (Crewe 2012: 3). Remarkably, many prison scholars worked alongside or within the penal system, sometimes as counsellors, psychologists, or ‘classification sociologists’ within the establishments they wrote about (Pollock 1997; Wacquant 2002). As Alison Liebling and Helen Arnold (2012: 414) contend, early prison sociology literature—largely influenced by the work of Sykes (1956, 1958)—identified three key themes: the notion of the prison as a “sustained social community” with flows of power that operated through it in complex ways; the division of prisoners into social roles; and the concept of ‘solidarity’—or, “the question of whether such solidarity existed, and, if so, what function it served” within the penal institution.

Beginning with Donald Clemmer’s (1940) general study of the prison community, the dynamics of social relationships in the prison have been thoroughly studied and documented. The concept of ‘prisonization’ was first introduced by Clemmer in his book *The Prison Community* (1940), in which he defined the term as a process of assimilation in prison where inmates take on “in greater or lesser degree . . . the folkways, mores, customs and general culture of the penitentiary” (p. 299). Just as we assimilate to norms, customs, and laws of society, inmates must assimilate to the prison community. Known as the ‘inmate code’ (Clemmer 1940), the embodied, verbal, and gestural codes considered unacceptable in the free world may be encouraged and rewarded within the prison.

In moving from general studies, such as Clemmer's investigation, to the specific, such as Sykes' (1958) and Irwin and Cressey's (1962), prison research in the second half of the twentieth century was more concerned with the dynamics of inmates' social relations within prison culture. Indeed, Sykes' ground breaking research suggests that inmates display (if not wholly subscribe to) a certain level of solidarity in opposition to prison staff. Uniting purpose and moral support, such inmate solidarity was created to offset the deprivations and 'pains of imprisonment,' such as the loss of liberty and autonomy, as well as the frustration of sexual desire (Sykes 1958). In effect, Sykes' work suggests that there are both limits to how far inmates will accept the authority of the prison staff, as well as overt and covert reasons for the inmates to resist that authority. In particular, research such as the work conducted by Ben Crewe (2006, 2007, 2011, 2012) and Yvonne Jewkes (2005, 2013) draws on Sykes' notions, such as his focus on the social community that exists within the prison and the social roles inmates enact within the prison walls.

In opposition to Sykes, some studies argue that inmate social dynamics are inherently dependent upon staff members (Mathiesen 1965), and that prison culture is defined by the exploitative nature of this relationship (Bondeson 1989; Grapendaal 1990). Nevertheless, the majority of prison sociological literature seems to agree that away from the watching eyes of staff members, "the wings and corridors of the prison would take on a complex character, comprised of action and interaction, movement and manoeuver" (Liebling and Arnold 2012: 414). Hidden within the prison is a world known only to inmates (and somewhat by staff). In essence, this is "where the action is" in prison (Goffman 1967). Upon realizing that this social world did not exist external to the wider community outside prison walls, later prison scholars

argue that the prison world interacts with the outside world, absorbing and internalizing the latter's political and social contexts into its daily operations (Jacobs 1977; Irwin 1980).

Within the prison sociological tradition, scholarship conceptualizes the prison community as formed by both 'importation' and 'deprivation' factors. Importation factors constitute values, characteristics, and habits brought into prison from the outside (Irwin and Cressey 1962), while the conditions and constraints of imprisonment encapsulate deprivation factors (Sykes 1958). To some extent, both or some combination of these models have been supported empirically, as prison research shows that there are variances in the respective contributions of imported characteristics, and the deprivations and pains of imprisonment (Liebling and Arnold 2012; see also Kruttschnitt and Gardner 2006). Yet, what must be noted is that the work of John Irwin and Donald Cressey (1962) and James Jacobs (1977) also offer a sense of how subjectivities operate within such penal environments and how inmates experience imprisonment.

Irwin and Cressey (1962) do not dispute that the inmate society was a response to imprisonment problems, but question "the emphasis given to the notion that solutions to these problems are found within the prison" (p. 145). Instead, their research depicts a version of 'criminal cultures' and subcultural norms 'imported' from the outside community. In *Stateville*, for instance, James Jacobs (1977) examines how Chicago gangs transplanted patterns of loyalty, leadership, and conflict into the prison environment, and how the prison's social structures 'reproduced' those existing in the urban ghetto. Inmate codes reflected the values of the street, and conflicts between inmates were mitigated by social, psychological, and material support provided by the gangs instead of a 'collective code' of behaviour (Jacobs 1977). Furthermore, prison administration/ management ideologies and their expectations of inmates were likewise adapted to broader social currents, legal interventions, and shifts in popular culture into the

prison (ibid). Cultural assumptions and social positions informed different perceptions of the penal institutions during this time; yet, the impact of *agency*—the capacity of individuals to actively shape their environment while engaging and being within it—was not often illuminated or always apparent in their work.

Through prisoner autobiographies and academic studies, the “subjective experience of incarceration” is now better documented (Crewe 2012: 6; see also Toch 1998; Jewkes 2005; Harvey 2007; Warr 2008), and while further studies have investigated how structure (Sykes 1958; Goffman 1961) and agency (Crewe 2004, 2012; Jewkes 2005; Liebling and Arnold 2012; Crewe et al. 2014) have impacted the experiences of inmates within incarceration, what becomes necessary is a re-examination of the structure/agency nexus within socio-spatialization. In other words, how specific spatial contexts (i.e. the prison space) are constructed, operated, and utilized speaks to how social actors (i.e. inmates) foster understandings of selfhood and identity. This discussion has been more prominent in recent U.K. studies, such as Ben Crewe and his colleagues’ (2004) study of prison space regarding the ‘emotional geographies’ inmates construct in order to let their guards down and express emotions privately and safely. Theoretically mapping out these ‘zones’ challenges typical depictions of prison spaces as unfailingly aggressive and emotionally undifferentiated (see also de Viggiani 2012 for a similar study). Crewe’s (2006) ethnographic work investigates the drug economy within prisons, in which his focus on inmates’ narratives emphasizes how the drug economy within the prison space is a meaningful act that shapes inmate hierarchies, and questions how identity is constructed when an inmate takes on the role of and perceives himself as a ‘drug dealer.’ Additionally, Crewe’s (2007) ethnographic study focused on how the prison social order functions for both the inmates and prison staff interviewed, and how power was exercised within

the prison space and how it was conceptualized between the inmates' and prison staffs' perspectives (see also Crewe 2011, 2012). Similarly, Yvonne Jewkes' (2005) ethnographic work explores how 'doing masculinity' within the prison space predominately results in hypermasculine inmates. By drawing on ethnographic data from her empirical study of four men's prisons in the United Kingdom, Jewkes (2005) argues that men in prison negotiate their position within the inmate hierarchy based on excessive displays of violent manliness. These male performances allow male inmates to simultaneously construct a 'macho' identity while attempting to 'fit in' with the dominant male culture. Indeed, her work inevitably questions whether wider social norms and hegemonic masculine ideals caused by patriarchy impact penal constructions of self.

In Europe more broadly, Gwénola Ricordeau (2008) interviewed inmates and their families in France. Her research suggests that the effects of incarceration are considerable in terms of family relationships, in that imprisonment punishes the entire family. She too found the effects of stigma to be salient for inmates' families, which often contributed to family breakdown because of the family members' desire to distance themselves from the stigma's origin, and to preserve their own identities as separate from that of the inmate. Another example is Elena Faccio and Norberto Costa's (2013) two-year ethnographic study in the Due Pallazi state prison in Padua, Italy. Their research suggests that the inmates' prison space reveals a complex universe of three basic conditions—loyalty, discipline, and circumspection—and that abiding by these conditions maintains the inmate hierarchy and social order necessary to diffuse the inmates' tension over prison overcrowding. In effect, the current project supplements existing prison sociological literature by incorporating a Canadian context, one that is much needed for Canadian prison research and Canadian prison sociology at large.

Corrections in Canada and Canadian Research Contributions

It comes as no surprise that prisons in Canada (and indeed, in much of the Western world) are viewed by the public as segregated units that house ‘bad’ people. Arguably, prisons exist to guarantee the safety of those on streets. While there are a number of officially stated reasons for imprisonment, such as protection from the public, and deterrence and rehabilitation for the inmate, Rose Ricciardelli (2014) notes that prisons have been justified as a means of confining prisoners in the interest of public safety, as well as punishing them for their wrongdoing and instilling more law-abiding behaviour. The governing body that oversees and is responsible for the management of penitentiaries and the supervision of individuals both within prison and on parole is the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC). The CSC is the federal government agency that manages sentences imposed by the court of a term of two years or more (CSC 2012). Indeed, the CSC’s mission statement outlines that as a part of the criminal justice system within Canada, this governing body respects the rule of law by actively contributing to public safety by encouraging the positive development of offenders into law-abiding citizens, all the while enacting safe, secure, reasonable, and humane control (CSC 2012).

Yet, while Canadians might believe that we imprison fewer people than other countries do, sadly that is not the case. Internationally, Canada has one of the highest incarceration rates after the United States and Russia (Comack 2008). In 2000 Canada imprisoned its population at a rate of 118 per 100,000 population compared to the European average of 84 per 100,000 people. Moreover, the rate of incarceration in provincial jails has risen 102 percent since the 1980s, and Canada imprisons young people at four times the rate that we imprison adults, and ten to fifteen times the rate of European countries (Comack 2008). To contextualize this imprisonment in financial terms, the largest portion of adult correctional service expenditures (71 percent) was

spent on custodial services in 2004/05, totalling gross adult correctional expenditures at \$2.8 billion (Beattie 2006; CAEFS 2007). Unfortunately, Canadian incarceration data have worsened more recently. Adult corrections data from 2010/11 indicate that Canada's rate of imprisonment has increased to 140 per 100,000 people (Dauvergne 2012: 6). Furthermore, among the provinces, Manitoba has the highest incarceration rate of 213 per 100,000 adult population (p. 8). The cost of operating Canada's adult correctional system totalled approximately \$4.1 billion in 2010/11, a 1.2 percent increase since 2009/2010 and a 40.2 percent increase from a decade ago (p. 10).

No longer are prisons placed within the centre of the city, to remind civilians of their responsibilities to uphold the law or face punishment (Crewe 2012). In fact, these institutions are often geographically and socially isolated from the rest of society (Hannem 2011). While more research needs to be conducted on inmates' experiences of incarceration in Canadian prisons, there are several researchers that have investigated and made significant contributions to understanding the prison experience within Canada.

James Waldram's (1997) study investigated the importance of Indigenous spirituality among Indigenous inmates. Conducting over 300 interviews with Indigenous inmates residing in prisons in two provinces (Manitoba and Saskatchewan), Waldram explores the role that Indigenous spirituality plays as a form of therapy to assist in the men's return to society, especially as these men grapple with their identities in relation to the trauma they experienced due to violence, sexual and physical abuse, alcoholism, colonialism, and systemic racism (Waldram 1997). Indeed, the men interviewed by Waldram emphasized the significance of Indigenous spirituality in their lives, and saw this spirituality as a process, one that had no logical end point, "but one that could provide a blueprint for the living of one's life in a more fulfilling,

rewarding, and altruistic way” (p. xiv). Moreover, Waldram’s interviews suggest that there is significant difficulty in creating, understanding, and maintaining an Indigenous identity “in the face of a domineering Euro-Canadian culture” (p. 63). The men interviewed located their people and their own identity within the context of the history of contact with the Euro-Canadians. It was because of Canada’s colonial history with Indigenous groups that the men felt they were “caught between two worlds” (ibid: 64), unable to fit comfortably in either the Indigenous or Euro-Canadian worlds. In effect, Waldram (1997: 67) argues that many Indigenous inmates experience identity conflict, by which “some are very seriously challenging past understandings of who they are; [while] others are only passively interested in exploring their [Indigenous] roots.” Therefore, Waldram’s research indicates that identity issues are fairly central to the overall rehabilitation process. Since identity issues are firmly rooted “within the colonial experience of oppression and policies of assimilation” (p. 67) in Canada, these issues must be handled within an Indigenous and decolonizing framework. The loss of culture and spirituality has led to a crisis in Indigenous identity, and so the work of Elders and spiritual leaders in prison, according to Waldram, represents one effort “to undo the damage done to both Aboriginal society and the Aboriginal psyche by colonization and assimilation” within Canada” (p. 111).

Stacey Hannem’s (2011) study focuses on the difficulties faced by male inmates and their family members involved in the incarceration process, particularly the negative financial implications of lost income and the added costs of maintaining contact with an incarcerated loved one. In her focus groups, Hannem found that when she interviewed female partners of incarcerated males the women reported general feelings of being targeted and under suspicion by CSC and its drug prevention policies. Most of the family members emphasized that the problem was not the routine drug screening upon entering the prison—they understood the requirements

of institutional security—but the disdainful and suspicious treatment they receive as a result. Hannem’s work finds that on the whole, family members believe that “undue blame is placed on visitors for the quantity of drugs available in prisons” (p. 207) and that it is the symbolic stigma of association with criminality that initially prompts the definition of inmates’ families as ‘risky individuals.’ Indeed, the “risky identity” (p. 209) and associated danger to institutional integrity that is assigned to family members then prompts the maintenance of an “in-group/out-group” division (p. 209) that allows prison staff to deny both inmates and their families respect and courtesy, manifesting in increased forms of stigma at an interpersonal level.

Ricciardelli’s work spans various prison sociological discussions. Conducting in-depth interviews with 56 male parolees between February 2011 and February 2012, she draws on inmates’ insights into experiences, narrative accounts, and testimonies of what occurs in Canadian federal prisons to investigate who these inmates are as individuals and the marginalized heterogeneity of the prison population in Ontario (Ricciardelli 2013, 2014; Ricciardelli et al. 2015). Ricciardelli has examined how masculinities are shaped, exerted, and reinforced within prisons, arguing that such masculinities govern social relations and guide interactions to enforce a hierarchy among prisoners whereby power and domination are asserted through physical, psychological, and material means thanks to prison masculine behaviours (Ricciardelli 2013). In particular, Ricciardelli (2014) observed how inmates perceived risk while they were incarcerated. Such ‘risk knowledges’ illustrate inmates’ understandings of risk depending on their current situation, their lived experiences, and their personhood. Indeed, she builds on this work to focus on how inmates mobilize and negotiate their masculine subjectivities to handle the uncertainty of imprisonment and the various risks encountered in prison (Ricciardelli et al. 2015).

In Out There/In Here: Masculinity, Violence and Prisoning, Elizabeth Comack (2008) makes similar claims; yet, where she differs from Ricciardelli is in her focus on the prison as a gendered space in which the Canadian government's fascination with "the resort to incarceration—especially of racialized and economically marginalized men—as a response to social anxiety" becomes intertwined with the gendering experiences of men within prison (p. 10). For these men, the "pressures to 'do' masculinity" are even more intense and exaggerated in prison (p. 10), and subsequently we find society solving the social anxiety problem by resorting to incarceration without considering how the impact of crime and violence within society exacerbates the lives of these already racialized and economically marginalized men.

Comack also addresses the racialized character of the prison system, noting that prison in Canada has become the contemporary equivalent for many young Indigenous people of what the Indian residential school represented from the early years of Confederation into the twentieth century (Jackson 1989: 216, cited in Comack 2008: 12). Indeed, speaking in terms of the white settler colonialism that has and still shapes Canada's history, Canadian prisons have been but one space of confinement within a long history of Indigenous incarceration. Other spatial forms of this incarceration include Indigenous reservations, residential schools, and the foster homes Indigenous children inhabit as they too are over-represented in the Canadian foster care system. Furthermore, Comack cites data on the staggering overrepresentation of Indigenous peoples within Canadian corrections. In 2004/05, Indigenous people comprised 3 percent of the Canadian population, yet they accounted for "22 percent of admissions to provincial jails and 17 percent of admissions to federal prisons." (p. 12) Specifically in Manitoba, a large majority of Indigenous peoples (70 percent) made up sentenced custody admissions in 2004/05, while Indigenous peoples in total comprised only 11 percent of the provincial population (Beattie 2006). This

overrepresentation has become even more severe in recent years. In 2010/11 Indigenous people accounted for 27 percent of adults in provincial and territorial custody and 20 percent of those in federal custody (Dauvergne 2012: 11).

Aside from the racial and class overtones, incarceration in Canada is overwhelming male-oriented. Indeed, even a preliminary look at prison statistics depicts this to be true, as both men and boys become the vast majority of those imprisoned (Comack 2008). In 2004/05, 89 percent of remand admissions, 90 percent of provincial/territorial sentenced admissions, and 95 percent of admissions to federally custody in Canada were men (Beattie 2006). As Comack (2008: 13) contends, often what goes unacknowledged in public discussions and the nature of crime is its “gendered character” within Canadian society. In effect, she argues, fears of crime can be reduced to discussions concerning the fears of men, especially “the familiar folk devils: gang members, rapists, wife beaters, drug dealers, and robbers” (p. 13).

While researchers such as Waldram, Hannem, Ricciardelli, and Comack have pioneered investigations that chart a greater understanding of the ‘prisoning’ experience (Comack 2008) that takes place in Canada, more research is needed that speaks to the ways in which identity and space constitute each other within a Canadian context. In the next section, I discuss how identity construction within prison impacts the experiences of incarceration, and explain how inmate roles become consistently ‘performed’ by the men—in other words, the creation of a ‘yard face’—as they encounter the prison environment.

Identity: Role Concepts and Performance

Erving Goffman's work was essential in establishing a literature that forges connections between sociological and social psychological understandings of prison. His work was pivotal in theorizing how an individual presents him- or herself in everyday life (Goffman 1959, 1961), arguing that daily interactions involved individuals that presented 'front-stage selves' while concealing their 'back-stage selves' in social situations. Moreover, he theorized how individuals will, to differing degrees and in different ways, incorporate "front management" tactics to protect themselves from potential exploitation by others (Goffman 1959: 23). Indeed, it was in Goffman's (1961) classic prison research that he examined inmates engaging in front management tactics. What he observed were men attempting to masquerade their private, pre-prison selves and present a public persona of bodily, verbal, and gestural codes demanded by the predominately masculine prison environment. In effect, such 'inmate codes' provided men the opportunity to enter into and maintain interactions with other inmates, and assisted them in navigating the prison environment safely.

However, while Goffman has pioneered research that explored a range of topics, from the ritual and routine physical interactions of individuals (Goffman 1967) to the ways in which individuals alter their bodies, words, and gestures to sustain a coherent interaction (Goffman 1972), his influence surrounding the interpretive schemata of being within micro-social interactions necessitates further discussion, and with it a greater understanding of how roles and statuses intertwine with the multiplicity of identities that can be created.

Interestingly, Goffman (1972: 75) argues that there are few concepts within the sociological imagination more commonly used than 'role' and "few that are accorded more

importance.” In this sense, defining particular role concepts would benefit how identity becomes performed in both day-to-day interactions and interactions found within prisons and jails. While status refers to “a position in some system or a pattern of positions” that is related to other positions through reciprocal ties, through responsibilities and rights centred on the individual (p. 75), a role consists of the activity an individual would engage in if they were “to act solely in terms of normative demands” upon someone in their position (p. 75). Additionally, a role should be distinguished from a ‘role performance,’ which is the actual enactment or conduct of the particular individual while they are performing their position. Role, then, is the “basic unit of socialization” as it is through roles that tasks in society can be allocated and arranged to enforce their performance (p. 77).

Goffman is clear in distinguishing how an individual, when performing a role, must see to it that the impressions of them “that are conveyed in the situation are compatible with role-appropriate ... qualities” effectively imputed onto them (p. 77). In other words, the social interactions of inmates dictate that they must ‘look tough’ while ‘acting cool,’ and that they must tread the delicate balance of getting along with other inmates but insofar as not to present polite qualities, as such expressions become conflated with weakness or ‘being punked’ in prison (see Chapter 4 for further investigation and elaboration of this balance). Enacting such performances of ‘looking tough’ and ‘acting cool,’ then, compels the inmate to control and monitor his expressions and behaviours to ensure consistent and appropriate treatment within the prison. As a result, such expressions and behaviours become (re)produced in order to enact a ‘yard face.’

From ‘Saving Face’ to ‘Yard Face’

Establishing a state of talk modifies the content, risks, and opportunities face-to-face talk provides, which is essential in types of social encounters that incorporate conversations (Goffman 1983). Insofar as participants in an encounter commit themselves to “keeping conversational channels open and in good working order ... [t]he satisfaction of ritual constraints safeguards not only feelings but conversation” as well (Goffman 1983: 18). ‘Ritual constraints’ can be conflated with the act of ‘saving face,’ by which a singular participant (or the entire group) attempt to maintain interaction by means of activating specific behaviour, speech patterns, dress, and manner that have been agreed upon by the group (Goffman 1967). However, ‘saving face’ in prison is uniquely expressed with various attributes associated with the prison culture, as the social relations, language, authority structure, and social categories vary from the outside public and their respective encounters (Goffman 1961; Sabo et al. 2001; Caputo-Levine 2012; Crewe et al. 2014). In doing so, incarcerated men make alterations, such as the understanding of one’s body, identity, and self in relation to the adoption of a specific inmate code and the behaviours that such codes require. As we shall see in Chapter four, these alterations can produce a “yard face” (Caputo-Levine 2012) that provides a framework for men in prison to follow; specifically, within such spaces as the prison gym or recreational room where such alterations to behaviour are emphasized. Not only does this face establish a structure of necessities and possibilities that preserve boundaries between inmates within encounters, but it sets standards for “systems of durable and transposable dispositions,” manners of representation, speaking, and thereby of feeling and thinking (Caputo-Levine 2012: 169).

Contemporary identity research has begun to describe the intersections between social identities and “the crosscutting of identities, statuses, and roles” (Navárez et al. 2009: 63; see

also Ashmore et al. 2004; Steward and McDermott 2004). As Rafael Navárez and his colleagues (2009: 64) contend, what becomes at stake for future identity research are questions about the various linkages of different identity domains, how the various aspects of the self intersect, and how “various identities become active or inactive as people locate themselves in various social contexts.” To this end, the notion of intersectionality becomes relevant to examine when researching the crossroads of identities, and how such identities configure to power relations implied by social contexts and structures. The interactions among various components of a person’s identities are “complex and difficult to schematize or isolate analytically” (Navárez et al. 2009: 64), and therefore an intersectional perspective permits new facets of knowledge to be discovered and new questions raised, such as the processes by which identities merge with each other.

The emergence of unique ways to experience self from the result of such intersections—such as through religiosity, spirituality, and socioeconomic, cultural, and historical background similarities with others, to name a few—should be drawn upon in order to further understand how selfhood is both impacted and altered throughout the life-course. While the terms ‘religion’ and ‘spirituality’ are often used interchangeably, they are used distinctively here, as some inmates may adhere to religious ideas while others may recognize spirituality as more conducive to their selfhood. As Harold Koenig and his colleagues (2001: 18) contend, religion is characterized by the belief in a superhuman power and “an organized system of beliefs, symbols and rituals that facilitate closeness to the sacred.” It also involves non-sacred goals such as social status and social networking (Stringer 2009). Conversely, spirituality is broadly understood as a “personal quest ... [for] answers to ultimate questions about life, meaning ... and relationships to the sacred” (p. 18). Thus, spirituality is often emotion-oriented and inwardly directed (Springer

2009). In order to maintain a sense of self and assist in their navigation through incarceration, research has shown that inmates may incorporate religious or spiritual activities (prayer, reading religious/spiritual texts, participating in religious/spiritual activities) to either reaffirm a past self or create “a new sense of self to cope with prison life” (Kerley and Copes 2009: 229, see also Maruna et al. 2006; Ward and Marshall 2007).

Additionally, research has shown that inmates may gain a greater sense of self through their connections to their racial/ethnic backgrounds. As Michael Weinrath and his colleagues (2012: 37) note, in 2007-2008 Indigenous Canadians made up 12 percent of the adult Canadian population in Manitoba, but comprised “66 to 69 percent of admissions to remand or sentenced to custody.” In other words, an Indigenous person “is over five times as likely to be incarcerated” as is a non-Indigenous person (p. 38). Given the over-representation of Indigenous men in custody (Perreault 2009), Indigenous inmates may find solace by engaging in Indigenous activities or joining Indigenous groups or gangs in order to maintain their sense of selfhood within prison. As such, it is important to examine how inmate identity construction vis-à-vis race/ethnicity has become impacted by the experience of incarceration, and upon the release back to the community.

Identity construction within a penal context takes on many challenges, and having to act in relation to a kaleidoscope of shifting and fluid identities, the inmate predominantly incorporates a masculine identity into how they manage their appearance or ‘front’ that is displayed to a wider group or public generally (Goffman 1961). To what degree do these men engage in hypermasculine behaviours—that is, the adoption of overly aggressive, physical, and intimidating tendencies?

Masculinity

What constitutes masculinity varies across time and place, as race, class, and sexual orientation will impact constructions of masculinity differently within and across societies (Inkle 2014). Therefore, it is essential to recognize that traditional/normative masculinity—which is defined in opposition to femininity as “strong, rational, dominant, invulnerable, powerful, independent, sexually aggressive, and so on” (p. 5)—remains predominant in Western society, particularly in settings where males may be vulnerable, such as in prison (Toch 1991; Sabo et al. 2001; Evans and Wallace 2008; Ricciardelli 2014). Indeed, at any given time, one form of masculinity is culturally exalted, and considering how traditional/normative masculinity has reigned as ‘hegemonic masculinity’ (Connell 1995, 2008; Connell and Messerschmidt 2005; Messerschmidt 2001, 2010, 2012), this notion is unsurprising. The notion of hegemonic masculinity as normative suggests that this practice of embodying specific types of ‘manhood’ requires all men to position themselves in relation to it. While there may exist both pluralities and hierarchies of masculinities, ideologically hegemonic masculinity legitimates patriarchal societies and “the global subordination of women to men” (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005: 832). As Raewyn Connell and James Messerschmidt (2005) argue although it could be supported through force, hegemony does not mean violence; rather, masculine dominance means “ascendancy through culture, institutions, and persuasion” (p. 832).

In terms of masculinity within the prison, Evan and Wallace (2008: 486) note:

Dominant forms and codes of masculinity can serve to legitimize violence, both towards others and the self, as a means of dealing with emotional pain, while talking about difficult feelings or asking for help would only lead to a loss of masculine power.

Certainly, the norms of traditional/normative masculinity are so pervasive that even when it conflicts with their beliefs, inner feelings, and values, males report experiencing intense pressure to perform their identities in this way (ibid. 2008). Such a split between the inner self and the outer performance increases emotional vulnerability, isolation, and stress overall (Evans and Wallace 2008; Inkle 2014).

Indeed, as Crewe (2014: 396) claims, one of the most significant absences from prison sociology is “the analysis of emotional flows between men in prison.” Turning to the notion of hypermasculinity, however, illustrates how the prison becomes a setting where the complexities of gendered experiences are evident, “in which the pressures on men to ‘do’ masculinity are even more intense and exaggerated” (Comack 2008: 10). In essence, a hypermasculine identity “is the belief that danger is exciting, violence is manly, aggression is acceptable, and going against authority displays a sense of power” (Porter 2012: 47; see also Mosher and Sirkin 1984; Mosher and Tomkins 1988; Ricciardelli et al. 2015). It is important to remember that this definition is a Westernized and culturally constructed form of masculinity, and that Indigenous forms of masculinity may vary significantly (McKegney 2014) For example McKegney (2014) points out that a Māori masculinity would differ from a Cree masculinity, which would differ from a Maoli masculinity, as all of these forms of masculinity claim “distinct cultural heritages that inform distinct cosmologies of gender” (p. 7). Furthermore, research has shown that while masculinity is homosocial—“performed for, and judged by, other men” (Kimmel 2008: 47)—when we situate hypermasculinity within a prison context, Hans Toch (1998: 173) argues that the ideology of hypermasculinity illuminates an important theme in prison violence, which is that “the fearful—those showing apprehension—are inviting targets of predation.” He goes on to say that two objectives can be achieved when one inmate assaults another who is fearful: “(a) one shows

contempt for the man's demeaning 'femininity,' while (b) one reassures oneself that one is different (i.e. non-fearful) from one's target" (p. 173). Indeed, as Donald Mosher and Sylvan Tomkins (1988: 63) point out, "fear is a deadly affect for successful warfare, being the most serious enemy within. It is assigned to the enemies to be defeated.... A man must not weep, but rather make his enemy cry out in surrender."

