

APTARA	HOJO	hojo12177	Dispatch: August 4, 2016	CE: XXX
	Journal	MSP No.	No. of pages: 18	PE: XXXX

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

The Howard Journal Vol 00 No 0. xxxx 2016 DOI: 10.1111/hojo.12177
ISSN 2059-1098, pp. 1–18

Sex in Prisoner Power Relations: Attitudes and Practices in a Ukrainian Correctional Colony for Men

ANTON SYMKOVYCH

Post-Doctoral Research Fellow, Department of Sociology, University of
Johannesburg, South Africa

Abstract: Most research on prison sex has originated in the global West, often employing quantitative methodology. Building on a semi-ethnographic study of a Ukrainian prison, this article explores how prisoners and officers perceive prisoner sex. Rape was not reported in this prison, despite the relatively young prison population. I argue that the informal prisoner power structure of the prison underworld diminishes sexual abuse. Thus, contrary to much of the literature, masculinity, homophobia, and informal prisoner hierarchies can equally instigate and restrain prison violence and sexual victimisation.

Keywords: prison sex; masculinity; sexual violence; prison culture; homophobia; inmate code; Ukraine

Sex¹ among male prisoners (henceforth prison sex) is often coercive and expresses the domination of some prisoners by others (Dumond 2000; Tewksbury and West 2000; Trammell 2011). Much of what we know about prison sex stems from research in the United States (US) and United Kingdom (Banbury 2004; Hensley, Struckman-Johnson and Eigenberg 2000; O'Donnell 2004; Tewksbury and West 2000), with a few notable exceptions (Booyens and Bezuidenhout 2014; Egelund 2014; Einat 2012, 2014; Gear 2005; Schifter 1999). Furthermore, because of restricted access, a great deal of research on prison sex utilises secondary, aggregated, or retrospective data. Using ethnographic data from a Ukrainian medium-security prison for men, I argue that, contrary to much of the literature, masculinity, homophobia, and informal prisoner hierarchies can both restrain and instigate violence and sexual exploitation. I demonstrate how power relations in prison incorporate human sexuality and mimic the social gender division, and how prisoner sociality reconciles virulent homophobia with sex among men.

I begin by reviewing sex's role in men's prisons (hereafter prisons) as a substitute for heterosexual liaisons, a means of inter-prisoner

1 *The Howard Journal Vol 00 No 0. xxxx 2016*
2 *ISSN 2059-1098, pp. 1–18*

3
4 subjugation and control, an expression of fluid sexuality, and a continuation of pre-incarceration sexual practices. Next, I explain this case study's methodology. I then outline the organisation and normative code of the Ukrainian underworld, followed by a discussion of how this informal prisoner sociality, whilst virulently homophobic and misogynistic, restrains sexual violence and exploitation. Finally, I present officers' views on inter-prisoner sex and locate prisoners' attitudes to sex among prisoners in their constructions of masculinity. I conclude by arguing that the masculinity-centred, misogynistic informal prisoner structure, whilst discriminating against prisoners deemed 'unmanly', limits sexual violence. Whereas scholars often associate violence and abuse in prison with masculinity, I demonstrate that its role in prison can be more nuanced, simultaneously justifying discrimination and curbing violence.

18 **Prison Sex as Background and Foreground of Power and Masculinity**

19
20 Deprivation of heterosexual relations and incessant threats to personal safety constitute the classical 'pains of imprisonment' (Sykes (1958); see also Ricciardelli, Maier and Hannah-Moffat (2015) on prisoners' apprehensions). Sex between men in prison can alleviate or exacerbate these pains (Kupers 2010; Schifter 1999; Trammell 2011). Prison sex can be consensual (Levan 2014; Robinson 2011; Schifter 1999), but it frequently represents exploitation or rape (Gear 2005; 2007; Kupers 2010; Trammell 2011). Some who seem to consent may simply be engaging in what has been called survival sex (Booyens and Bezuidenhout 2014; Egelund 2014; Eigenberg 2000; Jones and Pratt 2008; Levan 2014). Of course, male prisoners (hereafter prisoners) may have sex with prison staff, mostly female, and with visitors, predominantly wives (D'Alessio, Flexon and Stolzenberg 2013; Levan 2014; Schifter 1999). However, these relations are not the focus of the present study.

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
Researchers seeking to explain prison sex generally use one of three models: deprivation, importation, and power. The deprivation model is heteronormative and historically dominant. It posits that prisoners seek sexual gratification through masturbation, consensual sex, and rape ('coercive sex') due to a lack, or more often a total absence, of heterosexual relationships. According to this model, one of the parties to sex is 'natural' or 'dispositionally' homosexual, an 'insertee', and the other is 'situational', an 'inserter' (Hensley, Struckman-Johnson and Eigenberg 2000; Levan 2014; Tewksbury and West 2000; classical examples are Clemmer 1940; Sykes 1958). The importation model regards prison sex as an extension of men's sexuality on the 'outside'. Men either continue having sex with men once incarcerated, or prison provides an opportunity to explore their sexuality and challenge gender and heteronormative norms (Gear 2005; Robinson 2011; on women's prisons, see Einat and Chen 2012). Sex with men in prison is not a substitute for sex with women but the evolution and diversification of their sexuality, which constructionists, unlike essentialists, regard as dynamic (Blackburn, Fowler and Mullings 2014; Eigenberg 1992; Gibson and Hensley 2013; Schifter 1999). Finally, building on a feminist

view of rape, the power perspective explains rape as a means of domination, with sexual gratification merely a by-product of a quest to alleviate personal disempowerment by humiliating and harming others (Booyens and Bezuidenhout 2014; D'Alessio, Flexon and Stolzenberg 2013; Hsu 2005; O'Donnell 2004; Zaitsow 2014). Whilst many commentators prefer one of the perspectives, some research, often more recent and qualitative in its methodology, provides empirical support for all three (Gear 2005; Schifter 1999).

Attitudes to Prison Sex

Prisoners' and officers' attitudes to prison sex are diverse and nuanced. Some research finds general non-acceptance of sexual activity between men in prison (Einat 2012; Hsu 2005). Other studies demonstrate that whilst homophobia and misogyny often define prison cultures, prisoner societies around the globe legitimise and regiment sex between men. In this legitimisation, one of the parties assumes, or is forced into, a woman's role, becoming passive and submissive, the 'insertee' who is sexually penetrated (Gear 2005, 2007; Kupers 2010; Reed 2003; Trammell 2011). By re-imagining one of the male partners as a woman, prisoners can reconcile sex between men with prison's staple homophobia (Egelund 2014; Gear 2007; O'Donnell 2004; Richmond 1978; Schifter 1999).

That said, the sexually dominant prisoners, 'inserters', must also follow a strict protocol. Generally, they present sex as a release of 'tension' and alleviation of men's 'needs' (legitimised though the deprivation model). The 'inserters' refrain from being anally or orally penetrated and usually do not display emotional attachment to, or equality with, the other parties to sex, the 'insertees' (Eigenberg 2000; Schifter 1999). In some prison cultures or for individual men, such safeguards to masculinity are insufficient and men resort to force when penetrating another prisoner; equating weakness and subjugation with femininity, they grant the violent perpetrator masculine status (Levan 2014; Reed 2003; Sykes 1958; Trammell 2011).

