

Sport, Masculinities and Power relations in Prison

Berit Johnsen

The Norwegian University of Sport and Physical Education
2001

Chapter one

Introduction

When I was a child, we used to play a game called “police and thief”. We split into two equal groups with five-six children in each group where one group was the police and the other group was the thieves. The idea of the play was that the police should catch the thieves and put them in prison. We defined a place for the prison, for example, an edge of a lawn, the base of some trees or something like that. I remember I thought it was most fun to be a thief and try to avoid getting caught by the police. Whenever I was caught, however, I could do what was the most fun during playtime, which was to cheat the police guarding the prisoners and escape. The most boring was when my group was the police, and I had to be the one guarding the prisoners and try to prevent them from escaping. I seldom managed to keep the prisoners in prison, most likely because I was pretty easy to cheat.

Even if I thought it was fun to run away from the police and escape from the prison in the play when I was a child, I have never experienced this “for real” as an adult. As an adult I have come to understand that the police do not catch all the “thieves” or everyone who breaks the law. I have to admit that I break the law almost every day, but I have never got caught for it. When I drive to and from work, I have a tendency to drive too fast and in so doing I in fact break the law. I guess the reason why the police have never caught me for this offence is that they do not prioritise the control of traffic. Most likely, they rather prioritise catching those who “really” break the law, that is, those who commit more “serious crimes”.

For three years as an adult I was doing what I thought was very boring when I was a child. From 1989 to 1992 I worked as a non-trained substitute officer at a local male prison, and I did not find it boring at all. Actually I found this enigmatic institution in our society, “The prison”, most fascinating and interesting. The work as a substitute officer came to be the start of a “prison carrier” where the phenomenon “sport in prison” has occupied my time and energy in many ways. When I worked as a substitute officer, I arranged sport activities for the prisoners as well as practised sport together with them. During my master thesis work at NUSPE I carried out a qualitative study of some prisoners’ experiences with practising sport,

and for several years I taught physical education and control and restraint (C and R)¹ to trainees at the Prison and Probation Staff Education Centre (KRUS). My work and experience with sport in prison have inspired me to carry out the study presented in this thesis, and hopefully with the knowledge I have gained by doing this study, should qualify me to carry out more research in prisons.

The story in the paragraph above is the answer to the question: “why are you doing this project”, which I often get from fellow researchers when I present the work of this thesis. The story is the background and personal reason for doing a project about sport in prison. Towards the end of this chapter, the practical purposes and the research purposes² will also be clarified. First it is necessary to problematise and actualise “sport in prison” and “men in prison” which are the main issues in this thesis.

Sport in Norwegian prisons

Sports activities have been arranged for prisoners in Norwegian prisons since the 1920s. Hartvig Nissen, the director of the largest prison in Norway at that time, “Botsfengselet”, held the opinion that physical exercise was important for improving the prisoners’ health condition, both physically and mentally. In the 1930s the opinion of the administrators of the Prison Service was that regular physical activity could reduce the damage of the imprisonment and have a positive effect on the prisoners’ lives after the release (Nissen, 1927, in By; Grindaker; Hozman & Karlsrud, 1987: 4-5). During the 20th century, sport has strengthened its presence in the prisons, and the opportunity of practising sport is confirmed by national and international laws and rules. The Norwegian Prison Act §22 states that if the conditions are suitable, the inmates should be permitted to practice sport (Justisdepartementet, 1958). The Prison Rules §58 states that prisoners should, if possible, get the opportunity to practice sport in their leisure-time³, preferentially with professional instruction (Justisdepartementet, 1961). This rule also says that young prisoners in particular should be encouraged to practice sport, and that proper activities ought to be offered. The Council of Europe (1986) made new standard minimum rules for treatment of prisoners in 1986, and

¹ C and R is a practical subject where the trainees learn self-defence and strategies for handling riots.

² Maxwell (1996: 15) distinguishes between three different kinds of purposes for doing a study: personal purposes, practical purposes and research purposes.

³ It could be discussed whether the prisoners have any leisure-time at all while imprisoned, but the concept is used to denote the time when the prisoners are not at work or at school.

these state that sport and leisure-activities in modern prisons are of great importance for improving the health condition for the prisoners. Over the years, sport has become the dominant form of leisure-activity offered to prisoners in Norwegian prisons.

The Norwegian National Parliamentary Report number 27 (1997-98): “Om Kriminalomsorgen”, says:

“To an increasing degree, the effort is going to be directed towards sports that promote social skills and fellowship, such as football, volleyball, and other team sports. Nevertheless, weight training is still the most common sport activity in most prisons” (Justisdepartementet, 1998: 70) (My translation).

Because of social educational effects in form of social skills and fellowship supposed to be promoted by the team sports, the Ministry of Justice and Police seems to prefer team sports over weight training. By this the Ministry indicates that weight training does not promote the wanted social educational purposes compared to the team sports. Therefore, the Ministry does not seem to be pleased that so many prisoners practice weight training.

There may be several reasons why weight training is the most common sports activity in the Prison Service. One quite obvious reason is that prisons in Norway include weight training equipment and an exercise bike as a minimum of sport equipment because this equipment does not require much space⁴. In Norway there are many old and small prisons where the lack of space for practising sport is precarious. Newer and larger prisons, however, have a more varied choice of sport activities⁵. The newer prisons often have a large yard with a football⁶ field, and some of the newest prisons also have a gymnasium. The prison officers' obligations in relation to the sports activities vary from prison to prison. In some prisons, the prison officers can participate in the sports activities together with the prisoners, and in a few prisons they are even obligated to participate. In other prisons, however, the prison officers are not

⁴ The reason why prisons in Norway can offer sport to prisoners is partly because of the Prison Service's action against the increased drug problem in the Norwegian prisons in the 1980s. One of the efforts was to offer the prisoners more active and constructive leisure-time, and sport activities were important in this respect. Sport equipment was bought and renewed, professional instructors were employed in the largest prisons to lead the sport activities, and the Physical Activity Programme for Chemical Abusers was developed. (For more about this, see e.g. Grindaker, 1996).

⁵ The smallest prison in Norway can hold nine prisoners, while the largest can hold 356 prisoners.

⁶ Football means soccer in this thesis.

allowed to participate, because participation is considered a factor in reducing the security level. Their task is to stand ringside and supervise the prisoners during the exercise.

One may ask whether many of the activities that are carried out in prisons, such as weight training, are sport activities? In this thesis these activities are categorised as sport activities, and the basis for this is a broad understanding of sport:

“Sport is a specific activity where the aim is to express oneself physically. By the physical expression, the individuals show skills and patterns of movements that are given within historically and culturally defined norms and rules.” (Johnsen, 1994: 36) (My translation)

In this understanding of sport the expression of oneself physically is central, which makes it possible to include a range of activities in the concept of sport, e.g. weight training, running in the prison yard, sit-ups and push-ups in the cell, canoe paddling, etc.

The outline of sport in Norwegian prisons in this subchapter has mainly focused on sport as it is offered, regulated and practised in male prisons. Sport is offered in female prisons also, but only two of 43 prisons in Norway are female prisons. Some male prisons, however, have a unit for female prisoners, but the sport offered in these prisons seems to be adapted to the male prisoners who are in the majority. This obliquity between male and female prisons, or male and female units, is because it is primarily men who are imprisoned in Norway.

Male prisoners

Vegheim (1997: 99) says that the offender usually is a man and the crime statistics show a clear relation between men and crime⁷. Even if the crime statistics from year to year show an increase of people charged and punished for offences, the percentage between men and women in these figures remains relatively constant (Vegheim, 1997: 100). In 1999 the percentage of men charged for offences was 85.5 (Statistisk sentralbyrå, 2000). The crime statistics for the relation between men and imprisonment confirms the relation between men and crime. Of the average number that served their sentence in Norwegian prisons in 1999, there were 2362 men and 158 women, i.e. men constituted 93.7 percent of the Norwegian

⁷ The crime statistics are probably the least reliable of all published figures in social issues (Giddens, 1997: 181). It does not give the figures of the total crime; it only gives a picture of the crime registered by the police (Høigård, 1997b: 69).

prison population (Kristoffersen, personal communication, March 2000). The typical prisoner in Norway is therefore a man.

Research on sport in prison and research on men in prison

Searches in both national and international databases show that not many publications on the theme “sport in prison” exist. In Norway there are six master theses about the subject: Røskeland (1982); Aaberge (1986); Andersen (1994); Johnsen (1994); Grindaker (1996); Øster (1996), but only Andersen (1994), who studied female prisoners, carried out a study with a gender perspective. There also seems to be few international studies carried out on the theme “sport in prison”. Don Sabo (1994) who has worked as a teacher in an American male prison has written about sport and masculinity male prisons. Carrabine & Longhurst (1998) have written an article about masculinity in relation to prison management, including the prisoners’ exercise of sport. These two publications have focused on the problem that male prisoners are men and discussed it in relation to feminist theories about masculinity, which is a rather new phenomenon in the field of prison sociology.

According to Messerschmidt (1993: 1; 1997: 1), the major research and theoretical works in criminology have been alarmingly gender blind for a long time. Female criminologists have criticised the criminological research for not having any gender perspective, and since the 1970s they have, with basis in feminist theory, carried out research on female offenders to overcome the distortions and invisibility of women in criminology (Vegheim, 1997: 99; Carrabine & Longhurst, 1998: 161). As a result of this research, the female offender has become the gendered offender. Since most of the research on offenders has been carried out on male offenders where gender is not taken into consideration; the result is that theories about offenders are created without conceptualising gender (Gelsthorpe & Morris, 1990: 3-4). The male offender has therefore become the non-gendered offender.

According to Sim (1994) many of the studies carried out on male offenders have been academically sophisticated and theoretically advanced. They have produced a rich and compelling body of work on penalty and its historical and modern consequences, and generated a number of important sociological insights. Examples of such studies on prisons and prisoners can include some of “the classics”, such as Sykes (1958): “The Society of Captives”; Clemmer (1958): “The Prison Community”; Mathiesen (1965): “The Defences of

the Weak”; and Foucault (1991a): “Discipline and Punish”. What these studies have in common is their focus on male prisons and male prisoners. However, they have not focused on *prisoners as men* or *prisons of men* (Sabo & London, 1992: 4; Sim, 1994: 101).

Prisoners as men and prisons of men

Polych & Sabo (1995: 140) says:

“Whereas the study of men *in* prison can provide gender theorists with insights into men’s lives and identities, the study of the prisons *of* men can forge understanding of the multiple systems of domination that constitute late 20th century society.” (Emphasis original)

In the later years, as researchers have started to focus on the strong relation between men, masculinity and criminality with the basis in feminist theory, there has, according to Collier (1998: 3), been a “masculine turn” in the field of criminology. Concerning this relation, a field of research has been generated, “which has in recent years, assumed an increasing visibility, prominence, and political significance” (Collier, 1998: vii). Collier (1998: 3, with reference to Jefferson & Carlen, 1996) refers to this body of work as “being undertaken by women and men which has been concerned with exploring the relationship between men and crime via an explicit foregrounding of the concept of masculinity and/or masculinities.” The result of this research is that the male offender has become gendered. However, most of these studies have focused upon prisons of men and generated important knowledge of multiple systems of domination. Sim (1994: 101) claims that this work has not had a dramatic influence on the sociology of the prison. Studies of prisoners, despite taking male prisoners as the “primary subject matter”, rarely focus on men and masculinity (Morgan, 1992: 3; Sim, 1994: 100). Therefore, we do not have much insight into the lives and identities of prisoners as men.

While outside the Nordic countries there is a growing amount of literature concerning prisons of men and, to a certain degree also on prisoners as men (for example, Newton, 1994; Sabo, 1994; Sim, 1994; Thurston, 1996), these themes have not been studied very much in Norway or in the other Nordic countries. However, the Norwegian criminologist, Niels Christie has made a good point of departure for such studies in Norway. He says: “(T)o understand the crime in Norway, one has to understand the Norwegian society. On the other hand, it is easier

to understand the Norwegian society if one understands its crime” (Christie, 1989: 9) (My translation). Høigård (1997a: 19) says:

“(I)n focus, the whole arena of crime and punishment is a masculine arena, and in particular the crime, but also to a certain degree the control of crime. The control of crime can be looked upon as a mirror and as an active contributor in the hierarchisation between men.” (My translation)

I will claim, based on Christie’s and Høigård’s (ibid) statements, that in order to understand the lives and identities of men in Norwegian prison (prisoners as men), one has to understand the multiple systems of domination that constitute the Norwegian society (prisons of men). On the other hand, it is easier to understand the multiple systems of domination that constitute the Norwegian society (prisons of men) if one understands the lives and identities of the men that are in the Norwegian prisons (prisoners as men). This study will therefore, with the basis in feminist theory, consider both; prisoners as men and prisons of men, but the main focus will be on prisoners as men.

An objection to studying prisoners as men and prisons of men may be as Morgan (1992: 4) points out, that research on men and masculinity in a field such as crime and delinquency is perhaps too obvious. We perhaps have little difficulty in thinking about men and masculinities when we think about prisons? Although the connection between prison and masculinity is obvious, and in fact almost banal, Foucault (1982: 779) says:

“Everybody is aware of such banal facts. But the fact that they’re banal does not mean that they don’t exist. What we have to do with banal facts is to discover – or try to discover – which specific and original problem is connected with them.”

Polych & Sabo (1995: 150) points out the political problem related to studying men in prison from a feminist perspective; some men are imprisoned because they have exercised the worst kind of exploitation of women, such as rape, wife battering and so on. Polych & Sabo (ibid) say:

“It is, therefore, politically problematic to develop a profeminist theoretical framework that allows for understanding and reforming these men and yet, at the same time, holds them responsible for their complicity with the oppression of women.”

At the same time Polych & Sabo (1995: 149-150) say: “there are several reasons for why gender scholars need to devote more energy to understanding men in prison.” First, Polych & Sabo (ibid) say, systematic studies of men in prison will be helpful in expanding feminist theory to include critical analysis of men and masculinity. Second, with reference to Birrell (1990), Polych & Sabo (ibid) claim, as the feminists have self-critically faced the fact that feminist research has been strongly centred on white middle to upper class women, the same intellectual bias is to be found within the field of research on men with a basis in feminist theory. White, middle-to-upper-class intellectuals and professionals constitute the spearhead in this field as well. To focus on men in prison, the demographic antithesis of the practitioners of critical research on men, can help these practitioners to recognise and grapple with the intellectual biases and develop more inclusive theories of gender inequality by viewing the world from the standpoint of oppressed people. Third, according to Polych & Sabo (ibid), the study of men in prison provides a fruitful institutional site to study the politics of masculinity, i.e. the power relations between men and different masculinities (see more about this in chapter 3).

All three arguments that Polych & Sabo (ibid) mention reflect a shift in the field of feminist research. There is a move from focusing only on women⁸, to a more abstract focus on differences in form of class, sexuality and ethnicity, and how these differences are constructed and re-constructed (see among others Markussen & Lotherington, 1999). These shifts also make it understandable how it is possible to study prisoners as men and prisons of men with a basis in feminist theory.

The practical purposes and the research purposes of the study

According to Maxwell (1996: 16), “(P)ractical purposes are focused on *accomplishing* something – meeting some need, changing some situation, or achieving some goal” (Emphasis original). Concerning the practical purposes, I believe that by focusing on sport and masculinity in prison with the basic in feminist theory, we may be able to discover some

⁸ Morgan (1981: 94) says: “where gender is ‘taken into account’ it is usually in relation to women.

of the specific and original problems connected to the phenomena prisoners as men and prisons of men. Hopefully, this study will give insight into men's lives and identities in prison, and be a contributor to a better understanding of some of the multiple systems of domination that constitute our society. I also hope that this study can be a contribution to the field of feminist research in general, and to research on men and masculinity in particular.

Concerning the research purposes – what do I want to *understand*, what do I want to gain some insight into, and why is this happening Maxwell (1996: 16), I have to turn to my experience of working with sport in prison. This experience tells me first of all that there seems to be a discrepancy between the Prison Service's intentions in offering sports activities to the prisoners, and the male prisoners' motives for practising sport. While the Prison Authorities want the sport in prison to have social educational purposes (see page 3), the prisoners seem not to practice sport for learning social skills and fellowship. Based on experience from the practice of sport together with the prisoners, and the work during my master thesis, I suspect that there are other reasons why the prisoners exercise sport in prison, and most of them seem to be related to their life in prison. The core of the disagreement seems to be the weight training and the prisoners' development of large muscular bodies because the staff and the prisoners seem to have different concepts of what these large and muscular bodies represent. From discussions of this theme with trainees and prison officers, my impression is that many of them do not like the prisoners' exercise with weights because they do not see how this kind of training serves social educational purposes. Many of them have the opinion that the development of large muscular bodies may give the prisoners advantages if they commit new crimes after they are released. Discussions with prisoners indicate that the development of large muscular bodies has a relation to their existence in prison. In spite of this disagreement, some prison officers practice sports, and also weight training, together with the prisoners. Given that this disagreement does exist among the participants in this study, this study will explore what makes staff and prisoners construct such different meanings of the prisoners' exercise of sport, and of the prisoners' large muscular bodies. This will be done with the basis in the perhaps most banal fact in prison – masculinity. By seeing the sport activities in relation to the context in which they occur, hopefully one will be able to understand the prisoners', and eventually also the prison officers', involvement and engagement in sport activities in prison.

Outline of the thesis

The theoretical framework for this thesis is presented in the three following chapters. First, theories about crime and punishment are introduced, and they constitute the point of departure for this thesis. Second, theoretical perspectives on gender, men and masculinity that fall within the realm of feminist theory are presented. The last theory-chapter is an attempt to clarify the theories and understanding of power that constitute the basis for this thesis.

Chapter Five, entitled “methods”, states the scientific assumptions that this study is based upon. The methods used to produce the empirical data-material are also presented and discussed. The analysis of the data-material, including the central issues in the writing of the thesis, is outlined. At the end of the chapter some ethical issues are discussed, and suggestive criteria for how to judge this thesis are given.

The data-material is presented and discussed in Chapter Six to Chapter Eleven. Chapter Six focuses on the prison officers and how both male and female officers’ expressions of gender are in the process of change in the Norwegian Prison Service. Chapter Seven focuses on how the Prison Service tries to contribute in making the prisoners into “law-abiding persons”, and this issue is discussed in relation to expressions of masculinities. How the sports activities in the prison are meant to contribute in making the prisoners into “law-abiding persons” is discussed in Chapter Eight. This issue is also discussed in relation to expressions of masculinities. Chapter Nine focuses on the prisoners’ experiences of the sport activities in the prison. These experiences are related to how the prisoners use the practice of sport to do masculinity and gender, and what this means for their creation and re-creation of gender identity while they are imprisoned. The power relations between the prisoners and between the prisoners and the prison officers will be discussed in Chapter Ten and Eleven. In Chapter Ten the power relations between the prisoners are focused upon and this issue is discussed in relation to sport and expressions of masculinities. In Chapter Eleven the power relations between the prisoners and the male and female officers are discussed. In this discussion, the implications of the practice of sport and the expressions of genders are central issues.

In Chapter Twelve, the discussion of the data-material in relation to the research questions raised in the study is summarised. At the end of this chapter, some political consequences that could be expected as a result out of this study are discussed, and finally, some suggestions for further research are given.

Chapter two

Crime and Punishment

When it concerns theory, one can use the metaphor “theory is architecture” since the phrase to *build* a theoretical *framework* often is used (Richardson, 2000b: 927). Theory can also be understood as a perspective that decides which spectacles or lenses to put on when the world is studied. The “world” in this study is the prison and theories and conceptions of crime and punishment give us instruments to understand the existence of this world. There are many theories from which crime and punishment can be understood, but the theories presented in this chapter introduce ways of thinking about these phenomena that constitute the point of departure for this thesis.

Understandings of crime

Crime can be defined “as any type of behaviour that breaks a law” (Giddens, 1997: 174). In this definition, the criminal act comes first. The control of the crime is considered afterwards (Høigård, 1997a: 13). The definition implies that there are qualitative differences between “the criminals” and the rest of the population, and these differences in themselves explain why some people are “criminals”. With this perspective on crime, it is natural to focus on the persons who breaks the law and search for biological, psychological and social reasons for the deviance causing the criminal behaviour (Høigård, 1997a: 23). This perspective on crime has long traditions. For example, Cesare Lombroso (1835-1909), an Italian doctor and surgeon often called the father of criminology, had great faith in the scientific explanations for criminal behaviour. He based his explanations of crime on biological determinism and postulated that crime was an expression of biologically inherited factors, in other words, that one was born as a criminal. The criminals could be separated from the rest of the population based on specific marks on their bodies, for example tattoos, too many fingers, high cheekbones and the shape of the cranium. The latter is perhaps what Lombroso is most renown for (Lombroso, 1911, in Hauge, 1996: 184-185). Later biological theories claimed to predict criminal behaviour based on the shape of the body. People, particularly men who were muscular and athletic (mesomorphs), were more likely to become delinquent than those

having a thin physique (ectomorphs) or more fleshy people (endomorphs) (Sheldon, 1949, and Glueck & Glueck, 1956, in (Giddens, 1997: 175). In the search for psychological reasons for criminal behaviour, special interest has been paid to persons categorised as *psychopaths*. Within theories that explains crime based on psychological reasons, psychopaths are explained as withdrawn and emotionless characters who delight in violence for its own sake (Giddens, 1997: 175). Sociologists have searched for social reasons to understand what make criminals qualitatively different from the rest of the population. Factors that have been focused in this regard are, among other things, poor childhood circumstances and extensive use of drugs (Høigård, 1997a: 23).

Because the research on what kinds of people commit crimes is not sufficient enough and gives an overly simplified perspective on reasons for crime, many criminologists have abandoned this research tradition. The main stream within criminology today is to try to describe and understand social systems of control (Høigård, 1997a: 25-26). In recent years one has come to understand crime as a social relation, and Høigård (1997a: 26) says:

“(C)rime is defined as a social relation. The relation can be recognised in that various kinds of acts are interpreted and handled in a special way: the act is defined with success when it becomes a task for the Criminal Justice System¹.” (My translation)

With this perspective one can also understand crime as a discursive construction. The concept “discourse”, however, is used in many different ways. According to Foucault, discourse is constituted by statements (Schaanning, 2000a: 197, with reference to Foucault, 1972). But discourse does not mean language, spoken or written, as a form. Language becomes a discourse when it is tied up to practice (Schaanning, 2000a: 238). Central elements in the discourse are knowledge and power, and Foucault (1991a: 27) says:

“power and knowledge directly imply one another; that there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose

¹ In English, this understanding of crime is perhaps best known as “Labelling theory”, which says: “no act is intrinsically criminal. Definitions of criminality are established by the powerful, through the formulation of laws and their interpretation by police, courts and correctional institutions” (Giddens, 1997: 180).

and constitute at the same time power relations.” .. “(I)t is in discourse that power and knowledge are joined together” (Foucault, 1984: 100).

The concept discourse does not therefore refer to language or statements as such, but rather to the language and statements as it is tied to the exercise of certain practices (Schaanning, 1995: 8). With this in mind we have a presupposition to understand what Foucault meant when he said that one must treat discourses as “*practices that systematically form the object of which they speak*” (Foucault, 1972: 49). In understanding crime as a discursive construction, the crime is the object which is formed by language and practices. This mean “(N)o act is criminal in itself. The act becomes criminal when there is a law that labels the act as punishable” (Hauge, 1996: 21-22) (My translation). Or, as Christie (1999: 282) says, criminal “(A)cts do not exist in themselves. They are created by the meaning we give them” (My translation). This means that crime does not exist until we interpret acts as offences by making laws that forbid these acts (Christie, 1999: 287). Various power-mechanisms, such as the mass media and the politicians, affect the public opinion in a society. The result is that one “interpretation-scheme” of an act wins, and it becomes most relevant to understand the act as criminal (Høigård, 1997a: 26). Within this perspective on crime, the legislation comes first, thereafter comes the criminal act (Høigård, 1997a: 13). “Where there are laws, there are also crimes”, says Giddens (1997: 174). Laws can be the same in different societies, for example, the prohibition of theft. Laws can also differ from society to society. For example, the Netherlands has more liberal laws in relation to cannabis than Norway has. Laws also change historically. While some laws are removed from the Criminal Act, others are added (Andenæs, 1994; Statistisk sentralbyrå, 1997). Crime, as a discursive construction that varies historically and culturally, is what constitutes the basis for the understanding of crime in this thesis.

Punishment to prison

Imprisonment is a punishment where the convict loses his² liberty because he has broken the law. By the loss of liberty, the individual is inflicted an evil which is supposed to be experienced as an evil (Hauge, 1996: 15). To inflict pain to someone is something that we usually experience as morally reprehensible, and is actually forbidden by the law in many

² A convict can, of course, also be a woman. Since this thesis is about male prisoners, I will refer to a convict or a prisoner as he or him.

cases. How can we then explain that the court has the right to inflict evil (Hauge, 1996: 15)? This question is mainly answered in two ways in classical penal theory; *social defence* and *retribution* (Mathiesen, 1990: 17; Hauge, 1996: 17). Retribution has not been accepted as a reason for punishment in modern Nordic criminal law (Hauge 1996: 19). The theories for punishing people in our society therefore have a basis in the theories of social defence. By these theories the punishment is understood as a means for protecting the society against crime. The theories of social defence are split into two main groups – *general prevention* and *individual prevention*. General prevention is understood as “the prevention of criminal acts on the part of individuals not yet punished, or at least not undergoing punishment at the moment .. obtained by the deterrent, educative or habit-forming effect of punishment on others” (Mathiesen, 1990: 17). Individual prevention, on the other hand, is understood as “the prevention of new criminal acts on the part of the individual who is in fact punished .. obtained through improvement, deterrence, or incapacitation of the offender” (Mathiesen *ibid*).

Since the beginning of the 20th century, the leading paradigm for punishment to prison has alternated between punishment as general prevention and punishment as individual prevention. From the 1950s until late in the 1970s, the leading paradigm was individual prevention. Since the late 1970s, general prevention has been the leading paradigm. One reason for this is the increasingly conservative political climate and the belief in the value of the market, rather than public administration which has dominated the western world since then (Hauge, 1996: 339-340). The social control outside as well as inside the prisons has increased, and in Norway we have in the 1980s and 1990s seen a series increases in sentencing, a trend that seems to continue in the new millennium. For example, in September 2000 the Director General of Public Prosecutions demanded more severe punishment for murder and wanted to increase the average imprisonment from seven to ten years (Aftenposten, September 23. 2000).

Rehabilitation in prison

Even if the paradigms for punishing people have shifted, the ideology of rehabilitation, which can be viewed as an improvement of the offender, has survived and “is as old as the prisons themselves” (Mathiesen, 1990: 47). Fridhov (1994: 19-20) says:

“The creators of the prisons had similar thoughts: First, they looked upon themselves as real humanists – far more human than their predecessors. Second, because they were real humanists, they had both the right and duty to do what they thought was the best – both for the law offender and for the society. Third, they agreed upon what was best for all parts: That the prisoners become law-abiding citizens. What has been considered to be the best means to achieve this goal has varied over time from penance to prayers, to culture in a broad sense, from physical, mental and pedagogical efforts, and back again to the physical with important emphasis on sport. Two conditions remain the same throughout the whole period: The belief that it is possible to rehabilitate prisoners in prison – to make them law-abiding citizens, and that this is possible by means of work and training.” (My translation)

Fridhov points out that the basis for the ideology underlying the imprisonment is a dynamic and rational view of mankind: “(t)he good act originates from knowledge and reason. .. If only a person acquires the right knowledge, the person will also act good” (Fridhov, 1994: 23 and 54) (My translation).

Until recently one could trace the idea of humanity and rehabilitation in the official aims for the Prison Service listed in the yearly Norwegian National Budget. However, for the year 2001 “reduced crime” is the only aim besides “an management of the Criminal Justice System that is open and that focuses on quality” (The Norwegian Government, 2000: “Programkategori 06.30 Kriminalomsorg”, subchapter 3). Fairness or humanity is no longer the criteria by which imprisonment is evaluated. Today imprisonment is evaluated by its efficiency. For example, the Norwegian Prison Service’s “slogan” in the last years has been “more care and confinement for each crown”. Within the prisons, efficiency is measured by the number of escapes and participation in various activities (Hauge, 1996: 348-349). The cost-benefit analysis is dominating, and individual needs are no longer decisive for how and where the prisoner serves his sentence. What is decisive, is what the prisoner makes himself worthy of. The basis is exchange of goods, where the prisoner can offer his behaviour in exchange (Giertsen, 1995: 417-419). Feeley & Simon (1992: 455) say:

“The new penology is neither about punishing nor about rehabilitating individuals. It is about identifying and managing unruly groups. It is concerned with the rationality not of individual behaviour or even community organization, but of managing processes. Its goal is not to eliminate crime but to make it tolerable through systemic coordination.”

Even if the leading paradigm for punishment in the last 20-30 years has been general prevention, and even if the cost-benefit analysis is dominating in the prisons, the ideology of rehabilitation still exists. Besides that the Norwegian National Budget's main aim for the Prison Service for the year 2001, "reduced crime", supports a cost-benefit analysis, the National Budget also confirms the governmental interest of increased effort in programs for "life management" in Norwegian prisons (The Norwegian Government, 2000, "Programkategori 06.30 Kriminalomsorg", subchapter 4.1.2). At the present time the Norwegian Prison Service seems to be in the "era of programs" where various programs for "life management" are developed and run for the prisoners. This can be viewed as the present time's form of rehabilitation, and the increased emphasis on these programs may be a sign that the paradigm of individual prevention is put into the frontline again (Schaanning, 2000b: 507).

*

Power mechanisms in the society, such as mass media, make people understand that the causes of crime are to be found in the offender. This is reflected in the labelling of a person who breaks the law as a "criminal". This is also the view that constitutes the basis of rehabilitation in prison, where the ideology is that work practice, education, practice of sport, various programs for "life management" and so on, will change the prisoners and make them to "law-abiding citizens". This is not the view this thesis is built upon. This thesis views crime as a discursive construction where acts are criminalised as a result of the public constitution of meaning in a society. From this, an axiom can be made which constitutes the foundation in this thesis: *There are no criminals, only criminal acts.*

Chapter three

Gender, Men and Masculinities

In this chapter, theoretical perspectives about gender, men and masculinity falling within the realm of feminist theory will be presented. These theoretical perspectives will not be presented in detail; details will be given in the discussion of the data-material. The aim of this chapter is to build a framework for the discussion of the data-material as well as to present and elucidate elements of importance for this discussion.

The origin and development of Critical Studies on Men

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, with the impact of *Second Wave Feminism*¹, female researchers started, to an increasing degree, to gain access to the academic disciplines, in social sciences and the humanities in particular. This started an “academic revolution” that challenged the androcentric spots and biases that characterised these sciences at that time (Messner & Sabo, 1990a: 1, with reference to Spender, 1981). Women’s experiences and lives were put into focus, and a specifically female oriented scientific field – *Women Studies* – and political debate were developed². During the same period, with the impact of Second Wave Feminism, research on men that focused on men as males also evolved. However, the research on men and masculinity was marginal compared to the research on women (Carrigan, Connell & Lee, 1985: 557). Just as the research on women, the research on men in the 1970s and early 1980s focused on the concept of sex-roles. As Connell (1998: 3) says, “(M)ost discussions of men’s gender in the 1970s and early 1980s, centered on an established concept, the male sex-role, and an established problem; how men and boys were socialized into this role”.

According to Carrigan, Connell & Lee (1985: 556) and Connell (1998: 3), little new empirical research was conducted, and the research was first of all concerned with the differences between men and women’s role in the society. Abstract methods of social psychology using

¹ The term Second Wave Feminism describes the feminist movement that flourished in the late 1960s and 1970s. The term *First Wave Feminism* describes the feminist movement that existed late in the 19th century, but which died out in the beginning of the 20th century.

² For a Norwegian review of this development see, for example, Bermann, Holter, Sørensen & Aas (1988) and Steinfeld (1993).

masculinity/femininity scales were often employed in order to measure generalised attitudes and expectations in ill-defined populations (Connell, 1998: 3).

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, the unitary male sex-role was criticised for its multiple oversimplifications and for its incapacity to handle issues concerning power, e.g. the power differences between men and women (Carrigan, Connell & Lee, 1985: 578-581; Kimmel, 1987: 12-13; Connell, 1987: 47-54; Connell, 1998: 3-4). Research, on both men and women therefore started to move beyond the concept of sex-roles, which focused on men and women's biologically characteristics as decisive for the differences between the sexes (essentialism), and began to focus on the "social sex" – *gender*. One started to view gender as a social construction, and masculinity and femininity as relational constructs, which are historically and socially conditioned through a process of gender relations (Kimmel, 1987: 4-15). According to Kimmel (*ibid*), this development opened up new arenas for empirical research which Brod & Kaufman (1994: 4) have labelled *the Second Wave of Critical Studies on Men and Masculinities*. This resulted in a new generation of social research on masculinity and men in gender relations (Connell, 1998: 4).

Critical Studies on Men, Men's Studies, or in Norwegian, "*Mannsforskning*", are concepts that research within the social sciences has become familiar with. Nevertheless, there are differences in the understanding of these concepts. Within the Anglophone UK context, Men's Studies have been associated with US initiatives that are dominated by men or even for men only³. These studies can be either ambivalent toward feminism or even anti-feminist (Hearn, 1997: 50). In this respect, the Norwegian concept "*Mannsforskning*" is closer to *Critical Studies on Men* than to *Men's Studies*. In this thesis the term *Critical Studies on Men* is used, which are studies that are critical (that is feminist/pro-feminist), focus on men, explicitly gendered, and that are carried out by both men and women (Hearn *ibid*). According to Oftung (1998: 7), "(T)o understand men from a gender perspective is *Mannsforskningens* project" (My translation). Wahl (1997: 35) says that studies carried out with a gender perspective imply that gender is put into focus and discussed in descriptions as well as explanations and interpretations of the world. Brod & Kaufman (1994: 4) say that there are two aspects that characterise the *Second Wave of Critical Studies on Men*. The first one is a clear recognition that the theorisation of men and masculinity has to concern the elaboration

³ An example is Robert Bly's mythopoetic men who want to recover their lost manhood. Bly's book "*Iron John: A Book about Men*" (Bly, 1990), became a bestseller in the U.S. in 1990 (Messner, 1997: 2.).

and articulation of *relations of power*. The second aspect is the recognition that masculinity cannot be studied in the singular, but in the plural – *masculinities*.

Masculinity however, is a problematic concept, and the application and understanding of the concept have been an ongoing debate within the field of Critical Studies on Men. Hearn (1996: 203) lists some problems with the use of masculinity. These include “the wide variety of uses of the concept, the imprecision of its use in many cases, its use as a shorthand for a very wide range of social phenomena, .. and the use of the concept as a primary and underlying cause of other social effects” (Hearn, *ibid*). At the present stage of Critical Studies on Men, however, there is a shared understanding that the use of the concept at the present time can be fruitful (Hearn, 2000; Morgan, 2000). One does not wish a precise definition of the concept because it is men’s various expressions of masculinities and the relation between them that are put into focus and are the issues one wants knowledge about (Brod & Kaufman, 1994: 4-5; Hearn, *ibid*; Morgan *ibid*). According to Morgan (2000), in order to capture the diversity embedded in the concept of masculinity, it may be useful to relate to masculinity at a discursive level, where masculinity is understood as a discursive construction that varies historically, culturally and contextually. This is how masculinity will be understood in this thesis.

As previously stated, discourse in this thesis is to be understood as “*practices that systematically form the object of which they speak*” (Foucault, 1972: 49). In understanding masculinity as a discursive construction that varies historically, culturally and contextually therefore, it is masculinity that is the object formed by language and practices. This means that masculinity does not exist in itself as such, but is a constructed word. In every culture and context where this word exists, there is at any given moment knowledge of what this word means. For example, when I categorise a man who bench-presses many kilos as masculine by speaking or writing of him, I refer to this cultural or contextual knowledge. In this practice I exercise power because I produce and reproduce knowledge of what masculinity means in this particular culture or context. At the same time, the man who bench-presses many kilos is most likely aware of the cultural meaning of masculinity. Therefore he practises masculinity by lifting many kilos in bench-press, and in this practice he also exercises power in the production and reproduction of the knowledge of what masculinity is.

The “ethnographic moment” in research on men and masculinity

According to Connell (1998: 4), the recent research on men and masculinity can be categorised as the “ethnographic moment”, and he says:

“the recent research has been diverse in subject matter and social location, its characteristic is the construction of masculinity in a particular milieu or moment .. we might think of this as the “ethnographic moment” in masculinity research, in which the specific and the local are in focus.”

Even if research in this field represents great variety, Connell (1998) lists some general traits:

Studies within the field Critical Studies on Men have documented a *multiplicity or a plurality of masculinities*, and that masculinities vary historically, culturally and contextually. At the same time, the research also documents that various masculinities can exist in the same context (Connell, 1998: 4). However, says Connell (1995: 76), “(T)o recognize more than one kind of masculinity is only a first step. We have to examine the relations between them.” One has to focus on alliances, dominance, subordination and marginalisation, and the practices where such relations are constructed by exclusion, inclusion, exploitation, etc., which make these *masculinities exist in a hierarchy* (Connell, 1995: 76). Within the scholarship of Gender Studies, power relations are often assumed to have two structures. One is a hierarchical system between men and women, often referred to as the “gender order”, which is “a historically constructed pattern of power relations between men and women and definitions of femininity and masculinity” (Connell, 1997: 98-99). The other hierarchical system is a system where men dominate and exploit each other. In dynamic processes, both these two hierarchical systems are constantly in a state of change.

In different periods of history, or in specific cultures and contexts, there is in general a *hegemonic masculinity*. The hegemonic masculinity in a historical moment, in a culture or a context, is not necessarily the most common form of masculinity. Connell (1995: 77) stresses that “hegemonic masculinity embodies a ‘currently accepted’ strategy”, and that “hegemony is likely to be established only if there is some correspondence between cultural ideal and institutional power, collective if not individual”. Sporting heroes are often taken to be exemplars of hegemonic masculinity in Western culture in recent times. Other men, says Connell (1998: 5), live in a state of tension with, or within distance of, the hegemonic

masculinity. The dominance of hegemonic masculinity over other subordinated or marginalised forms of masculinity may be quiet and implicit, but it can also be vehement and violent, such as homophobic violence (Connell *ibid*). However, any hegemonic masculinity is always a subject to contest, and tendency to crisis within the power relations between men threatens the hegemonic masculinity directly (Connell, 1995: 90). This, Connell (1998: 6) says, indicates that the creation and recreation of masculinities are *dynamic*.

Even if multiple masculinities are constructed and re-constructed in various cultures and contexts, such as in institutions, and even if the relationship between them are defined, there are, according to Connell (1998: 5), “masculinities, as patterns of gender practice (that) are sustained and enacted not only by individuals but also groups and institutions”. Connell (*ibid*) names these masculinities *collective masculinities*, and an example can be the masculinities that are performed by the staff in a male prison. Masculinity is also an *active construction* which means “(M)asculinities do not exist prior to social interaction, but come into existence as people act. They are actively produced, using the resources and strategies available in a given milieu” (Connell *ibid*). In this way men, as well as women, are “doing masculinity” (Morgan, 1992: 47; Messerschmidt, 1993: 84), and in doing masculinity they are also “doing gender” (West & Zimmerman, 1987: 137-147). Messerschmidt (1993: 84), for example, looks at the commitment of various forms of crime as a strategy for “doing masculinity” and “doing gender”. Rape, for example, can be looked upon as an act where a man, by committing rape, confirms his masculinity and gender.

Masculinities also exist in *contradiction* to contradictory desires and conducts. For example, during a football-match the football players have to show consideration for fair play and not to hurting the opponents. At the same time the players want to win, and may therefore tackle roughly, even if they know that the opponents may be injured. The last trait of recent studies on masculinities, Connell (1998: 5) labels *bodies as arenas*. Male bodies are of great importance in the construction and re-construction of masculinities (Connell, 1995: 45). The centrality of the body in the construction of masculinity has led to a frequent problematisation of the male body in the literature on men and masculinities.

The sociology of the male body

According to Scott & Morgan (1993: 16), traditionally sociological work has been disembodied; so has the sociology of sport, and Theberge (1991: 124) says: “(I)t is ironic that in studying sport, where the body is essential to the experience, we have largely missed its meaning and importance”. Turner (1996: 31) says that even if the sociology of the body is underdeveloped, in the recent years there has been a growth of literature on the field the Sociology of the Body. The same development can be traced in the field of the Sociology of Sport (for an overview, see e.g. Loy, Andrews & Rinehart, 1993; Cole, 2000), and in the later years, several sport sociologists have problematised and discussed the relation between men, masculinity and the body (see, for example, Elias & Dunning, 1986; Messner, 1990; Messner & Sabo, 1990b; Pronger, 1990a; Pronger 1990b; Aycock, 1992; Messner, 1992; Gillett & White, 1992; Klein, 1993; Messner & Sabo, 1994; Young, White, & McTeer, 1994; Sparkes, 1999; McKay, Messner, & Sabo, 2000). However, discussions of the relation between men, masculinity and the body, also exist in literature within the field Critical Studies on Men, which does not discuss sport explicitly (see, for example, Reynaud, 1983; Mishkind, Rodin, Silberstein & Striegel-Moore, 1986; Connell, 1987; Morgan, 1993; Connell, 1995; Mosse, 1996; Miller, 1998; Petersen, 1998; Bourdieu, 2000). Both the sport-literature on men and masculinity and the other literature within the field Critical Studies on Men, which problematise and discuss the relation between the men, masculinity and the body, follows a tradition of feminist research on the body. However, in recent years there has also been an increasing amount of non-feminist literature focusing on the sociology of the body (see, for example, Featherstone, Hepworth & Turner, 1991; Shilling, 1991; Shilling, 1993; Turner, 1996).

Concerning the gendered body, Klein (1999: 3) says: “gender is an abstract category which cannot materialise, reveal itself or be visualised without a body.” It is through discourses we gender the body by materialising, observing and interpreting gender in the body, which means that gender does not exist in itself in the body. Regarding the male body, Connell (1990: 89) claims that “(M)asculinity is not inherent in the male body; it is a definition given socially to certain characteristics”. What characteristics we “read” from the male body as masculine are constructed in discourse about masculinity. Sport has been decisive for discourses about masculinity in such a way that we tend to “read” the athletic physical body as masculine. As Pronger (1990a: 150) says, “(A)thletic, muscular bodies are masculine bodies”. Men have dominated modern sport since its earliest days (Messner & Sabo, 1990a: 9; Messner, 1992:

16). Sport, as it was developed in the upper class in Britain in the 19th century, and what we know as the modern sport, can be looked upon as a strategy in the making of certain manliness in boys and men. According to Whitson (1990: 22), the development of modern sport and the construction of the athletic body, was a clear concern of maximising and celebrating, among men, the differences between men and women. As the decline of the practical relevance of physical strength in work and warfare disappeared throughout the 20th century, the representations of the muscular body as strong, virile and powerful gained an increasingly important ideological and symbolic meaning (Mishkind, Rodin, Silberstein & Striegel-Moore, 1986: 555; Messner, 1990: 213). Even if women have gained access to the sports arena and weakened the strong association between masculinity and sport, sport is still one of the few arenas left for the definition of masculinity (Whitson, 1990: 28; Connell, 1995: 54), and where men can “do masculinity” and “do gender”. The body has also come to play a central role in the gender order because it is so closely associated to what is perceived as “natural” (Messner, 1990: 213-214). Even if an athletic body is easily thought of as natural, it is nevertheless a product of social discursive practice. Through discourses, the masculine body is also interpreted as being powerful. Sport is therefore empowering, especially for young men, because through sport they learn to use the body to gain power by a combination of strength and skill. Whitson (1990: 23) says it is worth observing that it is the experience of force and skill coming together which is a great part of what makes sport so popular.

Within both the feminist research tradition and the less feminist dominated sociological tradition about the sociology of the body, there is broad agreement that the body is socially constructed. In both these traditions, however, there are fundamental differences in the view of what causes the social construction of the body. Within the feminist research tradition and Critical Studies of Men, for example, Connell (1987; 1995) focuses on structures in the society as decisive to the social construction of the body, while in contrast Pronger (1990a) and Petersen (1998) focus on discourses and the discursive construction of the body. This thesis views the body as discursively constructed, but this does not prevent the use of theories having a structural approach to the body, such as Connell’s theory. According to Connell (1995: 65), “(T)he social has its own reality”, which I interpret to mean that “the social” has a pre-discursive existence; that it exists independently and ahead of discourses as something “real” that has to be discovered in order to understand its meaning. Even if Connell (1995: 45-66) says that the body is formed by structures existing in the pre-discursive social reality, and

that the body reproduces these structures by practice, this thesis claims that these structures are only available to us through discourses. As Jefferson (1994: 16) says,

“the world cannot be ‘thought’ other than in discursive categories. .. If everything that produces social meaning is part of discourse, and the world cannot be thought except through discourses, then discourses become ubiquitous”.

This means that in the social construction of the body, the body can only be constructed by available discourses, and constructs itself within available discourses. As a basis for understanding the body as a discursive construction in this thesis, Kendall & Wickham (1999: 39-40) interpretation of Foucault’s understanding of the body will be used:

“Bodies are not discourse, they are non-discursive in their materiality. But bodies do not exist and operate in a non-discursive vacuum. Of course the word ‘body’ is itself a discursive production, but more than this, the entity that is the body is under the sovereignty of discourse. ..The body’s form is not independent of discourse, and articulations of the body (in a wide sense) are always discursive, yet the body itself is non-discursive.”

The understanding of the body as discursively constructed is partly influenced by postmodernist thoughts. Unlike many postmodernists, this thesis draws upon a definition of the body where the body has a non-discursive dimension. One can very well label this non-discursive material dimension as nature or sex, and the discursive dimension as culture or gender. In the books “Gender Trouble” (1990) and “Bodies that Matter” (1993), Butler tries to overcome the separation between sex and gender by claiming that the body is discursively constructed because it consists of materiality which is a result of power. I will rather say that this materiality does exist non-discursively *but* that this materiality is only available for us through discourses. According to Widerberg (1998: 134), “sex is just as socially constructed as gender; what is nature or not nature is decided beforehand ..”. The separation between sex and gender is a socially constructed separation, and by labelling something “sex” and using it as a category for describing aspects of the body, we produce and reproduce discourses in order to make these aspects available for us. Sex is understood as a social construction in this thesis because it is only available for us through discourses. However, the concept sex will not be used in this thesis. Because the body will be referred to as a discursive construction, the

concept of gender will be preferred even if it sometimes will come to refer to matters traditionally understood as sex.

Whether one sees structures or discourses as decisive for the social construction of the body, or whether one sees the body as having a non-discursive dimension or not, it is power, either in structures or discourses, which discipline the body. As Skårderud (1994: 178) says, “(T)he European history of the body is the discipline”, where the body is disciplined to reason and rationality (see later about disciplinary power). Heikkala (1993: 401-402), Vigarello (1995: 158), and others, claim that the body is both object and agent, and this is the basis also for this thesis. The bodies are objects for the discursive power, but they are also agents that through practice produce and reproduce discourses. At the same time, it is in discourses the meaning of the body is produced, and the standard for the “normal” body is set.

Postmodernism

Postmodernism has not only influenced how the body is understood in this thesis. Actually, most of the theoretical perspectives presented in this chapter are influenced by postmodernist thoughts. The concept of discourse, for example, is central in postmodernist theories, and especially in post-structural theories. However, the distinction between postmodernism and post-structuralism is blurred. Rail (1998: xi) says that post-structuralism is recognisable by the de-construction of binaries in linguistic systems, such as man-woman. Most renown for this, is Jacques Derrida. According to Richardson (2000b: 928), post-structuralism represents a particular kind of postmodernist thinking which links language, subjectivity, social organisation and power. The main focus, however, is on language that is understood as discourse. When a reality is understood as discursively constructed in this perspective, language is what constitutes reality. Therefore, reality is often referred to as a text. The focus on language in the concept of discourse has led to an association of Foucault to post-structuralism (Schaanning, 1995: 8; 2000a: 199). However, as previously discussed, to Foucault discourse does not mean language, both spoken and written, as a form; language becomes a discourse when it is tied to practice (Schaanning, 2000a: 238). Since this thesis follows Foucault’s understanding of discourse and sees discourse not only as language but also as practice, it is most suitable to use the term postmodernism in this thesis.

Two of the most central elements in postmodernist thoughts that have influenced the feminists scholarship, are most likely the rejection of the notion of patriarchy, and the focus on difference among men as well as women (Evans, 1995: 125; Petersen, 1998: 27). Evans (1995: 125) though labels the impact of postmodernist thoughts on feminism as *the postmodernist challenge*. In relation to the two elements mentioned above, this is so because the rejection of the existence of patriarchy and the existence of one unifying female subjectivity have after all challenged some crucial aspects of feminist thoughts.

One of the central postmodernist thoughts that will be used in this thesis is the “death of the subject” (Evans, 1995: 125). Evans (ibid) looks upon the postmodernist focus on difference not only as a difference between individual women or men, but also as a difference within each man and each women which indicates a fragmentation of the self. In this thesis this means that in the discursive construction of the male or female subject, there is at the same time a discursively construction if several identities. For example, the subject Berit is a collage of many identities; student, aunt, girlfriend, friend, sister and so on. However, to claim that Berit is *a subject* is not correct. According to Davies, (1997b: 274), the subject is an already discursively constituted subject that is in a process. Therefore, Davies (ibid) claims that one has to think of the subject as a verb and not as a noun, which means that the subject Berit is in a constantly process of subjectification (see also about the subject page 36).

A central issue in much postmodernist work (for example, Butler, 1990; 1993; Petersen, 1998) is sexuality. The reason for this is the realisation of that sexuality cannot be avoided in the study of gender because sexuality is closely related to both gender and power. This view has made me understand that in the study of gender, it is impossible to avoid taking sexuality into account. Postmodernist theory, together with queer theory⁴ focus on the relation between the social construction of gender and of sexuality. Much of the literature within postmodernism and queer theory is influenced by the work of Foucault, for example, Butler (1990; 1993). In this thesis, the understanding of the relation between gender and sexuality is

⁴ According to Petersen (1998: 101), “queer” is difficult to define. Nevertheless in a discussion of queer theory in relation to sociology, Stein & Plummer (1996: 134) see the following hallmarks for queer theory: (1) A conceptualisation of sexuality which sees sexual power embodied in different levels of social life, expressed discursively and enforced through boundaries and binary divisions. (2) The problematisation of sexual and gender categories, and of identities in general. Identities are always on uncertain ground, entailing displacements of identification and knowing. (3) A rejection of civil-rights strategies in favour of a politics of carnival, transgression, and parody which leads to de-construction, de-centering, revisionist readings, and an anti-assimilationist politics. (4) A willingness to interrogate areas that normally would not be seen as the terrain of sexuality, and to conduct queer “readings” of ostensibly heterosexual or non-sexualised texts.

based on Foucault's work. In the "History of Sexuality, Vol. 1" (1984: 155-156), Foucault says:

"It is through sex – in fact, an imaginary point determined by the deployment of sexuality – that each individual has to pass in order to have access to his own intelligibility (seeing that it is both the hidden aspect and the generative principle of meaning), to the whole of his body (since it is a real and threatened part of it, while symbolically constituting the whole), to his identity (since it joins the force of a drive to the singularity of a history)."

By this quotation Foucault indicates that sexuality is not biologically decisive. Sexuality is a social constructed discourse which forms individuals and in which the individuals form themselves. Sexuality as a socially constructed discourse is inevitable in the construction of gender, masculinity and femininity. This is how sexuality will be understood in this thesis.

*

Within feminist research and Critical Studies on Men there is an implicit understanding of a dynamic power that exists in the gender order, and in the hierarchical arrangement between men exhibiting various masculinities. When discussing power in relation to prison, however, it may be useful to take into consideration other theoretical perspectives of power. These will be discussed in the next chapter.

Chapter four

Power

In a prison power can easily be understood as a juridical-political form of power which is embedded in the formal bureaucracy that exists in the institution (Mathiesen, 1994: xix; (Lindgren, 1998: 324). With reference to Sawicki (1991), Lindgren (1998: 324) says that in a juridical-political model of power, the power is possessed in a centralised source that acquires a monopoly of power. From this source the power goes downwards and works in a primarily repressive manner. In a juridical-political model of power, however, the power is regulated by written laws. The members of a society are subject to the power-monopoly, but in return, the power-monopoly guarantees the rights of the individual by arrangements that maintain law and order and make sure that those who break the law are arrested and punished (Schaanning, 2000a: 325). However, in order to discuss power in such a complex context as a male prison, it is necessary to go beyond the juridical-political model of power, and the power embedded in the gender order and in the hierarchical arrangement between men exhibiting different masculinities. For this, Foucault's understanding of power will be used.

