**Men at work:
The construction of masculine identities
through work in prison**

Martha Morey

Her John Sunley Prize winning masters dissertation

Contents

'Prison labour is back'

We must be more demanding … of offenders … giving prisoners new opportunities by expecting them to engage seriously and purposefully in education and work. Our streets will not be safer, our children will not be properly protected and our future will not be more secure unless we change the way we treat offenders and offenders then change their lives for the better

Michael Gove, speech to Prisoner Learning Alliance, July 2015

It was in reference to the United States that Parenti said 'prison labour is back' (2001: 247), but prison labour is 'back' in British prisons and political discourses too, as budget cuts, privatisation, and moral panics about dangerous offenders and idle prisoners, have pushed prison labour up the political agenda (Parenti, 2001). As Gove's quote illustrates, prisoners are often positioned in contemporary public discourse as dangerous and idle 'others', and prison work programmes are promoted as part of the solution to their supposed 'anti-social' behaviour, lack of work ethic and other 'bad habits' (Liebling and Crewe, 2012). While aspects of this may be true for some individuals, it is unlikely to be representative of the diverse populations living in our prisons.

The nature and meaning of work has changed in contemporary Britain, redefining 'realistic' lifestyles and trajectories of employment. Illicit work has changed too. The promotion of entrepreneurialism, risk-taking and conspicuous consumption in contemporary society alters criminal motivations, practices and benefits (Winlow, 2001; Hayward, 2004; Hall, Winlow and Ancrum, 2008). Despite these arguably seismic transformations in legitimate and illicit work, *prison* labour seems to have changed comparatively little, remaining predominantly manual, menial, inefficient and poorly remunerated (Simon, 1997; Shea, 2007).

Existing research has explored singular aspects of prison work in terms of masculinity (such as cleaning (Sloan, 2012) or work allocation (Carrabine and Longhurst, 1998)), discusses multiple forms of prison work, but only tangentially (Crewe, 2009; Jewkes, 2012), or refers almost exclusively to formal policy and institutional practice/structure, rather than prisoner experiences or attitudes (Simon, 1999; Shea, 2007). These studies highlight the need for further research into prison labour, and this study hopes to contribute by adding an insight into all types of prison work from prisoners' perspectives and specifically in terms of their masculinity.

This study investigates the way in which different male prisoners experience various forms of prison work, what attitudes they form about this work and whether these attitudes are related to their masculinities, prior work experiences and hopes for the future. The primary research question is therefore: how and why do male prisoners engage with different forms of prison work? The secondary research questions are: what role does prior experience of work have on attitudes to work in prison? What are men's attitudes to different forms of work in prison? How are masculinities affected by experiences of prison work?

The focus on men and masculinities is because 'prison sociology is better understood when gender is problematised' (Newton, 1994: 104), and while 95 percent of the prison population in England and Wales is male (Prison Reform Trust, 2015), their gender is rarely problematised in criminological literature Messerschmidt, 1993; Newburn and Stanko, 1994). Of the literature that *has* investigated male prisoners' gender identities, much has been simplistic, over-emphasising the preponderance of hypermasculinity. The socio-political and labour market changes discussed above have triggered adaptations to masculinities, but only a handful of theorists have considered in what ways and with what repercussions (Connell, 1998; Connell and Wood, 2005; Nayak, 2006). Furthermore, these changes have rarely been related to offenders or prisoners (Winlow, 2001; Hall et al., 2008; Crewe, 2009).

Chapter one situates the research in the context of the contemporary prison experience: the socio-political factors shaping it, the changing prison population, and the transformation of prisoner society as a result of these developments. Prisoner masculinities, and the dearth of criminological research that identifies them as more than homogenously hyper-masculine, are also explored in this chapter. The resultant relevance of more general masculinities research will be demonstrated in terms of the significance of materialism, conspicuous consumption and transformed local and national labour markets to contemporary masculinities. The nature of prison work today, explored through an analysis of its historical practices and purposes, will also be examined in chapter one.

Chapter two explores the research design (e.g. why it was exploratory and used semi-structured interviews), data collection process (why the Category-C estate was chosen, how formal and informal access was negotiated and the sampling procedure), and data analysis (how data was handled and theory inductively developed). This chapter also discusses ethical considerations relevant to the study and how it ensured participants gave informed consent. Finally, chapter two includes reflexive consideration of the fieldwork experience, including how the researcher role was managed when 'going in green' (Sloan and Wright, 2015).

Chapter three presents general findings about participant perspectives on the organisation and nature of prison work. Frustrations about how work was allocated and remunerated are critically examined alongside the wide variety of attitudes participants expressed about different forms of prison work. Significantly, feelings about the *practice* of prison work often contrasted with feelings about the *purpose* of it. Furthermore, prison labour appears to serve a dual-purpose: it has an instrumental purpose, potentially enhancing prisoner quality of life, and a rehabilitative purpose, theoretically preparing prisoners for life after release. The extent to which either or both of these purposes were fulfilled by different forms of prison work varied between participants, however, there was overwhelming (but not exclusive) frustration expressed at what was seen by participants to be the irrelevance of available prison work to the latter purpose of preparing them for life after release.

The final chapter employs typological analysis to consider why prison work was experienced by participants as mostly inconsequential to their lives after prison. Two 'types' are proposed that suggests the importation by prisoners of different

masculinities, locales and experiences growing up, as well as distinct work and criminal histories and definitions of success. All of these imported factors shape distinct attitudes to and experiences of prison work. The impacts of neoliberalism, materialism, conspicuous consumption and labour market changes are also pertinent to these 'types', which require further investigation in other contexts. This section reiterates that prisoner masculinities are more diverse than is implied by the much-used term 'hypermasculinity', and demonstrates that imported identities, that are functions of prior employment or consumption, for example, are significant in shaping multiple and diverse prisoner masculinities that resemble 'outside' and 'legitimate' configurations more than much existing research suggests.

As a single-site, cross-sectional study into the experiences of 'enhanced'[1], Category-C male prisoners, this research is not generalisable. Instead, the aim is to highlight the importance of approaching issues of prison work with understandings of prisoner masculinities that are more nuanced than simply violent hyper-masculinities. Better understandings of men's attitudes to, and experiences of, different types of work helps to illustrate why they participate in some forms and not others, both inside and outside of prison. This is vital information if prison labour opportunities are to provide appropriate work experiences and training for the men undertaking it. The necessity of further research that prioritises prisoner testimony, and of situating it within the national and local contexts that structure it, is hopefully evident from this study.

---

[1] 'Enhanced' level on the Incentives and Earned Privileges scheme (see Prison Service Instruction 30/2013, section 4, for more information)

1. Contextualising prison work

Designing and conducting effective research into how and why male prisoners engage with different forms of prison work requires an understanding of the context of prisons, and prison work specifically, and masculinities, particularly in relation to work. The literature emphasises three findings. Firstly, prisoner masculinities include but are not limited to violent and spectacular hyper-masculinities, and are influenced by both orientations imported from individual milieus and indigenous adaptations to the prison experience. Secondly, prison work is concentrated around menial and/or manual work. How different men experience this has not yet been fully explored by contemporary research. Thirdly, labour market transformations have forced a reconstitution of the masculinities of many men, who look increasingly to leisure, conspicuous consumption, crime and/or entrepreneurialism as resources to accomplishing desired masculinities.

Contemporary prison experiences
As Rusche and Kirchheimer stated, 'the penal system of any given society is not an isolated phenomenon subject only to its own special laws. It is an integral part of the whole social system, and shares its aspirations and its defects' (1939: 207). The 'social system' in contemporary Britain has, for the last few decades, been structured by neoliberalism, the theory of which seeks individual freedoms, responsibilisation, deregulation, competition, privatisation of assets and the primacy of the market as society's organisational principle (Harvey, 2005). Neoliberalism's emphasis on money also contributes to 'the encouragement of competitive individualism, consumer desire and instrumental egoism' (Hall et al., 2008: 12), and the concurrent rise of 'the personal project as the cultural norm' (ibid.).

The neoliberal social system in which contemporary prisons exist has shaped penal institutions in significant ways. The 'no-frills … punitive minimalism' of current regimes (Liebling and Crewe, 2012: 294) is a function of 'managerialism-minus', which has permeated the prison estate since 2007 (ibid.). The result is increasingly 'austere regimes … defended on financial and moral grounds' (ibid.) which are rooted in neoliberal ideologies of efficiency, small government and the theoretically morally-neutral market (Harvey, 2005). Contemporary prisons are consequently managed in terms of the maxim of 'economic rationalism' and a definition of success based on the fulfilment of performance targets (Liebling and Crewe, 2012).

Neoliberal society has evidently changed the nature of imprisonment, but it remains an intrinsically painful experience (Sykes, 1958; Crewe, 2011). The pains of imprisonment (Sykes, 1958) appear to have been changed, rather than reduced by new policies, demonstrating that 'it is much easier to alter its form than to eliminate it from the prison experience' (ibid: 524). Contemporary prisons differ from those depicted in earlier studies in other significant ways. Firstly, longer and more indeterminate sentences in tandem with net widening through a lower custody threshold are changing the prison population and bringing in increasingly vulnerable individuals (Liebling, 2006). Secondly, contemporary prisons are less overtly brutal and violent than their predecessors (Phillips, 2008; Crewe, 2006b), but arguably more psychologically harmful (Crewe, 2011). Thirdly, technological advances mean that prison walls are more porous than ever, with internet-enabled mobile phones

providing some prisoners with unprecedented access to wider society and the potential to minimise some 'pains'. Finally and relatedly, drugs can be accessed increasingly easily, with serious repercussions for individuals as well as prisoner society generally (Crewe, 2005; 2006a).

A larger, less overtly violent and more individualistic and vulnerable population, increasingly porous walls and more widespread drug use, have all contributed to the transformation of contemporary prison experiences. Today's prisoner society is more fragmented than that found in earlier studies (Crewe, 2005; Phillips, 2008). 'Postcode pride' (Phillips, 2008: 322) has become salient, 'anchoring prisoners' belonging to somewhere external to the prison' (ibid.). The degree to which greater territorialism is a response to the deprivations of prison is unclear, but it underlines the enduring significance of prisoners' imported experiences and orientations, as theorised by importation models (Irwin and Cressey, 1962; Jacobs, 1977). Interrogating what experiences and attitudes prisoner's import, and how they are reconstituted in the prison context, is vital to furthering understandings of contemporary prisons (Newton, 1994; Crewe, 2009). It is therefore crucial to examine prisoner masculinities, which have been relatively ignored by criminological research (Carrabine and Longhurst, 1998). Of the research that does problematise prisoner masculinities, hypermasculinity is often over-emphasised at the expense of considering more diverse prisoner masculinities. Building on the more nuanced studies of prisoner gender configurations (Sim, 1994; Phillips, 2008; Crewe, 2009) means recognising that masculinities are plural, hierarchical, dynamic, actively constructed and requiring of continual 'accomplishment' (Messerschmidt, 1993; Carrabine and Longhurst, 1998; Connell, 1998). Masculinities are thus produced in objective practices and influenced, but not determined, by factors such as class and ethnicity (Newton, 1994; Connell, 1995). This results in a multiplicity of masculinities and the emergence of hierarchical relationships between hegemonic, subordinate, marginal or compliant masculine configurations (Connell, 1995; Jewkes, 2002; Phillips, 2012).

The masculinity most often referenced in prison sociology is a form of hyper-masculinity characterised by 'an abhorrence of femininity…aggressive homophobia, and a personal code of behaviour based on confrontation and force rather than negotiation and respect' (Jewkes, 2005: 61-62). While such masculinities undeniably exist in prison, focusing on them exclusively and overstating their proclivity is misleading and counterproductive in light of research highlighting greater diversity (Sim, 1994; Crewe, 2009; Phillips, 2012). Prisoners import masculinities which are shaped by individual values and experiences, as well as class, ethnic and religious backgrounds (Phillips, 2012). These masculinities are subsequently reconstituted within the prison environment and adapted in terms of available resources and the pains encountered there.

As a result of reduced access in prison to resources for accomplishing masculinities, those that *are* permitted become distorted and of heightened importance (Carrabine and Longhurst, 1998; Jewkes, 2002; Crewe, 2009). The centrality of body work – efforts to modify ones physicality, by going to the gym, for example – to many prisoner masculinities in the absence of most *material* expressions of identity and status, is one example of this (Carrabine and Longhurst, 1998). Crewe's (2006b) exploration of various prisoner orientations to female officers (chivalry, charm and

sexualisation) demonstrates another way in which prisoner masculinities adapt to the restrictions of their environment, in this case, heterosexual contact. Finally, prison also distorts the value of different jobs and wages, meaning work, pay and educational opportunities that might have been judged negatively outside, can be reconsidered as relatively valuable in the prison context (Sloan, 2012; Shea, 2007; Liebling and Crewe, 2012). These represent just a few examples of how diverse masculinities are accomplished in prison.

Contemporary masculinities
The existing literature suggests that prisoner masculinities are gendered responses to the emasculating experience of imprisonment, where the meaning of and access to usual markers of masculinity are distorted and reconfigured (Newton, 1994; Crewe, 2006b). However, they are gendered responses to *more* than incarceration, as they are also structured by external influences (Sim, 1994; Crewe, 2009; Phillips, 2012). The wider socio-cultural influences of prisoner masculinities are the same factors that shape non-prisoner and non-criminal masculinities. Exploring more general literature on contemporary masculinities is therefore highly pertinent.