The situation is seldom as clear-cut as the above argumentation suggests. Despite the strict rules, prisoners' sexual conduct may still violate the established informal norms, or prisoners may challenge the hegemonic sexual discourse of prison (Gear 2005; Schifter 1999). Furthermore, some researchers have identified an 'attitude-conduct' conflict whereby prisoners may disapprove in principle of same-sex sex between prisoners whilst personally engaging in it (Einat and Chen 2012, p.499).

Prevalence of Prison Sex: Methodological Challenges Persist

The prevalence of prison sexual activity, its legal status, and prison sex cultures, vary greatly across jurisdictions, institutions, and even parts of institutions housing specific populations. Due to methodological differences and the sensitivity of the issue, estimates differ enormously, and 'analyses of sexual activity in prisons have been inconsistent and inconclusive' (Saum *et al.* 1995, p.417; see also Dumond 2000; Gibson and Hensley 2013; Jones

1 *The Howard Journal Vol 00 No 0. xxxx 2016*
 2 *ISSN 2059-1098, pp. 1–18*

3
 4 and Pratt 2008; Marcum 2014; O'Donnell 2004). Prison cultures, whilst
 5 typically homophobic, differ in their acceptance of men-on-men sex: some
 6 accommodate it, albeit with a host of caveats (for example, US, Costa Rica,
 7 and South Africa), and others abhor it (for example, Israel and Taiwan)
 8 (Booyens and Bezuidenhout 2014; Einat 2012; Gear 2005; Hsu 2005;
 9 Schifter 1999; Trammell 2011).

10 Because of restricted access and sensitivity of the issue, researchers
 11 seldom have the opportunity to establish adequate trust with the research
 12 participants (Cochran 2012; D'Alessio, Flexon and Stolzenberg 2013;
 13 Eigenberg 2000; Morash *et al.* 2012; Saum *et al.* 1995; for a notable
 14 exception, see Schifter 1999). Although these studies offer valuable
 15 insights, such issues as how prisoners explain the nature and frequency of
 16 sex in prison, how they reconcile societal and prison-specific homophobia
 17 with the prison sex culture, and how they perceive their own sexuality
 18 and that of others, as well as the role of deprivation, require qualitative
 19 analysis (Eigenberg 1992; Saum *et al.* 1995). This article's methodology
 20 allows me to begin to address these issues.

21 22 **Semi-ethnographic Case Study of a Ukrainian Medium-security** 23 **Correctional Colony**

24 My semi-ethnographic study comprised almost daily visits to a men's
 25 medium-security prison in the Kyiv region, Ukraine, over five months. Ini-
 26 tially meeting suspicion, I eventually established my presence and gained
 27 the acceptance of the prison population. My sustained presence, genuine
 28 interest, independence and authenticity as a person and researcher culti-
 29 vated trust between me and the men in the prison – staff and prisoners
 30 alike. Both invited me to their informal gatherings and shared their food
 31 and drink. I spent time, talked with, and observed, prisoners of all ages,
 32 with different incarceration histories, and with different standings in the
 33 informal hierarchy. Similarly, whilst emphasising my neutrality, I had dis-
 34 cussions with officers from all prison departments, men with different
 35 experiences and reputations.

36 Over the five months, I spoke with about a third of the prisoners and
 37 with all officers and managers. Because my major interest comprised power
 38 relations, this inevitably led to discussions of the prison sex culture, *sub*
 39 *rosa* economy, drug use, argot, humour, prison labour, 'Europeanisation'
 40 and regime liberalisation, and many other issues. Neither prisoners, nor
 41 officers, nor I, shied away from sensitive issues. In fact, I was amazed by
 42 my research participants' openness and directness; many wholeheartedly
 43 self-appointed as my guides into the hidden world of a Ukrainian prison.
 44 Once clear that no topic constituted a taboo, my questions became direct
 45 and detailed, as did the responses. Although not everyone was eager to
 46 talk about sex at length, some did. Despite having conducted fieldwork in
 47 other penal institutions before, sometimes I could not conceal my emotions
 48 even when I wanted to, as this episode illustrates:

49
 50 *Fieldnote.* The prisoners told a joke which I didn't get. They patiently explain that
 51 if a prisoner discloses that he had performed oral sex on a woman, he could be

ostracised. The misogynistic explanation follows: ‘If he licks a woman, there is no reason he should not suck a dick’. Probably the astonishment and confusion is too vivid on my face. Prisoners wink at each other and say, ‘It’s good Anton is not a prisoner as it looks like we would have to [ostracise] him’.

After several months of informal, often prolonged, conversations, I identified 21 staff and 20 prisoners whom I found most helpful for advancing my research questions through semi-structured interviews, which lasted two to six hours, usually over several sessions. The interviewees included two ‘operational’ and one ‘non-operational’ Outcasts, as well as prisoners from other ‘castes’ (discussed in following sections), and officers from all grades, including the medical officer and Prison Commander.

We held our discussions and interviews mostly in private in various offices, prison workshops, the kitchen, and the segregation unit; one occurred on the prison parade ground whilst we paced back and forth for about two hours at 1 am during one of my overnight stays in the prison.² The busy prison life meant that other prisoners and officers at times interrupted conversations and interviews by walking in. Sometimes we paused; at other times, the interviewees drew the newcomers into our interviews. Occasionally, such co-optations took on the flavour of focus groups, with my research participants challenging each other’s claims. This, in turn, gave me license to challenge their accounts when incompatible with the behaviour I had observed, or when our values clashed (see Springwood and King (2001, p.409) on ‘colliding voices’). Most interviewees consented to be voice-recorded.

Given the nature of the data, the analysis was thematic. Although the content analysis of the observation and post-conversation notes, as well as interview transcriptions, notes, and recordings, produced myriad themes, this article limits itself to power, sex, and sexuality. As a case study of a single institution, without an ambition to generalise, this ‘near data’ research (Christie 1997, p.21) sheds light on how masculine prison culture may curb sexual violence.

The Case Study Prison

As it was a medium-security institution, the prison housed about 800 repeat or first-time serious offenders, mostly from the capital region. The majority were convicted of theft or burglary, often associated with drug abuse, although prisoners and officers concurred in their claims about the scarcity of drugs inside. Those convicted of murder, rape, or similar violent crimes constituted about a quarter of the population. Prisoners were mostly young: on one representative day, six were 20 years old or younger, 340 were aged 20–30 years, 341 were aged 30–40 years, 140 were aged 40–55 years, 11 were aged 55–60 years, and eight were older than 60 years. The average sentence length was five years, although several prisoners were serving 10–15 years. Most prisoners came from poor socio-economic backgrounds, many exhibited a low educational level, and most had never held any legitimate employment. About a dozen prisoners attended

1 *The Howard Journal Vol 00 No 0. xxxx 2016*
 2 *ISSN 2059-1098, pp. 1–18*

3
 4 Sunday mass in a prison Eastern Orthodox church; another 10–20 partic-
 5 ipated in weekly Protestant services.

6 Family connections varied: some men received regular visits, whilst oth-
 7 ers had none. A sentenced adult was permitted a long visit quarterly with
 8 legally-recognised close family members, such as (grand)parents, spouses,
 9 (grand)children, and siblings, for 24–72 hours (at the prison Commander’s
 10 discretion) in an isolated hotel section of the prison (Ukraine, Criminal-
 11 Executive Code (CECU) 2003, Article 143).³ Unlike other jurisdictions,
 12 Ukraine has no policy on sex in prison, even though the Ukraine, Prison
 13 Byelaws (2003) provide much detail on other aspects of incarceration.

