




This is to certify that the
thesis entitled
**Prison Victimization:
A Study of Sexual Assaults in Male Institutions**

presented by
Nobuhle R. Chonco

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for
Master of Science degree in Criminal Justice


Major professor

Date 11/13/87



RETURNING MATERIALS:
Place in book drop to
remove this checkout from
your record. FINES will
be charged if book is
returned after the date
stamped below.

300 A249

10X 153

ON 0921

FEB 09 1991

025

JUN 24 1991

JUN 06 1991

180-1

APR 11 2000

JUL 26 2008

**PRISON VICTIMIZATION: A STUDY OF SEXUAL
ASSAULTS IN MALE INSTITUTIONS**

By

Nobuhle Chonco

A THESIS

**Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of**

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Criminal Justice

1987

ABSTRACT

PRISON VICTIMIZATION: A STUDY OF SEXUAL ASSAULTS IN MALE INSTITUTIONS

By

Nobuhle Chonco

The purpose of this research was to study sexual assaults among male prisoners. The objectives of the research were to: determine the characteristics of the predators and victims, describe the anatomy of a set-up process and to assess the worthiness of the Importation and Functional models in the explanation of prison violence.

Forty residents and three staff members at New Way In (a pre-release center) were interviewed for a period of +- three months. Questions asked were general in the sense that residents were to talk about the problem of homosexuality in general without being personal.

The findings of this study indicated that the demographic factors such as age, criminal background, previous institutional background, and time served play a role in selecting targets for victimization. Race was found to play a lesser or no role in target selection.

To My Mother -- Gabisile Nxumalo,
my family -- Seshi, Nkuthalo and S'nqob'sile
whose love I will forever cherish

NIMENJALO!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to express my sincere gratitude and appreciation to Doctor David Kalinich for serving as chairman of my Thesis Committee. I am thankful for his immortal and immeasurable guidance and support through the rough road towards this endeavor.

I would also like to thank Doctors John McNamara and Vincent Hoffman for serving on my Thesis Committee, and for imparting valuable knowledge and assistance in the preparation of this work.

I thank also Frank, the Superintendent of New Way In for allowing me to use New Way In as my research site, Harvey Pershey for his cooperation and patience in organizing residents for the interviews, without him this work would not have been possible.

I also appreciate the cooperation of all the residents at New Way In, and for their enthusiasm to participate in the study.

Lastly I would like to thank my husband, Seshi for his understanding and support throughout this endeavor,
GAMBUSHE!

Ivy Goduka for your assistance and patience, you are not forgotten.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
1.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
	1. Statement Of the Problem and Purpose of the study.....	1
	2. Assumptions and Limitations.....	6
11.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	8
	1. Past Research on Prison Victimization.....	8
	2. Set-up Techniques.....	18
	3. Victim and Aggressor Characteristics.....	23
	4. Staff Response to Inmate Victimization.....	24
	5. Effects of Victimization on Victims.....	27
111.	RESEARCH DISIGN.....	32
	1. Research Site.....	32
	2. Research Population.....	34
	3. Research Methods.....	35
	4. Research Objectives.....	38
	5. Definition of Terms.....	39
IV.	QUALITATIVE FINDINGS.....	41
	1. Anatomy of A Set-up.....	58
	2. Summary.....	62
V.	DESCRIPTION OF VARIABLES.....	66
VI.	FINDINGS ON INMATE PERCEPTIONS BY DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS	82
VII.	DISCUSSION.....	103
	1. Recommendations.....	117
	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	119

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	Michigan Penal Institutions Where Residents Were Confined Before NWI.....	67
2	Time Respondents Had Served.....	68
3	Inmate Length of Sentence in Months.....	70
4	Inmate Level of Education.....	71
5	Inmate Advice to New Inmates.....	76
6	Inmate Attitude Towards Aggressors.....	78
7	Post Prison Homosexual Effects Upon Victims.....	79
8	Reasons for Homosexuality in Prison.....	80
9	Respondents' Ranking of General Harrassment, Sexual Intimidation, and Fear For Life.....	86
10	Nature of Problems by Type Of Crime.....	87
11	Nature of Problems by Time Served.....	88
12	Respondents Perceptions Of Whether Race is a Factor in Aggression By Age.....	90
13	Perceptions Of The Type Of Aggressor: Race By Level Of Education.....	91
14	Perceptions How Targets Escape Victimization By Age.....	94
15	Perceptions Whether Councillors Help Victims By Time Served.....	97
16	Perceptions Of Post Imprisonment Effects Of Victimization By Age.....	99
17	Perceptions Of the Effects Of Victimization On Victims By Type Of Crime.....	100

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem and Purpose of the Study.