Research identifies a vast range of masculinities. One example, the 'average Joe' (Smiler, 2006), represents industrious blue-collar workers who are 'reliable, responsible, and unexceptional' (2006: 624). This is a masculine ideal that contemporary research suggests it is an enduringly attractive to young, working-class men (McDowell, 2003). Another example is 'transnational business masculinity' (Connell, 1998; Connell and Wood, 2005),[2] an emerging response to deregulated labour markets, neoliberal socio-cultural transformations, and the subsequent fetishisation of conspicuous consumption, risk-taking and entrepreneurialism (O'Donnell and Sharpe, 2000). Those pursuing 'transnational business masculinity' are described as affluent, individualistic, egocentric, hedonistic and tolerant of diversity (Connell, 1998; Connell and Wood, 2005). The male business executives representing 'transnational business masculinity' in Connell and Wood's (2005) study, saw not only their work as an enterprise requiring management, but also their bodies, emotions and intimate lives: their bodies and mental health, for example, were commonly 'managed' by investing in personal trainers and various therapies.

A third and final example of 'legitimate' contemporary masculine configurations, is the development among young working class men of masculinities constructed around hedonism and leisure routines (Jewkes, 2005; Nayak, 2006; Roberts, 2013). These masculinities are pursued mostly by men displaced by contemporary labour market changes that find themselves in insecure, low-paid, and stereotypically feminine service-sector employment. By focusing on leisure practices, masculinities can be accomplished without the necessity of breadwinning or a stable working identity (Nayak, 2006). These 'new lads' (Roberts, 2013)[3] are therefore different to more structurally and generationally disenfranchised men who engage in low-level criminality with only intermittent formal work (Nayak, 2006).

For some men, whose masculinities do not depend on legitimate working identities, crime can provide access to resources that would not otherwise be available

---

[2] Similar to Mac and Ghaill's (1994) "new enterprisers".
[3] See also Nayak's (2006) 'real Geordies'.

(Messerschmidt, 1993). The 'gangster' and 'badass' masculinities described by Winlow (2001) and Messerschmidt (1993) respectively, prioritise the accumulation of wealth and the 'exaggerated display of luxury' (ibid: 122) as a means to respect and cultural distinction within their milieu. The growing importance of conspicuous consumption as an indicator of personal value, seems to have contributed to the development of new masculinities associated with entrepreneurial crime and the financial benefits apparently offered by it (Hall et al., 2008). The men in Hall et al.'s study were not averse to legitimate work, but 'wealth and conspicuous consumption were the sole sources of value' (2008: 13), and entrepreneurial criminality (most commonly drug dealing) offered the quickest route to their desired social distinction.

Research therefore evidences diverse 'criminal' masculinities (Messerschmidt, 1993; Connell, 1995; Hall et al., 2008). However, 'criminal' configurations of masculinity are not mutually exclusive to configurations that are 'legitimate'. For example, the importance of conspicuous consumption and the opportunity to showcase entrepreneurialism are central to both 'legitimate' 'transnational business masculinities' and the 'criminal' masculinities described by Hall et al. (2008). Work is also highly pertinent to both 'legitimate' and 'criminal' masculinities, and not coincidentally: 'the central function of masculine ideology is to motivate men to work' (Connell, 1995: 33). Winlow states that the 'transition from industrial to post-industrial work and masculinities, and from conflict to entrepreneurial criminal foundations' (2001: 162) is very much 'unresolved', so situating prisoner masculinities within contemporary labour market experiences is vital.

Contemporary experiences of work
Blue-collar work has traditionally been synonymous with solidaristic and communitarian shop floor cultures (Tolson, 1977). Willis' (1977) 'lads', who left school as soon as possible to enter the labour market, where they would have a 'job for life' and strong working identity, epitomises this trope. However, as a consequence of contemporary labour market transformations, there are significantly worse prospects for young men seeking a blue-collar 'job for life' (Messerschmidt, 1993; Standing, 2011). Obtaining stereotypically masculine work and accomplishing masculinity via traditional means (e.g. breadwinning), continues to provide significant benefits to those who are successful in this endeavour: 'factory overalls of well-paid local industries have become status symbols, a designer label of … gainful employment … of a secured and disposable income, of masculinity, provision and reflection upon industrial heritage' (Winlow, 2001: 169).

The decline of manual labour in the UK has been accompanied by a rise in entry-level service work. Resistance to hegemonic masculinity, such as that engaged in by Willis' 'lads' at school, now positions young working-class men as unsuitable for many new forms of service work requiring 'emotional labour' (Hochschild, 1983) and stereotypically feminine behaviours such as deference and empathy (McDowell, 2003; 2004). These jobs often represent the most realistic chance of employment for young men (McDowell, 2002), so masculinities are redefined and accomplished through alternative means (Nayak, 2006).

The adaptability of masculinities to different types of work implies that the changing nature of work, in the increasingly 'flexible' and precarious labour market, poses a greater threat to the accomplishment of desired masculinities. As Sennett states,

'instability is meant to be normal' (1999: 31) in the contemporary labour market, but precarious and intermittent work impedes the development of secure working identities (Sennett, 1999; Standing, 2011), and it is within this context that some men look to criminal activities to accomplish their desired masculinities.

Despite being shaped by the same economic, social and political forces as the wider labour market, prison work has followed a distinct historical trajectory. Hard labour, treadwheels and solitary cell work characterised the physically and psychologically gruelling prison work of the 18th and 19th centuries (Rusche and Kirchheimer, 1939; Simon, 1999). More productive and profitable work (mending roads and railways or with private companies) was briefly offered in the 19th century until the 1877 Prison Act re-established prison labour as purely punitive in response to opposition by unions and businesses (Rusche and Kirchheimer, 1939; Simon, 1999). Towards the end of the 19th century and into the 20th century, the 'stage system' aimed to incentivise prisoners to work harder by offering early release (Rusche and Kirchheimer, 1939). The Gladstone Report in 1895 ended the more brutal forms of prison labour so communal work and association took up a larger part of prisoners' days. Despite this improvement, prison work remained officially punitive, relatively menial and without a sufficient number of spaces (Simon, 1999).

World Wars I and II necessitated more innovative uses of prisoner labour power (Rusche and Kirchheimer, 1939; Simon, 1999) and recommendations made by the 1932 Departmental Committee on the Employment of Prisoners (report published 1933) led to a more productive, modern and rationalised system of prison labour. Positive developments continued with the first open prison in 1933, 'earning schemes' in many prisons by 1938 (although wages remained low), and by 1949 the purpose of prison labour had been redefined: '[training] convicted prisoners shall be to establish in them the will to lead a good and useful life on discharge and to fit them to do so' (Prison Rules, 1949; as cited in Rusche and Kirchheimer, 1939).

Despite optimism and various attempts to improve prison working practices, the pace of change slowed during the 1950s and 60s, as a growing prison population put the system under great strain (Simon, 1999). Prison work was neglected during the 1970s' 'nothing works' era, so it remained insufficient, unproductive and basic (ibid.) and by 1983, the purpose of prison labour had again been revised, this time in more narrow and efficiency oriented terms. The Woolf Report in 1991 led to the control of prison work being devolved to individual prisons (although it remained centrally regulated), increased pay (although not to levels that facilitate savings or victim or familial support, as Woolf recommended) and the active encouragement of private sector involvement in prison work (Prison Reform Trust, 1991).

Since the Woolf Report, workshops have expanded and increasingly involve training and qualifications, the private sector provides more work opportunities, and wages have risen (but remain meagre). Political rhetoric has been largely punitive (Michael Howard argued 'prison works', New Labour pushed their 'tough on crime' mantra and Chris Grayling wanted tougher prison regimes so they no longer 'look like holiday camps' to the public), and concerns regarding economic efficiency and high reoffending rates have contributed to the increasing centrality of prison work to the political agenda. Most recently, following his appointment as Secretary of State for Justice, Michael Gove outlined plans to 'liberate prisoners through learning',

incentivising education with early release (Gove, 2015) and potentially indicating a new direction for prisons policy over coming years that moves away from traditionally menial and manual prison work.

Whether work has become more constructive and purposeful is subjective: there has been a greater emphasis on vocational qualifications and education generally, but the majority of jobs remain focused on a few manual trades and monotonous, low-skilled work. The purpose of prison labour is unclear. Parenti states that, 'although rehabilitation is a worthy goal, the rehabilitative nature of prison labour becomes less convincing when we look more closely at the type of work that inmates do and at their real job prospects upon release' (2001: 252).

The lack of 'rehabilitation' provided by prison work is recognised by prisoners undertaking it, which undermines official claims of its purpose. Prison work appears to be a confused enterprise, but its significance goes beyond policy. As Parenti argues, contemporary prison labour has 'a cryptic appeal to traditional, positive notions of masculinity' (2001: 247) that is used to facilitate a political agenda of cost-cutting and efficiency. It is by employing 'the carrot of self-esteem, which in part is about some positive notion of what it is to be a man … to a bunch of caged, over-crowded, and extremely vulnerable men … [that] labour power is given willingly … all prison labour programs have huge waiting lists' (ibid.: 252).

What we know about prison labour and the men who do it
While much of the existing literature depicts relatively homogenous hyper-masculinities among prisoners, some contemporary prison sociology demonstrates prisoner masculinities as much more diverse (Crewe, 2009; Phillips, 2012; Bennett, 2012). Prisoner masculinities appear to be constructed in response to imported values and experiences, as well as individual adaptations to the prison experience, highlighting the relevance of both the importation and deprivation models. Existing research also underlines how labour market transformations are changing the costs and benefits of different forms of work, and therefore, different forms of crime (Winlow, 2001; Hall et al., 2008). For example, the valorisation of entrepreneurialism has encouraged some men to engage in legitimate and/or illicit forms of work (Connell and Wood, 2005; Hall et al., 2008). However, labour market shifts have also heralded renegotiations of the relationship between work and masculinities.

Increasing insecurity in all sectors has contributed to the increased salience of leisure and other non-work related facets, such as conspicuous consumption, to masculinities (Hayward, 2004; Nayak, 2006; Roberts, 2013). The research, on which this literature is based, is conducted exclusively in wider society as opposed to prisons, so this study will investigate how these changes to the experience of work impact on prisoners and prisoner society.

Finally, studies of prison work consistently demonstrate an enduring lack of clear objectives in prison labour policy or practice. The lack of prisoner voice in prison work literature means it tells us relatively little about how it is actually experienced. Of the few studies that do concentrate on prisoner perspectives, the focus is on singular forms of prison labour (e.g. Sloan's (2012) analysis of cleaning work). This research, and its emphasis on prisoner voice, will therefore provide greater breadth to present understandings of prison labour.

For the purpose of this study, work is broadly defined as any legitimate or illicit ways of making money, education, training or caring. Work in *prison* refers to all productive activity, and therefore includes employment in private and prison-owned workshops, orderly work,[4] 'service work',[5] education (vocational, academic and offender behaviour courses), volunteering, and illicit work within the prison's informal economy. Defining work in these broad terms is vital to respecting and recognising the subjective understandings and variable experiences of work present in the research demographic. Using these definitions, this research aims to examine the interrelation of prisoner masculinities, contemporary work experiences and attitudes to prison labour, which is absent from existing literature. How prisoners spend their sentence is increasingly referred to in public debates that portray prisons as 'holiday camps' and places of idleness. This study is therefore a timely attempt to provide empirical evidence to debates about prisoners generally and prison labour specifically. By framing this investigation of prison work in terms of prisoner masculinities, the research aims to discern whether there is a multiplicity of male gender identities in prison. If prisoner masculinities are heterogeneous, this study will seek to understand firstly, whether men with varied masculinities describe different experiences of and attitudes towards prison labour, and secondly, whether prison labour is used as a resource by men inside as a means to accomplishing their diverse masculinities.

---

[4] 'Orderly work' refers to wing jobs such as cleaning, kitchens or laundry as well as orderly work off the wings e.g. in the gym.
[5] 'Service work' refers to jobs that require 'emotional labour' and in which prisoners support peers (e.g. with addiction, education). Examples include classroom assistants and those employed by third-sector organisations.

2. Methodology

Designing appropriate and ethical research

Analysing existing literature highlights the dearth of research that explicitly and specifically examines attitudes to and experiences of prison work in terms of prisoner masculinities. This study is therefore exploratory and requires an inductive approach, as the relative absence of existing evidence precludes the use or evaluation of any predetermined categories or theories. In order to 'capture social life as participants experience it rather than in categories predetermined by the researcher' (Bachman and Schutt, 2011: 16), as well as fulfil the 'moral obligation' (Crewe, 2009: 487) of using the prisoner voice, data was collected through semi-structured interviews.

This is a single-site, cross-sectional, qualitative investigation into prisoners' experiences of and attitudes towards prison work, and how they relate to prisoner masculinities. The target population is therefore male prisoners in England and Wales. The most appropriate data collection method for this study is interviews, making the research liable to certain weaknesses: 'every method, every setting, every subconscious or unconscious transaction between interviewer and interviewee influences the outcome and therefore raises questions about the 'truthfulness' of the material that is subsequently analysed' (Liebling et al, 1999: 76). In using a social constructionist perspective, it is recognised that there is no objective 'truth' against which the interviews can fall short. Instead, interviews capture 'an *account* of an event, even a representation' (Roberts, 2013: 675, emphasis in original), the value of which is in revealing 'how situations were felt or interpreted by the individual in question' (ibid.). Semi-structured interviews allowed sufficient probing to cover the issues of work, masculinity and prison experience in a single session, as well as 'more opportunity for dialogue and exchange' (Noaks and Wincup, 2004: 79). Due to the exploratory nature of the study, it was important that the research design allowed sufficient flexibility to accommodate any unanticipated topics raise by participants.