14 The prison assigned prisoners to squads, each comprising about
 15 50 men. Squad members normally shared a dormitory and worked in the
 16 same workshop. This ‘carceral collectivism’ (Piacentini and Slade 2015)
 17 helped ensure mutual prisoner surveillance. Unlike in other jurisdictions,
 18 apart from the legally guaranteed eight hours of uninterrupted sleep, two
 19 hours of free time, and weekly days off, unless they are sick or over the age
 20 of retirement, Ukrainian prisoners actually have little idle time (Ukraine,
 21 Criminal-Executive Code (CECU) 2003, Articles 118, 119,129; Ukraine,
 22 Prison Byelaws (2003), Rule 31; cf. Gear 2005, 2007; Reed 2003; Schifter
 23 1999).

24 Like other Ukrainian prisons, the case study prison was grossly un-
 25 derstaffed, with virtually no electronic surveillance. On an average day,
 26 25 or fewer officers covered a vast industrial zone with various workshops,
 27 a segregation unit, a medical ward, and an extensive residential zone sub-
 28 divided into local zones, each housing two to four squads. In this context,
 29 the prison’s smooth operation depended on the self-regulated prisoner
 30 sociality.

31 32 **Ukrainian Response to Sykes: Prisoner Hierarchy**

33
 34 All inter-prisoner relations, including sexual ones, were embedded in an
 35 informal hierarchical power structure, the prison underworld. Most in-
 36 terviewed prisoners believed this inescapable, stratified fixture offered the
 37 only viable option to ensure peaceful coexistence. It operated by regiment-
 38 ing minute details of prison life and severely punishing transgressions
 39 of its inmate code and its concomitantly misogynistic and homophobic
 40 understanding of masculinity (Cowburn 1998; Flood 2008; Jewkes 2005).

41 42 *Prisoner Stratification*

43 Like prisons in the West and beyond, in Ukraine a prisoner’s place in
 44 the prisoner hierarchy depends, first, on how his manliness corresponds
 45 with a reductionist, hegemonic, working-class conception of masculinity
 46 (Clemmer 1940; Crewe 2009; Phillips 2012) and, second, on his attitudes
 47 toward prison authorities. During initial incarceration, established prison-
 48 ers observe, test, and interview, often cunningly through seemingly innocu-
 49 ous, friendly conversations, each newcomer to determine his status, based
 50 on his conduct, qualities, and past, including his sexual history. Whereas
 51 the informal hierarchy in this prison, as elsewhere in Ukraine, comprised

1
2
3
4 four main strata, Criminal Elites, Blokes, Collaborators, and Outcasts, for
5 the current discussion it suffices to note that prisoners fell into either
6 the ‘men’ (the former three strata) or ‘non-men’ (Outcasts) categories. The
7 latter comprised 64 out of 800 prisoners.

8 As in other prisoner societies around the globe, Ukrainian prisoners
9 symbolically degraded to the status of women, those who did not embody
10 the popular understanding of a man (Booyens and Bezuidenhout 2014;
11 Gear 2005; Schifter 1999; Trammell 2011). These ‘failed and fallen’ men
12 (Kupers 2010, p.114) became the Outcasts. Masculine ‘failures’ included
13 having committed crimes which prisoners universally consider unmanly:
14 sexual offences and crimes against children, as well as having ever been
15 anally or orally penetrated (consensual sex or rape) (Bandyopadhyay 2006;
16 Crewe 2009; Einat 2012; Hsu 2005). Other transgressions ‘below the dig-
17 nity of a man’ could include stealing from other prisoners, failing to re-
18 pay a debt, being an informant, or arbitrarily using force that had led
19 to grave consequences. As in other homosocial environments, prisoners
20 coerced some men to join the Outcasts because of their lack of ‘mascu-
21 line’ stoicism in coping with the travails of imprisonment and even for
22 not being appropriately social (Flood 2008; Jewkes 2005; Schifter 1999).
23 Lack of prison acumen could also lead to ostracism; for example, prisoners
24 might manipulate a newcomer in a card game by not explaining that his
25 ‘arse’ was at stake in the game (Dumond 2000; Gear 2005). Generally, the
26 Outcasts corresponded to ‘punks’ and ‘fags’ in US prisons (Sykes 1958;
27 Trammell 2011). However, unlike in some prisoner societies, Ukrainian
28 ‘non-men’ prisoners could not reclaim their masculine status, not even
29 through violence (cf. Egelund 2014; Gear 2005).

30 The expulsion from the group was both symbolical and physical: Out-
31 casts’ beds in dormitories and their tables in the prison cafeteria stood
32 apart from the rest. Maintaining its jurisdiction over Outcasts, the un-
33 derworld barred them from touching the food, cutlery, mugs or plates
34 of other prisoners. Informal rules outlawed shaking hands with Outcasts:
35 in traditional Ukrainian society, a handshake denotes recognition of an
36 individual’s masculinity.

37 38 39 *Power and Legitimacy of the Underworld*

40 Whilst discriminating against ‘failed men’, the prisoner stratified power
41 structure assuaged such pains of imprisonment as insecurity, as resolu-
42 tion of all disputes had to follow an established informal protocol. In fact,
43 whereas previous research often associates violence and sexual exploita-
44 tion in prison with masculinity and power hierarchies, my data show that
45 despite its harsh norms and sanctions, the Ukrainian underworld pris-
46 oner sociality curtailed violence (cf. Gear 2005, 2007; Morash *et al.* 2012;
47 Ricciardelli 2014; Schifter 1999; Trammell 2011). For example, in response
48 to my Freedom of Information request, the Ukrainian Penitentiary Ser-
49 vice (UkrPS) reported two murders and seven cases of bodily assault in
50 its 148 establishments holding 66,000 prisoners, including 10,300 con-
51 victed of premeditated murder and 4,700 convicted of grave bodily assault

1 *The Howard Journal Vol 00 No 0. xxxx 2016*
 2 *ISSN 2059-1098, pp. 1–18*

3
 4 (Ukraine, Penitentiary Service 2016). Notwithstanding the required scepticism about the official statistics, the level of violence could have been
 5 substantially higher, given the number of prisoners and minimal supervision.
 6 The relative peace emanated from one of the main tenets of the
 7 prisoner normative system: prohibition of arbitrary violence, *bespredyél*:
 8

9
 10 You are accountable (*otvecháyeshy*) for your every word, every step. If you say something,
 11 you must prove it. You cannot just come and hit somebody, even an Outcast,
 12 just because you don't like their face. Any conflict you've got, you bring it to [the
 13 Criminal-Elite]. If he finds that another con acted in violation of *ponyátiya* [informal
 14 rules], only then would that prisoner be punished. (Prisoner-Collaborator)

15 Whereas normative commitment to the underworld varied, the power of
 16 the underworld stemmed from its expediency and from its inescapability.
 17 When inter-prisoner conflicts, often arising from illicit activities, such as
 18 gambling, *a priori* could not be resolved through official means, the deeply
 19 institutionalised office of Criminal-Elite adjudicated such situation: 'There
 20 is no way to live [in prison] without *ponyátiya*. Take this situation: two cons
 21 [cannot come to an agreement] over drugs. What shall they do? Go and ask
 22 the Master [*Khazyáyín*, Prison Commander] to resolve the disagreement?
 23 [laughs] Do you think it would be better if they took out knives and dealt
 24 with it this way?' (Prisoner-Criminal-Elite). The UkrPS officially considers
 25 that 'criminal traditions', that is, the set of unofficial but universal norms
 26 and values guiding prisoner sociality, undermine prisoner 'rehabilitation'
 27 and 'correction' and threaten order. However, in this prison, maintaining
 28 the peace strongly depended on maintaining the inmate code – and the
 29 officers knew this.