Therefore, inmates who live in this hypermasculine world are routinely subjected to "character contests" with other inmates (Toch 1998: 174), in which status is conferred on those who best live up to the prescriptions of the hypermasculine identity. Inevitably, these hypermasculine attitudes and belief systems permeate the other facets of the inmate's selfhood, making it more difficult for the inmate to cast off his 'hypermasculine character' over time. For example, in his study of Indigenous masculinity, Sam McKegney (2014) uses the term "masculindians" to foreground the popular representations of Indigenous men found in settler culture. He quotes Brian Klopotek:

For at least the last century, hypermasculinity has been one of the foremost attributes of the Indian world that whites have imagined. With squaws and princesses usually playing secondary roles, Indian tribes are populated predominately by noble or ignoble savages, wise old chiefs, and cunning warriors. These imagined Indian nations comprise an impossibly masculine race. (Klopotek cited in McKegney 2014: 1)

Moreover, McKegney contends that investigating what it means to be 'masculine' and 'Indian' provides a means of tracking "colonial simulations and technologies of coercion that have served to alienate Indigenous men from tribal specific roles and responsibilities" (p. 3). Indeed, images of 'Indian' hypermasculinities have the power to consolidate settler-colonial and normative masculinities. Therefore, critiquing simulated settler stereotypes about Indigenous men opens up discussions of how settler definitions of Indigenous masculinity have been used to imagine and

empower white settler male identities that serve the struggles of community reintegration, heteropatriarchy, assimilation into dominant white cultures, and Indigenous continuance (McKegney 2014).

In effect, while identity and hypermasculinity appear synonymous on the surface, in actuality these two notions are significantly different. While hypermasculinity refers to attitudes of machismo, bravado, and hyper-aggression, identity is the focus of all possible and potential selves an individual can crystalize and constellate together to form both a present self (i.e. who the individual is now) and future self (i.e. who the individual works to be in the future). As a set of qualities, hypermasculinity is expressed in specific environments, and although it is not an all-encompassing identity trait, a hypermasculine identity can be forged within prisons and consistently (re)produced amongst daily social interactions within its walls. Therefore, a greater focus on how men mobilize and negotiate their hypermasculine behaviours to handle imprisonment and their community reintegration becomes central to further advancing conceptualizations regarding (hyper)masculine subjectivities, identity construction, and penal environments.

Concluding Remarks

Taken together, the intersections between the research of prison sociology, identity, and masculinity comprise a constellation of meaning that characterizes various accounts of how an inmate navigates the physical sites of the prison and the psychological landscapes of self. Examining the tradition of prison sociological inquiry reveals the journey scholars have taken to question how the prison structure impacts inmate agency within its walls. Scholarship originating from the U.S.A. and the U.K. has pioneered the way in order to bring inmate issues to the forefront of

academic and public circles; yet, more investigation is needed to examine how the multifaceted notions of identity and masculinity intertwine within carceral settings.

In recent decades, Canadian research has begun to contribute to the existing literature, but what needs to be analyzed further is how the experience of incarceration modifies identity construction and how such formations become detrimental to these men upon their release back into society. In line with the argument made by Ricciardelli and her colleagues (2015: 18), the existing literature on prison (hyper)masculinities “does not sufficiently capture the nuanced differences in how forms of gender are tempered ... within penal cultures and structures.” The distinctive manifestations of physical and emotional vulnerabilities of these men must be investigated further, as such manifestations are often “interrelated, mutually constitutive and ... exacerbated by uncertainty within the institutional context, particularly the perceived arbitrary exercises of power shaping prison living” (p. 18).

This chapter has illustrated the study of the prison sociological tradition, the various contributions made within both Canada and internationally, and the range of behavioural strategies employed by men in response to their perceptions of incarceration in order to decrease vulnerability and consequently increase status within carceral settings. Canadian research contributions have the ability to build upon existing prison sociological inquiry by analyzing in greater depth how inmate role strategies are adaptive within the penal environment, and how (hyper)masculinities impact identity formations, role performances, and socio-cultural and penal contexts. The next chapter supplements this understanding of identity construction by bringing spatial and place theory into view. The aim is to distinguish how spatiality and place-making processes impact identity and the ontological self in terms of how the prison constitutes itself as a geographical, spatiotemporal, and cultural entity.

Chapter Two

Space and Place in the Prison and Community

While this project focuses on the architecture of carceral space, masculinity, and impression management strategies and inmate identity constructions, it is central to understand how spatial and place theory enriches what can be known about the prison and its impact on men moving in and out of the prison system. This chapter examines how space is both socially and physically constructed in prisons. Carceral space, within which the experiences of incarceration are set, impacts the identity (re)constructions and behaviour of inmates throughout their interactions. Additionally, Moran (2012a: 306) asserts that carceral geography entails a new and vibrant field of “geographical studies into practices of incarceration, viewing such carceral spaces broadly as a type of institution whose distributional geographies, and geographies of internal and external social and spatial relations, could be explored.” Indeed, examining space and place provide a robust context for informing a study about incarceration in the Manitoba context.

As a starting point, it is necessary to discuss what is space and how physical and social space operate and permeate one another to (re)produce the agents that tend to habituate these spaces. Conceptualizing what it means to be within a space of carcerality and understanding the conditions under which such carceral spaces function overall are central to such a discussion. I propose that the prison is a) a ‘place space,’ b) a ‘social space,’ and c) a ‘carceral space.’ The prison space in general affects prison identities that are (re)created and (re)configured in the penal environment.

Prison as ‘place space’

As a ‘place space,’ the inmate gains a sense of ‘being-there’ that is instrumental in his ability to navigate himself through the prison culture appropriately. As Nigel Thrift (2003: 102) argues, “place space” centres on the notion that certain spaces are more ‘human’ than others, and that certain places permit bodies to live out more easily (or in this regard, at least approximate) “a particular Western idea of what human being should be being.” In doing so, place space consists of “particular rhythms of being” (p. 102) that confirm, naturalize, and evoke particular embodiments, emotions, memories, and the existence of certain spaces. As Edward Soja (1989) contends, spatiality is socially (re)produced and, like society itself, exists as an “‘embodiment’ and [as a] medium of social life” (p. 120). When we situate prison spaces within place, what arises from the research is that emotional expression becomes more or less ‘governable’ through formal and informal prison codes (Kupers 2005; Gear 2007; Evans and Wallace 2008). Contextualizing emotional geographies that inmates traverse frequently (Davidson and Milligan 2004; Crewe et al. 2014) allows us to examine how these individuals embody the penal environment and grants us license to investigate how they situate themselves within a prison setting.

It is important to consider how inmates interact with prison place spaces, as a sense of place subsumes a variety of related concepts, such as “rootedness, insidedness, [and] place identity” (Kyle and Chick 2007: 211). As Robert Hay (1998: 7) indicates:

Sense of place studies ... can be broader than those on place attachment by assessing ... subjective qualities (the sensing of place to create personal meaning) and social context in a geographic region, as well as community and ancestral connections to place.

Indeed, Hay’s (1998) conceptualization of sense of place and his emphasis on ‘personal meaning’ and the ‘social context’ complements the place space theorization. Rather than a

collection of universally defined physical attributes, places are symbolic contexts imbued with meaning (Kyle and Chick 2007). In effect, meanings emerge and evolve through ongoing interaction with other inmates and the prison environment. The meanings individuals and collectivities ascribe to a place are reflections of individual and cultural identity. For example, when inmates perceive areas such as the prison grounds or ‘the yard’—a sub-place within the grander prison place space scheme—they construct meanings of relaxation and/or stress alleviation (Caputo-Levine 2012). Furthermore, while all of the inmates imbue personal meanings within their idiosyncratic experiences of incarceration, the social context of the sense of place can be shared collectively. In other words, the prison place space itself—as a physical or geographic location, as a cultural community, as a checkpoint on inmates’ life-course trajectories, or as some combination of the three—becomes the commonality that connects the inmates together.

Prison as ‘social space’

As a ‘social space,’ the prison (re)produces social processes and interactions that the inmate must come to know as conceived, perceived, and lived through certain spaces’ exclusivity, boundaries, fixity, and social distances between inmates and other spaces. When we consider social space within a prison setting, it becomes necessary to qualify what it means to exist within a social space. Lefebvre ([1974]/1991) contends that within the modern era, physical or natural space is slowly diminishing and what is created in its place is social space; as every society produces its own space, what is constructed is a space with its own rhythms, routines, and daily interactions. In this respect, a “conceptual triad” (p. 33) formulates from social space: (1) spatial practice, which “secretes the society’s space” (p. 38) and is revealed through the deciphering of such

space; (2) representations of space, which entails space conceptualized by planners, urbanists, and social engineers—all of whom identify “what is lived and what is perceived with what is conceived”(p. 38); and (3) representational space, which is space that is directly lived through its associated images and symbols. Representational spaces exist as the “space of the ‘inhabitants’” (p. 39). Furthermore, Lefebvre argues that there exists a dialectical relationship within “the triad of the perceived, conceived and the lived,” (p. 39) and that all three contribute in different ways to the production of space “according to their qualities and attributes ... and to the society” in question (p. 46). With this in mind, Lefebvre claims that social space is not a product among other products; rather, social space subsumes things produced, and encompasses their interrelationships in their coexistence and simultaneity—or, in other words, “their (relative) order and/or (relative) disorder” (p. 73).

Lefebvre’s focus on social space is significant to this thesis project, as his theory of space attempts to show how the materiality and symbolic meaning of social space can impact physical space itself. In effect, showing the dialectical relationship between spaces and bodies illustrates how structure and agency—and how power and resistance along Foucauldian axes—interact, operate, and work through subjects that inhabit prison spaces. This argument becomes significant when we situate prison identities within this conceptual triad. When the inmate *perceives* the prison, he is observing the routines and practices that have been naturalized within the space itself. In effect, the inmate attempts to alter his sense of self to synchronize with the spatial practice operating within the formal penal system. When the inmate *conceives* the prison, he views the same structure that the prison architects, planners, and engineers had conceptualized and subsequently erected in a physical space: a representation of space that is a spectacle of both surveillance and security, constructed to house and punish all who are held within the penal

edifice. Finally, when the inmate *lives* the prison, he observes a representational space that impacts his selfhood. Consequently, the inmate is a unique figure that research has been attempting to understand for decades (Goffman 1961; Sabo et al. 2001; Kupers 2005; Gear 2007; Evans and Wallace 2008).

While agreeing with Goffman (1961) when he states that “the inmates are moved, the system is not” (p. 51), it is important to understand that the boundaries of social space do not confine *in toto*. While the prison in general may be framed by physical boundaries of separation that demarcate certain spaces from others, social spaces are framed by the codes of conduct inmates use to navigate prison culture. When inmates engage in activities to (re)affirm their hypermasculine demeanour, they invariably utilize the inmate codes—comprised of bodily, gestural, and verbal codes, as discussed in the previous chapter—to provide a safe passage into certain social spaces (i.e. particular ‘cliques’ within inmate groups). As a result, emotional zones are (re)constructed insofar as the space that is delineated by social boundaries enables inmates to locate ‘safe spaces’ to seek refuge from the inmate code, such as in visiting rooms, prison chapels, and classrooms (Crewe et al. 2014). Such spaces have been known to provide mental and emotional release for health benefits (Moran 2013a and 2013b; Crewe et al. 2014).

Prison as ‘carceral space’

Finally, as a ‘carceral space,’ the increasing trend of the construction of ‘supermax’ prisons positively impacts the inmates’ ‘docile bodies’ and (re)affirms inmates’ hypermasculine selfhood while within the prison and, subsequently, the urbanized ghetto they return to once their sentence expires. As Foucault (1984: 252) argues, space is fundamental in any exercise of power. While it is evident that prison space should constitute a carceral space, there is benefit to investigating

this notion further to unearth new facets of knowledge concerning how incarceration and carcerality influence the reciprocal relationship between prison spaces and identities. As research has outlined, it comes as no surprise that incarceration has a negative impact on the inmate, regarding friendships (Corley 2001), psychological well-being and mental health (Kupers 2005; Evans and Wallace 2008), recidivism and reintegration back into their community (Wacquant 2000), trust in prison administration and authority (Goffman 1961), the effort worked upon the inmate's own body involving discipline and training (Foucault 1995), and sports in prison (Sabo 2001).

What has been a substantially understudied yet growing enterprise, however, is the literature and discipline of carceral geography (Jewkes 2013; Moran 2012a, 2013a, and 2013b; Milhaud and Moran 2013; Moran et al. 2013). A focus of carceral geography has been on “hyperincarceration” (Moran 2012a, 2013a, and 2013b), which is what Loïc Wacquant (2009: 3) refers to as the “brutal swing from the social to the penal management of poverty,” particularly in North America. Hyperincarceration is the “punitive revamping” (Wacquant 2000: 384) of public policy tackling urban marginality through punitive containment, establishing a kind of “single carceral continuum” between the prison and the urban ghetto.

In gaining a stronger understanding of carceral geography and hyperincarceration we ultimately provide grounds to consider how agency, identity (re)construction, and mobility of inmates within such penal systems are influenced by carceral spaces. As Foucault (1995) states, the prison is an apparatus of corrective penalty, in which the point of application of the penalty is not the representation, but “body, time, everyday gestures and activities” (p. 128); the soul as well, insofar as the soul and the body combined forms “the seat of habits.” Inmates make alterations to themselves, such as the adoption of the inmate code or increasing their conformity

to the “cult of muscularity” in order to compete for hegemonic hypermasculine status within the carceral space (Holmberg 2001: 89). Arguably, these tactics on the body are similar to what de Certeau (1984: 29) argues are tactics that are “creative and flexible,” and as such can be seen as tactics to increase the muscular image of the inmate in order to enhance his hypermasculine demeanour and to “challenge assaults on identity” (Jewkes 2013: 128). Furthermore, the creation of carceral spaces highlights the emergence of the prison as the “institutionalization of the power to punish” (Foucault 1995: 130), and with it marks punishment as the strategy for disciplining the inmates within the penal system.

Foucault (1995) claims that in order for the carceral space to discipline inmates, the inmates must become “docile bodies” by which they could be “subjected, used, transformed or improved” (p. 136). The prison space as a carceral space, then, is both a machinery and a “laboratory of power” in which inmates may be brought into the space, explored, broken down, and rearranged, insofar that the inmates not only “may do as one wishes,” but operate as one wishes, “with the techniques, the speed and the efficiency that one determines.” In effect, such discipline would transform inmates into docile bodies that could be observed and surveyed more easily and readily within the prison setting (Bauman 2000).

As Foucault (1995: 143) argues, “disciplinary space is always ... cellular” in the sense that while discipline organizes an analytical space for further inmate surveillance, “in order to know, master, and use the conduct of each individual within the space” it becomes necessary to individualize disciplinary space. Inevitably, as the frequency of exerting disciplinary action increases (for example, the greater the use of solitary confinement by the prison administration to deal with inmate misconduct), the higher degree of likelihood that the prison will naturalize the high amount of surveillance and control within the carceral space. As will be discussed, the

carceral space has the tendency to legitimate “the legal power to punish, as it ‘legalizes’ the technical power to discipline” (p. 143).

Nowhere is solitary confinement more profound than in ‘supermax’ prisons. As Kate King and her colleagues (2008) claim, the super maximum security structure was designed to contain “the worst of the worst” offenders within this type of prison, such as those inmates who do not conform to prison administrative rules, and those who attack and kill other inmates and prison staff. This special type of housing involves “twenty-three hour-per-day, single-cell incarceration for extended periods of time” (Mears and Bales 2010: 545). Indeed, the psychological harm solitary confinement can induce is insurmountable (Metzer and Fellner 2010; Shalev 2011). Furthermore, gaining access to such documents concerning the well-being and treatment of inmates, as well as touring prison sites to gain such knowledge at the public level, has become increasingly difficult in the last decade (Piché and Walby 2010; Walby and Piché 2011).

Prison administration, as the sovereign of the physical penal structure, imposes their protocols and codes of conduct—i.e. their ‘laws’—upon the inmates they seek to control and secure within the prison order. This administration collectivizes the individual phenomenon of incarceration and, through their processes of calculation and quantification, categorizes individual inmate’s cases on a spectrum of risk for misbehaviour and resistance to prison rule. In an attempt to reduce ‘deviant normalities’ of inmates—i.e. selective cases in which the inmate frequently runs higher risks of prison rule resistance—the use of solitary confinement is implemented. What occurs here is in reference to Foucault’s (2007) argument, in which a prison administration—enforcing solitary confinement as an apparatus of security—inevitably takes an inmate population and plots them onto “different curves of normality” (p. 63), in which this

plotting of what constitutes as the ‘normal’ versus the ‘abnormal’ inmate establishes an operation of normalization that sheds light on “the distributions of normality” within prisons. In doing so, the prison administration attempts to bring “the most unfavourable in line with the most favourable,” which both reduces the risk of danger and secures the population from this danger—such as the risk of prison riots (Franke 1992; Rhodes 2001; King et al. 2008)—that could spread and ‘contaminate’ the population.

When we focus this effect of treatment within the notion of the carceral space, it is no wonder that hypermasculine demeanours are (re)constructed. The dehumanizing treatment of the inmate becomes internalized within himself, insofar that it perpetuates his need to build up a hypermasculine image of intimidation and resistance. Moreover, such a demeanour is only exacerbated when prison architectural designs reinforce the themes of isolation, confinement, and punishment in the carceral space. As Bert Useem and Anne Morrison Piehl (2008) argue, architectural designs for such carceral spaces predominantly include the imposition on their residents’ “near-complete deprivation of personal liberties, barren living conditions, control centres that regulate movement within the prison, exterior fences draped with concertina wire, lines painted on hallway floors that limit where inmates may walk, little and ill-paid work, and endless tedium” (p. 3). Additionally, such actions impact the heightened security and surveillance of prison architecture, as there have been increasing trends in prison operational procedures, including additional gun coverage by prison staff, “cancelling evening activities, tighter controls on visitation, and a reconfiguration of offices and shops to enhance security.” (p. 110)

Inmate Re-entry and Community Reintegration

According to Foucault (1995), the prison “makes possible, even encourages, the organization of a milieu of delinquents” that are “hierarchized, ready to aid and abet any future criminal act” (p. 267). In this sense, it becomes important to understand the impact that the carceral space has on the inmate once he leaves the prison. Additionally, the conditions to which the inmates are subjected to outside the carceral space condemn them to recidivism, as they are under closer police surveillance, assigned to particular residences within the urban core (or forbidden from other residences and areas), and are unable to find work outside the prison (Foucault 1995; Wacquant 2000). Ultimately, the hypermasculine demeanour that was managed by the inmate becomes so naturalized within the prison-as-carceral space that it is brought outside the prison walls to be performed with the daily interactions of freed inmates. Similarly, the inmate code learned within the prison setting—through the bonds formed with inmate groups that comprise substance abusers and drug dealers—is shifted into the urban core from the carceral periphery, in which the urban ghetto becomes a hot spot for subsequent recidivism and other illegal activities (Bauman 2000; Wacquant 2000, 2009).

Moreover, while it is arguable to say that there exists more privacy and emotional zones outside the prison, this does not exclude the impact of the prison-as-carceral space on the family of the inmate. According to Foucault (1995), the prison indirectly “produces delinquents by throwing the inmate’s family into destitution” (p. 268). Consequently, it is in this way that “crime can take root” (p. 267), which adds more individuals into the consistent carceral continuum and perpetuates the carceral cycle further.

More emotional zones outside the prison do not imply that emotional and mental stress will be alleviated from the inmate when he returns home. Just as the prison “cleanses the social body from the temporary blemish of those of its members who have committed crimes,” the homes that freed inmates return to are predominantly in urbanized ghettos (Wacquant 2000: 383). Such spaces are distinct insofar as they too contain a homogeneously marginalized population that has been “banished” from the broader society, and supplies “the scaffolding for the construction of its specific ‘style of life’ and social strategies” (p. 383). Inevitably, the ghetto engages a dishonoured category of society and “severely curtails the life chances of its members” (p. 383).

In doing so, Foucault (1995) suggests that the prison is a “double economic error” (p. 268): directly, by its intrinsic cost to society’s taxpayers, and indirectly, by the cost of the delinquency that the carceral space did not abolish. Unable to overcome the delinquency that was exacerbated by the carceral space, freed inmates thus have a higher propensity to recidivate (Foucault 1995; Wacquant 2000), which inevitably forces them to return to the prison from the urban core. This “carceral continuum” of criminality (Wacquant 2000: 384) or “revolving door” (Useem and Morrison Piehl 2008: 43) is thereby perpetuated by the carceral spaces created to diminish criminality in the first place. What occurs here is incarceration in two respects: incarceration within the prison-as-carceral space and incarceration in terms of “mechanisms of surveillance” used to trace inmates once they exit the prison (Foucault 1995: 299), such as through Global Positioning Satellite (GPS) monitoring and constant police check-ins of the inmates at their residence. In effect, the inmate himself is trapped within the web of policing and surveillance techniques that ultimately arrange themselves to influence the inmate into recidivism once more.

Wacquant's understanding of 'reintegration' contrasts with the view of the Foucauldian lens. Wacquant claims that Foucault erred in spotting the retreat of the prison; nor has the prison "lost its *raison d'être*" (Foucault 1977: 297-298, cited in Wacquant 2010a: 205). On the contrary, Wacquant contends that penal confinement has made a "stunning comeback" and reaffirmed itself among the central missions of Leviathan just as Foucault and his followers predicted its demise (Wacquant 2010a: 205). Techniques of penal 'normalization,' such as elaborate time schedules, hierarchical classifications, non-idleness, and the regimentation and close-up examination of the body, have been rendered "wholly impracticable by the demographic chaos spawned by overpopulation, bureaucratic rigidity, resource depletion, and the studious indifference if not hostility of penal authorities towards rehabilitation" (p. 205).

Furthermore, Wacquant insists that community reintegration is completely absurd, as the widening of the penal net within our contemporary era is remarkably discriminating; it affects the marginalized populations of society. Contrary to Foucault's assertion that penalization is an "all-encompassing master logic" that blindly traverses the social order to bend and bind its various constituents, penalization is a "skewed technique proceeding along sharp gradients of class, ethnicity, and place" (p. 205), functioning as a population divider that seeks to differentiate categories according to establishing conceptions of 'moral worth.' Therefore, it is misleading to speak of prisoner re-entry and community reintegration, insofar as the vast majority of former inmates who are released experience not re-entry but "*ongoing circulation between the two poles of a continuum of forced confinement*" formed by the prison and the dilapidated, broken-down neighborhoods returned to upon release (Wacquant 2010b: 611, italics in original; see also Wacquant 2000, 2002, 2010a). Similarly, former inmates must navigate their 'docile bodies'

both within and outside the formal prison structure, exacerbating this continuum further as they attempt to balance degrees of agency versus degrees of docility upon release.

Nevertheless, when an inmate is released back into the community, it is significant to consider the degree to which the impact of imprisonment within carceral spaces influences—or will continue to influence—his ability to formulate an identity for himself. Contrary to hypermasculine identities, such formulated identities are those that empower the men to conceptualize emotionality and cultural heritage—and their own versions of manhood—differently. In other words, we must question if certain carceral spaces—whether it be the experiences within such spaces or the physicality and the architecture of the spaces themselves—become points of significance along the linear trajectories of inmates’ lives. Arguably, these points of significance become substantial to the inmates in determining how to chart their life-course once they return to the community.

The Needs for Reintegration

In terms of inmates’ chances of acceptance in the everyday world post-release, Terri Winnick and Mark Bodkin’s (2008) study indicates that these men are marked with a highly discredited status (such as ‘ex-con’) and upon their return into their communities, ex-inmates will “adopt some sort of stigma management strategy” in an attempt to counteract the pervasive, negatively stereotyped beliefs about inmates that are prevalent in Western society (p. 300). These strategies include hiding the discredited status (i.e. secrecy), avoiding social interactions in public (i.e. withdrawal) and educating or “preventative telling” (p. 300) the public about the ex-inmates’ backgrounds (i.e. explaining and discussing the reasons why the men committed their crimes).

It is important to note, however, that not all ex-inmates adopt stigma management strategies, and that the ex-inmates vary in the degree to which they are subject to “community-imposed stigma” (Westervelt and Cook 2012: 175) or “public stigma” (Moore et al. 2013; see also LeBel 2012). While the use of stigma management strategies may soften or avert the negative anticipated public stigma, such strategies do have their costs. As Winnick and Bodkin (2008: 300) contend, preventative telling risks further stigmatization; “withdrawal keeps one positioned outside the opportunity structure; and secrecy increases tension and precludes close personal relationships.” Additionally, the use of stigma management strategies impedes ex-inmates’ ability to develop a stronger definition of self, as the men (and their identities) taken from their communities upon incarceration may not be the same as when they return to their communities. In other words, Sandra Westervelt and Kimberly Cook (2012: 168) use trauma as an example of how significant events in the life-course can alter identity construction:

Trauma disrupts the sense of self. For some, traumatic experiences attack the very core of survivors’ beliefs about self and the very world around them. Trauma shatters preconceived understandings of their worth and value; it discounts the control and agency that survivors felt they had over their lives prior to the traumatic experience.

Substituting trauma for incarceration, the act of incarceration—coupled with the pains of imprisonment—signifies an attack on the self and alters the ex-inmates’ understandings of self, autonomy, masculinity, and self-worth. Once released to their communities, ex-inmates feel a sense of “disorientation and displacement” (p. 169; see also Jamieson and Grounds 2005). Lost in the gap between how the ex-inmate views and defines himself and how others view and define the ex-inmate, the ex-inmate feels a sort of “identity frustration” (Westervelt and Cook 2012: 174) that inhibits him from constructing a positive self that bridges the gap. Subsequently, these

men battle the social and economic consequences of being stigmatized as ‘ex-con’ and increase their chances of possibly being involved in further criminal behaviour in the future (LeBel 2012).

However, there is potential for ex-inmates to engage in activism when they return to their communities. As Hames-Garcia (2004) suggests, ex-inmates have utilized the power of writing (short stories, poems, autobiographies, etc.) as a form of resistance to combat the penal system and to reinforce the need for society at large to become more aware of the conditions and treatment within incarceration. The John Howard Society of Canada adds to this activism with its publication of *Prison Voices*, a collection of photographs, short narratives, and interviews with various individuals that have experience incarceration in Canada (see also Rives 2008). Furthermore, the *Journal of Prisoners on Prisons*—an inmate written, academically oriented and peer reviewed, non-profit journal—is an alternative source of knowledge that enlightens public discourse surrounding carceral institutions, and provides a platform for inmates and former inmates to voice their concerns and the realities of incarceration and the criminal justice system (www.jpp.org). As a result, the writing and activism these men contribute have “profound social and political implications” to society abroad, and critique ethical underpinnings of what it means to have rights within prison spaces (Hames-Garcia 2004: 143).

It is important to note that the “needs for reintegration” (Westervelt and Cook 2012: 237) for ex-inmates goes even further than simply seeking financial support once they are returned to their communities. Such needs include—but are not limited to—material support (e.g. food, clothing, shelter), practical support (e.g. transportation, banking, shopping), and emotional support (e.g. affection, understanding, compassion, patience). The freedom “to explore and define oneself in the world, to incorporate ... experiences into a new definition of self” (p. 237) is a major need for reintegration, as well as reconnection with self, family, close friends, and the

wider world. Such material, practical, and emotional supports are especially significant for those men that are returned to their remote Indigenous communities, as in the perspective of Indigenous cultures, the need for sharing and assistance “is not so much a social obligation as an acceptance of the right of others to have what they say they want” (Brody 1987: 107). Finally, prisoner re-entry and reintegration is characterized by “protracted problems finding housing and meaningful employment” (Westervelt and Cook 2012: 26; see also Apel and Sweeten 2010; Bahr et al. 2010), long-term health problems associated with their incarceration (Appleton 2010), and the emotional toll on ex-inmates as they report struggling with depression and distrust (Grounds and Jamieson 2003; Irwin and Owen 2005).

Concluding Remarks

Conceptualizing the prison as a) a ‘place space,’ b) a ‘social space,’ and c) a ‘carceral space’ adds important dimensions to the investigation of how carceral spatiality impacts on inmates’ impression management strategies and identity constructions. Indeed, highlighting the significance of ‘being-there’ within prison ‘place space’ assists inmates in sharing their experiences of incarceration, regardless of the potential individual or collective meanings the place serves. Understanding how prison ‘social space’ functions in terms of Lefebvre’s (1974/1991) conceptual triad allows us greater insight into how social spaces (re)produce the perceived, conceived, and lived actions and experiences within its boundaries, whether such boundaries are built physically or are abstractly enforced through routine inmate interactions. Finally, examining the ‘carceral space’ of prison engages in unique discussions surrounding the use of isolation, confinement, and punishment within prison. Prison carceral space exacerbates the (hyper)masculine demeanours that are constructed by the men, and impacts their abilities to return to their communities post-release. The difficulties of shedding the hypermasculine

identity, such as anticipated stigma on the part of the inmate himself or public stigma upon release, disrupt and disorient the inmate's sense of self. In effect, the impact of prison carceral spaces results in the inmates' inability to manage or shed the stigma entirely, effectively attacking and reducing his understanding of selfhood, masculinity, autonomy, and self-worth. With this theoretical orientation now in place, the discussion next turns to the methodology that informs the project.