The interview schedule (Appendix 1) had four sections: experiences prior to imprisonment, experiences in prison, hopes for after release and 'opinion questions'.[6] Basic information was covered first, the most potentially emotive issues were embedded in the middle of the interview and 'opinion questions' were asked at the end (Noaks and Wincup, 2004). A mixture of open and closed questions were included because of the different responses they elicit (Noaks and Wincup, 2004).

The first two sections included retrospective questions, the answers to which it is more difficult to claim as valid or reliable (Wilson and Sapsford, 2006) because 'when individuals are being asked to give retrospective accounts of events … there is a risk that with the passage of time one gets a different account of events to that which would have been provided in a contemporary interview' (Noaks and Wincup, 2004: 81). However, it is participants' understandings of their prior experiences that are most significant to this research, because it is these memories of the past that frame experiences of prison work in the present.

---

[6] 'Opinion questions' refers to questions about gender stereotypes, social values and definitions of success.

Asking about future hopes (section three of interview schedule) elicits similarly 'nonfactual', speculative responses, but as Roberts argues, 'despite being *imagined* futures, [these answers] remain important because they represent current understandings of appropriate male behaviour' (2013: 672). Questions about opinions and values, as in the final section, can be awkward to raise. Crewe (2006) reports consciously avoiding questions that explicitly mentioned masculinity because of the tendency for this to make participants feel uncomfortable. As a young female interviewing male participants, I did not find these lines of questioning particularly awkward, partly because I could plead ignorance about 'manliness'.

Basic ethical principles of beneficence, nonmaleficence, autonomy and fidelity (Gelsthorpe, 2015) alongside codes of ethics such as the British Society of Criminology Statement of Ethics, which provides comprehensive guidelines, were used to help prepare for ethical issues that may have been encountered in the field. Complying with the Data Protection Act 1998 was a prerequisite for ethical research and ethical approval (successful applications were made to the Institute of Criminology and NOMS). Audio files were transferred to password protected and encrypted storage devices as soon as possible after recording (at the end of each day) and deleted from the dictaphone prior to entering the prison again (Sloan and Wright, 2015).

The participant information sheet (Appendix 2) and consent form (Appendix 3) were designed to obtain informed consent and protect the rights and welfare of participants. Both were written in accessible language that took account of the variable literacy and proportion of people in prison with English as a first language. I explained verbally to participants each point on the information sheet and consent form to ensure informed consent was given. For those who appeared to struggle with reading English, I read more slowly and indicated more carefully what each tick on the consent form referred to. The meanings of confidentiality and anonymity were clarified with examples: the use of a pseudonym ('I will give you a different name'); that I would be the only person to listen to or access their recording or interview notes; and that identifying information would be removed ('if you say 'hi I'm John and I'm from Hackney' I will change your name, take out Hackney and just say London'). Instances where confidentiality or anonymity would have to be suspended were also specified (there were four occasions, detailed in Appendix 2 and clarified in detail with the prison in advance) and illustrated with examples for those that were potentially ambiguous (e.g. 'if you told me it was easy to get drugs in here, I wouldn't have to disclose that to anyone, but if you said John was getting some thrown over the fence at two o'clock I would have to disclose that to the prison as it is both a threat to security and *specific'*). Participants were given the option of having their interview recorded or not. One participant declined to be recorded and all agreed to the anonymous use of quotes. The participant information sheet explained how to access support, making it easier to maintain 'ethical positioning' (Noaks and Wincup, 2004) and ensuring the welfare of vulnerable participants.

All research is arguably exploitative to an extent, but prisoners' offender (and potentially victim) status makes them a vulnerable sample requiring particularly careful ethical consideration (Noaks and Wincup, 2004; Sloan and Wright, 2015). Participants in this study would not benefit from the findings of the research and the only reimbursement I was able to offer was hot drinks and biscuits. Prison

researchers recognise that the opportunity to talk to someone impartial and who values their opinions and experiences, is an attractive opportunity for many prisoners. This could be seen as exploitative, but as Sloan and Wright explain, it can also 'empower those who are ordinarily not listened to and rarely have the ability to be heard' (2015: 154). Explicit and unspoken interactions with participants implied that many enjoyed being able to talk freely and be listened to ('I've been wanting to talk to someone about this for ages'). Furthermore, I made a conscious effort to maintain an open door and ensure participants felt comfortable coming back for an off-the-record chat about anything they wanted. Many participants took the opportunity to come back informally, including some who shared artwork and poetry or brought newspaper articles for me to read and discuss with them. The insufficiency of trading interview testimony with refreshments and a non-judgmental ear remained uncomfortable for me, but it was the only available resolution.

Sampling
I planned to interview between 18 and 24 prisoners during the fieldwork, spread evenly across three groups: prisoners employed in workshops, those doing 'orderly work', and unemployed prisoners. This was both feasible – in terms of the length of the fieldwork and the resources available – and valid – it would enable inductive theorising about prisoner work experiences and masculinities based on the testimony of a sample within the study's target population. However, once in the field it became clear that the workshop-orderly unemployed framework was inadequate. Firstly, the high turnover of employees meant that participants had held many positions while in prison. Classifying participants on the basis of their *current* prison work would over-emphasise its significance and misrepresent the diversity of their experiences. Secondly, some prison work was not covered by these 'types'. Work for charities or as classroom assistants could not be meaningfully grouped with workshop jobs or orderly work: it required a distinct set of expertise related to 'emotional labour' and 'soft-skills'.

I intended to use a non-probability convenience and quota sampling strategy, but once the redundancy of my intended work categorisation became evident, the quotas were modified to include an further education/'third sector' category. Participants were predominantly recruited by hanging about on the wing, leaving my door open (allowing prisoners to approach me) and participants referring their friends. One participant stood with me in a communal area of the wing during movement and stopped each prisoner that passed by, telling them to talk to me (I did not request this). After explaining that they did not have to talk to me, who I was, what I was interested in and what the interview would involve, I made a number of appointments (approximately half of which resulted in interviews). Six participants in total were recruited by officers. All bar one were at my request when I wanted to interview more unemployed prisoners, and also at points when I could not find available participants. The exception was when an officer brought a participant to me on their own initiative, because he thought they would be 'good to talk to'.

I conducted more interviews than I had planned. In total, 34 prisoners from a single, enhanced wing of the prison were interviewed (approximately 30 percent of that wing, 9.5 percent of the prison's enhanced prisoners and 3.4 percent of the prison's total population). The sampling strategy through which participants were recruited was optimal for this research: it is an exploratory study into an under-researched

area of prison sociology, from which theories that are 'grounded in the actual experiences of some actual members of the study population' (Henry, 2009: 79) could be inductively developed. However, it is vital to recognise that the sample is not representative of the target population of all male prisoners in England and Wales, and is therefore not generalisable. Some participants were keen to point this out, anxious for me to know they were not 'typical' prisoners and that I would have had very different experiences on a non-enhanced wing.

The prison
The fieldwork was conducted in a Category-C men's training prison in the South East of England with an operational capacity of just over a thousand. Its population at the time was predominantly from London, and was also diverse, with a high proportion of BAME inmates. The prison was selected for the study because it was a Category-C training prison, which is the most appropriate for 'real work', because it was physically accessible for me, and because my supervisor has good relations with the governor. I requested formal access through NOMS' centralised application procedure, and was eventually granted access by the prison. I liaised with a senior manager to negotiate dates, resources, security (I had to complete key and health and safety training) and access (carrying keys and alarms).

The prison's most recent inspection prior to the fieldwork reported a good variety of work, with the capacity for most prisoners to be engaged in purposeful activity during weekdays. However, inspectors also noted overreliance on unskilled wing work and concerns the amount of time prisoners could spend out of their cells. Prisoners could work in bike, double-glazing, woodwork, recycling and waste-management, painting and decorating, bricklaying, warehousing or printing workshops. They could also work for the prison doing 'orderly work' (as a cleaner, in the laundry, servery or kitchen or in the library or gym). 'Service work', such as classroom assistant or peer mentor, or employment by a third-sector organisation, was also offered. These roles were prisoner-facing, and they required 'soft-skills' and 'emotional labour'. Educational opportunities included offender behaviour courses, vocational qualifications attached to workshops, a number of PE courses and academic qualifications.

Data collection and analysis
Data collection consisted of 34 semi-structured interviews between 5th and 21st May 2015 over 11 days in the prison. Interviews ranged from 18 to 65 minutes, on average lasting 45 minutes. This resulted in over 21.5 hours of recorded interviews. I was allowed to draw keys, make tea for participants and supply biscuits, and was asked to wear a personal alarm at all times. Permission was also granted to use a dictaphone for recording interviews when participants consented. Some participants seemed to forget quickly that there was a dictaphone there, while others were visibly or audibly wary of it, asking when it was on or off and leaving some testimony until after I had finished recording. I was careful to clarify that I was the only person who would ever listen to it and reiterated the limits to confidentiality and anonymity. Using the dictaphone led to some participants obviously censoring themselves (by pointing at the device and mouthing something or simply looking at it and stopping talking) when discussing the particulars of their criminal activity. However, recording the interviews was advantageous in terms of the level of detail enabled by listening back after leaving the field. Using a dictaphone and not needing to take extensive notes

also facilitated eye contact and the ability to focus totally on the participant, which helped build rapport (Noaks and Wincup, 2004). In this instance, the benefits of using a recording device outweighed the costs.

I met and talked with the majority of staff on the wing, mostly in the mess during roll call when I was not allowed to remain in my office. Approximately half of the wing staff (all were uniformed) were 'young' (under 35) and relatively new to the job, and about two-thirds were male (most of the women were young). During the course of the fieldwork I developed good relationships with staff, I suspect in part because I had previously worked with one of the officers at another establishment. As I did not get permissions from the prison or the staff to use their conversations for research, I will not quote from any discussions.

Fieldwork required continual 'impression management' (Noaks and Wincup, 2004) for negotiation of 'social access' (Noaks and Wincup, 2004; Sloan and Wright, 2015). None of the staff I met in person had seen my application and very few were aware of the research at all, requiring the negotiation of access with multiple individuals. I felt the older male staff 'tested' me with regard to how much of the (often sexist) 'banter' I could handle, and I think I managed to 'pass'. Recruiting and interviewing similarly required 'social access' through the building of rapport. Having previously worked in a prison, I had some experience of developing rapport in a similar setting, but was 'going in green' (Sloan and Wright, 2015) in terms of managing a 'researcher role', which 'is not always fully understood and may be treated with suspicion' (Noaks and Wincup, 2004: 65). Awareness was therefore required about any questioning of my integrity by staff or prisoners (Liebling, 2014: 484); possible 'rumours' about me or my work (for example, that I was a psychologist); and how close I appeared to staff (Sloan and Wright, 2015). Avoiding appearing too close to staff was initially made more difficult by already knowing an officer, who was consequently more friendly with me, including around prisoners. However, it also transpired that I knew a prisoner on the wing from the same institution, so this potentially balanced out perceptions of my 'loyalties'. Overall, I believe I maintained a neutral position and that my 'research role' was accepted by staff and prisoners. I left the prison feeling like I gained a good understanding of the wing's character and dynamics.

It is important to reflexively consider how personal characteristics (young, middle-class, white female) and self-presentation may have impacted on the data collection. I wore jeans and loose fitting, high-neck, long-sleeve tops with trainers, carrying research materials in a bright orange rucksack. Gender was certainly the most structuring factor of my experience, as it was a highly sexualised environment. My clothing commented on ('I like your style miss, you dress well' by an older prisoner) and many remarks were made about my trainers, often centred around the fact they were not particularly clean (certainly compared to the shoes of prisoners and staff). In terms of my gender, there was little distinction between how it shaped interactions with prisoners and male officers.

These encounters resembled the approaches described by Crewe (2006b) in relation to male prisoners' treatment of female officers. Some were chivalrous/protective (an older prisoner said I should be careful because 'I've seen how [participant's name] sits in here with you, like he's god's gift to women'), sexualised ('give me your

number and we can carry on flirting'),[7] critical/resistant ('I'm not going to be like all the other guys you've got in here and sit here just so I can look at you for an hour if I don't know what you're about or … what you're studying, I've got loads I could tell you though')[8] and professional/respectful ('I really respect what you're doing miss, it's really good'). Mostly I was treated very politely and respectfully, and at no point did I feel unsafe, victimised or particularly uncomfortable. Existing research and my own prior experiences in prisons meant sexist behaviour was anticipated, and so not 'taken personally'. My gender and seeming naivety (a function of my age), worked to my advantage in some ways by enabling me to ask questions about masculinity and 'manliness' without much embarrassment. Furthermore, I believe the prisoners were more willing to participate because chatting to a young woman was more 'novel'.

Interviews were transcribed verbatim (with the exception of the interview that was not recorded and was typed from notes) and coded using QSR NVivo software. In detailing their diverse prison work histories, over numerous sentences and establishments, participants described some recurring experiences and attitudes. Discussions during interviews of these recurring issues were spontaneous in each instance, and identified as key themes via inductive theorising at the data analysis stage. Criminological research has not yet identified the factors prisoners themselves believe structure contemporary prison work experiences. These themes are analysed in the next chapter. Typologies were inductively developed during coding in relation to literature on prison sociology and prisoner society (e.g. Crewe, 2009; Phillips, 2012), consumerist culture and neoliberalism (e.g. Hayward, 2004; Hall et al., 2008), masculinities – 'criminal' and others (e.g. Connell, 1995; 1998; Jewkes, 2005) – and labour markets and employment (McDowell, 2002; Roberts, 2013). While not relating to all prisoners (the 'others' represents just under 30 percent of the sample), the '*entrepreneurs'* and the '*tradesmen'* represent new 'types' yet to be articulated in criminological work.

