



PROJECT MUSE®

Masculinity and Resistance in Adolescent Carceral Settings

Carla Cesaroni, Shahid Alvi

Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Volume 52,
Number 3, June/juin 2010, pp. 303-320 (Article)

Published by University of Toronto Press



➔ For additional information about this article

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/381537>

Masculinity and Resistance in Adolescent Carceral Settings¹

Carla Cesaroni and Shahid Alvi

Faculty of Criminology, Justice and Policy Studies

University of Ontario Institute of Technology

Le concept de « masculinité hégémonique » est un outil utile pour comprendre et remettre en question les constructions culturelles étroites de la masculinité, la diversité des expériences de vie des hommes ainsi que les trajectoires de relations de pouvoir entre les hommes. Un principe important du concept est que les scripts masculins sont souvent construits, maintenus et renégociés selon des réseaux sociaux particuliers dans des environnements spécifiques. Les études précédentes sur les effets des environnements carcéraux pour hommes se sont surtout concentrées sur les détenus adultes. Notre étude présente une analyse qualitative des expériences vécues par 350 jeunes hommes incarcérés au Canada. Nous explorons comment les comportements routiniers de subversion, d'affirmation de leur identité et de leur masculinité sont utilisés pour protester et donner un nouveau sens aux règlements et restrictions imposés par l'institution correctionnelle. Nous illustrons les différentes façons utilisées par ces jeunes pour résister à l'exercice du pouvoir, de la discipline et du contrôle social formel. Nous examinons les façons selon lesquelles les scripts masculins et les normes sous-culturelles se rencontrent pour générer les ressources psychologiques et les cadres d'action nécessaires pour résister activement à l'expérience de la captivité, des gardiens et de l'environnement correctionnel.

Mots clés : incarcération, jeunes, masculinité

The concept of hegemonic masculinity is a useful tool for critiquing and understanding narrow cultural constructions of masculinity, the diversity of men's real experiences, and the trajectory of power relations among men. One important tenet of the concept is that masculinities are often constructed, maintained, and restructured according to particular social networks in a given environment. Research that has been conducted on the impact of masculine prison environments has tended to focus on traditional adult male prisons. This paper offers a qualitative account of the lived experiences of 350 incarcerated Canadian male youth. It explores how everyday minor acts of subversion, assertions of youthful identity, and masculinity are used to contest and recast the meanings, directions, and restrictions imposed by the

institution. We draw attention to the various ways in which these youth resist the experience of power, discipline, and formal social control. We highlight the ways in which masculinities and subcultural norms intersect to provide the psychological resources and frameworks within which these young people actively resist the experience of captivity, their captors, and the correctional environment.

Keywords: prison life, youth, masculinities

Production

Over the last 50 years there has been a dramatic shift in penological research away from the study of prison life and its associated “pains of imprisonment” toward the study of hyper-incarceration (Simon 2000). Ethnographies of the carceral setting of ordinary prison social relations and subcultural adjustment have been eclipsed by a focus on incarceration rates, sentencing, the impact of large penal populations on local communities, and the privatization of prisons (Simon 2000). Though these analyses offer important critiques of the prison industrial complex and the expansion of imprisonment, they fail to provide sufficient commentary on the lived experiences of inmates (Sabo, Kupers, and London 2001).

In addition to the fact that prison inmates’ individual adjustment and coping are no longer at the centre of scientific inquiry, there are some inmates who have never been visible subjects. Research that has been conducted on the impact of prison environments has tended to focus on traditional adult male prisons (Lutze and Murphy 1999). Other groups, particularly young offenders, have generally been ignored (Liebling 1999). Additionally, gender is rarely considered as an environmental attribute in studies of adjustment (Lutze and Murphy 1999). When prison is considered as gendered, it is usually in relation to female inmates rather than men and boys and generally in regard to the reinforcement of gender-biased policy (Lutze and Murphy 1999).

Governments have “created structures, ostensibly to protect young offenders, that are predicated on anonymity and silence” (Balli 2005: 2). Much of the existing research on youth in prison has focused on youth as passive subjects receiving “correctional” treatment. Perhaps this is not surprising, given the focus, since the 1990s, on punishment, risk assessment, cost effectiveness, and a concomitant ambivalence towards the carceral experiences of young offenders themselves (Benekos and Merlo 2008).