My first encounter with Foucault's writings was "Discipline and Punish" (Foucault, 1991a), which I read immediately after I began my doctoral studies. The book left me insecure about my own knowledge about prisons. It made me frustrated and indignant, but made me think about prison and punishment in other ways than I was used to. I continued to read Foucault and literature that refers to Foucault's understanding of power, in particular literature concerning prisons as well as literature concerning sport and the body. As a result, Foucault understanding of power constitutes a framework in the presentation and discussion of the empirical material in this thesis. It is therefore necessary to clarify the interpretation of Foucault's understanding of power that will be used in this thesis and define some important concepts embedded in his understanding of power.

Foucault is not an easy man "to dance with" (Christensen, 2000). Foucault is "unclear" in his writings, and he has been interpreted in several different and sometimes opposite ways in the "Foucault industry" that now surrounds us (Christensen, *ibid*). Because Foucault's writings

are rather difficult to read and understand, the understanding of his writings in this thesis is based on others' interpretations of Foucault. In this respect Espen Schaanning's interpretation of Foucault's writings is of current interest¹.

Foucault's understanding of power

In "The History of Sexuality (Vol. 1)" (1984: 93) Foucault says: "power is not an institution, and not a structure; neither is it a certain strength we are endowed with; it is the name that one attributes to a complex strategic situation in a particular society." Schaanning, (2000a: 328) says that it may look as if Foucault defines power in this statement, but that the statement is hardly meant as a description of what power really is. This is because Foucault emphasised that he was not aiming at establishing a new theory of power. He was more concerned with the techniques of power and the technology of power, and how these in a daily social life are directed towards people in their routine activities. In this way we can talk about a kind of power that functions on a micro level, a micro power (Lindgren, 1998: 322). Sandmo (1992: 52) says there are two features of Foucault's understanding of power; it is productive and it is not localised anywhere. Power for Foucault is therefore not possessed; it is practised (Kendall & Wickham, 1999: 50). Because of this, Foucault prefers to talk about "power relations" and "exercise of power" (Schaanning, 2000a: 328). The power relations are dynamic, unstable and ever changing because the power does not have a source. (Foucault (1984: 93) says:

"The omnipresence of power: not because it has the privilege of consolidating everything under its invisible unity, but because it is produced from one moment to the next, at every point or rather in every relation from one point to another. Power is everywhere; not because it embraces everything, but because it comes from everywhere."

However, Foucault's concepts of power vary. In different phases of his writing, from about 1970 until his death in 1984, he analysed power in different ways and he used many concepts to characterise how power work. In the following, Foucault's analysis of power will be divided in three; the "disciplinary power", "power – resistance", "power and the subject"². In this thesis all three different forms of power will be used. There are objections, however,

¹ I am sometimes forced to refer to Schaanning as a second source as some of his references to Foucault are French, which I am unable to read.

towards combining parts of Foucault's writings and looking upon it as a totality. This is because Foucault's writings reflect his constant and very conscious change of positions and perspectives (Sandmo, 1992: 37). Nevertheless, according to Schaanning (2000a: 371), it is easier to understand Foucault's analysis of power if one keeps in mind that Foucault described the practices of power that are tied to those practices of knowledge which try to influence people's behaviour and actions.

Disciplinary power

In "Madness and Civilisation" (Foucault, 1973), "Discipline and Punish" (Foucault, 1991a), and "The History of Sexuality (Vol. 1)" (Foucault, 1984) through the concept of "bio-power", one is acquainted with the "disciplinary power". However, "Discipline and Punish" (Foucault, 1991a) is perhaps the work most renowned for the analysis of the disciplinary power. In this book Foucault shows how punishment in approximately 75 years (from about 1750 to 1825) changed from being directed towards the body, in the form of torture, to being directed towards the soul by isolation and segregation in prisons. Foucault explains this change by showing how discipline becomes central in the western world in the 19th century. By disciplining people's bodies, they are made into docile bodies, and by controlling people's bodies, they can be used. To obtain this, methods and techniques are developed to squeeze as much as possible out of the body. The control of people's bodies is also a result of the development of "bio-power" as the focus shifts from the threat of death to management of life. Foucault (1984: 139) says: "(T)he disciplines of the body and the regulations of the population constitute the two poles around which the organization of power over life is deployed." In the regulation of the population, the human being is looked upon as a species where the management of birth, death, health, etc., become central issues and important objects of knowledge (Foucault, *ibid*). For the discipline of the body, "using techniques of subjection and methods of exploitation, an obscure art of light and the visible was secretly preparing a new knowledge of man" (Foucault, 1991a: 171).

To make the discipline of the body complete, methods are also developed to ensure that the soul controls the body resulting in docility and good behaviour. Systems are developed to make *hierarchical supervision* of the bodies possible in order to ensure that the individuals behave well. By means of *normalisation* people's behaviour, in accordance with rules and

² Concerning this division, see, for example, Steinsholt (1991); Deveaux (1994); Kendall & Wickham (1999).

standards, is ensured. The “normalisation” is made possible by controlling the access to the life of the body and the life of the species, and a “normal” body and a “normal” population is obtained by the use of different means. For example, institutions develop their own “micro-punishment system”, which does not fall under the criminal act, but where “good” or “normal behaviour” is rewarded and sanctions are placed on the individuals for “bad” or “abnormal behaviour”. This is an “infra-penalty” that controls an area which is not regulated by laws (Foucault, 1991a: 178). The evaluation of individuals and the population no longer occurs as much in relation to juridical terms, that is, what is legitimate and forbidden, but rather in relation to what is “normal” and “abnormal” (Schaanning, 2000b: 449-452, 557-563). Special attention is paid to those who break the laws, i.e. those who deviate from the “normal”. These become objects for experts such as doctors, pedagogues, psychologists and psychiatrists, who discover “abnormalities” and classify these “abnormalities” as mental diseases. The normalisation enforces homogeneity, but at the same time, it also individualises because it makes it possible to measure the deviance (Schaanning, 2000a: 447-448). *Examination* becomes an important technique, and by comparison to the norm, it becomes possible to gain knowledge about the individuals in the search for “the truth” about them. By examination a specified system for registration and filing is developed which makes it easy to store knowledge about the individual. (For more about this see also Schaanning, 2000b: 437-455.)

In “Discipline and Punish” Foucault introduces Bentham’s concept “panopticon” (Bentham, *Panopticon*), which is a model of a prison where there is a tower in the middle with a ring of cells around it. This architecture makes it possible to supervise and control a lot of prisoners simultaneously. According to Schaanning (2000b: 457), Foucault introduces this concept to link the different forms for discipline and the criminal law. For Foucault, the panopticism represents the synthesis of the discipline of the body and the discipline of the soul. This synthesis is not primarily meant to describe the society in general, but to visualise in what ways the different techniques of discipline can be traced in the prison (Schaanning, 2000b: 457).

The prison therefore, becomes a place where the prisoner is constantly supervised by hierarchical supervision, and where the disciplinary techniques such as normalisation come into force. The prisoner’s behaviour and character is observed, written down and filed in order to measure the prisoner’s improvement in the effort of making the body docile. This is not “juridical knowledge”, defining and classifying the punishment in relation to the seriousness

of the offence and degree of evil will, but knowledge centred on the prisoner's potential improvement. Through a series of practices and discourses, knowledge is created about the prisoner – knowledge, which for the traditional criminal law, seems irrelevant. Traditional law reacted to the offence and convicted the offender, but the “law” that came into force by micro-punishment systems in the prison, reacts upon “abnormal” behaviour and convicts the delinquent. In prison “the criminal” is constructed because his life rather than his actions are of interest in the characterisation of him. “The criminals” become objects of knowledge, for psychologists, and psychiatrists. By these “knowers” classification of “the criminals” based on their instincts, abilities, traits of character and moral behaviour, a “ethnography of the prisons” or a “zoology of social sub-species” is constituted (Foucault, 1991a: 253). The focus is put to the law offender's “inner nature” in order to explain why their bodies are not docile and “normal”. The creation of this knowledge leads to a practice of it, in order to change “the criminal's” bodies into docile, well behaving and “normal” bodies.

In this manner Foucault indicates that offences, to an increasing degree, came to be looked upon as deviant behaviour. The court system becomes allied to those wanting to control, because it starts to take into consideration the possibilities of improvement when assigning punishment. In this way the prisons become a house of corrections, with the task of disciplining the prisoners in an effective way. According to Foucault, this form of disciplinary power demands a constant vigilance and curious presence and presupposes proximity. Besides examinations and observations, it demands intimate information that goes beyond the examination which is achieved by *confession*. According to Foucault (1988: 16), confession came to play an important part in penal institutions where the prisoner was supposed to tell “the truth” about himself. However, Foucault rejects the idea that the disciplinary power is identical to the institution - the prison. As we have seen, Foucault's understanding of disciplinary power is far more extensive than that which only concerns the prisons. In Foucault's perspective the institutions, as the prisons, are operational instances that integrate and reproduce already existing power relations. The disciplinary power goes ahead of the institutions. The institutions reproduce the disciplinary power, but do not produce it (Lindgren, 1998: 323).

One may easily get an impression of the disciplinary power as unambiguously suppressive. However, Schaanning (2000b: 386) says that perhaps Foucault make us experience the disciplinary power as suppressive, but Foucault himself does not take sides, he just writes the

stories. Foucault, however, meant that the disciplinary power is not always negative, it can also be creative and positive, and the disciplinary power will also be interpreted in this way in this thesis.

Power – resistance

Foucault (1984: 95) writes:

“Where there is power, there is resistance, and yet, or rather consequently, this resistance is never in a position of exteriority in relation to power. .. Their existence depends on a multiplicity of points of resistance: these play the role of adversary, target, support, or handle in power situations. These points of resistance are present everywhere in the power network”.

Schaanning (2000a: 360) says that Foucault’s concept of resistance is not primarily something that expresses hopes and alternatives, but is something that belongs to the way power operates. Resistance is not an alternative outside power. It is something needed for the power to operate. “Resistance is the indispensable double to the power” (Schaanning, *ibid*). The reason why power works as it does is that it meets resistance. Because the relation between power and resistance is strategic, it is also labile and moveable and therefore open for potential changes. Because resistance constitutes the other pole in a power relation, resistance can function as a key to understand how power-mechanisms operate (Schaanning, 2000a: 360-361).

In a prison therefore, much time and effort is spent on disciplining the prisoners just because they resist being disciplined. The “knowers”, such as the prison officers, teachers, psychologists and so on, develop procedures and routines, make plans and arrange programs, to which they expose the prisoners in order to make the prisoners’ bodies tractable. The points of resistance are the prisoners’ bodies, and their function is to be opponents, targets and places for support. The “knowers” record the effects and results of their effort and gather knowledge of what works and what does not work. This knowledge constitutes the basis for new efforts, which in turn gives new knowledge and so it continues. Because of the prisoners’ resistance, the disciplinary power can function. Or according to Schaanning (2000a: 360), it is a paradox: the whole network of efforts that is effectuated for disciplining the prisoners can function

because it does not function well. It is because the disciplinary power meets resistance that it is maintained and which makes the production and reproduction of discourses possible.

In a prison, prisoners and prison officers are parts of many different power relations. A prisoner relates, for example, to other prisoners and prison officers, both males and females, and power comes into play in all these relations. So it is for male and female officers, power comes into play in all relations between them. Formally prison officers have the power to enforce their wishes. For example, if a prison officer find a prisoner rude, he or she may request the prisoner to leave the room or even report him to the leadership. However, if a prison officer plays too much by the book, there is always a chance that the prisoners will turn against him or her and make his or hers daily work rather unpleasant without breaking any official rules. In order to make the everyday life in prison running as smooth as possible, prison officers may make adaptations in various ways, e.g. by doing favours not necessarily requested. (More about this may be found in, for example, Liebling & Price, 1999; Liebling, Price & Elliot, 1999.) This was the kind of power Foucault wanted to describe because it gives the possibility of reciprocity. According to Schaanning (2000a: 361), it is when we study the concrete exercise of power that we are able to see the strategic play of power.

Schaanning (2000a: 363) says that the kind of power Foucault analyses can also be interpreted by Rouse (1993; 1994) concepts of “alignments”, which means that a person exercising power towards individuals at the same time depends on other individuals to exercise power on himself or herself. In a prison there is a linear hierarchy and in this hierarchy there is dependency between persons at the different levels. A prisoner, located at the bottom of the hierarchy, for example, can complain about prison officers to the prison officers’ superior chiefs. Prison officers must therefore be careful and behave fairly in order to avoid serious complains. “Gossip and complaints are the weapons of the weakest”, says Schaanning (2000a: 364) (my translation).

Foucault claims that freedom is a character trait of the power relations, that power and freedom presuppose each other (Schaanning, 2000a: 356). But, does a prisoner have any freedom? In the way power is understood by Foucault, the answer is unambiguously yes. Foucault distinguishes between power on one side and domination and constraints on the other. Power is constituted by strategic relations between people where each part has the potential to react to its counterpart’s move; “a chackled prisoner is exposed to coercion, not

power” (Schaanning, 2000a: 357). The prisoner’s freedom is subjected to power whenever he can “choose” how to relate to things, how and when to say certain things, etc. (Schaanning, *ibid*). Foucault (1987: 12) says:

“there cannot be relations of power unless the subjects are free. If one or the other were completely at the disposition of the other and became his thing, an object on which he can exercise an infinite and unlimited violence, there would not be relations of power. .. Even though the relation of power may be completely unbalanced or when one can truly say that he has ‘all power’ over the other, a power can only be exercised over another to the extent that the latter still has the possibility of committing suicide, of jumping out of the window or killing the other. That means that in the relations of power, there is necessarily the possibility of resistance, for if there were no possibility of resistance - of violent resistance, of escape, of ruse, of strategies that reverse the situation – there would be no relations of power.”

Freedom constitutes the basic condition for resistance, and freedom and resistance are decisive for the existence of power and thereby the production of knowledge (Schaanning, 2000a: 359 and 365). It was at the end of his authorship that Foucault connected the exercise of power and the production of knowledge to freedom (Schaanning, 2000a: 355). Schaanning (2000a: 356) says that an important reason why Foucault insisted on the freedom of the individual was due to accusations that his analyses of power had forced people into rigid structures they were unable to escape. In the article “The subject and power” (1982: 777) Foucault writes:

“I would like to say, first of all, what has been the goal of my work during the last twenty years. It has not been to analyze the phenomena of power, nor to elaborate the foundations of such an analysis. My objective, instead, has been to create a history of the different modes by which, in our culture, human beings are made subjects.”

In the works discussed so far, “Discipline and Punish” (Foucault, 1991a) “The History of Sexuality (Vol. 1)” (Foucault, 1984), Foucault claims by this statement to have studied how subjects are made into objects by “dividing practices” (Foucault, 1982: 777). Within different disciplines of knowledge the subjects, and also each subject, are sorted according to what is mad - sane, sick and healthy, “criminal” and “normal” (Foucault, 1982: 778; Schaanning, 2000a: 366). This is perhaps not as clear in the aforementioned books, but is explicitly expressed in the two last volumes of “The History of Sexuality”; “The Use of Pleasure (Vol.

2)” (Foucault, 1985a) and “The Care of the Self (Vol. 3)” (Foucault, 1986b). In these two books Foucault focuses on the discourses and practices where human beings turn themselves into subjects.

Subject and power

According to Schaanning (2000b: 667-668), in the two last volumes of “The History of Sexuality” (Foucault, 1985a; 1986b), Foucault seeks to analyse the history of a particular area of knowledge: the knowledge about oneself. However, according to Schaanning (ibid), there is a lot of literature (e.g. Sawicki, 1991; Moss, 1998), claiming that in these two last volumes of “The History of Sexuality” (Foucault, 1985a; Foucault, 1986b), Foucault has drafted a philosophy of morals for the present time. Schaanning, who has studied these two books thoroughly, disagrees with this (Schaanning, 2000b: 669). I agree with Schaanning and therefore the relation between the subject and power will not be discussed in relation to ethics and morals. Neither will this relation be discussed in relation to sexuality, which is actually the theme of the books. In this discussion the focus will be on the principles of the relation between subject and knowledge. Foucault (1985b: 367) says:

“If one wants to analyse the genealogy (discursive origins, my comment) of subject in Western civilization, one has to take into account not only techniques of domination, but also techniques of self. One has to show the interaction between these two types of the self. When I was studying asylums, prisons and so on, I perhaps insisted too much on the techniques of domination. What we call discipline is something really important in this kind of institution. But it is only one aspect of the art of governing people in our societies. Having studied the field of power relations taking domination techniques as a point of departure, I should like, in the years to come, to study power relations, especially in the field of sexuality, starting from the techniques of the self.”

In this quotation Foucault shows that studying the genealogy of both the disciplinary power and the power used by individuals in the creation of themselves, is important in order to understand these issues at the present time. About the relation between disciplinary power and power individuals use in creation of themselves, Foucault (1982: 781) says:

“This form of power applies itself to immediate everyday life which categorizes the individual, marks him by his own individuality, attaches him to his own identity, imposes a

‘law of truth’ on him which he must recognize and which others have to recognize in him. There are two meanings of the word ‘subject’: subject to someone else by control and dependence; and tied to his own identity by a conscience or self-knowledge. Both meanings suggest a form of power that subjugates and makes subject to.”

In this quotation Foucault says that the subject is “subject to someone else by control and dependence”. This is the same statement as the one mentioned earlier in this presentation, that the individuals become objects of knowledge (see pages 31-32). It is almost impossible to separate Foucault’s notions of subject and object, and according to Foucault, neither a sovereign subject nor object exists (Lorentzen, 2000). The human being, understood as a subject to Foucault, is a social and cultural product, in a continuous process of change and redefinition (Lindgren, 1998: 324; Schaanning, 2000a: 369). In the first kind of subject Foucault mentions in the quotation above; “subject to someone else”, is the subject made into object by “dividing practices”. The individual becomes an “object for knowledge” and through the process where knowledge about it is constructed, it is created to a subject where its characteristics are defined by the power mechanisms discussed in the sub-chapter about disciplinary power. The individuals most exposed to this kind of subjecting knowledge are the deviants (Schaanning, 2000a: 367), such as prisoners. In the following, this process is labelled *objectification* in order to distinguish it from the second kind of subject Foucault mentions in the quotation above. This kind of subject is tied to his or her own identity by conscience or self-knowledge (Foucault, 1982: 781). This form of subjection concerns how the individual relates to himself or herself. This process is labelled *the processes of subjectification* in this thesis. This process is a matter of how the individuals establish themselves as subjects, how they get to know themselves, how they gain knowledge about themselves in order to define themselves, and how they eventually transform themselves (Schaanning, 2000a: 368). In this process the individuals subjugate themselves, they discipline themselves to make themselves into the subjects they want to be. However, the process of objectification and the process of subjectification cannot be separated, and as Schaanning (2000a: 368) claims, it is rather obvious that the process of objectification is decisive for the process of subjectification. Steinsholt (1991:117) says:

“Through the relations between power and knowledge, the discipline forces the individual back to itself and relates him or her to their own identity in a restrictive way. In such a way our identity is the result of disciplinary mechanisms of normalisation and individualisation. The

object for our resistance will therefore be to reject what we are, which means breaking through those limitations imposed by a disciplinary ascription of our own identity.” (My translation)

In the last two volumes of “The History of Sexuality” (Foucault, 1985a; Foucault, 1986b), Foucault illuminates a certain category of discourses and practices, namely discourses activated by individuals, groups and institutions to construct what individuals experience as the true subject (Schaanning, 2000b: 573). The individual then can only create and improve himself or herself in relation to those discourses that surround and fill the social field (Lindgren, 1998: 326) As Foucault (1987: 11)says,

“I am interested, in fact, in the way in which the subject constitutes himself in an active fashion, by the practices of the self, these practices are nevertheless not something that the individual invents by himself. They are patterns that he finds in his culture and which are proposed, suggested and imposed on him by his culture, his society and his social group.”

Based on the previous discussion, one can say that the subject is both a result of power and a tool for power. It is a result of power in the process where it is discursively constructed in the process of objectification, and it is a tool for power in the subjectification process where the individual uses discourses to construct himself or herself as a subject. Foucault is not interested in whether these discourses are true or not, or if the practices are ethical esteemed. His interest is in what kind of “regimen of truth” the knowledge and truth about “the others”, and the knowledge and truth about oneself, find themselves within (Schaanning, 2000a: 366 and 368; 2000b: 573-574).

*

Even if Foucault’s understanding about power shifted throughout his authorship, in my opinion, Foucault’s understanding of power is split into levels: one can understand perfectly well the disciplinary power without knowing about resistance and the subject. To understand resistance, one has to know about the disciplinary power, and it is actually a bit difficult to write about resistance without mentioning the subject. In writing about the creation of the self, one has to know both the disciplinary power and resistance. Even if Foucault’s various understanding of power as they are presented here are intertwined, they have hopefully been presented in such a way that both differences and the similarities are visualised.

The research questions

Based on Foucault's understanding of power, one may assume that power-relations exist in all relations in the prison. In the introductory chapter some additional assumptions were made based on my own experiences from working with sport in prison. One assumption was that the staff and the prisoners construct different meanings of the prisoners' exercise of sport and of the prisoners' construction of large muscular bodies. Moreover, it was assumed that the prisoners, and to a certain extent the prison officers, are engaged in the sports activities in the prison. These assumptions constitute the basis for the formulation of the research questions which clarify what is to be learned from the study (Maxwell, 1996: 53).

If the assumptions from experience are formulated as questions, one could ask: "if staff and the prisoners construct different meanings of the prisoners' exercise of sport and of the prisoners' construction of large muscular bodies – why?" And, "why do the prisoners and some of the prison officers engage in the exercise of sport in prison?" These questions may have many answers, and no answer supersedes the other. The focus on these questions will, however, be made with a point of departure originating from the theories presented in this chapter, and these theories will constitute the basis for the formulation of the research questions. Therefore, the different constructions of meanings of the prisoners' exercise of sport and their large bodies, and the participation in sports activities, are to be understood from theories about crime, masculinity and power.

In the formulation of the research questions, Foucault's understanding of power and the juridical-political understanding of power will constitute the framework. The object of exploration will be to try to understand how the construction and re-construction of masculinity that occurs in the exercise of sport influences and is influenced by the disciplinary power, the juridical-political understanding of power, the resistance and the power exercised by the subject in the creation of himself.

The first research question will explore the construction and re-construction of masculinity happening within the realm of the disciplinary power and the juridical-political power. The disciplinary power and the juridical-political power will be discussed together because, according to Mathiesen (1994: xix), the disciplinary power and the juridical-political power

interact with each other and neither of them can stand alone. An understanding of how the disciplinary power and the juridical-political power works, will serve as a basis for understanding the resistance and the creation of the self. The disciplinary aspect is also reflected in the social educational effects, idealistically achieved by the exercise of sport in prison. It is therefore, with the basis in the disciplinary and juridical-politically power, possible to analyse the prison officers' interpretation of the prisoners' exercise of sport and the prisoners' development of large muscular bodies in relation to construction and re-construction of masculinity. The first research question is therefore:

1. What are the leading discourses for the construction and re-construction of masculinities in the prison in general, and for the prison officers' interpretations of the prisoners' exercise of sport in particular?

Foucault's notion that the disciplinary power cannot exist without resistance and that this resistance can be related to the individual's creation of himself as a subject, leads to the next research question. Within this realm we can locate the discourses of masculinity within which the prisoners constitute themselves as men, and where they find meaning in their exercise of sport. The second research question is therefore:

2. What do the sports activities mean for the prisoners' creation and re-creation of themselves as gendered subjects?

The research questions above give a presupposition for understanding how discourses about masculinity influence the power relations existing on a micro level between individuals in the prison. Based on the discourses about masculinity that exist in this field, it may be possible to further understand the prisoners involvement in sports activities, and some of the prison officers' involvement in sports activities in the prison. This again can constitute a basis in order to understand the interaction between those participating in sports activities and the interaction between those who participate in sports activities and those who do not participate in sports activities. The third research question is therefore:

3. What do the sports activities mean for the construction and re-construction of power relations between the prisoners, between the prisoners and the male prison officers, and between the prisoners and the female prison officers?

At page 39, it was said that Foucault's understanding of power is like levels. To understand resistance, one has to acknowledge the disciplinary power, and that it is difficult to understand the resistance without knowing about the subject. When the subject is investigated, one has to see the creation of the self in relation to both the disciplinary power and the resistance. The data-material will therefore be presented in accordance with the order of the research questions.

*

If one is interested in the meaning the respondents find in different acts, Maxwell (1996: 17) says that this calls for a qualitative study. Therefore, it is the methods of the qualitative study that will be discussed in the next chapter.

Chapter five

Methods

In writing this chapter of methods, I have followed one of Wolcott's points (1994: 16) in which he advises to doctoral students to: "Tell the story. Then tell how that happened to be the way you told it." This thesis is "the story", and it is in particular a story about sport, masculinity and power in prison. In this chapter the intention is to "tell how it happened to be the way I am telling this story". First of all, this story is influenced by our time, as I most probably belong to what Denzin & Lincoln (2000: 9) call a new generation of qualitative researchers who are attached to postmodernism and/or poststructuralism. Researchers belonging to this generation, as well as many researchers working within the paradigms of critical theory or constructionism, argue that traditionally positivist methods are but one way of telling stories about society or the social world. These researchers reject the thought that the only way of doing research is to follow the quantitative, positivist methods and assumptions. They also reject the positivist and postpositivist criteria when evaluating their own work (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000: 10).

I am aware that not everyone shares this view. Many scientists reject any science that does not fall within the paradigm of positivism and post-positivism. Sparkes (personal conversation March 2000) opened my eyes to this when he said: "The chapter of methods is your defence chapter." A central issue in this chapter therefore, is to justify the story in this thesis as a story of science or research. A central concept in the philosophy of science is paradigm, and placing this study within the scope of paradigms, is therefore important in the justification process. This includes how paradigmatic assumptions have shaped the study and the story told in this thesis. In this chapter an overview of how this study has proceeded will be given. Towards the end of the chapter some higher level ethical issues will be discussed. Since positivist and postpositivist criteria are not appropriate to judge this work, I will at the end of this chapter suggest some criteria to use for evaluating this thesis.

Paradigmatic assumptions

A paradigm is an interpretative framework which is a “basic sets of believes that guides action” (Guba, 1990: 17; Denzin & Lincoln, 2000: 19). Figure 1 page 44 lists some inquiry paradigms. As we see from the figure, Guba & Lincoln (1994: 109) say that a paradigm is based on *ontological*, *epistemological* and *methodological* assumptions. Lincoln & Guba (2000: 174) ask if the interpretative paradigms sketched in Figure 1 are commensurable, if it is “possible to blend elements of one paradigm into another, so that one is engaging in research that represents the best of both worldviews?” Their answer to this question is *yes*, and they say that elements of the paradigm of critical theory, especially when it is carried out within the field of postmodernism, and the paradigm of constructionism fit comfortably together (Guba & Lincoln, *ibid*). This study is carried out at the intersection between these two paradigms, and beneath the ontology, epistemology and methodology which has been decisive for this work will be discussed.

The ontological assumptions of a study are reflected in the answers to the questions: “(W)hat is the form and nature of reality?” and “what is there that can be known about it?” (Guba & Lincoln, 1994: 108). Within the positivistic paradigm, reality exists pre-discursively, which means that the reality is “out there”, and knowledge is finding out the “way things are”. Within the paradigm of constructionism, the reality is discursively constructed. This reality also has a non-discursive dimension, as for example the materiality of the body, but as earlier stated, “the body is under the sovereignty of discourse” (Kendall & Wickham, 1999: 39). Embedded in the understanding that the reality is discursively constructed is an understanding that there are many, and often contrary, realities that are locally and specifically produced in different discourses where none of the realities are truer than other realities (Potter, 1996: 98; Schwandt, 2000: 197).

Answers to the epistemological question “(W)hat is the nature of the relationship between the knower or would-be knower and what can be known?” are closely related to the ontological questions (Guba & Lincoln, 1994: 108). In the positivistic paradigm the findings

Figure 1 Basic beliefs of alternative inquiry paradigms

<i>Item</i>	<i>Positivism</i>	<i>Postpositivism</i>	<i>Critical Theory et al.</i>	<i>Constructivism</i>
Ontology	Naïve realism – “real” reality but apprehendable	Critical realism – “real” reality but only imperfectly and probabilistically apprehendable	Historical realism – virtual reality shaped by social, political, cultural, economic, ethnic, and gender values; crystallized over time	Relativism – local and specific constructed realities
Epistemology	Dualist/objectivist; Findings true	Modified dualist/objectivist; Critical tradition/Community; findings probably true	Transactional/subjectivist; value mediated findings	Transactional/subjectivist/created findings
Methodology	Experimental/manipulative; verification of hypotheses; chiefly quantitative methods	Modified experimental/manipulative; critical multiplism; falsification of hypotheses; may include qualitative methods	Dialogic/dialectical	Hermeneutical/dialectical

(Guba & Lincoln, 1994: 109; Lincoln & Guba, 2000: 165)

are discovered through objective observation where the investigator will determine “how things really are” and “how things really work”, and the findings are reckoned to be true (Guba & Lincoln, 1994: 111). Within the paradigm of constructionism and critical theory, the answer to this epistemological question is that the knowledge about the world is socially constructed, and the knowledge is locally constructed in the interaction between the respondents and the researcher. However, the researcher is not a neutral spectator in the construction of knowledge. As a knowing subject the researcher is intimately part of any understanding of what counts as knowledge, or any claims the researcher makes of knowledge, because “there is no possibility of the theory-free observation or knowledge” (Smith & Deemer, 2000: 877). To interpret meanings in language and actions, the researcher’s task is to try to understand what the respondents do and say by interpreting it (Schwandt, 1994: 118). That the knowledge is locally constructed also means that the researcher’s interpretations are no more correct, better or worse, than any other interpretations (Schwandt, 2000: 201). This means that the knowledge produced in the story in this thesis is just one of many truths. As Foucault (1990: 51) says, “I believe too much in truth not to suppose that there are different truths and different ways of speaking the truths.”

The methodological question; “how can a researcher go about finding out what he or she believes can be known?” (Guba & Lincoln, 1994: 108) is constrained by the answers on the ontological and epistemological questions given above. This means that not every method is appropriate to answer the research questions. Based on the previous discussion, an experimental method that requires objectivity and a real world to be objective about, could never have been used in this study (Guba & Lincoln, *ibid*). In Figure 1 we see that the methodology of constructivism is hermeneutical/dialectical, and the methodology of critical theory is dialogic/dialectical. This means that the socially constructed knowledge is produced in the interaction between the respondents and the researcher. In the planning and designing of the study therefore, this is a central issue to be aware of for a researcher carrying out a study within these paradigms.

Planning and designing the study

In accordance with the research purposes, the research questions and the discussion above, the most relevant methods for this study were fieldwork, qualitative interviews and document analysis, the three methods that are most used in different combinations by qualitative

researchers (Janesick, 2000: 384). In relation to document analysis, a lot of the documents in a prison concern the prisoners' criminal cases and are therefore confidential. It would have been ethically problematic to use these documents without any consent from the prisoners, and even with consent it is doubtful that these documents would have given information of relevance in answering the research question. What was left was fieldwork, which almost always includes qualitative interviews.

Fieldwork is a good instrument for learning about contexts that the research questions in this study call for. By doing fieldwork one can spend time together with the respondents for a longer period in the social field to be studied and hopefully learn to know them well (Kalleberg, 1992: 5). In doing fieldwork one can also get an understanding of the framework within which the respondents interpret their thoughts, feelings and actions. This was essential in this study because it would give a better basis for exploring and interpreting the participation and construction of meanings of sport in prison seen in relation to theories about masculinities and power in prison. (Marshall & Rossman, 1989: 49, with reference to Wilson, 1977). However, to get a more complete feeling of the prisoners' life and the prison officers' work in this context, fieldwork also had to be carried out in settings other than the sport setting, for example on the landings and in the workshops. Høigård (1997a: 26) says:

“To understand the social meaning of acts, we have to be close to those who exercise the acts and study how they think, dream, create identities and social communities, experience possibilities for choice, what is experienced as victory and loss; all this within an analysis of the social and material framework these acts are exercised within.” (My translation)

Fieldwork then is useful in order to be close to the respondents and to analyse the social and material framework the acts, in this study the sports activities, are exercised within. However, in learning about the respondents' thoughts, dreams and so on, one has to come closer than merely being together with them and observing them. This can be done by field-talks, which are conversations in the field that are not arranged and more like ordinary talk between the researcher and the respondents, but which can be very informative (Wadel, 1991: 47; Fossåskaret, 1997: 24). To get even closer to the respondents, which was required to answer research questions in this study, one can interview respondents. In an interview the respondents can give more details about their own perspective of the prison-world, how they create identities as prisoners and prison officers, how they experienced the sports activities in

prison, etc. (Rubin & Rubin, 1995: 51; Kvale, 1996: 27). Semistructured interviews are in this regard useful. In this kind of interview it is possible to stay focused because “(I)t has a sequence of theme that shall be covered, as well as suggested questions. Yet at the same time there is an openness to changes of sequence and form of questions in order to follow up the answers given and the stories told by the subject” (Kvale, 1996: 124). It is common to develop and use an interview guide when using semistructured interview, and also to record the interviews on tape (Kvale, 1996: 29-131 and 160-163).

An important part of the planning of this study was the practical work related to where this study should be conducted. Since a qualitative study calls for in-depth studies of relatively few respondents, and since this study demanded a thorough study of the context, it was decided to study one male prison. Since it can be problematic to gain access to a prison, Bernard (1995: 143) advice was followed: “choose the field site that promises to provide easiest access to data”, and “(U)se personal contacts to help you make your entry into a field site.” At the elected prison, persons most probable to be positive to the study were contacted. In the formal application to the prison (Appendix 1), a rather rigid frame for the project was sketched. For example, a time schedule was specified to two to four times each week for one year. This was done based on the assumption that the more the prison knew about the frames of the study, the more likely it would be to have a positive response. The response from the prison did in fact turn out to be positive (Appendix 2). The next step was to send an application to the Norwegian Data Inspectorate (Appendix 3) and to the Ministry of Justice and Police (Appendix 4), which sent the application to an ethics committee. With effective help of “official gatekeepers”(Whyte, 1984: 37) both at the prison and at the Ministry of Justice and Police, permission was granted. After 6 months all formalities were cleared and I could enter the field (Appendix 5).

As discussed in the paragraph about epistemological assumptions, researchers do influence the production of knowledge. Since the study was going to have a gender perspective, it was especially important to take into account and be reflective of my own gender as a researcher (Morgan, 1981: 94). There is a growing amount of literature about being a female researcher and carrying out research on male respondents (see, for example, McKee & O'Brien, 1983; Gurney, 1985; Golde, 1986; Fine, 1987; Warren, 1988; Frøberg, 1996). In reading this literature, I was, in the worst case, prepared for not being accepted in the male dominated world of the male prison. I was also prepared for being inferior in the power relations with the

male respondents, and even prepared to put myself into that position in order not to be interpreted as threatening (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1996: 94). Most likely I would have to conform to the field to a large extent, probably more than a male researcher would have to do (Hondagneu-Sotelo, 1988: 613, with reference to Golde, 1986). Punch (1994: 87) says that that female researchers could be exposed to prejudice, sexual innuendo, and unwelcome advances. At the same time, being a female researcher can also give advantages in male dominated settings. For example, as Williams & Heikes (1993: 281) say, a general view is “that men are more comfortable talking about intimate topics with women than they are with other men.”

However, a female researcher is never only a woman. As Oftung (1998: 8) says, “(E)ven if the researcher’s gender often is methodically interesting, .. can the researchers’ gender never be more than *one* moment in the process where we construct knowledge” (Emphasis original. My translation). Even if I am a woman, I am also a researcher, and a person that has some knowledge about sport. These identities can also influence the production of knowledge, perhaps as much as gender. Even if these factors would most probably set me in a superior position to the respondents, I hoped that they would equalise eventual drawbacks my gender could cause. However, being aware of, and having knowledge about how a researcher’s gender could influence the construction of knowledge, is important. At the same time it is impossible to fully know how it will influence the production of knowledge (Frøberg, 1996: 20). When studying gender though, by being reflective of how one’s gender influences the research setting, and at the same time being aware of one’s feelings of being a female researcher in a male dominated setting, one can learn much about the construction of gender, masculinity and femininity. In doing so one can be one’s own informant and a sociologist to oneself (Spradley, 1980: 57; Wadel, 1991: 62). Reflectivity towards my gender has therefore been one of the key issues in the research process.

The fieldwork

Before entering the field a note about the project was written in the prisoners’ magazine (Appendix 6), and information letters were distributed to the prisoners and the prison officers (Appendix 7). In entering the field, however, once again one of Bernard’s (1995: 143) point of advise was followed: “(I)f you are studying modern institutions (hospitals, police departments, universities etc.), it is usually best to start at the top and work down.” With the

help of the staff at the activities department, who functioned as gatekeepers and were helpful with arranging practical issues during the fieldwork, access was arranged to some of the staff-meetings to give information about the project. At one of these staff-meetings the prison officers said that since I was a woman, it was proper to wear loosely fitting training clothes and not dress in tights that could reveal my body. I followed their advice, but this was also something I was aware of from practising sport together with prisoners when I worked as a non-trained substitute officer. Thus training with the prisoners, I always wore loose and baggy training clothes to cover my body.

After informing the staff, information meetings were arranged for the prisoners on each landing. At these meetings the prisoners were informed about the study, and for ethical reasons they were also informed about my background in the Prison Service. Even if the meetings with the prisoners were well announced beforehand with notices on the landings, not many prisoners showed up at these meetings. Because of this, and also because new prisoners entered the prison quite often, prisoners often asked during the fieldwork who I was and what I did in the prison.

The prisoners seemed to be positive to the project right away. Therefore I was stunned when a prison officer told me that the prisoners actually suspected me of being negative to the weight training, and therefore they believed that this study would result in a ban on weight training. This was surprising because the intention with this study was at all not to take the weight training away from the prisoners. Jacobs (1974: 225, with reference to Giallombardo, 1966) says: “for the researcher who chooses to study prisons, it is a formidable problem to ‘prove’ that one is who one claims to be.” Most likely the respondents experienced me as threatening in relation to this issue, and most likely my gender did play a role in this (see discussion about female officers’ view on weight training in chapter eight). In the beginning of the fieldwork therefore, a lot of time was spent in convincing the prisoners that I was not negative to weight training, and in building rapport and making them feel less sceptical and more comfortable with my presence (Bernard, 1995: 136). However, this makes Jacobs (1974: 222) claim understandable, that “carving out a workable research role inside prison is at once crucial and highly problematic”.

When I entered the field I had to sign a contract for declaration of anonymity (Appendix 8), and it was expected that I should wear keys and a portable alarm whenever I was in the

prison. Because these items are some of the staff's most important symbols, I was afraid of being identified as one of the staff, especially by the prisoners, and that this should prevent me from coming in contact with them (Mathiesen, 1965: 234). To wear keys, however, was necessary in order to be able to move around independently in the prison. In a prison there are a lot of locked doors, and without keys I would be dependent on the prison officers and be an extra burden for them. However, wearing keys was actually useful to help the prison officers in some ways, e.g. by following the prisoners back to their landings after they were finished training. These trips were very valuable because usually there were only the two of us, and the field-talk on these trips was very informative. Besides, these trips were an opportunity to visit and to come in contact with the prisoners and prison officers on the landings. In order to be in settings other than the sport setting, it was necessary to have a reason to be there, otherwise the prisoners seemed to become sceptical. To avoid this scepticism, the best thing to do when I, for example, should spend a day on a landing was to arrange with a prisoner or a prison officer to be together and follow them for a day or so. Being together with someone was also in other settings than the sport settings helpful in order not to be superfluous.

However, the fieldwork started out in the training room in the contract wing¹. The first time I was there I did not quite know what to do. I therefore started to draw a map of the training room (Bernard, 1995: 144). This was not a smart thing to do as I became very "observing" sitting there with pen and paper, something that created a distance to the prisoners. One of the prisoners got angry because he did not want to be observed in this way. I therefore decided not to take notes when observing. I always brought a small notebook and pen with me though, which was well hidden in the pockets of my baggy training trousers. If something important happened, I went to the toilet or out in the hall to take notes. I never felt comfortable doing this as it was almost like being a spy. Field-notes were therefore taken after the fieldwork. They were written the day after, because the fieldwork was carried out in the evenings when the sports activities in the prison were arranged. To write field-notes means to describe a series of acts and to interpret them (Album, 1996: 238). To write the field-notes the day after

¹ The prison that was studied had two main wings with weight training rooms - one in the contract wing, and one in the restrictive wing. The weight training room in the contract wing was pretty large and well equipped, while the weight training room in the restrictive wing was small and not as well equipped. It is these two wings that will be referred to in this thesis.

gave me time to reflect over and interpret what happened in the field. At the same time, since it took some time before observations were written down, some of the details were likely forgotten. However, a researcher doing fieldwork is never able to observe everything that is going on. Hondagneu-Sotelo (1988: 612) says: “(F)ieldnotes are composed from a researcher’s selective memory and perception ..”.

Because the prison is divided in many separate sites, it was difficult to get a full overview of it. There were many sites in the prison that were not visited during the period of one year the fieldwork lasted, for example, some of the workshops. Over the year however, a pretty good overview of the various sport activities was achieved. Generally, more time was spent on organised activities, such as weight training, because they were easier to relate to than those sport activities that were more unorganised and often cancelled, e.g. the football training². It was therefore only in the weight training rooms that it was possible to start the observation unfocused, and thereafter to focus on specific phenomena (Spradley, 1980: 56 and 76; Morse, 1994: 228). The adaptation to the sport activities varied. When watching soccer or table tennis matches, I was acting as a “complete observer” dressed in ordinary clothes. I was more like a participant, but still mostly an observer in the weight training room in the restrictive wing where I was dressed in training-clothes, but without participating in the training. I was more an “observer as participant” when training together with the prisoners in the weight training room in the contract wing, walking with some prisoners in the yard, or when being together with the prisoners at boccia tournaments. I was also an “observer as participant” when I was a functionary at the competition when the prisoners in the restrictive wing competed to become “the strongest man in the prison”, an unceremonious competition in running, ball-throwing, length-jump, etc. However, when participating in the bicycle group, or on a canoe trip and a ski-trip that lasted for several days, or in a dance group, I was more like a “participant as observer”, sometimes almost like a “complete participant”. Together with the prisoners or the prison officers on the landings or together with the prisoners at their workplaces however, I was mostly an “observer as participant”. During the course of a day the function could change though, depending on what we were doing. (See figure and discussion about this issue in Hammersley & Atkinson, 1996: 104.)

² It was the most eager football players among the prisoners that arranged the football training. The scheduled football training was often cancelled because few prisoners showed up. However, whenever there were enough prisoners that were interested in playing showed up, football was played every now and then in the exercise time.

The most difficult issue to deal with in all different settings during fieldwork was that the participation in the study should be voluntary. Concerning the prisoners, this was an ethical problem that was solved by making sure that the prisoners could avoid me if they wanted. For this reason, I was never at the same setting in the prison more than once a week so that the prisoners should never lose more than one practice each week if they did not want to train when I was present. Contact was never initiated with prisoners that did not signalise that they wanted contact. Sometimes though, when new prisoners showed up, I presented the project and myself. To leave the initiative of contact to the prisoners may have caused a loss of valuable knowledge because some prisoners that wanted contact probably did not dare to initiate it. It was actually a problem to get in contact with prisoners that were not working out. They may have thought that they were of no interest to the project because they did not participate in sport. Most likely it was easier for the prisoners that got used to my presence to initiate contact, like those who trained weights. Some of the respondents that participated in sport, became key-respondents and informal gatekeepers. Besides learning a lot from them, they were also helpful in initiating contact with other prisoners. They never directly initiated contact with other prisoners, but most likely because of their status, other prisoners initiated contact when they saw that these prisoners talked to me.

Of the prison officers, the best contact was achieved with those who exercised together with the prisoners. There was not the same ethical problem concerning voluntary participation in relation to the prison officers, as there was in relation to the prisoners. Most likely this was because the power relations between the prison officers and me were more equal than the power relation between the prisoners and me, where I felt the prisoners were in a subordinate position. As Wolf (1996: 35) says, "I think it is important to acknowledge and accept that when one is working with poorer and marginalized people, power differentials between feminist researchers and their subjects remain as such." Since I knew some of the prison officers from the time when they were trainees at the Prison and Probation Staff Education Centre, we became almost like colleagues. This was in fact problematic, because some of them told things about the prisoners, for example, what they were convicted of and so on, which was ethically problematical to handle because the prisoners had not given their consent to reveal this information. Because of this, and also because getting too close to the prison officers could make it difficult to built rapport with the prisoners, I tried to keep some distance. At the same time, I had to be careful not to relate only to the prisoners and to be "too much on their side" either, because then the prison officers could become

uncommunicative. (See, for example, Jacobs, 1974 and Mathiesen, 1965 for this phenomenon in relation to fieldwork in prison, and, for example, Spradley, 1980 and Whyte, 1984 about this problem in relation to fieldwork more generally.)

Somehow both practical and ethical problems seemed to sort out, and after some time in the field, the prisoners, the prison officers and myself got along well. To wear training clothes and especially to exercise together with the prisoners, made me a part of the setting, but at the same time there was also a distance. Since almost all the officers that exercised sport together with the prisoners were men, the atmosphere in the sport settings was homosocial and therefore marginalised me to some extent. To be marginal, however, made it possible to maintain some distance which can be positive according to Gurney (1985: 57, with reference to among others Lofland & Lofland, 1984), who bases this on a fact that it “may enhance the researcher’s critical insight into the dynamics of the setting”. During the fieldwork though, my gender did not cause me as much trouble as feared beforehand. Even if the prisoners were sceptical in the beginning, it was never problematic to get access to settings, and both prisoners and prison officers that I came in contact with were obliging and helpful. It might be, after the rapport was built, that the respondents did not consider me as threatening as a male researcher would have been (Hondagneu-Sotelo, 1988: 617, with reference to Warren, 1988). Although I did adapt, I never felt inferior in any situation. It especially looked as if the prisoners were curious and liked having contact with me. It may be that my background as a substitute officer in a male prison had made me so tolerant, perhaps even blind, to insults towards my gender that I have not reflected well enough upon how this influenced the production of knowledge.

In relation to the prisoners though, it seemed to be my profession, not necessarily as a researcher, but as a representative from the Norwegian University of Sport and Physical Education that had the largest influence on the production of knowledge in the fieldwork. One male prison officer confirmed this and said that having a higher education in sport was respected, and that I, without knowing it, had influence on the way the prisoners trained. He meant that because I always worked out on the exercise bike before starting to train weights, almost all of the prisoners had started to warm up before they started lifting weights. When I heard this, I did not dare to say that working out on the exercise bike had not been a matter of warming up, but a matter of observing, because there was such tremendous overview from the bike. I was surprised though by my influence on the prisoners’ training since I was very

careful not to interfere with the prisoner's training, because that would have put me in a superior position to them. Nevertheless, I sometimes gave them advice, but always after asking if it was OK for them.

Throughout the fieldwork the fieldwork-design worked well. During the year the fieldwork lasted, two to four times a week was spent in the field, and in addition to this I participated in two trips, a canoe-trip and a ski-trip, which each lasted for a week. The prison was visited about a hundred times during the year the fieldwork lasted. Concerning the design of the fieldwork, an important issue was flexibility and openness to observe unexpected phenomena that could enrich the study (Rubin & Rubin, 1995: 43). One such phenomenon did show up. The female prison officers were seldom present in the sport settings, and they almost never participated. Because of this, more focus was directed towards the female prison officers than originally planned. Most likely because the research questions were pretty broad, this dimension could be incorporated without changing the research questions.

The interviews

Much of the basic work in preparing for the interviews was done during the fieldwork, such as building rapport and trust (Reinharz, 1992: 26). The fieldwork also prepared the ground for the content of the interview in order to find themes to centre the interview on. The interviewing started earlier than planned, because some respondents with whom good contact had been established were going to leave the prison not long after the fieldwork started. The work with the interview-guidelines therefore, began just a couple of months after the fieldwork started. It was necessary to make three interview-guides because prisoners, male officers and female officers had to be interviewed in order to answer the research questions (see Appendix 9a for interview-guides in English and Appendix 9b for interview-guides in Norwegian). Several drafts were made though, but the result was that each of the three interview-guides were divided into two main parts, one related to general issues about the life in prison and one related to the practice of sport in prison. Each part was divided into topics essential to answer the research questions (Maxwell, 1996: 53 and 74). Each topic had some keywords, and based on the keywords, the main challenge was to elaborate on what the interviewee said with Fog (1994: 105) comments in the back of my mind:

“One can never beforehand learn which questions are ‘right’ because it is during the conversation that the ‘right’ questions will show up. What one can do, however, is to prepare oneself to be open to the other person so one can understand what the ‘right’ questions are”.

(My translation)

Because of the topics, the interviews were thematically organised, but at the same time they were also dynamic and flexible in the sense that they could keep the conversation going, and promote a positive interaction (Kvale, 1996: 124-135). In the preparation for the interviews I also tried to recapture some episodes from the fieldwork, concerning the respondents that were interviewed, and reflect upon issues that needed to be clarified. During an interview, these episodes were incorporated when it was natural. These, often common, experiences made the conversation flow because there was something concrete to talk about. Because respondents were leaving the prison, there was no time to carry out test-interviews. The first interview that was carried out, however, was with a female officer who knew the prison well and whom I knew pretty well. Much time after this interview was spent discussing the research topics so that she could give advice to how the interview guides could be improved.

The most decisive criterion for the prisoners who were selected for interviewing, was how well I got to know them during the fieldwork. Their experience and reflectivity on being imprisoned, and their experiences with various sport activities in prison was also decisive. An optimum variation in order to get heterogeneity was also important. To achieve heterogeneity, both prisoners that were physically active in different sports and prisoners that were physically inactive were interviewed. Moreover, prisoners that were serving their sentences in various wings and on various landings were interviewed (see, for example, Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Patton, 1990; Morse, 1994; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Rubin & Rubin, 1995; Maxwell, 1996, for this sampling). Concerning the prison officers, both male and female officers working in different wings and on different landings in the prison were interviewed. If they exercised with the prisoners and how well I knew the prison officers from before, was also decisive to who was interviewed. The last was especially relevant for the female prison officers because they did not participate as much in the sport settings, and consequently I did not have as much contact with them. Because of this, more female officers than male officers were interviewed (see Album, 1996: 246, for this selection). In total seven female officers, five male officers, and 13 prisoners were interviewed.

It was not difficult to get the prisoners and the prison officers to participate in the interviews, one prisoner even requested it! Of those asked, only one said no. It was actually often difficult to choose whom to interview, and I was troubled by a bad conscience in guilt to those that were not interviewed because they might get a feeling of not being important for the study. In regard to anonymity, the respondents were asked if they wanted to be interviewed when no one else was around. When they were asked, they were briefly oriented as to the content of the interview, and if they agreed that the interview could be recorded. After saying “yes” to being interviewed, many of the respondents blew their own cover by telling others that they were going to be interviewed.

A relevant question to ask is why did they want to be interviewed? What could they gain (Jacobs, 1974: 236)? Most likely, the prison officers let themselves be interviewed to be helpful, and it also seemed that some of them were flattered when they were asked to be interviewed. In the case of the prisoners, Mathiesen (1965: 239) says that the prisoners in his study wanted to have contact with him because they knew they were valuable for him; that is, for the prisoners, a high status person was interested in their views; and that a book was going to be written about the institution and that this could get right some of their perceived wrongs. This could be the case in this study too, but this study’s perspective of the prisoners may also have been a contributing factor for why they wanted to be interviewed. During the fieldwork and the interviews, effort was made to give the prisoners an understanding that this study was not about what they were convicted of. Attempts were made to get the prisoners to understand that the perspective of this study was that they were men in prison, and from this perspective to explore how they experience being imprisoned, and how they experienced the sports activities in the prison. They were never asked what they had done, but most of the prisoners that were interviewed spoke about their cases in the interviews. It actually seemed like the prisoners appreciated that interest was given to some other identity than the one related to their crime, which in a prison has a tendency to be fortified and always be focus (see construction of “the criminal” page 32 and in chapter eight).

One of the first prison officers that was interviewed said that it was likely that the respondents might talk more openly if they were interviewed right before leaving the prison. Whenever possible, I followed this advice. All the interviews were carried out in the prison, except from one interview with a prison officer, and the interviewees could decide when they wanted to be interviewed. Even if the interviewees were guaranteed anonymity, it was not possible to

maintain total anonymity. Most of the interviews with the prisoners were conducted in one of the rooms in the visiting department. If the prisoners were at work, they had to be fetched by the prison officers. If they were on the landings, I could go and get them, but the prison officers on the landing had to know why the prisoner left the landing and where he was going. The prison officers that were interviewed were on duty when the interviews were conducted, and they had to arrange their schedules with their colleagues. This caused some stress in the interview-situation because they could not be away from the landing for a very long time.