---

[7] I told him he was being inappropriate, that responding to any of his comments or questions was unprofessional and that as a researcher there are ethical codes I follow rigidly.
[8] This prisoner did not take part in the study.

3. 'What do you think you're going to do when you leave? That's never been asked once since I've been here': General findings on prison work experiences

I think you're kind of dangled with this thing, the prison service is supposed to be rehabilitating you and you know, helping you towards something where you won't reoffend, and I think the cold hard reality of it is … a path to meaningful employment, a job they can walk into where they're not just going to be earning minimum wage and struggling, they're actually going to have a future from it, I think most people in here, they're wasting their time. That's just what I feel, I feel like I'm wasting my time … most work in here, and even the educational courses, I think a lot of it is a con to be quite honest.

Ed

This chapter will explore general attitudes to prison work in terms of its organisation – the allocation of jobs and remuneration – and its different forms – workshop work, orderly work, 'service work' and education. The majority of participants, who were all serving a number of years, had experience of multiple prison jobs: 'everybody tries a bit of everything to be honest … we've got a lot of time on our hands' (Milo). This contributed to the numerous, wide-ranging and detailed opinions many participants shared about multiple forms of prison work. As discussed in previous sections, it is long- and mid-sentenced prisoners in Category- C establishments, like those in this sample, that could most benefit from good practice in relation to employment, training and education (The Howard League for Penal Reform, 2011). This general analysis of participants' experiences of and attitudes towards prison work is divided into two sections: the first about the *organisation* of prison work (its allegedly inappropriate allocation and poor remuneration) and the second about different *categories* of prison work discussed in terms of their practice – how participants felt about doing the work – and purpose – what participants gained from the work). These sections, and the topics within them, were developed inductively from the analysis of interview transcripts, rather than through a predetermined framework into which findings were sorted.

'It's not fair but that's how it is': Responses to the organisation of prison work
Participants voiced strong opinions about the organisation of prison work. These related to two themes: participants felt that work was allocated inappropriately and that remuneration was poor. The perception that work was inappropriately allocated manifested itself in three recurring issues. Firstly, participants were unsatisfied with the official protocols for work allocation. A number of participants felt the system was meaningless after being given positions they did not choose: 'nine out of ten times … you never get choice one[9] so you're stuck somewhere doing a job you don't want to do' (Spencer). Other participants perceived the work allocation system to be too general, and therefore ignoring individual needs or skills:

---

[9] Before being allocated work, prisoners were given the opportunity to express first, second and third preferences for what type they wanted to do.

> *… everyone's treated the same and that's the fundamental problem. If you've got someone with seven years then you can be gearing them towards something … I think you have to analyse how long people have got in here and what you can provide for them?*
>
> Ed

Frustrations with work allocation were compounded by the difficulty some participants encountered trying to leave jobs. William said it took him eight months to get transferred out of the warehouse, and another two participants described how prisoners purposefully got into trouble at work in order to be forced to move jobs.

Secondly, allegations were made by some participants that work was allocated unfairly, and the aforementioned official protocols ignored. These claims referred predominantly (but not exclusively) to gym orderly jobs, which were the most sought-after positions among participants: 'it's not what you know, it's who you know to get a gym orderly job' (Barney). Another participant explained how he had managed to get onto an over-subscribed gym course: 'because I play rugby with the gym guys, they said we'll put your name down and we're sure you'll find your way to the top of the list. So that's what happened, and they got me on the course' (Theo).

The third issue associated with participants' perception of inappropriate work allocation relates to how disrupted the process was, both on reception to the prison, and when returning after court appearances. Delays in being assigned a job led to prolonged periods at the beginning of their time in the prison, where participants were left in their cells for most of the day. The extent to which prisoners can cope with this depends on their mental and financial health. Employment was also disrupted by prisoners having to leave the establishment to attend trials and confiscation orders. On leaving the prison, prisoners lose their jobs, and a number of participants explained that this led to further periods of unemployment on return. Dwayne had been frustrated by this as he was nearing completion of his workshop qualification when he had to attend court for a number of weeks. Now back in the prison, Dwayne was trying to get his job back, and was anxious that his folder of work would be discarded because he no was longer officially employed there.

The second theme, relating to the organisation of prison work, was the participants' perception of poor remuneration which reflected findings in existing criminological work (Simon, 1999; Shea, 2007). Levels of pay varied by prison job, with workshops offering the highest wages and orderly work paying the least. Participants voiced two complaints about the remuneration they received for their prison jobs: that it is exploitative, and that it undermined rehabilitation.

In terms of exploitation, nearly 25 percent of participants described their prison wages as 'slave labour'. For some participants, their feelings about poor remuneration were part of a broader cynicism about prison exploitation that resembled the prison-industrial-complex thesis: 'it's slave labour … the prison makes a heck of a lot of money for doing it … private contracts while they pay prisoners peanuts' (Marcus). These participants felt their low wages and perceived exploitation were for the profit of private companies and the state. However, other participants were angry about poor remuneration because of the type of work they were doing. These prisoners felt that if their wages are the only benefit they receive for

undertaking menial, unskilled work (as opposed to self-development, learning new skills or preparing them for employment outside) then those wages should be higher. As a result of these sentiments about exploitative prison pay, some participants did not want to work 'for the prison' (anything that benefited the prison establishment financially). Aidan was refusing employment, waiting until a third-sector organisation was able to offer him work: 'working for [a third-sector organisation], I'm doing that for the prisoners and the organisation, but I wouldn't do anything to help out the prison'. The ability to refuse certain jobs was a privilege of those who had money sent in to them. Many participants described how drug users, who needed to pay for their habit and any debt they accrued, would choose workshop jobs because of their higher wages. Further complaints articulated by participants about poor remuneration being exploitative included: that pay in private prisons was much better, that docking wages as collective punishment was unfair and that variations in remuneration for different types of work 'forced' poorer prisoners into harder (workshop) jobs.

The second significant aspect of poor remuneration for prison work related to how participants felt it undermined rehabilitation. Low wages means it impossible for prisoners to (legitimately) either save money for their release, or send wages to support their family outside. These views reflect findings in other criminological work that has also analysed prison pay (Simon, 1999; Shea, 2007).

'I've not found a job in prison that I've actually enjoyed doing yet': Responses to the types of work on offer
In addition to attitudes about the *organisation* of prison work, participants also shared experiences and opinions of specific *types*: workshops (prison industries or those run by private companies), orderly jobs (helping to maintain the wing and estate generally), 'service work' (working with people, either for the prison or a third-sector contracted provider) and education (academic and offender behaviour courses). In terms of participants' occupation at the time of interviewing, 41 per cent were employed in orderly work, 21 per cent had jobs in workshops, 15 per cent did 'service work', 18 per cent were unemployed and six per cent were unknown.[10] However, partly as a result of participants serving a number of years, often in multiple prisons and occasionally as a second (or more) sentence, work experiences were numerous and diverse, with many having done jobs of different 'categories'.

Participants were asked about personal experiences working in prison (what jobs they have done, what they liked and disliked and why), as well as how they thought 'prisoners generally' felt about different jobs (how they thought 'others' felt). There were two recurring themes in these discussions. Firstly, many participants explained, often defensively, how they expected their own attitudes and experiences to be in contrast to how 'prisoners generally' might feel about that type of work. Cameron was an example of this. Despite 'hating' his job in the warehouse workshop, he still managed to reframe it as having some positives: 'I'm in a powerful position because I handle all tobacco and everything … [I can] say if you fuck me about mate I'll make some capital on your canteen'.[11] Therefore, even though Cameron claimed not to use the power his job provided, it was still important for him to believe that he *could*

---

[10] Does not add up to 100% as rounded to nearest whole number.
[11] This is the weekly orders of food, tobacco and toiletries etc. that prisoners can buy from an approved list.

use it should he want to. Secondly, testimonies were inconsistent and disorganised, with many participants contradicting themselves, giving the impression that they had never thought very deeply about prison work. While this was probably the case for most participants, the inconsistency and disorganisation of opinions about prison work highlighted something more theoretically significant. The ability to simultaneously feel positively and negatively about their prison job seemed to be a function of participants' different feelings about the *practice* of work and about the *purpose* of that same work. This section will therefore analyse each category of prison work in terms of how participants felt about the practice and as well as the purpose of it.

One of the defining features of workshop work was being off the wing all day, and participants' opinions about these jobs were divided by preferences for or against having their time structured this way. Some participants preferred workshops because they felt it resembled 'real life' and legitimate work most closely: 'it's a bit of normality' (Tariq). For others, having to be in the workshop all day was the primary motivator for *avoiding* such jobs: 'you're stuck inside a workshop, all day long … all you're given is some cold roll to last you from 8 in the morning until 4.30 at night. That's a very long day … it drags … it's not for me' (Spencer). Spending the day in the workshop was made more undesirable for participants when they felt they were treated badly ('they treat you like shit down there' - Sam)[12] or when there was a lack of work ('I found myself sitting around all day…I'd rather be sitting around [on the wing] where I have my TV … rather than sitting around in the workshop and reading the same magazine or newspaper over and over again' – Milo).

Participants' feelings about workshop working practices were largely dependent on the workshop as they offered heterogeneous types and amounts of work. In terms of the manual practice of workshop work, some participants were positive about their jobs because they enjoyed working with their hands, and got satisfaction from making something: 'you actually produce an end product that goes out to somebody' (Tariq). The practice of some workshops was disliked when participants felt the work was unskilled and tedious: 'it's the most boring, most monotonous, most soul destroying thing I've ever done in my life. Just standing there for hours on end' (Harvey). Finally, a few participants complained about the lack of work they felt there was in the workshops. However, of the seven participants currently employed in workshops, four were relatively happy with the practice of it.

In terms of the *purpose* of workshop work, participants expressed opinions across the spectrum, with a few expecting that it would help them find employment after release, and others seeing no point at all in workshop employment. For those on the positive end of the spectrum, expectations of workshop jobs helping them find jobs outside was specific to either there being an actual offer of employment (such as by the warehouse) or that their workshop happened to be related to an existing interest (such as Nathanael in the bike shop). Participants who felt their work served no purpose wanted to work in another sector, thought the workshop work was unskilled or found the training too basic ('the multi-skills is such low level that if you go out you still won't be able to get a job with it' – Tariq). Between these two extremes, some

---

[12] It is important to recognise that the majority of references to being treated badly were aimed at the management of the warehousing company rather than the civilian staff working there who many prisoners said they got on with.

participants saw an instrumental purpose to their work, most often, that if provided comparatively generous remuneration.[13]

Over 40 per cent of the sample was employed in orderly work, making it the most common employment category in this study. In 2012, HM Inspectorate of Prisons reported that wing work was menial and overstaffed. This seemed to still be the case, and some participants recognised it: 'it's overkill, they have like 10 cleaners to clean this wing' (Theo). Cleaning was the most prevalent form of wing work, but participants were also employed in the servery and kitchen, in the gym and on the segregation unit ('the block')[14] On the whole, the practice of wing work was described by participants positively or negatively in terms of the people it brought them into contact with. Cleaning and kitchen work was sociable, bringing participants into contact with civilians and other prisoners, while roles in the laundry or on the servery were more stressful because of the interaction it precipitated with other prisoners ('prisoners become animals at servery time … very picky and fussy and very short-fused about their food' – Wayne).

Beyond the social aspects of orderly work, there was much indifference about its practice. A small minority of participants were negative about orderly work (which they felt were dirty or subservient, for example), and only two participants described enjoying orderly work. William enjoyed working on the servery (although aspects of it made him anxious, such as having to read names and food requests, because of his poor literacy) and Saffon described the pleasure he got from cleaning. This is in contrast to Sloan's (2012) research, where she found prisoners enjoyed the practice of cleaning much more, because of the importance of cleanliness to them. While cleanliness was extremely important to participants in this sample, it did not translate into positive sentiments about the practice of cleaning work. Gym orderly work was the exception to these findings, with those who worked in the gym currently or in the past making only positive statements: 'I just live for it … I can't think of a negative other than injury, does that count as a negative?' (Jack). Gym orderlies enjoyed the practice of working-out and of helping train others. While these findings about the gym represents only a small sample (only five participants had ever worked in prison gyms), Carrabine and Longhurst (1998) found similarly positive sentiments about gym work in their study.

Despite the relative lack of enthusiasm for the practice of orderly work, these were the most sought-after jobs. Only Saffon saw his orderly job as potentially helping him on release, but the instrumental purpose of these positions was perceived to be great. Cleaners and servery workers had more free time, greater access to the gym, the ability to use phones during the day and the option of being alone in their cell, while those in the kitchen and servery got extra food. Therefore, despite not enjoying the work itself, or thinking that it would help them on release, the vast majority of orderly workers were happy with their job. Gym orderlies were again in a unique

---

[13] Workshops offered the highest wages and out of these, the warehouse paid the most. However, the warehouse had recently introduced a collective punishment scheme making some pay conditional, undermining its instrumental purpose for some participants.

[14] Some participants had worked in different wing jobs at other prisons, such as the laundry or as a barber.

position, with both gym orderlies in this sample planning to work in the sector on release, and recognising that their experience inside would help them with that.