There has been an attendant trend in Canada toward a focus on adult incarceration, statistics gathering, risk assessment, and an actuarial approach toward corrections. Canada collects systematic data regarding the processing of youth through the criminal justice system, including how many youth receive custodial dispositions and for what charges. Canadian data tend to exist only in the form of official reports and inquiries instigated in response to dramatic incidents within custodial facilities. Additionally, the priority in youth corrections in Canada has turned toward risk/needs assessment (notably the popular and controversial Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory – LSI/CMI) and the impact of custody on recidivism or post-release failure (Vandergoot 2006).

Unfortunately, we know little about how the Canadian youth justice system affects the children it processes (Doob 1999). There is, in fact, a general scarcity of empirical data regarding how youth experience custody, despite calls for research on the subject from a number of scholars (see, e.g., Maitland and Sluder 1996). Furthermore, little attention has been paid to the gendered aspects of the lives of incarcerated youth or to the way that masculinity might contribute to adjustment (Katz 2001). It is critically important to understand the ways in which youth deal with being in prison, given that in theory, at least, the goal of prison is to rehabilitate and not just punish young offenders.

To begin to address these concerns, this paper offers an exploratory, qualitative account of the lived experiences of 350 incarcerated adolescent males. We seek to make visible the authentic, lived experiences of youth offenders in custody. We highlight the existence and contours of hegemonic masculinity in the prison environment and attempt to make visible the important, but hitherto neglected, subject of how youthful offenders resist their own incarceration. We also draw attention to the ways in which these youth resist the experience of power, discipline, and formal social control.

Method

This article draws on data from three separate studies and 350 interviews with adolescent male youth in custody and detention facilities. Two of the studies were conducted under the Young Offenders Act (YOA) and the third under the Youth Criminal Justice Act (YCJA). Females have not been included in any of the studies to date, for practical and theoretical reasons. Females represent a very small portion of

young offenders in detention or serving custodial dispositions. More importantly, there is no reason to believe that the variables that predict adjustment or the experiences of males would be the same for young women.

The goal of the first study was an initial exploration of the experiences of adolescent incarcerated males (Cesaroni and Peterson-Badali 2005). One-hundred-and-thirteen incarcerated male youths, who were age 12 to 15 at the time of their indexed offence, were interviewed from July 1999 to September 1999 in 11 facilities. In this survey, only youth who had been in a facility for at least three weeks were interviewed. Sixty participants were from secure custody facilities and 53 were from open (group home-like) custody facilities in Ontario, Canada.

The goal of the second study was two-fold: (a) to interview “first timers” and (b) to examine what predicted youths’ adjustment in custody once they had settled into the daily routine of the institution (Cesaroni and Peterson-Badali 2009; Cesaroni and Peterson-Badali, 2010). It was a short-term longitudinal study of 100 males from Ontario, Canada who ranged in age from 12 to 17 years at the time of the interview. Interviews were conducted from July of 2002 to March of 2003 (one month before the implementation of the YCJA). Eleven facilities from southern Ontario were included. All youth had been sentenced to open custody/open detention (group home-like) facilities. The third study was conducted from October 2007 to March 2009. It attempted to examine the adjustment of adolescent males in secure detention facilities and compared previous findings on adolescent boys who had been sentenced (Cesaroni 2009). The study included 137 youth, who ranged in age from 13 to 19 years at the time of the interview, and sampled youth from five secure detention facilities in southern Ontario.

In the first study, 59% of respondents defined themselves as white and the remainder defined themselves as black (16%), Aboriginal (15%), or of other racial/ethnic origins (10%). The charges relating to the term of custody that respondents were serving at the time of the interview included a wide range of offences. Although many (53%) of the respondents’ charges included a violent charge, many also included property offences (59%) and administration of justice offences (57%), such as breach of probation or failure to appear.

In the second study, 59% of respondents identified as white and the remainder identified as black (18%), Aboriginal (6%), or of other

racial/ethnic origins (17%). Many of the youths who were interviewed had relatively little experience in custody; for 34% it was their first time in custody and a further 22% had had only one other custodial stay. For those who did have a previous custodial disposition, most had spent relatively short periods of time in custody.