The interviews started with a briefing where the situation for the interviewees was defined (Kvale, 1996: 128). A checklist was prepared in order to be sure that the interviewee got all the necessary information, for example about anonymity, withdrawal from the interview if they wanted, functioning of the tape recorder and so on (see point about briefing/introduction/building rapport in Appendix 9). The prisoners were also informed that they should not tell me about unsolved offences because, if this happened, it had to be reported to the police. Before the interview started, the interviewees signed an agreement to participate in the interview (Kvale, 1996: 153-154) (Appendix 10). This introduction was very artificial with the respondents I had learned to know well, both with the prisoners and the prison officers. In the field we could be almost on equal terms, but in the briefing, and in the rest of the interview as well, the relation between us became more hierarchical where the interviewees were in a subordinated position (Fontana & Frey, 2000: 658). None of us seemed comfortable with this situation, but sometimes we actually managed to retrieve some of the tone from the fieldwork. In the interviews with respondents I did not know that well, the hierarchical situation was more “natural”, and it did not take long before the relation between us functioned well.

I never experienced being in an inferior position in any of the interviews, which may be a problem when female researchers are in interview settings with men (McKee & O'Brien, 1983: 150). This may be because my gratitude to the respondents for sharing information, to whom they had no obligation (Gurney, 1985: 45), made me relative tolerant to insults towards my gender and therefore I ignored them. For example, one male officer told me after an interview that he had tested me. In the interview he had said that the prisoners regarded the female officers as sexual objects in order to test me to see if I reacted negatively. Since I did not, he chose to speak openly about this. He also said that to get the prisoners to tell about their relation to female officers, I had to show the same attitude in order to them as I have

showed him. To be honest, I did not notice that he tested me. In relation to the project this was relevant knowledge, and the prisoners were encouraged to talk about their relation to the female officers. The male prison officer's advice was followed, and a non-judgemental stance in the interview with the prisoners was maintained (Fog, 1994: 67; Kvale, 1996: 135).

Williams & Heikes (1993: 289) noticed that in their interviews of male respondents that the "respondents were very adept at framing their views – even if they were hostile and sexist – in ways that did not directly challenge or threaten the interviewer". It may be what Williams & Heikes (*ibid*) noticed in their interviews with male respondents also happened to the male respondents in this study. I never felt challenged or threatened in any way in the interviews, but I have to say that some statements gave me second thoughts (see, for example page 188). Nevertheless, I tried to use this knowledge constructively by being my own informant.

The interviews always started with an open question. The prisoners were asked if they could tell me about their experience of being in prison, and the male and female officers were asked about the reasons why they had become prison officers. The main purpose of these general questions was to "break the ice" and establish rapport (Kvale, 1996:128; Fontana & Frey, 2000: 660). In the beginning of the interviews little attention was paid to what the interviewees said. The main issue was to establish good interaction. Throughout the interview more attention was paid to what the interviewees said, how it was said, and my own reactions to what they said (Fog, 1994: 69). Attempts were made to interpret what they said in relation to theory and the purpose of the study, and new questions were formulated on this basis (Fog, 1994: 70-71). Nevertheless, the main issue in the interviews was to get the interviewees to talk as much as possible and to encourage them to talk by giving them feedback both non-verbally by nodding, smiling, silence, etc., and verbally by saying "mm", "aha", and so on. This also signalled an interest in what they said. In a typical interview, questions such as "would you like to tell about" or "could you tell more about" as well as a lot of "how-questions", were asked in the beginning. At the end of an interview the questions changed character and were more like "do I understand it correctly when you say", or "is it so that" to try to see the connections between parts of the interview. However, some of the interviews, especially with the female officers, developed in a more explorative direction where we together really struggled to understand the meaning of masculinity, and as well gender, in the prison. In these situations my gender and my background as a substitute officer were most likely useful. Our assumption that we shared certain background experiences because of our gender (Williams & Heikes, 1993: 287, with reference to DeVault, 1990), actually made us

more equal. Another probable reason why these interviews developed in this direction was that these female officers were very reflective about the gender-dimension of their work.

In some interviews however, the interviewees spend much time talking about issues that obviously were important for them but not very relevant for the project. For example, several prisoners spoke about their frustration with the prison management and the Prison Service. I tried not to take a personal stand in relation to what they said about these issues, but to be understanding. I felt trapped though, because neutrality to these issues could be interpreted as a sign of being “allied with the enemy” (Jacobs, 1974: 231). Usually they would talk for a while about issues they felt important, but sometimes attempt was made to manoeuvre back to the topics relevant for the study. This was done by questions that could lead them in that direction. Doing this was problematic though, because they should not feel that they were cut off.

Even if the topics we talked about were relatively harmless, there was a dilemma related to how far it was proper to go especially when the interviewees were talking about sensitive and private matters. Special attention was paid to non-verbal signals, and I stopped asking if they gave signals of not being comfortable. I also tried to move to other topics if the situation felt uncomfortable, e.g. if they started to talk about unsolved cases. In relation to the gender dimension in the interview setting, several prisoners claimed the same – they felt it was easier to talk to women. From this it is reasonable to believe that my gender in the interview context, both with the prisoners and the male officers, was helpful in building rapport and had a positive effect, perhaps in particular when they talked about sensitive matters.

Babbie (1983: 135) says that “(W)henever you ask people for information, they answer through a filter of what will make them look good. This is especially true if they are being interviewed in a face-to-face situation”. It may be that “looking good” was an important reason why the interviewees were eager to talk about, for example, about their practising of sport, and how much this exercise meant for them. Another quite obvious reason for the prisoners’ eagerness to tell about this issue was that they feared the consequences if anything negative was written about weight training or other kinds of exercise in the prison.

Most of the interviews, both with the prisoners and the prison officers lasted for one to two hours and all the 25 interviews were tape-recorded except for one. This interview was not

recorded because it was carried out the same day as the respondent was asked to be interviewed. This was because the respondent was leaving the prison the next day. Because no interview was planned this day, neither tape recorder nor interview-guide were brought along. After the interviews that were recorded “formally” were over and the tape recorder was turned off, yet another briefing, or more precisely debriefing, took place (Kvale, 1996: 128). Here the interviewees told about how they experienced the interview, and this part of the interview was very informative. It seemed that when the whole “interview-setting” was over, the interviewees felt freer to talk, and these sequences could last for about an hour or even more. Notes were not taken, but after the interviewees had gone back to their landings or to work, some time was used to recollect and write down the impressions of the interview (Kvale, 1996: 129). The interviews were rather exhausting. To stay concentrated during the interviews was one thing, but learning to know some of the respondents, especially the prisoners, through the stories they told, had a strong impact. These were stories of men who have lost the zest for life, that did not think life was worth living anymore, and stories of men who strive to keep believing in life, that wanted to believe that things would sort out when they got released after many years in prison. It took several days before these interviews were transcribed because I felt it was necessary to have some distance from the interview before starting the transcribing process.

All of the respondents that were interviewed were asked whether they wanted to read through the transcripts. Most of them did not think that this was necessary, but some accepted the offer and did read it through. The analysis of these interviews never started before the transcripts were returned. None of the respondents who did read through the transcripts, however, had any comments or wanted to make any changes. However, before leaving the field a note was written in the prisoners’ magazine thanking the respondents for their goodwill and co-operation (Appendix 11).

Analysis and interpretation of the data-material

In separating between analysis and interpretation, this thesis will follow Wolcott (1994: 23) who says:

“Into the pile or bin labelled ‘analysis’ I would place such terms as *cautious, controlled, structured, formal, bounded, scientific, systematic, logico-deductive, grounded, methodical,*

objective, particularistic, carefully documented, reductionist, impassive. Into the pile or bin labelled 'interpretation' go a set of terms largely complementary to the first: *freewheeling, casual, unbounded, aesthetically, satisfying, inductive, subjective, holistic, generative, systemic, impassioned.*" (Emphasis original)

Since the time available to do the fieldwork and the interviews was limited to one year, there was not much time to analyse the data-material during this period. The focus was kept on understanding the context by interpreting what went on and how things and events took place (Wolcott, 1994: 12; Dey, 1995: 32; Gubrium & Holstein, 2000: 491). The analysis conducted this year was more of a describing and introspective character, done by transforming the field-observations to field-notes and transcribing the interviews (Sparkes, 2000). In this period, however, memos were written, and these had the character of interpretations rather than analysis according to Wolcott's (1994: 23) classification. The more specific procedures, carried out in order to identify essential features and relationships by "wrest(ing) them from their humble origins and transform(ing) them into something grand enough to pass for science" (Wolcott, 1994: 24), here called the phase of analysis and presentation, did not start until the fieldwork was finished and the interviews were transcribed.

The main objective of the analysis has been to focus on the discourses, and this kind of analysis can be labelled discourse analysis. According to Potter & Wetherell (1987: 6), the label "discourse analysis" is used in many ways, and one can even find two books on the theme which completely lack overlap in content! Text-analysis for example, where the linguistics in a text is analysed, is often labelled discourse analysis, but as earlier stated, discourse in this thesis is based on Foucault's understanding of discourse, and is constituted by both language and practices. In a "Foucaultian tradition" then, text-analysis becomes discourse analysis when the text is seen in relation to certain forms of practice, remedies and institutions (Schaanning, 2000b: 512). It is from this point of departure one has to analyse the processes of objectification and subjectification, and, according to Davies (1997a: 12), to find and make visible the detail of how one's specificity is put and maintained in place.

In reading through the data-material to prepare the ground for analysis (Dey, 1995: 83), it was decided to only code the interviews and leave the field-observations to function as a background for the analysis of the interviews. The first thing to do when analysing the interviews was to decide what kind of story the interviewees told (Sparkes, 2000). According

to Mac an Ghail (1999), one always speaks from a standpoint of one position and interpreted through another. The basis for the interpretation of the male prisoners' stories was that men through being prisoners told these stories, and not through being "criminals" or victims, which could also have formed a basis for the interpretation of the stories. The basis for the interpretation of the interviews with the female and male prison officers was that men and women through being prison officers told these stories.

In analysing the stories of the male prisoners and the female and male prison officers, the computer program "WinMAX 98" has been used. Computer programs have made life easier for qualitative researchers because such programs simplify the process of arranging data in the coding process. Breaking up interviews, for example, is done with a few clicks instead of a time-consuming process where one worked with hard copies, cutting and gluing. However, the use of computers programs to analyse qualitative data can also be criticised. For example, the superior perspective may be lost, because the programs allow the researcher to work in a very detailed way (Kuckartz, 1999). These programs can also handle enormous amounts of data-material. Instead of 25 interviews, 100 interviews can be handled without difficulties. With such numbers, the question is whether qualitative data becomes quantitative because it may be tempting to split up and count and put weight on the dimension of the data material.

The computer program helps a researcher to *manage* the data, and as Weitzman (2000: 805) says, "(S)imply put, software can provide tools to help you analyze qualitative data, but it cannot do the analysis for you ..". How to code the interviews was therefore an issue that had to be decided before starting to use the software program. An important part during the transcription and the reading of the interviews was to look for suitable codes to use in the categorisation of the interviews³. Decisive in the making of codes was also the research questions. This process ended up using codes which Miles & Huberman (1994: 57) label *descriptive* codes. These kinds of codes entail little interpretation, they rather describe central themes in the study (Miles and Huberman, *ibid*). The categories in this study described the research questions. For example one category was named "power relations between the prisoners" and under this category there were sub-categories. For example, when the prisoners talked about disagreements in the football team, these sequences were put into the sub-category football. Of course there were sequences of the interviews covering more than one

³ A code is a label of one category, and to code means to split up the interview and put pieces into categories.

category. For example, if the prisoners talked about both power relations between the prisoners and how they constituted themselves as subjects, these sequences were coded under both these categories.

After coding the interviews, the data-material gathered under each category was printed out. The main issue when reading through the transcripts from the category “power relations between the prisoners” was to search for the prisoners’ meanings about this matter, and their meanings about the exercise of sport in relation to this matter. At the same time it was important to search for how the prisoners made their arrangements in relation to this matter. The next step was to interpret the prisoners’ meanings and arrangements in relation to theories about masculinity, crime and power. The main issue in this process was to try to understand why the prisoners constructed their meanings and arranged themselves the way they did.

Presentation and discussion of the data-material

According to Denzin & Lincoln (2000: 17), the qualitative researchers turn to postmodernism and poststructuralism has made the researchers realise that they cannot directly capture lived experience, but that lived experience is created in the social text written by the researchers. This makes the direct link between experience and text problematic, and according to Denzin & Lincoln (ibid), we now have a representational crisis that confronts the inescapable problem of representation. This crisis, however, has led to growth of new and untraditional ways of presenting research. According to Richardson (2000b: 928), the reason why new and untraditional ways of presenting knowledge has been accepted in the postmodernist time is because of a rejection of the grand narratives. This means that what we traditionally has been told is “the truth” is not more true than another “truth”. However, Richardson (ibid) also says that

“it does not automatically reject conventional methods of knowing and telling as false or archaic. Rather, it opens those standard methods to inquiry and introduces new methods, which are also, then, subject to critique. .. No method has a privileged status. The superiority of ‘science’ over ‘literature’ – or, from another vantage point, ‘literature’ over ‘science’ is challenged. But a postmodernist position does allow us to know ‘something’ without claiming to know everything.” (Emphasis original)

Within the postmodernist realm then, the ethnographic genre has been blurred, enlarged and altered, and now includes for example, fictional stories, poetry and conversations. These approaches to knowing and telling have until recently been labelled experimental or alternative (see, for example, Van Maanen, 1995 and Denzin & Lincoln, 2000), but Richardson (2000b: 930) now labels them *Creative Analytic Practices (CAP)* and says that “CAP ethnographies are not alternative or experimental; they are in and of themselves valid and desirable representations of the social.”

By using fiction, the researcher makes use of imagination (Richardson, 1994: 933; Banks & Banks, 1998b: 17). Eisner (1997: 263) says: “(W)ho would have predicted a decade ago that fiction might be considered as a legitimate form for a Ph.D. dissertation.” In the *presentation* of the data-material in this thesis, *elements* of the fiction genre will be used. This means that the data-material presented in this thesis is not fictitious because it can be traced back to transcript of the interviews. What is fiction, however, are the persons created with basis in the data-material. In the creation of these persons, imagination has been used to make each of them as believable as possible. There are two main reasons for introducing this element of the fiction genre in this thesis. First, the focus of this study has not been on the individuals as such. The focus has rather been on the discourses that create and specify the individuals, and how their specificity is established and maintained in place. Second, the creation of fictional persons also serves the purpose of ethics. To make the respondents non-identifiable has been one of the cornerstones throughout the whole study, and guaranteed anonymity was promised to the respondents participating in the study. This was especially underlined for the respondents that were interviewed. According to Sparkes (personal conversation Mars 28. 2000), creating personal stories the way it is done in this thesis it is a standard technique in ethnography (see, for example, Denison, 1996 and Clough, 1999), and the necessity of making respondents anonymous is a common argument for the use of this technique. Writing these stories in English also makes the sequences from the interviews less recognisable, and therefore also serves the purpose of making the respondents non-identifiable. Using fiction can also be a mode of representation if one wants to evoke in audiences a feel for the subjective experiences of others (Banks & Banks, 1998b: 18). Using fiction to present research has disadvantages however, especially if one wants to influence politics and social change. As Richardson (2000b: 933) says, “if one’s desire is to effect social change through one’s research, fiction is a rhetorically poor writing strategy. Policy makers prefer materials that claim to be ‘non-fiction’ even, but ‘true research’.”

The creation of the fictional persons has been an important part of the analysis of the data-material. Another essential part of the analysis has been the translation to English. Because this work was carried out within a sociological tradition that uses texts as windows into human experience⁴ (Ryan & Bernard, 2000: 769, with reference to Tesh, 1990), most attention has been paid to present the respondents' experiences and my interpretation of it. In order to find English expressions that express the respondents' experience, it has sometimes been necessary to restructure and rewrite segments of the interviews constituting the stories of the fictional persons. The stories have been written in a rather plain language in English. Asymmetry of cultural contexts and insufficient knowledge of the "slang" in English language has made it impossible to translate some of the most colourful "slang expressions"⁵.

When the stories were puzzled together, and in making the fictional persons believable, some considerations were taken. Regards to authenticity and fidelity were important in this process. Truthfulness has been another central element in the making of the fictional persons, as Banks & Banks (1998b: 179) says, "(T)he creator of fiction must know how to convince other of the truthfulness of his or her lies." The fictional stories the reader will meet in the following chapters are the stories of *Karen*, *Didrik*, *Tom*, *Lars*, *Atle* and *Kim*. *Karen's story* is puzzled together from the interviews of the seven female officers, while *Didrik's story* is puzzled together from the interviews of the five male officers. When stories from the interviews with the prisoners were made, it was necessary to make four of them in order to be able to present the various meanings and arrangements the prisoners had to issues discussed in this thesis. In the analysis of the data-material this seemed to be closely related to the location where the prisoners served their sentence in the prison, and also related to whether they were practising sport or not. In the making of the fictional stories, this had to be taken into consideration. *Tom's story* is created from the interviews of the prisoners that served their sentence in the contract wing when the interviews were conducted. *Lars' story* is mainly created from the interviews of the prisoners that served their sentence in the restrictive wing when they were interviewed. *Atle's story*, on the other hand, is puzzled together from the interviews of the prisoners that served their sentences both in the contract and the restrictive wing. Most of the

⁴ This is in opposition to a linguistic tradition that describes how texts are developed and structured.

⁵ Professionals have been helpful with this, and a real effort had been made to translate them in such a way that the meaning is justified. Karin Lillehei deserves particular thanks in this regard.

prisoners that were interviewed moved between the contract and the restrictive wing, so in creating Atle's story, it was possible to use the interviews from all the prisoners that were interviewed. In Atle's story, however, it did not seem right to include themes of sport from the interviewed prisoners not practising sport in the prison. To present the non-sport-practising-prisoners' meaning of sport in prison, *Kim's story* was therefore created.

To create these six different stories and in the presentation of them, sequences from the interviews were used all the time. What cannot be found in the interview-texts are some transitional phrases such as "you know", "however" or "...", that mark pauses of thought, inserted to get a floating text when two or more sequences from the interviews are combined. Some of the indecision given by e.g. "eh", or "mm", together with some of the "told" gestures given in parentheses, are also inserted to give a more "live" text (Rinehart, 1998: 208-209). It has been necessary to put in some supplementary comments in order to get the story to make sense. For example, in the example below, where they work is added because this was something they did not need to explain in the interview. In order to create a believable person in one "collective story" (Richardson, 1990: 25) ethnographic fiction writers draw upon a technique consisting in moving forward and backward in time (Banks & Banks, 1998: 20). In the story of Karen, this may be read as: *'I didn't train with the inmates when I worked in the restrictive wing because I don't think it's all right to have body contact with the prisoners. The weight training room is very small and therefore it's easy to come into body contact with the inmates. ... Anyhow, I now work in the contract wing and I think it is all right to be allowed to participate and train a bit'*⁶.

The stories of Karen, Didrik, Tom, Lars, Atle and Kim are not presented as one continuous story. The stories are divided into pieces of different length and presented as statements concerning an issue. In the chapter dealing with the power relations between the prisoners, however, a fictional group-conversation was constructed where Tom, Lars, Atle, Kim and myself are the participants. This fictional group-conversation was constructed based on the assumption that this was the best way to visualise the complexity in this issue. I am leading

⁶ A good strategy after the "collective stories" are created is to check the stories' verisimilitude. This can be done by asking prisoners to read through the stories of the prisoners, and the male and female prison officers to read through the stories of the male and female officers respectively (see Denison, 1996: 358, for the use of this technique among retired athletes). This has not been done in this study because of the limited time of one year for the production of the data-material. The access to the prison lasted only for the year when the fieldwork and the interviews were carried out, and I found it difficult to return to the prison after this year.

the conversation, and what I say is taken from the interviews or invented and serve the purpose to clarify what the prisoners say and making the conversation flow. The prisoners' statements, on the other hand, can be traced back in the interviews. Data-material from the fieldwork is also used a few places.

This conversation is the only time when my person is explicitly present in the text, although the author is actually present all the time. However, one of the problems of presenting texts is how to write oneself into it (Billig, 1994: 326; Fine, Weis, Weseen & Wong, 2000: 109). Certainly, the presence of myself could have been clearer and more visualised. In making myself clearer in the text however, there would have been a risk of losing the focus of the stories of Karen, Didrik, Tom, Lars, Atle and Kim. Gottschalk (1998: 209-210) says:

“Although self-reflexivity helps us to recognize that ‘the Other who is presented in the text is always a version of the researcher’s self’ (Denzin, 1994: 503), the task of ethnography should remain the de/inscriptions of Others, not oneself.”

Many books about qualitative research published in the last few years such as “Fiction and social research: By ice or fire” (Banks & Banks, 1998a) edited by Anna and Stephen Banks, include chapters not build up in the traditional way with introduction, theory, presentation, discussion and so on. In some of the chapters in this book, the writer has structured his or hers messages as a story, and the story constitutes the whole chapter. In this thesis however, fiction is only used in the presentation of the empirical material, and usually the fictional stories' are used to initiate a discussion. Thereafter, the empirical material is interpreted further and discussed in relation to theory. Sometimes quotations from the interviews are used in order to elaborate the discussion of the empirical material. The hermeneutic spiral of interpretation in the stories sometimes spins considerably further and takes the theoretical discussion further than the stories perhaps initiate. Other times, however, the spin is left at an earlier stage, sometimes so early that sequences of the stories are not taken into the following theoretical discussion at all. It is, however, never possible to finish interpretation, and there are uncountable ways to interpret a story. Therefore the readers will surely find numerous alternative ways of interpreting the stories of Karen, Didrik, Tom, Lars, Atle and Kim.

However, fixed to one viewpoint, Karen, Didrik, Tom, Lars, Atle and Kim's stories represent the way I have learned to know the prison. What is put into words in this thesis, is how I have

made sense of the chaotic experiences of the prison, (Clough, 1999: 446). As Richardson (2000b: 923) says, “This ‘worded world’ never accurately, precisely, completely captures the studied world, yet we persist in trying.”

Ethics

For whom is this thesis written? I was confronted with this question right at the start of the fieldwork when a prisoner asked what I wanted to achieve with this study. My answer to this question was to get a doctoral degree. The prisoner replied: “it’s OK that you get your doctoral degree, but how will this study benefit us, will it improve anything for us?” I replied that others had to decide the political consequences of the thesis, but that I hoped the thesis could also be beneficial to them. Later in the fieldwork when the prisoners asked the same questions they got the same answer, which they seemed to accept. It was not until a prisoner appealed to my social conscience that I realised that I could not view this study “just” as a study for obtaining a doctoral degree. This prisoner asked me not to write negatively about the weight training because he thought that would make the prison authorities ban the weigh training. My social conscience tells me that I cannot withdraw and leave it to others to decide what political consequences this study might have.

With reference to Behar (1993: 273), Fine, Weis, Weseen & Wong (2000: 108) says:

“‘We ask for revelation from others, but we reveal little or nothing about ourselves; we make others vulnerable, but we ourselves remain invulnerable.’ Our informants are then left carrying the burden of representations as we hide behind the cloak of alleged neutrality”.

According to Banks & Banks (1998a: 14), “there’s no such thing as .. non-political texts”. Since I am the one creating the political message in this thesis, I am also responsible for the political outcome of it⁷. Even though it is impossible to control what political effects this study may have (Richardson, 1996: 228), and even the possible naivety in believing that this thesis will influence the agenda for policy talk, an outline can be made of how I have also tried to make this thesis into a political document.

⁷ Besides being responsible for what is presented in this thesis, I am also responsible for all the stories that could have been written. There are many stories left in the data-material, and there are a lot of stories that could have been told among the prisoners and prison officers who were not interviewed (Næss, 1998: 24).

In whose voice do I write when I claim I am present in the text (Fine, Weis, Weseen & Wong, 2000: 119)? According to Fine et.al. (ibid), a researcher writes in his or her own voice. Richardson (2000b: 936) says that the desire to “speak for” others is suspect, but this thesis does try to “speak for” the prisoners. Chekhov (1967: xiii) writes: “when a criminal is arrested and placed on trial, everyone is interested, but when he is sentenced to imprisonment no one cares about his fate.” To try to present and discuss stories of the “invisible” life of the male prisoners with the aim to “empower them”, both as individuals and as a group, is the main political issue in this thesis. This is attempted by making an effort in order for the reader to understand the prisoners’ acts, thoughts, and feelings. However, in doing this, there is a risk of “de-empowerment” of the prisoners. If their stories are presented in such a way that they only pose critique against the Prison Service, depicting their complains as whimpering or whining, a resistance may be enforced against the prisoners that will most likely not be beneficial for them. At the same time, by discussing the prisoners’ stories in relation to gender, there is also a risk of forcing gender on them, something which also can “de-empower” them. According to Holter (2000), to be gendered for a man, can be “de-empowering”, because gender is usually related to women, which is considered “soft”. This can therefore make him lose some of the power he has as a “non-gendered” man.

In the attempt to “speak for” the prisoners, focus is put on some of the leading discourses in the shaping the future of the policy of the Prison Service assumed to be beneficial for the prisoners. These discourses focus on care and will have a great impact on the prison officers’ work in the future. It seems that these discourses suits female officers better than the previous discourses that were guiding the development in the Prison Service. For many years, female prison officers have fought to be recognised as professional prison officers and overcome the drawback of their gender. By discussing these discourses, the female officers’ gender is put into focus, and there is a risk of enforcing the drawback of their gender.

Now that the political intentions of this thesis are made clear, how should the reader understand this thesis as a political document? Inspired by the work of Foucault, I am also fascinated by his research strategies. Foucault’s aim was to make the “knowers” insecure of their own knowledge and force them to reflect on their own knowledge (Schaanning, 1995: 180; 1997: 274-275). One of the aims of this thesis is to make the readers question their opinions of sport in prison and to make them reflect upon them. To do this, one has to diminish the leading position of the writer in the text and focus rather on how meanings are

constructed about prisoners and their exercise of sport. In this way the text in this thesis can be looked upon as a node of a network, or a move in a social play, taking place within a social field (Schaanning, 1995: 187; 1997: 274). The social play is the construction and re-construction of meaning concerning issues related to prisoners and sport in prison, and the social field is the society in general and the Prison Service in particular. Hopefully this will result in greater reflectivity and more nuances in the political debate related to sport in prison, and in the last instance, will lead to beneficial political efforts.

Judgement criteria

According to Denzin & Lincoln (2000: 17), the researchers' turn to postmodernism and poststructuralism has also led to a legitimation crisis where the use of traditional criteria for evaluating and interpreting qualitative research has become problematic. If this thesis should be judged by the use of traditional criteria such as *validity* - if it closely reflects and mirrors the true world being described, and *reliability* - if another researcher studying the same prison will come up with compatible observations, it most probably would have been rejected. These two criteria are developed within a positivistic tradition where the existence of a real world that can be known, if one just uses the right methods, is assumed. It is quite obvious that it is impossible to use these criteria to judge a study carried out within another paradigm.

Qualitative researchers have tried to "reformulate" the criteria of validity and reliability to make them fit the tradition of qualitative research. This has led to an endless amount of books and articles concerning qualitative methods where the writers have come up with alternative criteria for judging qualitative research. Hammersley (1990: 61-63), for example, suggests replacing validity with *plausibility* and *credibility*, while Lincoln & Guba (1985: 294-328) suggest replacing validity with *transferability* and *credibility*, and reliability with *dependability*. Another example is Maxwell (1992: 281-287) who advocates five aspects of validity: descriptive, interpretative, theoretical, generalisability, and evaluative. Smith & Deemer (2000: 880-884) label such researchers as *quasi-foundationalists*. This is because in quasi-foundationalists suggested criteria they combine ontology of realism where they assume that there is a reality independent of us that, at least in principle, can be known as it is, with an epistemology following constructionism that assumes that knowledge is socially constructed. Smith & Deemer (2000: 893-894) say that this combination of a realist ontology and constructionist epistemology makes the knowledge about the world fallible.

Smith & Deemer (2000: 894) say that unlike the quasi-foundationalists, the *nonfoundationalists* have accepted the relativist implications of the fact that there can be no theory-free observation or knowledge. For nonfoundationalists, Smith & Deemer (ibid) declare, “relativism is not a problem, it is just the inevitable result of the fact that we, as human beings, are finite – a finitude we should learn to live with and not lament.” Our finitude as human beings is embedded in the ontology and epistemology that constitute the basis for this thesis. Our finitude as human beings ought to be taken into consideration in the judgement of this thesis. One has to think untraditionally in relation to who we are, what we do, and what type of world we create (Smith & Deemer, 2000: 885-886 with reference to Rorty, 1979 and Hazelrigg, 1989). This is not easy and needs to be clarified.

This thesis has constructed a particular reality of sport, masculinity and power in a male prison. By the use of theory, this reality is categorised and classified to make it as well arranged and understandable as possible. For example, one of the categories used in this thesis is “macho masculinity”. If one would have said that “I discovered many men with a “macho masculinity”, one would have presumed that “macho masculinity” was a natural category that existed in itself, capable of discovery by use of particular methods. However, if one claims that “macho masculinity” is a constructed category we have, for whatever social/historical reasons, used for categorising men; we interpret men as men with a “macho masculinity” by putting them into these categories. A nonfoundationalist will say that our categorisation of these men is a question about practice and moral and not about epistemology. This is because our human finitude prevents us from observing “macho masculinity” because this is something that for us does not exist in itself. It is practical for us to put men that have a certain appearance into the category of “macho masculinity” because it makes our world clear and understandable. At the same time it is also a moral issue, what right do we have to classify these men as men with a “macho masculinity”? To judge whether the classification in this thesis is good or bad is therefore a question of practice and moral since none of us are capable of observing “macho masculinity”. Smith & Deemer (2000: 886) say it like this:

“The point is not that we dispense with categorisation, which in any case is impossible for the finite human mind. To the contrary, the point is to examine and fully discuss *why we construct the world as we do*. This is a discussion that is practical and moral, framed by contingent social and historical circumstances, and certainly not epistemological in any theory-of-knowledge sense of the world.” (Emphasise mine)

Realising our human finitude raises the question; “how to make and defend judgements when there can be no appeal to foundations or to something outside of the social processes of knowledge construction (?)” (Smith & Deemer, 2000: 884). Research can be looked upon as an act of construction that is not epistemological but moral and practical. The judgement of the goodness or badness of this thesis can therefore be questions of practice and moral rather than epistemology. However, this does not imply that “anything goes”. As Sparkes (1998: 377) says, “(a)ccordingly, it is possible to advocate a view that is both relativistic and pluralistic, but not mindless”. Since reality is constructed in this thesis, criteria for judging it are also constructed (Smith & Deemer, 2000: 886). In the following therefore, a list of criteria are suggested for what may be pertinent in order to evaluate the “goodness” or “value” of this thesis. This list is by no means the only set of criteria. They are rather criteria that could serve as guiding principles, which may be helpful in judging this thesis in relation to its own internal meaning structure. (The list presented below is inspired by the work of Sparkes, 1995; Schwandt, 1996; Næss, 1998; Sparkes, 1998; Richardson, 2000a; Richardson, 2000b; Smith & Deemer, 2000)

1. In this study, is there coherence between the paradigmatic assumptions (ontology, epistemology, and methodology), the selected methods, and the move from the data-production to the story told in this thesis?
2. Is there coherence between the presented theory and understanding of central concepts, the data-production and the story told in this thesis?
3. Does the study answer the research questions raised? Does the study create new knowledge and contribute to the understanding of the relation between sport, power and masculinity in prison?
4. Is this study conducted within acceptable ethical and moral boundaries? Have the respondents been shown the respect they deserve? Are the truths that are presented in the story told in this thesis handled in an ethically responsible way?
5. Is it made clear how the subjectivity have been both a producer and a product of the story told in this thesis? Are adequate self-awareness and self-exposure given for the reader to

make judgements about this issue?

6. Are the creations of the fictional stories believable and authentic? Do the fictional stories convey a “feeling tone”? Have these fictional stories together with theoretical discussion of them evoked an understanding of the prisoners’ life in prison, and the female officers’ and the male officers’ working situation?
7. Has awareness been achieved in relation to how meanings are created about the prisoners’ exercise of various kinds of sports activities?
8. Has this study succeeded in viewing the world from the standpoint of oppressed people and contributed to the creation of a more inclusive theory of gender inequality? Has this study contributed to a better understanding of the politics of masculinity?
9. How can this work be useful? Can this study be a move in a social play that takes place within a social field and contributes to greater reflectivity and more nuances in the political debate related to sport in prison? Can this study initiate to improve the prisoners’ life in prison and the female and the male prison officers’ working conditions?

Chapter six

Polar Prison and Hegemonic Masculinity

As mentioned previously, the data material will be presented in accordance with the order of the research questions. In the next three chapters, the data-material related to the first research question will be presented and discussed. The discussion is divided in three because three focuses were needed in order to answer the first research question. This chapter will focus on the leading discourses the prison officers construct and re-construct masculinities within for the purpose of exercising disciplinary power and juridical-political power. The next chapter will focus on the leading discourses used to discipline the prisoners to construct masculinities that are considered to “normalise” them. The last chapter will focus on the leading discourses for the prison officers’ interpretation of the prisoners’ exercise of sport.

The analysis of the data-material showed that the presentation could be arranged in relation to themes important in order to answer the research questions. These themes are sometimes used as headings of the subchapters. In many respects these three chapters discuss issues that will be revisited in later chapters. This is because the exercise of the disciplinary power and the juridical-political power discussed in this chapter constitutes the basis for the discussion that will answer the two last research questions.

Polar Prison

The institution where the study was conducted is called *Polar Prison*. This is not the prison’s real name, because in order to maintain anonymity, the Ministry of Justice and Police denied permission for use of the real name. However, the prison that was studied has two main wings and, as stated previously, these two wings will be referred to as the contract wing and the restrictive wing. Each wing consisted of landings where the prisoners lived. During the daytime, most of the prisoners both in the contract and restrictive wings are at work or at school from about 8.00 a.m. to 3.00 p.m. Thereafter they return to their landings to have dinner. In the afternoon the prisoners are allowed to go out in the yard and stay there from

3.30 p.m. to 7.30 p.m. This period is called the exercise time and is a little shorter in wintertime. The contract wing and the restrictive wing have separate yards. Leisure-activities, such as sports activities, are arranged in the afternoon and in the evening. The activity department runs much of the leisure activities, for example, the sports activities. The prison officers also have responsibilities in the arrangement of the sports activities. Their responsibilities can vary from standing ringside and supervising the activity, to having the full responsibility for planning and carrying out the activities together with the prisoners. On each day- and evening-shift there are two prison officers on each landing. From 9.00 p.m. when the prisoners are locked up for the night and until 07.00 a.m., the number of staff in the whole prison would be six to seven prison officers and an additional senior officer. Based on this description, Polar Prison can be viewed as a “complete institution” (Goffman, 1967: 11-13), or as Foucault (1991a: 235-236) puts it, an “omni-disciplinary” institution. It has a barrier separating it from the society by locked doors, fences, bars and external walls. The prisoners eat, sleep and work in the same institution, and most of their activities are carried out together with other prisoners that are treated the same and everything is strictly scheduled. The “omni-disciplinary” institution takes care of many of the human needs, and this is carried out by a bureaucratic organisation consisting of many people.

The hierarchical organisation and the promotion of authoritarianism

Embedded in the bureaucratic organisation of Polar Prison is a rigid hierarchy. At the top there is a Governor 1, and then two Governors 2. Below the Governors 2, are principal officers, then senior officers, and thereafter prison officers. Prisoners are at the bottom. The paramount emphasis placed on controlling the prisoners is one of the main reasons for the endurance of this militaristic structure of prison staff since the 19th century (Thomas, 1972, in Carrabine & Longhurst, 1998: 170). In Foucaultian terms this hierarchical structure provides a hierarchical supervision of the prisoners. Newton (1994: 199) claims that in male prisons, “masculinities remain a dominant feature of the social structure, albeit modified to fit the situation”. In the same article Newton argues that embedded in the hierarchical regime in the prison is *authoritarianism*. In the definition of authoritarianism Newton (ibid) refers to Segal (1990: 116) who says that authoritarianism “has been described as the embodiment of masculinity: the masquerade of power concealing weak and dependent feelings through the assertion of strength and the rejection of everything gentle, spontaneous, soft, relaxed,

chaotic”¹. Connell (1987: 109) defines authority as legitimate power, and in relation to gender, authority is connected to masculinity. Connell (ibid) also says that the hierarchisation between men, by the denial of authority to some groups of men, and the successful claim to authority by men who perform the hegemonic masculinity, makes the connection between authority and masculinity complicated and contradicted. The connection can also be challenged in that women in some circumstances also exercise authority (Connell ibid), for example female prison officers (Farnworth, 1992: 280).

The embodiment of masculinity for the purpose of exercising authoritarianism has traditionally been an important issue in male prisons. The prison officers’ bodies and the physical dominance they are able to exercise, either individually or by operating together as one unit, have traditionally been important for the exercise of control in a male prison. Physical dominance can be looked upon as the display of the “masquerade of power” embedded in the exercise of authoritarianism. To construct and re-construct physical dominance, the body of the male prison officer has traditionally been of major importance. One of the respondents among the male prison officers said that the greatest difference between prison officers before and now is the size of the body. (He was most likely talking about male prison officers because not many female prison officers worked in male prison in Norway before the middle to late eighties.) A male body, especially if it is large and muscular, is interpreted as powerful (see page 23). A large muscular body is not only construed as a sign of potential for physical dominance; it is also construed as a sign of control and mastery (Finstad, 1998). However, it is not only the male body and shape that is important for the “masquerade of power”, the clothes also play a crucial role. At Polar Prison all the staff within the security unit wear blue coloured uniforms, and the female and male officers’ uniform look the same. Besides giving the security staff an identity as prison officers, easing the division between “us” and “the others”, that is, the prisoners, the uniform is embodied as a sign of the authoritarianism the security staff is able to exercise. When a man with a large muscular body wears the uniform, the “masquerade of power” becomes complete.

¹ According to Segal (1990:116), many researchers on men and masculinity refer to the work of Adorno et.al. (1978): “The Authoritarian Personality” when they connect authoritarianism to masculinity, although Adorno et. al. (ibid) did not address the issue of gender in their work.

Several of the prison officers in the study held the opinion that many male prison officers who developed their bodies in order to become large and muscular, expressed a particular masculinity which they called *macho*:

Didrik:

Here, among some of the male prison officers, there is a kind of macho culture. They aren't necessarily that large and strong, but they admire their colleagues who are large and strong, or who are very clever in one thing or another. It isn't important if you are good in handling the inmates or are doing a good job as a prison officer, but if you are clever in soccer, wrestling or particularly some tough sport, then you can become a senior officer for example. You gain entry to that clan in a way. I think these guidelines come from a level a little higher up than the prison officers where you find leaders who have embodied this macho culture, and it gets spread around in a way. .. Being thin and frail, oh no, that's not accepted. It isn't like that you are supposed to be! But, I think this macho culture was even more dominant before than now.

Karen:

I have noticed that there has been a change in attitudes. Now a male prison officer after he has been exercising C and R (see footnote page 2 for definition) can say loudly that he was afraid during the action. But, handling conflicts, as for example C and R, is still the male prison officer's domain. Female officers are never, or at least very seldom, used in C and R. I don't know why, but I think it has something to do with the attitudes of the senior officers². It's always the same ones who participate in these actions, the large and strong male prison officers. And I think it's all right that I can't participate as long as the prisoner or myself are in real danger because of me being a woman. But I have to say that I sometimes feel more competent to participate than many of my male colleagues. I don't know, but it seems that the senior officers think that we have to take the prisoner, and for that we have to have some strong men. And this way of thinking is very strong within these walls.

Ability to handle conflicts, both verbally and physically, has traditionally been important for prison officers to maintain control in a prison. This importance is reflected in areas such as the education of the prison officers where verbal and physical conflict handling is an important

² Senior officers formally lead the exercise of C and R, and therefore select which officers that are going to participate in the action.

subject. Physical conflicts, such as fighting among the prisoners, are difficult and dramatic in a prison because these situations require the use of C and R and physical strength for regaining control. In these situations, the embodied physicality in the large male officers' bodies is crucial. Historically, control in prisons has been maintained by interventions to regain control when situations got out of hand. Therefore "the macho look", where the large and muscular male body has been essential, has been used to promote the embodied authoritarianism. According to Zimmer (1986: 3), the staff will stress macho masculinity when it is a central criterion for successful job performance.

Some of the respondents among the male prison officers said C and R was used less frequently today than before. Even if conflicts handled by the use of C and R seems to occur rarely at Polar Prison, it seems to be important for the management to keep this physical force in a state of readiness, or "held in reserve" (Liebling & Price, 1999: 4), in case something happens³. In this way the management gives clear signals about what kind of masculinity they consider to be hegemonic in the prison. The hegemony of the embodied authoritarianism expressed by the macho masculinity is also supported by some of the field observations. During the fieldwork I noticed that only male prison officers worked in the intensive security unit where use of C and R seemed to occur most frequently. Not all of the male officers were large, but some of them compensated for a lack of size by being in good physical shape. Apparently the male prison officers working on this unit, held a high status among many of the other prison officers. This unit also seemed to be attractive to work in. This indicates that there is a tendency to consider the macho masculinity as hegemonic in the prison among several of the prison officers.

According to both Didrik and Karen, it seems that the hegemony of the macho masculinity is about to be challenged. Didrik says that the macho culture is becoming less dominant, and Karen thinks that male prison officers can admit fear today, which has traditionally been considered as a weakness and not in accordance with authoritarianism. According to the data material, it seems that this change is closely connected to a general development in the Prison Service.

³ This is particularly true for the senior officers and the principal officers who are in charge of the maintenance of the control over the prisoners.

From impersonal distance to personal care

Didrik:

Before it was more like prison, you know, just locking the inmates in and out. But now we are forced to be personal officers and to be more concerned about the problems of the inmates and to try to do something about their problems. And when a prisoner trusts you so much that he dares to speak to you about personal matters, then you become not only a prison officer but a person who can be there for him and help him. But prisoners don't talk about their problems and feelings to a prison officer who has this macho look, with a lot of muscles and in a way is so tough and hard, and who also has this condescending attitude towards the prisoners. But of course, being this macho is very effective for a prison officer in order to keep a distance and protect himself from having anything to do with the prisoners. And I think this also concerns the female prison officers who go for this macho look. I think they overplay, but anyhow, they also send the signal 'don't talk to me', and they cut off all the potential they have as women for deeper communication with the inmates.

Didrik claims that exhibiting a macho look signals distance because of the toughness and hardness embedded in expressing a macho look, and combined with a condescending attitude towards the prisoners, the signals of distance get even larger. In a system traditionally built upon distance between the prison officers and the prisoners, it is reasonable to assume that the macho masculinity has become hegemonic also because of its signals of distance. The general development in the Prison Service that Didrik speaks about in the story above demands the prison officers to be personal officers for the prisoners. The Norwegian National Budget (The Norwegian Government, 2000: 66) says:

“An aim is that all prisoners, both convicted and remanded prisoners, shall have personal officers. The personal officer's most important duty is to support and motivate the inmate to work with a purpose during his/her stay in prison, to survey the inmates' recourses and needs, to contribute in the planning of the process of serving the sentence and planning the future, and to support practical arrangements in planning the release.” (My translation)

Being a personal officer requires gaining close contact with the prisoners in order to get them to speak about their problems and motivate them to do something with these. The implementation of being a personal officer in the job as a prison officer demands that the prison officers show more *care* for the prisoners.

The caring aspect is also reflected in the shift of the label of the prison system. Instead of the Prison Service one can use the label (now perhaps the more “correct” label) “Care and confinement of criminals in institutions”. This development can also be illustrated by an observation from the early nineties when I worked as a prison officer: we separated our roles as professional and private. Prison officers were expected to be professional in relations with prisoners, and this was obtained by keeping distance and not being involved with prisoners, e.g. by telling the prisoner about ourselves. Several of the respondents among the prison officers in this study, kept their *professional*, *personal* and *private* issues separate. One of the male prison officers explained what he meant by this. He said that being professional is to carrying out tasks one is expected to do, for example, searching the prisoner in an emphatic and respective manner. One can also be personal in the relationship with a prisoner and tell the prisoner about one’s views and attitudes in relation to various issues. During a conversation about football, for example, one may tell the prisoner which team one supports. But, he said, one cannot be private and tell the prisoner about one’s family, where one lives, and so on. Even if the caring aspect seems to be reflected in being professional as well as in being personal, the prison officers were concerned about not getting too close to the prisoners. In the interviews, many of the prison officers, both male and female, discussed the importance of keeping clear limits in order to make explicit to the prisoners what could and what could not be done for him. Price & Liebling (1998: 3) say that being too close or too flexible are ways a relationship between a prisoner and a prison officer can “go wrong”. At the same time Price and Liebling (ibid) says, being too distant or too rigid are also ways a staff-prisoner relationship can “go wrong”.

Didrik says at the end of his story that female officers exaggerate when they pursue a macho look, and that female officers have a potential for communication which they should use. From this it seems that the macho look and being appropriately close and having personal communication, which hereafter will be labelled *having a personal relationship with the prisoners*, are related to gender. Distance and having a personal relationship with the prisoners in relation to male and female officers, will therefore be discussed separately.

Distance and closeness – male prison officers

Because of the distance signalled by the macho look, it seems from Didrik's story above that it can be advantageous to express another masculinity other than the macho masculinity for a male prison officer in order to achieve a personal relationship with prisoners. The data material indicates that male prison officers interested in having a personal relationship with the prisoners construct masculinity not appealing to distance, fear and condescension, but to contact, confidence and mutual respect where the focus on the body and strength is reduced.

Didrik:

If I had weight-trained with the prisoners and managed to lift 10 kilo more than them in the bench-press just to show off to the inmates, they would have been afraid of me because I have been physically strong. But I don't want the inmates to respect me because they are afraid of me. I want rather that the prisoners respect me because they know me as a person and think I'm an OK fellow. And I feel I have this respect because I'm professional, and the prisoners know that they can talk to me, and I also believe that they think it's valuable to talk with me. But I also take them seriously and I respect them.

From this story it seems that the traditional focus on the male prison officers large muscular male bodies have not only served the purpose of regaining control, but also in preventing situations from getting out of hand by frightening the prisoners. However, male prison officers that have the same attitudes as Didrik, do not represent a threat to the maintenance of control of the prisoners. Male officers can never lose their authority in a prison simply because they are men and therefore authoritarianism can be interpreted from their body. Even if they do not promote authoritarianism by displaying macho masculinity, they keep the authoritarian power "in reserve", and construct a masculinity where their bodily physicality is put into focus when it is needed. The following story of Atle exemplifies this:

A while ago I had a personal officer who I felt I could talk to. I liked him. But one day I decided that I wanted to move to the restrictive wing. I told him, and he tried to persuade me to stay, and that's understandable. Several weeks went on and I didn't hear anything, even if I spoke both to the principal officer and the senior officer about this matter. But nothing happened, and one day I had enough. Before locking up for the night, I put my things outside the cell and refused to go into the cell. My personal officer was at work that evening, and when I refused to go in, he suddenly changed personality in a way. I had never seen him like

this before. He went out and came back with seven officers, and my personal officer was first in the line. He grabbed my arm and twisted it around to my back until it hurt, and then they transferred me to the restrictive wing by using physical force.

It seems that the Prison Service's effort to make the prison officers to have a personal relationship with the prisoners has led to several male prison officers displaying a masculinity appealing to care. Stohr, Lovrich, & Wood (1996: 445) also conclude with "(C)learly, correctional officers are inclined to value service training as much or more than security training whether they are males or females"⁴. Because of the Prison Service's effort in caring, combined with the fact that caring masculinity does not threaten the production and reproduction of authoritarianism in prison, it seems that the caring masculinity is about to challenge the hegemony of the macho masculinity. Didrik, for example, does not display a macho masculinity because he wants to have a personal relationship with the prisoners. One male respondent illustrates this change very well when he says:

"I think that was what the Prison Service was built upon in general: if you were large and if you were in good shape and had muscles and such things, then you solved problems with your physique. This has changed. Now it's your brain you shall use to solve matters."

This development towards care seems to be a general trend in several countries:

"I have concluded that there is one trait, more than anything else, which distinguishes the truly exemplary correctional officer: the ability to intermittently, and sometimes almost simultaneously, impose both compassion and authority. The really effective and successful correctional officer is both a caring figure and a controlling figure, employing one approach and then the other as ever-changing circumstances require" (Kiekbush, 1992: 6).

Distance and closeness – female prison officers

Karen:

When I started working as a prison officer in a male prison in the late eighties, it was accepted that one should keep a great distance between prison officers and inmates.

⁴ Service training is related to the education of prison officers, where they, among other things, learn how to function as personal officers. Security training is learning how to maintain control over the prisoners by restrictive means such as the use of C and R.

Especially as a female officer you were supposed to be tough and follow a narrow path. I remember I was pretty strict and played by the book, mostly because I was terrified of making any mistakes. And I remember I tried to hide my gender as much as I could. But I felt that I managed the job, because I have always been good at speaking for myself. Therefore I didn't find it difficult to say no or have argumentation with the inmates. I suppose I wasn't always fair, and to be really honest, I didn't always treat the inmates with respect either. But I wasn't aware of it then because this was the accepted tone. And, in a way, I adopted this rough tone where also humour, and not the least sexuality expressed indirectly in an ironical, half-hidden way, was important. To understand this tone was essential to being accepted by your colleagues, and who doesn't want to be that?

From Karen's story above, it seems that 10 – 15 years ago for a female prison officer to be accepted, it was necessary for her to conform to a 150-year old gender stereotypical discourse constructed and re-constructed by male prison officers on how to keep superiority over the male prisoners. From Karen's story it seems that suppressing her gender and expressing authoritarianism by elements of the macho masculinity was necessary in order to adapt to this discourse. At the same time, she also had to adapt to an even longer historically constructed discourse for how women should relate to "superior" men. In relation to the male prison officers, she constructed herself within a gender stereotype where women, from the standpoint of the male prison officers, were looked upon, as one of the female officer respondents formulated it: "as something that had to be protected, and whose primary task was to decorate and brighten the place up". To challenge the male prison officers and try to do the work equally as well as them was not the best approach because then she might threaten the male officers' superiority⁵. As one respondent among the female officers said:

"I guess I was a little rebel in the beginning, I was a little noisy; I wanted things to happen right away. But, I miss that glow, I do, because you adapt pretty much over time. .. But, I

⁵ Zimmer (1986: 108-147) has developed a typology for female officers who work in male prisons. She typifies female prison officers trying to perform their job as male officers, working within an *institutional role*. Women viewed themselves as unable to perform the job of guarding on an equal basis with men, Zimmer (ibid) typifies working within a *modified role*, while women who work within a *inventive role* claim that women's disadvantages such as physical strength is compensated by their intuition, their superior communicative skills and their ability to obtain respect from the prisoners.

don't know if I let myself, how shall I put it, integrate, or I felt it wasn't, you shouldn't make too much noise, in a way"

According to Karen's story above, it was important to catch the humour and the tone, which is in accordance with Farnworth (1992: 292) who says: "(T)he most effective approach that enabled female officers to get on with the job whilst keeping on side with male officers was to use humour". In "getting on with their job" and being tough and following a narrow path in relation to the prisoners, while being inferior and vulnerable in relation to male officers in order to "keep on side with them", one can say that the female prison officers "strike a balance" within gender stereotypes (Jurik, 1988: 292). However, it also seemed that the females officers adapting to these gender stereotypical discourses, took part in the reproduction of them, and still reproduce them to a certain degree. As one of the female respondents said:

"if a male officer makes himself conspicuous, showing that he is clever and has clear opinions about matters concerning his job, and presents his meanings in a clear and direct manner, he is demonstrating good leading skills. If a female officer does the same, she can be provocative, also for other female officers, I think."

Didrik also reproduces these stereotypical gender discourses when he says that a female officer who creates herself "too much" within the discourse of hegemonic macho masculinity, is exaggerating. However, the respondents among the female officers said that to construct oneself within the macho masculinity discourse is an effective strategy if one is insecure. To keep a distance from the prisoners by being tough and hard and not showing any tolerance, but following the prison laws and rules letter by letter, is a security caution in order not to do anything wrong or make any mistakes. Mistakes are not in accordance with authoritarianism and are consequently not tolerated⁶.