Five participants were engaged in 'service work', which required 'soft skills' in a way workshop and orderly jobs did not. All of those with 'service jobs' found the generative nature of their work rewarding ('you're actually helping people' – Tristan) and were proud of their 'soft skills' ('I can talk the talk … I'm a very sociable person. I can talk to different people from all walks of life' – Ali). In describing how they interacted with the prisoners they worked with, participants emphasised how they used these skills to be effective in their role: 'I just sit and help out people, give them a bit of confidence …When it goes to awkward silence I might just throw something out there, start talking to make them feel a bit more comfortable' (Ali). However, there were also aspects of service work that participants felt negatively about. Three participants felt the teaching was generally to a low standard, and seemed frustrated they were not able to remedy this as part of their role: 'you've got grown men leaving the prison system who have qualifications equivalent to a 14 year old … I just don't see how that helps anybody in here, so I do find it frustrating' (Ed). The caring aspect of service work also posed difficulties for some participants, who appeared to not want to be emotionally invested in their job. After describing how hard they worked, going above and beyond to help prisoners,[15] some participants would go on to criticise those they worked with or explain how they did not like them: 'I don't know how much I really care about [the prisoners]' (Ali).

In terms of what participants felt service jobs provided them with, two thought it would help them find employment on release, but the other participants had instrumental motivations behind their choice of work. Service roles gave participants a great degree of responsibility and autonomy, sometimes working unsupervised across the prison. This was beneficial to participants, as it demonstrated their trustworthiness, which would be useful when seeking to move on to Category-D prisons and towards release: 'from doing this job … it just shows the level of trust on my behalf in the prison and how far I've come' (Marcus).

Instead, participants justified their like or dislike of education in terms of what they gained from it. A handful of participants felt offending behaviour courses had been directly useful to them, with more describing them as instrumentally beneficial in keeping a good record and following their sentence plan: 'doing all these courses … they don't mean nothing to me. They're just important for me to have to show the parole board I've not just sat in my cell' (Dwayne). However, the majority of participants concluded that offender behaviour courses were part of a tick-box, risk-assessment, statistics culture: 'maybe one out of every hundred [prisoners], the course might work … It's just about government statistics, making people do these courses even if people don't need to do them' (Spencer). Participants argued that they were least likely to reoffend if they got a job on release, so offender behaviour courses felt like a waste of time: 'you can't go into a job centre and say I've got TSP [Thinking Skills Programme] and I've got CSB [Cognitive Skills Booster] and I've got victim awareness' (Jack).

---

[15] One service worker had been extremely proactive in trying to improve education provision in the prison.

Academic courses were actively sought by most participants, and highly valued when they were in a subject and at a level that was appropriate to the individual. Limited access to Open University courses frustrated a number of participants, as did the lack of opportunities outside of level one and level two English and maths qualifications. However, the feeling that education was the best way to better oneself was expressed by an overwhelming majority of participants, regardless of what courses they had actually been able to access: 'anything educational I've enjoyed it because I just know it's going to better me and it's helping me into what I want to do'. For those participants who had had more turbulent experiences at school, the pride they felt in their achievements in prison manifested itself in reeling off the certificates and qualifications they had achieved, even if they did not think they would directly help them in anyway:

> *I've done nearly every course going in prison … I did everything just to go 'I've got 30 qualifications. You've been to university and got four! Just a little 'fuck you' to the community to prove that just because I'm in here don't mean that I can't be better than others*
>
> <div align="right">Cameron</div>

Discussion: The purpose and practice of prison work

These findings highlight that the majority of work undertaken by participants in this study was menial. Exceptions to this included some workshops, gym orderly jobs, 'service work' and some education. In terms of how prison work was allocated, participants on the whole perceived it to be inappropriate because official procedures were not seen as taking into account individual preferences or skills, and were also ignored for the appointment of some positions (e.g. gym orderlies). Work allocation was also felt to be disrupted: slow on initial entrance to the prison (another feature identified by HM Inspectorate of Prisons in 2012), and unsettled by any periods away from the prison for court appearances. While it is inevitable that the prison will not be able to accommodate each prisoner's work preferences, given financial and resource constraints, official protocols were perceived by participants to be lacking in coherence and transparency, and the adherence to these systems was seen as inconsistent. Each of these issues exacerbated frustrations about work allocation for many participants. Poor remuneration for prison work was the second key theme of these findings. The rate of pay received for work contributed to many participants feeling exploited. Arguably, prisoners are in a poverty of their own making, which Sykes suggested can lead to interpretations of their situation 'as an effort by the State to exploit them economically' (1958: 69). Some participants voiced suspicions that the state made a concerted effort to make money from them, but most were more frustrated by how poor remuneration undermined their rehabilitation, by making them unable to support their families outside or save up for release.

Analysis of general attitudes to types of prison work found that when work is low, and unskilled, the vast majority of participants were negative or indifferent to its *practice*, but often benefited from its instrumental purpose. Significantly, the benefits provided by these jobs were indigenous to the prison experience, a response to life *inside*. For example, wing cleaning may facilitate extra gym sessions and a workshop position might help structure time or provide money to buy tobacco in their canteens. While these benefits are recognised by participants as valuable, they did not feel these jobs provided useful experiences in terms of wider society. Participants were variably

accepting of the limited benefits offered by their prison job: some resented the lack of opportunity for self-betterment in their role, but others seemed unaware that their prison work was unlikely to benefit them in finding employment on release.

Participants who found external value in their prison work (chiefly those who were employed in the aforementioned exceptions to unskilled and low-skilled positions), as well as those who were critical of the lack of purpose they saw in their prison job, demonstrated how imported values, biographies and experiences, informed assessments of different forms of prison employment. Judging their job in terms of whether it provided an opportunity for self-betterment, or increased their chances of finding desired employment on release, related to imported factors that contrast with the indigenous modes of assessment used to consider the instrumental purpose of their jobs. However it is important to recognise that imported and indigenous values could simultaneously shape participants' attitudes to and experiences of prison work.

The *intended* purpose of prison work was unclear for participants in this study, which added to the resentment and frustration some already felt in response to the lack of opportunities for self-betterment in the prison. These participants expected prison work to help them find employment outside, and stop them reoffending, and were resultantly disappointed by the reality. Other participants seemed resigned to the limits of prison labour, so instead focused on maximising free time.

These findings demonstrate that there was a variety of attitudes towards different forms of prison work. However, participants were most likely to both be relatively content with their job, in terms of the practice of it and its instrumental purpose while in prison, and at the same time be frustrated by their prison work when considering it in terms of its irrelevance to their lives after release. This information is practically valuable for understanding how prison work is experienced by prisoners: its practice was satisfactory, it was instrumentally beneficial to prison life, but it was not 'rehabilitative'. The following chapter will explore why participants framed their responses in different ways, and how these approaches and variations relate to the wider context of neoliberalism and consumer culture.

4. Working masculinities: Typology of prisoner work orientations

Participants' experiences of and attitudes towards prison labour were structured by more than inappropriately allocated work or poor remuneration, and responses to different forms of work were not homogenous. By situating prison-specific experiences and attitudes towards work within individual biographies and relating them to imported values and identities, this research proposes two 'types' to which the majority of participants (approximately 70 per cent) correspond, to varying degrees. The decision to employ typological analysis reflects the relative dearth of criminological research into this area and recognises that suggesting the typology increases the ease with which this study's findings can be compared with research in different institutions or criminological studies (Crewe, 2009). While inductively developed on the basis of participant testimony during the coding process, which made certain commonalities between different groups evident, the typology was also informed by existing research on prisoner society (Crewe 2006b, 2009; Phillips, 2012; Sim, 1994), the sociology of work (Standing, 2011; Roberts, 2013) and masculinities (Hall et al. 2008; Connell, 1995, 1998, 2005; Messerschmidt, 1993; O'Donnell and Sharpe, 2000; Winlow, 2001).

Described, analysed and illustrated in detail below, the typology does not propose rigid classifications. The participants that relate to each 'type' are not homogenous, with some demonstrating a degree of crossover between the two, and one evidencing a desire to transition between them. Furthermore, the typology is not comprehensive. A minority, while presenting some aspects of one or both 'types', did not correspond closely enough to either to warrant inclusion. It is important that these participants and their experiences are not ignored as a consequence and research with a larger sample, or that focuses on prisoners with characteristics of the 'others', may highlight further 'types'. This is a potential danger of typological analysis, however 'an effective typology can draw attention to [the social world's] contours and can provide a conceptual pathway through its terrain' (Crewe, 2009: 154) and it is hoped that the typology proposed here can begin to do that. Discretion was used to sort participants to the *tradesmen*, *entrepreneurs*, or 'others' groups with reference to their work experiences outside prison, their values and ideas about success, money and consumption and the reasons behind their attitudes to prison work. When considered in terms of the proposed categories, participants differed in terms of: their masculinities, work experiences prior to imprisonment, assessments of prison work, and hopes for after release. This chapter explores the typology and investigates possible explanations for the variations exhibited between the proposed groupings.

The *Tradesmen*: 'I'm going to go back to what I was doing before'
Tradesmen were generally (but not exclusively) in their thirties or forties (of nine *tradesmen*, one was in his twenties), white (one was black and one was Asian), from the home counties (three grew up in London) and serving their first sentence (not provided with this data). Crime was not much of a part of the *tradesmen's* lives growing up; they had had mostly quite unremarkable working-class childhoods, generally with fathers that were breadwinners and who did some form of manual

work and mothers who were either housewives or did unskilled service work intermittently and/or part-time.

The employment history of the *tradesmen* was distinct: all had obvious careers, either in traditionally masculine manual work or running their parents' small business. Aidan was the only exception to this, with his career in a non-profit organisation. While some of the *tradesmen* had done odd-jobs before starting their long-term employment, their career provided the *tradesmen* with *working* identities, and they had overwhelmingly positive things to say about their occupations. Work for the *tradesmen* was thus an end in itself in terms of accomplishing masculinity, and their social reference points were such that they were generally very satisfied, both in their gender identities and their job outside. In this sense at least, the *tradesmen* had similar trajectories and masculinities to Willis' (1977) working-class 'lads' and Smiler's (2006) 'average Joe'. *Tradesmen* were more likely than the *entrepreneurs* or any of the 'others' to have children and wives or girlfriends waiting for them outside, and they expressed regret for their crimes in terms of the negative effect of their incarceration on loved ones: 'I don't want to commit a crime [again] because I don't want to … put my family through it and my daughter' (Theo). Just under half of the *tradesmen* had been convicted of violent offences, but, in all except one of these cases, the offence was unrelated to money and had occurred after the consumption of alcohol. The other *tradesmen* had committed 'one-off' crimes after being recruited by a friend involved in illicit schemes. While clearly incentivised by money, the *tradesmen* did not identify with 'being a criminal'.

In terms of prison work, one of the *tradesmen* was employed in a workshop (but wanted to be transferred out), four were orderlies, two were unemployed (by choice) and one had just started 'service work'. *Tradesmen* were generally happy with their prison jobs, which they saw as easy and providing a more comfortable prison experience by facilitating extra access to the gym and 'pod'.[16] *Tradesmen* mostly felt their prison job was irrelevant to their life after release. However, this did not frustrate the *tradesmen*, as the vast majority intended to return to the careers they had before entering prison, and so felt no need for 'personal development' or 'rehabilitation'. There were a few exceptions to this: William wanted a lorry licence (and was applying for D-Cats that offered it) and Tristan wanted a career-change after release, so was pursuing opportunities in prison related to that. However, after release Tristan initially intended to return to his previous work until he felt his career change was viable as a full-time occupation. Modest aspirations such as these were typical of the *tradesmen.* As William explained:

> *I'm just going to be another person that's earning the money to pay the rent … I'm just going to be a driver, that's all I'll be. I'm not going to be successful I … successful is … like you come from nothing, and you've got a better lifestyle and everything like that. Well I'm just going to be normal … do my job the way it's got to be done*

This does not mean that the *tradesmen* were completely satisfied with their prison work experiences. A number of *tradesmen* expressed generative ambitions and were frustrated by the prison's inability or refusal to assist them. Three *tradesmen* wanted

---

[16] The kitchen on the wing where prisoners could cook for themselves.

to pass their trades on to others, and had given their plans a great deal of thought (what resources they would need, how they could integrate it with other prison workshops, how a qualification could be incorporated to it): 'my idea was to try and get people into the scaffolding industry because … there's millions of scaffolders wanted out there but no one gets into it any more. So prison's not a bad idea to try and get into it' (Cameron). Other *tradesmen* described how they had taken the initiative to become a wing painter[17] or to teach other prisoners to read.

Proposing these ideas seemed to represent more than simply another way to pass the time. In describing their experiences of and propositions for generative work, the *tradesmen* were often explicit about their desire to help others: referring to his plan to personal train former drug addicted prisoners, Barney stated: 'maybe he's feeling better about himself and won't go back to drugs now … I could be helping people!'. Furthermore, while recognising they would benefit in some modest ways from their various propositions (although none wanted to be paid for any of this work), the *tradesmen's* motivations were on the whole compassionate, designed to help those prisoners they saw as worse off than them ('everything [in prison] has been fine for me … but lucky me, there are some horrific … stories in here, overcoming that is going to be immensely difficult' (Phil)). In this way, the *tradesmen* were dissatisfied with their experiences of prison work, not because they wanted more help for themselves, but because of what they saw as the wasted opportunities to help others.

The *tradesmen* are therefore defined by their unremarkable working-class childhoods and modest adult lifestyles and aspirations. The (generally manual) careers that typified *tradesmen's* working histories formed the basis for their masculine identities which resembled the 'average Joe' stereotype (Smiler, 2006) and the traditional 'lads' (Willis, 1977). *Tradesmen* mostly intended to return to these careers and did not see themselves as requiring 'rehabilitation', so were most likely to seek orderly work that contributed to an easier prison experience. Prison workshops seemed irrelevant to these participants, who were already had a trade. However, *tradesmen* were frustrated by the lack of opportunities to help and pass on their skills to those they saw as less fortunate.