Finally, in the third study, 32% of respondents identified as white and the remainder identified as black (48%), Aboriginal (4%), or of other racial/ethnic origins (16%). Eighty-five percent of the sample had previously been detained. Given that the sample was a detention population, it is perhaps not surprising that 70% had been charged with violent offences, including murder, manslaughter, sexual assault, assault with a weapon, aggravated assault, assault, robbery, and various weapon charges. Fifty-one percent of respondents indicated that weapons charges were among their list of offences.

The first author made an initial visit to a facility, giving a brief talk about the study to all potential participants or, in sites where this was not feasible, distributing recruitment posters within the young offender units of each facility. Youths who were interested were given the name of one staff member with whom they could speak should they wish to participate. This same staff member also acted as the liaison between the interviewer and the facility, thereby minimizing the involvement and knowledge of other staff regarding which youths had participated. The first author carried out all of the interviews. A formal consent protocol was read to each participant outlining the purpose of the study, the interview's risks and benefits to the participant, and the limits of confidentiality. Respondents were advised that some questions might make them uncomfortable, and they were free to refuse to answer any question if they chose without fear of reprimand. Interview questions were administered orally, with each interview taking approximately an hour.

Youth responded to a questionnaire that included a number of items taken from the developmental literature and focused on their lives before their current incarceration. It included items that probed instability in living (e.g., number of moves in the past year, contact with child welfare services), school-related problems (e.g., school suspensions, academic performance), drug and alcohol use, criminal justice contact (e.g., police stops, court appearances), and delinquent friendships (e.g., having friends who had been in custody or detention). A number of items were also included which probed youths' experience within the institution, including peer-on-peer violence, staff relations,

and feelings of well-being – these were derived from a number of studies on youth in custody and detention (see, e.g., Maitland and Sluder 1996; Evaluation Research Group 1997; MQOL survey – Measuring Quality of Life Survey in Liebling 2004; Liebling, Durie, Stiles, and Tait 2005; and items from Mulvey 2006).

All of the analysis to date for each of the three studies has been quantitative in nature. Informal conversations or comments that were additional to the closed-ended quantitative items, however, were noted with the permission of each youth. Studies 2 and 3 collected qualitative data in a more systematic way, introducing a number of open-ended questions about youths' experiences of prison. This included new exploratory questions in study 3 regarding rights in detention and prison masculinities.

Each of the authors independently reviewed the interview transcripts to determine key themes and then compared notes to assess concordance. As themes emerged, a coding frame was developed. Subsequent themes were compared to this frame and subsequently reorganized into larger thematic categories (Strauss and Corbin 1990). In the remainder of this paper we present a discussion of three key themes that emerged from this investigation.

Masculinities and the experiences of incarcerated adolescent males

According to Sabo, Kupers, and London (2001: 5), not only do men's prisons "constitute a key institutional site for the expression and reproduction of masculinity," they "facilitate and accentuate enactments of hegemonic masculinity." *Hegemonic masculinity* refers to the idealized and valorized male, to the most honoured way of being a man (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005). It accentuates male dominance, heterosexism, whiteness, violence, and competition and is always constructed in relation to various *subordinated masculinities* (Connell 1987; Sabo, Kupers and London 2001). Connell (1987), as well as Abrams, Anderson-Nathe, and Aguilar (2008) suggest that expressions of rugged individualism, stoicism, and competition constitute a hegemonic masculinity against which all other masculine performances are measured. The concept of hegemonic masculinity is a useful tool for critiquing and understanding narrow cultural constructions of masculinity, the diversity of men's real experiences, and the trajectory of power relations among men (Connell 2002).

One important tenet underlying the concept is that masculinities are often constructed, maintained, and restructured according to particular social networks and social institutions (Connell 2002). The behaviour that men exhibit or engage in, therefore, is often dependent on what type of masculinity exists in a given environment or social setting (Lutze and Murphy 1999). Nandi (2002) argues that the politics of prison and the deprivations associated with the carceral setting prompt a variety of masculinities. Confinement and isolation in prison evoke feelings of manhood in most inmates according to Nandi (2002). Ironically, the desire to prove one's manhood that frequently leads to criminal behaviour may be a adaptation strategy in prison (Jewkes 2005).