Chapter Three

Methodology

The aim of this thesis is to contribute to our understanding of the relationship between space, masculinity, and identity. The key question informing the project is: how does carceral spatiality impact on ‘doing’ masculinity within prison, inmates’ impression management strategies, and, in turn, their subsequent identity constructions post-release? To address this question, qualitative, semi-structured interviews were conducted with ten men who had experienced incarceration in Manitoba.

Participation in the study was voluntary, and the participants were initially recruited via posters placed in John Howard Society of Manitoba offices. While the posters were successful in recruiting eight men, two more men were recruited via two of the participant’s contacts and connections. Nine interviews took place in a small office at the John Howard Society of Manitoba, while the tenth interview was conducted at the respondent’s home. Participants were provided with an honourarium of \$25 at the beginning of the meeting in recognition of their time and contribution. Consent was obtained in writing prior to each interview (see: Appendix A). Basic demographic information was collected via a brief survey completed by each man post-interview (see: Appendix B).

During the interviews (which lasted an average of 29 minutes; the shortest being 9 minutes and the longest 48 minutes) a series of questions were posed pertaining to the men’s observations regarding incarceration, other men’s behaviour, spaces within incarceration, and men’s lives once released into the community (see Appendix C). These questions focused on several aspects of the project, including how the former inmates constructed their identities in

carceral spaces, how such identities were reconstructed if they had been challenged, in what ways did certain prison spaces impact inmates over others, how inmates presented or ‘performed’ as ‘masculine,’ and to what extent did the experience of incarceration impact an inmate’s identity when he reentered into his community? In posing these questions, probes were kept to a minimum, and used only to seek further elaboration of the men’s responses.

The interviews were audio recorded and later transcribed. Any information that could identify the participants personally was kept confidential. The audio-recordings of the interviews were downloaded to a computer file that was password protected, and the audio-recording device was wiped following download to computer. No names or names of agencies, businesses, or communities were included in the transcripts. To ensure anonymity, pseudonyms were assigned to each respondent.

In terms of potential risk from participating in this research, participants were informed that they may feel emotional or psychological stress from recounting their experiences of incarceration. The John Howard Society of Manitoba offered to assist the men if they required further counselling. A list of helpful resources (i.e. agencies and contact information) was also provided to the respondents if they felt they would prefer assistance from other counselling agencies (see Appendix D).

Demographic Characteristics

The average age of the men in the sample was 30.3 years old (the youngest was 20 while the oldest was 47 years old). Two men identified as Caucasian, two men identified as Asian, and six men identified as Indigenous. The average level of schooling was grade 10 (the lowest level was grade 9 while the highest level was grade 12). When asked if they were presently in a

relationship, eight of the ten men reported that they were not in one at that time; of the remaining two men, one man had been in a relationship for ten years and the other for two years. When asked if they had children, five men reported that they did while the other five reported that they had no children. Of the five men that reported that they had children, the number of children ranged from one to six. The average number of children was 3.4, and the average age of those children was 8.5 years old.

When asked where they each had grown up, seven of the men reported Winnipeg, one man had grown up in the Philippines, and two declined to answer the question. Finally, when the sample was asked where they had been living prior to or in between times of incarceration, seven men reported that they had been living in Winnipeg, while the remaining three declined to answer the question. Of the seven men that answered, one reported being homeless, three reported living in the inner city, and the remaining three did not state anything further other than Winnipeg.

All of the men had experienced incarceration within correctional institutions in Manitoba. In particular, there are four correctional institutions that house men that have committed crimes in Manitoba: Winnipeg Remand Centre, Milner Ridge Correctional Centre, Headingley Correctional Centre, and Stony Mountain Correctional Centre. Throughout the interviews the men referenced these institutions as 'Remand,' 'Milner' or 'Milner Ridge,' 'Headingley,' and 'Stony' or 'Stony Mountain.' The Winnipeg Remand Centre is a pre-trial detention centre located in downtown Winnipeg. This centre houses people waiting for court decisions on their charges or placement in correctional institutions. Milner Ridge Correctional Centre is a medium-security institution located in the Agassiz Provincial Forest, while Headingley Correctional Centre is a minimum, medium, and maximum security institution located in Headingley,

Manitoba. Remand, Milner Ridge, and Headingley are all operated by the provincial government. Finally, Stony Mountain Correctional Centre is a federal institution that offers minimum, medium and maximum security and is located in Stony Mountain, Manitoba. As Ricciardelli (2014) notes, the criteria to determine if a person will move into the federal system from the provincial system is the amount of time a person is ordered to serve in custody—the length of the prison sentence. Specifically within the Canadian corrections system, any individual sentenced to “two years less a day stays within the provincial system while those sentenced to two years or more are transferred to federal custody” (p. 27).

When asked what institutions they had spent time in, eight of the ten men reported that they had spent time in the Remand Centre awaiting trial and subsequent placement in other correctional facilities. Six of the ten men had spent time in Headingley, four of the ten men had been placed in Milner Ridge, and two of the ten men had been incarcerated in Stony Mountain. Recollections of the length of time served in correctional institutions were approximations at best, as the men found it difficult to exactly remember the range of time spent for each prison sentence they had received or the total number of months or years spent within a particular correctional institution. Therefore, the range of time spent in Remand for the men as a group was estimated between one-and-a-half weeks to one-and-a-half months. The range of time spent in Headingley was approximately between 2 months and 2 years, while the range of time spent in Milner Ridge was estimated between one-and-a-half weeks to one year. Finally, the range of time spent in Stony Mountain was approximately between two-and-a-half months to eight years. Nevertheless, five of the men had repeated experiences of incarceration, traversing back and forth between the jail/prison and the community. As such, while the length of their incarceration

may in some cases have been relatively brief, the experience of incarceration was nonetheless significant for the men.

In sharing their experiences, the men reveal the everyday realities of their incarceration. Inviting the former incarcerated men describe their own subjections within the prison space brings to light various and memorable experiences of their bodies and minds behind bars, and their interactions with fellow inmates. In essence, the stories the men shared capture the quotidian atmosphere of the prison space as it is lived and understood by the people confined there. How these men understood the prison space in their minds, in terms of their masculinity performances enacting particular and constricted ‘manhoods,’ illuminates the impact of incarceration within the men’s life-courses.

Narrative Identity Analysis

As Margaret Somers (1994: 621) argues, a narrative identity approach stipulates that identity continuously oscillates between “narrativity and relationality,” in which the self and the purposes of the self are (re)constructed “in the context of internal and external relations of *time* and *place* and *power* that are constantly in flux” (italics in original). By inviting the subject to talk, we see how relationships and stories that shift over time, space, and place become embedded within the actor, as the actor’s narrative identity becomes constituted through narratives, action, social processes, and interactions. Situating this understanding with the context of the study, qualitative interviews “are inherently sites of social interaction” (Rapley 2001: 309). Therefore, it was beneficial to examine how narratives unfolded former inmates’ “multiple, possible identities” through a narrative identity analysis (p. 309).

In turn, the ‘self’ is seen as grounded in the material reality of everyday life, and a key part of this material reality “is formed by the narrations of selves and others” (Stanley 1993:

206). By bringing a subject's material accounts together in this analysis, a 'narrated subject' is created that provides an epistemological standpoint regarding the research at hand or some other social phenomenon. As Margaret Somers and Gloria Gibson (1994: 58-9) argue, it is through narrativity "that we come to know, understand, and make sense of the social world, and it is through narratives and narrativity that we constitute our social identities." Indeed, Andrea Doucet and Natasha Mauthner (2008) agree with Stanley's (1993) argument, yet caution that it is essential to remember that although there is a "knowing but experiencing subject" (p. 404), researchers cannot know that subject to the fullest extent. In other words, there may well be something 'behind' or 'beneath' the narrative the subject tells; all we can come to know is what is narrated by subjects, as well as our interpretations from their stories "within the wider web of social and structural relations from which narrated subjects speak" (p. 404). Nevertheless, as Ken Plummer reminds us, a narrative identity analysis provides only a glimpse at how the self is represented within the research encounter:

Whatever else a story is, it is not simply the lived life. It speaks all around the life: it provides routes into a life, lays down maps for lives to follow; suggests links between a life and a culture. It may indeed be one of the most important tools we have for understanding lives and the wider cultures they are part of. But it is not the life, which is in principle unknown and unknowable. (Plummer 1995: 168; italics in original)

Data Analysis

The data collected from these interviews were coded in order to facilitate the analysis process. This type of coding is what Amanda Coffey and Paul Atkinson (1996: 29) refer to as "coding as an analytic strategy." This coding process made the data more manageable, while at the same time it allowed for a more complex and in-depth analysis (p. 30). The general themes were developed based on the research questions; specifically, how the men constructed their identities

in carceral spaces, their perceptions or their own engagements with acting more ‘masculine,’ and how their identity shifted post-release.

Additionally, while the data were being collected and processed, I found it important to be aware of emergent themes as the interviews and data analysis proceeded. These alternate or emergent themes arose concurrently with the general themes of the study, and included the importance of interactional-qua-physical spaces, the spirituality behind sacred spaces (or the re-organization of multipurpose rooms within prisons to create temporary sweat lodges), and the fluid conceptualization of segregation-as-quiet space—rather than the general fear of segregated cell units investigated in other prison sociological scholarship (King et al. 2008; Metzger and Fellner 2011; Shalev 2011). These concurrent themes are important to consider as such knowledge produces an enriched understanding of carceral spaces, forging connections between spatial theory, experiences of incarceration, and identity construction.

Furthermore, the participants’ choice of stories impacts the analysis, as choosing narratives to discuss in the research encounter, according to Somers (1994: 630), becomes a deliberate way of rejecting “the neutrality and appearance of objectivity typically embedded in master narratives.” Such rejection further promotes the expression of “multiple subjectivities” that permeates the self when participants choose a narrative to represent themselves (p. 630) and indicates that the struggles over narrative choice and narrations “are thus struggles over identity” (p. 631)

By situating the narratives within the context of spatiality, it became useful to examine, along Foucauldian axes, the ways in which a spatial methodology ‘maps out’ how power is exercised in unequal and unstable relations that produce knowledge. As Alecia Youngblood Jackson (2013: 841) contends, a spatial reading then involves “disentangling the complex

production of subjectivity as an effect of power/knowledge relations and practices.”

Understanding the multiple effects of social, cultural, and material practices within such relations of power/knowledge illustrates how these men-as-social subjects are in a continual process of “constructing and transforming their selves and their worlds” through their interactions with others (p. 841), while at the same time highlighting how spaces form chains of relations that advance, multiply, and branch out deeply into social networks. Practices of power/knowledge are spatial insofar as they spread out and (dis)connect to/with other forms of power/knowledge as inmates move through various spaces. As vehicles of power/knowledge practices (Youngblood Jackson 2013), these men and their subjectivities shift in response to the contextual demands of the spaces they encounter—namely, the prison space and the spaces of Winnipeg’s inner-city. Indeed, while power is acted upon them, “they also acted on power” (p. 844), such as when these men respond to the contextual demands of solitary confinement, and interpret the space as therapeutic instead of punishment (as discussed in the next Chapter). Therefore, situating power relations in terms of spatiality allows us further analysis of “how things change, transform themselves, migrate,” disconnect and reconnect, in order to (temporarily) produce different desires, different affects, and different practices, all within a wider space of ontological becoming (Foucault 2000: 294, cited in Youngblood Jackson 2013: 844-45).

The Researcher’s Standpoint

I incorporated aspects of Pierre Bourdieu and Loïc Wacquant’s (1992) self- reflexive sociology in order to understand how to position myself in relation to the respondents, the research encounter, and the analytical themes that arose from the data. Doing so allowed me to engage in a critical and reflexive analysis of my own social location while I attempted to make sense of my

observations, interactions, and conversations with the men I interviewed (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992). My interactions with all three elements relay how unspoken power relations govern each point of interest, both independently from each other and interdependently with each other.

Not only being an outsider to the incarceration process, but to the Canadian and/or Manitoban correctional system at large, I learned that I too was foreign and naïve to the experiences and impact of incarceration that infuses the lives of these men. In order to make sense of the lessons I learned while conducting this research, I sought to use the self-reflexive approach in conjunction with my own set of cultural assumptions and analytical frameworks. In other words, my experiences of being a white, working class, young male influence my epistemological standpoint. There is no synchronicity between my own life-course trajectory and theirs, which leads me to believe that a full understanding of the struggles these men have faced post-release cannot be achieved. At best, this thesis project will enrich the fragments and pieces of knowledge this group of men decided to share. By providing their own words and narratives throughout chapters four and five, my intention is to share the space to make room for their experiences along with my own understanding of carceral spaces and incarceration. While I do not ‘share’ their life experiences or standpoint, at the very least I can report on what these men have to say and provide a venue for their insights to be voiced and heard. In the process, unpacking the narratives of these men can serve to illuminate how masculinity, identity, and spatiality impact each other specifically and enrich Canadian prison sociology generally.

Chapter Four

Experiencing Prison Spaces: Letting the ‘Narrated Subjects’ Speak

This chapter considers the original three themes of inquiry—space, impression management, and masculinity—by drawing on the interviews with ten men who have experienced incarceration in Manitoba. How do these men construct their identities in prison spaces? What are their perceptions or their own engagements with acting more ‘masculine’? Attention will also be devoted to the emergent themes that arose within the interviews, such as the importance of interactional-qua-physical spaces, the spirituality behind sacred spaces, and the fluid conceptualization of segregation-as-quiet space.

As outlined in Chapter two, prison can be conceptualized as a) a ‘place space,’ b) a ‘social space,’ and c) a ‘carceral space.’ Each of these conceptualizations will be addressed in relation to the men’s narratives of prison experiences. Also significant, however, is that prison is a gendered space in which the men were tasked in engaging in impression management and the performance of masculinity. Indeed, organizing the chapter in such a way suggests that the possibilities of alternative masculinities—masculinities that incorporate emotionality and cultural teachings—can exist within the seemingly impenetrable hypermasculine façade of the prison. While it is shown that the inmate culture perpetuates hypermasculinity, inviting the men-as-narrated subjects to speak widens the cracks in the façade and opens up alternative understandings of what it means to be perform and sustain masculinities within carceral contexts.

Prison-as-Place Space

As mentioned in Chapter two, when we conceptualize the prison in terms of Thrift's (2003) 'place space,' it is this space that reaffirms the inmate's sense and experience of 'being-there,' or a place-specific understanding by which an individual is positioned onto the intersections of sociopolitical, geopolitical, and temporal axes. It is significant to note that the positioning of sense and experiences of 'being-there' within a carceral place becomes instrumental for the inmate's ability to navigate prison culture. Place space consists of "particular rhythms of being" (Thrift 2003: 102) that confirm, naturalize, and evoke particular embodiments, emotions, memories, and the existence of certain spaces. Examining place within prison spaces illustrates how emotional expression becomes more or less 'governable' through formal and informal prison codes (Kupers 2005; Gear 2007; Evans and Wallace 2008). In essence, exploring how the men describe their embodiment tells us something about how inmates adapt to the routines and 'rhythms of being' inside prison.

Several men in the study make this point concisely when they were asked to describe their initial experiences of the prison system:

Crowded (chuckle). It's definitely *a world inside of a world*. Um, there's definitely, it's almost the same as in the normal world, you have your hierarchy and it goes down the line, it's exactly like that. And it's a little bit more order, less chaos in there. (Isaac; italics emphasized)

Experience...I don't really know. Just, it's like, *you feel trapped inside*, like, you have no, no family there. (Dave; italics emphasized)

Uh, it made me feel closed in, you know... (Chris)

The majority of the men reported having had to learn the 'rhythms' of inmate interactions in order to successfully navigate the prison safely. Furthermore, the majority of the men had very similar feelings about feeling 'trapped' within the prison, not just in terms of being physically

confined and the reduction of freedom for mobility, but also in terms of being able to emotionally express themselves as well. Indeed, such feelings of entrapment added an additional stress for some of the men. Yet what became clear from their narratives was that regardless of whether or not these men were bothered or fearful of other inmates, they could not let that stress show:

You can't really show, like, your stress in there 'cause then guys will, they'll like try to get at you and stuff... [Y]ou're roughing it and shit so you got to kind of, you got to *act* as if, you know, nothing's bothering you. (Brandon; italics emphasized)

Um, it was actually, at first it was hard, just like for anybody. It's like going to a new school, like, you learn different things, you see different people, different attitudes, everything, what have you. For me it kind of just made me a little more aware, more stronger, more of a backbone, if anything. (Eric)

Um, the first, first six months I tried 'being solid'... and I tried doing it on my own ... (Jacob)

When the question was posed "Do you remember the unit(s) you were housed in at [place]? Can you describe it/them to me? How did you find living in that/those unit(s)?" the majority of respondents mentioned the overcrowded conditions, the lack of freedom and mobility within the prison system, and the boredom and repetitiveness the men felt while imprisoned. Such feelings were experienced regardless of the correctional facility the men had spent time in during their incarceration:

Well, provincial jail, it seemed like it was more of a high school setting. 'Cause there was a lot of testosterone. People wanted to fight a lot, there was not that much respect. But when I got into the federal aspect of it I was expecting it to be a little bit more harsher 'cause of the stories I've heard and whatever. But there I found it was, it was more mature, people there were more mature. You still had your idiots, right, but about 90 percent of them that were pretty well respectful. *I learnt quite a bit about myself while I was in there.* (Jacob; italics emphasized)

Remand sucks 'cause you're always locked up (chuckle). Yeah, you're only allowed out for an hour at a time. So you're, like, you come out for an hour and then you're locked in for an hour. So it's like an hour in, an hour out. So you're always in your cell, it's just you and your cellmate. Headingley's a bit better 'cause it's a dorm, so

you can kind of, you're in a big space. Like, there's twenty-four bunks, or fourteen bunks, yeah, and twenty-eight guys in one dorm and you all share. There's like two showers and two bathrooms. It gets pretty nasty in there. (Brandon)

Hmm, Remand was, was different, uh, more so than Headingley. Remand, at least, it's getting overcrowded in there. It used to be just like one to a cell, maybe two to a cell. Now it's like three to a cell. Fortunately I was only in two-to-a-cell when I went but it's, it's still pretty crowded inside, you know. It, um, [is] not really fun but you at least have a little more privacy, at least you just had, like, one person you had to deal with. Uh, Headingley was different. Where I was, I was in the Annex sections, so the Annex Section there's like Annex A, B, and C, but every one of them is like, um, like, they're all bunk beds and, like, they have at least, like, at least twenty guys in the same room and stuff like that, that you didn't really have much privacy for. Uh, but I transferred from Annex A to Annex C because I started working in the kitchen 'cause I needed something to do. 'Cause, you know, there's nothing more boring than doing nothing. (Henry)

When the men were asked "Can you tell me what a typical day looked like for you?" the majority reported very similar routines and schedules that structured their days inside. Indeed, the typicality of each day exacerbated the feelings of boredom and mundanity:

Um, I'd wake up for breakfast, go eat, usually go back to my room and go back to bed for a couple of hours. And I'd get up and, I don't know, just hang around with guys, talk to them, go play pool at Milner [Ridge]. That's about it. (Gary)

Go back to sleep (chuckle). (Chuckle) Yeah. There's not really nothing out there. Just wake up, and you're still in the same place, locked up... (Dave)

Similarly, boredom and mundanity were expressed when the question was posed "Where did you spend most of your time during the day? Can you describe that space for me?"

Uh, get up, eat, watch TV, go to the gym ... come back and eat some more, have a shower, make sure your room's clean, sit in your room for half the day, sit down and watch TV for half the day. That's pretty much it. (Isaac)

I would probably say in the TV room or in one of the other guy's rooms just talking. (Gary)

Uh, we got work out. It's forty-five minutes. We got -- actually on the blocks you can't do really nothing, you know, you can't do, yeah you can do, play cards, watch

TV, listen to music. Me, I love playing chess, eh. So, like, it's really boring out there, you know, on the, one the, on the block, so I don't want to be in one place, you know, you know, I want to, you know, I want to search, you know, I want to search... (Frank)

The experiences shared by these men suggest that the Manitoba prison system is not immune to the mundanity and typicality of prison routines and schedules reported in both historical and international prison sociological literature. Outlining the rhythms of being housed within a punitive place—i.e. a prison or jail—enriches our understanding of the similarities between prisons-as-place spaces, and lays the foundation to discuss the differences between place spaces in terms of experiences and emotions felt by inmates within incarceration.

Prison-as-Social Space

When we consider social space within a prison setting, it becomes necessary to qualify what it means to exist within a social space. As mentioned in Chapter two, Lefebvre's (1974/1991) "conceptual triad" (p. 33) allows us to understand and formulate social space as: (1) spatial practice, which "secretes the society's space" and is revealed through the deciphering of such space; (2) representations of space, which entails space conceptualized by planners, urbanists, and social engineers—all of whom identify "what is lived and what is perceived with what is conceived"; and (3) representational space, which is space that is associated through images and symbols—it exists as the "space of the 'inhabitants.'" Furthermore, Lefebvre argues that there exists a dialectical relationship within "the triad of the perceived, conceived and the lived" (p. 33), and that all three contribute in different ways to the production of space.

Social space within prison becomes significant when we situate prison identities within this conceptual triad. While the prison in general may be framed by physical boundaries of separation that demarcate certain spaces from others, social spaces are framed by the codes of conduct inmates use to navigate themselves throughout the prison culture. Current carceral geographical and prison sociological literature has outlined how such spaces have been known to provide mental and emotional release for health benefits (Moran 2013a and 2013b; Crewe et al. 2014).

However, the men's narratives suggest that there is a clear demarcation between theorizing and practicing social space. In other words, the men's responses in their interviews emphasized the perceived and lived experiences, while conceiving prisons hardly crossed the men's minds. When asked if they would like a say in how a prison was to be organized, in terms of the construction and organization of areas and cell rooms, the thought of conceiving space was negligible. Brandon makes this point clear when he states:

There's not really much you can change once you're in jail. (Chuckle) I don't know if I could change anything or if I would. It's set up, I guess it's set up alright, you know. But, yeah, I don't know what I would do. I never really thought about it (chuckle). (Brandon)

Brandon's statement can be generalized to speak for the other men, as almost all of them shared similar sentiments in very few words. In these terms, we can see how the men wanted to focus more on the perceived and lived over the conceived within the conceptual triad. Rather than conceptualizing how the prison could be built or what opinions they could have to impact and modify future prison construction, the men felt their perceived and lived experiences to take precedent, and in doing so, spent their time incarcerated working on constructing and modifying themselves within that space.

Indeed, the men were questioned regarding the various prisons they had been housed in generally, and in terms of spaces they felt safe to move to as desired specifically. When the question was posed “Were there spaces in the jail/prison that felt safer to you over others? Why or why not?” the majority of the men felt that in order to navigate the prison safely, they had to deal with the pressures of gang members and cliques, as well as managing relationships with other inmates. As Eric and Henry indicate in their narratives, there were pressures from gang members and cliques to join them. But as the two men suggest, inmates that serve prison time independently of gang ties (Frank) and confront their problems instead of avoiding them (Henry) reportedly appeared to have a greater sense of safety inside the prison:

I’d like to be, if I, you know, were to go to jail, I’d like to go to the ‘general pop’ where, you know, basically there’s no gangs. You know, there’s always that gang mentality, attitudes and stuff for ex-gang members and whatever have you. But, uh, I like to go there because I’m independent, you know, and I’m by myself. I don’t like to dwell or try to, you know, clique up with somebody. Like, you always run into people that try, you know, get, get them on the team or try to get, get bigger, whatever, eh. But me, I’m like “no, I do me, only me.” (chuckle) I don’t like to multiply. I like to just stick with myself, do my own time, basically. (Eric)

Some, it all depends on where you’re situated.... [T]here are people you get along with, other people you won’t get along with and those are the problem people that you have an issue with. It doesn’t matter where you go, you’ll always have a problem with somebody, right. But in jail it’s a whole other thing. When you have a problem with somebody you can’t just run away. You know, you can’t really say that you’re safe inside. You can only say that if you stand up for yourself every time kind of type thing. You can’t just back down, even with the guys who are, like, talk to you in gangs and whatnot. If you bow down to any one of those guys you’re pretty much asking them to walk all over you. (Henry)

Similarly, Frank furthered the notion that managing relationships with other inmates meant that they had to acknowledge each other’s difficulties—such as living together within the same cell space—in order to begin understanding each other’s perspectives. In effect, acknowledging the

standpoint of other inmates seemed to initiate steps towards a greater sense of safety within prison:

Sometimes I, yeah, a typical day, it's the same days. Go to other's room and talk, you know, ask them what happened, you know, like, you know, try to know them. 'Cause even though you don't like them you got to, you got to like them, you know. 'Cause you're only in that one box, like, small box, like, see, like, you know. And whatever happens you're always seeing them every time and then you're just going to be pissed off, like, you know, you don't like him, you got like him, you got to understand him, like, "what's up?", you know... But not like, you know, like friendly because, you know, you got to understand him, you know... (Frank)

Interestingly, staying out of social space proved difficult when the men felt the need to be emotional or let their guard down. The pressure to not show emotions in front of others weighed on the men's minds when they minimally engaged in social spaces. For instance, when the question was asked "Can you describe a space to me where the other men could let their guard down and be more emotional (happier, sadder, etc.)? Had you ever been in this space? What was this experience like for you?" the majority of the men affirmed the weight of 'staying solid' in terms of keeping up an unemotional front:

Me, it's hard to show emotion there, man. You know, like, when you cry, you know, like, you don't have to show. I didn't see the guys, I seen probably twice, you know, like. But, you know, it's hard to show weakness there, you know, 'cause they're going to eat you, you know. They're going to eat you in there. They're going to tease you every day. Like, I seen guys, right, you can't show weakness there, that's, that's all I can say there, you know.... So me, I fuckin, yeah man, I'm afraid to say that I cry at night, man, in my pillow, you know. I cry, man. I miss my kids, you know. But don't show weakness, man. Like, that's all I can say. (Frank)

I don't think you can't really, uh, I never really showed emotions in jail. No, you don't cry in jail, so. That, I mean, well, there was some guys in there that I thought were cool, so I'd tell them my feelings, you know, like, fuck, you know. But I'd never cry. (Brandon)

As Frank and Brandon's narratives suggest, the masculine imperative to conceal and manage emotions accordingly—restraining oneself from crying and concealing emotions overall—indicates the gendered nature of incarceration. Indeed, the hypermasculine culture embedded within the prison space, coupled with the double burden of hypermasculine front-work and emotion management (Hochschild 1983), brings to light how rules of navigating feelings and emotions are essentially scrutinized within a carceral context and the labour that these men go through to maintain hypermasculine demeanours. Furthermore, understanding prison as a social space provides significant information concerning how space is conceptualized by all that inhabit it. As a result, prison-as-social space opens up new discussions concerning how the prison space functions within Lefebvre's conceptual triad.

Prison-as-Carceral Space

Within the last decade, the literature and discipline surrounding carceral geography has greatly expanded (Jewkes 2013; Moran 2012a, 2013a, and 2013b; Milhaud and Moran 2013; Moran et al. 2013). Typically, one of the themes carceral geography has focused on has been on “hyperincarceration” (Moran 2012a, 2013a, and 2013b). Hyperincarceration is what Wacquant (2009: 3) refers to as the “brutal swing from the social to the penal management of poverty,” particularly in North America. Indeed, it is the “punitive revamping” of public policy by tackling urban marginality through punitive containment, establishing a kind of “single carceral continuum” between the prison and the urban ghetto (Wacquant 2000: 384).

In the context of the current study, a stronger understanding of carceral geography considers how carceral spaces—through the consistent monitoring of security camera practices

and the inmates' relations to the correctional staff—impact the inmates' experiences of incarceration throughout their sentences. As Foucault (1995) states, the prison is an apparatus of corrective penalty, in which the point of application of the penalty is not the representation, but “body, time, everyday gestures and activities” (p. 128). Interestingly, inmates make changes to their interactions in terms of finding the security cameras' ‘blind spots.’ These tactics align with de Certeau's (1984: 29) point that tactics are “creative and flexible.” Enacting such tactics resists the punitive structure of the prison and reaffirms the inmate's sense of agency—and, in some sense, a freedom to act as they see fit within a penal structure of control.

The majority of the men reported that they were aware of the consistent CCTV and prison guard surveillance, and that at times being watched made the men feel uneasy or anxious. Indeed, Jacob maintains that video surveillance enabled the guards to verbally harass inmates:

I just think it's, it's just for ways *for the guards to feel safe*. Yeah. Because the guards, there's no audio, but the guards are very vocal, they're, they're very ignorant, you know what I mean? They, they have no respect for you, but they, but they demand and command respect. I mean, um, they have your life in their hands and they can pretty much do whatever they want with you. And they use the cameras for their benefits, you know.