30 The success of the underworld stemmed from its perceived legitimacy
 31 and utility, combined with the certainty of its enforcement, including
 32 through violence or by the downgrading of status, or both. The certainty
 33 of punishment was a product of the prison's 'carceral collectivism' and
 34 pervasive mutual surveillance (privacy was virtually unattainable). In addition,
 35 a failure to report others' transgressions entailed severe sanctions.
 36 Therefore, unlike many formal rules, the informal ones were consistently,
 37 and harshly, enforced. One prisoner recalled: 'You know, [on the outside]
 38 I used to steal for four years before I was caught. I always got away with
 39 it. However, here, I stole once and I was black and blue. They [prisoners]
 40 beat shit out of me. I know here if I steal I'll be punished for sure, and
 41 punished severely' (Prisoner-Outcast).

42 Despite its origins in the Soviet Gulag and conservatism, the Ukrainian
 43 prison underworld is dynamic. One of the major changes following the
 44 restoration of Ukraine's independence was the highest cadre of the national
 45 Criminal-Elite (*skhódka voróv*, meeting of the 'thieves') prohibiting
 46 inter-prisoner rape by the mid-1990s. Formerly, ostracising a prisoner into
 47 Outcasts constituted a ritualistic rape, similar to 'emasculat[i]on' practices in
 48 other prisoner societies (Gear 2005; Reed 2003; Schifter 1999; Trammell
 49 2011). Since then, the expulsion has been symbolised by a verbal declaration,
 50 pouring a mug of urine on a prisoner, or a prisoner 'voluntarily'
 51 taking his bedding and moving to the *petushátnya* ('rooster-cot', also known

1
2
3
4 as the harem), a section of the dormitory where Outcasts sleep. Some
5 of my interviewees associated this ‘humanisation’ of the prison culture
6 with the fear of AIDS, something backed up by other studies (Eigenberg
7 2000; Einat 2012, 2014; Schifter 1999). Others explained the ‘punish-
8 ment with a dick’ (rape) was outlawed by the Criminal-Elite because of the
9 group’s concern for its diminishing hegemony – the number of Outcasts
10 was increasing, along with associated prisoner resentment, and the law-
11 enforcement officials (*musorá*) actively exploited the latter. Concurrently,
12 de-communisation meant the state was becoming more humane, curtail-
13 ing state violence and relaxing prison regimes. These transformations have
14 been eroding the basis for prisoner allegiance to the underworld, as such
15 allegiance partially constituted a response to the state’s treatment of pris-
16 oners as subhuman and harsh prison conditions. Regardless of the reason
17 for the ruling, it meant prisoners could no longer rape other prisoners with
18 impunity.

19 Notwithstanding their rhetorical condemnation, officers on the ground
20 depended on the underworld to maximise peace in prison. Their aware-
21 ness of this dependence meant that they accommodated certain informal
22 regulations of the underworld. For example, officers tolerated physical seg-
23regation of the Outcasts; they did not venture to assign them to the kitchen
24 or the Criminal-Elite to clean toilets (‘a task below a man’s dignity’), know-
25 ing the prisoners would respond with a hunger strike or self-mutilation.⁴
26 The officer in charge of the allocation unit told me he ‘encouraged’ new
27 prisoners to join Outcasts if they met the criteria, so as to avoid conflicts
28 later when such information became known. Many officers embraced the
29 prison culture, including homophobic and misogynistic prejudices; some
30 even seemed reluctant to search (touch) Outcasts.

31 A few officers lamented the ‘demise’ of the prisoner underworld, per-
32 ceiving a new ‘softness’ and a tendency to waver from old customs (see
33 Jewkes (2005, p.51) on ‘degenerated’ prisons). For example, several offi-
34 cers (and prisoners) expressed indignation that a Collaborator serving a
35 sentence for gravely assaulting a baby ‘walked around the camp [prison]
36 shaking hands with Blokes’ instead of being ostracised. What they meant
37 by ‘demise,’ however, was a softening of the informal norms, not necessarily
38 their erosion or disappearance.

40 41 **Regimentation of Sex**

42 On the one hand, the official policies neglected prisoner sex; on the other
43 hand, the informal law strictly regimented it. As in most other prisoner
44 societies, in Ukraine, sex between men in prison must mimic the pa-
45 triarchal gender division of the larger society for the prisoner sociality
46 to deem it legitimate (Egelund 2014; Gear 2005, 2007; Kupers 2010;
47 Schifter 1999; Trammell 2011). Hence, prisoners had to obey the ‘inserte’-
48 ‘insertee’ rules; only Outcasts could be ‘insertees’, as the prisoner sociality
49 had stripped them of manhood. Those who had retained masculine status
50 could anally or orally penetrate only an Outcast, but not touch his penis,
51 caress or kiss him, or be penetrated.

1 *The Howard Journal Vol 00 No 0. xxxx 2016*
 2 *ISSN 2059-1098, pp. 1–18*

3
 4 Although symbolically relegated to being women, unlike elsewhere,
 5 Ukrainian Outcasts did not imitate women in their appearance, mannerism
 6 or names (cf. Blackburn, Fowler and Mullings 2014; Levan 2014; Marcum
 7 2014; Reed 2003). Some, in the words of one Prisoner-Bloke, were ‘ugly
 8 like a nuclear war’. Furthermore, Ukrainian prisoner culture did not tol-
 9 erate any sustained sexual or domestic pairing of male prisoners, either
 10 voluntary or coerced. The informal prohibition of rape and arbitrary vi-
 11 olence meant that so-called ‘protective pairing’, in other words, sexual
 12 exploitation typical to some prison cultures, was unacceptable in Ukraine
 13 (cf. Booyens and Bezuidenhout 2014; Egelund 2014; Gear 2005, 2007;
 14 Reed 2003; Schifter 1999; Trammell 2011).

15 Like their counterparts in other countries, these Ukrainian Outcasts
 16 engaged in ‘unmanly jobs’, such as doing laundry, cleaning toilets, stand-
 17 ing lookout and fetching things (Egelund 2014; Schifter 1999; Trammell
 18 2011). Given the prohibition of rape, Outcasts comprised two subgroups:
 19 ‘operational’ (*rabóchiye petukhó*) and ‘non-operational’. The former provided
 20 sex services as a part of a *sub rosa* prison economy. However, according to
 21 the informal rules of the underworld, prisoners could not force Outcasts
 22 to provide services, including sex, and payment was mandatory, as one
 23 prisoner explained:

24
 25 Although I’m an Outcast, I’m not a slave and cons pay me. There was one *khitrozhópy*
 26 [smart-arse] prisoner, a young one, so he was telling me ‘tomorrow’ or ‘next week’
 27 [that is, was deferring a payment]. So I went to [the Criminal-Elite] and told him
 28 this. He called in this con and told him, ‘If you don’t pay by the evening roll call,
 29 tomorrow you’ll be *dráity paráshy* [scrubbing close-stools] [that is, will be ostracised].
 30 In 30 minutes he came back with five packs of [cigarettes] [that is, paid his debt].
 31 (Prisoner-Outcast)

32 Prisoners tended to approach Outcasts, but one Outcast actively initiated
 33 ‘business’. As he explained, he could gauge by a prisoner’s ‘look’ if the
 34 prisoner was ready to pay for sex favours: ‘I come up and say, “Hey, let’s
 35 go and relax!” The prisoner either tells [me] to fuck off or hesitates – and
 36 then it’s a matter of the agreed payment. But I won’t approach somebody
 37 I don’t know’. The ‘operational’ Outcasts also said they avoided clients
 38 under the influence of alcohol or drugs for two reasons: (i) the clients might
 39 have no recollection of the received services and thus deny payment; and
 40 (ii) sex in their condition could be too time-consuming as the contract
 41 implied their ejaculation.