A general attitude among the prison officers, both males and females, was that female prison officers do belong at Polar Prison. As a one of the respondents among the male officers put it, "I think it is obvious and important to have female employees." A common view among the

⁶ According to Ben-David, Silfen & Cohen (1996: 95-96), the greater the anxiety and insecurity experienced by staff, the more likely it is that staff will be punitively-oriented. The punitive type, who abstains as much as possible from communication with inmates, maintains authoritative status by ordering and demanding submission and obedience, and stereotypes all inmates as "bad" or "mean".

female prison officers in this study was that they felt accepted as prison officers⁷. One of the reasons why female prison officers feel that they are accepted as serious employees seems to be the development of a caring discourse in the Prison Service. It actually seems that in their struggle to be accepted as serious employees, they have promoted themselves within a discourse of care, and thereby been trend-setters for the development of a new discourse at Polar Prison, a discourse that actually seems to challenge the hegemonic macho masculinity.

It seems that this development is not only typical for Norwegian prisons. Price & Liebling (1998: 61) refer to a Danish study (Kriminalforsorgen i Danmark, 1998) which has studied the personal profile of ideal prison officers, and say:

“(I)nterestingly, recent developments in the role of the prison officer towards a ‘new interactional style’ have resulted in a shifting profile of the desirable officer including more of the typically female methods of communication and interaction”.

Rowan (1996: 32) concludes with: “(C)learly, female correctional officers play an important role in many maximum Security Prisons”. However, even if some of the problems female officers experienced in order to be accepted as professional employees have disappeared, the development towards care seems to have given the female officers new problems to handle:

Karen:

There has been a change in attitudes towards female prison officers. Now there is a more serious working culture. That female prison officers have become visible and that women have become a part of the leadership makes us accepted as serious employees and not barbie dolls. I feel I'm accepted as a professional prison officer, and that I do as good a job as a male prison officer. Because of the changes within the prison system, and also because I have become older and feel more secure of myself both as a prison officer and a woman, I now feel that this profession suits me better. Actually, I think that the change within the prison system is based on women's way of doing things. Many female prison officers have experience from jobs where closeness through caring, upbringing and guidance of children and youth has

⁷ Studies show, however, that female officers can experience resistance from their male colleagues in the form of sexual harassment, not being fully accepted, etc. (see, for example, Zimmer, 1986; Jurik, 1988; Szockyj, 1989; Farnworth, 1992; Belknap, 1995; Britton, 1997). We should keep in mind that the female officers in this study might have experienced sexual harassment from their male colleagues as well.

been a central task. My experience is that I have an advantage being a woman because the inmates like to talk to me, that I get better contact in a way. If that's because I'm a woman, I don't know. But it can be, because many men claim that it's easier to talk to a woman about close and intimate matters. But I don't like it when the female part of me becomes too visible. I don't know, but I feel that I lose some authority in a way. When I get to know a prisoner well, I still have to keep a clearly defined line because it's so easy for female prison officers to be misunderstood. The prisoners can be very engaged in you as a woman, and even fall in love with you. I can't, for example, be a comrade with a prisoner in the same way as a male prison officer can.

Even if the development of the caring discourse seems to suit female prison officers better, and even if they feel that their gender may give some advantages in their job, Karen still feels that her gender to some degree gives her a disadvantage in her job. She feels that she loses authority when the female part of her becomes too visible in her exercise of herself as a professional prison officer. This supports the earlier discussion that authoritarianism exercised by the prison officers in Polar Prison is understood as an expression of masculinity. Almost all of the interviewed female prison officers were glad to wear uniforms at work. It seems that the uniform helps them to hide their gender and express authoritarianism. Therefore it seems that the contradiction between presenting oneself as a woman and a prison officer to some degree still exists. Karen now has more space to establish her identity as a woman in her profession as a prison officer, but for Karen this is also a consequence of her age and experience as a prison officer. However, some of the boundaries Karen automatically has when she hides her gender and keeps a distance to the prisoners, seem to disappear when she displays more of her gender. The space gives her more opportunities in her work as a prison officer, but, as she says, it is very easy to be misunderstood and the prisoners sometimes think that she is interested in having private relationship with them.

*

The discourse on masculinity in a male prison has traditionally been a discourse concerning macho masculinity in order to promote authoritarianism which is important for controlling the prisoners. However, it seems that the discourse of masculinity is changing at Polar Prison, and the rest of the Prison Service as well, and that the caring masculinity is about to challenge the hegemony of the macho masculinity. This development seems to be closely related to

women's entrance as prison officers in male prisons. The result of this development is loosening the gender stereotypes that men and women historically have adapted to with the purpose of establish themselves as male and female prison officers. However, this development seems to have led to new problems for female officers in order to not get too close to the prisoners. The caring aspect has also led to a focus on confession to get the prisoner to tell "the truth" about himself. Even if this focus on care seems to be a positive development in the Prison Service, we should keep in mind that confession is a strategy for the disciplinary power. Confession is an important element in the construction of "the criminal" where his life rather than his law-offending actions is of interest in the characterisation of him.

Chapter seven

The “Normalisation” of the Prisoners

Because the discourse concerning what to consider as criminal acts is mostly a question of how to interpret men’s practices (see page 4; the sub-chapter about male prisoners), what acts are criminalised are often *socially unacceptable expressions of masculinities*. Earlier it was argued that the ideology of rehabilitation still exists in the prison. The idea is that work practice, education, practice of sport, various “life management” programs, etc., will contribute to change the prisoner into a “law-abiding person” behaving in accordance with norms and standards in the society. The ideology of rehabilitation reflects a belief that criminal acts are caused by “abnormalities” in the prisoner. The rehabilitation efforts can therefore be viewed as means to “normalise” the prisoner by disciplining his body to express *socially acceptable forms of masculinity*. In disciplining the prisoner such as by encouraging him to educate himself while he is in prison, he can be made useful by finding a job and supporting himself when released. He can then contribute to the social and economic productivity, rather than continuing to commit crimes and living off financial support from the society. By participating in various programs, the prisoner can be “normalised” by learning how to solve problems by legal, rather than illegal, means.

In the previous chapter, Polar Prison was described as a prison with two wings, the contract wing and the restrictive wing. A prisoner serving in the contract wing has to sign a contract where he agrees to stay drug-free. In return the prisoner “gains advantages”, such as 30 days rather than the ordinary 24 days leave. When a prisoner signs the contract, however, he is not trusted to stay drug free and is therefore subjected to urine tests. This can be viewed as a kind of examination where the prisoner is tested over and over again, and the test results are kept on file. The prisoner is tested at random intervals and he never knows when he is in turn, but he must deliver a urine tests whenever requested by the staff. These urine tests are usually done in the morning, and one of the prisoners told me that some of them have developed a technique in order to always have some urine in the morning. If they had to go to the toilet during the night, they would always hold some urine back in case of potential urine tests in the morning. If a urine test turns out to be positive, it indicates drug use, and the prisoner will

be transferred to the restrictive wing. The arrangement of contract serving can be viewed as a rehabilitation strategy disciplining the prisoners to express socially acceptable forms of masculinities. Prisoners not serving on contract are suspected of using drugs in prison, an act that is criminalised and therefore a socially unacceptable expression of masculinity.

Testing negatively on urine tests can be looked upon as good behaviour in itself, but in order to serve on contract the prisoner must also behave well in general. Bad behaviour is punished by transference to the restrictive wing. The contract system is therefore a sort of trade where the prisoner offers his behaviour in exchange for better serving conditions, and a good example of how cost-benefit arrangements dominate the Prison Service (Giertsen, 1995: 417-419). The contract serving arrangement is also a good example of how the prison's micro-punishment systems operate in order to "normalise" the prisoners. In this system no "neutral" behaviour exists. There is only good or bad behaviour, and the good behaviour is the "normal" behaviour. The prisoner therefore has to offer good behaviour or else sanctions are placed on him.

The micro-punishment system

Atle:

To get something here, you have to be "a nice boy", behave well by doing as they say, and think as the rest of the system. You see, one likes people to behave in the same manner in prison. People who try to think for themselves means more work for the prison officers, you know. In focus, yes, I experience that they try to take over because it is so easy to relate to a homogenous group. If you're not doing as they say, you get sanctioned. And you feel these sanctions as matters of course that are just taken away from you. Each of them doesn't mean so much, but it is the sum that creates frustration. You know, you have this element of punishment in the whole system. They can for example deny visits, and it's a punishment to be transferred to the restrictive wing, because there you don't get anything. But, if you play with this system you get positive answers on your applications about leaves and so on within a few days. If not, you have to wait weeks for answers on the same applications. . You are totally dependent on that they like your face! It's a kind of unwritten set of rules that exists in the prison, and which you in a way just sense is there and that makes things sometimes so unpredictable. .. And they are always suspicious. The whole prison system is built upon mistrust, and you are mistrusted from day one because they always believe that you will do

something wrong. If you show initiative to do something, for example, the management interprets this as if you are up to something. Engagement is interpreted as aggression, and all your reactions towards the prison system are explained as though you have a mental illness. Here, everything is explained by individual pathology! You have to prove your innocence every day and show the staff and the management that they can trust you. But, the trust you manage to build up it's a fake. You see, there are different forms of trust. The trust you have on the landing, you only have until you move out in the yard. There you don't have any trust anymore. The trust I have when I'm at my workplace has nothing to do with the trust I have on the landing. When we are on trips outside the prison, the trust you have depends on which prison officers who come along, how well they know you and so on. As I say, the life here is like a rubber band; you never know where they drag you. Sometimes it's square, sometimes oblong this way, and sometimes that way.

In this statement, it seems that Atle's views the objective of the prison's micro-punishment system not as "normalisation" to what the society defines as "normal". He describes a "normalisation" towards what the prison defines as "normal", and Atle describes a well-developed and well functioning micro-punishment system for this purpose. Atle also says that rules do not exist for everything, which leads to unpredictability. Mathiesen (1965: 94) noticed the same in his study of a Norwegian correctional institution and says: "unpredictability is based on normlessness". Most likely this is so because decisions made in the micro-punishment system are very much based on personal judgements.

While rewards often give the prisoner more freedom and space to construct himself, the sanctions on the other hand are practices limiting the space he can operate within. These are both of a physical nature, by keeping the prisoner or moving him to the restrictive wing, and of a social nature, by reducing the prisoner's opportunities to have contact with the world outside the prison. When sanctions are initiated there is always an appeal to the prisoner's rational consciousness, in an attempt to convince him that it is best for him is to behave well. The prisoner is in focus; he carries the responsibility for the "normalisation". Whatever the prison or the prison officers do, whichever way they stretch the rubber band, the prisoner has to adapt in order to be considered "normal". To step outside "the norm" is interpreted as bad or "abnormal" behaviour. According to Atle, this "abnormal" behaviour is not only sanctioned, but also explained by one of the most powerful discourses in the prison - the medical discourse. As Cohen (1985: 278) says,

“A special and influential form of Controltalk, ..., derives from the medical model of deviance. In its strong form, it appears in psychiatry, clinical psychology and various forms of therapy, in its weaker form in counselling and social work, and its most discredited (but still influential form) in the deeper ends of the crime-control system.”

According to Atle, prisoners who do not construct themselves as “normal” are labelled as agitators, while those who construct themselves as “normal” are “nice boys”. Both the explanation of the prisoners “abnormal” behaviour and the labelling of the prisoners are examples of how the prisoners are exposed to the process of objectification.

By making the prisoners behave in a proper way in the prison and by rendering them as little troublesome as possible, the prisoners are disciplined to express *masculinities that are accepted in the prison*. These masculinities can also be labelled *institutional acceptable masculinities*, where the prisoners adapt to the rules and the routines in the establishment. This means that a prisoner accepts the rules and routines, and is not critical to, or questions why, the rules and routines are as they are. He will do as the staff tells him to do, he follows their way of thinking, as Atle says, which means that he stays calm and quiet. “Quiet and calm” is a standard phrase used if nothing special has happened on the landing, when the prison officers give report, e.g. in the daily meeting in the morning between the prison officers from the landings, the senior officers and the principal officer. Well-behaved prisoners ensure homogeneity, and ensure a smooth running of the prison without any disturbances. The power exercised for this purpose is important to the management and the staff because it maintains the control over the prisoners. When the prisoners are disciplined into a large degree of homogeneity, agitators are easily created because small disturbances make the work troublesome for the staff and the management. As one of the prisoners said: “at the slightest sign of opposition, which can be small things that you have a right to claim, and they ‘cut your head off’.” The reason why criticism against the system seems not to be tolerated, may be that a system where authoritarianism is important, is perhaps vulnerable to inadequacies which are brought into daylight. This may be because focus on inadequacies reveals weaknesses in this system, which seems to be difficult to admit within such a system, since authoritarianism does not tolerate any weaknesses.

Disciplining the prisoners to become docile may be viewed as productive if the prisoners learn to stay drug free, follow rules etc. From Atle's story, however, it seems that the prisoners do not experience this exercise of power as productive, and seem to find this exercise of power repressive, or as a prisoner said, "the more inferior attitude you show, the better you manage in this system". From this viewpoint one can say that the staff denies the prisoners access to authority in order to maintain its superiority. This is carried out by the exercise of disciplinary power where the staff claims to know "the truth". Considering the earlier discussion of how the disciplinary power operates, this is not at least reflected in the constant suspicion and mistrust in the prisoner that Atle refers to, where "the truth" seem to be; "you can never trust a prisoner". This is also reflected in the explanation of the prisoner's behaviour based on individual pathology where "the truth" is founded on the scientific knowledge within the field of medicine and psychiatry. Järvinen (1996: 33) relates this phenomenon to Foucault's reasoning about hegemony which is built upon an imagination of "the other". To Foucault, Järvinen (ibid) says, "the other" is the one shut out of the hegemonic discourse, without access to the knowledge, and without the right to speak. As a prisoner formulated it, "you have no influence, you are just like a disturbing voice, at the end of a branch in a way, which doesn't at all influence how the tree grows". "The other" is also the object of the discourse, the one described and constructed in the expert's regimes of knowledge, often as having deviant identities.

*

In this chapter we have seen how the prisoners by examination and "normalisation" are disciplined to become docile in order to express socially acceptable masculinities and institutionally acceptable masculinities. How the exercise of sport relates to this, is the theme for the next chapter.

Chapter eight

Sport in a “Normalising” Perspective

As we have seen, one possible punishment for bad or “abnormal” behaviour is to be transferred to the restrictive wing where the prisoners have fewer possibilities to practice sport. In the restrictive wing there is a small weight training room. The prisoners who practice weight training in the restrictive wing are split in two groups and each group works out four times a week for one hour. During the year of the fieldwork, the free weights in this weight training room were removed and replaced with weight training apparatuses. The reason given for this was that the management feared that prisoners might use the free weights as weapons and hurt each other or the staff. In a hall, outside the weight training room, a few exercise bikes have been placed.

When the prisoners work out in the weight training room in the restrictive wing, two prison officers are always present, whereas no instructors are present. The prisoners exercise freely, and mostly they learn from each other. Once a week the prisoners in the restrictive wing can participate in football training run by one of the officers at the activities’ department. Some prisoners run or walk in the yard during the exercise time in the afternoons, and sometimes the prisoners play football on their own initiative during the exercise hour. Some weekends during the fieldwork, the prisoners in the restrictive wing arranged a tournament in the yard where they competed in various exercises such as length jump, throwing ball, running one round in the yard, etc. The winners of these competitions won the title “The strongest man at Polar Prison”, and the winners’ name was announced in the prisoners’ magazine.

In the contract wing there is a large weight training room with both weight training apparatuses and free weights. In this room there is also a treadmill and several exercise bikes. Just as with the prisoners in the restrictive wing, the prisoners in the contract wing are split into two groups and each group works out three times a week for two hours. During the exercise, one prison officer is present. The presence of just one prison officer together with the free weights can be interpreted as an indication that the prisoners in the contract wing are not considered to be as threatening and dangerous as the prisoners in the restrictive wing. In

the contract wing, the prisoners can also participate in a football team playing in local leagues. In summertime they play all matches in the football field in the prison yard, but in the wintertime they leave the prison and play matches in a sports hall during some weekends. The football team's training is mostly run by the prisoners themselves, but sometimes an officer from the activities' departments participates. The prisoners in the contract wing also have a table tennis team. In wintertime this team participates in a local table tennis league where teams from outside come to the prison to play matches. It did not seem like the table tennis team did not have much organised training, and the participants varied from match to match. During their time in prison, some of the prisoners in the contract wing have also educated themselves to become Boccia referees. They referee matches at Boccia tournaments for handicapped children and adults arranged outside the prison. Also in the contract wing some prisoners use the exercise time to run or walk in the yard. The prisoners in this wing are also separated into groups that leave the prison regularly in weekends together with prison officers to practice various activities such as outdoor life. The activities' department also arranges a physical activity program for the prisoners in the contract wing two times a year. In summertime they arrange a canoe trip, and in wintertime they arrange a ski camp, both lasting one week. The prisoners have to apply to participate in these programs and are obliged to follow a physical exercise regime both before and after the trips. The year the fieldwork lasted, there was also a bicycle group of six to eight prisoners from the contract wing. They were training for a race and went out bicycling together with prison officers and representatives from the activities' department.

An initiation to the debate about weight training

As we have seen, generally the conditions for practising sport are far better in the contract wing than in the restrictive wing. The enhanced possibilities to practice sport in the contract wing can be viewed as a commodity that is traded for the prisoners' good behaviour. Using improved facilities for weight training as a commodity may seem contradictory though, because neither the Ministry of Justice and Police nor many of the prison officers seems to have the opinion that the weight training serves the social educational purposes that they want the sport activities to serve (see page 3). It seemed to be an effective commodity though, because weight training was the sport activity that by far appeared to engage most prisoners both in the contract and in the restrictive wing. After a while in the prison I understood that for the prisoners "to train" was synonymous with weight training, and that "the training"

meant weight training. Better opportunities to practice weight training may be one reason why the prisoners offer their good behaviour in return and serve their sentences in the contract wing. The dilemma in a debate concerning weight training in male prisons in Norway is therefore what is to be preferred; prisoners who behave well and at the same time get better opportunities to create large muscular bodies, or prisoners who do not behave well and therefore serve their sentence in the restrictive wing? The debate is even more complicated when the creation of a large muscular body is also associated with the use of drugs such as steroids. The fact that weight training can serve social educational purposes is another argument that complicates the debate even more. One of the respondents among the male officers, for example, had the opinion that by training with weights the prisoners could be taught social skills, such as to function in a social setting and to co-operate with each other. These arguments are just some of the arguments in the debate of whether prisoners should be allowed to practice weight training or not, and it seems that the discourses related to this debate dominate the discourses about sport in prison.

The female and male prison officers were concerned about weight training for the prisoners. Many field-talks and much of the time in the interviews with the female and male officers were spent discussing this activity. The female prison officers were generally more critical of the prisoners' involvement in weight training than the male prison officers were.

Karen:

It's very good that the inmates practice sport and physical exercise, but to be quite honest I don't think the weight training is good, especially the way it's run today. More focus should have been on the development of the whole body in a way. I think weight training is too much prioritised, but on the other hand, for many of the inmates it seems like either they practice weight training or they don't exercise at all. Well, some play soccer, and as I say, soccer is one thing, weight training is something else. Soccer is a team play where they learn to play together and show consideration for each other, while weight training is egocentric where they can become more selfish than they already are, well, at least some of them. I don't think an inmate should train with weights and "pump iron" and become large just for the sake of being large. And if you are mentally ill for example, it's much better to use your muscles to jog or walk or something like that. And it's clear, when you consider that there may be rapists who have used their physical strength to engage in sexual intercourse and such things, that these people can use their time in prison to get even larger and stronger, it becomes in a way

.. eh, it doesn't seem right. Because when they come out, then they can have, or it becomes in a way easier for them to subdue a new victim, because that's the danger in many cases. Sure they would have managed to do things anyhow, but I don't like this "weight training thing". But it's also wrong to say 'no, because you are a rapist or because you are an assailant, you are not allowed to train with weights'. And on the other hand, they have to do something while they are in prison too, so it is perhaps better, though, that we have weight training than not having anything.

Didrik:

I can very well understand this discussion. But the question is, will a rapist or an assailant become less violent if he is not that large? Anyway, I choose to not look at it this way, or I can't think like this. I have to think about the inmates' situation here and now, and what we can teach the inmates who train weights while they are in prison. If not, it will just be political matters and only guesses, and then we condemn the inmate even before he is released. Then we talk about moralisation, and we have no right to do that. Actually, we have seen the prisoner's past, but that doesn't mean that he has to take this past with him into the future. .. I also think that if we hadn't allowed the inmates to train weights, it would have been a lot of frustrations among the inmates. Many of them would have had a lot of unused energy that could lead to unsafe situations in here. And, you see, the largest and strongest prisoners are also the calmest prisoners.

Karen is basically positive to the prisoners practise of sport and physical exercise in the prison. It seems that she is mainly concerned about the effects the sport and physical exercise have on the prisoners, and she wants the sport and physical exercise to have a social educational purpose. Karen is ambivalent towards the prisoners' weight training, something that is illustrated by the contradictories in her statement. She realises that weight training can serve the "positive" purpose of occupying the prisoners while they are imprisoned. On the other hand, she cannot see that weight training serves any social educational purpose, at least in the way weight training is carried out today where the prisoners can practice weight training any way they want. When the prisoners practice weight training for the sake of becoming large and strong, Karen has the opinion that the resulting large and strong bodies may give them advantages if they commit new crimes, particularly violent crimes. Didrik, however, does not share Karen's view, although he also wants the prisoners to learn something by practising weight training in prison. The aspect of disciplining the prisoners'

bodies by the use of weight training or other sport activities are therefore present in both Karen and Didrik's statement.

Both Karen and Didrik are concerned that prisoners convicted of violent crimes, "the assailants" and in particular "the rapists", practice weight training. This will be investigated further and used as an example of how prisoners are exposed to processes of objectification. A premise for the further analysis is an understanding of how the notion "the rapist" is created, how meanings are constructed from "the rapist's" body, and how weight training influences the construction of meaning from "the rapist's" body.

The construction of "the criminal"

A rape is an act that can be interpreted as an expression of masculinity. By labelling a man who has committed rape as a "rapist", the expression of masculinity becomes a part of this man's identity. In the prison, this identity is focused upon and fortified in the construction of "the criminal", or more specific "the rapist", "who is recognisable by all kinds of defects and dangers, and who represents a deviance from the normal" (Lindgren, 1998: 320) (My translation).

The body of a "rapist" itself does not necessarily have any meaning of defects, dangers or deviance from "the normal". Therefore, the body in itself is not decisive for the meaning Karen and Didrik construct from "the rapist's" body. What is decisive, however, is the construction of "the rapist", which implies a search for "the truth" in the person who has committed the rape. Within the medical and psychiatric discourses, the search for "the truth" by the use of scientific knowledge, implies searching for deviance or a reason for the crime within the body of the person who has committed the rape. Aycock (1992: 342, with reference to Foucault, 1980: 39, 55) says:

"The body provides a site for the interaction of power and knowledge: history and culture are so deeply inscribed upon the flesh by the technologies of control that we take them to be essential facets of being inseparable from our human nature."

It is likely that the interpretation of masculinity in the construction of "the rapist" plays an important role when both Karen and Didrik interpret "the rapist" as deviating from "the

normal” and as potentially violent and dangerous. This again seems to influence Karen and Didrik’s interpretations of “the rapist’s” weight training in the prison. They both seem to focus on the large muscular body he is likely to develop by this training. Both of them interpret strength from a large muscular body, but while Karen associates this strength to re-offending, Didrik says that he cannot allow himself to do that. In this respect, there is a significant difference in Karen and Didrik’s interpretation of “the rapist’s” muscular body. Karen reads “the rapist’s” body as dangerous, whereas Didrik reads the same body as docile.

The construction of “the criminal body”

To Karen, it is the body that connects the rape and the weight training. The presence of a hypermuscular body can in itself be experienced as intimidating, because it symbolises a potential force, power and strength the muscled body can exert over others (Gillett & White, 1992: 363). To Karen, when the hypermuscular body belongs to a man she knows has committed rape, his body has another dimension that she is not able to ignore in her interpretation of it, namely that this hypermuscular body is a “rapist’s” body. To Karen, this knowledge makes the potential force, power and strength symbolised by the hypermuscular body, more dangerous because increased strength of the body can be profitable to “the rapist” if he were to commit new rapes. By this Karen associates the masculinity expressed in criminal act of rape not only as personified but also as *embodied*. Karen therefore, in the construction of “the rapist”, views “the rapist’s” large muscular body as a form of *symbolic violence* (Bourdieu, 2000: 42-51). This is “a subtle form of symbolic domination rather than overt physical control, which contributes to the reproduction and reinforcement of power relations inherent in the existing gender order” (Gillett & White, 1992: 363). It is also likely that there is an element of uncontrollability in the symbolic violence and danger that Karen interprets from the hypermuscular body of “the rapist”. As she says, re-offending is a danger in many cases. Most likely, Karen interprets the masculinity expressed by “the rapist’s” hypermuscular body as grotesque. According to Morgan (1993: 81-82, with reference to Bakhtin, 1984), a grotesque body is easily interpreted as uncontrolled and unappealing according to dominant aesthetic standards and constructed as being close to nature.

The expression of masculinity Karen interprets from the hypermuscular bodies of men convicted of rape seems to be quite common, and the interpretation of the body’s shape as decisive for committing crimes has a long tradition (see pages 11-12). When the masculinity

expressed in criminal acts, such as rape, is personified and embodied through the construction of “the rapist”, these expressions of masculinity are assumed to fortify “abnormalities” rather than “normalise” men convicted e.g. of rape. By this interpretation of men who have committed rape, their expressions of masculinity is understood as dangerous. These men are therefore considered to be a threat to society’s safety, in particular to women, and their expressions of masculinity are considered to be socially unacceptable expressions of masculinity. The masculinity Karen interprets from “the rapist’s” hypermuscular body can be labelled *protest masculinity* (Connell, 1995: 109-119). According to Connell (1995: 114), “(P)rotest masculinity is a marginalized masculinity, which picks up themes of hegemonic masculinity in the society at large but reworks them in the context of poverty”. By means of a pressured exaggeration of masculine conventions, protest masculinity can also be a response to powerlessness and a claim to the gendered position of power (Connell, 1995: 111). According to Høigård (1997a: 17), there is a strong relation between low social class and registered crime, and this relation is clear for men in prison. With reference to among others Otnes (1987) and Høigård & Balvig (1988), Høigård (1997a: 17) claims that those who are in prison are poor. One way of interpreting the prisoners’ development of hypermuscular bodies is to see these bodies as a claim to the gendered position of power. However, since Karen associates the criminal act of rape as personified and embodied in “the rapist”, she interprets the hypermuscular body as a means to rape women. Therefore she sees “the rapist’s” creation of a large muscular body by weight training as an unacceptable way to claim a gendered position of power. Even if the creation of a hypermasculine body is not criminalised, Karen’s way of interpreting the hypermuscular bodies of men convicted of rape seems to be quite common and establishes one of the strongest arguments to prohibit weight training in the prisons.

Didrik, contrary to Karen, chooses to distinguish between the masculinity personified in the construction of “the rapist”, and the masculinity “the rapist” embodies by training with weights. He does not associate the potential force, power and strength one can interpret from a “rapist’s” hypermuscular body to re-offending. Actually, it seems that he does not interpret danger from a hypermuscular body. The reason why Didrik does not connect hypermuscularity to re-offending is probably because he does not interpret “the rapist’s” body as uncontrolled, grotesque and “abnormal”. Didrik seems not oppose to the use of a hypermuscular body as a claim to the gendered position of power as long as the prisoners do not commit crimes to obtain this position. What Didrik questions is the moral aspect of

embodying the crime in the creation of “the rapist” and the search for “the truth” in “the rapist’s” body which implies that the prisoner will commit new rapes. Doing this, he says, implies a new conviction of the prisoner even before he is released, and that he has no right to do this from a moral point of view.

Newburn & Stanko (1994: 2) says: “(I)t is crucial therefore to think about the power and variety of masculine values, ..., the process of identification, the way in which certain core values become associated with specific social groups, ..” By incorporating the body in the construction of “the rapist” as Karen does, “the rapist” is interpreted as empowered due to his construction of a hypermuscular body through the practice of weight training. In the search for “the truth” from this point of view, an implicit doubt exists that the prisoners will use their empowered bodies for law-abiding purposes. However, perhaps it is rather in the construction and re-construction of the discourse that gives the body of the “the rapist” or any other prisoner convicted of whatever crime, a meaning by associating certain values with the prisoners expression of masculinity, that the exercise of power happens? It is therefore not necessarily the prisoners’ expression of masculinity which is “wrong”, but perhaps rather the discursive meaning and construction of values given to this expression of masculinity?

Selfishness and autoeroticism

In her statement Karen says that *weigh training is egocentric where they can become more selfish than they already are, well, at least some of them*. The issue about selfishness can be interpreted as a contributor in Karen’s construction of “the criminal”. Karen suspects that the weight training entails a fortifying of the “abnormalities”, such as selfishness, which for her seems to characterise some of the prisoners. This is because when a prisoner practices weight training, he does not have to think about others, he can concentrate on himself and his body. Prisoners practising weight training are likely to become larger and larger. During the year the fieldwork lasted, some of the prisoners who trained with weights followed a special nutrition regime to stimulate their muscles to grow, and some of them walked and dressed in a certain manner. For example, some of them would wear special wide trousers and short, but wide, college sweaters common among people who train weights. Some of them not only wore these clothes when they trained, but it was their usual way of dressing on daily basis. Some of them, when walking around, would blow their chest up, put their hands out from the body as if they were trying to look as large as possible. They occupied a lot of space, which together

with the use of space is important to exhibit certain forms of masculinity (Connell, 1983: 19; Morgan, 1993: 71). It therefore seemed that they paid a lot of attention to how they presented themselves. It can be that the masculinity expressed by the prisoners' cultivation of their own bodies is interpreted by Karen as selfishness, and that this selfishness is viewed as a sign of narcissism that is perceived as negative (Klein, 1993: 218). Such a narcissism can also be an expression of autoeroticism (Aycock, 1992: 346), and it may be that Karen finds this kind of egocentric expression of masculinity unappealing and even repulsive (see above about the grotesque body), especially if it is exhibited by a "rapist". The prisoner's expression of narcissism can be interpreted as an "abnormality" that Karen seems to mean does not serve a social educational purpose. Selfishness in itself is not criminalised, but when the expression of selfishness is connected to "abnormalities" it is looked upon as fortifying the construction of "the criminal".

The "normalising" sport activities

While Karen seems to be of the opinion that weight training can develop and fortify "abnormalities" in the prisoners, she seems to view other sports activities as having a "normalising" effect on the prisoners. She claims that because they have to function as a team, football teaches the prisoners how to play together and to show consideration for each other. When Karen refers to football as teaching the prisoners to make allowance for each other, she seems to refer to knowledge. Originally team sports became the basis for moral training and were valued partly as a mean to learn loyalty and obedience (Messner, 1992: 10). A general notion within the psychology of teaching and group-psychology is that working together in groups promotes learning of social skills and fellowship (see among others Cartwright & Zander, 1953). However, as stated by the Norwegian National Parliamentary Report number 27 (1997-98) "Om Kriminalomsorgen" (Justisdepartementet, 1998: 71), one has to assume that the team sports change the offenders' attitudes and behaviour, even if this effect cannot be documented in a satisfactory way. When it comes to team sports, the work done by the coach in relation to getting the team to function, is most likely the factor of importance in learning social skills and fellowship. The play in itself is not likely to promote these effects (Kjørmo, personal communication, November 2000). Since the football team at Polar Prison did not have a coach, the prisoners would probably not learn social skills and fellowship from playing football. When Karen states that mentally ill prisoners should be practising endurance rather than strength training, she seems to refer to knowledge within discourses concerning

health. However, research projects at “Modum bads nervesanatorium” show that the psychological effects of physical exercise were not dependent on enhanced aerobic capacity. The same psychological effects were obtained independent of what kind of physical exercise that was carried out (Martinsen, 1998: 57). According to Martinsen (ibid), these results are in accordance with other studies, both national and international studies.

Karen’s recommendations of what sports activities the prisoners ought to practise can be interpreted within the disciplinary discourse in the prison. Her overall aim with the prisoners’ practice of sport activities seems to be to make the prisoners “normal” and lead them to expressing socially acceptable forms of masculinities. However, as the above discussion shows, one cannot conclude from our limited scientific knowledge that playing football does “normalise” the prisoners by teaching them to show consideration for each other, and neither does endurance training have a more “normalising” effect on mentally ill prisoners than strength training.

The docile bodies

Karen’s preference for football, and her belief in that playing football make the prisoners’ show consideration for each other, can also be interpreted as an instrument to control the prisoners. Her preference for endurance training can also be due to her wanting mentally stable prisoners because they are easier to control than the mentally ill prisoners. However, promotion of activities that are supposed to make the prisoners docile and to express socially acceptable forms of masculinities does not seem to be very intentional at Polar Prison. This is supported by the statement from Karen that the prisoners have to do something while imprisoned, and that exercising with weights is better than nothing. Didrik says that if the inmates were denied practising weight training, there would be a lot of frustrations and unused energy among them, possible leading to unsafe situations in the prison. Furthermore Didrik says that the largest and strongest prisoners are also the calmest prisoners which can be interpreted as that the officers would have difficulties handling the prisoners if they were denied weight training.

Historically, it is a well-known phenomenon that ruling groups have shaped and utilised sport to maintain control (Messner, 1992: 10) To use weight training as well as other sports activities in prison for this purpose is mentioned by several social researchers also in the

context of prison studies. Sabo (1994: 169) says: “(F)or prison officials, inmates’ involvement in sport and exercise helps make them more tractable”. Carrabine & Longhurst (1998: 168) says that it is “fairly clear that PE¹ as a form of masculine activity is implicated in strategies of management discourse to be mobilised in the maintenance of control in the male prison ..” Carrabine & Longhurst (1998: 166, with reference to HM Chief Inspector of Prisons for Scotland, 1988) also say that it is a “common(ly) held view among prison staff that the provision of PE is a positive element to the regime and often helps to relieve tension and frustration among inmates ”

When interpreting Didrik’s utterance about weight training, it is useful to focus again on the body. When Didrik uses the phrase “unused energy”, he seems to mean that if the prisoners were not allowed to exercise, a lot of energy would be accumulated in their bodies. The prisoners would become restless, and this accumulation of energy has to be physically “released” in one way or another. If not by physical exercise, the prisoner would perhaps find other physical expressions to release this energy, for example, fighting. Within sport sociology and psychology, this redemption of energy is mostly understood in two different ways. The first one is called the *catharsis theory* and states that there is a naturally aggressive human essence. It is based on a Freudian human instinct theory (Coacley, 1999: 181), and claims that because of the death instinct, destructive energy is built up in a person’s psyche. The only way of controlling this is to release it safely through an aggressive expressive activity (see among others Lorenz, 1966; Moore, 1966). Within the second theory, Coacley (1999: 183) says the frustration frequently results in aggression. Didrik, in his story above, connects unused energy to frustration. Since frustration is *released* through sport, people become less aggressive when they practise sport. Today a more common view is that this redemption of energy is a socially constructed and learned behaviour (Messner, 1990: 203). There is no evidence that sport releases people’s frustration, and Coacley (1999: 183-185) thinks that the reason why people feel a release of frustrations by practising vigorous physical exercise is assumable because the exercise involves intense concentration and often produces physical exhaustion.

*

¹ PE means physical education

The important aspect for Didrik seems to be that the weight training disciplines the prisoners into displaying docile bodies while imprisoned, which means that the prisoners express an institutional acceptable masculinity. Karen also realises that weight training can make the prisoners to exhibit an institutionally acceptable masculinity. However, since she also thinks that weight training makes “rapists” or “assailants” exhibit a socially unacceptable form of masculinity, the weight training seems to be a dilemma for Karen. The weight training is not a dilemma for Didrik since he does not interpret a prisoner’s hypermuscular body as expressing a socially unacceptable masculinity.

The control of the prisoners

None of the prison officers mentioned directly that they were against weight training for the prisoners because they found the prisoners large muscular bodies threatening to the maintenance of the control. However, in the data material there are indications of an understanding of the prisoners’ weight training and hypermuscular bodies as representing a threat to the maintenance of control over the prisoners. As one of the respondents among the male officers said:

“Of course, the signals affect me too, a large man who has committed serious crimes, like violence and such things, and the respect, the respect because of fear, and here I do not talk about positive respect, but respect gained by fear; that fear affects anyone, really.”

For example, the official reason by the management to remove the free weights in the weight training room in the restrictive wing was that they could be used as weapons. During the fieldwork, however, the prisoners showed me how some of the remaining equipment could be used as weapons. Nevertheless, since the weight training apparatuses that replaced the free weights prevents the prisoners from very heavy lifting, this removal can also be interpreted as a way of preventing the prisoners in this wing from becoming very large and muscular. Let us hear what Lars says about this:

You do remember what happened here when they removed the free weights; that was not a particularly popular decision. Now you cannot increase anymore. The possibilities to do some exercises have disappeared, and the training doesn’t give you that much anymore. It’s a machine there though, so you can maintain your strength, and keep a certain physical shape.

But, with the equipment that was here before, you could increase. Most of the lads are pissed off because of this. And, the argument that was used then, in a way that when you are in the restrictive wing, then you are so dangerous that you cannot use free weights. But, when you are in the contract wing then you are harmless. And that's just bullshit you know, I mean, it's the same lads that move back and forth between the restrictive and the contract wing. And they said that there have been some episodes with the free weights, but the lads say that nothing has ever happened, and some officers have confirmed this also. So, nobody knows the real reason for why the free weights were removed.

One can only speculate on what the “real” reason for removing the free weights were. It may be the fear that the weights could be used as weapons was the “real” reason, but the reason for the removal could also be to prevent the prisoners from expressing masculinity that fortifies the construction of “the criminal”. One safe profit of removing the free weights may be to prevent the prisoners from constructing a large body, which, as stated earlier, traditionally has been “the sign” of the exhibiting of authoritarianism in male prisons. This speculation finds support in the theory concerning authoritarianism, see page 76, where Connell (1987: 109) says that the hierarchisation between men is due to the denial of authority to some groups of men, and the successful claim to authority to men who exhibit the hegemonic masculinity. The masculinity which the prisoners express by creating a hypermuscular body through weight training, can be interpreted as a challenge to the hegemonic macho masculinity in the prison displayed by some of the male prison officers. In this way the prisoners’ hypermuscular bodies are interpreted as expressing an unacceptable institutional masculinity. Several of the respondents, both prison officers and prisoners, often described the masculinity expressed by the weight training prisoners, as macho. To eliminate or reduce the challenge of the hegemonic macho masculinity displayed by some of the male prison officers and the management, the staff tried to discipline the prisoners to not create hypermuscular bodies. Carrabine & Longhurst (1998: 168) in their article about masculinities and prison management say:

“The regime seeks to use PE to structure the management of prisons and prisoners. However, ..., this emphasis allows the prisoner a place to develop an excessive body and masculinity

which itself represents a challenge to the dominant masculinity of disciplined male² minds and bodies.”

Removing weights is one way to prevent the construction of hypermuscular bodies; limiting the time available for the prisoners to practice weight training is another. However, this can also be obtained by influencing the prisoners to not create hypermuscular bodies by telling them “the truth” - that it is much better for them to combine weight training with endurance training. It can also be obtained by stimulating and encouraging them to practice other kinds of sport, such as running and football. As one of the male prison officers said:

“I mean, I may pretend to know something about sport and training, and then I tell them that it is important to have endurance, too, and perhaps run a bit because then you will build your body in another way and perhaps even lift more, and then with words try to subdue the weight training.”

*

In this chapter we have seen that the construction of “the criminal”, in particular “the rapist”, is not only about personifying the expression of masculinity in the commitment of the crime³ a prisoner is convicted of through the process of objectification, but also how features about a prisoner are interpreted as “abnormalities”, and taken into consideration in the construction of “the criminal”. The disciplining of the prisoner to docility, by “normalising” means in order to make him controllable in the prison and function as a “law-abiding person” outside in the society, was presented somewhat negatively. However, this was done in order to visualise how the disciplinary power works in prison, and how it focus on issues which are unrelated to the criminal act, but related to the prisoners behaviour, in particular their practice of weight training and important in the construction of “the criminal”.

² The disciplined males in this quotation are the male prison officers.

³ A prisoner can be convicted of several crimes, especially those who are convicted of crimes related to drug abuse. These prisoners are often convicted of use of drugs, stealing, etc.

Chapter nine

The Creation and Re-creation of the Self and the Resistance

The second research question in this study is *what do the sports activities mean for the prisoners' creation and re-creation of themselves as gendered subjects?* The discussion of this question implies a shift of focus from the process of objectification of the prisoners to the process of subjectification where the prisoner is subjugated himself; the prisoner disciplines himself to make himself into the subject he wants to be. As previously stated, the process of objectification and the process of subjectification cannot be separated, and the process of objectification is decisive for the process of subjectification. Therefore, a prisoner's identity is the result of disciplinary mechanisms of normalisation and individualisation. For the prisoner, however, a central object to his resistance is to reject the identity imposed on him by the disciplinary power and to break through the limits this represents.

According to McNay (1992: 71), implicit in Foucault's understanding of the self, there is an understanding of gender as an active and continual process of creation (or enculturation) which is never finished. This implies that individuals, even if they are imprisoned, are in an active process where they create gender. Connell (1995: 114) says: "(A)n active process of grappling with a situation, and constructing ways of living it, is central to the making of gender". Central to a prisoner's creation of himself as a gendered subject therefore, are the ways he grapples with the situation of being imprisoned and constructs ways of living in prison. Because there are so few discourses available in prison, and because a prisoner can only "use the discourses with which he is armed" (Foucault, 1988: 35) (see also page 38), the prisoner has a limited number of ways of creating and re-creating himself as a gendered subject. At Polar Prison, the most common discourses used by men outside prison to construct (hegemonic) masculinity are not available or limited, such as having a working career, being a father or being successful in adult heterosexual relationships (Connell, 1983: 22-26). As mentioned earlier, success in sport obtained either by achieving results and/or by developing a strong and muscular body, is also an example of a common discourse whereby men construct masculinity. This discourse is available to some prisoners for their creation and re-creation of

themselves as subjects. For other prisoners who do not practice sport for whatever reason, this discourse is unavailable.

Similar to the previous three chapters, where the data-material used to answer the first research question was discussed, this chapter is arranged in relation to themes important in order to answer the research question. These themes are sometimes used as headings of the subchapters also in this chapter. It is almost impossible to separate the exercise of power used by the prisoners to create and re-create themselves as the subjects they want to be, and the exercise of power used by the prisoners to resist the disciplinary power. Nevertheless, the first part of this chapter emphasises the creation of subjectivity, whereas the last part emphasises the resistance.

The silenced masculinity

According to Sabo (2000), there is a silence around gender and prison masculinities, partly because prisoners seldom talk about it. The data material in this study supports Sabo's (ibid) observation, and one reason why prisoners seldom discuss masculinity and gender is that few of them seem to have a conscious relationship to the concept of masculinity or to themselves as gendered men. This consciousness seems to be lacking even if the creation of themselves as subjects in the prison was discussed, in particular in the interviews. The prisoners were apparently more comfortable discussing femininity, which they try to avoid in the constitution of themselves as subjects. For example, one prisoner whose work was to knit sweaters, did not want me to tell the other prisoners because he did not want them to know that he was doing such a "feminine thing". Likewise when discussing gender, which seemingly was easier for the prisoners to speak about than masculinity, they mostly spoke about gender in relation to women. A reason for this may be, as previously mentioned, that gender traditionally is linked to women. Sometimes the word masculinity and being a man was introduced during the interviews of some of the prisoners in order to explore how they related to these matters. When the concept of masculinity was introduced, however, they did not always know what to say. One of the prisoners was asked how he got confirmation of himself as a man in prison, and he answered characteristically, "ehh, I don't know. ... You don't think so much about it, you ... I don't think we think so much about it".

Nevertheless, some of the prisoners related masculinity to the body because they associated masculinity to muscles. One prisoner, for example, claimed that he was not masculine, because he did not exercise. He read a lot of books and considered himself an intellectual. I tried to tell him that being intellectual also was a way of being masculine, but he did not agree and made it quite clear that he was not masculine. McNay (1992: 17) says: “(I)n many respects, masculine characteristics can be seen to be related to dominant perceptions of the male body, i.e. firmness, aggression, strength”. Sport in this perspective is important, and as previously stated, muscular bodies are “read” as masculine bodies. The prisoners’ connection of masculinity to the body is therefore understandable, especially if one take into consideration that sport is perhaps the only “common” discourse for constructing masculinity that exists in the prison. However, most of the prisoners spoke about bodies, muscles, weight training and sport in relation to other discourses than constructing gender.

The general impression from the fieldwork and the interviews with the prisoners is that they took the gendered dimension for granted in the creation and re-creation of themselves as subjects. To them this seemed to be something which just existed, and which was very difficult to discuss or express in words. Apparently the prisoners do not have any discourse for how they construct gender, except for some when they talked about bodies, muscles and weight training. The stories of the prisoners therefore, in this chapter represented by the stories of Lars, Tom and Atle, reflect the prisoners’ non-including dimension of gender in the creation and re-creation of themselves as subjects. As previously mentioned, embedded in Foucault’s notion about the creation of the self, the individual is conscious and uses self-knowledge in the creation and re-creation of himself as a subject. Because the prisoners were little aware of the gendered dimension in the process of subjectification, it is the analyses of the prisoners’ stories by the use of theory that makes the prisoners into gendered subjects. In this way, the prisoners are exposed to objectification. Researchers always carry out objectification when they interpret and analyse data-material, and this is particularly important to keep in mind as the process of subjectification now will be discussed.

A matter of being “a criminal”

Lars:

I know that people think of me as a criminal, and that what I have done is criminal. I can’t look upon myself as a real criminal though. I didn’t want to do what I did. What I have done

is very serious, but still, it was something that happened when I was drunk. That's no excuse, but .. I don't feel less worthy because I have been in prison, but I feel less worthy because of the things I'm imprisoned for.

Tom:

I feel like a worse human being because I have done what I have done. But I don't go around and think of myself as a worse human being all the time. I regret what I have done very much, and I can't understand I could have done such a thing. I don't think I'm the same person now as the one who committed the crime. I have been a criminal, but I think I don't look upon myself as a criminal anymore. .. I don't feel like a worse human being because I have been in prison, but I know that when you have been in prison, people will look at you in a particular way. But I don't find it strange, that is because of the way prisoners are presented to people influences people when they make up their own opinion of prisoners. And, when just one side is focused upon all the time, I can understand it in a way.

Atle:

I have been a criminal all my life, and for periods I have lived off committing crimes for survival. So, I perhaps have shaky morals when it comes to that point. But I have never directly hurt anybody, which has been one of the excuses for my own conscience in a way in order to keep it going. But, I don't feel like a worse human being because I have committed crimes and been in prison.

When Lars says that he is aware of “people” thinking of him as a “criminal” and when Tom says he understands “people’s” opinion of him as a prisoner, they refer to the disciplinary discourse’s construction of “the criminal” as defect and dangerous, that is, as deviant from the “normal”. They are aware of that people react towards them as deviants and towards the values embedded in them by the disciplinary discourse. As Corey (1996: 65) says, “(D)iscourse foregrounds the criminal’s character”. Neither Lars nor Tom consider themselves “criminals”, and thereby they do not personify the criminal act they have committed. They disassociate themselves from what they have done and the masculinity they expressed when committing the criminal act(s) they are convicted of. Therefore they do not incorporate this expression of masculinity in the creation and re-creation of themselves as subjects.

However, some prisoners, such as Atle, do construct themselves as subjects within the discourses that construct “the criminal”. Atle says he has been a “criminal” all his life, and Tom says that he has been a “criminal”. Prisoners who consider themselves as “criminals” do in fact incorporate the masculinity they express when they committed the criminal act(s) they are convicted of, in the creation and re-creation of themselves as subjects. From the interviews it seems that most of the prisoners distinguish sharply between being a “criminal” and not being a “criminal”. For them, a “criminal” is a person living off committing crimes, or a person breaking the law over and over again, likely to continue committing crimes after the release. They consider a prisoner as not “criminal” if he is imprisoned for committing a criminal act without the intention of committing new crimes after the release.

Even if Lars and Tom do not create themselves within the disciplinary discourse which constructs “the criminal person”, they are not totally unaffected by this discourse. They are both influenced by the moral condemnation embedded in this discourse, and they constitute themselves as less worthy human beings because of what they have done. By the constitution of themselves as less worthy subjects, they find their place in the social hierarchy not only in the prison, but also in the rest of the society. Atle on the other hand is not affected by this discourse although he admits to have somewhat “shaky” morals at this point.

From the stories above, we read that neither Lars, Tom nor Atle create themselves as less worthy subjects because of their imprisonment, which seems to be a general notion among the prisoners in this study. There may be many reasons for this, but one prisoner said that while some prisoners experience imprisonment as a grievous injustice, other prisoners look upon the imprisonment as a chance to pay for something wrong they have done. However, the concept “prisoner” gives connotations of coercion and victimisation. The notion “prisoner” more than the notion “inmate” is a label used for a person imprisoned against his will. One of the prisoners, for example, said that the label prisoner gives more status than the label inmate does, and that most prisoners prefer to be addressed as prisoners. This means that being a prisoner is part of their constitution of themselves as subjects¹.

¹ Because the prisoners preferred to be referred to as prisoners, the notion “prisoner” will be used in this thesis.

Why exercise?

Lars (is practising weight training):

I lift iron and the reason why I started, well, I suppose there was little else to do. I mean, we have to do something. And you don't have, well, you also train to have a challenge. When you lift, it is a bloody good "high" when you see you can increase and lift more and more. I mean it isn't much that gives you a "high" in prison. It gives you self-confidence, and it makes you like yourself.

Tom (is running² in the yard and is playing football):

I have at all times made an effort to try to think and take responsibility for my own life when I can. Sure you can exist all right in here by doing as you are told to do, and hand everything over to the officers. I experienced that when I was in custody. It was very easy to just get up, eat, you didn't have to think about that you have to get up or decide when to get up. .. But I think if you are going to manage after release, you have to hold on to the things you can hold on to. Exercising then is a good way to take control of your life and over your own well-being. It gives a peculiar form of self-worth, and it's no doubt that it gives better self-esteem. First of all you see the results, you only have to look at the watch when you run, and when you see you are making progress, it gives you tremendous satisfaction. And ehh .. you, you feel, yes, it's meaningless to put into words because it influences something more than you are able to touch and feel. And, when it's stormy and the rain is pouring down, you don't want to go out but you do it anyhow, and you see that you are up to standard, and you are satisfied with yourself because you have won over yourself. And, after you have played a football-match, you are so tired that you hardly manage to bend over and your body hurts. Then you feel real good; you just slide into your bed and stay there. And in the evening you fall asleep at once and all your problems just disappear. That's recommended instead of all the medications that they give people here.

Atle (is practising weight training and is running in the yard. He is also playing football, which we will see later):

When I came in this time, I was very worn out as a human being because of drug abuse and the mental pressure which came to me when I realised I would have to spend years in prison and that everything would be destroyed – family relations and so on. My thoughts then were:

² Running in this thesis is perhaps better understood as jogging, but running was the concept the prisoners used.

'if I don't begin to exercise, I won't be able to manage these years in prison'. So, I said to myself: 'now you're going to start to train', and I was hard on myself, I have to say that. In the beginning it was like hell, but after a couple of months it started to be all right. I started to sleep instead of lying awake the whole night and thinking and getting worried, and I got a good feeling of well-being. Then it started to be fun, and I began to compete with myself. And then, it went in rapid succession. I started to run, I stopped smoking, and I noticed it became easier to run. And when you exercise with weights and notice you get resistance, and you discover that you actually have some forces you can use, what a good feeling it is when you just barely get the weight up! Then you are so exhausted that you can't take anymore, but you feel you have done a good job, and you get a great satisfaction by feeling that you have actually achieved something. But, to work out doesn't help me to forget. It rather makes me able to handle matters I find very difficult.

Irrespective if the prisoners considered themselves as “criminals” or not, a general feature in the data-material is that the prisoners' practice of sport is related to the fact that they are prisoners. Sabo (1994: 166) says that “(B)eing in prison is a constant colossal reminder of personal failure”. For Lars, Tom and Atle, physical exercise seems to be a means to do masculinities related to overcoming personal failures, and to create an re-create themselves as men with self-confidence, self-esteem, etc. Except for Tom, they do not seem to use physical exercise with the objective to construct socially acceptable masculinities. Tom actually tries to use the exercise of sport with the purpose of creating himself within a discourse where he is constructing a socially acceptable masculinity. In his statement *'if you are going to manage after release you have to hold on to the things you can hold on to'*, he is trying to take responsibility for his own life, something he has to do when he is released. This statement does not reflect a social educational effect, but rather a personal educational effect.