The *Entrepreneurs*: 'Started from the bottom now we're here'
Entrepreneurialism is the defining feature of this 'type', which represents a new and under-theorised masculinity that seems to be emerging in response to contemporary sociocultural and labour market changes. All bar two of the 15 *entrepreneurs* were from London[18][19], and like the places they grew up, the *entrepreneurs* were an ethnically diverse group: six were black or mixed race, five were white and four were Asian. Ranging from their twenties to their forties, the *entrepreneurs* were of more varied ages than the *tradesmen*. Their parents typically worked in the public sector, or as manual workers, often although not always with mothers in the former and fathers in the latter. *Entrepreneurs* were more likely than the *tradesmen* or other participants to come from single-parent households (just under 50 percent of *entrepreneurs* were from single parent households). Educational attainment varied, from leaving school before GCSEs to having a degree. Childhoods were most often

---

[17] As far as I was aware this was not a formal prison job, and the participant described how it took months to get paintbrushes, implying it was his initiative to request this task.
[18] One was from another major city and the other from a town.

characterised by deprivation, but never described by participants as 'poverty' (reflecting Hall et al.'s (2008) findings). Despite sharing stories that demonstrated some *entrepreneurs* had obviously grown up very poor, all were keen to emphasise that they did not have 'bad' childhoods, and that their parents had done their best: 'I got things and that, it not like I never went without things for Christmas and for my birthday … my mum didn't really have that much [but] … is the sort of woman who would give me her last bit of money' (Jake).

The *entrepreneurs* are firstly identifiable by what they perceived to be a stark choice, taken in the context of the inner-city communities in which they grew up, between legitimate and illicit work. On the one hand, the *entrepreneurs* had watched parents undertake low-paid, insecure jobs, sometimes two or more at a time, and often for very long and unsociable hours (only two *entrepreneurs* seemed to have family members that also worked in the illicit economy). The long-term benefits (or lack thereof) of this type of employment were thus evident to *entrepreneurs* throughout their childhood: 'I saw my mum working, doing the right stuff, morning until night and she never got anywhere' (Harvey). On the other hand, crime and violence were a significant part of almost all the *entrepreneurs'* lives growing up ('there was a lot of violence in my area, heck of a lot of violence' (Marcus)), and this appeared to be an alternative path to that offered by legitimate work: 'everyone around our area was just criminals and I just grew up and my idols were pretty much people that were doing bad things' (Zach). The perceived choice between precarious formal employment and risky illicit work, and opting for the latter (usually around the age of 12), is therefore the first factor identifying *entrepreneurs* and their work experiences.

The *entrepreneurs'* working histories were typified by consistent, profitable, criminal activity, which was their primary source of income, and sporadic and haphazard legitimate employment.[19] All of the *entrepreneurs* had experience in the formal labour market, and their legitimate working histories was the second factor uniting this 'type'. These jobs were often procured through agencies and in retail or catering. Ali described these as 'blender jobs': instances of employment the *entrepreneurs* knew were short term but which they were happy to do, partly to 'blend in' and hide their illegal activities from friends and family. However, some *entrepreneurs* also described enjoying their job, being quite committed to it and getting particular satisfaction from earning 'legitimate' money. Persevering with this work was however made impossible for some of the *entrepreneurs,* whose job security and wages were insufficient: 'you could never get enough [agency] work … I couldn't pay my bills, I was struggling' (Marcus). Other *entrepreneurs* did earn enough from legitimate jobs, but were unable to resist much more profitable illicit work:

> *I was earning enough from [legitimate work] per month that I didn't need to sell drugs but … it's hard to say 'stop! No, don't give me no more money '… so that goal that you set, and say I'll stop at 50 grand or I'll stop at 100 grand, it'll keep going further*   Zach

---

[19] A small number of entrepreneurs had also run (apparently successful) legitimate businesses before coming to prison.

The third aspect of the *entrepreneurs'* working histories that identifies them as a distinct group, was the enterprising nature of their criminal activities.[20] The link between drug dealing and entrepreneurialism was explicitly made by a number of participants: '[drug dealing is] wholesale retail, you buy in bulk, and you sell small. That to me it doesn't take a lot of thinking … transferable skills to do with what I was doing before' (Zach). When describing their drug dealing, *entrepreneurs* explained how they managed customer relations, dealt with losses and the importance of investing in their stock so their business would grow. The *entrepreneurs'* accounts of these processes were not dissimilar to how Connell and Wood's transnational business men described their work: their income was also related to customer satisfaction and they too could lose 'a lot of money by making a few wrong moves' (2005: 352). The older *entrepreneurs* described themselves as having been good at their entrepreneurial work, which had provided them with comfortable to decadent lifestyles, status, and a degree of power: 'I was living the highlife' (George). A small minority said they enjoyed the practice of drug-dealing, but most *entrepreneurs* explicitly described not enjoying it ('nothing but a headache, an absolute headache' (Harry)). All of the group identified downsides to this kind of illicit activity (long hours, high stress, insecurity and the threat of imprisonment), and also recognised that the time and energy they had committed to it came at the expense of their personal lives: 'I missed a lot of birthdays, times when people were going out, like my family … just running up and down chasing the pound note when I could have had fun' (Zach). Despite significant variations in the success of *entrepreneurs'* criminal activity, its enterprising nature was common to all of them.

The purpose of entrepreneurial crime, money, was a means to the masculinity, status and identity the *entrepreneurs* wanted to accomplish, much like the participants in Hall et al.'s (2008) study. Conspicuous consumption, material goods and wealth were integral to the *entrepreneurs'* positive self-conception, which was illustrated with stories of buying the latest car or scooter while still at school when their peers were unable to compete with their earning power. The *entrepreneurs* showed-off the experiences they were able to consume as a result of their money: 'I used to take four holidays a year, go Caribbean, America and then to Spain twice a year. Every year a different Caribbean country. I seen the world' (Zach).

However, the 'experience' *entrepreneurs* where most proud of was the ability to provide for (almost exclusively female) family members: 'I bought my mum a [business], I bought her a car, I sent her on holiday every single year' (George). While this was certainly generous, a number of the *entrepreneurs* described their 'providing' in a way which implied it was also a means to patriarchal status and control.

This patriarchal aspect of some of the *entrepreneurs'* masculinities was somewhat contradictorily combined with liberal attitudes (towards women in the workplace, for example) and a less stereotypically masculine side of the *entrepreneurs.* For example, a third of the *entrepreneurs* showed me drawings or poems and discussed creative ideas and aspirations they had. The majority of the *entrepreneurs* were also keen to emphasise their 'soft skills' and how they helped them to adapt to different

---

[20] While violence was sometimes involved (a number hinted at gang membership), it was secondary and instrumental to the primary focus on profitable crime.

situations and talk to all types of people: 'I'm a people person … how I speak to you is different to how I speak to my pals … when you go for a job interview you gotta change … I wouldn't be talking like this, my grammar would change as well' (Ali).

The *entrepreneurs'* masculinities, which are manifested in a willingness to take risks, good interpersonal skills, entrepreneurial ambitions, creativity, conspicuous consumption, and a mixture of traditional and progressive social attitudes, demonstrates that they are not stereotypically hyper-masculine men. While not fully captured by existing studies, this masculinity includes traits found in Connell and Woods' 'transnational business masculinity' (2005) as well as the criminal and consumerist identities described by Hall et al. (2008).

The prison labour experiences of *entrepreneurs* were varied: four worked in workshops, three did 'service work', six were orderlies and two were unknown/not classifiable. Those in workshops all enjoyed their work, apart from Harvey who felt his job was menial and monotonous, representing 'exactly what I've been trying to avoid my whole life'. Attitudes to orderly work amongst *entrepreneurs* were mixed, but those employed in 'service work' were all particularly enthusiastic about doing their jobs. While attitudes towards the practice of prison labour were mostly positive, feelings about its purpose were more complex. All of the *entrepreneurs* except for Harvey discussed how their prison job served an instrumental purpose in enhancing their prison experience (the same instrumental approaches discussed previously).

The first important theme relating to the *entrepreneurs'* feelings about prison work was that despite relatively positive views on the practice of their prison jobs and tangible instrumental benefits to their lives inside, prison labour was mostly seen as irrelevant to their lives after release. There were exceptions to this: Connor wanted to start a fashion line and a charity had provided a business mentor him to help with it, and for two other *entrepreneurs* their prison job was in the field they planned to open businesses in (Zach was a gym orderly and thought he might want to open a gym, and Nathanael worked in the bike workshop and wanted to open a bike shop on release).

All the *entrepreneurs* discussed opening a business in the future, but very few felt prison was helping them with their plans. In many of the conversations about working after release, *entrepreneurs* almost frantically described business ideas, listing a huge number of often extravagant plans ('I want to build like mini little chateaus [in the West Indies], with a long pier going out into the beach, jet-skis, horseback riding … a go-kart [circuit]' (Marcus)). This to some extent reflected the *entrepreneurs'* desire to make considerable amounts of money, but there was also an element of desperation, as if they only had so many ideas because they did not know what might provide them with the best chance of legitimate work on release. For example, Zach was considering opening a gym, a nursery, a café and a newsagents after prison, all of which related to his skill-set, but he was unsure which of these was most viable, and he seemed frustrated by his resultant inability to plan properly: 'I don't know, lots of ideas … closer to the time when I'm coming home I need to start honing my thinking and think which one I'm going to do. I just got to decide which one: cheap setup, good return'. In terms of how this impacted on the *entrepreneurs'* attitudes towards prison labour*,* their concerns and anxieties about future business

plans were manifested in a general desire for the prison to offer opportunities for self-improvement.

The second significant finding relating to the *entrepreneurs'* attitudes to prison labour was this desire for prison work to involve self-betterment. The *entrepreneurs* strongly believed they should have the opportunity to 'rehabilitate' ('the whole point of putting me here was to make myself better' (Connor)) and expressed preferences for education over prison work as a result ('anything educational I've enjoyed … it's going to better me and it's helping me into what I want to do' (Connor)). Some *entrepreneurs* had completed business and other educational courses that they had found interesting and engaging. However, as discussed previously, educational opportunities were limited and this frustrated a number of *entrepreneurs*: 'I got knocked back [from doing a degree], so it was pointless me doing all my level ones, level twos, and then my long distance [learning] …That sort of pissed me off' (Ravi). The pursuit of self-betterment also led a few *entrepreneurs* to explain that they did not want to help or improve the prison: 'I don't believe in working for the prison. I'd rather … something that is beneficial for me in the long run' (Marcus).

This analysis of the *entrepreneurs* evidences considerable ambitions amongst the participants in this 'type', driven by a desire for 'success' as defined by wealth, conspicuous consumption and the status and power that comes with that. This is manifested in the *entrepreneurs'* relative contentment with the practice of prison labour and its instrumental benefits while inside. However, the *entrepreneurs* saw this work as pointless when considered in terms of its purpose for them after release, and they were frustrated by what they perceived to be a lack of educational opportunities offering them self-improvement.

The '*Others*'
The *others* is not a typology whose 'members' share any characteristics other than their relative non-correspondence to the *entrepreneurs* and *tradesmen* typologies. But more than being a 'leftover' group, these participants represent sub-populations of prisoners whose experiences are structured by distinct factors such as serious addiction, certain ethnic backgrounds/nationality or age. That their approaches to work could not be systematically assessed into typologies is a result of their under-representation in this study's sample rather than their being 'random', inconsistent or 'abnormal'.

For example, Sam and Dwayne were both former drug addicts whose working lives had been characterised by the kind of sporadic legal and illicit work typical of *entrepreneurs*, but had more modest aspirations for the future (like *tradesmen*). Their work experiences had primarily been a means to funding their habit, as opposed to acquiring consumer status, and their future plans revolved around staying clean rather than a particular type of work. There were also two travellers, both of whom had been in care at points, experienced significant trauma in a variety of forms and had irregular and chaotic histories of employment. Beyond these similarities they were relatively distinct from each other in their illegal activities, attitudes to money, work preferences and future aspirations. Stanley and Douglas were both older prisoners but with contrasting working histories: Stanley was university educated w with a long and successful career while Douglas had travelled extensively with diverse employment but no 'career'. Their attitudes to prison work were distinct, but

functions of their age and relative difference to the rest of the prison population. Similarly, the two foreign national participants shared no common experiences, values or demographics, but their mutual status as foreign nationals structured both of their attitudes to work both in prison and wider society, although in vastly different ways. The two remaining 'other' participants shared no common ground.

Discussion: what does this mean for prison work?
As a result of the exploratory research undertaken for this study, a typology with two 'types', the *tradesmen* and the *entrepreneurs,* has been proposed. While informed by existing research, these 'types' represent new theories of prisoner masculinities that can inform future criminological research. However, it must be reiterated that the *tradesmen* and *entrepreneurs* are not proposed as fixed or homogenous categories, and care must be taken to ensure they are not reified as is a danger with typological studies (Crewe, 2009). Analysis of these 'types' (and of the 'others' who did not fit into either) evidenced significant differences between the *tradesmen* and *entrepreneurs* in terms of their work experiences prior to imprisonment, their feelings about prison labour, and their ambitions for after release. These findings have consequences for criminological understandings of prisoner masculinities and bring into question the nature and role of work in contemporary prisons.