42 All prisoners rejected the suggestion that Outcasts could be coerced into
 43 sex. Outcasts’ monopoly in providing, not only sex services, but also clean-
 44 ing, made them valuable. As a Prisoner-Collaborator explained: ‘Everyone
 45 tries to leave Outcasts in peace as if they don’t like it they can move the
 46 squad. And then who would clean the dorm [of that squad]? I will be the
 47 first to move to the [segregation unit for “inadequate sanitary condition”
 48 of the premises]’.

49 The reasons my interviewees offered for their ‘operational’ work varied.
 50 Most claimed heterosexuality (Saum *et al.* 1995) and explained their
 51 sex work in terms of a desire to earn extra money, since they lacked

1
2
3
4 support from the outside (see Einat and Chen (2012) on ‘canteen whores’).
5 As one sex-provider explained: ‘I need to get cigarettes and tea from some-
6 where. My family has disowned me. I think I’ve degraded. I no longer
7 care’. This self-perception was corroborated by others who, like prisoners
8 in other hypermasculine cultures, believed that prisoners became Outcasts
9 because of ‘physical and moral weakness’; that is, they were ‘lesser men’
10 or in Reed’s (2003) study in Papua New Guinea, ‘half women’ (p.117; see
11 also Booyens and Bezuidenhout 2014; Egelund 2014; Einat 2012; Schifter
12 1999). One Outcast self-identified as gay and had a male partner before
13 incarceration. Another described himself as bisexual, stating that in prison,
14 unlike on the outside where he had a woman partner and a daughter, he
15 was sexually attracted to men. Despite prostituting himself commercially
16 in the prison, sometimes he offered free sex services to prisoners whom he
17 fancied. He admitted that many refused such offers, but attributed such re-
18 fusals to prisoners’ ‘shyness’, implying their unwillingness to publicise their
19 same-sex sexual liaisons.
20

21 **‘It’s Your Own Business (but I Probably Disapprove)’: Attitudes to Sex**

22

23 Although the underworld discourse portrayed Outcasts as women and
24 legitimised consensual sex with them to alleviate the deprivation of het-
25 erosexual sex, many prisoners still viewed it as sex with men and for
26 ideological, and sometimes aesthetic, reasons did not seek it. Furthermore,
27 they questioned the sexuality, and by extension, the masculinity of those
28 prisoners who had sex with Outcasts. As one prisoner stated: ‘Those who
29 fuck the Outcasts say they . . . just need to release, and there are no women
30 [in prison]. But I think they like it. I wouldn’t be able to get a hard-on’
31 (Prisoner-Bloke). Some expressed qualms directly, but teasing prisoners
32 known to have had sex with Outcasts was more common (see Richmond
33 (1978) on gaol humour). Corroborating Einat’s (2012) findings in an Is-
34 raeli prison, in my study only a few cited deprivation as a sufficient reason
35 for sex with Outcasts (see Eigenberg 1992).
36

37 Even though prisoners might have questioned the heterosexuality of
38 those engaging in sex with Outcasts, they, nonetheless, respected privacy.
39 Thus, placing a piece of toilet paper or a chair on the handle of the door
40 leading to the communal toilet assured a prisoner would have privacy.
41 Prisoners generally used such brief periods of privacy for masturbation or
42 for an Outcast to perform oral sex on another prisoner. Some interviewees
43 mentioned that occasionally prisoners engaged in an illicit telephone
44 conversation with their girlfriends while an Outcast was performing fellatio
45 (which typically cost a pack of cigarettes and a tablespoon of tealeaves,
46 the major informal currency). Additionally, some prisoners used a (het-
47 erosexual) pornographic magazine during intercourse. These practices
48 emphasised the ‘heterosexuality’ of non-Outcasts as they presented sex
49 with other men as a means to release sexual ‘tension’ and as a substitute
50 for sex with women (see Eigenberg 2000).
51

52 Similar to prisoners in the global South, many Ukrainian prisoners
revealed a number of sex-related myths (Reed 2003; Schifter 1999).

1 *The Howard Journal Vol 00 No 0. xxxx 2016*
 2 *ISSN 2059-1098, pp. 1–18*

3
 4 Although not believing that sex ‘depleted’ their semen (Reed 2003, p.134),
 5 some were confident that sex with men, regardless of ‘inserter’-‘insertee’
 6 roles, caused irreversible sexual and moral damage. One of the jokes pris-
 7 oners shared depicted a released prisoner seeking sex with his son and
 8 daughter because of ‘inserter’ sex in prison. The popular consensus was
 9 that masturbation should suffice for sexual release. Although some mocked
 10 ‘persistent masturbators’, such jokes were condescending rather than vitri-
 11 olic, and prisoners attributed ‘frequent’ masturbation to youth (‘hormones
 12 at play’).

13 Although the majority of prisoners rarely, if ever, invoked God or reli-
 14 gion, many alluded to the biblical and cultural abhorrence of same-sex
 15 sexual liaisons (Einat 2012).⁵ Similarly, some officers, especially those with
 16 an anti-Western (pro-Russian) political stance, cited the Bible in support
 17 of their homophobia. They also called on conspiracy theories, portray-
 18 ing the government-backed push towards greater toleration as a Western
 19 plot to, in the words of one officer, ‘ruin [Ukrainian] moral values, fam-
 20 ilies, and our society’ (also see Egelund 2014). Other officers appeared
 21 condescending rather than disapproving, often invoking the concept of
 22 ‘situational homosexuality’ (promulgated by Soviet and post-Soviet psy-
 23 chiatry and penology). Still others expressed liberal views about the nor-
 24 mality of consensual sex between adults. Although the First Deputy argued
 25 that prison sex was illegal because Ukrainian law prohibits sex in public
 26 (and nudity, for that matter),⁶ none of the research participants men-
 27 tioned a single case of authorities prosecuting prisoners for their sexual
 28 behaviour.

29 Regardless of the diversity of attitudes towards same-sex sex, only one
 30 prisoner self-identified as gay and none of the non-Outcast prisoners dis-
 31 closed sexual liaisons with non-Outcasts or admitted a pre-existing or
 32 newly-developed sexual attraction to men, apart from the two aforemen-
 33 tioned Outcasts (Blackburn, Fowler and Mullings 2014; Egelund 2014;
 34 Richmond 1978). Whilst it was impossible to ascertain whether such men
 35 and liaisons existed, this suggests an entrenched homophobia. In accord
 36 with previous research, these prisoners derived and constructed their man-
 37 hood according to a patriarchal, working-class (or rather underclass) con-
 38 ception of masculinity, which censures equality in sexual relations and sex
 39 between men.