In spite of different views of the exercise of sport, Karen (see pages 95-96) and Lars agree upon the importance of the sport activities as means to activate the prisoners. According to Sabo (1994: 164), the sport activities can act as “a fleeting pastime, a form of physical play, something to do to get to the end of another day”. Lars, Tom and Atle agree that by practising sport they find possibilities to escape from the control and restraint of the disciplinary power. As Sabo (1994: 169) says,“(F)or inmates, sports and exercise are vehicles for self-expression and physical freedom ... a source of personal liberation”. Goffman (1961: 189) labelled this phenomenon *secondary adjustments*, which he defined as

“any habitual arrangement by which a member of an organization employs unauthorized means, or obtains unauthorized ends, or both, thus getting around the organization’s assumptions as to what he should do and get and hence what he should be”.

Secondary adjustments represents ways in which the individual stands apart from the self that were taken for granted for him by the institution. As the stories of Lars, Tom and Atle show, the prisoners use the sport activities not as a point of departure in “the criminal person” and as means to cure “abnormalities” and become “normal law-abiding citizens”. In this way the prisoners obtain unauthorised ends because they do not use the sports activities in the way they are supposed to in relation to “being a criminal”.

In a Foucaultian term one can use the word *heterotopia* for this phenomenon (see Foucault, 1986a; 1991b). Heterotopias are “free-spaces” or “those singular spaces to be found in some given social spaces whose functions are different or even opposite of others” (Foucault, 1991b: 252). For Foucault, heterotopias can be “real-existing” places that are absolutely different and act as counter-sites or compensatory sites to those of everyday life. Heterotopias can also be virtual spaces where “I come back towards myself; .. and (to) reconstitute myself where I am” (Foucault, 1986a: 24). In this thesis, the concept heterotopia will be used to describe the exercise of sports as free spaces where the prisoners can escape from the disciplinary power. For prisoners who are totally controlled by the prison authorities, the sports activities can function as heterotopias when they evoke a feeling of liberty and when the prisoners feel they are self-decisive. The sports activities as heterotopias are spaces where the prisoners can take care of themselves and where they can find pleasure, and where they can constitute themselves as the subjects they want to be. According to Wearing (1998: 146), heterotopias can act as sites for “struggle against and resistance to domination of the self and inferiorized subjectivities.” In this and the next subchapter the emphasis will be on sport activities as heterotopias in order to construct subjectivity, while the rest of this chapter will emphasise heterotopias as spaces for resistance.

From Lars, Tom and Atle’s stories we see that even if there were different reasons why they started to work out, it seems that the physical exercise has become a “heterotopia” to all of them, irrespective of what kind of sport activity they practise. A striking feature that can be read from the prisoners’ stories is the love for the physicality in sports, which results in a

feeling of well-being. From Tom's story, it seems that some of the feeling of well-being is even beyond discourse, when he says '*it's meaningless to put into words because it influences something more than you are able to touch and feel*'. The feeling of well-being is a well-documented effect of practising sport (for example, see Moses, Steptoe, Mathews & Edwards, 1989; Sørensen, 1997). For the prisoners, it seems that this feeling is related to the disciplining of their bodies to achievement or mastery. To see results by lifting heavy weights, perhaps heavier than ever before, to conquer oneself and go out to have a run in stormy and rainy weather, to run a specific distance faster and faster, and to manage to play a whole football match and get very tired, can be interpreted as symbols of self control. Gillett & White (1992: 366) say: "in a sociocultural context where a general sense of control is threatened, it is reasonable to expect that symbols of self-control would gain heightened significance". For a prisoner, therefore, over whom the prison authorities have taken almost total control, the significance of symbols for self-control seems to become important. The reason for this may be that they function as proof to the prisoner of being in control of his own construction of subjectivity. A quotation from one of the prisoners supports this: "(T)he prison can regulate when you work out, but not that you work out. They can, for example, never forbid me to run in the prison yard; there I'm my own master". All the above mentioned symbols of self-control are related to the prisoner's body and to what his body can achieve. At the same time, by centring his self-control on the body, a prisoner is also centring his construction of subjectivity on his body. As Sabo (1994: 166) says, "(A) regular fitness regimen helps a man center his identity in the undeniably tangible locus of the body."

When prisoners like Lars, Tom and Atle centre their construction of subjectivity on their bodies, they evaluate their bodies based on what they can achieve, and by this, the prisoners produce *self-knowledge*. According to the stories above, this self-knowledge is empowering and the power is expressed through the symbols of self-control. This makes the prisoners' exercise of sport a *truth game*, which Foucault (1988: 18) defines as "specific techniques that human beings use to understand themselves". Gillett & White (1992: 361) discuss Foucault's notion of truth games in relation to bodybuilding and says, "(O)ne of the central truths realized by bodybuilders is this construction and continual re-construction of a masculine or hypermasculine identity". For Lars the truth is the strong man; for Tom, the enduring man; and for Atle, the strong and enduring man.

According to Foucault (1988: 19-23), the truth games of knowing oneself have historically replaced the truth game of the care of the self where one occupies oneself with oneself, but Foucault (ibid) also says that these two truth games are closely related. Lars, Tom and Atle's construction of their bodies for achievements can also be read as cultivation of their bodies in an attempt to take the best possible care of themselves while they are in prison. The health effects that both Tom and Atle mention in relation to the practise of sports, such as sleeping well without using sleeping pills, stopping smoking and ability to handle difficult matters, can perhaps more easily be understood as caring for themselves rather than knowing themselves. The care of themselves, in particular the care of themselves expressed by those prisoners who lift weights, was spoken of as egoism by e.g. the female officers represented in Karen's story pages 95-96, and interpreted as narcissism. According to Klein (1993: 209-219), the narcissistic elements in a bodybuilding subculture play a therapeutic role because they serve to elevate the self-esteem and enable the bodybuilders to develop a more secure sense of their self. Comparing this to the stories of Lars and Atle who train weights, it may be a touch of narcissism we see in the well-being that they feel.

As stated earlier, sport achievements by means of bodily performances can be interpreted as expressions of masculinity (Connell, 1995: 54). It can be reasoned that within discourses of sport the prisoners create and re-create themselves as gendered subjects. This construction and expression of various desired forms of masculinities are crucial for the embodiment of power, which the prisoners feel as self-confidence, self-worth, self-esteem and self-satisfaction. It seems that this embodiment of power makes it easier for the prisoners to manage the imprisonment.

So far in this chapter we have mainly discussed the prisoners' embodiment of power in relation to their bodily performances in sports. In relation to the practice of sport activities for the construction of themselves as subjects, however, the data material shows that the prisoners were also concerned about the construction of a fit body or the construction of a fit and muscular body.

The body and hegemonic masculinity

Lars:

It's easy to put on weight in prison. You don't move so much, that's one thing. Another thing is that it is so easy to continue to eat even if you are full. Especially when you are locked up for the night, eating gives you a kind of comfort. It seems that eating is a substitute for other things in here. You see, it's so easy to feel sorry for yourself in prison. But self-pity is the biggest enemy you have in prison because if you start to feel sorry for yourself, then you have lost. Then you don't have the energy to do anything and you're really off the rails .. However, I have become more aware of what I eat after I started to train. I get some tips from other prisoners about how to eat correctly, and now I eat pasta, tuna and such things and avoid eating fat. There are people in here who have made eating almost a science. I listen mostly to what they say, but you notice that eating correctly give results, you do that. For example, when you have a fit body and look at yourself in the mirror, you look better with a fit body than when your stomach is hanging over your waistband. Then you feel you can be attractive for women too. I think a part of this also matters. And, I believe it doesn't hurt with a little vanity.

Tom:

I don't want to become fat. I'm afraid of that. Getting a big stomach, oh no! I don't think you look nice when you are sluggish and such things. I wouldn't have liked myself very much if my body had been sluggish. But I guess I'm lucky because I can eat almost anything without putting on weight. If I would be fat, I surely would have been more aware. Sometimes though, I think I perhaps should have been a little larger, but then I ask myself why? I'm pretty satisfied with my body, and I think that's important, too, because then, at least you don't look upon yourself as worse than the others.

Atle:

I have never been in such a good shape before, and when I look at myself in the mirror, at my body, my face, my muscles, I don't really know exactly what I look at, anyhow, I don't think I look too bad. I'm vain as most people are, and I like being in good shape. But, I would have liked to get rid of some of the flesh around my waist, it isn't that much and it doesn't mean so much either but... Anyhow, I have become more aware of what I'm eating, but I'm very fond of food, and it's difficult to keep your weight in here. But when I eat right I thrive better and it becomes easier to work out; it gives you more pleasure in a way. .. If I would have to stop

working out now, I would have problems, and I would have been dissatisfied with myself. Exercising is the only thing in the prison that gives me the possibility of escaping. Besides, exercising is a pleasure; it's something I wish to do. When I train or run, I forget that I'm in prison and I feel all right.

From the stories above we see that Lars, Tom and Atle not only evaluate their bodies based on what they can achieve; they also evaluate their bodies based on how they look. The judgement of their bodies seems also to be a truth game. Frank (1991: 54-61) discusses dieting in relation to truth games and argues that the truth for a dieting fat man, is the thin man. For Lars, Tom and Atle the truth about their bodies is a fit body, and the truth game is to eat and exercise in order to become fit and not fat (Frank, 1991: 59-61). The exercise of self-control is obvious, in particular in Lars and Atle's stories. Both of them say it is easy to gain weight in prison, and that it is easy to lose control over the eating. Eating to comfort oneself is one thing, but as a prisoner during the fieldwork said, it is very hard to keep the weight because the facility is so compressed. He said he hardly moves in the prison because the workshops, the training room, or wherever he has to go, are just a few steps away. Therefore, it seems that the prisoners represented by Lars and Atle's stories, put a lot of effort into disciplining their bodies to get them to look the way they want, which is not fat, but muscled, toned and fit.

However, the prisoners do not construct their bodies under circumstances of their own choosing (Shilling, 1991: 665). To present one's body in specific ways is a product of dominant discourses concerning what constitutes a desirable self (Whitson, 1990: 27). In the stories above it is striking how similar Lars, Tom and Atle want to present their bodies. It seems that they are influenced by the representation of the body in an overall western consumer culture, and Foucault (1980: 57) argues that "we find a new mode of investment that present itself no longer in the form of control by repression but that of control by stimulation. Get undressed – but be slim, good looking, tanned!" The body ideal that has come to dominate the modern discourses of masculinity is the developed or muscular body (Petersen, 1998: 48, with reference to Dutton, 1995), and it is seems that it is within these discourses Lars, Tom and Atle by stimulating control make investments in their bodies in order to constitute a desirable self. The investment that the prisoners make by physically exercising combined with a diet regime in order to construct their bodies as strong and/or enduring can be viewed as a kind of physical capital (Shilling, 1991: 655-658). Shilling (ibid) refers to Bordieu and claims that the production of physical capital is an expression of

class locations. According to Bourdieu (1978: 838; 1984: 212-213), the working class has a instrumental orientation to the body, where the body is a *means to an end*, and in relation to sport, this implies that the body is primarily a means for the experience of joy. The dominant classes, Bourdieu (ibid) argues, tend to treat the body as an *end in itself* where, for example, health and the presentation towards others are important.

Because of the strong relation between low social class and imprisonment (see page 99), it is reasonable to assume that the prisoners in this study are mostly working class males. From the data-material it seems that even if the prisoners to some degree are concerned about how they present their bodies towards others, the prisoners mostly have an instrumental relation to their bodies (see also last sub-chapter). Besides using their bodies to experience self-worth and self-confidence, the data-material shows that the prisoners also seem to value the strength, endurance, a degree of insensitivity, and toughness, which according to Connell (1995: 55) are important for the working class males' heavy manual work. It seems that strength, measured by how much one takes in "the bench", was the most valued bodily criteria among the prisoners. As one of the prisoners said: "(Y)ou admire someone that lifts 140 - 160 kilos on "the bench". Not that you kneel for him, but that's something, you know". The embodiment of a working class physical capital seems to constitute the *hegemonic masculinity* among the prisoners, where the expressions of strength, endurance, a degree of insensitivity, toughness and hardness seem to be important. Apparently, this form of masculinity is the same as the macho masculinity that is the hegemonic masculinity among the prison officers.

Together with the time and personal investment required to construct a physically well-developed and fit body, a fit body can also act as a symbolic capital within social relations (Bourdieu, 1978: 833-840; Shilling, 1991: 654; Gillett & White, 1992: 363). According to Lars, eating gives a kind of comfort, and gaining weight in prison is easy. It seems therefore, to be difficult to construct a physically well-developed and fit body and to express hegemonic masculinity. In order to construct hegemonic masculinity, the prisoner has to resist the self-pity and discipline himself to follow a diet regime and to keep up with a regular fitness-regime. In a prison this can be viewed as a symbolic capital because this masculinity expresses self-control by implying that the prisoner is able stand up with and master the imprisonment. According to Tom, keeping fit can also be viewed as symbolic capital since satisfaction with his body makes him regard himself as not '*worse than the others*'. In this

way the body seems to become a commodity, presented to others and to one's self as an indication of both self-worth and hegemonic masculinity.

From the stories above, it seems that self-worthiness is also related to experiences and feelings the prisoners have of their bodies. For Lars this is a heterosexual feeling of being attractive to women. For Tom this is a feeling of satisfaction about his body, while for Atle having a fit body gives him a feeling of thriving and pleasure. Connell (1995: 52-53) says:

“(M)asculine gender is (among other things) a certain feel to the skin, certain muscular shapes and tensions, certain postures and ways of moving, certain possibilities in sex. Bodily experience is often central in memories of our own lives, and thus in our understanding of who and what we are.”

In this quotation there is a clear parallel to Merleau-Ponty and phenomenology, where the body is a subjective experience, and experience is made through the body (Skårderud, 1994: 181, with reference to Merleau-Ponty, 1962). This gives a notion of how important the construction of the body by the practising of sport is for the prisoners' creation of themselves as gendered subjects. The experiences achieved through their bodies by the exercise of sport, such as pleasure and thriving, also seem to be important why the sports activities function as heterotopias for the prisoners. Because a prisoner has to work very hard to discipline his body to become fit and to feel attractive and satisfied, the prisoners bodies function as *cultural elixirs* (Klein, 1993: 189) and vehicles for pleasure and self-expression (Featherstone, 1991: 170)

According to Sabo (1994: 163), “(L)ike men outside the walls, prisoners use sport for creating and maintaining their masculine identities”. From the discussion above, it seems that the masculine identities constructed by men inside the walls do not differ much from those constructed by men outside the walls, especially working-class males. This is illustrated by what Lars and Atle's say about vanity, which seems to exist as much among prisoners as among “free men”. The effort the prisoners put into constructing their bodies within the western culturally dominant discourses about masculinity in order to show that they are “normal” men, can therefore be interpreted to be resistance against the disciplinary discourse that embodies the criminal act and construct them as “criminals”.

So far we have discussed the heterotopical exercise of sport with a main focus on the creation of the self. The confirmation of the sports activities as heterotopias for the creation of the self is clearly confirmed in the last part of Atle's story above. The rest of this chapter, however, emphasises the exercise of sports as heterotopias in relation to resistance.

The resistance

As discussed earlier, historically it is a well-known phenomenon that ruling groups have shaped and utilised sport in order to maintain control. However, throughout history, subordinate groups have used sport to contest this control (Messner, 1992: 10). The data-material shows that in relation to enduring the existence in prison, an important form of resistance in the prisoners' heterotopical exercise of sport is related to how they tried "to sustain sanity in an insane place" (Sabo, 1994: 163). However, first let us focus on some of the strategies the prisoners have found in relation to their existence in the prison:

Lars:

You can't have anything else than contempt for this system, and what they get are prisoners who "brown nose" the system. I have to say that I'm in constant opposition to this system; you feel it's so damned unfair! But, what I have also learned from being in prison is to try to enjoy yourself as best as you can here and now. Even if they base their explanation of us on individual pathology, we have learned to enjoy and just let it go. It's fantastic how you learn to adapt.

Tom:

To be imprisoned is to be declared incapable of managing your own affairs. You move from being an independent individual to be a non-individual, only a number. But honestly, I have to say that I have, while imprisoned, never really meant to be what one normally would label an agitator outside. But I have all the time tried to be myself and take responsibility for my own life in here when I can.

Atle:

Being in prison means that you have to compress the way you live very much. It's hard in the beginning, but after a while you find the little space where you can exist. You have to exercise a lot of self-discipline, and it's hard in the beginning when the compressing starts. But when

you have found your place, and learned to know people, I think it's OK. But, do you know what serving a sentence really is about? No? Well, I'll tell you a story. One day while I was at work, a prison officer came in and asked for my boss. I told him I hadn't seen my boss for a while, and that he wasn't there. But this prison officer didn't believe me and went to have a look. When he came back, I asked him 'why do you ask me when you don't trust me anyway?' He got furious and wrote a report on me. They called me to be investigated about this matter, and after a week I got the message that I was going to spend seven days in isolation³. Little by little you learn how to tackle this, and you develop the strength to take a lot of shit and handle going down and being isolated. But, this does something to you, you know, after a while you demand of yourself that you will stop caring about fighting back and claiming your right to not being stepped on. That's what serving a sentence really is about.

These stories of Lars, Tom and Atle reflect a general notion in the data-material which shows that it is not the juridical-political power regulated by laws and rules that makes the life in prison troublesome for the prisoners. What they struggle with is the disciplinary power, and in particular, the management and the prison officers' "administration" of the disciplinary power by the use of the authoritarian power. According to how the prisoners create and re-create themselves in relation to resisting the disciplinary power, we see from the stories above that the prisoners worked out different strategies. Even if Lars is in opposition to the micro-punishment system, he also chooses to create himself within the disciplinary discourse of objectification that "diagnoses" the prisoners. As long as this gives him joy and advantages in the prison, he does not care. The subject he expresses through this discourse is a subject that the disciplinary discourse tells him that he is, and Lars is amazed how he has learned to adapt to this discourse. Dostoevsky, who spent several years in prison supports this: "(Y)es, mankind is tough! Man is a creature who can get used to anything, and I believe that is the very best way of defining him" (Dostoevsky, 1983: 9).

Atle is also adapting. Even if it costs him a lot, he accepts the punishment because he is experienced, and he knows what is beneficial for him in the long term. By accepting the punishment of his "bad" behaviour however, he makes himself easy to control. One can interpret Atle's story as that Atle creates and re-creates himself as a very subdued subject where he exhibit a subdued masculinity, and the constant inferiority makes him create and re-

³ Solitary confinement up to one month is a form of disciplinary penalty in Norwegian prisons.

create himself as a subject who stops claiming his human worth. According to Atle's story, this seems to be an institutionally acceptable masculinity (see also pages 91-92).

Some people would perhaps label a prisoner like Tom an agitator. Nevertheless he lives in the contract wing and has to behave well. The reason for this could be that Tom manages to construct himself as the subject he wants to be without provoking the staff, and therefore manages to stay clear of the micro-punishment system. Even if the way Tom create and re-create himself most probably means more work for the prison officers, he is likely to behave well in general and construct an acceptable institutional masculinity.

Based on Lars, Tom and Atle's stories, living with the control of the disciplinary power "administered" by the authoritarian power, put the prisoners under mental pressure. From the interviews with the prisoners it seems like the work on their bodies by practising sport acted as a means to handle this physical pressure because they managed to maintain their mental health. As Sabo (1994: 164) says, "sport and fitness activities are a survival strategy, a regimen for maintaining physical and mental health in a hostile, unhealthful place." Therefore, the sports activities are heterotopias for the prisoners also in relation to stay sane during the imprisonment.

The physical in relation to the mental

Lars:

When I began training with weights, my mental state improved. I feel calmer in a way. I know for example that I can do 4-5 repetitions with 110 kilos on "the bench". And then I think: 'they can just come at me because I'm stronger than most of them'. You think perhaps that you are safer even if you don't want to use violence. You feel if you would be attacked, you could be able to defend yourself. It may have something to do with this. .. And when I physically exercise I can handle more adversity, and that makes it easier to serve the sentence. You see, training gives you the possibility of getting rid of a lot of frustrations and negative thoughts. You can burn this shit off, and that's good for your mental state, you know.

Tom:

When I came here I saw so many frightening examples that I had no choice but to start exercising. There were so many overweight, flabby, sluggish and completely uninteresting

people who didn't care about anything, something that I found repulsive. When I speak about flabby and sluggish, I both mean their bodies and their minds. Before I had never thought about how closely the physical and the mental are related, but they are indeed closely connected to each other.

Atle:

I'm sure there would have been pretty serious violence in here if we didn't have the opportunity to exercise. When you feel safe and get rid of the aggression by working out, you don't think about such nonsense. But training with weights and running is different, or they have different effects. When I train weights I get rid of a lot of aggression, and I feel a calmness after I have lifted. But when I run I have this calmness when I sweat in a way. It perhaps has something to do with these masculine things, I don't know. Let's say you normally lift 110 kilos on "the bench", and then you take 120 kilo, and that isn't exactly easy. I mean, you empty yourself of pretty much negative stuff in a way.

According to Sim (1994: 111), psychological violence together with physical violence can be seen as one of the cornerstones of male imprisonment. Sim (ibid) uses the concept "psychological violence" to describe how the staff and management's exercise of power appears to the prisoners. Most likely, the staff and the management at Polar Prison will not agree with Sim. However, the data-material shows that the prisoners agree with Sim. Several prisoners stated that they were under great mental pressure because of the staff and the management's exercise of power. As one of the prisoners put it: "(I)t's like hell being in prison. It is like mental terror. .. Before, I had never taken any medications, but in here I have to use sedatives and sleeping pills. .. Everybody looks upon you as a devil in a way". Besides supporting dominant patterns and ideologies, the psychological and physical violence are utilised within a balance of forces in which there is an everyday contesting of power, according to Sim (ibid). The contesting of power illustrates the play of disciplinary power-resistance that is put into force between the prisoners and the prison officers, as well as between the prisoners and the management. From the stories above, we see that the exercise of sport is an important factor for the prisoners in order to resist the psychological violence that is most likely also caused by the exercise of disciplinary power (see last sub-chapter). According to the stories above, it seems that the prisoners' bodies are the site of the resistance in this "play of power".

The prisoners build resistance by cultivating their bodies. Based on the stories above, it seems that the resistance is expressed by self-control. For Lars and Atle, self-control appears as a feeling of calmness, while for Tom, self-control seems to be a matter of non-decay and being able to take responsibility for his life in prison. According to Crawford (1984: 70), health is a metaphor for self-control, and health is achieved, not given. To Lars and Atle, mental health is something they have to construct and re-construct by removing negative thoughts, frustration and aggression; something they do by weight training and running. Sabo (1994: 164) noticed the same in an American prison and observed that some prisoners took part in physical exercise “to dispel anger and frustration, to get the rage out of their bodies and psyches before it explodes or turns in on them”. According to Crawford (1984: 81), release is the antithesis of discipline, and that there is an escalating common accepted discourse that release is important for achieving health. In this view, the production of negative thoughts, frustration and aggression is released by take part in sport, which makes the prisoners able to handle and resist the “psychological violence” in the prison. As Lars says, physically exercising makes him able to handle more adversity.

It is worth noticing what Atle says about the different forms of release obtained by means of running and weight training. He speculates as to whether the different effects of calmness achieved to running and weight training have something to do with masculinity. Following upon his interpretation, the different calmness he feels may be caused because running and weight training make Atle construct different masculinities. According to the previous discussion concerning hegemonic masculinity among the prisoners, Atle is constructing hegemonic masculinity when he weight-trains which is likely to be more empowering than the masculinity he constructs when he runs. As Connell, 1995: 52-53) (see page 120) says, masculine gender is closely related to bodily experience, and it may be that Atle, when he lifts heavy weights and create and re-create himself in the discourse where he construct hegemonic masculinity, feels the muscles and the power that this construction of masculinity gives him. To Atle it seems that the *feeling of power* is the most important, and it seems to be similar to Lars. However the *look of power* by the display of the muscular and strong body and showing the ability to lift 110-120 kilos in “the bench”, may also be important (Klein, 1993: 250).

It seems that for Tom the symbolic importance of the bodily discipline and health maintenance is important. For him overweight, flabby and sluggish prisoners signalise negligence of themselves. Because of the moral connotation that can be interpreted from

Tom's story, it seems that for Tom, overweight, flabby and sluggish prisoners signalise uselessness. Health for Tom may therefore be interpreted as an issue about morals; a way to express what it is to be a moral person (Crawford, 1984: 70). Sabo (1994: 166) relates a fit healthful body to hardness – a symbol of masculinity. Crawford (1984: 79) says: “(T)he cultural reaction to hard times can take many forms. I am suggesting here that one of them is a hardening of bodies”. From Lars, Tom and Atles' stories in the previous subchapter, serving a sentence at Polar Prison means serving “hard times”. One way to resist and tackle these hard times is to build a hard body that signals masculinity. Crawford (1984: 96) asks “(I)s ‘taking responsibility’ for one’s own body – through ‘health or ‘fitness’ or ‘self-care’ – a political act in itself?” In relation to Lars, Tom and Atles' stories, there is no doubt. By cultivation of their bodies to hardness, they also signalise hardness, and in these signals of hardness an implicit resistance towards the “psychological violence” may be interpreted.

The prison context and the construction of gender

Lars:

I prefer to stay in the restrictive wing because here you can be more yourself. In the contract wing you always have a wagging finger pointed at you that says ‘do this or I will push you down again’. I have been there, but then I “licked their arses” to please the leadership. Now I dare to say what I mean, and I’m not interested in adjusting to the terms the leaders set for advancement anymore.

Tom:

When you first came in you were scared, insecure and all such things. You know, I have never been in prison before. But being here becomes a routine and a habit. Anyhow, I became trusted not long after I came here, and because of that I felt I owed the prison something. It’s like when they are straight with me, I’ll be straight with them. And after all, I feel I have been always treated fair.

Atle:

When I served sentences as a teenager, I was more in opposition in a way. I was young and more idealistic and was searching for justice you could say. I refused to submit and was constantly trying to buck the system. The prison was just as determined to keep the system going, and the result was that I spent ten months in isolation. .. But I don’t position myself like

that anymore. Now I swallow my pride and try to figure out how to live as normally as possible within the limits and rules in force.

Prisoners not adjusting to the terms set for advancement by the staff and the management, serve their sentences in the restrictive wing. The control over the prisoners in the restrictive wing is carried out with a more visible authoritarianism. The exercise of authoritarianism by each prison officer in the restrictive wing is not necessarily different from the authoritarianism exercised by the prison officers in the contract wing. Even so, it seems that many of the tasks and routines carried out by the prison officers in the restrictive wing are more directed towards expressing authoritarianism. For example, two prison officers guarding the weight training in the restrictive wing is a clearer symbol of authoritarianism than one prison officer guarding the weight training in the contract wing. Because authoritarianism is more present in the restrictive wing, it seems that the prisoners' creation and re-creation of themselves as gendered subjects take place within gender stereotypes. This means that there are restricted ways a prisoner in this wing can construct and express himself as a man. Possibly the most important factor is the necessity to express hardness towards the prison system and to demonstrate that one is not somebody the staff and management "can mess with".

In order to handle their existence in the restrictive wing, the prisoners must find ways of create and re-create themselves as gendered subjects within the few discourses available. Using drugs in prison can be one strategy for a prisoner to construct himself as a gendered subject. This is because use of drugs is prohibited, and therefore can be viewed as a socially unacceptable expression of masculinity. In this perspective, drug use can be a strategy to do masculinity and express an opposition to the management and the staff. Another way of doing masculinity in the restrictive wing is to train with weights and build a muscular body. Even if the intention of building a muscular body is not necessarily to express opposition, this kind of masculinity in the restrictive wing may be interpreted as opposition. Such expressions of masculinity by the prisoners can be interpreted as protest masculinity in relation to the prison system, where they use their body to claim a gendered position of power. Connell (1995: 117) says that "(P)rotest masculinity looks like a cul-de-sac". This seems to be the case for Atle, who realised that to be in opposition was not beneficial for him in long terms.

In the contract wing the control over the prisoners is carried out with fewer symbols of authoritarianism. However, the authoritarian power is in play, in particular in the

“administration” of the disciplinary power. The regime in the contract wing is based on sanctions and if prisoners do not adapt to the regime, the most common sanction is transference to the restrictive wing. Tom says he became trusted not long after he came to the prison. The previously discussed general notion of distrust of the prisoners also indicates that in order to serve their sentence in the contract wing, prisoners must deserve to be trusted. This means that prisoners have to prove their good behaviour before they can offer their behaviour in exchange for trust. The way the disciplinary power works is to make the prisoner grateful for the trust shown by the prison officers and the management. Some prisoners serving their sentence in the restrictive wing wanted to serve in the contract wing but they were not transferred because they were not trusted. However, as stated earlier, even “trusted” prisoners in the contract wing have to continuously justify the trust by their behaviour.

The prisoners in the contract wing have more discourses available for constructing themselves as gendered subjects than the prisoners in the restrictive wing. In this wing prisoners may, for example, have a job outside. They leave the prison in the morning and arrive back in the afternoon. The gender stereotypes come into play less in the contract wing possibly because of less focus upon the authoritarian masculinity. Therefore the prisoners in this wing have more possibilities to create and re-create themselves as men. Even though the bodies of the weight-training prisoners in the contract wing can be as muscular as the bodies of the weight-training prisoners in the restrictive wing, they do not directly express protest masculinity in relation to the prison system. This is most likely because the prisoners by serving their sentence in the contract wing, behave well and do not demonstrate their opposition to the prison system.

*

Irrespective of the effort the prisoners put into creating and re-creating themselves as the gendered subjects they want to be, and irrespective how they try to resist the disciplinary power creation and re-creation of them as gendered subjects, they do not succeed completely. According to Steinsholt (1991: 122), identity will be forced on the individuals like a mask they have created themselves.

The mask

Lars:

I'm completely aware that the imprisonment has injured me. I have developed asocial features, and you get, I mean for sure that I also have developed a lot of bad habits; rough language and perhaps .. developed attitudes which are not so good. Yes, I mean you change over time, it is perhaps a strategy for defence or a mask you put on.

Tom:

You have, or you put on a shell. So you can say that you are not yourself, nobody is oneself in prison. They put on a prisoner costume, an invisible prisoner costume. You see this very clearly when, for example, somebody has been on leave. They are different the first days after they come back because they have forgotten their shells. The day after, or after a couple of days, they are back to normal, then it's the ordinary prisoner who's there. You see, all the time these shells are made, and one has to make a lot of effort to come in and knock on the inner part.

Atle:

It's very easy to play a role in the prison, to put on a mask that shows that nothing gets to you. A lot of the prisoners here play tough and hard, and that's a defence for not showing that you are vulnerable. You know, you play the buffoon when you have an inferiority complex. .. And, I think it's the macho ones that serve the hardest sentences. They give an impression of being so tough, they want to show that they can handle everything. They can, for example, never admit they have hard periods. They don't show their thoughts and feelings, but they must have thoughts and feelings too. When you are locked up for the night, I think it's these people who have the worse time because it's then the thoughts and feeling come to you.

Sabo (1994: 165-179) discusses a hardness – softness dichotomy in a male prison, and even if Sabo (ibid) does not use the phrase “mask”, it is easy to see the similarities between Sabo's notion of hardness and the prisoners description of a mask, a shell or playing a role. Sabo (1994: 168) states further that “(T)he hardness-softness dichotomy echoes and fortifies stereotypes of masculinity and femininity.” According to this, it seems like the prisoners' creation and re-creation of themselves as subjects wearing a mask, is about constructing masculinities that express hardness. However, Sabo (1994: 165) says there are many guises of hardness, which illustrates various ways of expressing masculinities. The construction of

masculinities that express hardness revolve around a male code for acting tough, being prepared to fight, avoiding intimacy, minding one's own business, avoiding feminine behaviours, suffering in silence, never admitting you are afraid, etc. (Newton, 1994: 195-197; DeRosia, 1998: 153-156; Kupers, 1999: 18-22; Sabo, 1999: 7; Sabo, 2000). According to Atle's story above, it seems that hardness is also expressed by construct a macho masculinity organised around the body. According to Sabo (1994: 169), the masculinity the male athlete creates by constructing himself as muscled, aggressive, competitive and emotionally controlled, fits well with the cultural directive for expressing hardness. Sabo (1994: 170) also says that in the male prison's cultural directive for expressing hardness, men's soft sides remains hidden. This fits well with Atle's story where he claims that a lot of prisoners are playing tough and hard with the purpose of hiding their vulnerability and inferiority complexes.

From the data-material, it seems like the prisoners' creation and recreation of themselves as subjects wearing a mask by constructing masculinities in order to express hardness and hide their soft sides, was related to a strategy of handling the imprisonment. According to the previous discussion in this chapter, resistance seems to be embedded in this strategy. From the data-material it can be interpreted that the resistance is directed towards power exercised from three sources – the staff and the management, the self, and other prisoners. While the resistance towards the staff and the management, together with the resistance towards the other prisoners seem to take a form of a fear of *seeming weak*, the resistance towards oneself seems more to take a form of a *fear of being weak* (Klein, 1993. 273). The resistance against the power exercised by the staff and the management has just been discussed, and the embodied hardness exercised in order to resist this power can be looked upon as a mask. The resistance towards the other prisoners will be discussed in the next chapter. When it comes to creating a mask for self-resistance, the data material shows that this was almost like a battle towards oneself for keeping oneself in a condition that makes it possible to cope with the imprisonment. Let us hear what Atle says about this:

In here, you can't sit down and listen to songs like "I can't stop loving you" or look at pictures or read old letters and so on. You have to get rid of all these things, or else it drives you crazy. Everything that has something to do with love, tenderness and closeness – you just have to get rid of it! But to miss a woman; it's not the sex you miss, it's just to lay in the arms of a woman, and not to be alone, something you really are in here – and these are bloody

important matters – makes you long so much that it makes you crazy. But I have become a world champion at not thinking about this. Well, that’s something I call it, it’s a kind of mental weapon. It demands consciousness or practice, and you have to burn yourself a couple of times before you learn it.

Sykes (1958: 97-98) says:

“Shut off from the world of women, the population of prisoners finds itself unable to employ that criterion of maleness which looms so importantly in society at large - namely, the act of heterosexual intercourse itself. Proof of maleness, both for the self and for others, has been shifted to other grounds and the display of “toughness” in the form of masculine mannerism and the demonstration of inward stamina, now becomes the major route to manhood. These are used by the society at large, it is true; but the prison, unlike the society at large, must rely on them exclusively.”

Sykes (ibid) says that the inward stamina is connected to being cut off from having sexual intercourse with women. The data-material, however, here expressed by Atle’s story, shows that it was the issue of feeling alone and not necessarily having the opportunity to be close to a woman in a heterosexual relationship, that made the prisoners feel most powerless irrespective of where they serve their sentence in the prison⁴. The resistance towards oneself in Atle’s story seems to develop techniques for the purpose of suppressing feelings of love, tenderness and closeness to a woman. Loneliness, however, seems to be a common feeling among the prisoners, and the following story told by Tom shows another strategy of resisting loneliness:

I guess I define myself as a very, lonely wolf really. But being a lone wolf is something which I both distance myself from in a way, but which I also call mine. Because one can become pretty cynical, and one can become pretty, yes if not actually hostile to other people, then at least very independent. But then I have also accepted that being independent also means being lonely.. .. But there is also a longing after participating and belonging to a place, and one milieu I have belonged to the entire time while I have been here is the sports-milieu.

⁴ Prisoners in Norway can have sexual intercourse when they have visits because the visits are carried out in separate visiting rooms.

According to the data-material, there seems to be many lone wolves among the prisoners, irrespective of whether they serve their sentence in the contract or the restrictive wing. This is in accordance with Mathiesen (1965: 122) where he found “a surprisingly large number of inmates appeared to live in relative isolation from others”. Being independent and lonely for Tom implies to long to belong to some place. The space Tom has found where he can resist the feeling of loneliness and create himself as a subject belonging to some place is in the sport milieu. Once again we have an example of how sport in different ways functioned as heterotopias for the prisoners, this time in relation to a search for social contact in an unfriendly society.

*

In this chapter we have seen that the exercise of sports functions as heterotopias for the prisoners in order to create and re-create themselves as subjects and to resist the disciplinary power. However, in the last story we have begun slightly to move towards the theme for the next chapter that will deal with the power relations between the prisoners.

Chapter ten

The Power Relations between the Prisoners

This chapter focuses on power relations between the prisoners and is based on Foucault's notion that power exists in every relation. The main subject matter in this chapter is how the exercise of sport influences the power relations and how the exercise of sport is eventually influenced by other factors of importance for the power relations between the prisoners.

The data-material shows that the creation of various masculinities influences every power relation between the prisoners. The exhibition of various masculinities seems almost like a game where a constant negotiation of power exists. Constant negotiation of power by the display of various masculinities seems to constitute a strategic situation between the prisoners. The strategic situation seems to be non-static, and based on the data-material, it always seems to fluctuate, move and quickly change from moment to moment. The data-material shows that the strategic situation is basically non-articulated; for the prisoners it just exists. However, the prisoners were very aware of this situation and it had a notable influence on their life in the prison. Some prisoners managed to articulate how the strategic play between them acts, but mostly the discourses concerning this matter consist of practises. In order to present both the articulated and the non-articulated dimension of the power relations between the prisoners, a fictional group conversation has been made (see also pages 66-67). To ease the presentation of the conversation, it is broken into pieces and given in separate subchapters.

The participants in the group conversation are Lars, Tom and Atle, who have previously been presented. A new fictional prisoner, Kim, also participates. He is serving his sentence in the contract wing and is representing the view of the non-sport-practising prisoners. In addition, I am present in the conversation. Once more it should be emphasised that the statements of the prisoners can be traced back to the interviews. Data-material from the fieldwork is also used in a few places. My statements in the conversation are taken from the interviews or invented and serve the purpose to clarify what the prisoners say and making the conversation flow. The gestures written in parenthesis are given to make the conversation dynamic and "alive". Some

of these gestures, such as “laughs”, can be traced back to the interviews, but most of them are made up.

Power relations between prisoners have been studied before. Both Sykes (1958) and Mathiesen (1965) have focused on solidarity between prisoners. Scraton, Sim & Skidmore (1991) and Sim (1994) have analysed the power relations between male prisoners in relation to masculinity, and they have focused in particular on the use of violence. Sim (1994: 116) suggests more research on the meaning of the body in prison cultures. This chapter’s objective is partly an attempt to respond to this suggestion, and the meaning of the body in the strategic power situation between the prisoners is the main issue in this chapter. The crimes that prisoners are convicted of are another important factor for the power relations between the prisoners, often focused upon in the literature (see e.g. Sim, 1994: 104, and Thurston, 1996: 144). This factor was also an issue when the prisoners in this study reflected on the power relations among the prisoners.

The case

Berit:

Can any of you tell me, is there a kind of hierarchy between the prisoners here at Polar?

Atle:

Ehhm, yes the hierarchy. Ehh, I don’t know, but severe sexual felony followed by murder and things like that, I would say, is the lowest you can get. Then comes sexual misuse of children, and after that rape, which I have a feeling of is one step above.

Lars (jumps in quickly):

You see, rape and sexual abuse of children aren’t accepted at all. It’s these people prisoners label as deviant. That’s because many prisoners have children and girlfriends themselves, and to imagine that they could be subjected to sexual violence .. it’s so.. (he closes his eyes and shakes his head). At the same time, when you are imprisoned you can’t be there and do something if these things happens with your loved ones .. I mean (throws up his arms), you feel so powerless that, that you get frustrated by these prisoners who have abused people sexually.

Atle (waits for a bit, and continues):

.. After these people come abuse, robbery and such things of elderly people, and above that again, ordinary crimes for profit. Then comes different kinds of robberies, and then I suppose it is drug trade on the top really, and then we talk about those who operate with large amounts.

Berit:

What about those convicted of murder then?

Atle:

Well, there are different people who serve sentences for murder. Mostly this is a crime committed once, often in affect, and I experience these people as “nice boys”. But you don’t tease these at any price.

Berit:

Mm, I see, but what about you, Tom?

Tom (silently):

Actually, I don’t care what people have done. I’d rather not know because I mean that doesn’t say anything about the person. I have chosen to relate to people the way they relate to me. Of course, if you want, you always get to know what people are convicted of. You either ask them, or, if they won’t tell, it’s just to call someone who lives in the same area where these prisoners are from. Many of the cases people here are convicted of have been well written about in the newspapers as well, such as mine, and prisoners read newspapers, too, you know.

Kim:

Ehh .. (he looks a bit insecure, but he gathers courage and says) people here talk a lot behind each other’s backs. If you should forget what you are convicted of, in certain situations you are reminded quite quickly, but I can say which situations these are. But the backbiting happens in the cell; ‘have you heard about him? He has done that and that’, and so on.

Lars (jumps in again):

But, I mean several people here don't have self-insight and don't understand what they have done wrong. I don't mean that you should live your life as a regretting sinner, but you have to stand up for what you have done. But these sexual offenders they, they don't see it, you know. And sometimes they are fired up into speaking about what they have done, and sometimes they also "flip out" and are laughed at in a way, you know. For sure, this isn't right, but it's done anyway.

Tom:

Mm, it's accepted that one on the basis of one's strength can assert oneself, but if one tries to assert oneself on the basis of one's weaknesses, then it's poor guy! Then it's easy to be abused, laughed at and neglected by the rest of the prisoners on that landing. ..

In this conversation we see that for the prisoners, it is easy to get to know what other prisoners are convicted of. Atle's ranking of the prisoners based on their convictions seems to agree with the literature where the sex offenders are ranked lowest. To understand the crime's importance for the ranking of the prisoners in relation to masculinity, one possibility is to view different crimes as different expressions of masculinity (Connell, 1993: xii). From the conversation above, it seems that some expressions of masculinity are more accepted than others; some expressions of masculinity are even condemned because they transgress an acceptable limit such as sexual abuse, for expressing masculinity. However, the ranking of these expressions of masculinity in a hierarchy is based on the personification of the crime in the construction of "the criminal", and the data-material shows that the prisoners themselves contributed in the making of "the criminal" in prison. This can be seen from what Lars and Atle say above, where Lars views sexual offenders as deviant, and Atle is careful in relation to those committed murders. Tom, however, does not personify the masculinity expressed when the criminal act was committed and disassociates himself from this hierarchical arrangement.

From the conversation above, it seems that the condemnation of the masculinity personified in prisoners who have committed sexual offences can cause frustration and make some prisoners feel powerless. As Lars says, because he is in prison, he cannot defend his loved ones if they are exposed to this kind of abuse. The feeling of powerlessness expressed by Lars is most likely related to masculinity since a man is expected to defend his family and is not a "real" man if he is unable to defend them. Lars also says that some prisoners convicted of sexual

crimes cannot understand what they have done wrong, and therefore do not stand up for what they have done. This indicates that standing up for what you have done is a way of constructing an acceptable masculinity in prison. According to Lars, some prisoners convicted of sexual crimes do not construct this kind of masculinity. They are ridiculed and do not seem to understand that they are ridiculed, or understand the mechanisms in this play of power. They receive attention when other prisoners laugh of them, but do not understand the malice in this situation, which is to get them to reveal their weaknesses. Revealing weaknesses is not in accordance with the cultural directive of hardness and the display of hegemonic masculinity. According to Platek (1990: 462), "(A) prisoner who fails to observe the norms acquires a special "doubtful" status".

Where to serve one's sentence and being in-between a rack and a hard place

Tom:

.. Many in the restrictive wing think that some of us here in the contract wing have brown-nosed our way up in the system. Especially if you are transferred directly to the contract wing when you arrive at the prison, you are stigmatised as an "arse-licker". If you have worked your way up in the system, you are more respected in a way. But I don't bother, it's about me playing my game, you see?

Lars:

It's all about avoiding the two extreme points. If you get too close to the prison officers it's easy to become a squealer. On the other hand you have the prisoners who are criminally active here in the prison, like some of the drug abusers who have a difficult time in here. They are mentally exhausted and put a lot of pressure on the rest of us.

Atle:

Oh yeah, bringing drugs into the prison is also one way to be accepted; 'I have heroin, take two', this puts the heat on you, you know.

Lars:

Yeah, but anyway, in here, you are on your own. You can't lean on the prison because that's a sign of weakness. And really, you know, when you get down to it, you are on your own, you can't expect to get support from anybody in here.

The difference between the prisoners' construction of gender in the restrictive and in the contract wing has been discussed previously. However, the conversation shows that there is some opposition between the prisoners in the restrictive wing and the prisoners in the contract wing. It seems that conforming too much to the prison system is viewed as a sign of submissiveness, which is embedded in the concept to "brown-nose". Submissiveness to the prison system and the weakness a prisoner, according to Lars, signals when leaning on the prison system does not fit the cultural directive of hardness and expressions of masculinity. The data-material shows, however, that it was the prisoners in the restrictive wing that criticised the prisoners in the contract wing and not vice versa. This may be due to the fact that most of the prisoners in the restrictive wing belong to the top of the hierarchy based on convictions such as drug abusers, etc. Their status is also probably a result of the hardness, and thereby the expression of masculinity they signalise to the staff and management. However, the power they exercise by expressing disrespect to the prisoners in the contract wing seems to be nuanced. For example, according to Tom, the prisoners who strive their way to the contract wing are more respected than those moved to the contract wing upon arrival at the prison. Nevertheless, we must keep in mind that many prisoners move forth and back between the contract and the restrictive wing. Apparently, some prisoners in the contract wing are not affected by the disrespect they are exposed to by the prisoners in the restrictive wing, as Tom says, *'(B)ut I don't bother, it's about me playing my game, you see?'* As discussed earlier, not bothering and minding one's own business can also be interpreted as a sign of hardness and thereby an expression of masculinity. According to Lars, however, in order to manage in prison, one has to find a balance between expressing weakness by leaning on the prison, and hardness by getting involved in criminal affairs in prison.

Friendship and sexuality

Tom: (takes a deep breath):

I have to be extra careful to not hurt anybody by the way I live my life here, I mean, being a "lone wolf". I have to be careful, because if anyone thinks that you get a too large piece of the cake, which means that there's less to them, can raise some aggression and reluctance against you. Nobody has said anything to me, but "The Law of Jante" says 'don't believe you are something or think that you are something special'. And the mentality in "The Law of Jante" has its origin in that people are afraid that something is going to be taken away from

them. But as long as they see that I live my own life, and that I don't take anything away, anything that they feel should have been theirs, things are sorted out. .. The fact is, you see, that we are all here, but nobody wants to be here. All of us are in a damned situation and we try to make the best of it. But this doesn't mean that people get close to each other. You just have superficial relations, you make acquaintances as I call it, just to get the time to pass without other obligations.

Berit (nods):

I see, but how is your relationship with the others then?

Atle:

You see, the way we relate to each other here is to make fun of each other all the time, there are small fights and people are throwing shit at each other the whole time. There is a lot of, I mean, if you say, for example, something wrong, you get dirty comments back all the time. And it's very easy that a conversation in a prison becomes like that because everybody relates to each other in this way.

Kim:

Actually I have some pals on the landing where I am. If I'm a little depressed or something like that, either I pay them a visit or they come over to me, and we always find something to do. We can also talk about problems, or our families or something like that. I don't talk to everybody about these matters, but I have one real good pal here, and I think we are good support for each other.

Tom (quietly):

I can't talk about my private life to other prisoners at all. We just don't talk about these things. If I did, I'm sure I would have been laughed at behind my back. I don't know, but it just, it doesn't work.

Berit:

But, is it acceptable, for example, to give each other a hug?

Lars (laughs, and shakes his head):

Oh no! If I gave another prisoner a friendly warm hug, I would have got a headbut back, and I would have been suspected for having covert intentions. As far as I know it may be that other prisoners are having sexual relations here, but I don't know of anybody.

Atle:

Neither do I, but I've heard talk about it, but I've never witnessed anything. In here, sexuality is about pornography, pin-up pictures of women, jokes and so on. The sexuality is crude and vulgar in a way. And this is typical when men are gathered like this, but really, we all imagine sex as something nice and tender in a way. But sexual abstention over long time together with exaggerated focus on pornography and such things does influence you, and it does something to you which isn't good, I think. Like me, I masturbate a lot more in here than I have sex and masturbate outside. And after the release I have problems with having sexual relationships with women because I'm so used to satisfying myself and just think of myself. When I masturbate, it's something really different than being together with another person where you want to have a good time, and endurance and pleasure is important; it isn't like just do it and then it's over in a way.

Lars:

I mean, really, you don't talk seriously about sexuality with other prisoners. You just don't do that. If you do, then you are gay, there's no doubt about that. Then you are, then you are done, you know.

With reference to Remy (1990), Newton (1994: 196) uses the term fratriarchy to describe a system “based simply on the self-interest of the association of men itself”. According to Newton (ibid), in most forms of fratriarchy unwritten codes are an important element, but these codes vary to suit the particular form the fratriarchy takes. At Polar Prison, one of these codes is apparently “The law of Jante” (Appendix 12). However, no peer-solidarity seems to exist, a feature Mathiesen (1965: 124-136) found in a study of a Norwegian correctional institution. The data-material shows that very few of the prisoners in this study have someone in the prison that they can call friends, they mostly relate to other prisoners as peers, allies or acquaintances in a silent deal saying: “I'll scratch your back and you'll scratch mine”. Therefore, the prisoners send the signal that they mind their own business and do not interfere in others' business, which is quite usual and a common way of expressing hardness and masculinity. The avoidance of intimacy also seems to have another reason. The data-

material indicates that to show friendliness can also be interpreted as weakness, which does not fit the cultural directive of hardness. An important factor in signalling hardness, as discussed before, is to be independent and relate to others only superficially. Nevertheless, a few prisoners have friendships with other prisoners, as one can read from Kim's statement above. Contrary to what could be expected, these prisoners did not seem to be interpreted as weak and it seems that it is possible to have friendships without being regarded as weak. A natural question to ask since peer-solidarity is almost non-existent is whether a fraternity exists between the prisoners at Polar Prison?

The data-material indicates that the resistance against the prison system unifies the prisoners in the restrictive wing, at least to some degree, and makes way for a kind of fraternity¹. This fraternity is frail because prisoners move back and forth between the restrictive and the contract wing. However, the fraternity discussed in male prisons by Newton (1994: 196), also excludes "weaker" men. It seems from the fieldwork that prisoners convicted of sex related crimes mostly serve their sentences in the contract wing. Most likely this is because they are not drug abusers, but also because they are harassed by the other prisoners in the restrictive wing. Even in the contract wing these prisoners are harassed by other prisoners, but the harassment is more hidden, e.g. in the form of backbiting (see Kim's statement page 135). Most likely this is because open harassment is considered as bad behaviour and could lead to transfer to the restrictive wing.

Newton (1994: 196) also says that fraternity in prison is composed of working class masculinities. One of the forces that operates in subordinate masculinities, like those in the lower working class, is aggressive homophobia (Newton *ibid*). This aggressive homophobia is expressed in Lars' last two statements. Homosexual intercourse in male prisons is well documented in the literature and is often described as a superior-subordinate relationship where a prisoner in the subordinate position is looked upon and treated as a woman (see, for example, Sabo, 1994: 166-168; Sim, 1994: 106-107). This also reflects the manifestation of manhood embedded in heterosexual intercourse, which many prisoners are deprived from. None of the respondents in this study, neither prisoners nor prison officers, knew of any homosexual activity in the prison. Some of them though, have heard rumours that it had happened some time ago. In contrast, sexualisation of women is prominent and well

¹ See e.g. Lauesen (1998) for more about solidarity between prisoners subordinated to strict regimes.

illustrated in Atles' last statement. According to Atle, this seems to be a play between men in order to express masculinities that are accepted in a homosocial gathering, but this pornographic sexuality is not what Atle is dreaming of (see also Atle's statement pages 130-131). According to Messner (1992: 96-102), exaggerated exercise of heterosexual power by suppression of women and extensive homophobia in a homosocial gathering provide construction of the acceptable heterosexual masculinity.

Even if exclusion of women is a feature of fratriarchy (Newton, 1994: 196), it seems that women are symbolically present among men in a fratriarchy, at least in the jokes. Lyman (1987: 151) says that humour and joking in men's relationships create a kind of intimacy, and that the humour and jokes generally are aggressive and sexual. Lyman (ibid) also says that joking between men may moderate the latent tension and aggression they are feeling towards each other. Thurston (1996: 146) says that joking is a strategy for negotiating status and policing gender relations within the dominant hierarchies in the prison. According to the conversation above, fratriarchies seem to exist in relation to sexuality and joking both in the restrictive and the contract wing. The discussion of sexualisation of women will be revisited when exploring the power relations between the male prisoners and the female officers.

The importance of the body and the visibility of sport

Berit:

But, what do you talk about, and whom do you mostly talk with?

Lars:

Ehh .. I talk mostly with those I share interests with, like those who practice weight training. I guess we for the most talk about weight training and bodies and such things. How you get good results and so on.

Berit:

What are good results then?