It's, like, they can sit there 'cause they know they're being watched on camera but they can't be heard, and they sit there and chastise you and then they poke, poke, and the – you react, they go to the camera, say “Look, I was, I was just standing there and he attacked me.”

I've seen it so many times where guards just, maybe they had a bad day or didn't like the person. And they'd go agitate that person, agitate that person, and say, “Well, do something. What are you? A bitch?” You know, “You're a fag. You're a cunt,” you know. And they would use such, and the biggest words they'd ever use in jail was “goof.” You know, “You're a goof.” Do something, poke at you. And then when you react, they've got you on tape. And then they say, “I didn't say nothing or do nothing. He just attacked me.” It shows on camera that he's standing there and all of a sudden BOOM, they see the guy acting. But they can't, they don't hear what they're saying.

Pretty much it's *their* word against yours. And you have no, you have no right. And they always, they always tell you, “You gave up your right the day you, the day you

got sentenced”.... And it was, well, ‘he said/she said’ kind of thing, right. But either, either way the guards seemed to win some of the time without cameras. But now that they have cameras, *they win all the time*. (Jacob, italics emphasized)

According to Jacob, the presence of cameras has meant that prison staff are winning “all the time” in their interactions with inmates now that they can utilize security camera footage as evidence to justify their actions. Therefore, inmates’ attempts to socialize out of the camera’s gaze made them feel less anxious about coming into conflict with prison staff.

However, interaction out of camera view has costs for inmates as well. When asked whether security cameras in jails and prisons made inmates feel safer, several of the men felt that security cameras did not make them feel safer during their incarceration. Dave, for example, commented: “The security cameras? No. I don’t know, they just, they don’t.” When probed further, Dave affirmed that the lack of privacy was the main issue reason he believed security cameras did not make him feel safer. Gary also mentioned the issue of privacy:

I guess in the high suicide scenario that makes sense, but otherwise I don’t think it’s necessary, as least the jails I went to. ‘Cause some of the guys get bothered.... Like, [the staff is] spying on them. (Gary)

Interestingly, Frank pushes this notion further by expressing not only the lack of privacy, but how ineffective the security cameras are in reducing inmate-on-inmate misconduct:

No man, it’s not private, you know. It’s not private. ‘Cause they’re looking at you and fuckin, even though there were cameras there and everywhere what if someone just stab you right away? That’s what I did to that guy. I, I just punched him right out and, you know, they didn’t come at the time, you know. What if, if that’s a knife, you know, he’s dead, you know. It’s not safe, man, that’s not safe, you know. If they plan to do something to you, man, if they plan something to do to you you’re dead on the spot there, you know. What if they stab you with a pencil in the neck? That’s, you know, that’s not safe. It’s, I don’t know, probably so *they have a record, you know, of what happens*. So, like, it’s not safe, like, it’s not safe. (Frank, italics emphasized)

By drawing on Foucault (1995) we can see how Frank's narrative suggests that inmates are both objects and subjects of knowledge. Prison staff are able to examine the practices and activities of the inmates through security cameras. Caught within the security camera's gaze the majority of the time, inmates are subjected to the carceral procedure of surveillance. In effect, the footage produces evidence of information gained about and from inmates, which then fuels prison staff's knowledge of inmate populations in general, circumventing power over inmates within a power/knowledge nexus.

Jacob, Brandon, and Eric agreed that their safety was secured with the cameras.

Nevertheless, they felt that such safety came with subsequent costs, including the opening of 'blind-spots' within the cameras' surveillance and an inherent lack of inmate privacy:

'Cause it's such a big area, they'd have cameras but there's still little blind spots in there. You could get jumped or whatever... (Jacob)

Yeah, for sure, yeah. There's cameras everywhere. So, yeah, you can't do shit. I mean, well, there's, there's ways around it but, yeah.... Well, there's certain cameras, like, certain bunks where there is no camera so you can chill there. Uh, there's no cameras in the bathroom. So that's where a lot of fights happen there, right, in the bathroom. And other than that, yeah, there's cameras all over.... [T]here's not enough guards, right. There's only a few guards that work and there was eighty of us in there. There was three dorms ... and, um, there was only, like, two guards but there's cameras, right. So. There's, well, maybe four guards ... yeah, but there's, yeah, you've got not privacy in there. There's, the cameras watch everything. (Brandon)

You know, people know that they're being watched. I mean, it is, like, I can't say, like, uh, I never always thought about it, sure, but I just forget it's there because it's there. It's almost like you having a tattoo on your back that you don't realize it's there, you know, 'cause you're not constantly looking. But if you're, uh, doing something wrong, you know, you're always trying to avoid the cameras, right. You try to be out of the camera view, I guess you could say. (Eric)

Similarly, when asked if there were spaces that were more unsafe than others, more than half of the men reported that they did not feel safe while incarcerated. Frank and Dave recalled feelings of apprehension towards the prison space itself, indicating that no matter what physical space you occupied or navigated through, there were always feelings of insecurity present:

I don't feel safe everywhere in jail. 'Cause you don't know, you don't know who's who. Sometimes they're playing, right. Sometimes you don't know who's with you. I don't feel, I don't feel trust. I don't feel comfortable. (Frank, italics emphasized)

You can't be safe in there. (Dave)

Brandon and Jacob identified certain spaces in the prison as more unsafe than others; for Brandon it was the main building in Headingley, for Jacob it was the gym, the bathrooms, and the yard:

Where I was, I was actually (chuckle) I was in Winding River, so it's like this 'therapeutic community' they call it. The 'psycho treatment centre' in jail. But, like, I don't know, I wouldn't want to go to the main building 'cause that's all where all the shit happens. Like, my best, one of my best friends is in the main building and, fuck, he gets into fights all the time. He's in the hole. Yeah, there's more gangs there, so. (Brandon)

Yeah, it's when you went to 'rec' and the gym, like, the bathrooms, 'cause they have no cameras in the bathroom and that's where, I'd say, maybe a good fifty percent of the stabbings happened. And same with out on the yard.... But the most unsecure place is 'rec,' I mean, because there's no guards there. They let you in, lock the doors and they watch cameras. And it takes about five, ten minutes to come from where they are to where you are. Anything can happen in thirty seconds. I mean, so that was about the only time that it was really stressful. (Jacob)

Therefore, in terms of place space, the men's narratives indicate that the 'rhythms of being' within prison suggest an understanding of the lack of freedom and mobility, coupled with boredom and mundanity of daily prison life. The typicality of prison life exacerbated the men's stress of their prison living situations, and while they each tried various ways to cope with their

stress and frustrations, most activities would only reduce stress temporarily and minimally. In terms of social space, the men emphasized perceived and lived experiences over conceived ones, reformulating Lefebvre's 'conceptual triad' to focus on either improving their unemotional fronts when engaged in social interactions, or attempting to remove themselves from social spaces entirely to ensure some sort of mediated safety between the men and other inmates. Finally, in terms of carceral space, these narratives illuminate how the relationship between prison guard surveillance and inmate tactics impact incarceration experiences. Feelings of safety, coupled with experiences of (mis)using security cameras for observation illustrate how prisons-as-carceral spaces have been experienced by these men.

Encouraging the men-as-narrated subjects to speak raises the issues of the gendered nature of the prison space. The prison as a gendered space suggests that the inmate culture strongly encourages the men to attend to their constructions of masculinity. Indeed, upholding these carceral 'feeling rules' suggests that performing and enacting masculinity within prison is a conscientious activity that is constantly under threat of scrutiny from other inmates (Hochschild 1983). As the next section discusses, emotion management was routinely enacted in masculinity performances, and such performances were a key component of their experiences of incarceration.

Masculinity and Hypermasculinity

As R.W. Connell and James Messerschmidt (2005: 846) contend, understanding masculinity requires acknowledgement of both "the plurality of masculinities and the hierarchies of masculinities." Across various institutional and cultural settings, in a variety of countries,

multiple patterns of masculinity have been identified. Furthermore, cultural consent, institutionalization, and the marginalization or delegitimation of alternatives “are widely documented features of socially dominated masculinities” (p. 486). Interestingly, they note that hegemonic masculinity need not be the “commonest pattern” in the everyday lives of boys and men (p. 486). At the local, regional, and global levels, the (re)construction of masculinities suggests that formed masculinities change over time and change within various situations.

Indeed, evaluating the connections between masculinities at the local and regional levels—in other words, the intricate local masculine practices that have regional significance, and vice versa—indicates that inmate hypermasculine practices either witnessed or enacted by the men interviewed are significant to the regional contexts of the inner-city communities these men return to upon release. In turn, a regional hegemonic masculinity provides a cultural framework that not only materialized for these men in their daily practices and interactions, but became exacerbated once they were incarcerated. While these created alternative masculinities are distinct from hypermasculinity, that is not to say that other inmates post-release shed their hypermasculine statuses. Indeed, it is plausible that if enough inmates attempt to enact their hypermasculine identities back in their communities upon release, then the cultural framework of the regional hegemonic masculinity could shift to one that fosters hypermasculinity. Such a shift could have damaging effects to alternative masculinities, as they are further delegitimized. In a sense, therefore, examining the interconnections between masculinity and spaces becomes paramount.

Connected to the performance of masculinity is the particular impression management techniques men use while incarcerated. The respondents in this study reported that either they themselves performed specific ‘fronts’ to engage other inmates or that their constructed fronts

were not as successful as bigger, stronger, and more intimidating men, causing them to avoid social interactions altogether. These impression management techniques were intricately connected to masculinity; specifically, how the men reportedly perceived themselves and other men as ‘masculine.’ The men’s observations on hypermasculine behaviour—in terms of activities throughout the day and demeanour of other men—suggest that acting ‘tough’ and getting ‘solid’ are still a prevalent mental constructs in prison living today. Interestingly, even the use of laughter during the interview while sharing experiences of hypermasculinity is significant to consider. As we will see in both this chapter and the subsequent one, several of the men—particularly Brandon, Dave, Eric, Frank, Henry, and Isaac—chuckled during their interviews. Their chuckling suggests there is an oscillation between the men coping with the hypermasculine culture that impacted them in prison and their attempts to express emotions—for example, joy, happiness, contentment—through subversive gestures. Indeed, the release of emotion can represent the cracks in the hypermasculine façade that is perpetually maintained within the prison space. Additionally, it becomes important to investigate the extent that spaces within the prison encouraged or prevented (hyper)masculine performances, not solely in terms of hypermasculinity, but also in terms of the men’s ability to express emotions within limited spaces of privacy.

When asked the question “Do you think that men act tougher when they’re in jail/prison? If so, what would that look like?” the majority of men reported observing role-associated qualities of being hypermasculine:

Yeah. Uh, because they’re bigger and they have more time, have more, they did more time than other people. And they, they got the best cells, like, the one, the one-man cells, yeah. (Adrian)

Um, just at the social level, like, uh, they'll just like try and, I don't know, it's more, it's like jokingly dominate, like, each other, I guess, yeah. (Gary)

Definitely, definitely. Yeah you would have to, it's, you know, it's, um, when you go into prison you can't be a wimp. You can't be weak, you can't show weak. You can't be a bitch 'cause you'll be treated like one. And you know what? If I, I spotted that on you and let's say how I am now if I was in federal or not I spotted that on you and I'm this fuckin big muscle guy and that's fuckin all toned up and ready to kick the fuckin shit out of you. Um, if I found you're weak I'm going to try to take you under my wing to make sure that none of these muscle heads that want to fuck around with or fuck your ass, you know, 'cause there is guys there that would do that too, if they're doing life and stuff like that. It's not always just lifers. Everybody thinks it's just lifers that does that shit and it's not true. It's, you know, it's guys out there that have the mentality of being fuckin straight fuckin' pig asses, like that, eh. And no, no respect for the human body. So ... (Chris)

Yes (chuckle). Um, well because you just, some people feel like they have to, just so, you know, people won't basically mess, you know, try to, *try to tower you or tower over you*. Uh, people feel like they have to work out more and more, and basically when you do work out people look at you like you, you are the stronger person. Like, you know, "don't mess with that guy" type of thing, you know, "that guy works out, he does a thousand push-ups a day." Whereas some people can't do five to ten push-ups a day. And, uh, yeah that type of thing, yeah. (Eric, italics emphasized)

On the other hand, men such as Frank and Isaac were a few of the respondents that reportedly felt somewhat indifferent to the hypermasculine behaviour being performed by other inmates. These men felt that they had nothing to prove by emphasizing their masculinity through violence and aggressiveness, while at the same time they acknowledged that they would not be intimidated by hypermasculine inmates:

Some guys, yeah, I see some guys, some big guys they're acting tough, you know, they're acting solid there. They talk, they talk solid, you know, they talk "oh fuck hey, fuck yourself, holy shit hey, you did that? Holy fuck," you know, like, you know. And then they're going to ask me "why are you—," "well, fuck, I stabbed a guy man, holy shit," (chuckle) you know. I don't, I'm not telling that to them because, you know, they ask me what happened, I stabbed a guy and fuckin I plead guilty, got to do this time, you know... I don't have to act tough. (Frank)

I was raised by a woman so I don't, I don't stick out my chest and (*sounds of beating chest*) and do that kind of thing. That's just a waste of time. 'Cause I know how strong I am and I can hold my own weight. I don't need to prove myself to other

guys. They do, they want to prove that they're the tougher one. Have fun: don't waste my time. (Isaac)

When the men were posed the question "Do you think that there are certain spaces in jail/prison where inmates act 'tougher' than usual? Why or why not?" the majority reported that in the recreational room/gym or the range/yard was where men acted more 'tough' and 'solid.'

Isaac, for instance, replied:

Yeah, out in the common area, and definitely in the gym. "I got to push more weights than the other guy..." yeah, okay. I find it very pathetic that after all these years of evolution men are still stupid that way. We haven't got past that. (Isaac)

When Chris was asked this question, he replied that playing sports in the gym seemed to be the arena where men would subtly try to hurt one another, not only to prove their hypermasculinity to one another, but to reduce the stress of living within the prison:

I, uh, felt fuckin good. I felt really good. It takes, uh, it takes a lot of stress out, um, especially when you're playing sports because, especially football and hockey, you get to, uh, you know, you get to throw your body around, throw your shoulders into people, you know. Sometimes you want to do it just to hurt somebody and uh, just to make it look fuckin better than what it's supposed to be like. But I guess, it's uh, you know, sometimes you can't always hurt somebody. Sometimes it's just about releasing some stress and tiring yourself out and then going back to the range and just chilling back, and smoke a joint, and just take, just take it easy. Um, so you can carry out for the next day. (Chris)

Interestingly, when asked whether there were spaces in jail/prison that were mainly occupied by particular racial/ethnic groups the vast majority of the men reported that race was not an issue within the prison. These men felt that some kind of positive interaction was necessary when engaging with other races in order to maintain a positive prison atmosphere for the inmates. Specifically, the men conflated race with gang affiliation, as relations between

inmates of other races appeared to have been cordial, in terms of similar lengths of prison sentences and crimes committed in the community. These commonalities connected inmates of different races together and assisted in the development of positive interactions within the prison:

No. In the Block 6 that I was in well there was, *we're all different races, hey, so we all got along*. Uh, just because probably we're in jail and some of them did time, some of them did a lot of time.... And some of them did the same crimes and so they thought "Oh yeah I did that too" and "Yeah, I did that." So they kind of, how you say it... Yeah, it's like similar crimes they've done. (Adrian, italics emphasized)

Indeed, tension between gangs was considered one of the bigger threats to a more positive prison atmosphere according to Chris:

Um, no, everybody had their boundaries. Everybody has their, their floor to hold. Um, and everybody's got gangs and everybody's got to make, everybody's got to make a buck somehow. So you got to mix and mingle with other gangs one way or another and if you don't want to mix and mingle with them then obviously you guys are at war with each other. So if there's a rival like that then that's, always end up being separated anyways one way or another.... [I]t causes too much tension, too much heat on the population and too many people get hurt. (Chris)

Isaac provided a similar narrative to Chris, as he believed that the domination of specific spaces within prison was more focused on gang affiliation rather than race:

Uh, not really by cultural or race, more by, like, I was on the Hell's Angels range, so the Hell's Angels basically took the top tier and the rest of us took the, the bottom. And then there was the other gangs' ranges on different levels. It's more to gang, uh, gang affiliation stuff than race. Yeah, 'cause we had every race, *it didn't matter*. (Isaac, italics emphasized)

Therefore, we see how these men also construct identities in terms of gang affiliations. Rather than race, associations to gangs highlighted the shared experiences of those inmates who were members of specific gangs. Given such shared experiences within these gangs and between

inmates, gang affiliations can be conceptualized as pseudo-families interacting with other pseudo-families within the prison space.

These findings indicate that, indeed, the complexities of gendered experiences “in which the pressures on men to ‘do’ masculinity” are even more exaggerated and exacerbated, and the experiences even more intense while incarcerated (Comack 2008: 10). While the belief that “danger is exciting, violence is manly” and aggression is acceptable may prevail for those that mold their identity to hypermasculine traits (Porter 2012: 47), this dominant form of masculinity within prison is not the only form of masculinity that exists. Indeed, forms of masculinity that incorporate emotionality suggest that alternative identities could exist within the prison space. Turning our attention to interactional spaces illustrates how alternative forms of masculinity—forms that emphasize emotionality and acceptance of others as they are—can exist within the hypermasculine inmate culture.

Emotionality within Interactional Spaces

While questions about how space was navigated and conceived by the men within prison were posed during the interviews, the men’s responses suggest that the physicality of spaces hardly crossed their minds; physical spaces did not appear to impact their incarceration experiences. However, an emergent theme that arose from the interviews was the interactive social networks between inmates. Interactional space bridges the discussion between space and masculinity. While this theme is similar to social spaces in prison, interactional spaces should not be conflated with social spaces, as the former focuses on the *intense experience* of presence with another individual reciprocating a deep and meaningful conversation, as opposed to the latter which emphasizes the *social networks* that were found within social encounters between inmates within

the inmate hierarchy. Additionally, while inmate hierarchies and economies have been extensively researched (Davidson and Milligan 2004; Kupers 2005; Gear 2007; Evans and Wallace 2008; Crewe 2012; Crewe et al. 2014), there has not been a significant amount of focus on the impact of interactional spaces associated with physical presence, significance, and meaning while the individuals engage in the interactional act.

Interactional spaces have been conceptualized in terms of presence within digital/virtual communities and environments where online users engage in various subcultural practices, from commenting on message boards to cyberbullying and online stalking (Miller 2011; Hayward 2012). Instead, I seek to modify the previous criminological connotations of the term and insert the notion within this analysis of men's experiences of incarceration in order to further unpack the presence of inmates within the spatial encounters that are significant and meaningful to the men involved.

The men reported that while incarcerated, their experiences placed less emphasis on the physical spaces they inhabited and focused more on the interactional space between other men and groupings. Specifically, when the question was posed "Can you describe a space for me where the other men could let their guard down and be more emotional (happier, sadder, etc.)? Had you ever been in this space? What was this experience like for you?" several of the men reported that there was not a physical space the men would seek out to express themselves, but a particular inmate that they tentatively trusted. For Frank and Henry, it was the quasi-kinship with their confidantes that enabled the respondents to let their guards down:

Yeah, I seen guy's there. He's crying 'cause his baby mama or something fuck someone outside, you know, try to cheat on him. He cried and fuckin', yeah, man, he's a big guy too; he's a big boy man. He's a big boy, like big, big. He's on juice and he cries in my bunk. He said "I want to go out of here man." Fuck, man, *that's*

my workout partner and he's big. Fuck, man, you know, "this chick, man, my kids, you know, all this shit," I said "fuck man don't do that," like, 'cause I'm reminding my, my kids too, right, 'cause I fuckin' my, my tears is almost fuckin dropping. Fuck, man, this is fucking, you know, "let's work out man, you know, "take this shit away, man," you know. And fuckin, "yeah it's hard man and," you know. Fuck and then all of a sudden it's on the news. Like, fuck, this guy fuckin' cry man, you know, fuck, you know. And he's a big guy, you know. Like, they're talking, you know. They see, man. They see, they talk. (Frank, italics emphasized)

The only time was when we were outside. Pretty much. There was not enough privacy in that place to give you that. Like I said before, Remand, you can kind of get more privacy if you go back into your room and just shoot the shit. But no guy really ever did that because, I mean, when you take another guy into your room just to have like a quiet talk it looks bad.... You normally don't do that. Other times you just go to the gym or like one of my other jobs (chuckle) that I helped out in, it wasn't really a job but, you know, people used to pay me like cans of coke, coke and chips and whatnot, for shaving their heads (chuckle). Yeah, so I was like shaving their heads with a razor and we were shooting the shit like a barber (chuckle) kind of, which was very interesting. I'll tell you what, I've never shaved another guy's head until I went there (chuckle). That was weird. That was super, super weird, especially 'cause like it's you shaving your head. It's like you can just feel, like, the stubble and then you're shaving it then you feel, like, skin. And it's just like you're not moving anymore (chuckle). You're moving their head (chuckle). So that was interesting. But yeah you would have, like, those odd times, but other than that nothing... [But] if you're willing to trust a guy with a razor over your head, you know, you're, you're willing to talk with him about a few more things other than you would other people, right? (Henry)

Henry's experience of becoming an impromptu barber indicates that there did exist opportunities within the prison to engage in the kinds of intimacy that are not otherwise allowed by the inmate hypermasculine culture. Finding privacy between Henry and the men he assisted with shaving permitted a tentative trust within the dyad. Indeed, by willing "to trust a guy with a razor over your head," such men were more open to sharing experiences and conveying emotions that would not otherwise be possible in the prison setting. In general, Frank and Henry's narratives suggest that within the hypermasculine culture of the prison, there were cracks in the 'yard faces' of men where alternative forms of masculinity that expressed emotions and personal dialogues could be enacted.

Interestingly, it was the dyadic relations between the respondents and their confidantes that emerged from these men's experiences. Respondents reported that if they were to let their guard down, it would be only with one other person that could be tentatively trusted. While current prison literature has examined the relationships between inmates and their spouses outside of prison (Martinez and Christian 2009; Christian and Kennedy 2011), homosexual and homophobic relations between male inmates (Gear 2007), as well as same sex friendships among female inmates (Huggins et al. 2006; Einat and Chen 2012), there have been relatively few studies that have focused on relationships between male inmates. For example, Alice Propper (1989) examined interactions amongst male inmates and found that besides homosexual relationships, there are occurrences in prison where male inmates form 'father/son' or 'husband/wife' relationships with each other. Specifically focusing on 'father/son' relationships, her findings suggested that inmate quasi-kinships can form where older and/or inmates with more experience in the prison system will take younger and newer inmates under their wing and express reciprocal closeness and caring for each other. Similarly, interpersonal and interracial relationships have been investigated from a quantitative perspective. An example of this is Nicole Shelton and colleagues' (2010) research, in which they build an interpersonal process model of intimacy to illustrate networks between individuals. By implementing a diary methodology, in which 74 individuals were recruited to complete diary measures of self, partner disclosure, and partner responsiveness every two weeks for a 10 week period, the researchers' findings challenge the notion that people are more likely to interact with those that are racially similar. Their results show that when individuals reveal information about themselves and accept others for who they are, this interpersonal process moves people out of their comfort zone and can establish interracial friendships.

Interactional spaces further emphasize the need to study quasi-kinships and interpersonal interactions within prison. While prison friendships have been considered by inmates as more of an oxymoron than legitimate, trustworthy relationships (Corley 2001; Sabo 2001), these findings suggest that men do resort to confiding their experiences and expressing their emotions. However, fronts are only dropped when the network between the man and the confidante is secured—such as through a ‘workout buddy’ or a ‘barber’—and when it appears that men are overloaded with emotions and need to find a release. Otherwise, the majority of the men suggested that if these two conditions were not met, letting your guard down in prison and expressing emotions was hardly conceivable.

Spirituality and Sacred Space

Ann Game (2001: 236) asserts that space can take on a “doubled quality” in which space can be intimate, protective, sheltering, and inhabited, while concomitantly conditions the possibility “of openness to the cosmos.” Sacred space, then, is both “centring and opening” to religious and spiritual experiences. Sacred spaces mark out a centre in the world, fix a point in the homogeneity of profane space, “provide a place where we can inhabit the world, *and* they provide vertical connection with the gods” (p. 236, italics in original; see also Eliade 1959).

Typically, spatial forms and architecture across religious traditions—poles, pillars, spires, temples, steeples, bell towers, and domes—give expression to this connection to the cosmos (Game 2001). Within prison, however, such a cosmological connection must be expressed in other forms, as security and safety measures supersede religious and spiritual furnishings and accommodations (Waldram 1997; Beckford 2001). It is a truism to say that space, spatial boundaries, and spatial segregation are extremely intense in prison. Indeed, the aphorism by

John-Paul Sartre—‘Hell is other people’—applies particularly well to spaces of incarceration. The ability to establish at least some ‘ownership’ over space is endemic among inmates, especially with the extreme overcrowded conditions within prisons that have increased exponentially in the last decade in Western countries (Beckford 2001; O’Reilly-Shaughnessy 2001; see Office of the Correctional Investigator (2014) regarding ‘double-bunking’ assessments). Therefore, the need for inmates to secure a sacred space to practice their religion or spirituality becomes significant in relation to spatiality.

When asked about whether there was a space in prison where the other men could let their guard down and be more emotional (happier, sadder, etc.), the men talked not only of interactional spaces, but also spirituality and sacred spaces. For instance, Jacob reported that equality between and acceptance of inmates was significant to the sacredness of the chapel and spirit grounds:

Two places was in chapel, right, and also at, uh, spirit grounds, at the lodges.... They always ask you to leave your human ego at the gate. Once you enter the sacred grounds you, you go as a humble child, right. Nobody’s better, nobody’s stronger, no one’s better looking. We’re all equal there. And the camaraderie there was really good, you know, there was no phony guys there. You could just be yourself there because, again, it’s a place of, like, of worship. Like, you don’t do anything trashy at chapel. ‘Cause a few times I’ve been to chapel and it was fun, you know, you sing songs, have cake and coffee. And I mean, so it, it was just like, you know, and there were always guests, people came over there, so you got to see different people and just interact, you know, especially in chapel. They always bring different groups in, male, female, so you can sit there and yap and, you know...And then, you know, you have to go back to your cell after. But, you know, you left there in good spirits and if you didn’t allow anybody to, to pop your bubble, you could carry that for a few days, you know what I mean. (Jacob)

Indeed, several men had mentioned feelings of relaxation and contentment when entering either the chapel or the sweat lodge. By fostering this connection to the sacred, organized religion and spirituality can play an important role in assisting men coming to terms with their

identities, their feelings, and their ontological selfhoods. For example, it is common for religious and/or spiritual inmates to develop exceptionally powerful attachments to things such as photographs, images, books, talismans, and religious artefacts (Beckford 2001). Two men raised the importance of sacred objects in their narratives: Adrian, referring to the cross pendant he wears around his neck, and Jacob, regarding the Indigenous drum he had made for himself to give to his partner once he was released:

[W]henver I, uh, think of picking up the bottle I just hold my cross ... and I just think of all the chances God gave me and I'm just very thankful and I just don't want to drink anymore. I just don't want to let him down. (Adrian)

I learned how to make drums. And I figured out what a drum is about, you know. It's okay to learn how to make them but there's a purpose of why you make things, instead of just making them to look nice. So I made two drums. I have one I call the 'four direction' drum because it took me four times. After I made it, it didn't work so I'd take it apart, four times. That's why I call it the 'four direction' drum. And, I made it for my partner ... and, you know, so it's like once I learned to calm myself and not allow situations to bother me, I made the drum and it sounds beautiful, it sounds very nice. So I gave that to her when I got out. The second drum I made was for myself, and I made that one really nice and so pretty much that's, you know, it's kind of funny, I had to go to jail *to find myself*, I had to go to jail *to find my culture*, and I had to go to jail *to find out what a real man is about*. Yeah, and that's, you know, I'm grateful for it. You know, some people think I'm crazy when I say that, "I'm grateful that I went to jail," you know, because it made me realize who I was. (Jacob, italics emphasized)

In order for Jacob to "find" himself, the prison space was significant to such self-discovery and cultural recovery. Conceptualizing his own perspective of what defines a "real man," Jacob emphasizes a masculinity that not only takes into account conflict resolution and anger management, but roots his identity construction in Indigenous culture and its teachings. This Indigenous masculinity illustrates how alternative masculinities can be constructed within prison, and that this alternative process of identity construction fostered positive self-development for Jacob upon release.