Connell (2002) suggests that dominant patterns of masculinity are often engaged with, contested, and constructed in adolescent peer groups. Yet few studies have investigated the role of masculinities and peer relations in the adjustment of adolescent inmates (Newburn and Stanko 1995; Sim 1995). Displays of toughness, bravado, and masculinity may be important to adolescent youth in custody, as research suggests that the pressure to behave in "sex-appropriate" ways intensifies in adolescence (Steinberg 1999). According to Sim (1995), young offender institutions are the site of a dominant and uncontrolled culture of masculinity.

Jewkes (2005: 48) suggests that all forms of masculinity, regardless of age, inevitably involve putting on a "manly front" and that many manifestations of masculinity are a presentation or performance approved by one's mates. The importance of being manly, standing up for oneself, and withholding emotion, together with the existence of a male pecking order, were clear in the vast majority of narratives we collected, as illustrated in the following:

You're living with 85 guys, it's a show, guys are always in competition. (Interviewee Brk600C, study 3)

There is a lot of testosterone, because it's a place filled with all guys, everyone wants to be the top dog, constantly testing each other. If you don't stand up, you're called a bitch. Usually it's the biggest guy, everyone is scared of him, that is the top dog. Or the one that everyone knows from the outside has a reputation. (Interviewee Ken505A, study 3)

It is important to stand up and show you are a man and defend yourself. If you show that you have a weakness then you will get picked on and punked off a lot. If you show you can defend yourself you will be OK. (Interviewee Brk608B, study 3)

A lot of people portray the tough guy act because of the environment, I think that because of jail the guys try to act tough, because in prison it's all male and on the outside it's not and that's what males do when they are together. (Interviewee Brk #601, study 3)

In addition, we discovered that physical assertions of strength and tests were a vehicle for male bonding and an inmate solidarity of sorts (Jewkes 2005). It is clear that masculine displays are a vehicle by which youth establish an adolescent masculine identity in a way that is acceptable among their peers (Jewkes 2005).

Sim (1995) suggests that adult male institutions are often heavily influenced by powerful masculine subcultures that have an impact on violence and fear within prisons. He argues that institutions sustain, reproduce, and intensify the most negative aspects of masculinity, including physical violence, psychological intimidation, and constant bullying. Often, in a young offender institution, peer group respect and individual status in prison rest on a reputation of aggressiveness and physical strength (Jewkes 2005). It was clear from our interviews that status was often achieved by means of threats, bullying, and predatory aggression (Jewkes 2005).

Peer relationships and peer conflicts were a universal concern in our respondents' narratives. In young offender facilities, masculinity is kept under both constant surveillance and constant threat (Sim 1995). Perhaps this is not surprising, given evidence that bullying is a normative event in youth facilities. Indeed, between 20% and 45% of prisoners in young offender institutions report they have been victimized during the course of their current sentence (Beck 1995; O'Donnell and Edgar 1999). One third (35% and 27% respectively) of our respondents from each of the first two studies reported that they felt that the chance of being attacked in their institution was medium to high. In the third (detention) study, the rate was three quarters (75%). The following quotations illustrate why youth often feel that they must constantly be alert for aggression and violence:

You never know what a kid is going to do. If kids come up to you, you have to do something about it. (Interviewee Arr #307, study 1)

Depends on who it is. If a kid is really mouthy he'll get attacked all the time. If you keep to yourself the way I do, you won't. (Interviewee Arr #308, study 1)

I'm sure that everyone would like to punch some of these kids out, but they won't because they'd put up a good fight. Everyone thinks it's just a matter of doing it. (Interviewee Syl #107, study 1)

Tough kids would not do well here because you would get in a lot of fights. Because of the other residents. Every guy wants to be a big tough guy. Guys go around pushing each other around and stuff ... It's worse than school 'cause you can't leave here. (Interviewee #302, study 2)

The fact that masculinities are often engaged with, contested, and constructed within young offenders facilities may be an important factor in the types of difficulties that arise among these youth. The way in which youth attempt to resist their experience of captivity and their correctional environment, however, may also be the source of friction between youth and staff.