40 As in all masculine societies, prisoners closely monitored each other’s
 41 conduct, simultaneously aware that they were equally scrutinised (Flood
 42 2008; Jewkes 2005; Robinson 2011). This mutual surveillance meant that
 43 prisoners were ‘caught up in a power situation of which they [were] them-
 44 selves the bearers’ (Foucault 1991, p.201). As mentioned, a failure to report
 45 a transgression constituted a serious violation of the inmate code, as the
 46 following incident highlights:

47 When I entered the [industrial] shop, at first, I couldn’t believe it! [Prisoner A] and
 48 [Prisoner B] were sleeping naked on the floor, with B’s arm on A. OK, [Prisoner A]
 49 is young and so on. But [Prisoner B]! He is an old con, a *muzhik* [Bloke, a man]!!
 50 We all have drunk tea with him.⁷ So I was really confused. But I was with another
 51 prisoner. So if I didn’t tell this to the others, they would beat the shit out of me

1
2
3
4 when this became known. So I ran to get [another prisoner] with a mobile, we
5 took pictures and sent them to [Head of the Security Department at that time] and
6 around the camp [prison]. (Prisoner-Collaborator)

7
8 As this comment demonstrates, the underworld survived via pervasive
9 surveillance, exacerbated by the lack of privacy and the certainty of en-
10 forcement of informal norms. This incident also suggests that, contrary to
11 the deprivation model, both new and seasoned prisoners, young and old,
12 could seek intimacy, if not sex.

13 Some prisoners, in accord with Schifter's (1999) findings in Costa Rica,
14 violated the informal sex regimentation, albeit at their peril. Outcasts stated
15 that whilst most prisoners followed the prescribed sex protocol, some of
16 their clients contravened it, with all parties being mindful of transgressing.
17 One told me: 'Some of them will grab my dick and wank me off – they
18 do like it. But they threaten me that if I tell anyone they will get me . . .
19 Some can't cum without a finger in their arse' (Prisoner-Outcast). Prisoners
20 mentioned both innocuous transgressions and rape. Although I did not
21 hear of any rapes in this prison, because either they did not occur, or the
22 rapport we had established was not sufficient, one prisoner mentioned an
23 incident when two drunken prisoners raped their cellmate in Kyiv remand
24 prison. In response to my Freedom of Information request, and despite
25 universal scepticism about the official recording of sex and rape in prison
26 (Eigenberg 2000; Jones and Pratt 2008; Saum *et al.* 1995; Zaitsow 2014),
27 the UkrPS reported it had officially registered two rape cases in 2011 and
28 one in 2013. Such cases demonstrate that the underworld's tight hold does
29 not entirely preclude sexual victimisation.

30 Unlike prisoners in Costa Rica, South Africa, or the US, these Ukrainian
31 prisoners did not construct their masculinity in terms of their sexual
32 prowess or having sex slaves (cf. Egelund 2014; Gear 2005, 2007; Schifter
33 1999; Trammell 2011). Furthermore, whereas other studies report 'mount-
34 ing physical desire' (Sykes 1958, p.72) and sex as common among prison-
35 ers, my research participants generally claimed that a minority of prisoners
36 were having sex in the prison (cf. Reed 2003; Schifter 1999). Some disclosed
37 a diminished libido and ascribed it to the authorities adding bromide to
38 prisoner food, although the latter dismissed this as a conspiracy theory.
39 Others explained a diminished sex drive by pointing to the uninspiring
40 environment, busy timetable, and poor nutrition. One of the prisoners
41 told me to look around for the reason: 'Would you get horny in these
42 conditions? Depressed – yes, horny – no' (Prisoner-Collaborator). Others
43 said they 'sublimated' by doing sports, reading, working, and generally
44 keeping busy, and masturbating when needed.

45 Whereas officers in their jokes and stories occasionally alluded to sex,
46 prisoners generally toned down such references. Apart from occasional
47 jests and banter, mostly related to masturbation, prisoners did not recount
48 their sexual achievements or boast about their sex appeal, a behaviour
49 typical of homosocial communities (Crewe 2009; Flood 2008; Phillips
50 2012; Reed 2003). Even prisoners receiving conjugal visits, the minority,
51 tended not to accentuate it; some attributed this discretion to respect (and

1 *The Howard Journal Vol 00 No 0. xxxx 2016*
2 *ISSN 2059-1098, pp. 1–18*

3
4 compassion) for those less fortunate. However, prisoners generally praised
5 those who managed to establish relationships through online dating sites
6 and social media (using illicit phones) and to eventually get married. The
7 praise was chiefly misogynistic, since both prisoners and officers believed,
8 and readily shared anecdotes to support their views, that prisoners ex-
9 ploited prison wives, *zaóchnitsy*, to receive food parcels and conjugal visits
10 and abandoned them after release (see Blackburn, Fowler and Mullings
11 (2014) on women prisoners exploiting ‘sugar daddies’). Witnessing one
12 such prison wedding, I heard only cynical comments from the officers
13 present; the bride overheard and rebutted them fiercely, denigrating the
14 officers’ manhood by pointing to their low social status and potential
15 marital problems.

16 Although in the Ukrainian prison, unlike reported elsewhere, sex hardly
17 constituted a taboo (cf. Saum *et al.* 1995), many prisoners were uncom-
18 fortable admitting that they had a sexual liaison with an Outcast, as the
19 following incident makes clear:

20
21 *Fieldnote.* I am interviewing a prisoner in a squad supervisor’s office. At some point,
22 another prisoner joined us when he entered the office looking for his friend. Later,
23 the squad supervisor entered the office to get paperwork and was engaged by my
24 interviewees to support their statements. So now all three were participating in
25 the interview. Somehow, the prisoners mentioned the role of Outcasts. One of the
26 prisoners stated that these ‘were not men’ and that he did not understand how
27 a ‘normal’ man would have sex with them. The squad supervisor challenged the
28 prisoner by reminding him how he saw him engaged in oral sex with one of the
29 Outcasts under the staircase in the sewing shop some time ago. All laughed but
30 it was evident that the prisoner was embarrassed, both because of the information
31 revealed and the fact that he was being dishonest. Afterwards, his responses sounded
32 more honest He seemed to reconcile his actual experience with his values and
33 convictions and admitted that at times they diverge.

34 Exactly how prevalent sex was in this prison is difficult to determine.
35 The above story indicates the reluctance of many prisoners to talk about
36 their own experiences, suggesting the precarity of masculinity in prison
37 and the engrained homophobia of the prison culture. Nonetheless, all
38 research participants agreed it was impossible to hide anything in the
39 prison for too long, and offered a host of anecdotes in support of this claim.
40 Whereas few non-Outcasts admitted to having sex with Outcasts, eight
41 ‘operational’ Outcasts claimed to have regular clients (four were offering
42 only oral sex), although the estimates of the number of clients ranged
43 from several prisoners to claims by one ‘operational’ Outcast that a third of
44 prisoners had used his services. Whereas most ‘operational’ Outcasts cited
45 heterosexuality and unwillingness to face publicity as prisoners’ reason
46 not to engage in sex with Outcasts, one Outcast attributed it to financial
47 constraints. He stated that during holiday seasons, with a concomitant
48 influx of parcels from relatives, he could have dozens of clients a day, ‘with
49 barely a break for a cigarette’. Yet most prisoners estimated that no more
50 than a tenth of prisoners used sex services by Outcasts, even during the
51 festive season.