Researchers who concentrate on victimology seem to ignore the problem of prison victimization. They tend to pay more attention to community victimization. Those few who have attempted to study prison victimization have dissenting opinions as to what cause such victimization. Some scholars like Irwin (1980), Scacco (1975) explain the causes of prison victimization in terms of the Importation Model i.e they believe that the quality of prison inmate adaptation is influenced by the inmate's pre-institutional experiences. Others like Sykes (1958), Wheeler (1961) assert that deprivations imposed by imprisonment on inmates enable them to find inappropriate ways to satisfy their egos in order to cope with the pains of imprisonment (the functional model).

In studying prison victimization, it is essential to note that prisons house individuals against their will (American Correctional Association, 1970). Individuals from different backgrounds are concentrated in such institutions. Toch (1975) mentions that there are situations that some people encounter in life which produce serious coping problems. He cites prisons among other institutions as

being frightening, disappointing, boring to people exposed to them, as being harsh inhuman environments with their enforced intimacy, segregation, uniformity, and routine, separation from love and status. Prisoners in order to deal and cope with the environment develop their own coping strategies either by exploiting other inmates or by trying to win the good faith of the guards. Because prison events are strange, puzzling and abnormal, victimization of some kind should be expected. According to Toch (1975) every stressfull setting has norms which dictate non realistic adjustments. Prisons being stressful therefore generate artificial ways of adjustments, for example, an inmate who wants to maintain his manhood must fight even if this means breaking formal intititutional rules.

Prisons also have myths and these myths are shared by staff and inmates. The myths proscribe feelings of despair, weakness, and vulnerability. They dictate manliness, rationality, invulnarability, and pragmatic orientation. They presume coolness, toughness, and a capacity to negotiate obstacles (Toch, 1976). Men in prison must be manly to confer their status. This is done in different ways, like being aggressive,violating prison rules, and inflicting physical or moral pain on other inmates. Toch (1976) believes that jails and prisons have a climate of violence, where inmates are terrorized by other inmates and therefore spend their lives in prison in fear of harm. Some

inmates request segregation, others lock themselves in their cells and still many others injure themselves or commit suicide. It is a common phenomenon for old prisoners to test new arrivals for manliness. This therefore leaves weak and first offenders vulnerable. Fear in prison is a sign of weakness and makes men fair game for exploitation. An inmate who seeks help from staff is labelled a "snitch" and therefore makes him doubly vulnerable (Toch, 1980).

Toch (1976) believes that as long as there are prisons, there will be situational causes of violence that are likely to persist. He attributes this to the fact that the occasions for violence are built into the circumstances of prison life and into the values engendered by prisons.

Fishman (1934) also believed that the environment of prisons is the major determinant of prison violence because it is such that inmates have to follow the monotonous often boring pattern of prison existence. The study of prison victimization is therefore very important to determine the extent and nature of such victimization.

Since there is a controversy among scholars as to which model (functional or importation) best explains the origins of prison victimization, or whether both models have equal strength to explain victimization in institutions, this research endeavours to address the above mentioned controversy by asking questions that are directly or indirectly related to the models. Both models seem to have

deficiencies. The importation model neglects to account for the processes that the functional model accounts for. For example, it is faulty to assume that there is no "pain of imprisonment" and that such pain has little or no impact on inmates. The functional model deficiency is that it does not take into account pre-institutional experiences and past socialization an inmate may have had or the outside influence an inmate may have from the free society (i.e. newspapers, friends, lawyers and many other things). It is not true that an inmate is free from free community contacts nor is the assumption that all inmates are uniformly dismayed and suffer the same status deprivations. Different kinds of victimization were explored, among others, physical and economic victimization were found to be more prevalent and related, that is, one leads to the other.