Lars (smiles and laughs a bit):

Oh, that's when you manage to increase you know, both in muscle-size and how much you can take in "the bench". Like, when you meet someone you're not training together with the

day after a good practice, you say like 'yesterday I managed to take so and so many reps at 90 kilo for the first time', and so on. But to tell the others thing like 'yesterday I managed to take a couple of kilos more than him', this kind of bragging is not accepted. Personally I don't need to brag about these things, but the lads ask each other you know, how the practice was yesterday. Actually, you don't have to tell, because the lads talk with each other, and everybody will hear it anyway, and all those who can lift over 100 kilos are talked about. Actually I think the real big lads here envy each other. It's sort of who can take the most then. I really don't know anything about it, but I think some of them don't like that others manage to lift 5 kilos more than them.

Kim:

You know, when these weight training guys meet in the yard and tell each other how much they have lifted, they speak so loudly that everyone a couple of meters around them can hear. If you ask me who lifts 150 kilo here, I know because I've heard. You hear it everywhere! They also talk about each other. If one of them has lifted very much, for example, broken the record and managed to take 175 kilo, and hears that this has been discussed, then you can see how he blows himself up. It's all about how much they lift. One of these guys, who actually lifts a lot, can't walk three rounds in the yard², then he gets exhausted. (Takes a deep breath) I think it's OK that these guys train, it's OK, and that's it. But they in a way push it, they make themselves stick out. You can just see it in the way they walk. It seems like the most important thing is to show that you train. Actually that's why I find these guys a little peculiar, the way they walk around and show their muscles time and time again. I mean, they tower over others based on their bodies, and it is often the only thing they have to show. (Silent:) No one has asked me if I train in my cell, nobody knows, only me. In there I do some sit-ups and push-ups and do a little bit of stretching. You see, that's not an accepted form of practice in a way, because that's something you do just for your own sake.

Atle (jumps in):

I guess weight training is accepted because of the masculinity, the maleness and the toughness. Perhaps we really should have been training aerobics and such things, but that's too feminine you know. You see, just as people outside, people in here are interested in

² One round in the yard is about 400 m.

different kinds of things even if the main focus is on the macho things. I mean, weight training, stick your chest out, eh .. yes, the physical stuff.

Tom (with a little resignation in his voice):

You know, these weight-training guys don't compare themselves with what they achieved one month ago, they don't use themselves as a measure for their progress. No, they compare themselves with each other. The clue is to be better than the next guy. And, you see, this kind of training is often used as criteria for where to be placed in the prison hierarchy. By this I mean that some of these guys consider how many kilos they can do in "the bench" as equal to being the best in the prison, yes in the world. Even if you have the same tendencies among the soccer-players, my impression is that these guys don't look upon themselves as 'God's gift to (laugh) ..

Berit (laugh):

.. women'?

Tom:

No, but .. (laughs a little bit more). But, I think you achieve a high status by being one of the important players on the football field, too. Actually, you do because sport in itself is an activity that invites performance and achievements and you are measured in relation to others. And if you are good in one thing, it's easily transferable to the more general. I have actually experienced getting more recognition on the sports-arena than any other place here in the prison; be it at work, at school or any other place. Nothing else has given me such concrete recognition as participation and achievements in sport, I mean concrete occasions where mostly prisoners but also officers, have said to me; 'you did well', 'well done', and so on. I think this is because what you do in the sport-arena is so visible, most of what you do is so visible. People see it, and they notice it. ..

(It all gets silent. It seems that everybody is reflecting on what Tom just said. After a while I feel I have to reinitiate the conversation, and ask a new question)

Berit:

But what about doping³?

Tom (answers quickly):

I'm convinced that a lot of those training with weights in here one day or another after the release will start using anabolic steroids. Well, remember it's someone who hates weight training who makes this statement.

Atle (shakes his head):

I don't agree, because it seems that most of those who train with weights and are large openly take a standpoint against the use of dope. The common attitude is that dope is for those in the twenties with a lack of time, not for us in the thirties and forties. So, I think most of the guys here who have trained for several years are proud of that they have managed to build themselves up to what they are today without the use of dope. But there is a lot of talk about dope, but I don't think there is as much talk as in weight training milieus outside.

Lars:

Actually, I have experienced being offered both dope and drugs. But when you make it totally clear that you aren't interested in any of these things, and after having said no a couple of times, they understand and stop offering.

Berit (looks a bit thoughtful):

Ehh .. use dope to get large, but I mean, really, how important is it to become large then?

Atle:

Well, I don't know, but I have actually provoked some people here a few times, people I know could have gotten me if they have wanted. And then I have provoked them just for testing them, but they haven't done anything. (Nods, and gets thoughtful) When I think about it, actually they haven't. And if I really think it through, actually I've noticed that people relate to me differently after I started to weight-train. I don't know, but perhaps the physical plays a more important role in here than outside because out there you have several factors to play with. Even if I don't want to admit it, it is very primitive in a way, yeah, I think it is...

Lars (nods):

³ "Doping" in this connection means performance-enhancing drugs.

Oh yeah, it means a lot to be physically strong in prison, it does. You see, in here, the values are turned upside down. If you have a large body you don't need any arguments, you can just raise your voice, smash your fist in the table and look them straight in their eyes. Then, things turn out as you want. And actually, having a fit and well-built body means more in relation to other men than in relation to women. It's almost at the level of the animals, the more you puff up your feathers, the better you are. You see, to look fit help you on the daily basis in the prison, I think, no, I know that. Thin arms and a beer belly and, and a scrawny neck won't get you very far, you know. And they rather have to know, how shall I explain this, it's a kind of system that you can't define, but it is tough so visible and silly. You have to prove that you are "the man" if someone wants you, they rather know that they get resistance either by fighting back or by showing that you can use the knife.

Atle:

Mm, and, you see, some of these big guys use their body and strength to frighten others. Sometimes they aren't concrete in their threats; they hinting all the time, you know, and they really manage to frighten people. Lately I have started to protect those who have hard days in here because those who can't either protect themselves verbally or physically are bugged and made fun of and such things. And I can do that because I'm at the same macho-level as them, perhaps a little bit above. And because they know I'm fitter than they are, I mean physically, this stops them from saying anything to me. But you have to be careful. To interfere in such things is thought of as one of the stupidest things to do, you see, there's very little difference between being a hero and an idiot in prison. Actually you get some status by daring to stand up and help others, but I can't accept that somebody terrorises a whole landing. It's perhaps not the right way to handle this problem, to threaten back in the same way, I mean, but it works. (He shrugs his shoulders and hurries to continue:) But because I'm big I don't go around and rebuke others, I'm not macho in that sense.

Berit:

Not a big difference, ehh .. I don't understand ..

Atle:

Well, the weakest has to give in, and nobody wants to be the weakest, I mean that's a 'guy'

ting. And these people who bug and make fun of other prisoners gang up and then become stronger, so you have to be careful. You're not supposed to lose face, you see?

The data-material shows that the body's influence on the power relations between the prisoners was discussed in relation to the large and strong body, and in relation to weight training. Moreover, among the prisoners the opinion of how influential the large and strong body is for the power relations between the prisoners varies. Some prisoners thought that other factors such as mental strength, knowing the right persons, intelligence, social skills, age, reputation from outside and how long or how many times you have been in prison, are just as important as a large and strong body for the power relations between the prisoners. A general notion in the interviews is that the large and muscular body seems to be most important for the power relations between those who train with weights. Lars' statement in the beginning of this sub-chapter reflects this. The social gathering among those who train weights, the talk between them, and Lars' utterance, *'It's sort of who can take the most then'*, can be understood in that with practice and talk there is an ongoing negotiation of status. How much a prisoner is able to take in "the bench" seems to be "the measurement" of strength. There are probably several reasons for this, but "the bench" is a free-weight-exercise that demands greater skill to manage than weight-training apparatuses, and thus has a potential for the presentation of oneself as a proficient athlete (Aycock, 1992: 348). Voluminous muscles in the breast, shoulders, arms and back, seem to be the most important for the prisoners who train with weights. It is mainly by displaying these muscles by "pumping themselves up" that they exhibit their masculinity. Several prisoners also have tattoos on their arms, shoulders and chest that contribute in drawing attention to these muscles.

Lars also describes how those training with weights are talking with and about each other. "The law of Jante" seems to prevail also here but only to a certain degree. According to Lars, when a prisoner talks about his results he is not supposed to be boasting in such a way that he promotes himself at the expense of others. Even if there seems to be a competition by lifting most kilos in "the bench", the prisoners tell about their results in relation to themselves, not in relation to others. The others make the comparison. Except for this exception, it seems that "The law of Jante" does not exist when it comes to weight training. It is accepted for weight training prisoners to boast about their achievements in the weight training room, and to talk about them loudly so that those standing around can hear it. It is also accepted that these prisoners "pump themselves up" and show off their muscles and occupy space. In short, the

weight-training prisoners are allowed to be very visible. From Kim's and Tom's statement in the beginning of the conversation in this subchapter, it seems that the other prisoners not practising weight training have no choice but to relate to the weight-training prisoners' body size and strength, and accept these factors as favourable for where to be placed in the strategic power situation between the prisoners.

It is reasonable to ask the cause of why the weight-training prisoners are allowed to be so visible in the prison, and why is it so important for them to be this visible? Atle answers this question when he says *'I guess weight training is accepted because of the masculinity, the maleness and the toughness'*. According to an earlier discussion, the hegemonic masculinity among the prisoners seems to be the macho masculinity. This is one way of understanding why the large and strong prisoners' way of expressing themselves are accepted. According to Scraton, Sim & Skidmore (1991: 66), "(T)he culture of masculinity which pervades male prisons is all-inclusive and reinforces hierarchies based on physical dominance." Therefore the hegemonic masculinity among the prisoners is most likely a product and a reflection of the macho masculinity considered being hegemonic among the staff at Polar Prison. Other studies also suggest a relation between prison regime and the culture among prisoners, for example, Newton (1994: 199) who says: "(I)t might be concluded that if prisons were controlled in a less rigidly masculine manner, there might be less masculine organisation amongst prisoners, together with all the problem that brings".

Tom's statement that the exercise of sport in general in a male prison is visible, agrees with the findings of Sabo (1994: 163). According to Tom, because of the visibility it seems to be easy for a prisoner to get recognition for his achievements, for example, on the football field. Nevertheless, recognition is also given because something is valued, and it may be that the prisoners receive recognition for their visual achievements in sports because sports achievements can be interpreted as an expression of valued masculinities in the prison. According to Kim, the prisoners also practise sport and thereby exhibit these masculinities in order to be seen and get recognition. It seems to be important for a prisoner to visualise his practice of sport and be "onstage" when expressing this masculinity; or else his exercise is not recognised. A prisoner's skills in football are visible to other football-players and spectators, who are prisoners not playing football, and prison officers. A reputation as a good football player can, according to Tom, increase status. Unlike the football players who have spectators when they play matches, the prisoners who lift a lot are seen only by those in the weight

training room. However, because it is accepted for these prisoners to boast about their performances, their skills are “onstage” also outside the weight training room. According to Atle who claims to have tested other prisoners and noticed that people relate to him differently after he started to train with weights, it seems that the weight-training prisoners’ bodies are always “onstage”. Lars’ utterance concerning that looking fit is helping a prisoner in the daily life in prison support this, most likely because the large and strong body expresses the hegemonic masculinity. A prisoner with such a body can, according to Lars, express his superiority and get things the way he wants, for example, by raising his voice or smashing a fist in the table.

It seems that prisoners who construct hegemonic macho masculinity consider this masculinity as desirable. For some prisoners it is so desirable that they even use performance-enhancing drugs. According to Lars, doping is available to the prisoners which is a problem for the prison authorities since selling and keeping more drugs than one’s own supply is prohibited (Staffeloven § 162b, Den norske stat, 2000). According to Atle, some of the younger prisoners use these kinds of drugs, and according to Lars, there is a lot of talk about these drugs amongst the prisoners. The use and the talk about these drugs may be interpreted as an indication of the importance of the body and strength in striving to attain status among prisoners. According to Tom, the desire for macho masculinity expressed by some of these prisoners may be a need to show themselves as heterosexual attractive. In this respect, the macho masculinity is constructed within a heterosexual discourse. Nevertheless, according to Lars, *‘having a fit and well-built body means more in relation to other men than in relation to women’*. With this basis it seems that the embodiment of power and thereby the body’s signals of superiority is also directed towards other men in prison in the sense of showing power. One may say that the expression and interpretation of power in the macho masculine body is homosocial and takes place within a discourse between men. This discourse imposes a “truth” on prisoners, a “truth” that a prisoner recognises and which others have to recognise in him (Foucault, 1982: 781) (see also page 37). “The truth” concerning a prisoner that constructs hegemonic macho masculinity is that he is threatening. In a culture built on physical dominance, this is important, and raises status.

It may be that the recognition of themselves as threatening turn some of the weight-training prisoners into nuisances and help them bullying weaker prisoners. Atle’s knows that he communicates with these prisoners because he creates himself within the same discourse as

them, and therefore he knows he can fight these nuisances with their own means. In the same statement, he differentiates subtly the concept “macho”, which implies that there are several ways of exhibiting oneself as “macho”. According to what Atle says there seems to be at least two, one defensive way for prevention, and one offensive way for tormenting. In any case, in this “play of power”, there is a winner and a loser, where the loser is considered to be less manly than the winner, and among the prisoners, there seems to be a fear of appearing as a loser.

To make a fool out of yourself and to win the competition

Tom (nods and says):

People here are afraid of making a fool of themselves. You see it on the football-field, too. Many times there have been attempts to arrange football training for those who haven't played so much football before, but there is no response even if many say that they really would have liked to participate. And when we who play football train, we are just playing. We don't practice more basic training like technical training or endurance training, because people don't dare. I think it's a little special in prisons that people don't handle adversity, at least not more than they already have, and especially when other prisoners look at you and perhaps laugh of you when you make mistakes. I mean everybody makes mistakes, either in sports or in other things. But it has to be said though, that for sure you'll hear it when you make mistakes. But there are those who don't fix things at once, but who really try over and over again to get it right, so it depends how you handle it. We also see it in the summer when we play volleyball in the yard. Most of those who participate are football players, but there are several others, too. So there are several here that want to practice sport. There's no doubt about that

Lars:

People here are also extremely afraid of not winning. In the restrictive wing, for example, we have been arranging these tournaments in the yards on the weekends and so on. Long jump, ball throwing, triple jump, running and things like that just for fun. Some participate even if they aren't especially clever, but they have a good time and a good laugh. But there are many that don't participate at all. Anyhow, after the competition they say 'well I could have participated in that event', 'I think I could have managed to get second there'. You see, they are extremely afraid of not winning. During the competition they just walk around and scowl

at those who participate. After the event is over, however, they try to jump or throw as good as the winner. I have to say that I think these unceremonious competitions are extremely important because it makes the prisoners laugh together. It loosens a bit of the tensions that exists between the prisoners because the day to day life in here gets serious very easily.

The data material does not say whether or not the prisoners found it worse to lose in the sports arena than in other arenas. However, the conversation in this subchapter shows that many prisoners did not want to lose in the sports arena. This may be related to the visibility of sport, because in the public spaces where the sports events are carried out, it is very clear who the winner is and who the loser is. In addition, the sport activities in prison are one of the most important arenas where manliness is proven, as discussed in the previous subchapter. To lose competitions or even risk revealing one's lack of skills by participating in sports events may de-masculinise a prisoner. In short, a loser is considered less manly than a winner. To the prisoners, it seemed to be very important to announce the winner, e.g. the winner of the competition in the restrictive wing was announced in the prisoner's magazine and addressed as "The strongest man at Polar Prison". Other sports results were published in this magazine, too. It also seems that in order to get the prisoners to participate in different sports events, they must be arranged as competitions where the winner wins a prize such as chocolate, coffee, sports clothes, etc.

How strongly many prisoners feel that the sports arena is an arena where one has to prove one's manliness is also illustrated in Tom and Lars' statements where they are mentioning prisoners not wanting to participate in sports events. It is impossible for these prisoners to participate in sport even if they want to. They cannot let go, participate and laugh at themselves and others, just for the sake of having fun. Nevertheless, some prisoners do participate in sports even if they are not good at it. Most likely this is because they compensate by creating themselves within other discourses, like age, mental strength, contacts, etc., which give them advantageous positions in the strategic power situation. During the fieldwork some prisoners did in fact participate just for fun and that they actually got recognition for their gutsiness. It actually seems that sports events such as the competition of becoming "The strongest man at Polar Prison" can further the fratriarchy between the participating prisoners. Most likely this is because unceremonious competitions stimulate the prisoners to laugh together and loose some of the tensions between the prisoners in the daily prison life that can otherwise be very serious.

Now we move to a discussion of various sports events, and first what happens on the football field will be focused on.

On the football field

Atle:

On the football field, you feel much freer in what you can say to a person. Generally in the sports arena, more than anywhere else, you become more spontaneous, you are not that calculating and you don't have that "wait and see" attitude. And the play unites us in a way, it obviously has a positive effect on the milieu in here. When you play football it doesn't help you to be large and strong because a little shit can run circles around you. Everything becomes in a way turned upside down, you know, and on the field people become more equal in a way. I have played football with the worst bastards I know, but the play makes you get rid of the remonstrance you have for that person. The game makes you discover positive sides about this person, and the barricades you have for him are torn down in a way. In that sense playing football is really peacemaking in a way. But there is some cussing⁴ when we play football. I don't like it, and I have clearly said so, and it became silent quite quickly.

Tom (a little thoughtful):

Yes, there is some cussing on the football field. But, I don't know if those who don't take part hear the cussing when we play matches or train. We cuss out each other quite often, but I think it sounds worse than it's really meant. It may happen that some don't want to play football because of the cussing. But we have to be careful to not cussing too much because we are dependent of all the players, and some may not come back if they have been cussed at. On the football field, I understood quite quickly that I couldn't say too much to the older ones. I just noticed, they showed it very clearly, in a way, yes it is, I don't know, you just notice it (shrugs his shoulders). Sometimes after matches, especially if there has been a lot of shit-sliding there can be some backbiting, and you get to know that players have reacted on the shit-sliding from others. I think that's a bit sad, because most of us are aware of that we shouldn't have said these things.

⁴ Verbal abuse with a lot of swearing directed towards other persons.

Berit:

But I wonder, how do you decide who is going to play in the matches and so on. Who picks the team?

Tom:

Well, if you can't kick the ball, you won't get to play. And the rule is that those who participate in the training, get to play. But who decides, I really don't know. I don't think that it is anybody special. Everybody knows in a way who will play where. And if we are too many players, everybody knows who will start on the bench.

Atle (nods):

It is an unwritten hierarchy, it really is. If everybody were asked to write down who is where in the hierarchy, I'm sure the answers would have been quite similar. The best one decides, and you accept that because he is good and knows a lot about football.

Also on the football-team it seems that the discourse of physical ability and skills rules, here in relation to being a good football-player. There seems to be a clear hierarchy where the best player is on the top. Everyone seems to know the hierarchy even though this is not explicitly articulated, and it is accepted that the best player decides. The data-material shows that among the football-players, unlike among those who trained weights, there was no competition of being the best football player. Most likely this is because football-skills are primarily developed before the imprisonment, during childhood and youth. The possibility of becoming a good football player in the prison is also small because basic technical and endurance training are absent.

Mathiesen (1965: 123) found that “the soccer team may in fact be viewed as a centre from which social conflicts rather than social integration emanated.” Mathiesen (ibid) mentions two reasons for this, the placements in the team and the participant's relative abilities. According to Tom, cussing out seems to be a reason why there are conflicts in the football team. Tom is aware that cussing may prevent the recruitment to the team. If one views this in relation to the previous discussion, prisoners who are not as good as good football-players, not only visualise their lack of skills but will also be told explicitly how lousy they are, something which de-masculinises them even more. The de-masculinising effect of cussing someone out can also be the reason why some players seem to be offended by the cussing and therefore talk behind the

backs of those who cuss. The backbiting may indicate that “The Law of Jante” and “Thou shalt not fancy thyself better than we” is also in play between the prisoner who play football. “The Law of Jante” seems to be particularly important for the older players who do not accept youngsters cussed at them. It seems that by expressing themselves within the age-discourse they compensate for their position in the skill-discourse.

Atle’s opinion that playing football has an effect of social integration does not agree with Mathiesen (1965: 123) (see above). It seems that Atle manages to focus on the play and forget the factors of importance for the strategic situation between the prisoners when he plays football. He points at the equalising effect of playing football, and just as the competition of becoming “The strongest man at Polar Prison”, to Atle playing football can further the patriarchy among the players. At the same time he confirms the cross-contextual position of the large and strong body. The impression from the fieldwork is that very few of those who trained with weights also played football. There could be several reasons for this, but one possible reason is that when a prisoner exhibiting himself within the discourse of weight training enters the football field, he carries with him visible signs of physical ability and skills. As previously discussed, a large and fit body is also a sign of mastery and control. If such a prisoner reveals that he is a bad football player he would probably be de-masculinised, and even more so than prisoners not exhibiting themselves within the discourse of weight training.

In the weight training room, negative and positive feedback

Berit:

What about you Kim? Would you have liked to start playing football and joined the football team?

Kim (shakes his head):

Oh no! If I had started to play football now, people here would have been shocked! But, if I had started when I arrived here, nobody would have cared. Actually I would have liked to start weight training, but I feel if I start to train with weights now, I’ll be forced to do my best and to lift as much or rather more than the others. And you feel, or hear, that; ‘he’s not doing well’, I mean, it’s the backbiting, especially among the big guys. Well, actually this doesn’t mean anything, but .. I have been in the weight training room once, but I thought it was too

small. You see, there I can't be left alone. As I see it, you are not allowed to be a beginner. (With a little resignation in the voice:) And then it's the times when you are allowed to train that are forced upon you. It's not only the prison that says that my landing is only allowed to train between 6.00 p.m. and 8.00 p.m., Monday, Wednesday and Friday, but it is also pressure from the rest of the group. Today it is Monday, then you have to be there on Wednesday, too, and so on. It's not like; today I feel like training. It's more like; if you have dropped out a couple of times, then you are not taken seriously.

Lars (jumps inn):

Yeah, but ehh, I have to say that I use my energy on those who are interested in the training and who train regularly over a period of time. Those who only train now and then, you don't feel they take the training seriously. I don't reject them if they ask for advice and so on, but I use my energy to create a good milieu among us who trains regularly, that we function well together in a way.

Kim:

I mean, if I were allowed to train with weights when I felt like it, for example, right after dinner when almost everybody else sleeps, then I could have trained on my own and been left alone and trained the way I wanted. I didn't have to run for 10 minutes on the treadmill, or lifted so and so much. I didn't have to compete with the others; that's what I don't feel like, you see? It doesn't suit me to carry out my training in front of the rest, and I think I'm not the only one that feels like this. But, those who are large and strong, it's in the training room they can display themselves.

Atle (nods):

Mm. I too believe that there are many here who would have liked to start weight training, but who have difficulties getting started. Because, I remember myself, I didn't manage to do one third of what the others lifted. I mean, it's a little bit embarrassing when you have to take off all the weights before you can start to lift. Actually, that was a "pain in the ass" in the beginning, but now I don't bother that much, but I guess it's hard for others. I have to admit that I felt completely lost when I started. (Laughs and continues:) There I was, I felt shabby, but at the same time I knew that I'm not a small man, but I was mentally weak you know. And there they were, all these fit young lads, you know, who smashed up 100 and 120 and 140 kilos on "the bench". And then there was me, who didn't even manage to lift 60 kilos!

(laughs) *Of course I was bullied, but I didn't care because being large and strong has never meant much to me. But I made up a kind of an excuse; 'I'm an old drug abuser' and so on, so actually it wasn't that bad. What I also did know was that these youngsters respected me because I have lived an extreme life with drug abuse and so on, and because of that I got good contacts. But, what I experienced in this situation was that the youngest, toughest and those who lifted most challenged the older ones, Because, in the weight training room, the youngest have self-confidence and are physically superior. It's like the animal kingdom you can read about in the "National Geographic", you know, where the young males want to take over the territory of the older males. That's what I experienced, but for me it didn't matter, I returned the challenge. But, I believe this prevent other older prisoners from training with weight.*

Lars:

It's actually an unwritten rule that you won't bully anybody who doesn't manage to lift as much as you, so basically everybody is welcome in the weight training room. But people observe and watch each other and such things, you know ..

Berit:

But, how do you schedule yourself in the weight training room, I mean, who decides who is going to train where, and so on?

Lars (heaves a sigh):

Well, it's just like first come, first serve, in a way. But, when this is repeated over time, like everybody knows that I'm on a training program, and on Wednesdays I start on "the bench", the others arrange themselves in relation to that in a way, it's just like this. But not everybody trains, it is perhaps when I think about it, if those who hardly train half an hour once a month take a bench that usually this day is used by one that has trained in a program for a long time, this can create a little irritation, you know. I have witnessed a couple of quarrels. But what often happens is if someone trains on "the bench" and I need it, I just ask if I can use it when the other one takes breaks. I mean, you do take breaks, so it's actually no problem. Nobody can say 'this is mine', we all share the equipment. And you get unpopular quite quickly if you are difficult and don't share the equipment with the others. These people get frozen out in a way. But, I have to admit, when there are many in the weight training room, I shut my mouth. But when it's few, I try to encourage others to come along. Sometimes I train

in a program together with a training partner. It's easier to train regularly when you have a training partner, because if you feel like not training one day, he says 'come on, we are doing that program and you have to come'. Besides the training gets more social if you have a partner, too. You get to know him better, and you tend to spend more time together with him also when you're not training. With some training partners I have shared groceries, and we have also bought groceries together because then you can afford more, and then we have made training-food together, like pasta and so on.

Kim (nods):

I have actually seen one that didn't train becoming pals with one that did train, and they began training together. I think he was lucky, but I don't think this happens very often, I've just seen it once. It seems like either you're a training-freak, or you're not. But I think it would have been easier if the PE-officer had encouraged me to start weight training and helped me to get started, instead of another prisoner because then I feel I owe him something. That's me (shrugs his shoulders), someone else may have an opposite view. But it's that system again, you know; 'it was me that got you started with weight training', it can become a drawback that can be used against you.

Berit:

But, do you give each other advice and so on?

Atle:

I've never tried to give advice to someone that's better than me, but I have given advice to those who look like they have just started to weight-train. Actually I don't want to interfere too much, people have to find out themselves in a way. Like myself, I've learned a lot from looking at others who have been training for some years, how they carry out different exercises and things like that. You know, it's like driving a car; nobody wants to admit that they are lousy drivers.

Lars:

Yeah, if it's one you train with, you tell. But, if it's one you don't train with, you shut your mouth because here, people mostly get pissed off if you try to give them advice or you try to correct them. You step on them, you know. But, you see, when prisoners get the opportunity to teach others about training, they feel superior, oh yeah, then they are really on top. And if you

tell a prisoner: 'damn I didn't know that', he's full of himself for several days. So, you just don't do that.

Berit:

But, do you try to encourage each other, like for example you say 'come on', 'well done', 'good work' or something like that?

Lars:

Sure, when your training partner is doing well, you tell him, and when he is doing an exercise you say 'come on, one more, you can manage it, that's good' and so on. So we encourage each other in a way, we're yelling, and pushing each other to give each other a push for lifting more. But I don't say such things so much to the others I don't train with. It's not like I observe each and everyone in the training room and tell everyone they're doing well. I don't do that, I don't.

Atle:

When I'm doing an exercise I don't like to be talked to. Those who scream 'come on', and such things, I mean, that's too silly because then everybody watches you. Sometimes I think it's embarrassing when someone says I have done well. I don't know but, what should I say, it's like, you're not used to hearing it I think; I suppose it has something to do with that. You see, it can be worse handling positive feedback than negative feedback. I mean, you're not used to, if a guy comes over to you and says 'damn, now you have improved' and things like that, you just don't say such things you know.

Kim (jumps in):

Oh, I've heard people talk about each other in this way. If they mean someone has improved, getting bigger muscles and so on, there can actually be someone who comments 'damn man! Have you ever benefited from working out', or, 'now the ladies will look at you when you come out', and such things.

Tom:

Actually, I don't think there's much encouragement here, there's not. You see, when we lose football matches, we got comments. Even it's supposed to be for fun, it's something behind it,

like; 'that's what we knew, that you were going to lose'. But if we win, we don't hear anything. That's a bit annoying, but I suppose, this is the way it is so (shrugs his shoulders) ..

Lars:

You just don't brag about other prisoners. It's considered being, it isn't, perhaps it isn't manful enough, ehh, I don't know. I mean, it isn't, well, it isn't accepted at all. It may be because you're then suspected of having sexual interests. At least, it isn't accepted. It also may be because, if you brag about somebody, then you're subservient. I mean, you can say that friendliness in prison may often be mistaken for weakness. It's the same as you just don't show weakness.

In the weight training rooms there seems to be two sets of “rules”. The first official one says: everybody is welcome in the weight training room, do not bully or harass anyone not lifting as much as you, and, everyone has equal rights to the equipment. However, the conversation above shows that another sets of “rules” exists, which effectively seems to regulate the activity in the weight training rooms, both in the contract and in the restrictive wings. These rules are: the more regularly you train weights, the more welcome you are; the most important thing is to lift a lot; and, those who train regularly, have first priority to use the equipment.

It also seems that the “unofficial rules” were decisive for the power relations between the prisoners in the weight training rooms, both in the contract and in the restrictive wings. The most powerful prisoner, the one at the top of the hierarchy, is a prisoner training regularly and lifting the most. Unlike the hierarchy among the football-players, the hierarchy among the weight-training prisoners is not given. It always seems to be a contest of who is on the top (see Lars' statement about lifting the most page 143). In this contest, the most important thing is to visualise oneself, and according to Kim, it is impossible to avoid attention in the weight training room. In order to visualise oneself and to observe and watch the others, there seems to be an intricate play of signs and symbols. According to Atle, a partner can be helpful in drawing attention. When he yells for the purpose of encouragement, he draws attention and everyone in the weight training room can see the heavy lift. According to Aycock (1992: 345-346) clothes and equipment, such as weight belts and gloves, are important for exhibiting oneself as a serious athlete. During the fieldwork I observed several prisoners using particular weight training clothes such as wide pants and jackets, in addition to belts and gloves. When they were asked what purpose these clothes and equipment served, they did not say they used

these equipment and clothes in order to exhibit and visualise themselves. They said the belts and gloves were used to avoid injuries, and that these clothes, besides being functional, were the only ones that could be bought in the prison. However, my interpretation during the fieldwork was that these prisoners were very visible because they, with this equipment and clothes, signalled a manliness that supported their exhibiting of macho masculinity.

In order to visualise oneself as serious, one must also treat the weight training apparatuses and the free weights properly, showing that one is used to them and can handle them. Handling equipment like this can be interpreted as a way of doing masculinity (Lie, 2000). Being visible also means occupying and using space, and showing the others your routines and when you use various equipment. However, orienting oneself in relation to the others for the purpose of getting to know their routines and when the equipment is available (Aycock, 1992: 350) is also important in the weight training rooms. This brings us to how to watch and observe others, a phenomenon which Aycock (1992: 346-348) labels *the aimless gaze*, where the point is looking as if one is not interested in the others for the purpose of camouflaging that one actually is observing them. These unofficial “rules” together with multiple symbols and signs make it reasonable to believe that it can be difficult for a beginner. Atle did handle being a beginner, but according to himself, this was because he created himself within the discourses of crime-history, good contacts and age in order to compensate for the lack of physical ability and skills. According to Atle, one way the youngsters try to achieve status is to prove their physical ability and skills. The weight training room seems to be their “homefield”, and here age alone seems not to be enough to compete with these youngsters.

It seems that learning and teaching about weight training correspond to the hierarchy of physical ability and skills. One’s physical ability and skills in weight training are usually correlated with one’s experience with this kind of exercise. Especially learning, but also teaching, seems mostly to be unspoken. Atle, for example, has learnt about weight training by looking at others who weight-train. According to the conversation, it seems that the prisoners prefer learning by observing for avoiding de-masculinising themselves, something which confirms a superior-subordinate relationship. Like Lars says, *‘people mostly get pissed off if you try to give them advice or you try to correct them. You step on them, you know’*. If any particular prisoner should introduce him to weight training, Kim feels that he would be in a subordinate relationship to this prisoner. To avoid this subordinate position is important to Kim because the superior position could be used to claim favours back. According to

Kristoffersen (1986: 164-168), this is a kind of *general reciprocity*, where a prisoner who has done another prisoner a favour, gets a favour back later. However, the “back-paying favour” does not exactly need to balance the original favour.

It also seems that superior-subordinate relationships regulate the prisoners’ encouragement of each other. Encouragement on the football field or in the weight training room seems to be common and accepted (see also Tom’s statement at page 144). This may be because encouragement in these settings is meant to motivate rather than showing friendliness or admiration. Lars connects bragging about other prisoners to masculinity, and says that friendliness is often mistaken for weakness where being weak means to subordinate oneself to the one you brag about. Lars says also that friendly encouragement, compliments and admiration may be mistaken for sexual interest, and it seems that homophobia is one reason why such comments are viewed with suspicion. Nevertheless, it seems to be possible to give compliments to each other, even of each other’s bodies. One accepted form of giving compliments is to underline the heterosexuality by relating the compliment to women. As Kim has heard prisoners say to each other, *‘now the ladies will look at you when you come out’*. Compliments of other prisoners’ bodies can also be acceptable if given in a “masculine manner” where swearing seems to be important, like, *‘damn man! Have you ever benefited from working out’*. Klein (1993: 215-218) names this phenomenon as “gender narcissism” where one, for example, by feeding back an ideal or a positive image, mirrors back to a person his gender as an ideal.

When nobody says anything to the football players when they win, it is most likely because they do not want to make themselves inferior by bragging about others. They prefer to comment when the football team loses matches because this gives them a chance to gloat and place themselves in a superior position to the football-players.

In spite of all the superior-subordinate relationships between the prisoners in the weight training room, a kind of fratriarchy seems to exist between the prisoners who train with weights regularly. Lars, for example, puts an effort in creating a good milieu among these prisoners and most of the prisoners have no problems sharing equipment with others. However, the fratriarchy seems to be most present among the prisoners who train with weights together as training partners.

*

In this chapter several issues of importance for the strategic power situation between the prisoners have been discussed. Some of these issues are related to the practice of sport, such as size and strength of the body and skills as a football player, while others, such as what one is convicted of and where one serves one's sentence, are not. A prisoner asserting himself within the discourses constituted by the issues discussed in this chapter, expresses hardness or masculinity. From this discussion we see that the masculinities constructed and expressed in various sport activities have an impact on the strategic power situation between the prisoners, but that this impact varies from situation to situation. The discussion also shows that masculinities created within discourses constituted by other factors of importance for the strategic power situation between the prisoners, also influence the relationship between the prisoners when they practice sport. For example, on the football field, older prisoners are not cussed out by younger prisoners, and in the weight training room the prisoners do not brag about each other in an admirable way because of the fear of being interpreted as homosexual and submissive.

Chapter eleven

The Power Relations between the Prisoners and the Male and Female Officers

The last theme explored in this study is *what do the sports activities mean for the construction and re-construction of power relations between the prisoners and the male prison officers, and between the prisoners and the female prison officers?* As in the previous chapter the point of departure for the discussion concerning this matter is Foucault's notion that power exists in every relation. In addition, the discussion will be related to the "new" discourse at Polar Prison, where the caring masculinity challenges the hegemony of the macho masculinity. In this discussion it is also important to keep in mind that for the prisoners the practice of sport seems to be an issue of coping with the imprisonment.

In this chapter the data-material is presented through the stories of Atle, Didrik and Karen. For the purpose of illustrating central moments in the data material, the stories of Atle, Didrik and Karen are longer than the stories presented in the previous chapters. As in the last chapter, gestures such as "laughs" are written into the stories to make them more "alive". However, unlike the last chapter, all of these gestures can be traced back to the interviews. The chapter is divided in two main parts. In the first part of the chapter Atle, Didrik and Karen tell one story each concerning how gender influences the "general power situation" between the prisoners and the male and female officers. It was previously discussed that the prisoners relate gender to women, and from the data-material it seems that the male officers do the same. Atle's story therefore mostly concerns his relationship to female officers. Didrik's story is short which illustrates how little the male officers reflected on what gender meant for their relationship with the prisoners. Karen's story shows that for the female officers it was important to consider the gendered dimension in their relationship with the prisoners. Consequently, the discussion of the stories in the first part of the chapter is mostly focused on the relationship between the prisoners and the female officers. The second part of this chapter deals with how the sports activities function in the power relations between the prisoners and the male and female prison officers. In this section of the chapter Atle, Didrik and Karen also tell one story each but here Didrik's story is the longest. This is because when the male officers described their participation in sport, gender seemed to be a key factor in their

relationship with the prisoners, although gender was never explicitly mentioned. This relationship is a central issue in the discussion of the stories in the last part of the chapter.

Some “general” factors of importance

Atle:

In here, we rank the prison officers. Ehh .. at the bottom are the female prison officers (laugh), or it can be a male prison officer, too. Prison officers doing a good job are ranked higher than those who are not doing their job, but we don't talk to these ones. And, a prison officer that looks the other way regarding rules that are not of importance, one who uses common sense in a way, is accepted as a human being. They, for example, learn your first name and don't forget what you told them last week. The others are in a way just “blue-jackets”. I don't mean that he should open the gate for you, but what's the risk to the system in breaking a little rule such as letting you leave the weight training room five minutes before you are supposed to? I think such a prison officer is a good prison officer. He takes his work seriously, but at the same time, he cares about the lads on his landing. Actually, you are not supposed to talk to prison officers at all, especially in the restrictive wing, because that might get you into trouble. But I mean, in here you have to relate to them anyway, you just have no choice ..

Actually, I don't think there are any big differences between male and female officers, there are more individual differences, I would say. Ehh .. the female officers aren't softer than the males, I mean, there is no soft line and all those things the politicians talk about, that's for sure! If they get jobs as senior officers and so on, then they are hard nuts. They seem to stick to the rules, there is in a way no space for common sense, and it's the rules that count. I actually remember when women began working in male prisons as prison officers. I had been serving time many years before they came. But when the female prison officers suddenly showed up, I actually thought it was a little repulsive. You see, they disturbed my locked-up existence in the prison in a way, and I didn't like that. They were in way representatives for the prison system with all the negative things that means, and at the same time, they represented something good, a longing and a hope. So for me it was a crash because in one person there was both attraction and social repulsion, or at least distance. I have to say though that I was pretty young when this happened, and I wouldn't in a way show that I, ehh .. I wasn't able to relate to the female part of that person because I wouldn't, it became

impossible for me; you feel inferior to the prison officers because they make decisions for you and I couldn't in a way be inferior to a woman. In fact, it wasn't more difficult than that. Today I don't feel like this, it's now more normal with female officers, but perhaps there is a bit left, because I still can't look at a female officer as a woman completely.

After all, after I got used to them, I think it's positive that there are female officers in male prisons. For example, their presence makes it calmer on the landings. I mean, people in a way pull themselves together, they don't talk that roughly and they don't swear in the same way when there is a female officer there. But, the female staff is an on-going theme for discussion. I mean, you are allowed to look at them, and in a male-dominated society you can't avoid this talk (laugh). It's mostly joking, but we talk about how they look and so on; 'she's pretty', 'she's not even worth touching', 'she has small breasts', 'she has big breasts', 'she has a big but', and so on. I mean, it's just superficial talk.

But, female officers represent another limit that you have to relate to because restrictions are also put on your relationships with female prison officers in a prison. And a break on these restrictions can get you into serious trouble. For example, if you live in the contract wing and run the risk of becoming improper with a female officer, just one word from her can send you to the restrictive wing. Outside a woman can just say no, and nothing more happens, you are still the same as before. But here you get further reduced; I mean it's so artificial! Well, you run the same risk with a male officer, too, but that is something quite different. You almost have to be physically aggressive or extremely vulgar before he reacts and you are sent to the restrictive wing. Your contact with the female officers is therefore so unnatural. You put the brakes on that I think shouldn't be there in a man-woman relation. I have to admit though that I have met women in here that I really would have liked to know better, I mean have a closer relation with, but I don't even give it a second thought. But I won't tell you about all the thoughts and fantasies I've had about female officers both when I have been sober or wasted. I have, I have thought all the thoughts that are possible to think about female officers, and very often with great pleasure. But when I address them, or they address me, then it's all clear, then they are prison officers.

Sometimes though, if I get to know a female officer well, something that takes a long time in this system, and if we hit off well, I can look at her more as a woman. It's far from a flirting-relationship though. If I could have chosen my personal officer, I would have chosen a woman

that I had a good relationship with because I actually think it's easier to talk with a woman. I don't know why .. But, they wear uniforms and it's not the same, I mean it makes you a little reserved. I have to admit that I have problems with talking openly to system-representatives because I feel I disgrace myself in a way, and thereby risk hurting myself. As I've said before, nobody has a close relationship to me in here.

Didrik:

My relationship with the prisoners may seem pretty superficial and flippant. When we are many together, we have a bit of a flippant tone, but there is deeper contact beneath this surface. If I contact a prisoner or if he contacts me, and it's just the two of us, we talk more seriously and then they often talk about their problems and so on. In fact, I feel I have a lot of deeper contact with the prisoners. I have no problems with being personal with them, but I won't tell them about my private life. I try to keep it there.

Generally speaking I have to say that male officers are more powerful than female officers because of the body and muscles and these things. However the female officers contribute a lot in the creation of a kind of calmness that I can't fully explain, but some situations simply call for a man. I don't know, but perhaps it's easier for men to draw a line when it's needed, eh .. that the inmates take us more seriously when we say it, I do believe that, yes, I do.

As a male officer I also have to strip search and take urine samples of the inmates. These tasks are far from the nicest part of the work; I'm never happy when I have to strip search an inmate. But these things have become a part of the job, it's something you just have to do. There are several inmates, however, that have asked me if I'm gay since I want to see their dick and keep an eye on them when they; I mean we are suppose to watch them when they pee in the glass. But, I mean, a male-male relationship in a prison is OK for me as long as the inmate isn't gay and gets a kick out of it, but it happens once in a great while. I remember though, on a landing where I used to work before, where there was a gay inmate. Once we had a talk, he sat down pretty close to me, and ehh .. I'm not used to that. It's something about the intimate zone, and this became too intimate for me and I didn't feel good about it. I told him so, and we joked a bit and then it was OK again. But it's on such occasions one can imagine how a female officer feels when she gets this kind of unwanted attention.

Karen:

Even if I believe that the inmates look at us as prison officers, I think many inmates also look at us as sex objects. Officers that have been together with the inmates, for example, at their workplaces, have heard the inmates talking about; 'it would have been cool to lay a female officer' and so on, that this would have given them status in a way. But they don't express this to us because they know it will be sanctioned. However with sex there is a lot of power that the inmates use to make us insecure. But I mean we can't take the opportunity away from them to say something positive about you. When they say to me 'you look nice today' or when they say 'how fit you look' when I arrive or leave the prison on my bike, I think that's a nice thing to say, and I say 'thank you'; one cannot be that strict either. But I don't tolerate disrespectful and fawning comments like being called "babe" and things like that, then I say to them 'it's OK that you use my first name, but I don't tolerate to be called babe'. I can also say that I want them to use my family name because that's a way to differentiate when they become like this. For sure the inmates can use flattery to achieve something, I mean, they don't give male officers compliments for how they look. And when you experience compliments an inmate gives as flattering, the next time he comes and asks you if you can fix something for him, you do fix it. But I try not to spruce myself up too much. When I'm on the landings, for example, I always have my hair in a ponytail. But sometimes, if I have forgotten the rubber band or if I don't care to put it up in a ponytail, the inmates comment it at once 'how nice you are without a ponytail', 'can't you wear your hair down', and so on. I feel they look at me more as a woman immediately.

I think it's important to be aware of the signals you send out in what you say, how you dress, your body language, and the way you act because the inmates can interpret the slightest thing wrongly, and then you can be on thin ice, you know. For example, whenever I visit an inmate in his cell, I leave the door open because then the other inmates can see that there is no monkey business going on. Being careful isn't only important for protecting yourself, I think it's also important for showing the inmates respect by not provoking them and making it difficult for them. I don't think it's right in relation to them either, to walk around in here in a tight T-shirt and a short skirt. But these things aren't easy to be aware of. Another thing is that nobody tells you about it. You are just supposed to understand, and mistakes, or at least scandals, are not tolerated. Therefore, to handle being a female prison officer is all up to you. For example, every summer we get young female (non-trained) substitute officers coming in the prison for the first time, and they don't know anything about these mechanisms. Even if they wear uniforms, some of them have two or three buttons of the shirts open, they tighten

the belts so that their body shape is visible and wear platform shoes and so on. Of course they get a lot of comments from the inmates, and I understand that they find it flattering. The inmates find them cool, but there is no clear line between being cool and flirting! When you have to give orders or handle conflicts and get the inmates to respect you as a person who has authority, they won't listen to you because you have focused on being seen instead of being heard. And I notice that in the summertime when there are a lot of substitute officers here, the inmates become more interested in me as a woman, too, or they try to test my limits, that can happen.

For sure good looking female officers attract a lot of attention when they come here, but what really matters is how you are as a person. That you show respect because then you also get respected, that you are around when it's needed, that you are clear on where your limits are so that they know they got your number, that they feel safe with you, that you do what you promise to do, and that you keep your word; it's these things that really matter and are decisive in determining if they like you or not. .. Perhaps we as women are more tactful than the men are, that we are more like; it shall be like this and this and this. I believe this is simply because of that we are, are sex objects you know. At the same time, if we set the same limits as the male officers do, oh, what was it the inmates said once, ehh .. then we were lesbians or not women anymore (laughs). But I do believe that the inmates also respect us because they very often want to talk with us about their families and their social problems and so on. I believe they relax more when they talk to us because we don't have big muscles and aren't large and strong and so on, and I believe that if you can show a little tenderness and sympathy, I think you can win a lot as a woman. But I also believe there are male officers that show the inmates this kind of care, but male officers are very often too opinionated and too much militaristic and these kind of things. The difference between a male prison officer and me however, is that he can have body contact and hug an inmate, something which I can't. I can tap him on the shoulder, but that's it in a way.

The first part of Atle's story reflects a notion of referring to a prison officer in general as "he". It seems that for the prisoners, the ungendered prison officer is a man, while the gendered prison officer is a woman. However, Atle also says there are small differences between male and female officers, and he thinks individual differences are larger than the differences between the groups of male and female officers. This is in accordance with international literature. Price & Liebling (1998: 60) claim that the most important and consistent findings in

studies of female entry in male prisons carried out in USA, Australia and UK, is that there are more similarities than differences between male and female officers in the way they carry out their work. Price and Liebling (ibid) also say that prisoners tend to judge each individual staff member regardless of gender; they rather discriminate within the genders. This tendency was also seen among the prisoners at Polar Prison. In Atle's story we see that the officers that the prisoners thought did a good job, regardless of gender, were ranked higher than those who did not do their job. From the stories of Atle and Karen it seems that one reason why gender was not important for how well the prisoners thought the prison officers did their job, may be found in the discourses regulating the relationship between the prisoners and the female officers.

From the stories of Atle and Karen it seems that the discourse regulating the relationship between the prisoners and the female officers make both the prisoners and the female officers restraint their expressions of gender. The female officers restraint their expressions of gender for the purpose of not to visualise it, and to focussing on being heard rather than being seen. As discussed earlier, to restraint her expression of gender is necessary for a female officer in order to be able to exercise authoritarianism. The prisoners restraint their expressions of gender for the purpose of not being sanctioned. This means that the prisoners cannot exercise as much male heterosexual power as they most likely can do towards women outside the prison. If a female officer finds the prisoners' exercise of the male heterosexual power suppressive, she can, by the use of authoritarianism, exercise disciplinary and juridical-political power and punish the prisoners. The female officers' position in exercising power and punishment towards the prisoners contradicts the gender order where men are usually assumed to be superior to women. This may be the reason why Atle finds the relationship between himself and female officers artificial. It seems that the way prisoners tackle the humiliation that comes from the fact that female officers are more empowered than themselves, is to develop a strategy of not looking '*at a female prison officer as a woman completely*'. However, if a prisoner learns to know a female officer well, which according to Karen's story, implies that he knows her number and that he has a well-defined space where he can display his gender and relate to her more as a woman.

While it seems to be the ability to express authoritarianism that strengthens the female officers' position in the relationship between the prisoners and the female officers, it seems nevertheless to be the ability to exercise male heterosexual power that strengthens the

prisoner's position. Even if the prisoners restraint their expressions of gender in relation to the female officers, it seems that they manage to suppress the female officers by making the female officers feel like sex objects. As Karen says, *'with sex there is a lot of power that the inmates use to make us insecure'*. According to Atle's story, we can interpret some ways the prisoners use this male heterosexual power in a repressive manner; *'at the bottom are the female prison officers'*; *'it's mostly joking, but we talk about how they look and so on'*; *'she's pretty'*, *'she's not even worth touching'*, *'she has small breasts'*, *'she has big breasts'*, *'she has a big but'*. In Didrik's story we see how a gay prisoner is able to make a male prisoner insecure by making a pass. There is no reason to believe that Didrik became insecure because the prisoner's exercise of a homosexual masculinity was more powerful than the male officer's exercise of heterosexual masculinity. The reason why the gay prisoner managed to make the prison officer insecure seems to be that this situation became private for the male officer, as Didrik says, *'this became too intimate for me'*. As discussed earlier, a prison officer is not supposed to be private with the prisoners. From Didrik's story, however, it seems that he has no problems in separating between being personal and private in his relationship to heterosexual prisoners or in relation to homosexual prisoners as long as the homosexual prisoners do not pay any sexual interest to him. As he says, *'a male-male relationship in a prison is OK for me as long as the inmate isn't gay and gets a kick out of it'*.

It is reasonable to assume that being sexualised is experienced as private for the female officers, too. According to Karen's story, female officers seem to work hard to restraint their expressions of gender in order to avoid being sexualised and to keep their relationship to the prisoners at a professional and personal level (see page 80 for the division between professional, personal and private). From Karen's story it seems that being sexualised makes it difficult to *'get the inmates to respect you as a person who has authority'*. We have also previously discussed that if the female officers' female side became too visible, they felt that they lost authority. According to Karen's story, it seems that in a male prison the female officers assume the responsibility of not being sexualised. Even if the uniform helps the female officers to hide their gender, they still run the risk of losing authority also when they wear the uniform. Some of these "risk factors" are related to how they exhibit themselves when they wear the uniform, for example, how they style their hair. From Karen's story we see that it is also possible for a female officer to behave in a sexy way and to wear the uniform in such a way that it reveals her gender. A female officer must also be careful in the way she carries out her job, for example, not going into a prisoner's cell and closing the door

because other prisoners may suspect her of having a relationship with this prisoner. If female officers do not know about or forget these matters, e.g. by not keeping her hair in a ponytail, it seems to signal to the prisoners that they can express more male heterosexual power. As Karen says when she is not keeping her hair in a ponytail, *'I feel they look at me more as a woman immediately'*. According to Karen's story, a female officer does not only show carefulness on behalf of herself but also on behalf of her female colleagues. When, for example, female (non-trained) substitute officers act in a way that encourages the prisoners to exercise male heterosexual power, it seems that the prisoners exercise this power, not only in relation to these substitute officers, but also in relation to other female prison officers. As Karen says, *'in the summertime when there are a lot of substitute officers here, the inmates become more interested in me as a woman, too, or they try to test my limits, that can happen'*. However, from Karen's story, these female substitute officers cannot be blamed because they are not told how to behave. From Karen's story a discourse seems to exist of how female officers should relate to prisoners. However, this discourse is not articulated or put into language yet, the female officers get to know it only through practice.

From Karen's story it seems that the prisoners also use the male heterosexual power in a suppressive manner by accusing the female officers of being lesbians when they apply rules and regulations in the same way as male officers do. According to Karen, *'if we set the same limits as the male officers do, oh, what was it the inmates said once, eh, then we were lesbians or not women anymore'*. This illustrates how the prisoners by the exercise of male heterosexual power can use homosexuality in a repressive manner in order to signal that this is not how a woman should behave. At the same time both Karen and Atle agree that female officers are in general more tactful than the male officers¹. It seems that to focussing on being heard instead of being seen, setting clear limits, although not as strict as the male officers' limits, together with acting tactful, are some guidelines female officers follow in order to express authority and exercise disciplinary and juridical-political power. In this manner the female officers may battle the prisoners exercise of male heterosexual power. In a study of policewomen, Wexler & Logan (1983: 180) concluded that the most common source of stress for the policewomen come from that they were women. To conclude that the female officers' gender is the most common source for stress in this study may be too far-fetched, but it seems that their gender can be a source of stress.

¹ Farnworth's (1992) study shows the same.