Resistance

Prisons are inherently punitive (Austin, Irwin, and Kubrin 2003). They are the ultimate sanction of most Western societies, a potent symbol of the state's power to punish, and as such, they illustrate a complex interplay of power, order, conflict, and socialization (Crewe 2007). As one youth told us, "The worst thing is that it is so unforgiving" (Interviewee CasRex203, study 2).

Nandi (2002) argues that young men's feelings of powerlessness and the challenges that they face in prison compel them to rethink their notions of being a man. Real men are believed to be autonomous, self-regulated, dominant, and convinced of their own efficacy (Nandi 2002). However, these masculine scripts are unavailable to incarcerated youth. Indeed, their ability to make choices is severely restricted in prison. Youth may generate a situationally accomplished, unique masculinity that is an adaptive response to the depriving conditions of the carceral setting (Messerschmidt 2001). As Jewkes (2005: 61) suggests, "As a response to the label prisoner, with all its connotations of weakness, conformity, and the relinquishing of power, manliness becomes the primary means of adaptation and resistance."

Many qualitative studies of prison life suggest that the manner in which they are treated is more important to most inmates than is their physical environment (Liebling 2003). Respect, procedural fairness, and the application of formal rules appear to play an important role

in an inmate's everyday pain and frustration and in how they view the legitimacy of the institution (Liebling 2003). She suggests that prisoners may be willing to comply with fair forms of authority but are much more likely to resist less fair forms, especially when authority manifests itself in the daily actions of front-line staff. A strong and consistent theme throughout our interviews with youth was the inconsistent, unfair exercise of power and authority vis-à-vis petty everyday rules, as some of the following quotations illustrate:

Some staff try to make their own rules and they change them depending on what staff are here – other rules that are suppose to be enforced they don't enforce them – so you don't know what you will get in trouble for. (Interviewee SprLne 306, study 2)

This place is a mess, the staff power trip and everyday they come up with new rules and you cannot do anything about it. (Interviewee Roh403, study 2)

The rules – they're stupid and some of them don't even have a base behind them ... we cannot even roll up our sleeves cause it's considered intimidating. (Interviewee Roh900, study 2)

You get less freedom than you would on the outside. You have to tell them when you go to the bathroom. They tell you when to eat and sleep. In the holding cell, they deny you toilet paper ... playing games with you. They want you to know they are the boss. (Interviewee CasRex 200, study 2)

While such views of prison as a social control mechanism are to be expected, we were also struck by the ways that youth resist such control. The resistance of youth to institutional authority appeared to manifest itself in two ways. The first was what Crewe (2007) would suggest were confrontational manifestations of power: concerted physical resistance, displays of bravado, and toughness. Youth talked about non-compliance or stand-offs with staff; about threatening or fighting staff, refusing to go to their rooms, or instigating fights among other youth; and about being placed in physical restraints and being sent to segregation. Youth spoke about these incidents as instrumental decisions. Some talked about them as a way to alleviate boredom or as a way to have fun. As one youth told us, he liked to "[s]tir up as much trouble as I can, 'cause I have time to do so might as well have fun doing it." (Interviewee Pen201, study 1)

Bosworth and Carabine (2000) have suggested that, in understanding resistance to social control, it is critical to study subjective, expressive

elements of power rather than purely instrumental effects. Bosworth and Carabine (2000: 511) argue that “getting one over, winning an argument, amusing oneself at an officer’s expense” are all expressive, everyday forms of subversion and dissent within custodial institutions. This second form of resistance was also apparent in our youths’ narratives. Further, many instances of everyday minor acts of subversion were embedded in subcultural values, which included the use of coded street language, cultural signs, and symbols (teeth sucking for example), and manipulation. Wilson (2003) describes how youth are often skilled at using staff and the rules to their advantage, and this was apparent among a number of our respondents, as illustrated in the following:

I just follow the rules, being a big dog. Don’t get in trouble, that is big dog status. Listen to the staff, do stuff for the staff. That way when it is time for your 10 minute phone call you can get 45 minutes (from them). (Interviewee Yrk411, study 3)

Previous studies of incarcerated youth have noted that younger inmates often expect respect to be offered before they will return it (Crewe 2005). For most youth, getting and giving of respect was seen as extremely important and highly symbolic. It was mentioned almost universally as something that was highly valued. Youth sought this from their peers and expected it from staff. Many youth were conscious of the role of respect as a negotiated exercise of power between themselves and staff. For instance, one youth remarked,