The present study identifies the characteristics of race, age, physical appearance criminal background, previous institutional background, and time served. The dynamics of how inmates become involved in homosexuality were investigated. This study also addresses the question of the staff response to prison or prisoner victimization, and the effects of victimization on offenders after imprisonment. Through the information gathered the study makes some recommendations as to what could be done to improve on the existing prison policy, in dealing with the problem of physical assaults. For example, if correctional officers

are trained to formally and informally detect the anatomy of a set up process, for sexual targets, they can be able to intervene at an early stage, thus disrupting the whole process before the target becomes a victim.

This research also describes the process by which certain targeted inmates escape victimization. Concentration of the study is on physical victimization that is sexually related. The research suggests that economic victimization is related to sexual assault, for example, when the target fails to pay his gambling debts or in loan sharking when he fails to pay the escalating interest of his loan (this is more like reciprocity where an inmate for doing or giving something out expects something in return). Sexual assault also results when the predator refuses to accept the rejection from the target or when the victim revenges himself on his predator (this is more like retaliation than reciprocity), or when two predators are interested in the same "kid"(this is more status related than the other two in that the winner will have both: i) status as a good fighter and ii) a "kid".

Different set up techniques are identified. These techniques involve several steps and if a target fails to dismantle these steps by i) minding his business, ii) limiting the number of inmates he associates with,

iii) controls his voraciousness (i.e not to accept anything from anyone), it becomes difficult for him to back off, unless if he decides to fight.

Assumptions and Limitations:

This research assumes that physical victimization is the major victimization in prisons. It results when inmates test one another for manliness or when some provoke others in the manner that requires violence. Physical victimization may also result when gangsters are in conflict or when the bystanders are stabbed without reason except for showing off (predators showing off and trying to get a more manly status).

Another assumption is that neither the importation nor deprivation models can best explain prison violence, except by trying to incorporate the two models. Slosar (1979) refers to this as "The Alternate Society". His model emphasizes the inmate system as a collective problem solving mechanism without necessitating a choice between the deprivation model and importation model. It is based on the notion that the official social structure of the correctional institution fails through oversight, design or limited resources to meet the basic needs of the inmates. It further maintains that an inmate may also bring with him demands or life styles that are in conflict with or go

beyond even the liberal provisions of the institution, in this case a discrepancy exists between the prison policy and the inmate's code of "ethics".

A major limitation of this study is that only residents in a prerelease center were interviewed. They may have been somewhat different from inmates in prisons. Only three staff members from New Way In were interviewed. Their version of the sexual assault problem in prison may also have been different from staff members working in minimum, maximum, and medium security institutions. Prison records were also not reviewed to determine the characteristics of inmates who were mostly given tickets for inflicting pain on other inmates, or for violating major institutional rules. The answers to interview questions by residents reflect their personal observations and personal experiences rather than a social reality. Therefore their answers may have been colored by their own biases which make the results of the study more vulnerable to objectivity.

The following chapter reviews literature. It provides some basic knowledge as to what other scholars have done or failed to do in the field of prison victimology. Most literature reviewed deal with prison violence, prison sexual assaults and the effects of prisonization on inmates. Different kinds of victimization and set up techniques are also mentioned.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Past Research on Prison Victimization

Jayewardene and Doherty (1985) conducted a study on individual violence in Canadian Penitentiaries. They found that homicides by inmate against inmate is higher than staff murder by inmates. According to these authors there were a total of 66 offenders killed while incarcerated in a fifteen year period (the average annual penitentiary population being less than 10.000). They say that in Canadian penitentiaries the homicides rate was an average of 43.62 per 100.000 during the period 1967 through 1981 as compared to 3.74 per 100.000 for the general population of males age eighteen or older for the same period. Most of the homicides occurred in maximum security institutions with a cell capacity of 461.

Jayewardene and Doherty's study correlates with Feld's (1981) study where he found that juvenile and adult institutions that emphasize custody (i.e. tight security control, coercion) to treatment have a higher incidence of violence than those who are treatment oriented. The reason given for this being that inmates try to rebel against authoritative settings by being aggressive towards each

other or towards staff. Similar findings are shown by Sieverdes and Bartollas (1986) in their study of security and adjustment patterns in both juvenile and adult institutions. Based on the above findings one can assume that institutions with tight security, limited inmate movements, and coercive, have more violence than institutions with relaxed methods of controlling inmates.