The prisoners' use of male heterosexual power and the female officers' use of disciplinary and juridical-political power seems to create a strategic situation where these two forms of power are in constant interplay. As long as the prisoners restraint their expressions of gender and avoid to use heterosexual power in a way the female officers find repressive, and as long as the female officers restraint their expressions of gender and manage to construct and re-construct authoritarianism, the power relations between the prisoners and female officers seem to balance. At the same time, there are tensions and fluctuations. For example, by the female officers' toleration of flattering comments, the prisoners can manipulate and make the female officers do them favours. On the other hand, a female officer can express authoritarianism and exercise disciplinary and juridical-political power if she does not tolerate fawning comments with repressive sexual undertones. One way to set limits is to request to be addressed by her family name. By doing so she is also marking a "gendered" distance because while her first name is gendered, her family name is non-gendered².

According to Karen's story, the female officers are trying to show prisoners respect by hiding their gender and not dressing in a "challenging" way. By showing respect in this manner, the female officers feel that they could gain respect from the prisoners, too. This is supported by Price & Liebling (1998: 65), who learned that while some prisoners thought that the female officers should act more sexy, other prisoners thought it was not right of female staff to "wind themselves up". In her study, Zimmer (1986: 137) also found that some inmates disliked it if female officers dolled themselves up. However, according to Karen's story, it also seems that female officers could gain respect by exhibiting their gender in certain ways, for example, by showing tenderness and sympathy. As Karen says, *'I believe that if you can show a little tenderness and sympathy, I think you can win a lot as a woman'*. In this way a female prison officer could achieve better contact with the prisoners, something which is important within the caring discourse in the Prison Service.

It is possible that the female officers who express their gender in an "appropriate" manner as discussed above, manage to relate to the prisoners at a personal level. However, when the

² However, an almost striking feature during the fieldwork was that the prisoners mostly addressed the female officers by their first names, while the male officers were addressed by their family names. This may be an indication of the female officers more personal relationship to the prisoners.

prisoners want to be private, e.g. by talking about their problems and private matters, they always seem to keep in mind that the one they talk to, man or woman, is a prison officer. Atle is afraid that the information he gives when he talks openly can be used against him. Most likely this is due to a general suspicion towards the prison system, that information given by confession can be used to discipline the prisoner in ways he does not want. The female officers' presence seems to create a certain calmness on the landings, as can be seen in the stories of both Atle and Didrik. This may be due to the female officers' gender, and its appeal to personal contact as well as the prisoners' restraint their expressions of gender whenever female officers are present. This is shown in several studies which have found that female prison officers have a calming effect in male prisons (Zimmer, 1986: 153; Jurik, 1988: 297-298; Price & Liebling, 1998: 64).

In situations where the imbalance of power is striking, e.g. when the prisoners deliver a urine test³, it seems that the prisoners try to attack the male officers' expressions of authoritarianism by accusing the male officers of being homosexual. Homosexual masculinity is subordinated to heterosexual masculinity in the hierarchisation between men, and homophobia is a known mechanism in the suppression of heterosexual masculinity (see, for example, Connell, 1995: 154-157). By accusing male officers of homosexuality, the prisoners try to de-masculinise the male officers. Despite the prisoners' struggle, the power relations between the prisoners and the male officers seem to be in clear imbalance where the male officers are superior. As discussed previously, within the discourse of authoritarianism a male prison officer can never lose his authority because he is a man, and as Didrik says, '*some situations simply call for a man*'. Whereas a female prison officer has to put a lot of effort into expressing authoritarianism, it seems that a male officer has to put effort in tearing down the barrier his gender creates if he wants to be personal and express caring masculinity. According to Karen's story, a male prison officer's large muscular and strong body can lead to distance instead of closeness between a prisoner and himself. The reason for this may be that since muscles and being large and strong are symbols of authoritarianism, the prisoners in their opposition towards the system, try to not lose face towards a "system representative" (Szockyj, 1989: 320). However in her story Karen also says '*I also believe there are male*

³ At Polar Prison, the male officers strip search and take urine test of the prisoners. A female officer can carry out these tasks if no male officer is available. According to Jurik (1988: 295), "(L)imited duty assignments represent an institutionalized type of role encapsulation". This may be the case, but more probably the respect for the male prisoner's privacy is the reason why the male officers usually do these tasks. (See e.g. Farnworth, 1992, for further discussion about this issue).

officers that show the inmates this kind of care'. Most of the male officers that were interviewed said that they had good contact with the prisoners. A couple of them mentioned that they could talk seriously with prisoners when they were alone, but that the relationship with the prisoners was superficial and flippant. As discussed earlier, one of the characteristics of patriarchy is joking. It is therefore reasonable to assume that a male officer to some extent is a part of this patriarchy, where both the male officer and the prisoner "negotiate the latent tension and aggression they feel toward each other" (Lyman, 1987: 151). Kidding can be a way of displaying yourself to both other prisoners and male officers, which make the kidding to a kind of "masculine play" where nobody wants to be the weakest.

Sport and power

Didrik:

I remember when I started to train with the prisoners some years ago. Back then it wasn't usual that prison officers trained with the inmates in their regular training times (laughs). Oh, they scowled at me, and they didn't like my interference at all. They wanted to have the equipment themselves, and some of them tried to, to say 'I'm going to use this equipment, and you as an officer have no, it's not your equipment', they tried to chase me away. But I told them very clearly how things should be, that we officers should train with them on an equal basis. I tried to be a little diplomatic of course, that one should ask if the equipment was available and so on. In the beginning it was like a mental battle with them, but after a while it all went pretty well, and now it has completely turned around. Now they come over and wonder why I haven't been in the training-room for a while, and I meet them in the yard and so on and they say 'now you better get your bottom to the training room!' Now they actually think it's all right that we train with them. When I wear training clothes and train with them and do the same things as they do, the atmosphere between us gets more informal and we become pals in another way, more like training colleagues in a way, and I get a special contact with them. They look upon you as a human being and not as a prison officer, and they open up more and do not have the same strenuous attitude as they can have when you wear the uniform. They get to know you and they value and clearly respect those who participate. Actually, they do respect people that they are together with in their day to day activities more than those who are just prison officers.

I have to say though that it was when we were allowed to play football with the prisoners I had the best contact that I ever have had with them. Even if this is a while ago, these prisoners still come over to me and ask if I won't play with them again. They are very interested in getting me to play with them, they think it's great. I believe this is because on the football-field we meet each other on an equal basis. One thing is that you get your uniform off, but tackles hit me just as the others. They see that I stumble, they see that I lose the ball, they see that there are a lot of things that I don't fix, and perhaps they even fix these things better. And I believe this contributes to equalise, I mean get rid of, what shall I say, eh .. I mean the officer-inmate role is a kind of a superior-inferior relationship, and this is totally removed when we are on the football-field. And I don't care if they tackle me or if my team loses; it doesn't matter at all. But, there is something about the attitude here, that we're not supposed to lose face at any price. I think this attitude is all wrong, I mean it's real bad not only on the football field but also in general. I've told the inmates that 'I'm a human being, and so are you', I mean, it's as simple as that for me. And I have said many times in many occasions that 'now I went too far' or 'this wasn't right', and they support me at once and say 'it's fine you tell us'. And then, you're finished with this matter, and everything is all right again.

When I'm in the training room with the inmates though, I've noticed that they come over to me and ask what I think about that exercise versus another one, if I have any suggestions about a good exercise for a particular muscle-group and so on. They know that I have some knowledge about training, but it also seems like they want to talk to me because they appreciate that the officer wears training suit and is like them. When I give them advice, I always try to underline the importance of practising endurance-training and such things without being persistent. I don't directly interfere in their training though, I rather try to influence them by the way I'm training; I train with less kilos and more repetitions and practice a lot on the exercise bike. I also tell them why I train like this; that I'm doing quite a lot of running in the forest and so on, and that I won't be large and heavy but rather strong and have endurance. I try to, when the situation calls for it, to encourage these people until you almost get embarrassed yourself, it's like an empty hole, and you can actually fill it up until they almost start laughing themselves. Sometimes it almost gets stupid, but they think it's great. You see, they have never gotten any encouragement, and it's actually easier for them to handle criticism than encouragement. And, this way of influencing them by encouraging them, I mean, it's so simple and it doesn't cost a crown!

Even if I say to the inmates that I train with few kilos and many repetitions, I do have to show off a little, too (laughs). For sure most lads like to, and I mean this concerns women, too, we like to be the one that lifts the most and is the best in competitions. The competition instinct is present, that's for sure! One day a few weeks ago, some of the lads (prisoners) were going to exercise their legs. On the machine where they were going to do this exercise, it was actually a bit fun because I had put on 200 kilos on this machine the day before because I then exercised my legs. I didn't think much about it, but the lads couldn't manage to lift 200 kilos. These guys train a lot and are large and strong, at least in the upper part of their bodies, so I had to laugh a bit and I kidded a bit; 'don't you manage to get this up? Come here, I'll show you', and I went over and managed to lift it up (laugh). It was so fun, and one of them – his eyes got big you know, because I'm much smaller than him, and he burst out: 'damn, you've got strong legs!' It was like, for me it was fun, and it made me feel a little good too (laughs well). Of course they respected me for this, because they didn't expect me to be able to do such a thing. But I explained to them that I got strong legs because I do a lot of alpine-skiing. But, for sure it was fun. But it's the bench-press that's the big "macho-exercise" here, it's in this exercise one shall show off that one's lifting the most. I haven't trained that much with bench-press, but I really would have liked to lift 200 kilo on "the bench". For sure I would have impressed them a lot, but I'll never bother (laugh), to exercise that much to do this many kilos. This is one of the reasons for that I don't do this exercise; I just have to admit that.

You see, a lot of inmates here respect officers that are large and strong. They, they admit it too in a way, it's very obvious. There are officers here that are pretty large and strong and they seldom need to raise their voices. An officer that's small and scrawny and perhaps has been working here for a long time and really has more power because of his position, has to work harder to achieve the same as a larger officer. Because the inmates admire these large and strong macho-officers, I believe that these officers have a unique opportunity to get in contact with the prisoners. They have something in common with the prisoners in a way, they build their bodies, and they should therefore have a lot to talk about. But, I think very few of them use this opportunity. In the training room, instead of taking the initiative and explaining things to the prisoners they are rather just "leaders of the pack". And, it's a bit daring to say but, but when they train with the prisoners their body language and their attitude towards the inmates says 'if it's any mess on my landing, you know who to deal with if I'm at work'. These things are known without having to say. The status these officers have among the prisoners is

based on the fact that they are macho, strong and tough, I mean; 'we won't do him any harm because then he'll beat us'.

I also use to participate in ski-trips and canoe-trips with the inmates. When we are on these trips, there is a clear difference if there are female officers there or not. On a trip with no female officers, the conversation is perhaps a little more careless, a little rougher, it's ehmm .. it's more, a little outdoing each other; it's like this when one is going to impress the others a bit, you cheeky more, and, yes, the tone is a bit loosen. And I have to admit that I like to play. Sometimes it happens that I tease them a bit, but I'm mostly just dragged along. If someone starts to call me a chicken or a sissy when we are out on the slopes (laughs), then, then I'm there at once. But when you are on trips outside the prison, you have a special type of contact with the prisoners. Again you take the uniform off, pretty soon we start to use the first names, and in a way we are on the same wavelength and get to know the inmates better. Things that perhaps are a problem on the landing are possible to solve on these trips and the work with them becomes much easier to carry out when we have a little distance from the prison.

Atle:

I have to say that there are pretty many laid back prison officers here. It's actually admirable that some of them stand up for us and make an effort in arranging, for example, trips like canoe-trips and ski-trips. Their effort is in fact valued very highly among us lads. Generally, there is a great difference between these officers and the others. These prison officers may come over to you and have a chat, not about anything special, but just to hear if you're all right or of it's something you are wondering about. You also see that prisoners turn to these officers and ask them things like 'how was your vacation', 'how are you', 'it's a long time since I've seen you', and things like that. This is even more seldom to see because you only talk to officers if there's something you are wondering about or if you need help with something.

I think the greatest setback is that the prison officers aren't allowed to play football with us anymore. I mean they do themselves a disservice by not participating. I don't know why they don't play anymore, if they have decided this themselves or if it's the leadership that denies them, it's quite destructive anyway. One of the most important arenas where the prison officer and the prisoner can co-operate and do things together is by playing sports together. By not

participating they cut off a natural way of getting in contact with the prisoners, actually they close a door, perhaps they even lock it up.

But there are some officers though who participate in weight training, and I think in the prison, it's in the weight training room that most of the prison officers and the prisoners put away their roles, more than anywhere else really. It's not so much, I mean the role play doesn't function in the same way there, but that requires that the prison officers also train. Of course the officers with large bodies are noticed without it being directly stated in a way, actually I think many prisoners admire them, I do think so. Some prisoners do respect these officers a bit, too, I believe.

I think it's all right when prison officers train, it's like they change when they take off the uniform, they become in a way easier to talk to. Of course it depends on the prison officer, but most often you come in contact with them and you talk about other things. For example, we exchange training experiences, and talk about training methods and so on. Sometimes I also train with them; I ask if we can train together if the officer uses the same apparatus as I need to train a particular muscle group, and they have always been positive to me. But there aren't many of the prisoners who train with the prison officers, but I give a damn and train with them as long as we can have a good time together. I think it's important, too, in order to improve the atmosphere between the prisoners and the prison officers. That we can train together as pals in an OK way can also make your stay in prison a little bit easier.

Some female officers have also been training in the weight training room, but I have noticed that they are a bit disruptive. Actually, I can only speak for myself, but I notice small signals in a way, also from the other prisoners, I mean, we are though so goddamn obsessed with sex all the time. If a person of the opposite sex comes into the training room, ehh, this female person attracts my attention. And then, you know ehh .. and then I notice that the other prisoners react the same, they are as engaged as I, I do notice that. Actually, it doesn't matter but I think it becomes in a way, I sense a waiting attitude, a calmness as right before five males will go at each other (laughs). I feel a kind of insecurity in a way. If a female officer just sits there in her uniform and watches us, it's not like this. It's if she trains it becomes like this. But, if the female officers train, they mostly do their workout on the exercise bike. It seems like they don't dare to do any other exercise. I believe they are afraid of, I don't know but it seems like they are afraid of losing their authority or something like that. Perhaps they

think it's not feminine to exercise with weights, or perhaps they believe that they will be stared at if they do any other exercise. And, well, I have to admit that they are stared at.

Karen:

I didn't train with the inmates when I worked in the restrictive wing because I don't think it's all right to have body contact with the prisoners. The weight training room is very small and therefore it's easy to come into body contact with the inmates. And, the inmates in this wing, I don't know, but they are though in a way more disgusting in many ways. I mean, you can't always see the difference between prisoners in the contract and the restrictive wing, but there is though a little difference between some of them. Another thing is that you are more looked at there than in the weight training room in the contract wing. Now, I would never, as a woman, train with the inmates in the restrictive wing.

Anyhow, I now work in the contract wing and I think it is all right to be allowed to participate and train a bit. I haven't told the inmates about my scepticism of weight training though, because this is in a way a bit of a sensitive theme, and if I do say so, I think the inmates wouldn't have been so positive towards me as they are today. I actually feel welcome among the prisoners who train with weights, at least nobody has said anything negative about it. When I train with the inmates, I feel I get closer to them in a way because you are more equal with them when you wear training clothes than when you wear a uniform. It's more like, ehh what should I say, we talk more like pals, I mean it's easier to, eh .. to talk about things in the training room which you don't talk about on the landings. I believe it becomes easier for the inmates to relate to you as a person in a way, you do something together. There's actually a different atmosphere in the weight training room than on the landings. It has actually struck me how different my relation with the inmates is when I'm not wearing a uniform, it's like I'm another person in a way. I can, for example, tolerate it when an inmate says to me 'you've got a nice body', something which I never would have tolerated when I'm in my uniform. But the prisoners are also different when I train with them. They are helpful and straight and show me how to do things, and then I perhaps use some femininity because I want to know them better; 'can't you show me this', 'how do you do this', and so on. Perhaps they feel on top when they can help me too? I've also noticed that some prisoners lift so much that they become completely blue in the face because I'm actually a woman. And I believe they do this especially when there are women present in the weight training room. It can't be healthy, but I believe they would have just started to laugh of me if I had begun discussing with them how

to train with weights. First, even if I had trained weights before, they would pretty quickly have understood that I don't know anything about weight training. Second, with my size and upper arms they wouldn't have taken me seriously. The only thing I try to do is to tell them that they have to try to warm up before they start lifting those very heavy weights. But if I had said 'I'm training and I have been training for several years', then I could, even if I'm a woman, have said something about it. So, women can, but you have to show more than a man that you can because it isn't so visible, you have to legitimatise it. If I have managed to lift more than the inmates do and had muscles, I think they would have looked up at me, but at the same time I would also have challenged them.

Even if some of the inmates in the weight training room are pretty large and strong, I don't find them deterrent. If they start to behave badly, I just say to them that they have to leave and go back to their landings, I mean, they have to be aware that I'm the one who decides. I also have to set my own limits. Especially when I take the uniform off, I notice that the inmates look at me more as a woman immediately. And you have to be much more aware of setting clear lines when you not wearing a uniform than when you wear a uniform. But it's also when you are getting along nicely with the prisoner it's most difficult to set the limits. But, it's then it's most important because then you are more private, you are more a woman, and you have to watch your step carefully and be aware of your limits.

As a female in sport settings you will always attract attention, but it depends very much on how you dress and where you are, and also how familiar the prisoners are seeing you in training clothes. There are no guidelines for how to dress or how to behave when you are in different training settings; you have to feel it yourself. But I think it is important that we don't expose ourselves too much and attract more attention than necessary. I exercise mostly on the bike and not so much with the weights when I train with the prisoners. I wouldn't have felt comfortable if I, for example, should have laid down on a bench and started exercising on the bench-press because then I feel that would have exposed myself in an unfortunate way. Even if the weight training room in the contract wing is large, in a way it gets too intimate and I try to cover myself by wearing loose and baggy clothes. I would never have thought of wearing tight clothes. I can wear a big, coloured T-shirt, and last summer when I was participating in a canoe trip, the weather was nice, and I wore T-shirt and baggy shorts. I even had a bath, which of course was commented on by the inmates; 'Karen, it's not common to bath in shorts

and T-shirt'. But I said 'it is for me' (laughs) and they accepted that. On that trip the inmates behaved almost like gentlemen, and I thought it was all right to feel like a woman.

I remember though in the prison where I worked earlier, there was a good-looking female aerobic instructor who came into the prison once a week to run aerobic classes for the inmates. She wore tight clothes, and in aerobics some of the exercises are quite challenging in relation to sex. It seemed to me that the prisoners participating in this exercise weren't there because of the exercise, but because they wanted to look at her. I reacted very strongly to this, almost moralising in a way. I don't know why, perhaps because I was jealous of her fit and beautiful body? But I know it's more complicated than that, because if she had been outside the prison I wouldn't have noticed her at all. But I think it's something about a "culture of watching". In prison the watching is so controlled, both what the prisoners can watch and when they can watch it. So when they have the possibility to see a beautiful girl practising aerobics it can be exciting, I can understand that. I guess it's healthy for the prisoners, even if some of them have a pretty bad view of women, but I don't know if it's healthy for that girl. She becomes something without an identity, and that's transferred to me in a way. In a male prison there are so few women, and we are so vulnerable that things like this cause all of us to be treated like her. You don't feel exactly stepped on, but because you are a woman you feel that you have to go out and defend yourself. I think that's why I react so strongly to this, but I'm not sure of what I think about it.

The beginning of Didrik's story shows an example of how the prisoners try to oppose the prison officers by denying them access to a space the prisoners have defined as theirs. As Didrik's story shows, the use of authoritarianism may be a tough match where the mechanisms of power and resistance are at odds with each other. According to both Didrik's and Atle's stories, one reason why the prison officers managed to be accepted in the weight training room seems to be the contact the prisoners and the prison officers get by practising this activity together. From Karen's story, it seems that female officers also can come into better contact with the prisoners by practising sport with them. However, the improved contact felt by the female officers when practising weight training with the prisoners, restricts the female officers from mentioning their resistance towards weight training. If a female officer were to tell the prisoners that she is against their practice of weight training, the prisoners would probably show their opposition to her by being unwilling to have personal contact with her. From the previous stories it seems that the male and female officers have

different experiences with practising sport with prisoners. Moreover Atle's story shows that the prisoners' experience the presence of male officers in sports settings differently than the presence of female officers. The power relations between the prisoners and the male and female officers in relation to the male and female officers' respective participation in sport, will therefore be discussed separately.

The prisoners – the male officers and the exercise of sport

To take off the uniform and wear the same kind of clothes as the prisoners, combined with doing the same as the prisoners do, seems to be an effective way for the male officers to tear down the barrier caused by authoritarianism and achieve a personal relationship with the prisoners. By moving their relationship to a personal level in the sport setting, the power situation between the prisoners and the male officers seems to change to a more equalised relationship as human beings. Nevertheless, there is a superior-inferior relationship defined at all times. How the relationship turns out in the sport setting also depends on what kind of contact the prisoners are interested in. According to Atle's story, concerning the male officers and the prisoners training together in the weight training room, it seems that most of the prisoners can be involved with the male officers to some extent. As discussed in the previous chapter, the power relations between the prisoners influence the prisoners' relationship with the prison officers in order not to get too close to the prison officers. It may be that this power mechanism, together with a general opposition to "system representatives", makes some prisoners reluctant to train with weights with the male officers.

As stated earlier, male officers who express caring masculinity and have a personal relationship to the prisoners, base their relationship with the prisoners on contact and mutual respect. In order to express caring masculinity when practising sport with the prisoners, male officers have to reject the fundamental ideas that the traditional male officer- prisoner relationship is built upon. In sport settings, in order to display caring masculinity, a male officer has to present himself as inferior or equal to the prisoners instead of striving to show superiority and never "losing face" and admitting mistakes. In both Didrik's and Atle's stories we see that playing football together is an activity where the male officers and the prisoners have the opportunity to co-operate on an equal basis. In order for the male officers to do and display caring masculinity when they play football with the prisoners, they have to focus on

the play and the contact they can have with the prisoners, rather than focusing on showing the prisoners how good they are at football or trying to win the match⁴.

According to Atle's and Didrik's stories, the contact-creating aspect is also present in the weight training. The prisoners and the male officers train together, exchange experiences and talk about training methods. In Didrik's story we also see that a male officer with knowledge of weight training can exercise disciplinary power and encourage the prisoners not to train with heavy weights by the way he is training and by giving training advice. For this to be a successful strategy, he talks to them about training in a non-provocative manner and is inclusive and personal and tells the prisoners why he prefers to train like this. If he provokes the prisoners when he gives them training advice, they may turn against him, which will make it difficult for the prison officer to exercise disciplinary power and influence the prisoners' way of training. While encouragement in the relationship between the prisoners was a sign of inferiority, in Didrik's story we see that for a prison officer to encourage a prisoner is an effective way of exercising disciplinary power. Because the superior-inferior relationship between the male officers and the prisoners is always defined, it is unlikely that the male officer will be in an inferior relation to a prisoner by encouraging him.

According to Didrik's story, a male officer who displays caring masculinity can also play with the hegemonic macho masculinity, which Didrik has done in the exercise of his legs and in other activities, such as when he tries to be better than the prisoners in the ski-play. Even if Didrik displays a caring masculinity, it seems that he cannot completely free himself from the hegemonic macho masculinity and the power a male officer can exercise over the prisoners if he has a strong and large muscular body. He is, for example, careful with revealing his weakness in the "macho exercise" – "the bench-press". For Didrik, this "play" with the macho masculinity can be interpreted as nostalgia regarding the power male officers can exercise over the prisoners by the display of macho masculinity (Denzin, 1991: 26). As discussed before, the exercise of power by the display of caring masculinity is not based on fear as in the display of macho masculinity, but on contact and mutual respect. The power Didrik exercises in this "nostalgic play" is not based on fear but on superiority and admiration. A

⁴ The prison officers cannot play football with the prisoners because of "security reasons". The prison officers' task is to guard the prisoners when they are in the exercise yard, and if they play football, they can lose control over the prisoners in the exercise yard that do not play football.

male officer that displays hegemonic macho masculinity by lifting heavy weights to show the prisoners who is the strongest for the purpose of frightening them, does not play with macho masculinity. For this officer, macho masculinity is crucial in order to maintain control over the prisoners. However, according to Didrik's story, these prison officers have the unique potential to come into contact with the prisoners that train with weights because the prisoners admire them. The reason why very few of these male officers use this opportunity is most likely that their way of controlling the prisoners is to frighten them and to treat them with a condescending attitude.

According to Didrik's story the best contact between male officers and prisoners is achieved through doing activities together outside the prison. When they are out on trips, e.g. on canoe-trips, the prisoners and the prison officers call each other by first name, which is an indication that they have a more personal relation. It seems that some officers also use this personal contact to "work with the inmates", which can be interpreted as a way to exercise disciplinary power by trying to influence them. According to Atle's story, the male officers⁵ who make an effort in arranging these trips, have a special status among the prisoners and are highly ranked in the judgement of the prison officers (see page 164). In Atle's story we see that the prisoners view these officers differently than other officers. It seems that the personal contact created on these trips is re-created inside the prison even if the male officers there wear uniforms and express more authority.

The prisoners – the female officers and the exercise of sport

Karen's description of the prisoners in the restrictive wing as "more disgusting" and her feeling of being looked at, is probably due to the fact that the prisoners in this wing do not restrain their expressions of gender as much as the prisoners in the contract wing. Unlike the prisoners in the contract wing, the prisoners in the restrictive wing cannot be punished by being sent to the restrictive wing. A possible punishment for prisoners in the restrictive wing, if they make passes that female officers find inappropriate is solitary confinement. This is a rather hard punishment and the insult towards the female officer should be severe to justify this punishment. The lesser necessity to restrain their expressions of gender makes the prisoners freer to exercise male heterosexual power in a suppressive manner, and give the

⁵ According to Didrik's story, female officers also participate in these trips, but in the fieldwork I experienced that the male officers were in charge of the arrangements of these trips.

female officers a feeling of being sex objects. It actually seems that this cuts off the opportunity for the female officers to be involved with the prisoners in the restrictive wing on a personal basis by practising sport with them.

According to Karen's story, the female officers feel more comfortable in the weight training room in the contract wing. Since the weight training room in the contract wing is larger, it is easier to avoid body contact. This can be one reason why Karen trains with the prisoners in the contract wing. Another reason may be that the prisoners in the contract wing have to restraint their expressions of gender more and exercise male heterosexual power in a way which will not be offensive to the female officers, or else they could be sanctioned. Nevertheless, only a minority of the female officers trained with the prisoners in the weight-training room in the contract wing during the year of the data-production. Those who were training seemed to have a "sports-identity" and were comfortable in training clothes. Even if they became more private when they took off the uniform and wore training clothes they seemed to tackle this by setting limits and constructing authoritarianism. The data-material shows that for some female officers the participation in sport with the prisoners is correlated to sport skills. Some female officers with little experience with sports activities felt that they would reveal lack of skills and thereby lose authority if they exercised sport with the prisoners. Another reason why female officers do not want to train with the prisoners seems to be that some female officers do not want to get the kind of contact with the prisoners that they could achieve by training with them. Apparently, these female officers are more comfortable having a distanced and professional relationship with the prisoners.

In accordance with Karen's story, female officers seem to think it is all right that the prisoners treat them more as women in informal settings, and some may even tolerate jokes with a sexual undertone. Apparently the female officers and the prisoners construct gender differently in more informal situations than other times. This makes the power relations between the prisoners and the female officers different on the canoe-trip or in the training room than elsewhere in the prison. On the canoe trip, or in the training room, it seems that the prisoners and the female officers have a larger register available to construct themselves as men and women. Karen illustrates this by saying that she is an another person when she is not wearing a uniform. In the weight training room she can allow herself to be more private and display more femininity and subdue herself in order to learn to know the prisoners better. The prisoners in the weight training room help her and they lift heavy in order to show themselves

off. On the canoe trip she exposes more of her gender by revealing more of her body, and the prisoners behave like gentlemen. Both when she is on a canoe trip outside the prison and when she is training with the prisoners in the weight training room, Karen allows the prisoners to exercise male heterosexual power, but in a manner which she does not find offensive.

At the same time, in accordance with Karen's story, it is in the settings where she is more a woman and having a good time with the prisoners that she has to be cautious and set clear limits. That she constructs less authority when she needs it the most may look like a paradox. However, to gain respect and express authoritarianism in order to exercise power and set limits, the female officers seem to use their integrity as prison officers and their comfort in these situations. As Karen says, *'if they start to behave badly, I just say to them that they have to leave and go back to their landings, I mean, they have to be aware that I'm the one who decides'*. From Karen's story, knowledge seems to be a way of getting respect from the prisoners, and just as male officers, female officers can, by means of knowledge, exercise disciplinary power in order to encourage the prisoners to train with lighter weights. Displaying knowledge, however, seems to be most effective in the form of practice, e.g. by showing large muscles. Because female officers are likely to have smaller and less muscular bodies than male officers, they have to prove a larger degree of knowledge than male officers do. However, if a female officer would lift as many kilos as the prisoners do, she would have challenged them most likely because, according to the gender order, men are supposed to be the superior part when it comes to bodily strength. At the same time, a female officer lifting more than the prisoners could be admired according to Karen's story. There is a parallel with male officers displaying macho masculinity either seriously or playing with it in the weight training room. Just as is the case with these male officers, female officers who lift more than the prisoners would have been able to exercise power by being admired.

According to Karen's story, women in sport settings with the prisoners will always attract attention, which is also confirmed in Atle's story. Karen says: *'there are no guidelines for how to dress or how to behave when you are in different training settings; you have to feel it yourself'*, which indicates that the female officers are not introduced to the discourse for how women should dress in sports settings with the prisoners as I was when I entered the field (see page 49). Even if an articulated discourse exists for how to dress, although the female officers seem not to be introduced to it, the data-material shows that no articulated discourse seems to

exist for how women should behave when exercising sport with the prisoners. It seems that female officers have to find the guidelines for how to dress and behave in the sport settings by themselves. However, the most important guideline seems to be not to expose femaleness in a way that contributes to the sexualisation of oneself, something that will reduce one's ability to exercise authoritarianism. According to Karen's story, to sexualise oneself will also sexualise other female officers and lead to a situation where the female officers collective exercise of authoritarianism will be reduced. Even if female officers get to know this discourse through practise and experience, "foreigners" may come into the prison and unknowingly expose their femaleness in an "unfortunate" way. When established limits for the "culture of watching" are crossed by "unfortunate" exposure of the female body, the prisoners exercise heterosexual male power in a manner that is difficult for the female officers. It makes the female officers lose authority and they have to make an effort to re-establish the limits in order to assume a position where they can exercise authoritarianism again. However, even if the female officers are careful with not attracting attention, and even if they feel that they do not contribute in sexualising themselves, we see from Atle's story that the prisoners do look at them and sexualise them, not openly, but in a more covert way. During the fieldwork, when a female officer practised weight training with the prisoners, I noticed that the exercise of male heterosexual power was not visible to her. It took the form of an atmosphere, perhaps what Atle calls a "waiting attitude", where the prisoners, by looks and movements in the weight training room sent signals to each other and not to the female officer. However, during the fieldwork in the weight training room in the contract wing, I had the same feeling as described in Karen's story. I also felt uncomfortable being sexualised and was careful when I worked out with the prisoners. Only when I worked out on the exercise bike, I felt it was OK to take off my college-sweater, and then only if I wore a coloured T-shirt. In spite of this, I found out during the interviews with the prisoners that I was sexualised. In an interview with one of the prisoners, I got an elaborated and detailed explanation of why a woman was sexualised when she took part in the weight training:

I asked the prisoner if I influence them in the same way as a female officer when I train with them in the weight training room.

Prisoner:

A little bit. Yeees. But you are in a way, you are accepted in a little different way. Because you have a kind of defined task among us, you are in a way, you obviously come in among us

with your own tasks in a way, so that's a bit different. But you are though a woman among us and, so you, that's a part of the same (laugh). .. But for sure, when you take off your college-sweater then, then, it's (laugh) ten antennas that's just, that are tuned in at once. But it's, but it's just the way we are.

Berit:

But do you think it would have been the same if a female officer had done the same?

Prisoner:

A little different because there have been female officers that have trained with us too. ... But it isn't very different because, because for us are, are in a way things unattainable anyhow. So it's in a way purely, it's purely in a way just, just the autonomic⁶ signals we react upon in a way.

Berit:

What kind of signals then?

Prisoner:

No, just that you take off your sweater, and that you, that we see your curves, and that you, that you sweat, that we can, that we can smell you and such things you know (clears his throat). It's different than we are used to, with just sweat from men and, and, these things we walk in all the time (clears his throat). And then it's men's fantasy, you know; when you see women not far away from you that, and if you're not used to seeing them then, then you think about, about things that have in a way a turn-on effect on you at once

Berit:

Is that purely sexual?

Prisoner:

(Heave a sigh) Yes, yes I'm sure you can say that it's, that it's something purely sexual. And that, but it's not like, it's not, it doesn't have to be something, something degrading for you in

⁶ In the interpretation of this sentence I have understood "autonomic" as automatic.

a way, or, or, or in relation to you. I mean it's just that it has a purely sexual effect. Not that you suddenly get attacked and raped in a way, but, but, that, that your presence in a way touches the sexual sensors to, to, to those of us that are present in a way.

Berit:

Do I touch them more when I'm training than when I'm not training?

Prisoner:

Yes, for sure. Because you use yourself, you are more visible, and you (clears his throat), I'm sure about that.

When I heard that I was sexualised, I felt it degrading, even if this prisoner thought it was not. While a male officer seems to have no problems in separating being personal and private when he exercises sport with the prisoners, a female officer becomes more private once she takes off her uniform, puts on training clothes and exercises with the prisoners. Her gender is more visible, and the prisoners cannot avoid looking at her as a woman. Even if she is careful, she has a greater chance of being exposed to the prisoner's exercise of male heterosexual power in a suppressive manner, even if this is not intended to be suppressive from the prisoners.

*

In this chapter we have seen that even if a prison officer is mostly thought of as "he", and even if the prisoners discriminate within the genders rather than between the genders, there are nevertheless differences in the power relations between the prisoners and the male officers and the prisoners and the female officers. In the heterosexual power relation between the male officers and the prisoners there seems to be an imbalance of power, and the male officers have to make an effort to tear down the barrier of authoritarianism if they want to express caring masculinity. To participate in sport activities with the prisoners is an effective means in order to express caring masculinity and to come into contact with the prisoners. However, this requires that the male officer interfere with the prisoners in a humble and subdued manner. In doing so, male officers can also exercise disciplinary power over the prisoners, for example, by making them to train with lighter weights. In the heterosexual power relations between the prisoners and the female officers, however, there is a "play of power" between the prisoners'

exercise of male heterosexual power and the female officers' exercise of disciplinary and juridical-political power. In order to exercise disciplinary and juridical-political power, female officers have to express authoritarianism, which means hiding or restraint their expressions of gender. Even if the female officers' gender is more visible when they practise sport with the prisoners, this is also a good opportunity for the female officers to come into contact with the prisoner. However, the contact-creating aspect in the sport setting between the prisoners and the female officers seems to be based on a changed display of gender both for the female officers and the prisoners. The female officers may allow the prisoners to exercise male heterosexual power in a manner that they do not find repressive, and they might even subdue this exercise of power in order to create contact. However, it seems that female officers have to be comfortable with this situation in order to gain advantages from it and feel that they do not lose any authority. Female officers are nevertheless sexualised, but the prisoners do not visually indicate to them that they are sexualised.

Chapter twelve

Summarising Discussion

Following Maxwell (1996: 15) classifications, the research purposes, practical purposes and personal purposes of this study were clarified in the introductory chapter. In the chapter of methods, potential political consequences were outlined in the subchapter about ethics. In the following summarising chapter, the presentation is structured around the research purposes and the political consequences.

The research purposes in this thesis are based on my experience working with sport in prison. Given that a disagreement about the purpose of sport exists between the prisoners and the prison officers in the study, the first research purpose is to understand why the staff and the prisoners construct different meanings of the prisoners' exercise of sport and of the prisoners' construction of large muscular bodies. The second research purpose is to understand why prisoners and prison officers engage in the exercise of sport in prison. With a basis in these two purposes, three research questions were formulated using theories about crime and punishment, feminist theories about masculinities, and Foucault's understanding of power. The issues these research questions raised were discussed in relation to empirical material produced during one year of fieldwork in a male prison and in relation to the theories mentioned above. The main issue raised in all three research questions is the construction and reconstruction of gender and masculinity through the practice of sport in prison. In order to illuminate this issue, the contextual aspect and the theoretical aspect of Foucault's understandings of power were central. In the following summary of the discussion, these two aspects are reduced in order to answer the research questions in a concise manner.

Research question one – the discourses

The first research question raised in this thesis is:

What are the leading discourses for the construction and re-construction of masculinities in the prison in general, and for the prison officers' interpretations of the prisoners' exercise of sport in particular?

This research question raises three issues that have been discussed separately within the realm of Foucault's understanding of disciplinary power. The first issue discussed was the leading discourses for the prison officers' construction and re-construction of masculinities seen in relation to the prison officers' exercise of disciplinary power as well as political juridical power. The second issue discussed was the leading discourses for the discipline of the prisoners' construction and re-construction of masculinities. The discussion of the second issue prepared the ground for the third issue discussed, which was the prison officers' interpretation of the prisoners' exercise of sport.

Concerning the prison officers, their most important task is to supervise and control the prisoners. In order to carry out these tasks, the exercise of disciplinary power and juridical-political power is crucial. However, in order to exercise these forms of power, the prison officers have to display authoritarianism, which can be viewed as the embodiment of masculinity (Segal, 1990: 116). Authoritarianism can therefore be interpreted from the male officers' bodies and from the uniform. Traditionally, authoritarianism has been displayed by the large muscular bodies of the male prison officers and by the prison officers' toughness, hardness and condescending attitude to the prisoners. Because the exercise of disciplinary power and political juridical power has traditionally been carried out within a discourse where authoritarianism is displayed by physical force and distance to the prisoners, the *macho masculinity* has become the hegemonic masculinity at Polar Prison. When female officers entered Polar Prison at an increasing rate 10-15 years ago, this gender stereotypical discourse of macho masculinity was what they had to adapt to in the construction of themselves as prison officers. In order to be able to express authoritarianism in this manner, female officers had to hide their gender.

Since the female officers entrance in the male prisons, there has been a development towards more care in the Norwegian Prison Service, a development confirmed in, for example, political documents. This development demands the prison officers to act as personal officers where having a personal relationship with the prisoners through involvement and contact is important. Male officers that construct themselves within this discourse of caring are

expressing *caring masculinity* based on contact and mutual respect, where the focus on the bodily physicality to control the prisoners is strongly reduced. However, male officers never lose their authority because authoritarianism is interpreted from their bodies, and they can put their bodily physicality into focus whenever it is needed, such as in conflict situations. The establishment of the caring discourse now seems to challenge the hegemony of the macho masculinity at Polar Prison. Even if this discourse seems to give the female officers more space to express their gender in the profession as prison officers, authoritarianism still is to be interpreted as an embodied expression of masculinity because the female officers feel they lose authority if their gender become too visible.

The discipline of the prisoners' construction and re-construction of masculinities is an important matter in order to control the prisoners. To understand the discourses that are decisive for this discipline, one has to turn to the relation between men, crime and punishment. Because criminal acts are mostly committed by men, the acts that are criminalised can be viewed as socially unacceptable expressions of masculinity. When socially unacceptable expressions of masculinity are considered to be caused by "abnormalities" in men who commit crimes, rehabilitation strategies can be initiated in the prison for the purpose of "normalising" these men. The "normalising" is carried out by different means with the purpose of disciplining the prisoners body into expressing socially acceptable masculinities. In Polar Prison a micro-punishment system also exists in order to "normalise" the prisoners. However, the standard of this "normalisation" is what the prison system defines as normal. While "normal" or good behaviour in the prison is rewarded, sanctions are placed on the prisoners for "abnormal" or bad behaviour. This "normalising" discourse disciplines the prisoners to stay quiet and calm and forces them to assume institutional acceptable masculinities if they want to achieve benefits in the prison.

Concerning the prison officers' interpretations of the prisoners' exercise of sport, these interpretations seem, for some of the prison officers, to be influenced by the discourses of "normalising" the prisoners to construct socially or institutionally acceptable masculinities. This is primarily because politically, as well as among the prison officers in the study, a common view is that the sport activities should function as a means for "normalising" the prisoners with a purpose of teaching the prisoners social skills and fellowship. Based on a discourse that claims that team sport promotes these features in an individual, team sports are preferred over weight training. Nevertheless, of the sport activities at Polar Prison weight

training is the activity that engages most prisoners. Several of the prison officers in the study, in particular the female officers, think that weight training cannot serve a “normalising” effect. They think that instead of contributing to “normalisation” of the prisoners, weight training may rather contribute to enhance “abnormalities” in the prisoners, such as in “the rapist”, because he can construct a large, strong and muscular body by this kind of physical training.

One way of understanding this interpretation of “the rapist’s” body is to turn to the discursive construction of “the criminal” and “the criminal body”. By labelling a man who has committed rape a “rapist”, the masculinity this man expressed when he committed the rape becomes a part of this man’s identity. In prison, this identity is focused upon and fortified in the construction of “the criminal”, or more specifically “the rapist”, where one searches for “abnormalities” in “the rapist’s” body that can explain why this man committed rape. When a “rapist” constructs a large muscular body by training weights while imprisoned, this large muscular body is easily interpreted as an “abnormality” that may make it easier for “the rapist” to commit new rapes when released. With this interpretation of the criminal act, one associates the masculinity expressed in the criminal act of rape not only as personified, but also as embodied. The exercise of the body to become large and muscular is not a criminal act in itself. However, when a “rapist” exercises his body to become large and muscular, this can be looked upon as a socially unacceptable form of masculinity because the body is considered dangerous. This man is therefore considered to be a threat to the society’s safety, in particular women’s safety. However, not all of the prison officers agree with this interpretation of “the rapist’s” body, mostly because they separate the masculinity personified in the label “the rapist”, and the masculinity “the rapist” embodies by training with weights. Those prison officers who make this separation do not interpret “the rapist” large and muscular body as an “abnormality”. They question the ethics in the interpretation of the masculinity expressed by the large muscular body of a “rapist” as an “abnormality” capable of predicting crime.

In spite of the critique against weight training, weight training is nevertheless used as a commodity that is traded for the prisoners’ good behaviour. Prisoners who sign contracts that they will stay drug-free during imprisonment serve their sentences in the contract wing. Here they have access to a larger and better-equipped weight training room than the prisoners serving their sentence in the restrictive wing. Some of the prison officers in the study suggest that prisoners who practice weight training are the calmest prisoners. This is based on a

discourse that says that physical exercise makes people expel a lot of frustration. From this point of view the prisoners training with weights construct an institutional acceptable masculinity, and weight training is an effective means to control the prisoners to stay quiet and calm. On the other hand, the masculinity the prisoners express when they construct their bodies to be large and muscular by training with weights, was interpreted as macho masculinity by the staff. Since these prisoners display the same masculinity as the hegemonic masculinity among the staff, their display of macho masculinity may be interpreted as representing a threat. By constructing large and muscular bodies the prisoners can resist control by means of physical force and challenge this control by using the same means.

Research question two – the creation of the self

The second research question in this study is:

What do the sports activities mean for the prisoners' creation and re-creation of themselves as gendered subjects?

This research question raises an issue that has been discussed within the realm of Foucault's understanding of the creation of the self, where the individual exercises discipline over himself in order to create himself as the subject he wants to be. Even if many prison officers interpret the prisoners exercise of sport within the discourse of "the criminal" and want the sports activities to be a contributor in making the prisoners construct socially acceptable masculinities, the study shows that the prisoners' motives for practising sport are quite different. Even if some prisoners look upon themselves as "criminals", which means that they personify the masculinity they expressed when they committed the criminal act that they are convicted of, the practice of sport for the prisoners is not an issue of "normalisation" and construction of socially acceptable masculinities. For them, the practice of sport is a means to cope with the imprisonment and create and re-create themselves as men with self-confidence, self-esteem, etc. By practising sport the prisoners create a space where they take control over the creation and re-creation of themselves and their own well-being. Such spaces can be labelled *heterotopias*, and by making the practice of sport into a heterotopia for the creation and re-creation of himself as a subject, a prisoner centres his construction of subjectivity on the body. Bodily performances can be interpreted as expressions of masculinity, and when

these bodily expressions become a part of the prisoners' subjectivity, the prisoners are empowered, which makes it easier for them to handle the imprisonment.

However, visual expression of their bodies is also important for the creation and re-creation of themselves as gendered subjects. For most of the prisoners, the bodily ideal is the developed and muscular body where strength, endurance, a degree of insensitivity and toughness are important. These bodily expressions constitute the hegemonic masculinity among the prisoners, which is labelled macho masculinity. The sport-practising prisoners must exercise considerable self-discipline in order to express this bodily ideal, and managing to create himself within this bodily ideal therefore results in self-worth. The study shows that masculine identities constructed by men inside prison are similar to men outside. The prisoners efforts to construct masculinities just as "normal" men do, and their effort to create and re-create themselves as "normal" men, can therefore be interpreted as a resistance to the disciplinary discourse that embodies the criminal act and constructs the prisoners as "criminals".

While the prison uses the sports activities to maintain control over the prisoners, the prisoners use the sports activities to resist this control. The prisoners have different strategies for how to resist this control. Common to all, however, is that their exercise of sport is related to resisting the psychological violence that they experience as embedded in the control. When using sport for this purpose the prisoners built resistance by the cultivation of their bodies. This means that the prisoners' bodies become the sites of the resistance. The resistance is expressed as self-control which is a metaphor for health. To many prisoners, health is a matter of releasing negative thoughts and frustrations and expressing hardness. Hardness in prison is a symbol of masculinity either in form of a feeling of power or a look of power.

For the prisoners in the restrictive wing, the expression of hardness is mostly used to resist the prison system. It seems that to use drugs or to construct a large muscular body are means the prisoners use for this purpose. However, to construct a large and muscular body for the purpose of expressing hardness and resisting the prison system can also be understood as masks they construct in order to create themselves as gendered subjects. To serve their sentence in the contract wing, the prisoners have to prove that they can be trusted before they can offer their good behaviour in exchange for trust. If they show bad behaviour, for example, by demonstrating their opposition towards the prison system, they are sanctioned by being

moved to the restrictive wing. Even if the prisoners in the contract wing do not demonstrate their opposition towards the prison system, they nevertheless construct a mask in order to exercise hardness towards themselves. While the resistance towards the prison system takes the form of a fear of seeming weak, the resistance towards oneself takes the form of a fear of being weak in order to keep oneself in a condition that makes it possible to cope with the imprisonment, e.g. displaying good behaviour. The resistance towards oneself could be to create a mask of hardness for the purpose of resisting the lack of possibilities for constructing masculinity, such as in heterosexual relationship. It could also be to resist the feeling of weakness, such as in the feeling of loneliness. In this respect the sports activities could function as a heterotopia in the search for social contact in an unfriendly society.

Research question three – the power relations

The third research question asked in this study is:

What do the sports activities mean for the construction and re-construction of power relations between the prisoners, between the prisoners and the male prison officers, and between the prisoners and the female prison officers?

This research question raises issues that have been discussed within Foucault's understanding of power-resistance: that resistance is inextricably linked to power. To construct masculinities for the purpose of expressing hardness is the way the prisoners exercise power and claim their positions in the strategic power situation that seems to exist between the prisoners. One way of expressing hardness is to construct a large, muscular and strong body by practising weight training. Nevertheless, the large and strong body seems to be most influential for the power relations between the weight-training prisoners. "The Law of Jante" seems to regulate the interaction between the weight-training prisoners and prevent them from promote themselves at the expense of others who train with weights. Towards prisoners not practising weight training, however, "The Law of Jante" seems not to apply. Most likely this is because they express hardness by promoting hegemonic macho masculinity. The weight-training prisoners are allowed to be very visible, for example, by talking loudly about their achievements in the weight training room, and other prisoners have no choice but to relate to this behaviour and accept the weight training prisoners' bodies and strength as a criteria for claiming one's position in the strategic power relation between them. Unlike the football-playing prisoners

who are “onstage” only when playing football, the weight-training prisoners are also “onstage” outside the weight training room. The large, muscular and strong body is mostly used to send a message, through practise and talk, in-between men in order to show power. The hardness of the prisoners who express macho masculinity is often promoted as threats. These threats, in a play between men, create losers and winners where the losers are considered to be less manly than the winners.

Among the prisoners there seems to be a general fear of appearing as a loser because the losers are considered to be less manly than the winners. This prevents many prisoners from participating in sports events, such as football, and prevents those who do participate in football from practising basic technique training, because visualising one’s lack of skills seems to be de-masculinising. Cussing is a “problem” between the football players, and the cussing de-masculinises the prisoners even more because they are explicitly told what lousy football players they are. However, the football play also seems to be integrating and promotes a patriarchy between the prisoners who participated in the play.

Between the prisoners in the weight training room, there seems to be “unofficial rules” that regulate the relationship between them. These rules exclude novices and favour prisoners who lift a lot and train regularly. Among the weight-lifting prisoners there is a contest of lifting the most and their performances on “the bench” seems to be the most important criteria. There is an intricate play of drawing attention and visualising one’s expression of a masculinity that signals control and mastery, and of camouflaging that one is observing the others. Among the prisoners in the weight training room there is also a play of achieving a superior position and avoiding an inferior position. While teaching others about weight training gives a prisoner a superior position, learning from others puts a prisoner in an inferior position. Giving compliments can also put a prisoner in an inferior position, because showing friendliness is mostly considered as weakness in the prison. Homophobia also prevents the prisoners from showing friendliness toward each other, and prisoners giving others compliments can be suspected of having sexual interest. It is, however, possible to give compliments without assuming an inferior position by underlining the heterosexuality in the compliment or by giving the compliment in a tough manner. In spite of this competition by means of showing hardness and avoiding showing weakness, there seems to be a patriarchy between the prisoners who train together regularly, and in particular between training partners.

Nevertheless, constructing masculinities by the exercise of sport is only one of several ways the prisoners express hardness, and the prisoners disagreed upon how empowering the exhibition of masculinities constructed by the practice of sport actually are. However, the practice of sport activities is very visible in the prison and prisoners easily gain recognition in the sport arena probably because sport achievements are expressions of masculinities that are valued in the prison. Even so, a general trend among the prisoners is that the exhibition of “sport masculinities” was not the most important factor for the strategic power situation between them. The most important criteria seems to be the masculinities the prisoners expressed when they committed the acts they were convicted of. Other ways a prisoner could construct masculinity and express hardness without exercising sport was to oppose the prison system by smuggling and using drugs, keeping to oneself, minding one’s own business and not relying on anyone, as well as expressing an accepted heterosexual masculinity by the expression of extensive homophobia and suppression of women. These expressions of masculinities, together with the masculinities the prisoners constructed by practising sport, seem to constitute a dynamic situation in the strategic power relation between the prisoners.

*

While female officers have to discipline their expression of gender in order to be able to exercise authoritarianism, it seems that male officers have to put effort in tearing down the barrier their gender creates if they want to express caring masculinity. One way to tear down this barrier and to obtain a personal relationship with the prisoners is to practise sport with them. However, to effectively use the sport activities for this purpose, a male officer should not participate for the sake of displaying his superiority, for example, as a clever football player or as a man who manage to lift more kilos than the prisoners in the weight training room. The male officers have to present themselves as inferior or equal to the prisoners and focus on the contact creating aspect and not being afraid of “losing face”. In order to establish good contact with the prisoners, the male officers can also play with the macho masculinity and try to outdo the prisoners, not for the purpose of frightening them, but for the purpose of playing and being admired. Focusing on personal contact, play and admiration, the male officer is in a unique position to exercise disciplinary power. In the weight training room a male officer can influence the prisoners to train with lighter weights, encourage them, and give them positive feedback. Because of his position, a male officer will not assume an inferior relation to the prisoners. However, the best way to obtain contact with the prisoners is

by participating in trips together with the prisoners outside the prison, and this contact seems to be re-created when they come back to the prison.

Female officers only practised sport with the prisoners in the contract wing. In order not to be sanctioned, the prisoners in the contract wing have to restraint their expressions of gender to not exercise male heterosexual power in a manner that the female officers find repressive. While it seems that male officers have no problems in distinguishing between being personal from being private when practising sport with the prisoners, this is difficult for the female officers. They are more private when they take off their uniforms and display their gender, wearing training clothes and using their bodies. Therefore the female officers must be more aware of setting up limits in these situations. Even if practising sport with the prisoners requires more consciousness as to how to dress and behave for the female officers, no articulated discourse for how to behave and dress seems to exist for the female officers in this setting. The female officers have to learn this discourse through experience and practice. Female officers practising sport with the prisoners seem to have sporting skills and are comfortable in training clothes, and manage to exercise authoritarianism without wearing the uniform. When they practise sport together, both the female officers and the prisoners constructed gender differently than elsewhere in the prison. Female officers display more gender and also allow the prisoners to display more gender, letting them exercise more male heterosexual power. When a female officer displays her gender in a manner where she feels she does not contribute to sexualise herself and lose authority, within as well as outside the sport setting, she may gain a lot. This allows for a play of power between the female officers and the prisoners which has potential for creating contact. Female officers can also exercise disciplinary power when practising sport with the prisoners, but they have to prove their knowledge even more than male officers because they are expected to not be as good in sport as male officers.