I don’t respect anyone who doesn’t respect me, so staff can kiss my ass. If you push staff’s button they say they will break my fingers – how can you respect them for that? The only power I have over them is respect ... (Interviewee Brk617a, study 3)

It is important to recognize that adolescent experiences in carceral settings, like those of adult inmates, are predicated on the power dynamic between inmate and staff. However, these experiences are also predicated on the power dynamic between adult and adolescent during a period of rebellion and identity formation. Certainly, establishing a stable, integrated identity is a central task of adolescent development that can be disrupted by an onerous, overly restrictive institutional environment (Greve, Enzmann, and Hosser 2001). Thus, being relegated to being child-like, dependent, and strictly controlled at an age that is about individuation, independence, and control of one’s destiny may increase conflict between correctional staff and

youth in the same way that it does between adolescents and their parents. However, unlike in the case of the interplay between children and their parents, not all the injustices youths perceive are simply imagined. Canadian reports and inquiries identify a number of non-trivial forms of injustice perpetrated by staff, including the inconsistent application of rules; staff involvement in creating or allowing violence to occur; verbal abuse, overuse of force, and, at the extreme, sexual, physical, and psychological abuse (see Law Commission of Canada 2000). Additionally, punishment by front-line staff in the form of infractions or negative behavioural reports can have a dramatic impact on connections to home communities inasmuch as they affect requests for temporary passes, early release, and important custodial privileges (like the ability to use the phone).

In addition to being cognizant of youths' vulnerability vis-à-vis staff, there is a need to be sensitive to their vulnerability as children (despite displays of masculinity and toughness).

In recent years, adolescent male crime and young men in custody have been the focus of public anger and of othering, rendering invisible some of the vulnerabilities incarcerated boys sometimes exhibit (Katz 2001). As a group, incarcerated young offenders are characterized by multiple forms of familial, socio-emotional, and academic disadvantage (Goldson 2005). Yet despite an almost-universal history of hardship leading to (often serious) offending, and in the context of the hard man performances discussed previously, many of the youth interviewed communicated youthful preoccupations. When these youth were asked what they wished for upon release, the most common wishes were money, cars, and staying out of prison. In addition to these material concerns, they talked about missing girlfriends, about crying when their peers could not see, about missing their toy dinosaur collection, and about being homesick. They spoke about wanting "unlimited knowledge" and about their desire to go to a hockey game, a theme park, or camping for the first time. They aspired to go to university, to become an accountant or an architect, and to have kids and a family. In effect, their concerns underscored an adherence to middle-class norms and aspirations but also the kinds of vulnerabilities and childhood desires any other young person might exhibit.

Conclusion

In the age of hyper-incarceration, risk assessment, and an actuarial approach to corrections, youthful offenders have become largely

invisible subjects. We have attempted to make visible the authentic lived experiences of youth offenders in custody. We suggest that the hitherto neglected subject of how youthful offenders resist their own incarceration is an important one. In an effort to examine some of the ways that male youth negotiate the incarceration experience, this exploratory study presents themes emerging from a qualitative analysis of interview data with 350 incarcerated young male offenders. Two main themes emerged from our analysis. First, it was clear that these males felt the need to measure up to a standard of hegemonic masculinity. The importance of not showing weakness, standing up for oneself, and being tough and unemotional were all aspects of a dominant masculine performativity, a finding which lends credence to the argument that the conceptualization and analysis of gender in relation to identity might play an important role in treatment and rehabilitation of young offenders (Abrams et al. 2008).

Second, these youth demonstrated their resistance to the prison environment in two ways: through direct confrontation with correctional staff and through symbolic and expressive acts of trivial subversion. Everyday minor acts of subversion, and assertions of identity and masculinity were used to contest and recast the meanings, directions, and restrictions imposed by the institution. James and Prout (1990) suggest that youth in custody are not just passive, incompetent, and incomplete beings. According to Wilson (2003: 412), incarcerated youth often “shape, modify and attempt to control this tightly regulated environment so as to better cope with their incarceration.” Youth in custody, therefore, are not necessarily without agency and, as Cheliotis (2006) argues, in the carceral setting, human agency often manifests itself as resistance.