Sykes (1966), in his study of *The Society of Captives*, identified loss of security as one of the pains of imprisonment. He found that many inmates armed themselves or lived in fear because they lived with other inmates considered dangerous and aggressive. He found that 10 percent of inmates specialized in violence and 30 percent subjected others to manipulations, and 35 percent used both violence and manipulations to victimize their fellow prisoners. Exploitation according to Sykes, is the central element of prison life.

In prisons he studied, Bowker (1980) found that most aggressors were black and victims were white. Unfortunately he did not explain why this is so. Carroll (1974) attributes this (black aggressiveness) to the myth that, white males from the beginning of slavery were accorded access to both black and white females and therefore . . . "in the confines of the prison, the rage of black males at their psychological emasculation is vented against white males" (Carroll, 1974 pp. 181-182). Leger and Barnes (1986)

give a socio-political explanation. They say that blacks in the United States are usually discriminated against on the basis of skin color and as they pass through the Criminal Justice Systems (from arrest by white police officers, trial by white judges, and incarceration in institutions run by white keepers) they view themselves as victims of a white based, oppressive politico-economic order in which the legal system is used to keep minorities in a subordinate inferior status, and therefore when they are in prison they direct their rage towards white inmates. Toch (1977) attributes black inmate aggressiveness towards white inmates to the fact that blacks in the free society are the minority, and therefore victims of the social structure that is dominated by whites, and once behind the walls, the black man seeks to even the score against his white oppressors.

Edward Bunker (1972), like Bowker, found in his study of violence in prisons that violence is caused by racial paranoia. Should a white inmate stab or victimize a black inmate in any way, black inmates seek revenge against white inmates and vice versa.

Most scholars above do not give (as one of their reasons) the assumption that it is possible that white inmates are mostly victimized because they have almost all the characteristics of the victimizable person. Most of them come to prison already expecting to be picked on because of their assumed minority status behind the walls.

Black inmates who are familiar with prison life soon become aware of the scared inmates. Scared inmates import their fear and therefore offer themselves a good chance of being victimized. In prison white inmates are perceived weak until they prove themselves otherwise. Weakness vs strength determines whether or not an inmate (whether black or white) will be victimized. To this Johnson (1976) says "younger inexperienced white inmates usually panic and this therefore makes them susceptible to prison victimization."

Lockwood (1980), in his study on prison sexual violence in New York State Prisons, found that aggressive overtures can be divided into certain categories. These are:

<u>Aggressive Behavior</u>	<u># of incidents in which behavior occurred</u>
1. Sexual Assault	12
2. Other physical violence	39
3. Insulting or threatening language	29
4. Touching or grabbing	11
5. Propositioning only	49
6. Other	8

Lockwood (1980), like many other scholars on prison victimization, found that most aggressive behavior occurred in State prisons (maximum security prisons) for adult offenders (82 percent) out of 152 incidents, and 72 percent took place in jails or juvenile facilities, 77 percent occurred within sixteen weeks after the prisoner entered the

state prison. He therefore concluded that the reception center is the most risky stage of confinement. Brownmiller, (1975) like Lockwood ascertains that rape is usually more frequent in State and Penal institutions where inmates convicted of crimes of violence predominate.

Schwartz (1973) conducted a study in Glen Mills, a penal institution for delinquent boys to determine the role of peer pressure to prison violence. He found that inmates who adhere most to the inmate code were more violent than those who were not. He also found that peer pressure plays a very important role in determining the pattern of victimization (i.e. who will be victimized and why).

Gendreau, et al. (1985) found that institutional misconduct by inmates is the result of inmate idleness. They believe that the incidence of victimization in prisons may decrease if inmates are always occupied, i.e., kept busy. They found that the University of Victoria program (UVIC) had an effect on institutional misconduct of inmates. It had an inverse (negative) effect on inmates who did not stay long in the program, and positive effect on inmates who stayed longer in the program.