Summary and Conclusion

Although researchers and the media commonly report rampant sexual abuse in prisons (Jones and Pratt 2008; Marcum 2014; Saum *et al.* 1995; Zaitsow 2014), this study, the first of its kind in Ukraine, suggests coercive sexual activity in this particular Ukrainian men's prison is limited. This can largely be attributed to the prison underworld. Ukrainian prison authorities may portray this informal organisation as a threat to prisoners' 'correction' and 'rehabilitation', but, in fact, it works to curtail violence and sexual victimisation by regimenting the minute details of inter-prisoner relations, including sexual activity, levying severe punishments on transgressors and guaranteeing a degree of protection and co-existence to all. This is not a defence of the organisation, however, as my findings also suggest it can instigate prison violence.

Being limited to a single institution, and given the sensitivity of the issue at hand, this study cannot provide a holistic picture of sexual and power relations in the Ukraine's vast penal system, nor can it measure accurately the prevalence of sex in an individual institution. Instead, the 'near data research' (Christie 1997, p.21) notes the place of human sexuality in prisoner power relations in one prison. It traces the infusion and extension of homophobia and misogyny from the larger society into the prisoner sociality. A hegemonic conception of masculinity is translated into the stratification of prisoner sociality, with some assigned the status of women and relegated to the bottom of the hierarchy. In this way, the prisoner sociality reconciles virulent homophobia with sex among men. However, whilst importing homophobia and misogyny and mimicking the patriarchal gender division of the outside society by legitimising sex with 'non-men' prisoners, the Ukrainian prisoner sociality erodes the structural base for sexual exploitation ('protective pairing') by outlawing and punishing the arbitrary use of violence. Thus, unlike in many other prison societies, these Ukrainian 'non-men' prisoners have a choice whether to engage in sex with other prisoners – and most elect to not do so because they self-identify as heterosexual men and express homophobic beliefs equal to those of other prisoners or officers. To sustain peace and bolster its legitimacy, the underworld organisation allows the Outcasts this choice. However, whether the Outcasts would have the same choice were they to live in the prison with greater popular demand for sex and fewer willing sex-providers is unclear.

Furthermore, despite the informal discourse equating 'emasculated' prisoners with women and legitimising sex with them, the majority of the prisoners see the Outcasts as men, albeit not sufficiently manly men, and due to, foremost, homophobic attitudes, abstain from, and disapprove, sex and relationships with these 'fallen men'. Many prisoners and officers were obviously uncomfortable about men having sex with men. A few invoked cultural (even political) and religious reasons for their discomfort, despite generally appearing to be not very religious; some alluded to aesthetics and hygiene. Thus, shifts in acceptance of same-sex relationships in Ukrainian society-at-large may eventually affect sex cultures in the country's prisons.

1 *The Howard Journal Vol 00 No 0. xxxx 2016*
2 *ISSN 2059-1098, pp. 1–18*

3
4 Finally, prisoners in this study did not construct their masculinities in
5 terms of their sexual exploits with either men or women, countering the
6 findings of previous research. Only further research can ascertain whether
7 the downplaying of sexual power is a reason for, or the result of, relatively
8 limited sexual liaisons in the prison.⁸

Notes

- 11
12 1 Notwithstanding the diversity of sexual practices, hereafter 'sex' refers to a sexual
13 activity involving at least two individuals (as opposed, for example, to masturbation
14 or sex with inanimate objects or animals).
15 2 Prisoners acquire this conversational habit in remand prisons to gain some privacy.
16 3 The law in Ukraine does not recognise same-sex families. The policy allows long
17 visits with unmarried partners of a different sex if the couple has common underage
18 children (Ukraine, Criminal-Executive Code (CECU) 2003, Article 110). For shorts
19 visits of up to four hours in the presence of prison staff the law places no restrictions
20 on visitors.
21 4 Prisoners told me about nine Criminal-Elites who slashed their veins in response to
22 the authorities assigning them to cleaning toilets. Anticipating refusal, the authorities
23 had assigned this task knowing they would ultimately be able to place the prisoners
24 in segregation.
25 5 Homophobic beliefs do not necessarily prevent prisoners from engaging in same-sex
26 sex (Einat and Chen 2012).
27 6 A similar legal challenge occurred, albeit briefly, in British prisons when parliament
28 outlawed smoking in public spaces in England and Wales. The prison service solved
29 the problem by declaring landings to be public spaces and allowing prisoners to smoke
30 in their cells.
31 7 Drinking tea from the same mug and passing it around the circle constituted a tradi-
32 tional homosocial ritual, symbolising fraternity – thus excluding Outcasts.
33 8 *Acknowledgements*: I am especially indebted to Professor Roy King and Dr Margaret
34 Wilson for their valuable comments; my thanks also go to the anonymous reviewers
35 for their very useful comments. My sincerest thanks to my research participants: you
36 not only made the study possible, but my research experience extremely enjoyable,
37 highly rewarding, and memorable. I would also like to express my gratitude for
38 support from the Fulbright Program in Ukraine, the Cambridge Overseas Trust, and
39 the Center for the Study of Law and Society, University of California-Berkeley. I
40 presented an earlier version of this article at the Center for the Study of Law and
41 Society Summer Speaker Series, UC Berkeley School of Law, in June 2015.

References

- 39 Banbury, S. (2004) 'Coercive sexual behaviour in British prisons as reported by adult
40 ex-prisoners', *Howard Journal*, 43, 113–30.
41 Bandyopadhyay, M. (2006) 'Competing masculinities in a prison', *Men and Masculinities*,
42 9, 186–203.
43 Blackburn, A.G., Fowler, S.L. and Mullings, J.L. (2014) 'Gay, lesbian, bisexual, and
44 transgender inmates', in: C.D. Marcum and T.L. Castle (Eds.), *Sex in Prison: Myths and*
45 *Realities*, London: Lynne Rienner.
46 Booyens, K. and Bezuidenhout, C. (2014) 'An exploratory study of sex and rape behind
47 bars in a South African prison', *International Criminal Justice Review*, 24, 377–91.
48 Christie, N. (1997) 'Four blocks against insight: notes on oversocialization of criminolo-
49 gists', *Theoretical Criminology*, 1, 13–23.
50 Clemmer, D. (1940) *The Prison Community*, London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
51 Cochran, J.C. (2012) 'The ties that bind or the ties that break: examining the relationship
between visitation and prisoner misconduct', *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 40, 433–40.