Therefore, by fostering a connection to the sacred, we see how organized religion and spirituality reaffirm their role in assisting men coming to terms with not only their identities, but their feelings and ontological selfhoods as well. Inmates are more likely to display anger and hurt if the sacredness of these objects are defiled by other inmates or staff, when such objects are invested with exceptional power and value (Beckford 2001). While the full extent of the role of religion and Indigenous spirituality in the men's lives is beyond the scope of this study, the men's narratives illustrate how the sacredness of both the objects and spaces within prison must be guarded and upheld in order to preserve the sanctity of the inmate's connection to the sacred.

Solitary Confinement: Peaceful, 'Quiet' Space?

As Foucault (1995) argues, "disciplinary space is always ... cellular." While solitary confinement ensures a prison administration's ability "to know, master, and use the conduct of each individual within the space," (p. 143) what is also significant is the issue of how inmates interact with(in) disciplinary space. Indeed, understanding how secluded and "forced sojourns" experience disciplinary space becomes paramount when attempting to conceptualize 'being within' solitary confinement (Piché and Major 2015: 16).

Granted discretionary powers, prison administration are enabled to manage inmates and institutions while pursuing legal and policy mandates (Kerr 2015). Segregation units typically involve "twenty-three hour-per-day, single-cell incarceration for extended periods of time" (Mears and Bales 2010: 545). Indeed, segregation has been shown in prior research to induce to psychological harm to inmates (Metzer and Fellner 2010; Shalev 2011). In some instances, when placed within this solitary environment inmates have shown signs of not only psychological decomposition, but tendencies of intermittent disorientation, rage, resentment, and mental

deterioration (Pizzaro and Narag 2008; Fathi 2015; Parkes 2015). Inmate management has been raised in recent literature in relation to inmates' inherent dignity and human rights (Ward and Birdgen 2007; Ward and Syverson 2009; Ward and Willis 2010), while the use of solitary confinement—for the prevention of foreseeable harm by the inmate himself, for the protection of other inmates and prison staff from the inmate, and to further punish the inmate for his wrongdoings—can be conceived in terms of mitigating risk against prison administration (Shalev 2015). Furthermore, current literature has noted that it has become increasingly difficult to gain access to official documents concerning the well-being and treatment of inmates, as well as touring prison sites to gain such knowledge at the public level (Piché and Walby 2010; Walby and Piché 2011; Piché and Major 2015). While it has been shown that solitary confinement reduces human beings to a degrading, brutalizing, dehumanizing, lonely, and meagre existence (Piché and Major 2015: 24), it is significant to consider how the disciplinary space enables a “therapeutic quiet” (Parkes 2015: vii) for inmates wishing to escape the action of the prison and seek comfort in a quiet sanctuary (Beck et al. 2008).

Seven of the ten men reported that they had spent time in segregation. Surprisingly, however, when asked the question “Do you agree or disagree that there is a fear of spending time in segregation? Why or why not?” only three of the men reported that they were fearful of spending time in segregation. In particular, Adrian and Frank raised the issue of the cramped conditions of segregation as their biggest concern:

It was scary, and they told us “you only get one hour out” and I didn't like it, 'cause it was scary.... It was like the size of this room. About five feet I think... five feet and six feet, about there ... maybe bigger. (Adrian)

So, yeah, fuck, it's dark there, man. It stink, man. It's just a little space. You got a bed, you got a little dirty toilet. You're going to eat there...fuck it, you feel, you know, you feel sorry there. You feel, you know, but you did it, right? Like, like that's

how they, you know, that's how they punish you there, you know. Like, yeah, you did it, you know, you should have made it, you should have, you shouldn't do that, something like that. (Frank)

Frank extended the fear of segregation to a general fear of the prison itself. Such physical spaces reminded him of his past inmate identity construction and his subsequent fear of the experiences within those spaces. This fear further encouraged Frank to distance himself from his prior inmate identity:

Ah, there's a fear of going everywhere, there's a fear of going anywhere. Even right now if I went back to jail, there's a fear of me going back to jail too. Because of who I used to be before and...but it's not me ..., you know. (Chris)

Interestingly, seven of the men said that they did not have fear of spending time in segregation. As Jacob, Isaac, and Eric explain:

Actually, you know what? Some of the gentlemen I met, it was kind of like, the way they explained it was just 'me time.' It was kind of nice just to get away because you didn't have to deal with anybody's crap. You got your tray given to you three times a day. And, I mean, the only thing is you couldn't go for a walk outside, that's the only stressful thing. But most of the time you had a TV there, books, you know what I mean. You're there for ninety days or thirty days or whatever, how long you're there for, in segregation. You know, at first it's kind of bogus 'cause for the first week they say you're not allowed your TV, but then after a while they bring you – it takes a week to get your stuff packed out and then brought to you. But otherwise they said "yeah, you still get canteen." And, I mean, it's not like you can walk to the canteen like you do when you're out of segregation there. You have to fill out a form and, you know, there you can go there every day and get one. But in segregation it's once a week, so. (Jacob)

Uh, for me I, *I didn't mind the quietness* because it was nice and quiet. But then, on the other hand, not hearing other people and not being able to use the phone or whatever was a problem. So, yeah ... [S]ome people are claustrophobic. So, that fear would come up. Surprising mine didn't come up and I'm claustrophobic. (Isaac; italics emphasized)

Certain people, yeah, I guess. But *basically it's the safest place you could be* (chuckle). Like, you know, if you have worries about, you know, debts or, you know, certain people that want to get you or fight and whatever. Really that's the safest

place for somebody. But at the same time it's the shittiest place 'cause you don't get all the extras. Yeah, you don't get that time, that extra time, freedom. (Eric; italics emphasized)

Even for the men that had not spent time in segregation, there were similar thoughts of contentment and quietness within this solitary space. For instance, Brandon recalls his indifference towards segregation when he was in prison:

I was lucky I never went to segregation. I wouldn't care if I did, whatever, right. It doesn't matter... You're in jail already, right. What's, what's, the 'hole,' you know. Just, it would be probably better if you're in the hole 'cause then you don't have to see people you don't like, right? (Brandon)

Similarly, Henry talked about how—despite its restrictive space—some inmates might be well-suited to segregation:

I'm, I would never personally try to go to isolation because, you know, isolation cells are even smaller. They're not, they're there just for one person for cramped space. So you don't have much time to, you can't really move around a lot. So you're, it's constricting and that's what it meant for, to show you that this is how much freedom you have, which is pretty much not much. But, I mean, if you were a loner who works better without a crowd I would say isolation is actually just perfect for you instead. 'Cause, I mean, if you don't exercise much, if you're sitting around reading books all day or writing or drawing or something like that then being in a private cell, like, even [if] it's small or not would be a lot better. (Henry)

For these men, solitary confinement is not conceptualized in terms of punishment, but rather as isolation with positive connotations. This group of men saw the solitary space as a chance for inmates to escape the daily risks of interacting with the inmate population. Seeing this solitary space as peaceful and “quiet” outweighed the consequences of minimal mobility to go out on the range or to purchase items at the canteen.

Concluding Remarks

This chapter has developed an alternative theorizing of the prison space by examining how it is conceptualized as a) place space, b) social space, and c) carceral space. Simultaneously, addressing the men's experiences through their narratives lets the men-as-narrated subjects speak, and conveys their stories of incarceration in their own words.

According to the men's experiences, the lack of freedom and mobility, as well as the boredom and mundanity of daily prison life, indicate that these are 'rhythms of being' within prison. While the men had various methods of coping with their stress and frustrations within these place spaces, most activities had little effect on reducing the stress these men had been feeling. Moreover, the men's emphasis on perceived and lived experiences over conceived ones indicates that this group of men would either resort to improving their hypermasculinity within social interactions, or attempted remove themselves from social spaces to seek sanctuary from other inmate confrontations. Lastly, in terms of carceral space, these narratives illuminate how the relationship between surveillance by prison staff and inmate tactics of locating security cameras' blind-spots illuminate the men's feelings towards safety within prison-as-carceral space. The men's experiences of being watched upon and prison staff (mis)using security cameras for observation suggest that both inmate/prison staff relations are not harmonious, and that surveillance to gather knowledge about inmates was a significant issue for the men interviewed.

As these narratives suggest, alternative masculinities can exist within prison spaces. Examining interactional spaces as interconnections between spaces and masculinities illustrates how emotionality is expressed or prohibited depending on the situation between inmates. Indeed,

the tentative quasi-kinships between inmates, as depicted in the experiences of Frank and Henry, suggest that there exist cracks in the hypermasculine façades of inmates and in the hypermasculine inmate culture generally. Furthermore, the emphasis on sacred spaces in their narratives indicates that self-reflexivity is significant to conceptualizing what defines a ‘real man,’ as was the case for Jacob. A masculinity that not only takes into account conflict resolution and anger management, but roots identity construction in Indigenous culture and its teachings, suggests that alternative masculinities formed within prison have the ability to exist out in the community once the inmate is released.

Finally in terms of solitary confinement, this group of men conceptualized the isolation of segregation with positive connotations instead of the space conceptualized as punitive. This solitary space was seen as a chance for the men to escape the daily risks of interacting with the inmate population, and find contentment within the stressful prison environment.

Therefore, this chapter has discussed not only the original three themes of inquiry—space, impression management, and masculinity—but has examined three additional themes that arose from the research encounters: the importance of interactional-qua-physical spaces, the spirituality behind sacred spaces, and the fluid conceptualization of segregation-as-quiet space. Overall, these themes contextualize the issues faced by men within incarceration, and lead to a discussion about what community reintegration and re-entry can do to mitigate such issues—if reintegration is even at all possible. The following chapter shifts the focus from the men’s experiences within prison to their experiences with community reintegration and re-entry post-release. In the sense of Lewis Carroll’s *Alice in Wonderland*, entering prison for these men was similar to falling down the ‘rabbit-hole’ into a nonsensical world that the forced the men to

radically adapt. Climbing back out of the rabbit hole and returning to their world, however, was an entirely, different problem to confront.

Chapter Five

Community Reintegration, Current Issues and Narratives

How do you get over being incarcerated for months if not years, and then released back into a society, just as suddenly as you were first taken? Or do you get over it? How do you make sense of that experience for yourself, your friends, and your family? How do you find your place back in your home and community? How do you overcome the barriers set in your way? Is this venture even possible? These are just some of the questions that confront inmates when they are released from prison (Westervelt and Cook 2012). In negotiating their dislocation of life after imprisonment, these men begin a road to recovery and reintegration that, for many, is not an easy path to traverse. Some of these men find this process more problematic and fraught with setbacks than others, but all men will find reintegration difficult. Indeed, the incarceration of these men has not only disrupted their relationships with others and connections to community but also their sense of self, their identity, and, in some cases, very personal understandings of who they are now as free people (ibid).

This chapter is divided into two sections. The first section will highlight the discussion between Michel Foucault and Loïc Wacquant in terms of the prison's function within society. Doing so illuminates the issue concerning the plausibility of inmates legitimately 'reintegrating' into their communities upon release. In the second section, the focus sharpens to examine the men's narratives in terms of emergent themes surrounding community reintegration. Such themes include the most difficult struggles the men faced upon release, the supports available to the men upon release, and the extent to which incarceration has changed their selfhoods as they currently live and work outside of the prison system.

Foucault versus Wacquant: The Problem with ‘Reintegration’

In *Discipline & Punish*, Foucault (1995) asserted that the punitive procedures of the prison disciplinary model had been transformed into “penitentiary techniques” (p. 298), in which the carcerality of the prison space had functioned so well to govern, modify, and observe upon its inhabitants that such techniques could be spread throughout society. The transportation of these techniques “from the penal institution to the entire social body” gradates punishment and continuous monitoring of inmates as they attempt to reintegrate back into their communities (p. 299). In effect, Foucault predicted that a “carceral city” would emerge from the transportation and extension of the carceral, prison space (p. 307). As mentioned in Chapter two, it would be a truism to say that the prison punishes delinquency. However, Foucault contends that for the most part, delinquency is produced in and by “an incarceration which, ultimately, prison perpetuates in its turn” (p. 301). As an institutional product, delinquency is then learned by the inmates, inevitably making it more difficult for them to desist from crime post-release.

Therefore, the notion of incarceration would serve to govern and monitor the ‘delinquent’ populations on the outside, and the rise of the “panoptic society” would extend the mechanisms of surveillance and discipline into social service resources, alternative education programs, psychological counselling, and so forth (Foucault 1995: 301). Indeed, once the spread of carceral, punitive procedures had spread into every capillary and network within society, Foucault argues that prison retrenchment would ensue. With mechanisms of surveillance and discipline crosscutting various fields and institutions within society, the purpose of the prison would be degraded, as the “carceral continuity” and the diffusion of the prison’s punitive procedures would be naturalized (p. 303). By operating at every level of the social body and by mingling ceaselessly “the art of rectifying and the right to punish” (p. 303), the prison would be

substituted for the notion of the carceral society, and would henceforth naturalize “the legal power to punish, as it ‘legalizes’ the technical power to discipline” (p. 303).

An example of the shift from the prison to the carceral is found in the work of Christophe Mincke and Anne Lemonne (2014). The authors examined the Prison Act of 2005 enacted in Belgium to observe what the effects have been on (former) inmates since the passing of the Act, and how the Act’s passing has developed and legitimized ‘punitive procedures’ in the community. “Traceability” was indicated in their study (p. 545), in which the potentiality of the panoptic gaze—that is, highlighting a ‘potential gaze’ over an actual, constant gaze—had become developed and legitimized through various surveillance mechanisms, such as GPS tracking, changes in parole conditions, and required attendance to counselling and social service resource centres. Moreover, the exponential increase of surveillance archives (*ibid*; see also Koskela 2003) has been a significant punitive procedure, insofar as the potentially infinite accumulation of data—through the resources they either seek out on their own or are parole-mandated to attend, and the places and spaces they habituate (or avoid) in the community—renders the (former) inmate traceable and, arguably, knowable through potential monitoring. Traceability affirms the continuity of carceral space, all the while maintaining the mastery of the situation. Indeed, we are far from the time when prison guards could only see as far as the prison wall and noting the inmate’s presence within a cell, workshop, or engaging in an activity (or inactivity) (p. 545). In essence, the power gained through traceability opens up new types of knowledges, from forecasting possibilities of recidivism by tracking various indicators to criminal career analyses and constructing models that predict situations of violence. It is no longer the question of understanding, as Mincke and Lemonne suggest, but rather the possibility

of anticipating (former) inmates' actions slightly ahead of time in order to maintain continuity, both in control and in permanent monitoring.

In effect, the rise of the 'panoptic society' and such traceable practices suggest that from a Foucauldian perspective, reintegration then would be achievable for inmates post-release. However, former inmates would have to consent and conform to the mechanisms of surveillance and discipline in order to assimilate into the social body. The spread of the carceral institution's impact throughout society, as devices or "mechanisms of normalization" (Foucault 1995: 306), suggests that all of society's individuals will be subtly coerced into a social moral order that legitimizes and naturalizes the power of discipline. While attempts to reintegrate may be difficult for inmates who have acquired delinquent skill sets, subjecting all of society's individuals to such carceral mechanisms renders everyone equal to "the power of normalization and the formation of knowledge in modern society" (p. 308).

Contrasting the view of the Foucauldian lens, Wacquant claims that Foucault erred in spotting the retreat of the prison. Wacquant agrees with Foucault that penalty is a "protean force ... and must be given pride of place in the study of contemporary power" (Wacquant 2010a: 204). As Wacquant (2010a) argues, the purpose of the prison did not diminish, contrary to what Foucault speculated. Instead, penal confinement has both increased in strength at an exponential rate, and has reaffirmed itself as a dominating institution and a "voracious carceral system" (p. 205). The techniques of penal 'normalization' that were emphasized in Foucault's *Discipline & Punish*, such as elaborate time schedules, hierarchical classifications, non-idleness, and the regimentation and close-up examination of the body, have been rendered "wholly impracticable" (p. 205). Such impracticability has been caused significantly by the "hostility of penal authorities towards rehabilitation" witnessed in our contemporary, Western society (p. 205). Furthermore,

Wacquant disagrees with Foucault regarding the mechanisms or devices for ‘normalization’ (Foucault 1995), in which the widening of the penal net, anchored in the carceral institution, “[has] *not* spread throughout the society, in the manner of capillaries irrigating the entire body social” (Wacquant 2010a: 205; italics in original). Instead, the widening of the penal net is remarkably discriminating, as the penal net only drags in and catches the marginalized populations of society.

Any benefit of incarceration is largely negligible, as correctional systems are a costly endeavour for society (Wacquant 2010a; Ricciardelli 2014). It costs the U.S. \$25,000 per inmate per year in a Californian state penitentiary and \$70,000 in New York’s county jail (Wacquant 2012a: 5). In Canada, annual overall expenditures for adult corrections for 2009-2010 totalled \$3.9 billion, while the average cost of keeping a prisoner incarcerated for 2009-2010 was \$113,974 (Ricciardelli 2014). Indeed, these costs are astronomical and generate no real wealth for society (Wacquant 2012a).

According to Wacquant, then, it is misleading to speak of prisoner re-entry and community reintegration, insofar as the vast majority of former inmates that are released do not experience re-entry. As previously mentioned in Chapter two, inmates are caught up in the “*ongoing circulation between the two poles of a continuum of forced confinement*” formed by the prison and the dilapidated, broken-down neighborhoods they return to upon release (Wacquant 2010b: 611, italics in original; see also Wacquant 2000, 2002, 2010a, 2010c). Contrary to Foucault’s assertion that penalization is an “all-encompassing master logic” that blindly traverses the social order to bend and bind its various constituents (p. 205), penalization is a “skewed technique proceeding along sharp gradients of class, ethnicity, and place,” functioning as a population divider that seeks to differentiate categories according to establishing conceptions of

‘moral worth’ (p. 205, see also Wacquant 2010c). Wacquant goes on to argue the (re)integration question:

How could former prisoners be “*re-integrated*” when they were never integrated in the first place and when there exists no viable social structure to accommodate them outside? How could there be “re-entry” when they are enmeshed in a carceral lattice spanning the prison and neighborhoods deeply penetrated and constantly destabilized by the penal state? (Wacquant 2010b: 612; italics in original)

To speak of “pathways to reintegration” (Visher and Travis 2003: 9), Wacquant argues, is to disregard the undeniable fact that there was *no integration* into society prior to incarceration, as evidenced by the social profile of jail and prison detainees in America (Wacquant 2009, 2010b).

Therefore, prisons today have shifted their operations from rehabilitative to primarily warehousing “the rejects of the labour market” (Wacquant 2012a: 5). A strong representation of punishment, the prison and its resurgence has come to serve three missions that have little to do about crime control: to “bend the fractions of the postindustrial working class to precarious wage work, to warehouse their most disruptive or superfluous elements,” and to monitor and police the boundaries of the ‘deserving’ citizenry while (re)asserting state authority within the restricted domain it now assigns itself (Wacquant 2012b: 240).

The Plausibility of ‘Re-entry’ Programs

Typically, inmates are referred to programs upon release that attempt to mitigate inmates’ issues, such as substance abuse, anger management, and the like. However, the question of inmate (re)integration—or whether inmates will ever fully reintegrate into their communities—is unpacked further by Wacquant. He provides a critical and somewhat negative perspective on the goals of ‘re-entry,’ arguing that reintegration and rehabilitative community programs are not

adequately geared toward effecting the (re)integration of released inmates. Emphasizing budgets and operations and lacking in funding and political interest, such programs are frequently relied on by governments to deal with these marginalized populations (Wacquant 2010b).

Concomitantly, however, governments have exceedingly high expectations for programs to perform “a simulacrum of rehabilitation after custody while such rehabilitation has been jettisoned *in custody*” (p. 615, italics emphasized).

In short, Wacquant contends that re-entry programs are nothing more than “bureaucratic charades,” and that such programs are an integral component of “prisonfare” (Wacquant 2010b: 615-616), a process by which the police, the courts, and custodial/rehabilitative institutions are rolled out from the state to monitor and contain the urban disorders brewing within marginalized communities. Re-entry programs, then, are government techniques for managing problems and territories in the city, whose reach stretches beyond prison bars and over inmates’ life-courses, “keeping them under the stern watch and the punctilious injunctions of criminal justice even as they return to their barren neighborhoods” (p. 616).

These “barren” neighbourhoods are significant to consider, as the social aspects of such community and neighbourhood spaces impact these men’s chances of improving their quality of life and reducing recidivism. As mentioned in Chapter three, nine of the ten men had indicated in the brief post-interview questionnaire that they had grown up in Winnipeg, and when asked where they had been living in between periods of incarceration, three men had mentioned Winnipeg’s inner-city communities and one man reported being homeless. It is significant to note, therefore, that on their release from custody, the men were returning to communities plagued with social issues, including poverty, unemployment, socio-economic disadvantage, crime, and violence (Comack and Silver 2006).

While Indigenous peoples have always inhabited the area known as Winnipeg, there was a substantial increase in Indigenous people arriving to Winnipeg's inner city during the 1960s and 1970s—just as suburbanization was relocating businesses, and large numbers of people with them, to the suburbs, and globalization was relocating heavy industry from Winnipeg to other parts of the world (Silver 2008, 2010). In recent years, there has been a growing number of refugees and immigrants from war-torn countries arriving to Winnipeg, settling particularly within the city's inner-city communities. Similar to Indigenous and other low-income people who have, for decades, inhabited these communities, these groups were attracted by the availability of cheap, affordable housing (Deane 2006; Cooper 2013). But they also encountered spatial profiling (Comack and Silver 2008; Silver 2006, 2010), impoverished conditions (Lezubski et al. 2000; Silver 2000, 2006), and social exclusion from the rest of Winnipeg (Silver 2006, 2010; Ghorayshi 2010; Hart 2010). As opposed to the more privileged residents living in the suburbs (Comack and Silver 2006: 8), today Indigenous and immigrants groups alike are disproportionately located in Winnipeg's inner city, while Indigenous people are disproportionately represented among the city's poor (Deane 2006; Silver 2008; Cooper 2013). For example, the Lord Selkirk Park neighbourhood within Winnipeg's North End has been historically poor and marginalized. Recent data suggest that 66 percent of the Lord Selkirk population identify themselves as Indigenous, compared with 10 percent in all of Winnipeg (Cooper 2013). In addition, the unemployment rate is significantly higher in Lord Selkirk Park than any other neighbourhood in Winnipeg at 18.7 percent, and the percentage of the population falling below after-tax low-income cut-off is much higher in Lord Selkirk Park at 74 percent, than in Winnipeg at 16 percent overall (ibid).

Indeed, the spatialized and racialized character of Winnipeg's inner city suggests that crime increases when the degree of inequality and the incidence of poverty increase (Silver 2010). In other words, when released men are returned to spatially concentrated communities of socially excluded groups and racialized poverty, this environment can be particularly damaging to these men's desistance from crime, manifesting in further criminal activity, violence, and family disruption (ibid). This phenomenon was demonstrated quantitatively by Robin Fitzgerald and his colleagues (2004), who found that the closer one moves to the geographic centre of Winnipeg, the higher the incidence of property crimes and crime of violence. Other researchers (Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives 2005, 2006; Comack and Silver 2006, 2008; Dobchuk-Land et al. 2010) have found strong qualitative evidence of high levels of crime and a deep concern about crime and violence in selected Winnipeg inner-city neighbourhoods. Steven Kohm (2009, 2012) provides similar evidence using a mixed-methods approach; his combination of interviews and General Social Survey data suggest that geographic and socio-economic dislocation contribute to injustices experienced by both Winnipeg's urban poor and inner-city residents.

However, it would be incorrect to frame Winnipeg's inner city in an entirely negative light. While it is true that Winnipeg's inner city confronts many difficulties—rates of poverty are high; average incomes and average levels of education are low; drugs, gangs, and violence are a frequent concern expressed by inner-city residents (CCPA-Mb 2005; CCPA-Mb 2006; Comack and Silver 2006; Silver 2008; Dobchuk-Land et al. 2010; Ghorayshi 2010)—they also display remarkable strengths, especially in relation to encouraging people's desistance to crime and assisting in their reintegration. These include a wide range of vibrant and effective community-based organizations (CBOs), such as housing co-operatives, alternative educational initiatives,

and community economic development initiatives (Silver 2008). Most family, youth, and resource centres tend to be neighbourhood-based and operate in a community-building and capacity-building fashion. For instance, CLOUT (Community Led Organizations United Together), a coalition comprised of several inner-city organizations, works to provide inner-city youth resources such as alternative education, shelter, and information concerning Indigenous culture in the hopes of giving them opportunities to desist from crime and reintegrate into their communities (ibid; see also O'Brien 2013).

In particular, many urban Indigenous families are in a process of cultural recovery and survival. Lawrence Deane and Eladia Smoke (2010: 53) contend that the ways in which housing can shape family interactions and life-course trajectories “can either assist in this recovery process, or become another structure that impedes it.” Housing initiatives have been related to the practice of community economic development (CED) in various ways, and a range of CBOs is in place to support and promote CED. SEED Winnipeg runs, supports, and finances a variety of grassroots CED initiatives for both individuals and organizations, as do LITE (Local Initiatives Toward Employment), the Assiniboine Credit Union, and others (Loxley 2000; Silver 2008). Another example is the North End Housing Project, which has been closely associated with Inner City Renovations. These organizations hire local residents in the inner city to undertake housing renovations and construction projects. The OPK (Ogijiita Pimatiswin Kinamatwin) program works with gang members who wish to leave the criminal activity of the gang, but without necessarily leaving the gang (Bracken et al. 2009). This program trains gang members in construction skills to be hired by construction companies working within the inner city (Silver 2008).

In their examination of the OPK program in Winnipeg, Denis Bracken and his colleagues (2009) argue that the program's values—(re)acquiring traditional Indigenous culture and providing the training of marketable skills—encourage social capital acquisition for its members—social capital referring to the resources, norms, and mutual trust developed across social networks (Putnam 1993). By encouraging social capital acquisition, OPK assist its members in coming to terms with their position as marginalized, colonized people within Canadian society. In a sense, this intrapersonal and social transformation can be described as symbolic healing or decolonization, as the program works to address the 'Other-ing' structure and culture of Canadian society, the biography and past experiences of the program's members, and the members' working for desistance and reintegration (Bracken et al. 2009).

Taking into account the Foucauldian/Wacquantian divide, this thesis project more closely aligns to Wacquant's view of 'reintegration.' While it is true that to a certain extent, the 'mechanisms for normalization' that Foucault spoke of ring true for the men interviewed, at the same time we must consider the degree to which the widening of the penal net has caught and dragged the marginalized into its reach, as Wacquant argues. These men were and still remain under constant surveillance by police and probation officers even once released. While there is significance in understanding how surveillance impacts individuals' abilities to discipline themselves and shift their subjectivities towards the norm of society—as examined by Foucault—this process of conformity that (former) inmates are encouraged (or forced) to follow is a null argument. The marginalized in society have always been enmeshed within the 'carceral lattice,' and to argue that attending programs will increase their chances of finding meaningful employment, adequate housing, and so forth is nothing more than a 'bureaucratic charade' in the Wacquantian sense. As such, to the extent that such programs only emphasize individual change

and conformity, they will not—in and of themselves—address the social sources of marginalization.

Providing the appropriate resources for marginalized, racialized groups and building positive networks that empower Winnipeg’s inner-city residents remains an ongoing task. As the next section discusses, the feat of reintegration for the group of men interviewed was anything but simple, especially with all ten men returning back into the inner city from where they had been arrested.

Inmate Reintegration: What the Narratives Tell Us

Social identities, according to Margaret Somers and Gloria Gibson (1994), are constructed through both our narratives themselves and the act of narrating our stories, in which we attempt to come to know, understand, and make sense of our experiences within the social world. As “narrated subjects,” our ability to narrate indicates how we as individuals perceive our pasts, present situations, and life-course trajectories towards the future. Therefore, by inviting narrated subjects to speak, as Andrea Doucet and Natasha Mauthner (2008) suggest, we empower individuals to express their understandings of life circumstances and encourage them to position themselves as authenticated knowers of their own lives.

When asked the question “What was the hardest thing you had to deal with once you were released from prison?” the men reported various struggles they faced upon release, such as staying off of drugs and/or alcohol, finding employment and effective social programs to participate in, maintaining meetings with probation officers, and the fear of how family and friends would view the men after release. The dominant issues mentioned were recidivism, or the difficulty of staying out and not going back into prison, and the fear of being released.