Finally, the interviews underscore the importance of remembering that, in the end, these are young people after all and not adults. Youth justice policy is often characterized by a moral panic over youth crime, in which a largely misinformed public, the media, and politicians have driven a “get tough on crime” agenda, while paying relatively less attention to getting tough on the causes of crime (Schissel 1997). A focus on the latter entails action to deal with the social precursors of youth crime, coupled with an understanding, first and foremost, that young people are not adults. Our findings here underscore this point and call into question the ethos of punishment and *responsibilization* (i.e., children need to be treated as adults when they do something wrong) that currently prevails.

These themes are important for a number of reasons. The first is that we know so little about the lived experiences of incarcerated young male offenders. As Simon (2000) argues, "[W]e need to reconstitute sources of knowledge that can make prison social order more visible to a public whose infatuation with incarceration depends on deep ignorance of its fundamental effects." Secondly, these themes are important because they have implications for treatment. In an era in which incarceration, risk management, and standardized programming have become the norm, it is important to understand that incarcerated youth may act out in ways that belie the fact that they are still children. However, though they demonstrate agency and resistance, and even a professed masculinity, they are generally still kids, not coarsened men, and they may be in need of individualized nurturing rather than of harsh punishment (Katz 2001).

Note

- 1 The preparation of this article was supported by a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada doctoral fellowship to Carla Cesaroni and by the University of Toronto Centre of Criminology's John Beattie Research Fund. The authors gratefully acknowledge the support and assistance of Lee Tustin and the Ministry of Community and Social Services (Ontario), Nadia Mazahari and the Ministry of Children and Youth Services (Ontario), Anthony N. Doob, Michele Peterson-Badali all of the facilities that supported this research, and the young men who participated in each of the projects.

References

- Abrams, Laura S., Ben Anderson-Nathe, and Jemel Aguilar
2008 Constructing masculinities in juvenile corrections. *Men and Masculinities* 11(22): 22-41.
- Austin, James, John Irwin, and Charis Kubrin
2003 It's about Time: America's Imprisonment Binge. In Thomas G. Blomberg and Stan Cohen (eds.), *Punishment and Social Control*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Balli, Cecilia
2005 Introduction. In Steve Liss (ed.), *No Place for Children: Voices from Juvenile Detention*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Beck, G.

- 1995 Bullying among young offenders in custody. *Issues in Criminological and Legal Psychology*, 22: 54–70.

Benekos, Peter J. and Alida V. Merlo

- 2008 Juvenile justice: The legacy of punitive policy. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice* 6(1): 28.

Bosworth, Mary and Eamonn Carrabine

- 2000 Reassessing resistance: Race, gender and sexuality. *Punishment and Society* 3(4): 501–515.

Cesaroni, Carla

2009, October

The experiences of adolescent males in secure detention. Discussion paper prepared for the Ministry of Children and Youth Services (Ontario) Research and Outcome Measurement Branch.

Cesaroni, Carla and Michele Peterson-Badali

- 2005 Young offenders in custody: Risk and adjustment. *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 32(3): 251–277.

Cesaroni, Carla and Michele Peterson-Badali

- 2009 Understanding the experiences of incarcerated male youth: The importance of a developmental framework. In Aidan Renshaw and Emelina Suarez (eds.), *Prisons: Populations, Health Conditions and Recidivism*. New York: Nova.

Cesaroni, Carla and Michele Peterson-Badali

- 2010 Understanding the adjustment of incarcerated young offenders: A Canadian Example. *Youth Justice: An International Journal*.

Cheliotis, Leonidis K.

- 2006 How iron is the iron cage of penology? *Punishment and Society* 8(3): 313–340.

Connell, Raewyn

- 2002 On hegemonic masculinity and violence. *Theoretical Criminology* 61(1): 89–99.

Connell, Raewyn and James W. Messerschmidt

- 2005 Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender and Society* 19(6): 829–859.

Connell, Robert

1987 *Gender and Power*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Crewe, Ben

2005 Codes and conventions: The terms and conditions of contemporary inmate values. In Alison Lielbling, and Maruna Shahid (eds.), *The Effects of Imprisonment*. Portland, OR: Willan.