In terms of the consequences for criminological understandings of prisoner masculinities, this study proposes the existence of two masculine configurations that are distinct from the understandings presented in current literature. The masculinities of both the *tradesmen* and the *entrepreneurs* resemble aspects of various 'conventional' and 'legitimate' masculinities. Furthermore, they represent a significant departure from the characterisation of prisoners as primarily violent and hyper-masculine men.

As discussed above, the *tradesmen's* masculinities are based on their manual labouring careers which provided the participants with strong working identities and modest working-class lifestyles. This resembles the legitimate 'average Joe' (Smiler, 2006) and 'lads' (Willis, 1977) masculinities which are similarly accomplished through stereotypically male work. Furthermore, the communitarian values presented by the *tradesmen* (illustrated by their desire to undertake generative work in prison) are emulative of the solidaristic 'shop-floor' culture that is central to the masculinities of Willis' (1977) 'lads'. The *entrepreneurs'* masculinities are shaped by the entrepreneurial nature of their illicit work, and in this sense corresponds to the competitive, individualistic and risk-taking aspects of 'transnational business masculinity' (Connell, 1998; Connell and Wood, 2005). Also resembling 'transnational business masculinity' is how the *entrepreneurs* applied their entrepreneurial approach to more aspects of their life than just work: for example, in their self-presentation and management of their bodies or in their attitudes towards women, relationships and sex. The outcome of the *entrepreneurs'* criminal activity, money, facilitated conspicuous consumption which was also integral to the accomplishment of their masculinities, echoing Hall et al.'s (2008) findings about similar masculinities outside of prison. The criminal status of the *entrepreneurs'* work was not vital to the accomplishment of their masculinities, as evidenced by their desire to 'go straight' after prison with legitimate businesses. At its most fundamental level, the successful accomplishment of the *entrepreneurs'* masculinity depended on making money and being able to engage in conspicuous consumption, whether this

was achieved legally or illegally was 'significant only in relation to the potential downsides of both' routes (Hall et al., 2008: 55).

Understanding the masculinities accomplished by *tradesmen* and *entrepreneurs* *de*monstrates that characterisation of prisoners as predominantly violent and hyper-masculine is both erroneous and misleading. While men from both 'types' may have engaged in the spectacular displays of hedonism and/or violence that epitomise hypermasculinity, such behaviour is not essential to the successful accomplishment of their masculinities. This explication of the *tradesmen* and *entrepreneurs* *m*asculinities also evidences their relationship to non-criminal masculinities. Both masculinities discussed here are more than simply 'criminal', with bases in legitimate work identities on the one hand and in making-money and conspicuous consumption on the other. While the *entrepreneurs* used criminal means to accomplish their masculinity, their ultimate aims (of making money and consuming) are legitimate in contemporary society. Conspicuous consumption has become 'a mode of expression' (Hayward, 2004: 4) for those of all social backgrounds, and the desire to make money is explicitly encouraged by the neoliberal maxims of competition, individualism and 'the market'. As Bennett explains: 'crime provides a means through which [offenders] can pursue and realize conventional dreams of material success … Rather than being a pure rejection of the conventional community, these accounts illustrate that crime is closely linked to the dominant values of society' (2012: 11).

In terms of the consequences of these findings for prison labour, analysis of the *tradesmen's* and *entrepreneurs'* working experiences while inside, raises questions about the nature and role of work in contemporary prisons. Despite both 'types' expressing generally positive views about their prison jobs in terms of the practice of it and the instrumental benefits while inside, almost none of either the *entrepreneurs* or *tradesmen* felt they were gaining anything that would help them on release. For the *tradesmen* this was largely a function of their already having legitimate careers, and their intention to return to them when released. As a result, *tradesmen* generally felt they did not require any 'rehabilitation'. However, the *tradesmen* were still frustrated by prison work because of the lack of opportunities to engage in generative activities and pass on their trades to prisoners who lacked skills and work experience.

The *entrepreneurs'* feelings that prison labour was not beneficial to their plans for after release stemmed from what they believed to be a lack of opportunities for self-betterment. *Entrepreneurs* generally did not want to help the prison through their work, but they were keen to 'use their minds', engage in education and undertake work that was more creative and less stereotypically masculine: '[the jobs are] stereotypical to a man ... there are people that can draw and can do other things' (Connor). The *entrepreneurs* all intended to open businesses after leaving prison, and while a number of the men in this 'type' had enjoyed business courses, *entrepreneurs* did not articulate a desire for more help with this: they wanted to improve themselves generally through education. Therefore, while the *tradesmen's* and *entrepreneurs'* contrasting feelings about prison work could appear superficial (with both 'types' being relatively content with their jobs and the instrumental benefits of them), the *tradesmen* were frustrated by the missed opportunity to help prepare other prisoners for release, and the *entrepreneurs* wanted more opportunities for general self-betterment. It therefore appears that prison work fails to cater for the

ambitions of either 'type' and does little to rehabilitate prisoners in their own eyes. In reaching this conclusion, many of the *tradesmen* and *entrepreneurs* expressed implicit or explicit resignation to feeling that the prison did not really want to help them.

These findings raise a number of issues about prison work and how it could be reformed. Firstly, there is an apparently problematic incongruity between the *tradesmen's* desire to pass on manual skills and the *entrepreneurs'* ambition to better themselves with more academic and less-manual education and training. Secondly, it would be pertinent to explore whether the *entrepreneurs* would benefit from more business-related work provisions inside despite not expressing a desire for this when asked to suggest ways to improve prison work provisions (especially as a result of the unrealistic business ideas proposed by some of the *entrepreneurs*). Finally, future research might investigate whether there is a link between the misleading representation of prisoners as hyper-masculine, and the inapplicability of prison work provisions to the actual masculinities of many prisoners. Depictions of prisoners in much of the existing literature as generally hyper-masculine, violent, work-shy and unskilled have not been borne out in this research, but it seems plausible that prison work may have been designed in response to this false assumption.

5. Conclusion

This research investigates prisoner attitudes to, and experiences of, prison labour, and the relation of these attitudes and experiences to prisoner masculinities. The study was conceived in response to the relative dearth of research into prison work, and what seemed to be, in the context of other studies, the overemphasis of hyper-masculinities amongst contemporary male prisoners. Through semi-structured interviews with 34 prisoners, this study uses the prisoner voice to answer the primary research question: how and why do male prisoners engage with different forms of prison work?

By analysing attitudes towards the organisation of prison work, it is clear that participants are frustrated by what they perceive to be inconsistent, impractical and impersonal systems of work allocation. The poor remuneration of prison labour was also evidenced to contribute to the resentment of and resistance to certain forms of prison work (either those that helped the prison, or those that made others – the prison or private companies – money).

The practice of different forms of prison work was experienced positively or negatively by participants according to imported preferences. However, assessments of the *practice* of prison work often contradicted assessments of the *purpose* of it. Prison labour apparently serves a dual-purpose: an instrumental and indigenous purpose, whereby prison work is a means of enhancing the prison experience, and a 'rehabilitative' purpose, to promote self-betterment and assist prisoners in entering appropriate employment on release. Therefore, attitudes towards prison work are a function of how participants feel about the practice, instrumental purpose and rehabilitative purpose of their prison job.

The typology proposed in response to this research highlights diverse masculinities among participants that correspond to different experiences before imprisonment, different hopes for after their release, and different motivations for engaging in types of prison labour. The *tradesmen's* strong working identities, and intentions to return to their careers, led to a feeling amongst these participants that they did not need 'rehabilitation'. Instead, they wanted to engage in generative work, passing their skills on to others. *Entrepreneurs* on the other hand, had experience of, and wanted to continue pursuing, entrepreneurial and material success. Most of the *entrepreneurs* seemed indifferent to receiving help in prison specific to these ambitions, but they all expressed a desire to engage in prison work that developed them. Further research can therefore build on this exploratory study by investigating the extent to which the *tradesmen* and *entrepreneurs* categories hold explanatory power with prisoners in different settings, or whether the typology would be enhanced by the inclusion of other 'types', that this study has not exposed.

These findings raise three issues of considerable importance to criminology and understandings of the prison, as well as to policy-makers and prison managers. Firstly, this research has evidenced a diversity of prisoner masculinities, which have greater resemblances to 'legitimate' masculinities ('average Joe's' for the *tradesmen* and 'transnational business masculinity' for the *entrepreneurs*) than the violent hyper-masculinities emphasised in much existing literature. Secondly, the failure of

prison work to provide for the needs of either the *tradesmen* or the *entrepreneurs* raises the possibility that it is designed for the hypermasculinity stereotype of prisoners which, as discussed, is not representative of the actual prison population. Finally, the purpose (rehabilitation, deterrence, punishment, to instil work ethics) of prison work is unclear. This created confusion and frustration amongst much of the sample, and underlines the importance of meaningful declarations of its purpose. The absence of a clear purpose also means that these (and other) findings cannot be used to assess prison work provisions as either 'bad' or 'good', because it is unknown what 'bad' or 'good' would look like.

The pace at which society, the prison and the labour market are changing in contemporary Britain, means that any attempts to define and explore prisoner masculinities and work experiences, will necessarily be cross-sectional. While this makes capturing the issues in theory and research particularly hard, it does not mean they are not worth doing, and the significance of the findings presented here are evidence of that.

Bibliography

Bachman, R. and Schutt, R. (2011). *The Practice of Research in Criminology and Criminal Justice.* London: SAGE

Bennett, J. (2012). 'Prisoner backgrounds and biographies' in Crewe, B. and Bennett, J. (eds) *The Prisoner.* Abingdon: Routledge

Department of Business, Education and Skills (2011). *Making prisons work: skills for rehabilitation.* Available at: <

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/23026 0/11-828-making-prisons-work-skills-for-rehabilitation.pdf > [accessed 10 October 2014]

Carrabine, E. and Longhurst, B. (1998). 'Gender and prison organisation: Some comments on masculinities and prison management' in *The Howard Journal,* vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 161–76.

Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities.* Cambridge: Polity Press

Connell, R. W. (1998). 'Masculinities and Globalization', *Men and Masculinities*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 3-23.

Connell, R. W. and Wood, J. (2005). 'Globalization and Business Masculinities', *Men and Masculinities,* vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 347-364

Crewe, B. (2005). 'Prisoner society in the era of hard drugs' in *Punishment and Society,* vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 457-481

Crewe, B. (2006a). 'Prison drug dealing and the ethnographic lens' in *The Howard Journal,* vol. 45, no. 4, pp.347-368

Crewe, B. (2006b). 'Male prisoners' orientations towards female officers in an English prison' in *Punishment and Society,* vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 395-421

Crewe, B. (2009). *The Prisoner Society: Power, Adaptation, and Social Life in an English Prison.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Crewe, B. (2011). 'Depth, weight, tightness: Revisiting the pains of imprisonment' in *Punishment and Society,* vol. 13, no. 5, pp.509-529

Gelsthorpe, L. (2015). *Ethics in Criminology,* lecture notes distributed in Criminological Research Methods at the University of Cambridge, January 2015

Grayling, C. (2015). Speech to the Conservative Party Conference. Available at: http://press.conservatives.com /post/98797333925chris-grayling-speech-to-conservative-party [accessed 10 October 2014]

Gove, M. (2015) The Treasure in the Heart of Man – Making Prisons Work (speech to Prisoners Learning Alliance, July 2015). Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/the-treasurein-the-heart-of-man-making-prisons-work> [accessed 8 August 2015]

Hall, S., Winlow, S. and Ancrum, C. (2008). *Criminal Identities and Consumer Culture.* Cullompton:Willan

Hayward, K. (2004). *City Limits: Crime, Consumer Culture and the Urban Experience.* London: The GlassHouse Press

Henry, G. (2009). 'Practical Sampling' in Bickman, L. and Rog, D. (eds) *The SAGE Handbook of Applied Social Research Methods.* Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications

HM Inspectorate of Prisons (2007). *Time out of Cell: A Short Thematic Review.* Available at: <https://www.justicein spectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2014/07/Time-outthematic.pdf > [accessed 19 November 2014]

Hochschild, A. (1983). *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of human feeling.* Los Angeles:University of California Press

The Howard League for Penal Reform (2011). *Business behind bars: Making real work in prison work.* Available at: <http://howardleague.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Business_behind_bars.pdf> [accessed 21 November 2014]

Irwin, J. and Cressey, D. (1962). 'Thieves, convicts and the inmate culture' in *Social Problems,* vol 10, pp. 142-155

Irwin, J. and Owen, B. (2001). 'Harm and the contemporary prison' in Liebling, A. and Maruna, S. (eds) *The Effects of Imprisonment. Abingdon: Routledge*

Jacobs, J. (1977). *Stateville: the penitentiary in mass society.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Jewkes, Y. (2002). *Captive Audience: Media, Masculinity and Power in Prisons.* Cullompton:Willian Publishing

Jewkes, Y. (2005). 'Men Behind Bars: "Doing" Masculinity as an Adaptation to Imprisonment', *Men and Masculinities,* vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 44-63

Jewkes, Y. (2011). 'Autoethnography and Emotion as Intellectual Resources: Doing Prison Research Differently' in *Qualitative Inquiry,* vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 63-75

Jewkes, Y. (2012). 'Identity and adaptation in prison' in Crewe, B. and Bennett, J. (eds) *The Prisoner.* Abingdon: Routledge

Liebling, A. (2006). 'Prisons in transition' in *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, vol. 29, pp. 422-430

Liebling, A. (2014). 'Postscript: Integrity and Emotion in Prisons Research' in *Qualitative Inquiry,* vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 481-486

Liebling, A. and Crewe, B. (2012). 'Prisons beyond the new penology: the shifting moral foundations of prison management' in Simon, J. and Sparks, R. (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Punishment and Society.* London: SAGE Publications

Liebling, A., Price, D. and Elliott, C. (1999). 'Appreciative inquiry and relationships in prison' in *Punishment and Society,* vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 71-98

Mac and Ghaill, M. (1994). *The making of men: masculinities, sexualities and schooling.* Buckingham:Open University Press

McDowell, L. (2000). 'Learning to serve? Employment aspirations and attitudes of young working class men in an era of labour market restructuring' in *Children, Place and Culture* vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 389-416

McDowell, L. (2002). 'Transitions to work: masculine identities, youth inequality and labour market change' in *Gender, Place and Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography,* vol. 9, no. 1, pp.39-59

McDowell, L. (2003). *Redundant Masculinities? Employment change and white working class youth.* Malden: Blackwell Publishing

McDowell, L. (2004). 'Masculinity, identity and labour market change: some reflections on the implications of thinking relationally about difference and the politics of inclusion' in *Geografiska Annaler,* vol. 86, no. 1, pp. 45-56

Messerschmidt, J. (1993). *Masculinities and Crime: Critique and Reconceptualization of Theory.* Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield.