Eric, Brandon, and Frank felt that their greatest issues with reintegration were staying out of trouble and not returning to prison:

Not going back. For me, like I said, I'm not, uh, institutionalized. When I get out I stay out for quite a while and I, uh, love my freedom, but I see, I notice when people get out there's a lot of bragging rights there, you know, they're like fresh out, "oh yea I just go released, I just did this, I just did that, this happened, that happened." But ultimately it's like, whatever, you know. Sure it's like, it's like, it's almost a front, but it isn't, it's a, it's a truth right, it's true, it's just, you know, a lot of people like to add on extra things to spice it up, make it sound a little bit better than it is, and a little bit worse, you know, worse or better... [B]asically for me, like, when I, you know, when I get out it's, it's everything to me, it's like freedom all over again, so. (Eric)

Um, (chuckle) I don't know, man, it felt good to be released. Well, coming here I didn't really know anything about John Howard. I just knew I was getting bail to this program and that I was going to have to stay here for a long time, so that was kind of hard. 'Cause I'm like, you know, shit, I have to go through this again and I have to stay here, if I leave here, I go back to jail. So, you know, it's kind of, I don't know, it's different... So I guess when I got released, yeah, the hardest part was just coming here and, you know, like, like, I guess what would you call it, like, adapting to how it is here, getting to know the guys and then going through all that again, you know, and then just trying to, try not be like you're in jail. (Brandon)

Uh, I still got probation, like, you know, two years' probation, I got to do that, you know. I can't, I can't go home yet, you know, I got to finish that two years, and I got to do some programs, so, yeah, counselling... I just tell [my friends] man, fuck, man, you got to do what you got to do, man, you know. Just don't go back in jail and keep away from trouble. (Frank)

The second dominant struggle faced by the respondents was fear, in terms of life on the outside of prison and the world these men would be returning to after their prison sentences.

Chris and Isaac talked about a feeling of dread upon being released:

Yeah, I had the biggest fear, just being released and back into society. Uh, being hard, and they got, uh, a hardball fuckin' attitude and getting released into society, its, everybody else looks so much more fuckin' smaller, and uh, smaller or fatter, one or the other. And you coming out this big muscle-toned guy and just, uh, you just *feel fear*, you feel like you're not ready for it. Like, you know, you feel like, uh, fuckin' "I could eat you up, man, in a matter of minutes, in a matter of seconds I could have you down on the ground..." It's, I don't know, it just, it's a little bit, I guess trying to

hold back your fear, I guess. You know, trying to, trying not to make sure that you unleash, you don't want to unleash those demons. 'Cause this is society that's, uh, going to take the hard ass of you and it's not their fault, it's your own fault. (Chris, italics emphasized)

Uh, it sounds silly. I wasn't in for very long compared to other people, but leaving from a place that has almost 90 percent no chaos to jumping into a world that's 90 percent full of chaos, it was a very, it was actually fairly dramatic, more than I ever expected. Um, I was scared to actually leave to what I was going to go back to.... [T]here's so much order in there where you have to have, you know, there's everything's on a schedule. And when you leave from there to, to the real world where you have to make your own schedule, it's not as easy as people would think.... And that's why people go back to what they were doing. And that's why a lot of people in jail go back to what they know best. Because "well, here's order, [and] here's no order." (Isaac)

When asked about the supports they had in the community the majority of the men reported some sort of support from family, friends, or both. Specifically, Eric, Jacob, Gary, and Adrian mentioned that they received emotional support from both family members and friends:

Usually not a whole lot but enough to keep me going, you know. Like, yeah, I always have friends or a couple of family members on my side to support me. Well, they don't like it obviously. They feel like, you know, at the same time they want to help you, but eventually they don't want to help you. Because if they see you keep going you know back and forth, they, they, you know, eventually get sick of helping you out. I, this time is the time I learnt that I'm running out of those people. Like, there's only so many times you can keep going back and forth and then they just get sick of it. It's like, okay, well you can't help somebody that doesn't want to be helped. And me, I got lucky, 'cause I still got a few people out there and I am one person that needed, you know, I do need that extra help. (Eric)

I didn't find it too hard to, to come out. Because I know that my family was happy when I phoned them and said, "Okay, I'm getting released on this day. I'm going to this halfway house. I have to stay there for twenty-four hours and then I'll come and visit you the next day." Yeah, they were all happy and of course they gave me shit, like "Why didn't you write letters? Why didn't you send me visitor forms?" Well, you know, I had to answer those kind of dumb questions. But my answer to them was like, you know, "You didn't do the crime with me, so why should you be locked up with me?" (Jacob)

Well, my parents mainly, and I got a couple of friends, so. (Gary)

They don't like it, they tell me "[Adrian] I don't want to see you go back to jail, stay out of jail." Yeah ... I feel cared for, I feel like they care for me and I like that people care for me and they don't want to see me go back to jail. It's, like, support. (Adrian)

Interestingly, Henry, Chris, and Brandon reported that they had received more emotional support from their immediate families—and extended relatives, in the case of Chris—than from their friends:

When I was a kid, when I was younger I should say, I didn't really care for studying. I didn't really care for staying in school and everything like that so none of that bothered me. But, you know, now that I, like when I came out, it's like I don't have an education, I don't really have too many skills, what the hell am I going to do when I come out, you know. And I'm lucky, again I'm really lucky for my family. 'Cause if it wasn't for them, like, I don't know what I'd do.... None of my friends, [they] wouldn't take me in... (Henry)

I had a lot of support. When I first went to jail I didn't have no support, I didn't have fuck all. I, my attempted murder was against my mom's boyfriend, my mom disowned me right after that. Even to this day I don't talk to her. It's kind of hard, but, you know, yeah, I had one support in my own family and who I love very much and she... (Pauses) I see her every day, I go home and see her every day. It's my auntie. All of her kids and grandchildren that are all my cousins but they're all my sisters and brothers. (Chris)

(Chuckle) I don't know, my friends laugh 'cause it's funny, right? You know, we grew up in the North End, so I mean, fuck, we've all been to jail. So to my friends it's just like, "Ah, fuck. [Brandon's] in jail again" ... And my family, well, I don't know man, like there's a lot of people in my family that's been to jail. So, like, they don't like it, you know, that I've been to jail. But I mean, I guess they can't really do anything about it, what are they going to do, right? (Brandon)

Furthermore, Frank mentioned that he had only a few friends to interact with and receive emotional support from upon release, while he received no support from his family. According to Frank, his family was too disappointed in him for being incarcerated to extend any type of support:

No. 'Cause my mom's back home, right, my dad is here but he's, you know, in my culture it's different. It's like, you know, I'm a disgrace, you know. When you go to jail they won't tell to your... family that you're in jail. 'Cause it's embarrassing, it's

embarrassing for our name, you know... I don't, I don't, I don't, you know, have any support from my family actually, you know.

The last two men had support from neither friends nor family. One respondent refused to elaborate on family and friend supports, simply citing that they did not exist (Dave), while the other respondent reported that he did not have friends, only tentative acquaintanceships (Isaac).

Overwhelmingly, when asked whether they thought that being incarcerated had changed them as a person, nine of the ten men felt that incarceration had changed them as men:

Yeah, it definitely has, man. It's, uh, it's made me feel a hell of a lot better about myself, uh, it has given me some ways, uh, of life for being, you know, being solid and hardened and learning how to be a man. Um, besides, you know, you know going around and hurting somebody, it's just, you know, you can make some pretty solid choices too. (Chris)

I think it's made me, it's kind of been like a 'wake up' call for me... to change my behaviours. So it changed me in a good way I'd say, even though I was very resentful at first, yeah. (Gary)

For Chris and Gary, we see how the prison space itself had an impact on their selfhoods. Not only did the men learn how to be a 'man' in terms of ascertaining hypermasculine traits of acting 'solid' and 'tough,' but the space assisted their abilities to construct 'solid choices' of what it meant to be their *own* man. While the former masculine conception typically emphasizes the acceptance of aggression and that violence is 'manly,' we see a shift in their identity constructions to the latter masculine conception. Creating new adaptations of masculinity—i.e. learning to be their own man—emphasized positive life choices and promoted acknowledgement of other men's feelings. In doing so, we see that Chris and Gary were able to construct more positive identities for themselves once they were released.

Similar to Chris and Gary, Henry found that the advice of other inmates and their adaptations of a new, alternative masculinity assisted him in his own identity construction while incarcerated:

You know, like, I'm, I'm actually pretty grateful for that experience believe it or not. 'Cause some of those guys were, weren't too, weren't too bad. I mean, I would never trust them (chuckle). But some of the advice they gave was, was pretty solid. So ... when I came out and trying to find my own way again, I mean, it all clicked afterwards too. (Henry)

Interestingly, while Henry remarked on the tentative friendships he maintained in prison—in the sense that friendships made in prison were loosely built on trust (Corley 2001)—he did interact with other inmates that had adapted their hypermasculine selfhoods in order to assist their (and Henry's) transition back into their communities upon release.

Brandon had similar feelings about 'thinking differently' on the outside. He too fell into the adaptive masculinity category, as he notes how even when released and he engages in conflicts back in the community, he internally negotiates with himself to diffuse his anger and attempts to express his alternative masculinity over his hypermasculinity:

Uh, I guess, some, like, I don't know... I guess it does change you because you think, you think differently. Like, you know, like, you know, you've been locked up and then, you know, you can't do certain things 'cause you're going to end up going back to jail, so you've got to try to do stuff. But, you know, then, I don't know, there's some days where you just don't care and you're like "Fuck I don't care if I go back to jail." So, I guess you kind of, yeah, you, you think differently. Like, for someone that hasn't been to jail, they think different than I think, you know what I mean. 'Cause I think, like, I don't care, you know, I've already been there, if I go back, like, whatever, it is what it is, you know, there's nothing I can do about it. You know, and sometimes that's how I think. So, yeah, it's changed me, *definitely changed the way I think*, you know. And then there's sometimes someone, like, like, I don't know, like, if someone talks to me and I don't like it, you know, my, *my jail mentality kicks in* and I'm like "fuck you man, don't talk to me like that you know"... They think they're tough, you know, I'm going to put them in their place kind of. It definitely changed me, yeah, I think so. (Brandon, italics emphasized)

These narratives emphasize the significance of incarceration within the men's lives. The impact of the space itself influenced the men's abilities to construct hypermasculine selves while incarcerated. Upon release, however, the majority of the group had realized that their prison 'mentality' could not foster any benefits or support for the men on the outside. For example, this was an active and conscious process for Gary and Chris to make this change. They constructed alternative masculinities for themselves that emphasized conflict resolution and anger management. In terms of managing their impressions or 'fronts,' what we view is a shift from acting 'hard' and 'solid' and wearing a 'yard face' to emphasizing positive or 'solid' choices, receiving and accepting advice from others, and reducing the need to wear a 'yard face' in their daily interactions on the outside. For these men, the event of incarceration along their life-course trajectories had allowed them to become self-aware of the masculinity that reflected their own identities, and shaped their identity constructions for the better upon release.

When asked whether they felt the need to hide the fact that they had been to prison, eight of the ten men reported that they did not. Henry's feelings on being honest with his past were made clear:

Well, it was a mistake. I did something really stupid. I betrayed a lot of people and that was my fault, you know, there's no two ways about it. And hiding from that means that you're embarrassed by it or anything else it means that you're running away from your problem. You know, if you, if you made the mistake, own up to it and then look to the future and keep going. You know, work for now from what you did for the future. And that's what I, that's how I look at it, you know what I mean. The past is the past, you can't change it, but it doesn't mean you can't learn from bits and pieces of it. People will always make the same mistake over and over again until they finally realize it, 'cause not everybody will realize it like at the time that they think about it, you know what I mean.... Like, I'm not going to let that mistake hold me down for the rest of my life, you know what I mean. Life's too short to keep on living the past mistakes. I'm not saying that I'm going to be selfish and, like, like, hurt other people again to do, to do that, just so I can, you know, live my life the way

I want it. But, you know, I understand that, like, I'm not the only person that lives in this world and I can't please everybody but it doesn't mean that I have to, that I can't try. And I think, I don't really want to say, I think it just, *it makes me seem more human*, you know what I mean. (Henry, italics emphasized)

Accepting his past misgivings, and emphasizing his humanness, Henry was able to find a commonality with others in society that had not experienced incarceration. Accepting his mistakes shows that he, just like the rest of society, is human, with flaws and regrets and a past marked with erred judgements. However, by both accepting his past inmate identity and the choices he had made at that time, Henry emphasized the need to avoid living in the past and instead promoted living for the future.

Similarly, Isaac's avoidance of hiding the past is captured by the idiom 'every cloud has a silver lining.' Isaac believed that he could use his experience of incarceration and assist other men in developing healthier perspectives about prison life:

I do not hide it, um, because I am not, I am ashamed of being in prison, yes, but (short pause) I can use it as a learning tool for other people. Like, *I can tell them my story* about, you know, going in. And it can be very scary, it can also be a nice relaxing place to go, but it can also be very scary 'cause you screw up and they're gonna take a round out of you. So it's, you know, but you can teach people stuff from your experiences and that's what I like to do. So I don't hide it. I, I say, you know, I'm not proud of it, but this is what I've learned from it. So make it, I try to make it as positive as possible. (Isaac, italics emphasized)

Acceptance was significant for Jacob, as his experience of incarceration was wrought with scheming and impression management in order to achieve an advantage or opportunity over other inmates. Learning how to accept himself allowed Jacob to cast off the 'yard face' and to acknowledge his past mistakes. Indeed, acceptance of his inmate identity allowed him to move forward and construct a more honest identity for himself:

Actually, no, it's like, I learnt, like I said, what I learnt in jail, I learnt how to, to accept myself. And I mean, and honesty is the best policy. Uh, before I used to manipulate and, I mean, I always schemed, you know. Never, I've never once looked at myself and said "okay I have to be this way, no I have to do this." And I lied my way out of everything.... You know, sometimes I try to stay away from being honest, but something stops me ahead and says, you know, "your dishonesty got you in jail and because you've been honest these last three and a half years you've been out things have been good, so try to keep that same aspect." (Jacob)

Frank, Gary, Chris, and Eric each expressed similarly how hiding their past inmate identities would be detrimental to constructing their future selves. With incarceration being a significant event in each of their life-courses, we see how their acceptance of the tragic times in their stories can condition the men to move forward and develop positive futures and future selves:

No. I've been in jail, what am I, what am I going to do. I did that shit, you know. I, it doesn't mean it feels like, "Oh fuck, I'm tough, I'm solid," you know. I've been to jail, you know, you know, fourteen months, you know, it doesn't like that. As I told you, you know, my family's, like, "You don't got to tell them you were in jail." Fuck, you know, I tell them I went to jail. I don't know, I went to jail 'cause I went to jail, it doesn't feel me tough, it doesn't feel me tough. I just don't, not hiding nothing, you know. (Frank)

Not particularly. I don't know, *it's part of my story* I guess. (Gary, italics emphasized)

No, no. I'm very proud of my tattoos 'cause all my tattoos *tell my story* from being in jail. (Chris, italics emphasized)

No. Well, I have no idea. I think because I've been there, done that and I'm not going to hide that. Like, I mean, it would be nice to hide, lie about it and somebody that, that's not familiar with that type of people, person, you know, if you want to get involved with something, somebody, say, like, a relationship. But now I know, like, uh, lying doesn't help ... If you want to be honest and straight-up about something you got to let it out and you got to bring it out. 'Cause if you lie and hide it or whatever that just comes back. It's karma and that karma stuff, I know a lot of people might not believe it but believe it or not it's true. Whatever you, you know, give out, what you put in you get out, you know and what goes around comes around. Everything you do bad comes back at you once or even twice as hard sometimes. (Eric)

The remaining respondents, Adrian and Brandon, felt the need to hide the fact of their incarceration, such as when trying to find employment or interacting with new people. In particular, Adrian had been worried about the anticipated stigma that he would have felt when seeking out employment.

Uh ... yeah, especially when I'm looking for a job. Like, uh, I don't want to tell my boss I've been to jail, and looking for a job 'cause they might not hire me. Yeah, so or other people, when I go shovelling snow or stuff I don't tell them I've been to jail. 'Cause that just might scare them and they might not hire me. (Adrian)

Interestingly, not only did Brandon hide the fact that he had been incarcerated in order to secure some sort of employment, but he emphasized that when he attempts to find employment or meet new people, he distanced himself from what he thought was 'typical' of what other men did when they were released, such as when they brag about being 'locked up' and attempting to reassert their hypermasculine identity in the community. Asserting that the masculine identity he had created for himself upon release was distinct from hypermasculinity, Brandon avoids mentioning his incarceration in order to save face and shift the stigma away from him:

Sometimes. Uh, I don't know, if I'm going for a job interview I'm not going to be like, "yeah, I just got out," you know, fuckin, whatever. Um, I don't know, sometimes when I talk to people I don't like to tell them I was in jail 'cause then they look at you different. Like, "oh, this guy's been to jail," you know, "you can't trust him" and shit. So sometimes I don't, and sometimes I talk about it. Like, if I see, like, if I see an old friend I'll be like "yeah, fuck, I just got out," you know, or yeah. I guess, yeah, I don't go around telling people I've been locked up, although some guys do, some guys like that they've been to jail. They think they're all cool. But me, I don't like to tell people I've been to jail, man. It makes me look stupid, you know. (Brandon)

Furthermore, when the question was asked “Is there anything else you would like to share with me about your experience of being in prison?” several respondents opened up about how essential social programs were to their community re-entry. Specifically, Jacob mentioned that having a larger number of comprehensive social programs would not only have encouraged him to desist from crime but encourage other youth to do the same. Rather than solely relying on incarceration to deal with deviancy, Jacob reportedly felt that the corrections systems at both the provincial and federal level need to incorporate consistent programming into their operations that encourage open discussions surrounding youth and their issues with their families, as well as anger management, conflict resolution, and cultural survival and continuity:

More programs. Like, you know, they, they’ve got to have more of an outlet than just housing. ‘Cause that’s what I find wrong with, with both federal and provincial is like, they’re housed, they talk, it’s called, what do they call it, ‘Corrections.’ *Nothing gets corrected; all of it is, it’s a school for scoundrels.* Like ‘cause a buddy says like before “I didn’t know there was certain things—how to steal a car, how to break into houses, how to do this, how to do that—I learnt that in jail.” Yeah, and, you know, and then the programs I took there, if I would have [taken] them sooner in the provincial aspect instead of housing [...] Like I think that’s where they need to start is in the provincial part because, and same with the youth, like they need to start with anger management programs, uh, ‘the inner child,’ ‘warrior’ [programs]. Like, all of these things I learned in federal, they never had none of that stuff in provincial. And I think what they need to do in provincial is what they do in [Stony Mountain] is your autobiography. Because you have to write about yourself. Because there, I learnt who I was because they made me look at myself... You know what I mean. But I learnt that I looked inside myself and turned myself inside-out, and I didn’t like that person, so I started changing that person.

And in this day and age it seems to, everybody wants to put a Band-Aid on everything. But the core thing is to have everybody look at themselves and by doing that it’s like, ‘young warrior,’ ‘inner child,’ anger management, domestic violence programs. Like those programs, like, I’m so programmed I can probably do a lot of programs, I could facilitate a lot of programs ‘cause I’ve learnt so much. And the thing they talk about, your ‘toolbox,’ and, I mean, you can have a toolbox while you’re sitting in jail for four years and it gets dusty. It’s like when you buy a tool and you don’t use it, how good is that tool? So they need to, have more programs where, they show you the tools [...] Show you how to use it and continue to use it instead of putting into what they call a toolbox. ‘Cause a lot of us have toolboxes that we close and just put underneath the thing and say, “well, I know where that tool is.” You

know what I mean. So but if there was more programming in the earlier stage of criminal life, instead of waiting for them to be adults and go to [Stony Mountain]. (Jacob, italics emphasized)

Indeed, Jacob shares Foucault's (1995) contention that the prison space (re)produces delinquency and criminality. Without appropriate and comprehensive social programs both in prison and in the community, the men that leave the "school for scoundrels" are hardly desisted from criminal activity upon release. Furthermore, the necessity for inmates to use *relevant* tools to construct their identities and new pathways from crime was significant for Jacob. In his mind, the synchronicity between the inmate and the social program is paramount in order to deter youth from creating criminal identities and engaging in subsequent criminal lifestyles.

Similarly, Henry's perspective on the prison is one that supplements the need for more comprehensive social programming in corrections. His self-awareness of the superficial relations and hypermasculine behaviours exuded inside speaks to the significance of building stronger relations between inmates and between inmates and the social programs they attend, both within the prison and once returned to the community:

Inside? (chuckle) Don't do it (chuckle). I hope you don't ever have to experience what I did, you know. It's, what you're doing now is interesting because of the fact that you can get into the minds of some people that have experienced it and it is an interesting thought. And it's very interesting because of the way the community and the dynamic works, you know. 'Cause it's just like you, if you've never experienced it you wouldn't really actually know what it's actually like, you know... Yeah (chuckle). But it's, it's, where I was at it wasn't too bad. Like I said before, it's a little community. So if you help other people they will usually help you and usually you can get along. But like I was saying again, *everything's fake, everything's fake there*. Like, people try to be nice sometimes with other people just 'cause they want to get something or they want to have as many people in their, for their backers, like, as they can get. (Henry, italics emphasized)

As mentioned in Chapter two, understanding both the rhythms of the place and the social relations between the prison space's inhabitants was crucial for men to safely navigate inmate interactions. Henry's mention of the importance of both the dynamics and the inmate community signifies the necessity for reflexivity within inmates. In other words, appropriate social programming can assist men coping with prison life and their struggles through becoming self-aware of their current situation, their biographies, and past experiences with the corrections system. Additionally, comprehensive social programs can assist the men moving forward and returning back into society in the hopes of desistance and reintegration. Isaac noted how there are pros and cons to prison life, and how keeping a positive perspective in social programs can benefit inmates:

Overall it's, it can be a good thing, if you're open-minded, in my opinion. You have to be open-minded to, for change really, and... (sigh) Remand and going to jail is one way to hopefully open up your eyes, but on the downside that's also ways that you can learn different talents in crime. So it has its yin and yang. (Isaac)

Isaac's perspective draws on the prison space's production of delinquents that Foucault (1995) had theorized. While Isaac asserted the need to be open-minded to all social program opportunities in prison, he fully understood that men housed in prison—as a “school for scoundrels,” according to Jacob—will interact and exchange their criminal skills, invariably increasing their criminal skill-set knowledge. The same can be said when we consider how inmate identities are constructed, insofar as the physical prison space provides and encourages social interactions that permit men to alter their (hyper)masculine behaviours to fit other men's dominating hypermasculinities. In turn, such men that alter their masculinity to match others' hypermasculinities are inevitably constructing hypermasculine identities for themselves. Therefore, Jacob's insight is another narrative that brings to light the serious issues surrounding

conceptions of masculinity, inmate identity construction, and the need for appropriate social programs in prison, as well as the necessity to consider how to assist (former) inmates from using their criminal ‘talents’ learned in prison post-release.

Concluding Remarks

This chapter has sought to engage in the issues of community reintegration through former inmates’ narratives. As we have seen, traversing a simple path to reintegration after incarceration is easier said than done for these men. Moreover, relationships with others and connections to community have been disrupted because of the men being incarcerated but also their sense of self and the ways in which they foster new identities for themselves post-release. While Foucault and Wacquant may hold substantial differences in how the prison functions within modern society, where they come together is on the significance of the prison as a carceral space that impacts those housed inside its walls, for both better and worse. While the prison produces delinquency by encouraging inmates to interact and increase their knowledge bases in criminal skills—drawing on Foucault—the prison has the potential to act as a resource for cultural recovery for Indigenous and immigrant inmates by providing social programs that foster positive individual and cultural development for marginalized populations. Concomitantly, however, this chapter has outlined how the prison serves as a reminder of the ‘carceral continuum’ such men are caught in, as they move between the carceral edifice and the inner city. In a Wacquanian sense, this continuum begs the question of whether reintegration is truly attainable for marginalized populations, as such peoples were never ‘integrated’ into Western society initially.

Regarding the men's narratives, it is clear that recidivism and fear of release appear as the dominant concerns for the men. Indeed, the transition from the prison community to the outside brought about worries and fears of adapting to their community. However, having family and friend support systems seemed to mitigate the risk of recidivism and dread of leaving the prison space. For most of the men, incarceration changed them as men, in such a way that most of them did not feel the need to hide the fact that they had 'done time.' The men's experiences, whether positive in terms of self- and soul-searching or negative in terms of mundanity and fearfulness of their safety, illustrate the complexity and interconnectivity of identity construction and selfhood. These men that have been removed from their communities and are incarcerated in prison do not exert the same identities they once had post-release. Regardless of "community-imposed stigma" (Westervelt and Cook 2012: 175) or "public stigma" (Moore et al. 2013; see also LeBel 2012) the men could have allegedly faced, they declined the use of stigma management strategies. While some of the men did experience a sense of "disorientation and displacement" (ibid: 169; see also Jamieson and Grounds 2005), stigma management strategies would have impeded their abilities to develop a stronger definition of self and grow as individuals.

As mentioned above, illuminating the debate between Foucault and Wacquant raises the question of inmates legitimately 'reintegrating' into their communities upon release. Themes that the men spoke of—their most difficult struggles upon release, the supports available upon release, and the extent to which incarceration has changed their selfhoods—suggest that rather than arguing for greater and more expansive 'needs for reintegration,' perhaps what is needed is a new conceptualization of such needs. In other words, instead of focusing on the 'needs for reintegration,' a more empowering notion should focus on the needs for *restoration*, in which research investigates what are needed by inmates to be *restored* into a community, and in turn,

how can that community grow and be empowered by viewing that inmate as an asset—rather than a liability.

In the next chapter, I turn to the possibilities of moving forward and pushing beyond the experiences of incarceration to promote social justice and advocacy for inmates' voices. This venture is accomplished through both reflecting on the existing prison sociological literature that has grounded this project, as well as incorporating a restorative justice framework that promotes positive, proactive, re-entry focused policies for inmates and emphasizes the need for the *restoration* of inmates into the community over community reintegration.

Conclusion: Moving Forward

The goal of the thesis project was to investigate the extent to which prison space impacts identity (re)constructions and behaviours of inmates throughout their interactions, both within the corrections system and once released into the community. Indeed, this project has demonstrated the need to investigate the intersections of spatiality, masculinity, and impression management, as such a lucrative venture benefits future prison sociological inquiry. By conducting interviews with former inmates—men that have been incarcerated in Manitoba’s penal system—the valuable and insightful knowledge these men have shared with me has great potential to assist the lives of those that exist behind prison bars.

Having covered a lot of theoretical and empirical material, it is now time to reflect. In this conclusion, I return to key literatures with which I’ve engaged and I explain the conceptual contributions this thesis project has made. Next, I suggest a restorative justice framework to direct future theorizing and researching of Canadian prison sociological inquiry. Finally, I outline the limitations of the thesis project. While this research benefits Canadian prison sociology, it is important to discuss the weaknesses of this thesis project in order for future inquiry to overcome and remedy these drawbacks.

Engagements with Specific Literatures

By undertaking this thesis project, I have contributed to several literatures. First, I have outlined both the historical, international, and Canadian contributions to prison sociology that I hope scholars will find useful in future research (Chapter 1). Discussing these contributions offers a way to conceptualize how prison sociological inquiry has been investigated in past research, and

a means to account for various prison sociological theorizing at various levels of comparison. If Canadian prison sociological inquiry is as significant as I have suggested, these contributions will hopefully help anchor future studies of Canadian prison sociology in the coming decades.

Second, I have engaged in literature focusing on space and place (Chapter 2). Building a framework for the thesis project that incorporates Lefebvre's 'conceptual triad' of spatiality and Cresswell's theory of place and embodied experiences of rhythms and 'being' is significant to consider within prison sociology. Specifically, conducting the current study along Foucauldian and Goffmanian axes, and incorporating the current carceral geographical perspectives along the way contextualizes the prison and indicates to future scholarship that the need for an interdisciplinary understanding is required for subsequent prison sociological investigations. Discussing these theories in terms of prison spaces—of prison as a 'place,' 'social,' and 'carceral' space—speaks to those scholars working with spatial and place-making interests, opening up new avenues of theorizing and practice that hopefully increases the importance of prison sociological work within Canada.

Third, literature examining both the historical, international, and national contributions to prison sociological literature, as well as studies concerning identity, impression management, and masculinity, have been engaged (Chapter 1). Indeed, historical studies have carried the prison sociology discipline forward. The work of Sykes (1956, 1958), Irwin and Cressey (1962), and Goffman (1961) have all made a considerable impact within contemporary prison sociology (see for example Crewe et al. 2004; Jewkes 2005; Crewe 2006, 2011, 2012, 2014; Crewe and Bennett 2012; Liebling and Arnold 2012; Crewe et al. 2014; Ricciardelli et al. 2015). Furthermore, with the lack of prison sociological research within Canada, the work of Waldram (1997), Hannem (2011), Ricciardelli (2013), and Comack (2008) charter pioneering research in

the ways in which the “prisoning” experience (Comack 2008) takes place within a Canadian context. Taken together, such theoretical contributions constructed a solid framework for the thesis project upon which the workings of identity and masculinity could be further investigated. Indeed, this study has shown that identity construction within a penal context takes on many challenges, and having to act as a kaleidoscope of shifting and fluid identity (Navárez et al. 2009), the inmate predominantly incorporates a masculine identity into their front managements (Caputo-Levine 2012; Crewe et al. 2014). Moreover, while masculinity is homosocial—“performed for, and judged by, other men” (Kimmel 2008: 47)—when we situate hypermasculinity within a prison context, a hypermasculine identity “is the belief that danger is exciting, violence is manly, aggression is acceptable, and going against authority displays a sense of power” (Porter 2012: 47; see also Mosher and Sirkin 1984; Mosher and Tomkins 1988; Ricciardelli et al. 2015). Hypermasculinity, then, can only exist within specific environments, whereas masculinity varies across time and place, as race, class, and sexual orientation impact masculinity differently among societies (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005; Inkle 2014). Indeed, understanding these distinctions assists future research in laying the groundwork for emancipatory projects attempting to contest and dismantle conventional and traditional norms of masculinity (Silverman 1992). Therefore, by examining how identity, impression management, and masculinity theoretically weave together within the prison, this thesis project encourages future research to engage in similar subject matter in order to enrich what can be further known about the inmates’ struggles within carceral contexts.