Crewe, Ben

2007 The sociology of imprisonment. In Yvonne Jewkes (ed.), *Handbook on Prisons*. Portland, OR: Willan.

Doob, Anthony

1999 Youth justice research in Canada: An assessment. *Canadian Journal of Criminology* 41(2): 217-224.

Evaluation Research Group

1997 *Juvenile Survey Instrument: National Evaluation of Juvenile Correctional Facilities*. Baltimore: University of Maryland.

Goldson, Barry

2005 Child imprisonment: A case for abolition. *Youth Justice* 5(2): 77-90.

Greve, Werner, Dirk Enzmann, and Daniela Hosser

2001 The stabilization of self-esteem among incarcerated adolescents: Accommodative and immunizing processes. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 45(6): 749-768.

James, Alison and Alan Prout

1990 *Constructing and Reconstructing Childhood*. Basingstoke, UK: Falmer.

Jewkes, Yvonne

2005 Men behind bars: "Doing" masculinity as an adaptation to imprisonment. *Men and Masculinities* 8(1): 44-63.

Katz, Jackson

2001 Boys are not men: Notes on working with adolescent males in juvenile detention. In Don Sabo, Terry A. Kupers, and Willie London (eds.), *Prison Masculinities*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Law Commission of Canada

2000 *Restoring dignity: Responding to child abuse in Canadian institutions*. Ottawa: Law Commission of Canada.

Liebling, Alison

- 1999 Prison suicide and prison coping. In Michael H. Tonry and Joan Petersilia (eds.), *Prisons: Crime and Justice – A Review of Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Liebling, Alison

- 2003, November
Legitimacy, Prison Suicide and the Moral Performance of Prisons. Paper presented at the Challenge of Practice, the Benefit of Theory, American Society of Criminology, Chicago.

Liebling, Alison

- 2004 *Prisons and Their Moral Performance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Liebling, Alison, Linda Durie, Annick Stiles, and Sarah Tait

- 2005 Revisiting prison suicide: The role of fairness and distress. In Alison Liebling and Shadd Maruna (eds.), *The Effects of Imprisonment*. Portland, OR: Willan.

Lutze, Faith E. and David W. Murphy

- 1999 Ultramasculine prison environments and inmates' adjustment: It's time to move beyond the "boys will be boys" paradigm. *Justice Quarterly* 16(4): 709–733.

Maitland, Angela S., and Richard D. Sluder

- 1996 Victimization in prisons: A study of factors related to general well-being of youthful inmates. *Federal Probation* 60: 24–31.

Messerschmidt, James W.

- 2001 Masculinities, crime and prison. In Don Sabo, Terry A. Kupers, and Willie London (eds.), *Prison Masculinities*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Mulvey, Edward P.

- 2006 *Pathways to Desistance Study*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine.

Nandi, S.

- 2002 Re/Constructing black masculinity in prison. *Journal of Men's Studies* 11(1): 91–107.

Newburn, Tim and Elizabeth A. Stanko

- 1994 *Just Boys Doing Business? Men, Masculinities and Crime*. New York: Routledge.

O'Donnell, Ian and Kimmett Edgar

1999 Fear in Prison. *Prison Journal* 79: 90–99.

Sabo, Don, Terry A. Kupers, and Willie London

2001 Gender and the politics of punishment. In Don Sabo, Terry A. Kupers, and Willie London (eds.), *Prison Masculinities*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Schissel, Bernard

1997 *Blaming Children*. Halifax, NS: Fernwood.

Sim, Joe

1995 Tougher than the rest? Men in prison. In Tim Newburn and Elizabeth A Stanko (eds.), *Just Boys Doing Business? Men, Masculinities and Crime*. New York: Routledge.

Simon, Jonathan

2000 The “society of captives” in the era of hyper-incarceration. *Theoretical Criminology* 4(3): 285–308.

Strauss, Anselm and Juliet Corbin

1998 *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. 2nd ed. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Steinberg, Laurence

1999 *Adolescence*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Vandergoot, Mary E.

2006 *Justice for Young Offenders: Their Needs, Our Responses*. Saskatoon, SK: Purich.

Wilson, David

2003 “Keeping quiet” or “Going nuts”: Some emerging strategies used by young black people in custody at the time of childhood being reconstructed. *Howard Journal* 42(5): 411–425.