Nayak, A. (2006). 'Displaced Masculinities: Chavs, Youth and Class in the Post-industrial City' in *Sociology,* vol. 40, no. 5, pp. 813-831

Newburn, T. and Stanko, E. (1994). 'Introduction' in Newburn, T. and Stanko, E. (eds) *Just Boys Doing Business.* London: Routledge.

Newton, C. (1994). 'Gender theory and prison sociology: Using theories of masculinities to interpret the sociology of prisons for men' in *The Howard Journal,* vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 193–202.

Noaks, L. and Wincup, E. (2004) *Criminological research: understanding qualitative methods*, London: SAGE Publications.

O'Donnell, M. and Sharpe, S. (2000). *Uncertain Masculinities: Youth, ethnicity and class in contemporary Britain.* London: Routledge.

Parenti, C. (2001). 'Rehabilitating Prison Labor: The Uses of Imprisoned Masculinity' in Sabo, D., Kupers, T. and London, W. (eds) *Prison Masculinities.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press

Phillips, C. (2008). 'Negotiating Identities: Ethnicity and social relations in a young offenders' institution', *Theoretical Criminology,* vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 313-331

Phillips, C. (2012). *The Multicultural Prison: Ethnicity, Masculinity, and Social Relations among Prisoners.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Prison Reform Trust (1991) The Woolf Report: a summary of the main findings and recommendations of the inquiry into prison disturbances. http://www.prisonreformtrust.org.uk/Portals/0/Documents/Woolf%20report.pdf

Prison Reform Trust (2015). Bromley Briefings http://www.prisonreformtrust.org.uk/Portals/0/Documents/Prison%20the%20facts%20May%202015.pdf

Prison Service Instruction (2013). '30/2013 Incentives and earned privileges', available: https://www.justice.gov.uk/offenders/psis/prison-service-instructions-2013

Roberts, S. (2013). 'Boys will be boys…won't they? Change and continuities in contemporary young working class masculinities' in *Sociology,* vol. 47, no. 4, pp.671-686

Rusche, G. and Kirchheimer, O. (1939). *Punishment and Social Structure.* New York: Russell and Russell

Sennett, R. (1999). *The Corrosion of Character.* New York, NY: W. W. Norton and Company

Shea, E. (2007). *Why work? A study of prison labour in England, France and Germany.* Berlin: Duncker and Humbolt

Sim, J. (1994). 'Tougher than the rest? Men in prison' in Newburn, T. and Stanko, E. (eds) *Just Boys Doing Business.* London: Routledge

Simon, F. (1999). *Prisoners' Work and Vocational Training.* London: Routledge

Sloan, J. (2012). 'Cleanliness, Spaces and Masculine Identity in an Adult Male Prison' in *Prison Service Journal,* vol. 201, pp. 3-6

Sloan, J. (2014) 'Masculinity and Imprisonment for Public Protection' in *Prison Service Journal,* vol. 213, pp. 30-34

Sloan, J. and Wright, S. (2015). 'Going in green: reflections on the challenges of 'getting in, getting on and getting out' for doctoral prisons researchers' in Drake, D., Earle, E. and Sloan, J. (eds) *The Palgrave Handbook of Prison Ethnography.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Smiler, A. (2006). 'Living the image: a quantitative approach to delineating masculinities' in *Sex Roles,* vol. 55, pp. 621-632

Standing, G. (2011). *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class.* London: Bloomsbury

Sykes, G. (1958). *The Society of Captives: A study of a maximum security prison.* Princeton, NJ:Princeton University Press

Tolson, A. (1977). *The Limits of Masculinity.* London: Tavistock

UKCES (2014). Working Futures 2012-2022, Evidence Report 83. Available at: < https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/298510/workingfutures-2012-2022-main-report.pdf> [accessed 8 August 2014]

Willis, P. (1977). *Learning to Labour: How working class kids get working class jobs.* Farnborough:Saxon House

Wilson, M. and Sapsford, R. (2006). 'Asking Questions' in Sapsford, R. and Jupp, V. (eds) *Data Collection and Analysis.* London: SAGE Publications

Winlow, S. (2001). *Badfellas: crime, tradition and new masculinities.* Oxford: Berg

Appendix 1: Interview schedule

1. Experiences prior to imprisonment

a. Growing up
i. Where are you from? Tell me about where you grew up
ii. Were you aware of a certain type of work being dominant in your area?
iii. What did you want to be when you grew up? Why?
iv. Did you have any role models growing up?
v. What did your parents do?

b. Work experiences
i. How did you make a living? How did you get into that? Were you good at it?
ii. Would you have preferred to do another job? What?
iii. Did it provide you with anything beyond money?
iv. What did you like and dislike about different types of work you have done?

2. Experiences in prison

a. Do you work in prison now? What?
b. Why did you choose this work?
c. Have you done other jobs? Here or elsewhere
d. Would you do your prison job outside?
e. What is the best job in prison? And the worst?
f. What have you liked and disliked about the prison jobs you have done?

3. Hopes for after release

a. What would you like to do after prison?
b. What would you want your son or daughter to do?
c. How would you define success?
d. Have you been successful? Do you think you will be in the future?

4. 'Opinion questions'

a. Is work important to men in particular? Why?
b. What is important to being a 'good' or 'proper' man?
c. Is there anything you consider to be 'men's work' or 'women's work'?
d. Thinking about labour market changes in the last 50 years, the decline of manual labour and the rise of service work, do you feel differently about these different types of work? Why? Would you prefer to do one type over the other?

Appendix 2: Participant information sheet

Work and identity among male prisoners
Martha Morey

Who am I?
I am a research student from the Institute of Criminology at the University of Cambridge. I do not work for the Prison Service and they have not funded or commissioned this study.

Why am I doing this study?
I am interested in finding out more about how prisoners experience work inside and what they feel about it. I am also interested in your experiences of work before prison (your own, family members, friends) and what you hope to do when you are released. I think that the study will help other researchers, as well as the Prison Service, understand more about what makes work in prison good or bad.7

What will participation involve?
Participation will involve one interview where I will ask you to tell me about your experiences with work prior to prison, what work you have done during your sentence and what you hope to do when you are released. I will also ask you about your experiences growing up in terms of what work those around you have done, be it formal employment, caring at home or anything else. This might include your family, friends and people in your community. Other questions will ask you about your opinions about different types of work generally. You can refuse to answer any questions without explaining why.

Do I have to take part in the study?
No, taking part in the study is completely voluntary and choosing to not take part will not disadvantage you in any way.

Are there any risks involved in taking part in the study?
In the interview I will ask you to tell me about some aspects of your background and about your experiences before prison as well as inside. Some questions may ask you to think about things you have not previously thought about, or choose not to think about. For some people, this might trigger some unhappy or upsetting thoughts. However, you do not have to answer any questions that you do not want to. Also, at the end of the interview you will be able to discuss anything you have found difficult. If the interview is distressing, you can ask for it to stop at any time, and I will advise you on who in the prison you can talk to about your feelings.

Are there any benefits in taking part in the study?
I am not able to pay you for taking part in the study, but if you agree to participate and are interviewed at a time when you would usually be working or in education, you will not lose any pay. Taking part in the study will not affect your privilege level or any decision about your parole or release.

You may feel that talking about your experiences is useful or helpful to you. People who have taken part in similar studies have often welcomed the chance to speak to

someone neutral who is willing to listen to them. You will also be contributing to my understanding of work and prison work in particular.

Will the interview be confidential?
The information you share in the interview will normally be kept completely confidentially. However, I will be obliged to pass on to a member of prison staff any information regarding:

- Anything you say that implies a threat to yourself or to others
- Any breach of prison rules that occurs during the interview
- A specific threat to prison security
- Any serious offences you admit to that you have not yet been convicted for

In all other circumstances, everything you tell me will remain completely confidential. I will store the information securely, for five years. I will be the only person to have access your interview.

Will I be anonymous?
If you agree to quotes from your interview being used, this will be done in a way which means you cannot be identified. I will give you a different name and change details about your life which would 'give away' who you are.

How do I agree to take part in the study?
If you would like to take part, I will ask you to complete a consent form confirming that you understand what the study involves, that you have had a chance to ask any questions and whether you are happy for the interview to be recorded.

What if I change my mind and no longer want to be in the study?
You can stop the interview at any point and you will not have to explain why. You can also insist that some or all of your interview is excluded from the study after we have finished it. You can do this at any point up until 1st June 2015 when I will begin writing the research findings. If you make any of these decisions, I will destroy your interview recording and any associated material. If you wish to make this decision you would not be disadvantaged in any way and nothing will be held against you.

What shall I do if participating in the study causes me anxiety?
If after the interview you feel that some of the things you have discussed have made you feel anxious or distressed, you can access support in various ways:

- Speak to a member of staff or ask me to contact a member of staff who you would like to talk to me
- Contact a peer support worker, such as a Listener, or I will contact on your behalf another prisoner in your establishment to let them know you would like their support
- Contact the Samaritans, whose number will be printed on posters in your wing.

What will happen to the results of the study?
Your interview will contribute to my Masters dissertation. In the future the findings may also be used in publications about the issues I am interested in, which will

mainly be academic articles. I will also discuss my findings with my supervisor and other academic students. An overview of the study will be made available to the National Offender Management Service (NOMS).

Can I get more information about the study or complain about an aspect of it?
The study has been reviewed by the Ethics Committee of the Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge. If you would like more information or have any questions or complaints about the research, please feel free to ask me directly. If you do not wish to pursue a question or complaint in this way, you should contact JO HUDSON who will deal with the issue themselves or pass it on to me, where relevant.

Thank you for taking the time to read this information. If you have any further questions at any stage of the research, please do not hesitate to ask me.

Martha Morey

Appendix 3: Consent form

Project title: Work and identity among male prisoners
Researcher: Martha Morey, Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge

Please tick the boxes **if you agree** with the following statements:

YES

1. I have read and understood the Participant Information Sheet for this research (or have had it read out to me and have understood it) and I have had the chance to ask questions about it

☐

2. I know that I am participating voluntarily and that I do not have to answer any questions if I do not want to

☐

3. I understand that I can withdraw from the research at anytime, without giving any reasons, until 1st June 2015

☐

4. I agree to take part in the study and understand this means being interviewed by the researcher

☐

Please tick either the **YES or NO** boxes for the following statements:

	YES	**NO**
5. I agree to my interview being recorded	☐	☐
6. I agree to let the researcher use quotes from my interview as long as it is done in a way that means I cannot be identified	☐	☐

Participant name: _____
Date: _____
Signature: _____

About the author
Martha is an ESRC funded PhD candidate in the Prisons Research Centre at the Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge. Her current research is exploring issues of prisoner masculinities and prisoner work experiences in greater depth through a three-site comparative study with prisons located in English regions that have distinct contemporary and historical labour markets. Martha is also the co-author of a chapter in the forthcoming 'New Perspectives on Prison Masculinities' (Maycock, M. and Hunt, K. (eds.), *in press*).

About the Howard League for Penal Reform
The Howard League for Penal Reform is a national charity working for less crime, safer communities and fewer people in prison. It is the oldest penal reform charity in the world. It was established in 1866 and is named after John Howard, the first prison reformer. We work with parliament and the media, with criminal justice professionals, students and members of the public, influencing debate and forcing through meaningful change to create safer communities.

We campaign on a wide range of issues including short term prison sentences, real work in prison, community sentences and youth justice. Our legal team provides free, independent and confidential advice, assistance and representation on a wide range of issues to young people under 21 who are in prisons or secure children's homes and centres.

By becoming a member you will give us a bigger voice and give vital financial support to our work. We cannot achieve real and lasting change without your help. Please visit www.howardleague.org and join today.

Chief Executive: Frances Crook
Research Director: Anita Dockley

About the John Sunley Prize

The John Sunley Prize celebrates excellence and the impact of post graduate research into penal issues. Each year thousands of exceptional Masters dissertations are researched and written but few are even lodged in university libraries or shared with the wider penal affairs community. Many will be of publishable standard and would contribute to the pool of knowledge about penal issues. The John Sunley Prize has been established to ensure that the best of these dissertations now get the recognition they deserve.

For more information please visit http://howardleague.org/research/the-john-sunley-prize/

Please note
Views expressed are those of the author and do not reflect Howard League for Penal Reform policy unless explicitly stated

2017