- 1
2
3
4 Cowburn, M. (1998) 'A man's world: gender issues in working with male sex offenders
5 in prison', *Howard Journal*, 37, 234–51.
- 6 Crewe, B. (2009) *The Prisoner Society*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 7 D'Alessio, S.J., Flexon, J. and Stolzenberg, L. (2013) 'The effect of conjugal visitation on
8 sexual violence in prison', *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38, 13–26.
- 9 Dumond, R.W. (2000) 'Inmate sexual assault: the plague that persists', *The Prison Journal*,
10 80, 407–14.
- 11 Egelund, A. (2014) 'Masculinity, sex and survival in Zambian prisons', *Prison Service*
12 *Journal*, 212, 16–20.
- 13 Eigenberg, H.M. (1992) 'Homosexuality in male prisons: demonstrating the need for a
14 social constructionist approach', *Criminal Justice Review*, 17, 219–34.
- 15 Eigenberg, H.M. (2000) 'Correctional officers and their perceptions of homosexuality,
16 rape, and prostitution in male prisons', *The Prison Journal*, 80, 415–33.
- 17 Einat, T. (2012) 'Rape and consensual sex in male Israeli prisons: are there differences
18 with Western prisons?', *The Prison Journal*, 93, 80–101.
- 19 Einat, T. (2014) 'International contexts', in: C.D. Marcum and T.L. Castle (Eds.), *Sex in*
20 *Prison: Myths and Realities*, London: Lynne Reinner.
- 21 Einat, T. and Chen, G. (2012) 'What's love got to do with it? Sex in a female maximum-
22 security prison', *The Prison Journal*, 92, 484–505.
- 23 Flood, M. (2008) 'Men, sex, and homosociality: how bonds between men shape their
24 sexual relations with women', *Men and Masculinities*, 10, 339–59.
- 25 Foucault, M. (1991) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, Harmondsworth:
26 Penguin.
- 27 Gear, S. (2005) 'Rules of engagement: structuring sex and damage in men's prisons and
28 beyond', *Culture, Health & Sexuality: An International Journal for Research, Intervention*
29 *and Care*, 7, 195–208.
- 30 Gear, S. (2007) 'Behind the bars of masculinity: male rape and homophobia in and about
31 South African men's prisons', *Sexualities*, 10, 209–27.
- 32 Gibson, L.E. and Hensley, C. (2013) 'The social construction of sexuality in prison', *The*
33 *Prison Journal*, 93, 355–70.
- 34 Hensley, C., Struckman-Johnson, C. and Eigenberg, H.M. (2000) 'Introduction: The
35 history of prison sex research', *The Prison Journal*, 80, 360–7.
- 36 Hsu, H.-F. (2005) 'The patterns of masculinity in prison sociology: a case study in one
37 Taiwanese prison', *Critical Criminology*, 13, 1–16.
- 38 Jewkes, Y. (2005) 'Men behind bars: "doing" masculinity as an adaptation to imprison-
39 ment', *Men and Masculinities*, 8, 44–63.
- 40 Jones, T.R. and Pratt, T.C. (2008) 'The prevalence of sexual violence in prison: the state of
41 the knowledge base and implications for evidence-based correctional policy making',
42 *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 52, 280–95.
- 43 Kupers, T.A. (2010) 'The role of misogyny and homophobia in prison sexual abuse',
44 *UCLA Women's Law Journal*, 18, 107–30.
- 45 Levan, K. (2014) 'Consensual sex', in: C.D. Marcum and T.L. Castle (Eds.), *Sex in Prison:*
46 *Myths and Realities*, Boulder, CO.: Lynne Reinner.
- 47 Marcum, C.D. (2014) 'Examining prison sex culture', in: C.D. Marcum and T.L. Castle
48 (Eds.), *Sex in Prison: Myths and Realities*, Boulder, CO.: Lynne Reinner.
- 49 Morash, M., Jeong, S., Bohmert, M.N. and Bush, D.R. (2012) 'Men's vulnerability to
50 prisoner-on-prisoner sexual violence: a state correctional system case study', *The*
51 *Prison Journal*, 92, 290–311.
- O'Donnell, I. (2004) 'Prison rape in context', *British Journal of Criminology*, 44,
241–55.
- Phillips, C. (2012) *The Multicultural Prison: Ethnicity, Masculinity, and Social Relations among*
Prisoners, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- 1 *The Howard Journal Vol 00 No 0. xxxx 2016*
2 *ISSN 2059-1098, pp. 1–18*
3
4 Piacentini, L. and Slade, G. (2015) 'Architecture and attachment: carceral collectivism
5 and the problem of prison reform in Russia and Georgia', *Theoretical Criminology*, 19,
6 179–97.
7 Reed, A. (2003) *Papua New Guinea's Last Place: Experiences of Constraint in a Postcolonial*
8 *Prison*, Oxford: Berghahn Books.
9 Ricciardelli, R. (2014) 'Coping strategies: investigating how male prisoners manage the
10 threat of victimization in federal prisons', *The Prison Journal*, 94, 411–34.
11 Ricciardelli, R., Maier, K. and Hannah-Moffat, K. (2015) 'Strategic masculinities: vulner-
12 abilities, risk and the production of prison masculinities', *Theoretical Criminology*, 19,
13 491–513.
14 Richmond, K. (1978) 'Fear of homosexuality and modes of rationalisation in male pris-
15 ons', *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology*, 14, 51–7.
16 Robinson, R.K. (2011) 'Masculinity as prison: sexual identity, race, and incarceration',
17 *California Law Review*, 99, 1309–408.
18 Saum, C.A., Surratt, H.L., Inciardi, J.A. and Bennett, R.E. (1995) 'Sex in prison: explor-
19 ing the myths and realities', *The Prison Journal*, 75, 413–30.
20 Schifter, J. (1999) *Macho Love: Sex Behind Bars in Central America*, New York: Haworth.
21 Springwood, C.F. and King, C.R. (2001) 'Unsettling engagements: on the ends of rapport
22 in critical ethnography', *Qualitative Inquiry*, 7, 403–17.
23 Sykes, G.M. (1958) *The Society of Captives: A Study of a Maximum Security Prison*, Princeton,
24 NJ.: Princeton University Press.
25 Tewksbury, R. and West, A. (2000) 'Research on sex in prison during the late 1980s and
26 early 1990s', *The Prison Journal*, 80, 368–78.
27 Trammell, R. (2011) 'Symbolic violence and prison wives: gender roles and protective
28 pairing in men's prisons', *The Prison Journal*, 91, 305–24.
29 Ukraine, Criminal-Executive Code (CECU) (2003) No 1129-iv, 11.07.2003. Available
30 at: [http://zakon.rada.gov.ua/cgi-bin/laws/main.cgi?nreg=1129-15&p=13084853-](http://zakon.rada.gov.ua/cgi-bin/laws/main.cgi?nreg=1129-15&p=13084853-84754605)
31 [84754605](http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/z1277-03) (accessed 31 March 2016).
32 Ukraine, Prison Byelaws (2003) (Verbatim: Rules of Internal Regimentation of Crim-
33 inal-Executive Establishments) No 275, 25.12.2003. Available at: [http://zakon2.](http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/z1277-03)
34 [rada.gov.ua/laws/show/z1277-03](http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/z1277-03) (accessed 31 March 2016).
35 Ukraine, Penitentiary Service (2016) *General Features of the State Criminal-Executive*
36 *Service of Ukraine*. Available at: [http://www.kvs.gov.ua/peniten/control/main/uk/publish/](http://www.kvs.gov.ua/peniten/control/main/uk/publish/article/628075)
37 [article/628075](http://www.kvs.gov.ua/peniten/control/main/uk/publish/article/628075) (accessed 31 March 2016).
38 Zaitsow, B. (2014) 'Responding to sexual assault', in: C.D. Marcum and T.L. Castle (Eds.),
39 *Sex in Prison: Myths and Realities*, London: Lynne Reinner.

40 Date submitted: March 2016
41 Date accepted: June 2016
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

AUTHOR QUERY FORM

Dear Author

During the preparation of your manuscript for publication, the questions listed below have arisen. Please attend to these matters and return this form with your proof.

Many thanks for your assistance.

Query References	Description	Remarks
Q1	Author: Please confirm that given names (red) and surnames/family names (green) have been identified correctly.	

UNCORRECTED PROOFS