Other women, such as non-trained substitute officers or sport instructors, who come into the prison without the knowledge of how to relate to the prisoners in a “proper manner”, may extend the prisoners’ exercise of heterosexual power. These women extend the prisoners exercise of heterosexual male power, not only in relation to themselves, but also in relation to female officers who do restraint their expressions of gender. In regard to sport, women participating in sport with the prisoners – female officers or, for example, sport instructors – always attract attention even if they are careful by not displaying their body too much. When,

for example, a sport instructor expose her femaleness in an “unfortunate” way, the regulated “culture of watching” is extended. This is difficult for the female officers because the femaleness is exposed on behalf of women as a group. Even if the prisoners do not visualise the sexualisation of women or female officers participating in sport activities, they are nevertheless sexualised. It seems the sexualisation is usually not meant to be repressive, but the female officers as well as other women, probably find it repressive since it makes them lose authority.

*

The discussions of and the answers to the research question illuminates *one* way of understanding the prisoners’ and the prison officers’ construction of meanings about sport and the prisoners’ large muscular bodies, and the prisoners’ and the prison officers’ engagement in sport activities. Particular theories have coloured the creation of the research questions as well as the discussion of the data-material. Besides, I have myself coloured the production of the data-material because I have been active in the production, as well as the discussion, of the data-material. The use of other theories and other researchers would have given us other ways of understanding the prisoners’ and the prison officers’ construction of meanings about sport and the prisoners’ large muscular bodies, and the prisoners’ and the prison officers’ engagement in sport activities.

Practical and personal purposes, and political consequences

The answers from the research questions prepare the ground for discussing the practical and personal purposes and the political consequences of this study. However, because research purposes together with the practical and personal purposes are political, and because the political consequences are also practical and personal, these three issues will be discussed together. Based on Polych & Sabo (1995: 149-159) argument “why gender scholars need to devote more energy to understand men in prison”, two practical purposes were formulated for this study. The first purpose is to give insight into men’s lives and identities in prison and to contribute to a better understanding of some of the multiple systems of domination that constitute our society. The second purpose is to contribute to the field of feminist research in general, and to research on men and masculinity in particular. One can only hope that this study’s discovery of some of the specific and original problems connected to men’s lives and

identities in prison (prisoners as men) and to a few systems of domination that constitute our society (prisons of men) will be useful for gender scholars, feminist research and for research on men and masculinity in the future. However, since I find this enigmatic institution in our society, “The prison”, most fascinating and interesting, my personal aim with this study is to carry out more research in prisons. I am therefore mostly concerned about the criminal-political consequences that can be deduced from this study’s discovery of some of the specific and original problems connected to men’s lives and identities in prison and to a few systems of domination that constitute our society.

In the chapter of methods a political consequence of this thesis was raised which was to *empower the prisoners by making the readers question their opinions of sport in prison and making them reflect upon them*. An important issue in this thesis has been to focus on how meanings are constructed and re-constructed about prisoners and their exercise of sport. We have seen that sport has functioned as a means for rehabilitation in Norwegian Prisons since approximately the 1930s. Based on the assumption that team sports have a social educational effect, prisoners are encouraged to exercise team sports for the purpose of learning social skills and fellowship. However, this discourse seems to be at most partly true because this effect cannot be documented in a satisfactory way (Justisdepartementet, 1998: 71).

Mathiesen’s (1965) study of a correctional institution in Norway shows that playing football creates conflicts rather than social integration (p. 123). This study shows that the football play creates conflicts as well as social integration. Because “the truth” in the discourse, that is, “team sports have a social educational effect”, can be questioned, we should perhaps be careful when using this discourse as an argument for prisoners to practice team sports. Even if there is not much research in this field, the work done by the coach to get the team to function seems to be the most important factor for the social educational effect (Kjørmo, personal communication, November 2000). Since the prisoners’ teams do not have a coach, this effect is absent in prison, a fact which further reduces “the truth” in the discourse “team sports have a social educational effect”.

The discourses decisive for how meanings are constructed about the most common activity in the Norwegian prisons – weight training – are the construction of “the criminal” and the construction of the “criminal body”. These discourses state that the large and muscular bodies constructed by training with weights are dangerous bodies, in particular the large and muscular bodies constructed by prisoners convicted of violent crimes such as rape. As the

discussion of these discourses shows, one may question the ethical foundation of using these discourses in the interpretation of the prisoners' large and muscular bodies. Taking the ethical aspect into consideration, it is reasonable to ask: who constructs the prisoners' large and muscular bodies into dangerous bodies, the prisoners building these bodies or us interpreting these bodies? In the debate about weight training in prisons, it is perhaps time to reflect upon systems of domination that, in processes of identification, associate certain core values with a specific social group – the male prisoners?

The macho masculinity that the prisoners' large and muscular bodies express may be a reflection of the hegemonic macho masculinity in the prison. This possibility should be taken into account in relation to the abovementioned issues. It will therefore be interesting to follow the development towards more care in the Norwegian Prison Service and to investigate what happens if the caring masculinity becomes the hegemonic masculinity in Norwegian male prisons. This might entail that the prisoners will show resistance in ways other than constructing a large and muscular body. Nevertheless the development towards more care in the Prison Service seems to be a positive development that will hopefully continue. We should, however, be aware that this development entails yet another means for the exercise of disciplinary power – the confession.

In the debate as to what purpose the prisoners' practice of sport should serve, the aspect that men who practice sport in prison are actually imprisoned seems to be missing. The prisoners in this debate are “the other” – the one excluded from the hegemonic discourse, without access to knowledge, and without the right to speak. However, since this study shows that the aspect – being imprisoned – is very important for the prisoners' practice of sport, should we perhaps accept sport being a heterotopia and a site for resistance, as an adequate political purpose for the prisoners' practice of sport?

Another issue important to focus on is the ethical basis for using better opportunities for practising sport as a commodity for the prisoners' good or “normal” behaviour. Opportunities to practice sport should perhaps be a matter of course, in particular for the positive health effects reported by the prisoners.

The only acceptable argument for reducing the prisoners' practice of sport (in particular weight training) from this study, is the role it has in the power relations between the prisoners.

To practice sport is empowering for a prisoner because the masculinities expressed through the practice of sport are valued in the prison. Expressing these masculinities may increase the sport-practising prisoners ability to exercise power over other prisoners, and a reasonable question to ask is whether this is acceptable.

However, some political efforts should be possible without many debates. Concerning the prisoners, it seems that flexibility and to organise the practice of sport in such a way that the prisoners can be left alone without attracting attention, could encourage more prisoners to practice sport. Concerning the prison officers, the contact creating aspect of practising sport with the prisoners should be emphasised. However, this requires that the male officers are introduced to the discourse of how to express caring masculinity when they participate in sport activities. For the female officers, they have much to gain if the discourse of how to relate to the prisoners on a general basis and in the sport setting is articulated. This also concerns other women that come into the prison such as non-trained substitute officers and sport instructors. However, this is not enough. Female officers, as well as other women working in male prisons, must be introduced to this discourse when they start their work in the prison. At the same time, in this discourse of how to relate to the prisoners, there must be room to discuss situations that are difficult to handle, such as how to behave when practising sport with the prisoner.

Suggestions for further research

This study carried out at the intersection between the paradigm of Critical Theory and Constructivism has hopefully resulted in new knowledge and perspectives of sport in prison and the imprisonment. New research projects carried out at the intersection between these paradigms on other aspects of the imprisonment, for example, work, school, “life management” programs, etc., will probably give additional knowledge and new perspectives on the imprisonment.

The use of qualitative methods such as fieldwork with the field-talks and the semi-structured interviews, have been a positive experience in regard to producing data-material. Even if these methods of producing data-material are time consuming, it is nevertheless recommended for further research in prisons. These methods give an unique opportunity to learn about the contexts in which the object of study is carried out, and to learn to know the respondents. To

learn to know the contexts are of importance when complex social settings, such as the prison is, are studied. Learning to know the respondents is also important in order to make them talk about the object studied.

Even if the theme sport in prison in Norway has been studied previously and resulted in several reports and master theses, we have still a lot to learn about sport in prison. One suggestion for further research on sport in prison may be to do more extensive studies on prisoners not practising sport and their views upon sport in prison. This focus would probably tell us more about the strategic power situation between the prisoners, and which efforts need to be initiated in order to arrange the sports activities in such a way that more prisoners would find it attractive to practice sport. A second suggestion is to carry out more studies on the prisoners' views of what the sports activities mean in relation to being imprisoned. The knowledge produced in such studies potentially could give the prisoners "a voice" in the debate about sport in prison. A third suggestion is to extend the research on the contact creating aspect of the various sports activities within the realm of the caring discourse. This could result in more knowledge about if, and if so, how, one could use various sports activities more effectively for this purpose.

Finally, research carried out from a gender perspective with the focus on the construction of gender and masculinities is perhaps one of the fields in male prisons that has the greatest potential for the creation of new knowledge. This is an interesting issue to study in relation to the development towards more care in the Prison Service where one sees a change, in particular, in the male and female officers' construction of gender. If, and eventually how, this would effect the prisoners' own construction of gender is a particularly interesting and relevant issue.

References

- Adorno, Theodore et. al. (1978): *The Authoritarian Personality*. New York, John Wiley
- Album, Dag (1996): *Nære fremmede: Pasienkulturen i sykehus*. Otta, TANO
- Andenæs, Johs. (1994): *Straffen som problem*. Gjøvik, Exil
- Andersen, Knut (1994): *Kvinner i fengsel, fysisk trening, psykisk helse og stoffmisbruk*. Oslo, Norges idrettshøgskole
- Aycock, Alan (1992): "The confession of the flesh: Disciplinary gaze in casual bodybuilding". *Play and Culture*, (5), 338-357
- Babbie, Earl (1983): *The Practice of Social Research*. Belmont CA, Wadsworth
- Bakhtin, Michail (1984): *Rabelais and his World*. Bloomington, Indiana University Press
- Banks, Stephen P. and Banks, Anna (1998a): *Fiction and Social Research: By Ice or Fire*. Walnut Creek CA, Alta Mira Press
- Banks, Stephen P. and Banks, Anna (1998b): "The struggle over facts and fictions". Banks, Stephen P. and Banks, Anna (eds.): *Fiction and Social Research: By Ice or Fire*. Walnut Creek CA, Alta Mira Press
- Behar, Ruth (1993): *Translated Woman: Crossing the Border with Esperanza's Story*. Boston, Beacon
- Belknap, Joanne (1995): "Women in conflict: An analysis of women correctional officers". Raffle Price, Barbara and Sokoloff, Natalie J. (eds.): *The Criminal Justice System and Women: Offenders, Victims, and Workers*. New York, McGraw-Hill, Inc
- Ben-David, Sarah; Silfen, Peter and Cohen, David (1996): "Fearful custodial or fearless personal relations: Prison guards' fear as a factor shaping staff-inmate relation prototype". *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 40 (2), 94-104
- Bentham, Jeremy: *Panopticon*, Works, ed. Bowring, Vol. IV

- Bermann, Tamar; Holter, Harriet; Sørensen, Bjørg Aa. og Aas, Gro H. (1988): *På kvinners vis - med kvinners råd: Nye perspektiver på forskningspolitikken*. NAVF's sekretariat for kvinneforskning
- Bernard, H. Russel (1995): *Research Methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Walnut Creek CA, AltaMira Press
- Billig, Michael (1994): "Repopulating the depopulated pages of social psychology". *Theory and Psychology*, 4, 307-335
- Birrell, Susan (1990): "Women of color, critical autobiograh, and sport". Messner, Michael A. and Sabo, Donald F. (eds.): *Sport, Men and the Gender Order: Critical Feminist Perspectives*. Champaign Illinois, Human Kinetics Books
- Bly, Robert (1990): *Iron John: A book about men*. Reading MA, Addison-Wesley
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1978): "Sport and social class". *Social Science Information*, 17, 819-840
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1984): *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. London, Routledge
- Bourdieu, Pierre (2000): *Den maskuline dominans*. Valdres, Pax Forlag A/S
- Britton, Dana M. (1997): "Gendered organizational logic: Policy and practice in men's and women's prison". *Gender & Society*, 11 (6), 796-818
- Brod, Harry and Kaufman, Michael (1994): *Theorizing Masculinities*. Thousand Oaks CA, Sage Publications
- Butler, Judith (1990): *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York, Routledge
- Butler, Judith (1993): *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex*. New York, Routledge
- By, Inger Åshild; Grindaker, Tor Kr.; Hozman, Zora og Karlsrud, Knut (1987): *Fysisk aktivitet/idrett - et sentralt fag i utdanningen av fengselsbetjenter*. Lecture at "Norsk forening for idrettsforskning" conference in Hurdal, October, 26-27. 1987

- Carrabine, Eamonn and Longhurst, Brian (1998): "Gender and prisons organisation: Some comments on masculinities and prison management". *The Howard Journal*, 37 (2), 161-176
- Carrigan, Tim; Connell, R. W. and Lee, John (1985): "Toward a new sociology of masculinity". *Theory and Society*, 14, 551-603
- Cartwright, Dorwin and Zander, Alvin (1953): *Group Dynamics: Research and Theory*. New York, Tavistock Publications
- Chekhov, Anton (1967): *The Island: A Journey to Sakhalin*. New York, Washington Square Press
- Christensen, Jens E. (2000): Opposition to Espen Schanning's defence of the thesis: *Fortiden i våre hender, Foucault som vitenshåndtør*. Universitetet i Oslo, Det historisk-filosofiske fakultet
- Christie, Nils (1989): *Hvor tett et samfunn*. Oslo, Universitetsforlaget
- Christie, Nils (1999): "Hvordan er Danmark mulig?". *Nordisk Tidsskrift for Kriminalvidenskab*, 86 (4), 280-291
- Clemmer, Donald (1958): *The Prison Community*. New York, Rinehart
- Clough, Peter (1999): "Crises of schooling and the 'crisis of representation': The story of Rob". *Qualitative Inquiry*, 5 (3), 428-448
- Coacley, Jay J. (1999): *Sport in Society: Issues and Controversies*. Oslo, UNIPUB, Akademia
- Cohen, Stanley (1985): *Visions of Social Control*. Cambridge, Polity Press
- Cole, Cheryl L (2000): "Body studies in the sociology of sport: A review of the field". Coacley, Jay J. and Dunning, Eric (eds.): *Handbook of Sport Studies*. London, Sage Publications
- Collier, Richard (1998): *Masculinities, Crime and Criminology*. London, Sage Publications
- Connell, R. W. (1983): *Which Way is Up? Essays on Class, Sex and Culture*. Sydney, Allen and Unwin

- Connell, R. W. (1987): *Gender and Power*. Cambridge, Polity Press
- Connell, R. W. (1990): "An iron man: The body and some contradictions of hegemonic masculinity". Messner, Michael A. and Sabo, Donald F. (eds.): *Sport, Men, and the Gender Order: Critical Feminist Perspectives*. Champaign Illinois, Human Kinetics Books
- Connell, R. W. (1993): "Foreword". Messerschmidt, James W.: *Masculinities and Crime, Critique and Reconceptualization of Theory*. Maryland, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers
- Connell, R. W. (1995): *Masculinities*. Cambridge, Polity Press
- Connell, R. W. (1997): *Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics*. Stanford CA, Stanford University Press
- Connell, R. W. (1998): "Masculinities and globalization". *Men and Masculinities*, 1 (1), 3-23
- Corey, Frederick C. (1996): "Personal narratives and young men in prison: Labelling the outside inside". *Western Journal of Communication*, 60 (1), 57-75
- Crawford, Robert (1984): "A cultural account of 'health': Control, release, and the social body". McKinlay, John B. (ed.): *Issues in the Political Economy of Health Care*. New York, Tavistock Publications
- Davies, Bronwyn (1997a): "Constructing and deconstructing masculinities through critical literacy". *Gender and Education*, 9 (1), 9-30
- Davies, Bronwyn (1997b): "The subject of post-structuralism: A reply to Alison Jones". *Gender and Education*, 9 (3), 271-283
- Den norske stat (2000): *Norges Lover; Straffeloven*.
- Denison, Jim (1996): "Sports narratives". *Qualitative Inquiry*, 2 (3), 351-362
- Denzin, Norman K. (1991): *Images of Postmodern Society: Social Theory and Contemporary Cinema*. London, Sage Publications

- Denzin, Norman K. (1994): "The arts and politics of interpretation". Denzin, Norman K. and Lincoln, Yvonna S. (eds.): *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks CA, Sage Publications
- Denzin, Norman K. and Lincoln, Yvonna S. (2000): "Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research". Denzin, Norman K. and Lincoln, Yvonna S. (eds): *Handbook of Qualitative Research - 2nd ed.* Thousand Oaks CA, Sage Publication
- DeRosia, Victoria R. (1998): *Living Inside Prison Walls*. Westport, Praeger
- DeVault, Marjorie L. (1990): "Talking and listening from women's standpoint: Feminist strategies for interviewing and analysis". *Social Problems*, 37, 96-116
- Deveaux, Monique (1994): "Feminism and empowerment: A critical reading of Foucault". *Feminist Studies*, 20, 223-248
- Dey, Ian (1995): *Qualitative Data Analysis: A User-Friendly Guide for Social Scientists*. London, Routledge
- Dostoevsky, Fyodor (1983): *Memoirs from the House of the Dead*. Oxford, Oxford University Press
- Dutton, Kenneth R. (1995): *The Perfectible Body: The Western Ideal of Physical Development*. London, Cassell
- Eisner, Elliot W. (1997): "The new frontier in qualitative research methodology". *Qualitative Inquiry*, 3 (3), 259-273
- Elias, Norbert and Dunning, Eric (1986): *Quest for Exitement: Sport and Leisure in the Civilizing Process*. Oxford, Basil Blackwell
- Enterkin, Jill (1998): "Prison service cross-posting policy and female prison officers". *Prison Service Journal*, 117, 32-35
- Evans, Judith (1995): *Feminist Theory Today: An Introduction to Second-Wave Feminism*. London, Sage Publications
- Farnworth, Louise (1992): "Women doing a man's job: Female prison officers working in a male prison". *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 25 (3), 278-296

- Featherstone, Mike (1991): "The body in consumer culture". Featherstone, Mike; Hepworth, Mike and Turner, Bryan S. (eds.): *The Body: Social Process and Cultural Theory*. London, Sage Publications
- Featherstone, Mike; Hepworth, Mike and Turner, Bryan S. (1991): *The Body: Social Process and Cultural Theory*. London, Sage Publications
- Feeley, Malcolm M. and Simon, Jonathan (1992): "The new penology: Notes on the emerging strategy of corrections and its implications". *Criminology*, 30 (4), 449-474
- Fine, Gary Alan (1987): "One of the boys: Women in male-dominated settings". Kimmel, Michael S. (ed.): *Changing men: New directions in research on men and masculinity*. Newbury Park CA, Sage Publications
- Fine, Michelle; Weis, Lois; Weseen, Susan and Wong, Loonmun (2000): "For whom? Qualitative research, representations, and social responsibilities". Denzin, Norman K. and Lincoln, Yvonna S. (eds.): *Handbook of Qualitative Research – 2nd ed.* Thousand Oaks CA, Sage Publication
- Finstad, Liv (1998): *Kjønnets betydning i politiarbeidet. Hva slags maskulinitet og femininitet godtas og oppmuntres innen politikorpset?* Lecture at the seminar "Maskuline subkulturer" in Oslo, March 19. 1998
- Fog, Jette (1994): *Med samtalen som utgangspunkt*. København, Akademisk Forlag
- Fontana, Andrea and Frey, James H. (2000): "The interview: From structured questionnaires to negotiated text". Denzin, Norman K. and Lincoln, Yvonna S. (eds.): *Handbook of Qualitative Research – 2nd ed.* Thousand Oaks CA, Sage Publications
- Fossåskaret, Erik (1997): "Ustrukturerte intervjuer med få informanter gir i seg selv ikke noen kvalitativ undersøkelse". Fossåskaret, Erik; Fuglestad, Otto Laurits og Aase, Tor Halfdan (red.): *Metodisk feltarbeid: Produksjon og tolkning av kvalitative data*. Oslo, Universitetsforlaget
- Foucault, Michel (1972): *The archeology of knowledge*. New York, Pantheon Books
- Foucault, Michel (1973): *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*. New York, Vintage

- Foucault, Michel (1980): *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and other Writings 1972 - 1977*. New York, Pantheon
- Foucault, Michel (1982): "The subject and power". *Critical Inquiry*, 8, 777-795
- Foucault, Michel (1984): *The History of Sexuality (Vol. 1): An Introduction*. Harmondsworth, Penguin Books
- Foucault, Michel (1985a): *The History of Sexuality (Vol. 2): The Use of Pleasure*. London, Penguin Books
- Foucault, Michel (1985b): "Sexuality and solitude". Blonsky, Marshall (ed.): *On Signs: A Semiotics Reader*. Oxford, Basil Blackwell
- Foucault, Michel (1986a): "Of other spaces". *Diacritics*, spring, 22-27
- Foucault, Michel (1986b): *The History of Sexuality (Vol. 3): The Care of the Self*. London, Penguin Books
- Foucault, Michel (1987): "The ethic of care for the self as a practice of freedom". Bernauer, James and Rasmussen, David (eds.): *The Final Foucault*. Cambridge Mass.: MIT Press
- Foucault, Michel (1988): "Technologies of the self". Martin, Luther H.; Gutman, Huck and Hutton, Patrick H (eds.): *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault*. Amherst, The University of Massachusetts Press
- Foucault, Michel (1990): "An aesthetics of existence". Kritzman, Lawrence D. (ed.): *Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Writings 1977-1984*. New York, Routledge
- Foucault, Michel (1991a): *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. London, Penguin Books
- Foucault, Michel (1991b): "Space, knowledge and power". Rabinow, Paul (ed.): *The Foucault Reader: An Introduction to Foucault's Thought*. London, Penguin Books
- Frank, Arthur W. (1991): "For a sociology of the body: An analytical review". Featherstone, Mike; Hepworth, Mike and Turner, Bryan S. (eds.): *The Body: Social Process and Cultural Theory*. London, Sage Publications

- Fridhov, Inger Marie (1994): *Nordisk fengselsforskning - ikke helt fraværende*. Oslo, Nordisk Samarbeidsråd for Kriminologi
- Frøberg, Sissel (1996): *Vitenskapsteori og kjønnet forskningspraksis: Essay i vitenskapsteori*. Universitetet i Oslo, Institutt for sosiologi
- Gelsthorpe, Loraine and Morris, Alison (1990): "Introduction: Transforming and transgressing criminology". Gelsthorpe, Loraine and Morris, Alison (eds.): *Feminist Perspectives in Criminology*. Buckingham, Open University Press
- Giallombardo, Rose (1966): "Interviewing in the prison community". *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, 57, 318-324
- Giddens, Anthony (1997): *Sociology*. Cambridge, Polity Press
- Giertsen, Hedda (1995): "Fengselsvesenets skjulte verdimønstre". *Lov og Rett*, 34 (7), 414-427
- Gillett, James and White, Phillip G. (1992): "Male bodybuilding and the reassertion of hegemonic masculinity: A critical feminist perspective". *Play and Culture*, (5), 358-369
- Glueck, Sheldon W. and Glueck, Eleanor (1956): *Physique and Delinquency*. New York, Harper and Row
- Goffman, Erving (1961): *Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates*. New York, Anchor Books
- Goffman, Erving (1967): *Anstalt og menneske*. Danmark, Jørgen Paludans forlag
- Golde, Peggy (1986): *Women in the Field: Anthropological Experiences*. Berkley, University of California Press
- Gottschalk, Simon (1998): "Postmodern sensibilities and ethnographic possibilities". Banks, Stephen P. and Banks, Anna (eds.): *Fiction and Social Research: By Ice or Fire*. Walnut Creek CA, Alta Mira Press
- Grindaker, Tor Kr. (1996): *Treningsintervirksomheten i fengselsvesenet*. Oslo, Norges idrettshøgskole

- Guba, Egon G. (1990): "The alternative paradigm dialog". Guba, Egon G. (ed.): *The Paradigm Dialog*. Newsbury Park CA, Sage Publication
- Guba, Egon G. and Lincoln, Yvonna S. (1989): *Fourth Generation Evaluation*. Newbury Park CA, Sage Publications
- Guba, Egon G. and Lincoln, Yvonna S. (1994): "Competing paradigms in qualitative research". Denzin, Norman K. and Lincoln, Yvonna S. (eds.): *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks CA, Sage Publications
- Gubrium, Jaber F. and Holstein, James A. (2000): "Analyzing interpretive practice". Denzin, Norman K. and Lincoln, Yvonna S. (eds.): *Handbook of Qualitative Research – 2nd ed.* Thousand Oaks CA, Sage Publications
- Gurney, Joan Neff (1985): "Not one of the guys: The female researcher in a male-dominated setting". *Qualitative Sociology*, 8 (1), 42-62
- Hammersley, Martyn (1990): *Reading Ethnographic Research: A Critical Guide*. London, Longman
- Hammersley, Martyn and Atkinson, Paul (1996): *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*. New York, Routledge
- Hauge, Ragnar (1996): *Straffens begrunnelser*. Oslo, Universitetsforlaget
- Hazelrigg, Lawrence (1989): *Claims of Knowledge*. Tallahassee, Florida State University Press
- Hearn, Jeff (1996): "Is masculinity dead? A critique of the concept of masculinity/ masculinities". Mac an Ghail, Màirtin (ed.): *Understanding Masculinities*. Buckingham, Open University Press
- Hearn, Jeff (1997): "The implications of critical studies on men". *NORA*, 1, 48-60
- Hearn, Jeff (2000): *Is Masculinity Dead?* Lecture at the seminar "Researching Masculinities" in Trondheim, March 20-23. 2000
- Heikkala, Juha (1993): "Discipline and excel: Techniques of the self and body and the logic of competing". *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 10, 397-412

- HM Chief Inspector of Prisons for Scotland. (1988): *Report for 1987, Cm 541*.
- Holter, Øystein G. (2000): *Masculinities in Context*. Lecture at the seminar "Researching Masculinities" in Trondheim, March 20-23. 2000.
- Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierrette (1988): "Gender and fieldwork". *Women's Studies International Forum*, 11 (6), 611-618
- Høigård, Cecilie (1997a): "Hva er kriminologi?". Finstad, Liv og Høigård, Cecilie (red.): *Kriminologi*. Oslo, Pax Forlag
- Høigård, Cecilie (1997b): "Kriminalitetsbilder og kriminalstatistikk". Finstad, Liv og Høigård, Cecilie (red.): *Kriminologi*. Oslo, Pax Forlag A/S
- Høigård, Cecilie og Balvig, Flemming (1988): *Kriminalitet og straff i tall og tekst*. Oslo, Universitetsforlaget
- Jacobs, James B. (1974): "Participant observation in prison". *Urban Life and Culture*, 3 (2), 221-240
- Janesick, Valerie J. (2000): "The choreography of qualitative research design: Minuets, improvisations, and crystallization". Denzin, Norman K. and Lincoln, Yvonna S. (eds.): *Handbook of Qualitative Research – 2nd ed*. Thousand Oaks CA, Sage Publications
- Jefferson, Tony (1994): "Theorising masculine subjectivity". Newburn, Tim and Stanko, Elizabeth A. (eds.): *Just Boys Doing Business: Men, Masculinities and Crime*. London, Routledge
- Jefferson, Tony and Carlen, Pat (1996): "Masculinities, social relations and crime". *The British Journal of Criminology*, 36 (3)
- Johnsen, Berit (1994): *Idrett som virksomhet for kontraktsonere i Drammen kretsfengsel*. Oslo, Norges idrettshøgskole
- Jurik, Nancy C. (1988): "Striking a balance: Female correctional officers, gender role stereotypes, and male prisons". *Sociological Inquiry: Journal of the National Honor Society*, 58 (3), 291-305

- Justisdepartementet (1958): *Fengselsloven av 12. desember 1958 nr 7, med endringer, sist ved lov av 11. juni 1993 (The Norwegian Prison Act).*
- Justisdepartementet (1961): *Fengselsreglementet: Gitt av Fengselsstyret 12. desember 1961, Sist revidert pr. 25. mai 1992 (The Norwegian Prison Rules).*
- Justisdepartementet. (1998): *St meld nr 27 (1997-98): Om kriminalomsorgen.*
- Järvinen, Margaretha (1996): "Makt eller vanmakt?". *Kvinnovetenskapelig tidskrift*, (1), 47-62
- Kalleberg, Ragnvald (1992): "Om samfunnsvitenskapelig feltforskning". Hammersley, Martyn og Atkinson, Paul: *Feltmetodikk: Grunnlaget for feltarbeid og feltforskning.* Oslo, Ad Notam Gyldendal
- Kendall, Gavin and Wickham, Gary (1999): *Using Foucault's Methods.* London, Sage Publications
- Kiekbush, Richard G. (1992): "What makes a good correctional officer". *American Jails*, VI (6)
- Kimmel, Michael S. (1987): "Rethinking 'masculinity': New directions in research". Kimmel, Michael S. (ed.): *Changing Men: New Directions in Research on Men and Masculinity.* Newbury Park CA, Sage Publications
- Klein, Alan M. (1993): *Little Big Men: Bodybuilding Subculture and Gender Construction.* New York, State University of New York Press
- Klein, Gabriele (1999): *(De)construction of the Body and Sex/Gender: Theoretical Perspectives for Sport Science.* Northampton, Smith College.
- Kriminalforsorgen i Danmark (1998): *Indstilling om ensartede strategier i forbindelse med trusler om vold m.m. fra indsatte.* København
- Kristoffersen, Ragnar (1986): *Bagatellenes tyranni - samhandlingsstrukturen i et norsk fengsel.* Universitetet i Oslo, Institutt for sosialantropologi
- Kuckartz, Udo (1999): *Learning how to Use winMAX 98.* Seminar in Oslo, January 1999

- Kupers, Terry A. (1999): *Prison Madness: The Mental Health Crisis Behind Bars and What We Must Do About It*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers
- Kvale, Steinar (1996): *InterViews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*. Thousand Oaks CA, Sage Publications
- Lauesen, Torkil (1998): *Fra forbedringshus til parkeringshus: Magt og modmagt i Vridsløselille Stadsfængsel*. København, Hans Reitzels Forlag
- Lie, Merete (2000): *Seeing Gender: Images of Masculinities*. Lecture at the seminar "Researching Masculinities" in Trondheim, March 20-23. 2000
- Liebling, Alison and Price, David (1999): *An Exploration of Staff-Prisoner Relationships at HMP Whitemoor*. Cambridge, University of Cambridge, Institute for Criminology
- Liebling, Alison; Price, David and Elliot, Charles (1999): "Appreciative inquiry and relationships in prison". *Punishment & Society*, 1 (1), 71-98
- Lincoln, Yvonna S. and Guba, Egon G. (1985): *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Beverly Hills CA, Sage Publications
- Lincoln, Yvonna S. and Guba, Egon G. (2000): "Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences". Denzin, Norman K. and Lincoln, Yvonna S. (eds.): *Handbook of Qualitative Research – 2nd ed.* Thousand Oaks CA, Sage Publications
- Lindgren, Sven Åke (1998): "Michel Foucault". Andersen, Heine og Kaspersen, Lars Bo (red.): *Klassisk og moderne samfundsteori*. København, Hans Reitzels Forlag
- Lofland, John and Lofland, Lyn H. (1984): *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis*. Belmont CA, Wadsworth
- Lombroso, Cesare (1911): "Introduction". Lombroso-Ferrero, G.: *Criminal Man According to the Classification of Cesare Lombroso*. New York, G. P. Putnam & Sons
- Lorentzen, Jørgen (2000): *Kjønnets tilblivelse: Laqueur og Foucault*. Lecture at the seminar "Researching Masculinities" in Trondheim, March 20-23. 2000
- Lorenz, Konrad (1966): *On Aggression*. New York, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich

- Loy, John; Andrews, David L. and Rinehart, Robert E. (1993): "The body in culture and sport". *Sport Science Review*, 2 (1), 69-91
- Lyman, Peter (1987): "The fraternal bond as a joking relationship: A case study of the role of sexist jokes in male group bonding". Kimmel, Michael S. (ed.): *Changing Men: New Directions in Research on Men and Masculinity*. Newbury Park CA, Sage Publications
- Mac an Ghail, Màirtìn (1999): *New Times in an Old Country: Emerging Sexual and Ethnic Masculinities*. Lecture at the seminar "Boyhood - construction and experience" in Oslo, April 15. 1999
- Markussen, Turid og Lotherington, Ann Therese (1999): "Kritisk kunnskapspraksis: En introduksjon". Lotherington, Ann Therese og Markussen, Turid (red.): *Kritisk kunnskapspraksis: Bidrag til feministisk vitenskapsteori*. Oslo, Spartacus Forlag
- Marshall, Catherine and Rossman, Gretchen B. (1989): *Designing Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks CA, Sage Publications
- Martinsen, Egil W. (1998): "Psykiatrisk forskning på fysisk aktivitet: En oversikt". Moe, Toril; Retterstøl, Nils and Sørensen, Marit (red.): *Fysisk aktivitet: En ressurs i psykiatrisk behandling*. Oslo, Universitetsforlaget
- Mathiesen, Thomas (1965): *The Defences of the Weak: A Sociological Study of a Norwegian Correctional Institution*. London, Tavistock Publications Limited
- Mathiesen, Thomas (1990): *Prison on Trial: A critical Assessment*. London, Sage Publications
- Mathiesen, Thomas (1994): "Forord". Foucault, Michel: *Overvåkning og straff: Det moderne fengsels historie*. Oslo, Gyldendal Norsk Forlag
- Maxwell, Joseph A. (1992): "Understanding and validity in qualitative research". *Harvard Educational Review*, 62, 279-300
- Maxwell, Joseph A. (1996): *Qualitative Research Design: An Iterative Approach*. Thousand Oaks CA, Sage Publications

- McKay, Jim; Messner, Michael A. and Sabo, Donald F. (2000): *Masculinities, Gender Relations, and Sport*. Thousand Oaks CA, Sage Publications
- McKee, Lorna and O'Brien, Margaret (1983): "Interviewing men: Taking gender seriously". Gamarnikow, Eva; Morgan, David; Purvis, June and Taylorson, Daphn (eds.): *The Public and the Private*. London, Heineman Educational Books
- McNay, Lois (1992): *Foucault and Feminism*. Boston, Northeastern University Press
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice (1962): *The Phenomenology of Perception*. New York, Humanities Press
- Messerschmidt, James W. (1993): *Masculinities and Crime: Critique and Reconceptualization of Theory*. Maryland, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers
- Messerschmidt, James W. (1997): *Crime as Structured Action: Gender, Race, Class, and Crime in the Making*. Thousand Oaks CA, Sage Publications
- Messner, Michael A. (1990): "When bodies are weapons: Masculinity and violence in sport". *International Review for Sociology of Sport*, 25 (3), 203-219
- Messner, Michael A. (1992): *Power at Play: Sports and the Problem of Masculinity*. Boston, Beacon Press
- Messner, Michael A. (1997): *Politics of Masculinities: Men in Movements*. Thousand Oaks CA, Sage Publications
- Messner, Michael A. and Sabo, Donald F. (1990a): "Introduction: Toward a critical feminist reappraisal of sport, men, and the gender order". Messner, Michael A. and Sabo, Donald F. (eds.): *Sport, Men, and the Gender Order: Critical Feminist Perspectives*. Champaign Illinois, Human Kinetics Books
- Messner, Michael A. and Sabo, Donald F. (1990b): *Sport, Men and the Gender Order: Critical Feminist Perspectives*. Champaign Illinois, Human Kinetics Books
- Messner, Michael A. and Sabo, Donald F. (1994): *Sex, Violence and Power in Sports: Rethinking Masculinity*. Freedom CA, The Crossing Press

- Miles, Matthew B. and Huberman, A. Michael (1994): *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks CA, Sage Publications
- Miller, Toby (1998): "Commodifying the male body, problematizing 'hegemonic masculinity'". *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 22 (4), 431-447
- Mishkind, Marc E.; Rodin, Judith; Silberstein, Lisa R and Striegel-Moore, Ruth H. (1986): "The embodiment of masculinity: Cultural, psychological, and behavioral dimensions". *American Behavioral Scientist*, 29 (5), 545-562
- Moore, Robert A. (1966): *Sports and Mental Health*. Springfield Illinois, Charles C. Thomas Publications
- Morgan, David (1981): "Men, masculinity and the process of sociological enquiry". Roberts, Helen (ed.): *Doing Feminist Research*. London, Routledge
- Morgan, David (1992): *Discovering Men*. London, Routledge
- Morgan, David (1993): "You too can have a body like mine: Reflections on the male body and masculinities". Scott, Sue and Morgan, David (eds.): *Body Matters*. London, The Falmer Press
- Morgan, David (2000): *Problems with Masculinities*. Lecture at the seminar "Researching Masculinities" in Trondheim, March 20-23. 2000
- Morse, Janice M. (1994): "Designing funded qualitative research". Denzin, Norman K. and Lincoln, Yvonna S. (eds.): *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks CA, Sage Publications
- Moses, Jennifer; Steptoe, Andrew; Mathews, Andrew and Edwards, Sara (1989): "The effects of exercise training on mental well being in the normal population". *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 1, 27-61
- Moss, Jeremy (1998): *The Later Foucault*. London, Sage Publications
- Mosse, George L. (1996): *The Image of Man: The Creation of Modern Masculinity*. New York, Oxford University Press

- Næss, Fiona J. Dowling. (1998): *Tales of Norwegian Physical Education Teachers: A Life History Analysis*. Oslo, Norges idrettshøgskole
- Newburn, Tim and Stanko, Elizabeth A. (1994): "Introduction: Men, masculinities and crime". Newburn, Tim and Stanko, Elizabeth A. (eds.): *Just Boys Doing Business: Men, Masculinities and Crime*. London, Routledge
- Newton, Carolyn (1994): "Gender theory and prison sociology: Using theories of masculinities to interpret the sociology of prisons for men". *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 33 (3), 193-202
- Nissen, Hartvig (1927): *Et fengsels gjerning i kirke og kultur XXXIV*. Oslo
- Oftung, Knut (1998): "Mannsforskning". *Mannsforskning: Nyhetsbrev og faglig forum for "Nettverk for forskning om menn"*, 1, 7-11
- Otnes, Berit (1987): "Kriminalitet og straff i ulike livsfaser". *Samfunnsspeilet* (1)
- Patton, Michael Quinn (1990): *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks CA, Sage Publications
- Petersen, Alan (1998): *Unmasking the Masculine: 'Men' and 'Identity' in a Sceptical Age*. London, Sage Publications
- Platek, Monika (1990): "Prison subculture in Poland". *International Journal of the Sociology of Law*, 18, 459-472
- Polych, Carol and Sabo, Donald F. (1995): "Gender politics, pain and illness: The AIDS epidemic in North American prisons". Sabo, Donald and Gordon, David F. (eds.): *Men's Health and Illness: Gender Power and the Body*. Thousand Oaks CA, Sage Publications
- Potter, Jonathan (1996): *Representing Reality: Discourse, Rhetoric and Social Construction*. London, Sage Publications
- Potter, Jonathan and Wetherell, Margaret (1987): *Discourse and Social Psychology: Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour*. London, Sage Publications

- Price, David and Liebling, Alison. (1998): *Staff-Prisoner Relationships: A Review of the Literature*. Unpublished manuscript submitted to HM Prison Service
- Pronger, Brian (1990a): "Gay jocks: A phenomenology of gay men in athletics". Messner, Michael A. and Sabo, Donald F. (eds.): *Sport, Men, and the Gender Order: Critical Feminist Perspectives*. Champaign Illinois, Human Kinetics Books
- Pronger, Brian (1990b): *The Arena of Masculinity: Sports, Homosexuality and the Meaning of Sex*. New York, St. Martin's Press
- Punch, Maurice (1994): "Politics and ethics in qualitative research". Denzin, Norman K. and Lincoln, Yvonna S. (eds.): *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks CA, Sage Publications
- Rail, Geneviève (1998): "Introduction". Rail, Geneviève (ed.): *Sport and Postmodern Times*. New York, SUNY Press
- Reinharz, Schulamit (1992): *Feminist Methods in Social Research*. New York, Oxford University Press
- Remy, John (1990): "Pathriarchy and fratirarchy as forms of androcracy". Hearn, Jeff and Morgan, David (eds.): *Men, Masculinities and Social Theory*. London, Unwin Hyman Ltd.
- Reynaud, Emmanuel (1983): *Holy Virility: The Social Construction of Masculinity*. London, Pluto Press
- Richardson, Laurel (1990): *Writing Strategies: Reaching Diverse Audiences*. Newbury Park CA, Sage Publications
- Richardson, Laurel (1994): "Writing: A method of inquiry". Denzin, Norman K. and Lincoln, Yvonna S. (eds.): *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks CA, Sage Publications
- Richardson, Laurel (1996): "Ethnographic trouble". *Qualitative Inquiry*, 2 (2), 227-229
- Richardson, Laurel (2000a): "New writing practices in qualitative research". *Sociology of Sport journal*, 17, 5-20

- Richardson, Laurel (2000b): "Writing: A method of inquiry". Denzin, Norman K. and Lincoln, Yvonna S. (eds.): *Handbook of Qualitative Research – 2nd ed.* Thousand Oaks CA, Sage Publications
- Rinehart, Robert (1998): "Fictional methods in ethnography: Believability, specks of glass, and Chekhov". *Qualitative Inquiry*, 4 (2), 200-224
- Rorty, Richard (1979): *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature*. Princeton NJ, Princeton University Press
- Rouse, Joseph (1993): "Foucault and the natural sciences". Caputo, John and Yont, Mark (eds.): *Foucault and the Critique of Institutions*. Pennsylvania, The Pennsylvania State University Press
- Rouse, Joseph (1994): "Power/knowledge". Gutting, Gary (ed.): *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault*. Cambridge, The Cambridge University Press
- Rowan, Joseph R. (1996): "Who is safer in a male maximum security prisons?". *The Keeper's Voice*, 17 (3), 31-32
- Rubin, Herbert J. and Rubin, Irene S. (1995): *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. Thousand Oaks CA, Sage Publications
- Ryan, Gery W. and Bernard, H. Russel (2000): "Data management and analysis methods". Denzin, Norman K. and Lincoln, Yvonna S. (eds.): *Handbook of Qualitative Research – 2nd ed.* Thousand Oaks CA, Sage Publications
- Røskeland, Marit (1982): *Idrett og innsatte: Muligheter for organisert idrettsutøvelse i Oslo kretsfengsel Avd. A*. Oslo, Norges idrettshøgskole
- Sabo, Donald F. (1994): "Doing time doing masculinity: Sports and prison". Messner, Michael A. and Sabo, Donald F. (eds.): *Sex, Violence and Power in Sports: Rethinking Masculinity*. Freedom CA, The Crossing Press
- Sabo, Donald F. (1999): *Understanding Men's Health: A Relational and Gender Sensitive Approach*. Gender and health equity workshop: Global health.

- Sabo, Donald F. (2000): *Prison Masculinities: Issues for Research on Men, Masculinities, and Gender Relations*. Lecture in Oslo, October 13. 2000
- Sabo, Donald F. and London, Willie (1992): "Understanding men in prison: The relevance of gender studies". *Men's Studies Review*, 9 (1), 4-9
- Sandemose, Aksel (1936): *A Fugitive Crosses His Tracs*. New York, Alfred A. Knopf
- Sandemose, Aksel (1998): *En flykning krysser sitt spor*. Oslo, Aschehoug & Co
- Sandmo, Erling (1992): "Foucault's fengsel: En presentasjon av det moderne fengsels historie". *Historisk tidsskrift*, 71 (1), 36-58
- Sawicki, Jana (1991): *Disciplining Foucault: Feminism, Power and the Body*. London, Routledge
- Schaanning, Espen (1995): "Forord/Etterord". Foucault, Michel: *Seksualitetens historie 1: Viljen til viten*. Gjøvik, Exil
- Schaanning, Espen (1997): *Vitenskap som skapt viten: Foucault og historisk praksis*. Oslo, Spartacus Forlag A/S
- Schaanning, Espen (2000a): *Fortiden i våre hender: Foucault som vitenshåndtør: Bind 1*. Universitetet i Oslo, Det historisk-filosofiske fakultet
- Schaanning, Espen (2000b): *Fortiden i våre hender: Foucault som vitenshåndtør: Bind 2*. Universitetet i Oslo, Det historisk-filosofiske fakultet
- Schwandt, Thomas A. (1994): "Constructivist, interpretivist approaches to human inquiry". Denzin, Norman K. and Lincoln, Yvonna S. (eds.): *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks CA, Sage Publications
- Schwandt, Thomas A. (1996): "Farewell to criteriology". *Qualitative Inquiry*, 2, 58-72
- Schwandt, Thomas A. (2000): "Three epistemological stances for qualitative inquiry: Interpretivism, hermeneutics, and social constructionism". Denzin, Norman K. and Lincoln, Yvonna S. (eds.): *Handbook of Qualitative Research – 2nd ed*. Thousand Oaks CA, Sage Publications

- Scott, Sue and Morgan, David (1993): *Body Matters: Essays on the Sociology of the Body*. London, The Falmer Press
- Scraton, Phil; Sim, Joe and Skidmore, Paul (1991): *Prisons under Protest*. Milton Keynes, Open University Press
- Segal, Lynne (1990): *Slow Motion: Changing Masculinities, Changing Men*. London, Virago
- Sheldon, William A. (1949): *Varieties of Delinquent Youth*. New York, Harper
- Shilling, Chris (1991): "Educating the body: Physical capital and the production of social inequalities". *Sociology*, 25 (4), 653-672
- Shilling, Chris (1993): *The Body and Social Theory*. London, Sage Publication
- Sim, Joe (1994): "Tougher than the rest? Men in prison". Newburn, Tim and Stanko, Elizabeth A. (eds.): *Just Boys Doing Business: Men, Masculinities and Crime*. London, Routledge
- Sørensen, Marit (1997): *The Psychology of Initiating and Maintaining Exercise and Diet Behaviour*. University of Bergen, Faculty of Psychology, Department of Biological and Medical Psychology
- Skårderud, Finn (1994): "Idéhistorier om kroppen". *Tidsskrift for Den Norske Lægeforening*, 114 (2), 177-184
- Smith, John K. and Deemer, Deborah K. (2000): "The problem of criteria in the age of relativism". Denzin, Norman K. and Lincoln, Yvonna S. (eds.): *Handbook of Qualitative Research – 2nd ed*. Thousand Oaks CA, Sage Publications
- Sparkes, Andrew C. (1995): "Writing people: Reflections on the dual crisis of representation and legitimation in qualitative inquiry". *Quest*, 47 (2), 158-195
- Sparkes, Andrew C. (1998): "Validity in qualitative inquiry and the problem of criteria: Implications for sport psychology". *The Sport Psychologist*, 12, 363-386
- Sparkes, Andrew C. (1999): "Exploring body narratives". *Sport, Education and Society*, 4 (1), 17-30

- Sparkes, Andrew C. (2000): *The Use of Narratives in Qualitative Research*. Lecture at Norges idrettshøgskole, March 28. 2000.
- Spender, Dale (1981): *Men's Studies Modified: The Impact of Feminism on the Academic Disciplines*. Oxford, Pergamon Press
- Spradley, James P. (1980): *Participant Observation*. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston
- Statistisk sentralbyrå (1997): *Kriminalitet og rettsvesen 3. utgave*
- Statistisk sentralbyrå (2000): *Kriminalstatistikken*
- Stein, Arlene and Plummer, Ken (1996): "I can't even think right: 'Queer' theory and the missing sexual revolution in sociology". Seidman, Steven (ed.): *Queer Theory/Sociology*. Cambridge, Blackwell
- Steinfeld, Toril (1993): "Kvinneforskning som vitenskap". *Kvinneforskning, mannsforskning, kjønnsforskning: Forskningsstrategiske perspektiver på forholdet mellom kvinneforskning og mannsforskning*. Sekretariatet for Kvinneforsknings Skriftserie for Forskningspolitikk
- Steinsholt, Kjetil (1991): *Makten er først og fremst der den ikke er: Makt, disiplin, motstand, identitet og frihet hos Foucault*. Universitetet i Trondheim, Pedagogisk Forskningsinstitutt
- Stohr, Mary K.; Lovrich, Nicholas P. and Wood, Marcia J (1996): "Service versus security concerns in contemporary jails: Testing general differences in training topic assessments". *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 24 (5), 437-448
- Sykes, Gresham M. (1958): *The Society of Captives: A Study of a Maximum Security Prison*. New Jersey, Princeton University Press
- Szockyj, E. (1989): "Working in a man's world: Women correctional officers in an institution for men". *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 31 (3), 319-328
- Tesh, Renata (1990): *Qualitative Research: Analysis Types and Software Tools*. New York, The Palmer Press
- The Council of Europe (1986): *European Prison Rules*

- The Norwegian Government (2000): *The Norwegian National Budget*
- Theberge, Nancy (1991): "Reflections on the body in the sociology of sport". *Quest*, 45, 123-134
- Thomas, James E. (1972): *The English Prison Officer Since 1850: A Study in Conflict*. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Thurston, Richard (1996): "Are you sitting comfortably? Men's storytelling, masculinities, prison culture and violence". Mac an Ghail, Màirtìn (ed.): *Understanding Masculinities*. Buckingham, Open University Press
- Turner, Bryan S. (1996): *The Body & Society: Explorations in Social Theory*. London, Sage Publications
- Van Maanen, John (1995): "An end to innocence: The ethnography of ethnography". Van Maanen, John (ed.): *Representation in Ethnography*. Thousand Oaks CA, Sage Publications
- Vegheim, Berit (1997): "Kjønn og kriminalitet". Finstad, Liv og Høigård, Cecilie (red.): *Kriminologi*. Oslo, Pax Forlag A/S
- Vigarello, Georges (1995): "The life of the body in 'Discipline and punish'". *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 12, 158-163
- Wadel, Cato (1991): *Feltarbeid i egen kultur: En innføring i kvalitativt orientert samfunnsforskning*. Flekkefjord, Seek A/S
- Wahl, Anna (1997): "MOLNET - att föreläsa om feministisk forskning". *Kvinnovetenskapelig tidskrift*, 3-4, 31-44
- Warren, Carol A. B. (1988): *Gender Issues in Field Research*. Newbury Park CA, Sage Publications
- Wearing, Betsy (1998): *Leisure and Feminist Theory*. London, Sage Publications
- Weitzman, Eben A. (2000): "Software and qualitative research". Denzin, Norman K. and Lincoln, Yvonna S. (eds.): *Handbook of Qualitative Research – 2nd ed.* Thousand Oaks CA, Sage Publications

- West, Candace and Zimmerman, Don H. (1987): "Doing gender". *Gender & Society*, 1 (2), 125-151
- Wexler, Judie G. and Logan, Deana D. (1983): "Sources of stress among women police officers". *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 11 (1), 46-53
- Whitson, David (1990): "Sport in the social construction of masculinity". Messner, Michael A. and Sabo, Donald F. (eds.): *Sport, Men, and the Gender Order: Critical Feminist Perspectives*. Champaign Illinois, Human Kinetics Books
- Whyte, William F. (1984): *Learning From the Field: A Guide From Experience*. Newbury Park CA, Sage Publications
- Widerberg, Karin (1998): "Translating gender". *NORA*, 6 (2), 133-138
- Williams, Christine L. and Heikes, E. Joel (1993): "The importance of researcher's gender in the in-depth interview: Evidence from two case studies of male nurses". *Gender & Society*, 7 (2), 280-291
- Wilson, S. (1977): "The use of ethnographic techniques in educational research". *Review of Educational Research*, 47 (1)
- Wolcott, Harry F. (1994): *Transforming Qualitative Data: Description, Analysis, and Interpretation*. Thousand Oaks CA, Sage Publications
- Wolf, Diane L. (1996): "Situating feminist dilemmas in fieldwork". Wolf, Diane L. (ed.): *Feminist Dilemmas in Fieldwork*. Colorado, Westview Press
- Young, Kevin; White, Philip and McTeer, Willia (1994): "Body talk: Male athletes reflect on sport, injury, and pain". *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 11, 175-194
- Zimmer, Lynn E. (1986): *Women Guarding Men*. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press
- Øster, Lars O. (1996): *Fysisk aktivitets innvirkning på en gruppe insattes selvbylde*. Trondheim, Norges Teknisk-Naturvitenskapelige Universitet
- Aaberge, Kari (1986): *Treningscenter for innsatte med rusmiddelproblemer*. Oslo, Norges idrettshøgskole