Fourth, engaging in the qualitative methodological approach of conducting interviews greatly benefits the current study specifically and Canadian prison sociological inquiry generally. While the limitations of the study are discussed below, this thesis project has utilized snowball

sampling techniques to obtain a purposive sample of men that have been incarcerated within Manitoba correctional facilities. Implementing Somer's (1994) narrative identity analysis has enriched this thesis project in terms of how identity oscillates between "narrativity and relationality" (p. 621), and how ontological selfhoods are embedded "in the context of internal and external relations of *time* and *place* and *power* that are constantly in flux" (p. 621, italics in original). As inherent sites of social interaction, qualitative interviews have enabled this thesis project's examination of former inmates' narratives and the "multiple, possible identities" that have been generated both within prison and in the community post-release (Rapley 2001: 309).

Fifth, analyzing the emergent themes obtained from the interviews opens up new discussions surrounding not only spatiality, masculinity, and impression management, but also 'interactional' space, 'sacred' space, religion and Indigenous spirituality, and the reconceptualization of solitary confinement as 'quiet,' peaceful space. Further knowledge production within prison sociological work must take into account this epistemological standpoint. The insight has the ability to examine inmates' struggles inside the prison and redresses the respondents' needs for a healthy and satisfactory community reintegration.

Sixth, community reintegration and re-entry program literatures have been engaged. Illuminating the debate between Foucault and Wacquant over the plausibility of full (re)integration into the community provided a suitable framework to build onto the themes that the men spoke of—their most difficult struggles upon release, the supports available upon release, and the extent to which incarceration has changed their selfhoods. These themes suggest that instead of promoting inmates' 'needs for reintegration' (Westervelt and Cook 2012; see also Winnick and Bodkin 2008), what should be conceptualized and further discussed are the needs for *restoration*. Such research would investigate what is needed by inmates to be *restored* into a

community. In effect, prison sociological work could assist community growth and empowerment by configuring the inmate as an asset—rather than a liability. In the next section, therefore, I expand this focus by engaging with the restorative justice literature to highlight the importance of inmates ‘moving forward’ into their communities and advocate for their community ‘restoration’ over (re)integration. Restorative justice practices have the ability to not only empower inmates but the communities of the released inmates, providing support to strengthen community solidarity and encouraging positive growth for all community members. The need to incorporate traditional Indigenous teachings into restorative approaches is crucial (Ross 1996), especially for Indigenous (former) inmates. Indeed, when considering the spatial contexts of Winnipeg’s inner-city neighbourhoods that these men return to post-release, such restorative approaches have the ability to foster positive individual and social change for both the men and for their communities.

Moving Forward: A Restorative Justice Approach

Sociologists, criminologists, and other scholars can no longer afford to ignore prison sociology’s prominence and prevalence within Canada. More research is required. Indeed, research projects such as this one indicate how not only future theorizing of Canadian prison sociology should be conceptualized, but how such projects aim to benefit inmate reintegration and re-entry in practice. Chris’ response to the question “Is there anything else you would like to share with me?” provided an interesting insight into how this research could assist inmates on the verge of (re)integrating into their communities:

Uh, you know what, it’s been a good experience just coming back to terms, uh...I hope you can do good with it. You know, for the record I think this is good what you’re doing. There should be more guys that come and explain it. I’ve been offered to write a book about my life experiences.... I was a little scared, you know. But I

think I should, I should, I just don't have the time right now. Like, I got to find time to pull out one of those little notebooks and just start writing. And, uh, even, even a recorder, just, you know, sit around and talk like this how I'm talking with you. But like I said, it's like, anything you do like this it, you got to make sure you do it right. You don't want to bullshit in your stories at all because, you know, *all my life wasn't bullshit*. Everything I did was what I did. You know, it's life learnt right there, a lesson learnt, you know. (Chris, italics emphasized)

As mentioned in Chapter five, there is much contention surrounding the plausibility of re-entry programs for inmates and the question of (re)integration debated between Foucault and Wacquant. However, 'moving forward' should be pushed past the Foucauldian/Wacquanian debate and, rather than conceptualizing an inmate's release into his community in terms of reintegration, perhaps what needs to be understood is his release into his community in terms of *restoration*. In other words, perhaps if an inmate is restored into the community, instead of reintegrated, there is a greater potential for a reciprocating relationship between the inmate and his community.

The distinction between 'reintegration' and 'restoration' is a significant one. Drawing upon Wacquant's focus on reintegration (Wacquant 2009, 2010b), it is arguable that these men were never really integrated into their communities specifically and society generally. Distinguishing between reintegration and restoration, then, requires us to reconceptualise the notion of community, and in particular how community is defined by communities themselves. If the concept of 'community' is problematic, then we must wonder if by placing ourselves 'within' a community that we are presuming there are others who do not belong to this community. Indeed, redefining community allows us to understand reintegration as a process of perpetuating a fixed identity that recognizes 'them'—former inmates—as marginalized individuals and subsequently entrenches these men back into their criminalized and inner-city lifestyles. In

effect, the notion of reintegration provides these men little to no alternatives for positive growth, as the identification within the community has demarcated the boundaries and confines them to a meagre living post-release.

While there has been a tendency for communities to form through an ‘us’/ ‘them’ binary, not all communities follow this strategy (Woolford 2009). Indeed, there are some communities that fit what some would refer to as “becoming communities” (Woolford 2009: 106; see also Nancy 1991; Agamben 1993). This type of community life indicates a sense of common identity that is not marked by rigid borders. Instead, community represents something much more fluid here, definable only by those who experience it. Contrary to reintegration, redefining community rather as “a process of becoming” suggests that shifting identification within the community can open up dynamic processes that acknowledge and incorporate particular social, cultural, economic, political, and historical circumstances (Woolford 2009: 108). In addition, restoration acknowledges that as a settler-colonial city, Winnipeg must recognize and engage in processes of decolonization in order to promote and empower ‘becoming communities’ within the city’s limits. As mentioned in Chapter five, returning to Winnipeg’s inner-city communities means that these men are returning to the existing social issues in these communities that hinder positive growth and empowerment for the men at the individual, collective, and community levels. Indeed, as there is a clear overrepresentation of Indigenous individuals in both the Canadian corrections system as well as my group of respondents, it becomes important to acknowledge the need for Indigenous cultures and how such cultural heritage can come into play to further restoration.

In order to assist in the process of restoring Indigeneity into Winnipeg’s inner-city communities, John Braithwaite’s (2002) work on restorative justice informs such a vision. He

outlines restorative justice values that should guide official responses to injustices and that are preserved in international human rights agreements, including (but not limited to) emotional restoration, restoration of human dignity, restoration of damaged relationships and communities, peace, freedom, compassion and caring, and empowerment or self-determination (see also Westervelt and Cook 2012). Restorative justice provides opportunities for perpetrators and those injured to meet in a safe and facilitated process to make amends and develop a plan for redress. In a sense, there is potential to understand inmates as both perpetrators and injured survivors. While the sample of men interviewed is hardly generalizable, the struggles and experiences they faced within the penal system have shaped their identity (re)constructions and behaviours, and have fostered positive developments for them post-release. Moreover, the injustices faced by the Indigenous inmates in terms of Canada's colonial oppression and simultaneous cultural genocide have structured the continuous cycle of violence, poverty, imprisonment, and injustice faced by Canada's Indigenous populations (Waldram 1997; Comack 2008; Perrault 2009; Hannem 2011).

Restorative justice practices have been utilized in cases ranging from post-conflict societies using Truth and Reconciliation inquiries to cases of juvenile crime to homicide and sexual assault (Westervelt and Cook 2012). Elements of this approach that make it attractive in the present context include opportunities for inmates to share their experiences with their community, and opportunities for inmates to take responsibility for their actions, genuinely apologize and make amends with their community, which can restore, strengthen, and empower both the inmates and their communities.

As Braithwaite (2002: 157) contends, "An underestimated way restorative justice might confer power upon the disenfranchised is simply by listening to their stories and taking them seriously." Again, while Braithwaite refers to victims and injured persons resulting from a

perpetrator's actions, I believe that this process has the ability to restore relations between inmates and their communities, first, to lessen the 'offender' and 'deviant' stigma the penal system conveys onto its inmates post-release, and second, to empower communities to foster acceptance and support for marginalized individuals. Indeed, the purpose of sharing former inmates' experiences would be to reclaim their humanity, shed stigma, discuss openly and publicly the unjust conditions and broken legal and penal system within Canada, hear system officials take responsibility and offer apologies for both their present and historical errors, and finally, to build a plan to make amends, restore, and empower (see: Toews [2013] regarding teaching and experiencing restorative justice pedagogies within correctional facilities).

According to Gordon Bazemore and Shadd Maruna (2009: 379) the most notable absence of restorative justice thinking has been precisely “at the point in the system where application of these practices seems most appropriate”—namely, as a model for re-entry. Restorative justice is ideally suited for the restoration of individuals into their communities. For inmates post-release in particular, a goal of 'restorative re-entry' would be the “transformation of individuals from liabilities to assets” (ibid; see also Maloney et al. 2000). A restorative justice framework in this sense would outline an inmate's involvement in 'giving back' to their community and individuals harmed by the inmate's actions. Through such reciprocity, the inmate has the opportunity to change not only his self-image, his public image—from that of a 'deviant' who has harmed community members to that of a 'resource' for rebuilding that community—and his community's public image—by promoting community support and pride to empower and strengthen community solidarity (Bazemore and Stinchcomb 2004; Maruna 2006).

Limitations and Implications of the Study

While much has been learned from the present study, no research is immune from limitations, both in theory and in practice. Highlighting the limitations of this thesis project can hopefully contribute to future theorizing and research in Canadian prison sociology.

First, while I have strived to acknowledge and be open-minded to the experiences the men have shared, I do realize the epistemological ground I stand on while engaging in such research. In other words, my standpoint—as a white, working class, young man—impacts my perceptions of these men’s experiences, and while I have gained some understanding of their struggles—from incarceration to their return post-release—my experiences are not relatable to theirs. This thesis project only provides pieces and fragments of knowledge that these men have chosen to share. Sharing the social-constructivist understanding of subjective ‘truths,’ I cannot make the claim that the thesis project illustrates these men’s ontological experiences *as a whole*. However, while my own standpoint barricades my efforts to ‘truly’ understand their experiences, this does not mean that this research is all for naught. Rather, this thesis project highlights the importance of subjective experiences from various standpoints, and the attempts made by academic inquiry to bridge a relationship between researchers and the individuals we ask to engage in our research. Doing so speaks to the significance of personal experiences that individuals can share when they move throughout similar life-course events (i.e. the incarceration period, followed by release) and the need for researchers to examine how individuals construct identity within subjective experiences of imprisonment.

Second, the information obtained by the sample of men is in no way generalizable to the inmate populations of Manitoba specifically or Canada generally. Therefore, the thesis project

only highlights the experiences of ten men in particular who have interacted with the Manitoba correctional system and community release. However, rather than attempting to produce generalized findings from a larger inmate population, the qualitative research conducted in the thesis project indicates that there is inherent *value* in the small sample's experiences that must be examined and discussed that could not be accomplished in a larger, quantifiable sample.

Third, methodologically speaking, the decision to have a purposive, snowball sample impacts the type of experiences mentioned in the interviews. In other words, while purposively seeking out men that have experienced incarceration was a main objective of the thesis project, it is important to note that in terms of experiences, there is a potential that men with similar experiences will choose to participate in the study. Similar experiences could alter the findings of the study in general. The same can be said for obtaining a sample through snowballing techniques. As I relied on two of the ten men to recruit other men to participate in the study, there is the chance that these two men would enlist the help of their friends and associates who may have similar experiences in prison. Therefore, while the benefits of purposive, snowball samples are simultaneously their own weaknesses, it is significant for researchers to acknowledge the benefits and costs of implementing such samples, and be cautiously aware of the experiences their participants share within the research encounters. Doing so illustrates the need for future research to incorporate additional methods (i.e. surveys, questionnaires, diaries, journals, prison poetry and writings, etc.) to triangle various sources of knowledge that illuminates experiences of incarceration within inmate populations.

Fourth, the sample of men to interview was capped at ten, due to the time restraints of both the thesis project and degree completion. However, there is a chance that a larger sample of men could alter the themes that had emerged from the interviews. While limiting the sample to

ten men may impact the other knowledges and experiences that could be shared, the significance of qualitative work suggests that hypothetically, even a sample size of one person can provide a significant amount of knowledge, information, and experience that enrich prison sociological inquiry at large. Rather than assessing numbers and data trends, this thesis project aims to promote the humanness of the sample, the intricacies of experience, and, in a Heideggerian sense, the complexities embedded of 'being' within the world.

Fifth, the degree of influence of my own subjectivity in analyzing the emergent themes that arose from the interviews is a potential limitation. In other words, historical and international contributions to prison sociological literature have outlined themes such as masculinity and impression management. Concurrently, however, I felt it necessary that within the field I be open to alternative themes that arise 'from the ground,' such as 'interactional,' 'spiritual,' and 'quiet' spaces. Balancing between the themes that theory determines and what themes emerge in practice can be quite difficult for researchers. While this thesis project attempted to balance between theory and practice, the themes that this study has discussed are not an exhaustive list. There is the potential for existing themes that this study has not recognized. Therefore, it is important for prison sociological researchers to balance between theory and practice to the best of their ability, as doing so opens up fascinating observations within prison sociological work that inevitably enhances the discipline.

Sixth, it is important to mention that seven of the ten men interviewed had been recruited from the John Howard Society of Manitoba's bail supervision program, while the three other men were recruited through posters placed at the John Howard Society of Manitoba's office and were not from the bail supervision program. Therefore, recruiting from that specific program may impact the findings that arose from the stories the men shared, as the requirements for

admission to the program may have produced more of a homogeneity in the sample than might otherwise have been the case. Moreover, given that the majority of the men interviewed were dealing with current charges, their standpoints on 're-entry' and community reintegration may be skewed.

Seventh and final, the choice of venue to conduct interviews may impact the experiences shared by the former inmates. As mentioned above, while researchers must be aware of sampling techniques to recruit participants, the location for the interview must be acknowledged when examining the respondents' experiences. The John Howard Society of Manitoba provided me with a small office in their building so that I could interview the sample of men. Ideally, the office was to be convenient for both the participants and myself. This organization provides social service programs to marginalized populations—such as my respondents—and the fact that the location of the interviews took place within the same building could impact their experiences of returning to their communities. Several of the respondents after their interviews indicated that the John Howard Society had provided them programs to assist their reintegration, even though I had made it clear that I did not represent the organization. Therefore, it is important for researchers to acknowledge the spaces they use to conduct their interviews, especially when it appears that social service organizations have connections with the respondents-as-clients. Such decisions may impact the findings that arise from the interviewing process.

Concluding Remarks

The narratives presented here are the men's stories. They deserve to be shared and discussed, rather than discredited and silenced by current political ideologies existing in Canada. These

men's lives, while sharing certain commonalities in terms of demographic information, are intricately complex, with separate life-course events that make their stories unique.

Indeed, bringing their narratives to the forefront illuminates the intense experiences of sadness, pain, and suffering in silence. Being 'locked up,' in terms of both physical incarceration and emotional hardening, has made these men re-evaluate their ambitions, aspirations, and values within themselves. While "everything's fake in there"—inside the prison walls—their stories were not. Their stories constitute the lived experiences and testimonials of what it means for men who are tasked with the challenges of impression management and the performance of masculinity—both within carceral spaces and in their struggles to re-enter the community. As such, the men's narratives enrich both academic and public inquiry into how we treat and come to know those we consider as 'offenders' or 'deviants.'

References

- Andermatt Conley, Verena. 2012. *Spatial Ecologies: Urban Sites, State and World-Space in French Cultural Theory*. Liverpool, UK: Liverpool University Press.
- Agamben, Giorgio. 1993. *The Coming Community*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Apel, Robert and Gary Sweeten. 2010. The Impact of Incarceration on Employment during the Transition to Adulthood. *Social Problems* 57: 448-479.
- Appleton, Catherine. 2010. *Life after Life Imprisonment*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Ashmore, Richard D., Kay Deaux and Tracy McLaughlin-Volpe. 2004. An organizing framework for collective identity: Articulation and significance of multidimensionality. *Psychological Bulletin* 130: 80-114.
- Bahr, Stephen J., Lish Harris, James K Fisher and Anita Harker Armstrong. 2010. Successful Reentry: What Differentiates Successful and Unsuccessful Parolees? *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 54: 667-692.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. 2000. Social Issues of Law and Order. *British Journal of Criminology* 40: 205-221.
- Bazemore, Gordon and Jeanne Stinchcomb. 2004. Civic engagement and reintegration: Toward a community-focused theory and practice. *Columbia Human Rights Law Review* 36: 241-286.
- Bazemore, Gordon and Shadd Maruna. 2009. Restorative Justice in the Reentry Context: Building New Theory and Expanding the Evidence Base. *Victims and Offenders* 4: 375-384.
- Beattie, Karen. 2006. Adult Correctional Services in Canada, 2004/05. *Juristat* 26(5): 1-34.
- Beck, Victoria Simpson, Stephen C. Richards and Preston Elrod. 2008. Prison Visits: On the Outside Looking In. *Journal of Prisoners on Prisons* 17(1).
- Beckford, James A. 2001. Doing Time: Space, Time Religious Diversity and the Sacred in Prisons. *International Review of Sociology* 11(3): 371-382.
- Bierie, David M. 2012. Is Tougher Better? The Impact of Physical Prison Conditions on Inmate Violence. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 56: 338-355.
- Borch, Christian. 2008. Foam architecture: managing co-isolated associations. *Economy & Society* 37(4): 548-571.

- Boudieu, Pierre and Loïc Wacquant. 1992. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Bracken, Denis C., Lawrence Deane and Larry Morrissette. 2009. Desistance and social marginalization: The case of Canadian Aboriginal offenders. *Theoretical Criminology* 13(1): 61-78.
- Brody, Hugh. 1987. *Living Arctic: Hunters of the Canadian North*. Toronto, CAN: Douglas and McIntyre.
- Braithwaite, John. 2002. *Restorative Justice and Responsive Regulation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rubin, Herbert J. and Irene S. Rubin. 2012. *Qualitative Interviewing: The art of hearing data (3rd Edition)*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- CAEFS [Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies]. 2007. *Human and Fiscal Costs of Prison*. Retrieved from <http://www.caefs.ca/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/Human-and-Fiscal-Costs-of-Prison.pdf>.
- Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives-Manitoba. 2005. *The Promise of Investment in Community-Led Renewal. State of the Inner City Report 2005*. Winnipeg: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives-Manitoba.
- _____. 2006. *Inner-City Voices: Community-Based Solutions. State of the Inner City Report 2006*. Winnipeg: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives-Manitoba.
- Chesney, Catherine T., Céline Bellot and Marie-Ève Sylvestre. 2013. Taming Disorderly People One Ticket at a Time: The Penalization of Homelessness in Ontario and British Columbia. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice* 46: 161-85.
- Christian, Johnna, and Leslie W. Kennedy. 2011. Secondary narratives in the aftermath of crime: Defining family members' relationships with prisoners. *Punishment & Society* 13(4): 379-402.
- Clemmer, Donald. 1940. *The Prison Community*. Boston, MA: Christopher.
- Coffey, Amanda and Paul Atkinson. 1996. *Making Sense of Qualitative Data: Complimentary Research Strategies*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Comack, Elizabeth. 2008. *Out There/In Here: Masculinity, Violence, and Prisoning*. Winnipeg, MB: Fernwood Publishing.

- Comack, Elizabeth and Jim Silver. 2008. A Canadian Exception to the Punitive Turn? Community Responses to Policing Practices in Winnipeg's Inner City. *The Canadian Journal of Sociology* 33(4): 815-844.
- _____. 2006. *Safety and Security Issues in Winnipeg's Inner-City Communities: Bridging the Community-Police Divide*. Winnipeg: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives-Manitoba.
- Connell, R.W. 1995. *Masculinities*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- _____. 2008. Masculinity construction and sports in boys' education: a framework for thinking about the issue. *Sport, Education and Society* 13(2): 131-145.
- Connell, R.W. and James W. Messerschmidt. 2005. Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept. *Gender & Society* 18: 829-859.
- Cooper, Sarah. 2013. *It's getting great: Government investment in Gilbert Park and Lord Selkirk Park*. Winnipeg: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives-Manitoba.
- Corley, Derrick 2001. "Prison Friendships". Pp 106-107. in *Prison Masculinities*, edited by Don Sabo, Terry A. Kupers and Willie London. Philadelphia, US: Temple University Press.
- Cosgrove, James F. 2008. Goffman Revisited: Action and Character in the Era of Legalized Gambling. *International Journal of Criminological and Sociological Theory* 1(1): 80-96.
- Crewe, Ben, Jason Warr, Peter Bennett and Allan Smith. 2014. The Emotional Geography of Prison Life. *Theoretical Criminology*, 18(1): 56-74.
- Crewe, Ben. 2006. Prison Drug Dealing and the Ethnographic Lens. *The Howard Journal* 45(4): 347-368.
- _____. 2007. Power, Adaptation and Resistance in a Late-Modern Men's Prison. *British Journal of Criminology* 47: 256-275.
- _____. 2011. Soft power in prison: Implications for staff-prisoner relationships, liberty and legitimacy. *European Journal of Criminology* 8(6): 455-468.
- _____. 2012. *The Prisoner Society: Power, Adaptation, and Social Life in an English Prison*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- , 2014. Not Looking Hard Enough: Masculinity, Emotion, and Prison Research. *Qualitative Inquiry* 20(4): 392-403.
- Crewe, Ben and Jamie Bennett. 2012. "Introduction". Pp. xxi-xxv. in *The Prisoner*, edited by Ben Crewe and Jamie Bennett, London, UK: Routledge.

- Crewe, Ben, Alison Liebling and Susie Hulley. 2014. Heavy—light, absent—present: rethinking the ‘weight’ of imprisonment. *The British Journal of Sociology* 65(3): 387-410.
- CSC [Correctional Service Canada]. 2012. *Classification of Institutions*. Retrieved from <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/plcy/cdshtm/705-7-cd-eng.shtml>.
- Dauvergne, Mia. 2012. *Adult correctional statistics in Canada, 2010/2011* (ISSN: 1209-6393). Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics: Statistics Canada.
- Davidson, Joyce and Milligan, Christine. 2004. Embodying Emotion Sensing Space: Introducing Emotional Geographies. *Social & Cultural Geography* 5(4): 523-532.
- Davis, Angela Y. 2001. “Race, Gender, and Prison History: From the Convict Lease System to the Supermax Prison”. Pp 35-45. in *Prison Masculinities*, edited by Don Sabo, Terry A. Kupers and Willie London. Philadelphia, US: Temple University Press.
- De Certeau, Michel. 1984. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. California, US: University of California Press.
- De Viggiani, Nick. 2012. Trying to be Something You Are Not: Masculine Performances within a Prison Setting. *Men and Masculinities* 15(3): 271-291.
- Deane, Lawrence. 2006. *Under One Roof: Community Economic Development and Housing in the Inner City*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- Deane, Lawrence and Eladia Smoke. 2010. Designing Affordable Housing with Cree, Anishinabe and Métis People. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research* 19(1): 51-70.
- Dobchuk-Land, Bronwyn, Owen Toews and Jim Silver. 2010. Neighbourhood-Level Responses to Safety Concerns in Four Winnipeg Inner-City Neighbourhoods: Reflections on Collective Efficacy. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research* 19(1): 18-33.
- Doucet, Andrea and Natasha S. Mauthner. 2008. What can be known and how? Narrated subjects and the Listening Guide. *Qualitative Research* 8(3): 399-409.
- Einat, Tomer and Gila Chen. 2012. What’s Love Got to Do With It? Sex in a Female Maximum-Security Prison. *The Prison Journal* 92(4): 484-505.
- Eliade, Mircea. 1959. *The Sacred and The Profane: The Nature of Religion*. London: Harcourt Brace & Company.
- Evans, Tony and Patti Wallace. 2008. A Prison within a Prison? The Masculinity Narratives of Male Prisoners. *Men and Masculinities* 10(4): 484–507. DOI: 10.1177/1097184X06291903.
- Ezzell, Matthew B. 2012. “I’m in Control”: Compensatory Method in a Therapeutic Community. *Gender and Society*, 26: 190-215.

- Faccio, Elena and Roberto Costa. 2013. The presentation of self in everyday prison life: Reading interactions in prison from a dramaturgical point of view. *Global Crime* 14(4): 306-403.
- Fathi, David C. 2015. Unites States: Turning the Corner on Solitary Confinement? *Canadian Journal of Human Rights* 4(1): 168-177.
- Fitzgerald, Robin, Michael Wisener and Josée Savoie. 2004. *Neighbourhood Characteristics and the Distribution of Crime in Winnipeg*. Ottawa, CAN: Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics.
- Flyvbjerg, Bent. 2006. Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research. *Qualitative Inquiry* 12 (2): 219-245.
- Foucault, Michel. 1984. "Space, Power, Knowledge." Pp. 239-256 in *The Foucault Reader*. New York: Pantheon.
- _____. 1995. *Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Toronto, Canada: Random House of Canada Ltd.
- _____. 2007. *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the College de France 1977-1978*. Picador.
- Franke, Herman. 1992. The Rise and Decline of Solitary Confinement: Socio-historical Explanations of Long-term Penal Changes. *The British Journal of Criminology* 32(2): 125-143.
- Game, Ann. 2001. 'Belonging: Experience in Sacred Time and Space.' Pp. 226-239 in *TimeSpace: Geographies of Temporality*, edited by Jon May and Nigel Thrift. London: Routledge.
- Garcia Jiménez, Enrique and Rocio Lorente García. 2014. Identity of the inmate and new spaces of re-socialization after leaving the correctional institution. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences* 132: 351-356.
- Gear, Sasha. 2007. Behind the Bars of Masculinity: Male Rape and Homophobia in and about South African Men's Prisons. *Sexualities* 10(2): 209–227. DOI: 10.1177/1363460707075803.
- Ghorayshi, Parvin. 2010. Diversity and Interculturalism: Learning from Winnipeg's Inner City. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research* 19(1): 89-104.
- Gieryn, Thomas F. 2000. A Space for Place in Sociology. *Annual Reviews of Sociology*, 26: 463-496.

- Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York, NY: Anchor Books.
- _____. 1961. *Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates*. Toronto, Canada: Random House of Canada Ltd.
- _____. 1967. *Interaction Ritual*. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books.
- _____. 1972. *Encounters: Two Studies in the Sociology of Interaction*. London, UK: The Penguin Press.
- _____. 1983. *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia, USA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Griffin, Marie L. and John R. Hepburn. 2012. Inmate Misconduct and the Institutional Capacity for Control. *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 40: 270-288.
- Grounds, Adrienne and Ruth Jamieson. 2003. No Sense of an Ending: Researching the Experience of Imprisonment and Release among Republican Ex-prisoners. *Theoretical Criminology* 7: 347-362.
- Hames-Garcia, Michael. 2004. *Fugitive Thought: Prison Movements, Race, and the Meaning of Justice*. Minneapolis, USA: University of Minnesota Press.
- Hannem, Stacey. 2011. "Stigma and Marginality: Gendered Experiences of Families of Male Prisoners in Canada." Pp. 183-214. In *Critical Criminology in Canada: New Voices, New Directions*, edited by Aaron Doyle and Dawn Moore. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Hart, Michael. 2010. "Colonization, Social Exclusion, and Indigenous Health." Pp. 115-125 in *The Social Determinants of Health in Manitoba*, edited by Lynne Fernandez, Shauna MacKinnon, and Jim Silver. Winnipeg: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives-Manitoba.
- Harvey, Joel. 2007. *Young Men in Prison: Surviving and Adapting to Life Inside*. Cullumpton, UK: Willan.
- Hay, Robert. 1998. Sense of place in a developmental context. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 18: 5-29.
- Hayward, Keith J. 2012. "Using cultural geography to think differently about space and crime." In *New Direction in Criminological Theory*, edited by Steve Hall and Simon Winlow. Florence, USA: Routledge.
- Hochschild, Arlie Russell. 1983. *The Managed Heart: The Commercialization of Human Feeling*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Holmberg, Carl Bryan. 2001. The Culture of Transgression: Initiations into the Homosociality of a Midwestern State Prison. Pp. 78-92. in *Prison Masculinities*, edited by Don Sabo, Terry A. Kupers and Willie London. Philadelphia, US: Temple University Press.
- Huggins, Denise W., Loretta Capeheart and Elizabeth Newman. 2006. Deviants or Scapegoats: An Examination of Pseudofamily Groups and Dyads in Two Texas Prisons. *The Prison Journal* 86(1): 114-139.
- Inkle, Kay. 2014. Strong and Silent: Men, Masculinity, and Self-injury. *Men and Masculinities* 17(1): 3-21.
- Irwin, John and Donald R. Cressey. 1962. *Thieves, Convicts and the Inmate Culture*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Irwin, John. 1980. *Prisons in Turmoil*. Boston, MA: Little Brown.
- Irwin, John and Barbara Owen. 2005. Harm and the Contemporary Prison. Pp. 94-117. In *Pains of Imprisonment*, edited by Alison Liebling and Shauna Maruna. Portland, OR: Willan.
- Jacobs, James B. 1977. *Stateville: The Penitentiary in Mass Society*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Jamieson, Ruth and Adrienne Grounds. 2005. Release and Adjustment: Perspectives from Studies of Wrongly Convicted and Politically Motivated Prisoners. Pp. 33-65. In *The Effects of Imprisonment*, edited by Alison Liebling and Shauna Maruna. Portland, OR: Willan.
- Jewkes, Yvonne. 2005. Men Behind Bars: 'Doing' Masculinity as an Adaptation to Imprisonment. *Men and Masculinities* 8(1): 44-63.
- _____. 2013. "On Carceral Space and Agency". Pp. 127-131. in *Carceral Spaces: Mobility and Agency in Imprisonment and Migrant Detention*, edited by Dominique Moran, Nick Gill and Deirdre Conlon. Surrey, UK: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.
- John Howard Society of Canada. 2005. *Prison Voices*. Kingston, CAN: John Howard Society of Canada.
- Journal of Prisoners on Prison. 2013. "Journal of Prisoners on Prisons." Retrieved May 6th, 2015 (www.jpp.org).
- Kerley, Kent R. and Heith Copes. 2009. Identity Maintenance and Religious Social Support in the Prison Context. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 53(2): 228-244.

- Kerr, Lisa Coleen. 2015. The Origins of Unlawful Prison Policies. *Canadian Journal of Human Rights* 4(1): 91-119.
- Kimmel, Michael. 2008. *Guyland: The Perilous World Where Boys Become Men*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.
- King, Kate, Benjamin Steiner and Stephanie Ritchie Breach. 2008. Violence in the Supermax: A Self-Fulfilling Prophecy. *The Prison Journal* 88(1): 144-168.
- Koenig, Harold G., Dana E. King and Verna Benner Carson. 2001. *Handbook of Religion and Health*. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Kohm, Steven. 2009. Spatial Dimensions of Fear in a High Crime Community: Fear of Crime or Fear of Disorder? *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice* 51(1): 1-30.
- _____. 2012. "Justice and Victimization in the Inner City: Notes from Central Winnipeg." Pp. 175-189 in *Thinking about Justice: A Book of Readings*, edited by Kelly Gorkoff and Richard Jochelson. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- Koskela, Hille. 2003. Cam Era—the contemporary urban Panopticon. *Surveillance and Society* 1(3): 292-313.
- Kruttschnitt, Candace and Rosemary Gardner. 2006. *Making Time in the Golden State: Women's Imprisonment in California*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kupers, Terry A. 2005. Toxic masculinity as a barrier to mental health treatment in prison. *Journal of Clinical Psychology* 61(6): 713–724. DOI:10.1002/jclp.20105.
- Kyle, Gerard and Garry Chick. 2007. The Social Construction of a Sense of Place. *Leisure Studies* 29: 209-225.
- LeBel, Thomas P. 2012. Invisible Stripes? Formerly Incarcerated Persons' Perceptions of Stigma. *Deviant Behavior* 33: 89-107.
- Lefebvre, Henri. 1991. *The Production of Space*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Lezubski, Darren, Jim Silver and Errol Black. 2000. "High and Rising: The Growth of Poverty in Winnipeg." Pp. 26-51 in *Solutions that Work: Fighting Poverty in Winnipeg*, edited by Jim Silver. Winnipeg: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives-Manitoba and Fernwood Publishing.
- Liebling, Alison and Helen Arnold. 2012. Social relationships between prisoners in a maximum security prison: Violence, faith, and the nature of trust. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 40: 413-424.

- Loxley, John. 2000. "Aboriginal Economic Development in Winnipeg." Pp. 84-110 in *Solutions that Work: Fighting Poverty in Winnipeg*, edited by Jim Silver. Winnipeg: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives-Manitoba and Fernwood Publishing.
- Maloney, Dennis, Gordon Bazemore and Joe Hudson. 2000. The end of probation and the beginning of community corrections. *Perspectives* 3: 23-30.
- Martinez, Damian J. and Johnna Christian. 2009. The Familial Relationships of Former Prisoners: Examining the Link between Residence and Informal Support Mechanisms. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 38(2): 201-224.
- Maruna, Shadd. 2006. Who owns resettlement? Towards restorative reintegration. *British Journal of Community Justice* 4(2): 23-33.
- Maruna, Shadd, Louise Wilson and Kathryn Curran. 2006. Why God is often found behind bars: Prison conversions and the crisis of self-narrative. *Research in Human Development* 3: 161-184.
- Mauer, Marc. 2001. "Crime, Politics, and Community since the 1990s". Pp 46-53. in *Prison Masculinities*, edited by Don Sabo, Terry A. Kupers and Willie London. Philadelphia, US: Temple University Press.
- McKegney, Sam. 2014. *Masculindians: Conversations about Indigenous Manhood*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.
- Mears, Daniel P., and William D. Bales. 2010. Supermax housing: Placement, duration, and time to re-entry. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 38: 545-554.
- Messerschmidt, James W. 2001. "Masculinities, Crime, and Prison." Pp. 67-72. in *Prison Masculinities*, edited by Don Sabo, Terry A. Kupers and Willie London. Philadelphia, US: Temple University Press.
- _____. 2010. *Hegemonic Masculinities and Camouflaged Politics*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.
- _____. 2012. Engendering Gendered Knowledge: Assessing the Academic Appropriation to Hegemonic Masculinity. *Men and Masculinities* 15(1): 56-76.
- Metzner, Jeffrey L. and Jamie Fellner. 2010. Solitary Confinement and Mental Illness in U.S. Prisons: A Challenge for Medical Ethics. *The Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and Law* 38: 104-108.
- Milhaud, Olivier and Dominique Moran. 2013. "Penal Space and Privacy in French and Russian Prisons". Pp. 167-182. in *Carceral Spaces: Mobility and Agency in Imprisonment and Migrant Detention*, edited by Dominique Moran, Nick Gill and Deirdre Conlon. Surrey, UK: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.
- Miller, Vincent. 2011. *Understanding Digital Culture*. London: Sage.

- Mincke, Christophe and Anne Lemonne. 2014. Prison and (Im)mobility. What about Foucault? *Mobilities* 9(4): 528-549.
- Moore, Kelly, Jeffrey Stuewig and June Tangney. 2013. Jail Inmates' Perceived and Anticipated Stigma: Implications for Post-release Functioning. *Self and Identity* 12(5): 527-547.
- Moran, Dominique. 2012a. "Doing Time" in Carceral Space: TimeSpace and Carceral Geography. *Geografiska Annaler, Series B*: 305-316.
- _____. 2012b. Prisoner reintegration and the stigma of prison time inscribed on the body. *Punishment and Society* 14(5): 564-583.
- _____. 2013a. Between outside and inside? Prison visiting rooms as liminal carceral spaces. *GeoJournal* 78: 339-351.
- _____. 2013b. Carceral geography and the spatialities of prison visiting: visitation, recidivism, and hyperincarceration. *Environment and Planning Design* 34: 174-190.
- Moran, Dominique, Laura Piacentini and Judith Pallot. 2013. "Liminal TransCarceral Spaces: Prison Transportation for Women in the Russian Federation". Pp. 109-124. in *Carceral Spaces: Mobility and Agency in Imprisonment and Migrant Detention*, edited by Dominique Moran, Nick Gill and Deirdre Conlon. Surrey, UK: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.
- Mosher, Donald and Mark Sirkin. 1984. Measuring a macho personality constellation. *Journal of Research in Personality* 18: 150-164.
- Mosher, Donald and Sylvan S. Tomkins. 1988. Scripting the Macho Man: Hypermasculine Socialization and Enculturation. *The Journal of Sex Research* 25(1): 60-84.
- Nancy, Jean-Luc. 1991. *The Inoperative Community*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Navárez, Rafael F., Ilan H. Meyer, Robert M. Kertzner, Suzanne C. Ouellette, and Allegra R. Gordon. 2009. A Qualitative Approach to the Intersection of Sexual, Ethnic, and Gender Identities. *Identity* 9(1): 63-86.
- O'Brien, Carol S. 2013. "Having CLOUT: Becoming an ally and having the power to resist colonialism and neoliberalism in Winnipeg's inner city." Master's thesis project, Department of City Planning, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg.
- Office of the Correctional Investigator. 2014. *Annual Report 2013-2014: Of the Office of the Correctional Investigator* (ISBN: 1493-5295). Ottawa: Government of Canada.
- O'Reilly-Shaughnessy, Peggy. 2001. *Friction within the Machine: Aboriginal Prisoners behind the Wall* (Master of Arts Program Thesis). Peterborough: Trent University.
- Parkes, Debra. 2015. Ending the Isolation: An Introduction to the Special Volume on Human Rights and Solitary Confinement. *Canadian Journal of Human Rights* 4(1): vii-xiii.
- Perreault, Samuel. 2009. The Incarceration of Aboriginal People in Adult Correctional Services. *Juristat* 29(3): 1-27.

- Piché, Justin and Kevin Walby. 2010. Problematizing Carceral Tours. *British Journal of Criminology* 570-581.
- Piché, Justin and Karine Major. 2015. Prison Writing in/on Solitary Confinement: Contributions from the Journal of Prisoners on Prisons, 1988-2013. *Canadian Journal of Human Rights* 4(1): 1-31.
- Plummer, Ken. 1995. *Telling Sexual Stories*. New York, USA: Routledge.
- Putnam, Robert D. 1993. The Prosperous Community: Social Capital and Public Life. *American Prospect* 13: 35-42.
- Pollock, John. 1997. *Prisons: Today and Tomorrow*. Sudbury, MA: Jones & Bartlett Publishers.
- Porter, Kevin. 2012. *Angry Little Men: Hypermasculinity, Academic Disconnect, and Mentoring African American Males*. Chicago, IL: African American Images.
- Propper, Alice. M. 1989. Love, Marriage, and Father-Son Relationships Among Male Prisoners. *The Prison Journal* 69: 57-63.
- Rapley, Timothy John. 2001. The art(fullness) of open-ended interviewing: some considerations on analysing interviews. *Qualitative Research* 1(3): 303-323.
- Rhodes, Lorna. A. 2001. Toward an Anthropology of Prisons. *Annual Reviews of Anthropology* 30: 65-83.
- Ricciardelli, Rose. 2013. Establishing and Asserting Masculinity in Canadian Penitentiaries. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 1-22.
- _____. 2014. *Surviving Incarceration: Inside Canadian Prisons*. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press.
- Ricciardelli, Rose, Katharina Maier and Kelly Hannah-Moffat. 2015. Strategic masculinities: Vulnerabilities, risk and the production of prison masculinities. *Theoretical Criminology*, 1-23.
- Ricordeau, Gwénola. 2008. *Les Détenus et leurs proches: Solidarités et sentiments à l'ombre des murs*. Paris: Éditions Autremets.
- Rives, John. 2008. *The Perfection of Guilt: new and selected poems*. Hamilton, CAN: Mini Mocho Press.
- Ross, Rupert. 1996. *Returning to the Teachings: Exploring Aboriginal Justice*. Toronto, CAN: Penguin Books.
- Sabo, Don. 2001. "Doing Time, Doing Masculinity: Sports in Prison". Pp 61-66. in *Prison Masculinities*, edited by Don Sabo, Terry A. Kupers and Willie London. Philadelphia, US: Temple University Press.

- Sabo, Don, Terry A. Kupers and Willie London. 2001. "Gender and the Politics of Punishment". Pp 3-18. in *Prison Masculinities*, edited by Don Sabo, Terry A. Kupers and Willie London. Philadelphia, US: Temple University Press.
- Shalev, Sharon. 2011. Solitary Confinement and Supermax Prisons: A Human Rights and Ethical Analysis. *Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice* 11: 151-183.
- _____. 2015. Solitary Confinement: The View from Europe. *Canadian Journal of Human Rights* 4(1): 144-165.
- Shelton, Nicole J., Thomas E. Trail, Tessa V. West, and Hilary B. Bergsieker. 2010. From strangers to friends: The interpersonal process model of intimacy in developing interracial friendships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 27(1): 71-90.
- Silver, Jim. 2000. "Solutions that Work: Fighting Poverty in Winnipeg's Inner City." Pp. 126-154 in *Solutions that Work: Fighting Poverty in Winnipeg*, edited by Jim Silver. Winnipeg: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives-Manitoba and Fernwood Publishing.
- _____. 2006. *In Their Own Voices: Building Urban Aboriginal Communities*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- _____. 2008. *The Inner Cities of Saskatoon and Winnipeg: A New and Distinctive Form of Development*. Winnipeg: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives-Manitoba.
- _____. 2010. "Spatially-concentrated, Racialized Poverty as a Social Determinant of Health: The Case of Winnipeg's Inner City." Pp. 161-171 in *The Social Determinants of Health in Manitoba*, edited by Lynne Fernandez, Shauna MacKinnon, and Jim Silver. Winnipeg: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives-Manitoba.
- Silverman, Kaja. 1992. *Male Subjectivity at the Margins*. New York: Routledge.
- Soja, Edward. 1989. *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. London, UK: Verso Press.
- Somers, Margaret. 1994. The narrative constitution of identity: A relational and network approach. *Theory and Society* 23: 605-649.
- Somers, Margaret and Gloria Gibson. 1994. "Reclaiming the Epistemological 'Other': Narrative and the Social Constitution of Identity". Pp 37-99. In *Social Theory and the Politics of Identity*, edited by Craig Calhoun (ed.). Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.
- Stanley, Liz. 1993. The Knowing Because Experiencing Subject: Narratives, Lives, and Autobiography. *Women's Studies International Forum* 16(3): 205-215.
- Stewart, Abigail J. and Christa McDermott. 2004. Gender in Psychology. *Annual Review of Psychology* 55: 519-544.

- Stringer, Ebonie Cunningham. 2009. 'Keeping the Faith': How Incarcerated African American Mothers use Religion and Spirituality to Cope with Imprisonment. *Journal of African American Studies* 13:325-347.
- Sykes, Gregory. 1956. Men, merchants and toughs: A study of reactions to imprisonment. *Social Problems* 4: 130-138.
- _____. 1958. *The Society of Captives: A Study of a Maximum-Security Prison*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Thrift, Nigel. 2003. "Space: The Fundamental Stuff of Human Geography." Pp. 95-107. in *Key Concepts in Geography*, edited by Sarah L. Holloway, Stephen P. Rice and Gill Valentine. London, UK: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Toch, Hans. 1998. Hypermasculinity and prison violence. Pp 168-178. in *Masculinities and violence*, edited by Bowker. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Toews, Barbara. 2013. Toward a restorative justice pedagogy: reflections on teaching restorative justice in correctional facilities. *Contemporary Justice Review* 16(1): 6-27.
- Useem, Bert and Anne Morrison Piehl. 2008. *Prison State: The Challenges of Mass Incarceration*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Visher, Christy A. and Jeremy Travis. 2003. Understanding individual pathways: Transitions from prison to community. *Annual Review of Sociology* 29: 89-113.
- Wacquant, Loïc. 2000. The New 'Peculiar Institution': On the Prison as Surrogate Ghetto. *Theoretical Criminology* 4(3): 377-389.
- _____. 2002. The curious eclipse of prison ethnography in the age of mass incarceration. *Ethnography* 3(4): 371-398.
- _____. 2009. *Punishing the Poor: The Neoliberal Government of Social Inequality*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- _____. 2010a. Crafting the Neoliberal State: Workfare, Prisonfare, and Social Insecurity. *Sociological Forum* 25(2): 197-220.
- _____. 2010b. Prisoner re-entry as myth and ceremony. *Dialectical Anthropology* 34: 605-620.
- _____. 2010c. Urban Desolation and Symbolic Denigration in the Hyperghetto. *Social Psychological Quarterly* 73(3): 215-219.
- _____. 2012a. 'The Prison as an Outlaw Institution.' *The Howard Journal* 51(1): 1-15.
- _____. 2012b. The Wedding of Workfare and Prisonfare in the 21st Century. *Journal of Poverty* 16: 236-249.

- Walby, Kevin and Justin Piché. 2011. The Polysemy of punishment memorialisation: Dark tourism and Ontario's penal history museums. *Punishment and Society* 451-472.
- Waldram, James B. 1997. *The Way of the Pipe: Aboriginal Spirituality and Symbolic Healing in Canadian Prisons*. Peterborough: Broadview Press.
- Walmsley, Roy. 2005. *World Prison Population List* (sixth edition). Home Office: HMSO.
- Ward, Tony and Astrid Birgden. 2007. Human Rights and Correctional Clinical Practice, *Aggression and Violent Behaviour* 12: 628-643.
- Ward, Tony and Bill Marshall. 2007. Narrative identity and offender rehabilitation. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 51: 279-297.
- Ward, Tony and Kendra Syversen. 2009. Human Dignity and Vulnerable Agency: An Ethical Framework for Forensic Practice, *Aggression and Violent Behaviour* 14: 94-105.
- Ward, Tony and Gwenda Willis. 2010. Ethical Issues in Forensic and Correctional Research, *Aggression and Violent Behaviour* 15: 399-409.
- Warr, Jason. 2008. "Personal experiences of prison staff." Pp. 17-29 in *Understanding Prison Staff*, edited by Jamie Bennett, Ben Crewe and Azrini Wahidin. Cullumpton: Willan.
- Weinrath, Michael, Melanie Janelle Murchison and Trevor Markesteyn. 2012. "Measuring Success of Corrections Programs: The Evaluation of the Minobimasdiziwin Prison Gang Intervention Program." Pp. 32-51. In *Thinking about Justice: A Book of Readings*, edited by Kelly Gorkoff and Richard Jochelson. Winnipeg, CAN: Fernwood Publishing.
- Westervelt, Sandra D. and Kimberly J. Cook. 2012. *Life After Death Row: Exonerees' Search for Community and Identity*. New Brunswick, CAN: Rutgers University Press.
- Winnick, Terri A. and Mark Bodkin. 2008. Anticipated Stigma and Stigma Management Among Those to be Labeled 'Ex-con'. *Deviant Behavior* 29: 295-333.
- Woolford, Andrew. 2009. *The Politics of Restorative Justice: A Critical Introduction*. Winnipeg and Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- Youngblood Jackson, Alecia. 2013. Spaces of Power/Knowledge: A Foucauldian Methodology for Qualitative Inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry* 19(10): 839-847.

Appendix A: Informed Consent Form



UNIVERSITY
OF MANITOBA

Winnipeg, Manitoba
Canada R3T 2N2
Telephone: (204) 474-9260
Fax: (204) 261-1216

Department of Sociology

Informed Consent for Inmate Interviews

Project Title: The Impact of Life behind Bars: Understanding Space, Impression Management and Masculinity through Ex-Inmate Narratives

Researcher: James Gacek, Graduate Student, University of Manitoba, Department of Sociology

Phone: xxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Email: xxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Faculty Advisor: Elizabeth Comack

Phone: xxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Email: xxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Complaints: Human Ethics Secretariat, _____

Sponsors: Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council; Manitoba Research Alliance

This consent form, a copy of which will be left with you for your records and reference, is only part of the process of informed consent. It should give you the basic idea of what the research is about and what your participation will involve. If you would like more detail about something mentioned here, or information not included here, you should feel free to ask. Please take the time to read this carefully and to understand any accompanying information.

Project Description:

James Gacek from the University of Manitoba is conducting a study on how prison models of supervision compare and contrast with each other, as well as the impact of prison experience on inmates' identities and behavior, and the degree to which such models of supervision have an impact upon inmate perceptions and experiences of incarceration within Manitoba corrections and their return to their community once released.

Participation in this study will involve an in-person interview conducted by the researcher of the study. The interview will take place **during regular office hours (9am to 4:30pm) at the John Howard Society of Manitoba at 583 Ellice Avenue. The interview will take approximately 60 minutes and will be audio-recorded on a digital recorder and transcribed.** The interviewer will request that you permit him to digitally record your conversation, but if you object the interviewer will transcribe it by hand. The interviewer will ask you questions about your background/demographics and what you see as your physical, mental and emotional needs and challenges with regards to your safety and security throughout your experiences of incarceration. **In recognition of your time and effort, you will receive an honorarium of a twenty-five (25) dollars whether or not you answer all of the questions or finish the interview.** Your participation in the interview is voluntary and you do not have to participate in an interview if you don't want to. You can stop the interview at any time and you are free to not answer any question you don't want to. Your decision to participate or not participate will in no way affect your relationship with the John Howard Society of Manitoba, other institutions or agencies, or any services that you receive.

Please initial here if you would like to receive all reports produced based upon this research:

Confidentiality:

Any information that could identify you personally will be kept confidential. The audio-recordings of the interviews will be downloaded to a computer file that is password protected. The audio-recording device will be wiped following download to computer. No names or names of agencies, businesses or communities will be included in the transcript. The transcripts and consent forms will be number coded and stored separately in locked cabinets at the researcher's university office. These consent forms and the transcripts will be stored separately so no one can link your name to your interview information. Only the researcher himself will ever be able to see your interview. All of the transcripts, recordings and consent forms will be destroyed five years after the completion of the data collection. This will be 2019. Please note that in accordance with Section 17(2) of *The Child and Family Service Act*, the researcher is required by law to report current and past unreported child abuse or situations dangerous to children of Child and Family Services. This refers to people who are currently children, not to past abuse or to people who are now adults. Please note that the researcher is also required by law to report current criminal offenses to the Winnipeg Police Service and the proper Authorities. These are the same laws followed by service providers.

Dissemination:

The information you give will be combined with information collected from other inmates. A summary of the results from the interviews will be prepared for a thesis project concerning inmate perceptions on prison designs, and a more detailed summary will be supplied to the John Howard Society of Manitoba and the Manitoba Research Alliance for distribution. In addition, electronic copies will be provided to the agencies for posting on their websites to download. These summaries will be available in September 2015.

The findings of this study will be disseminated in aggregate (group) form only through reports prepared by the researcher, journal articles, conference presentations and presentations to community organizations and institutions. **No names or identifying information will be included in the findings.**

Risks and Benefits:

There is the potential of risk from participating in this research. Participants may feel emotional or psychological stress from recounting their experiences of incarceration. The John Howard Society of Manitoba has offered to assist you if you require further counselling. A list of helpful resources (i.e. agencies and contact information) will be provided to you if you feel you would like assistance from additional counselling agencies.

There may be a short-term benefit to you in terms of having an opportunity to tell a concerned listener about the challenges and needs of inmates regarding their safety and security within Manitoba corrections and upon their return to their communities. In the long term, you may benefit if the findings of the research help persuade government officials and other policy-makers to change in a positive direction policies that directly affect you.

Consent:

Your signature on this form indicates that you have understood to your satisfaction the information regarding participation in the research project and agree to participate as a subject. In no way does this waive your legal rights nor release the researcher, sponsors, or involved institutions from their legal and professional responsibilities. You are free to withdraw from the interview at any time, even after it begins, and /or refrain from answering any questions you prefer to omit, without prejudice or consequence. Your continued participation should be as informed as your initial consent, so you should feel free to ask for clarification or new information throughout your participation.

The University of Manitoba may look at your research records to see that the research is being done in a safe and proper way.

This research has been approved by the Psychology/Sociology Research Ethics Board. If you have any concerns or complaints about this project you may contact any of the above-named persons or the Human Ethics Coordinator (HEC) at _____. A copy of this consent form has been given to you to keep for your records and reference.

If you agree to participate in this interview, please place your name and signature in the appropriate spaces below.

I _____ (print name) understand what the study is about and what participation involves and the signature below means that I agree to participate.

(signature)

(date)

(signature of interviewer)

(date)

Email or surface email address to which a summary of findings and written reports (at your option) should be sent:

Appendix B: Demographic Information

Respondent: _____

How old are you? _____

Do you identify with a specific race or ethnicity? _____

What level of schooling did you complete? _____

Are you presently in a relationship? For how long? _____

Do you have any children? How many and what are their ages?

Where did you grow up?

Where were you living prior and/or in between your times in incarceration?

Appendix C: Interview Schedule

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview. In this project, I am interested in learning about men's experiences of being incarcerated, especially in terms of the impact of the space of the prison on their sense of self and their interactions with each other—and how that experience of incarceration might carry forward into the community once released.

Experiences of incarceration.

Which jails/remand/prisons have you been incarcerated in? For how long? What was that experience like for you?

How did you cope with stress or frustrating situations while incarcerated?

Next we have some questions about your perception of prison spaces.

Do you remember the unit(s) you were housed in at [place]? Can you describe it/them for me? How did you find living in that/those unit(s)?

Can you tell me what a typical day looked like for you? (i.e. your routine or schedule)

Where did you spend most of your time during the day? Can you describe that space for me?

Where did you eat your meals? Can you describe that space for me?

Have you spent time in segregation? For how long? Can you describe that space for me? What was that experience like for you?

When you got time to yourself, how did you like to spend it? (reading, watching TV, etc.)

Were there spaces in the jail/prison that felt safer to you than others? Why or why not?

Were there certain spaces in the jail/prison that were more 'unsafe' than others? Please describe to me a space in the jail/prison where you felt unsafe.

Can you describe a space for me where the other men could let their guard down and be more emotional (happier, sadder, etc.)? Had you ever been in this space? What was this experience like for you?

Next we have some questions regarding prison architecture and security.

Do you agree or disagree that security cameras in jails and prison are used to make inmates feel 'safer'? Why or why not? -- If you were given a say in how spaces in the prison (such as the dining hall, the visiting room, individual cells, etc.) were organized or constructed, how would you change them? Why would you change them or why not?

Were there cells in your unit that got robbed? Why do you think some cells got robbed over others?

Do you agree or disagree that the spaces in the prison (such as the dining hall, the visiting room, individual cells, etc.) have been organized and constructed to meet the needs of the inmates? Why or why not?

Do you agree or disagree that there is a fear of spending time in segregation? Why or why not?

The next set of questions deals with your perception of other inmates.

Do you think that men put act tougher when they're in jail/prison? If so, what would that look like?

Do you think that there are certain spaces in jail/prison where inmates act 'tougher' than usual? Why or why not?

Were there spaces in jail/prison that were mainly occupied by particular racial/ethnic groups? What groups and what spaces were they? How did this make you feel?

The final set of questions deal with your perception of community re-entry and reintegration.

What was the hardest thing you had to deal with once you were released from jail/prison? How did you manage to cope with that?

Did you have a lot of supports in the community when you were released? What did that involve?

Do you think that being incarcerated has changed you as a person? In what ways?

Do you feel the need to hide the fact that you have been to prison? Why or why not?

Is there anything else you would like to share with me about your experience of being in prison?

Thank you very much for your time and contribution to my research.

Appendix D: Counselling Services

The John Howard Society of Manitoba

Location: 583 Ellice Avenue

Phone: _____

Klinic Community Health Care

Location: 870 Portage Avenue

Phone: Crisis Line: _____

Toll Free: _____

Bergen & Associates Counselling

1st Location: 143 Smith Street

2nd Location: 1483 Pembina Highway

Phone: _____

Men's Resource Centre

Location: 115 Pulford Street

Phone: _____

Ma Mawi Wi Chi Itata Centre- McGregor Neighborhood Care Site

Location: 363 McGregor Street

Phone: _____

Spence Neighborhood Care Site

Location: 443 Spence Avenue

Phone: _____

Crisis Response Centre

Location: 817 Bannatyne Avenue

Phone: _____

St. Raphael Centre Inc.

Location: 225 Vaughan Street

Phone: _____