Wooden and Parker (1983) conducted a research project aimed at studying the sexual behavior of inmates, especially the dynamics of sexual exploitation and coercion. It was conducted in a medium security penal institution in California. It housed inmates serving short sentences (i.e.

five to seven years) and inmates who have been evaluated by the California Department of Correction's placement board as being less violent. They found that homosexuals are divided into "punk" or "kid", "queen" or "sissy," "jocker" or "stud" and the "homosexual."

The "kid" or "punk" refers to inmates who have been "turned out" or coerced into homosexual behavior. They assume a female role. The "queen" or "sissy" refers to an inmate who adopts the stereotypical version of the submissive partner. He also takes the female role but has adopted the female characteristics and effeminate mannerisms. He regards himself as a "woman" rather than as a man. The "jocker" or "stud" is an inmate who identifies with "masculine" identity and does not consider himself a homosexual because he adopts a male role. He considers his partner a homosexual because he plays a submissive role. The "homosexual" or "gay" takes any role (i.e. with one partner he can play a submissive role and with the other partner he may adopt a male role.

They also found i) that some of the men (about 9%) of the heterosexual men had been sexually assaulted since coming to California prison, (ii) that about 41% of the homosexuals had been pressured into sex, (iii) that some of the homosexuals were sent to prison for less serious offenses and viewed by staff personnel as causing fewer disciplinary problems, (iv) that heterosexual inmates who

were sexually active in prison were just as likely to be married as to be single, separated, or divorced, furthermore, those heterosexuals who were married and received conjugal visits were slightly more sexually active in prison than those heterosexual who were married whose wives did not visit them.

Unfortunately Wooden and Parker's study does not address the question of who become a "kid" and how and what kind of an inmate assumes the "jocker" or "stud" role. In their study it is also not clear whether "homosexuals" adopt an active role in forced homosexual behavior.

Bowker (1979) identifies four general types of prison victimization among prisoners. These are physical, psychological, economic and social. Only two are relevant to this study, the physical and economic victimization.

According to this study physical victimization results partly because of economic exploitation of inmate by inmate.

Physical Victimization:

According to Bowker (1980), this victimization includes assault, homicide, and homosexual rape. He mentions that the prison environment combines a number of different factors into what may be called a "controlled war" which makes victimization easy. These factors include 1) inadequate supervision by staff members, 2) architectural

designs that promote rather than inhibit victimization, 3) the easy availability of deadly weapons, 4) the housing of violence prone prisoners in close proximity to relatively defenseless victims and 5) a generally high level of tension produced by the close quarters and multiple, crosscutting conflicts among both individuals and groups of prisoners. Bowker (1979) also mentions that besides prison environment, prisoners justify their need to take revenge for real or imagined slights or past victimizations.

Physical victimization includes victimization of inmates by staff, of staff by inmates, and of inmates by inmates. Such victimization is caused by many things like loan sharking, gambling frauds, protection rackets and blackmail.

Loan-sharking is related to physical victimization in this way: Inexperienced inmates or inmates not yet "prisonized" (Clemmer, 1958) who borrow money without the realization of the interest rate, may be physically victimized when they are unable to pay back the loan. Part of the loan-sharking system involves the escalation of the interest rate if the loan is not paid back in time, so that the level of indebtedness quickly rises beyond the prisoner's ability to pay. The victim may then have to perform sexual or other illegal services in lieu of payment, or he may be sexually assaulted if he refuses to give in (Bowker, 1980).

Prison gambling involves systematic overcharging, and when an inmate is in debt and unable to pay (as in loan sharking) he is assaulted. Protection rackets provide a guarantee of freedom from harassment in return for regular payments of good, money or services. If the protected inmate fails to pay for services rendered he may then be intimidated, harassed or sexually assaulted. A subtype of protection racket is the blackmail scheme in which inmates pay for protection against having their reputations damaged (Bowker, 1980).

Bowker (1982) gives the following reasons why prisoners choose to victimize or assault one another:

- 1) The desire of inmates to achieve higher status in the prison community, since violent prisoners have a higher status than the non violent prisoners. One way to move up in the status hierarchy is to defeat someone who is ranked above one, thus winning a higher place on the ladder and a better reputation. Hefferman (1972) like Bowker, feels that the search for power and status are the main causes of victimization in prison. He says that in order for an inmate to gain power he must do things that are considered extraordinary by the inmate subculture or he ought to act manly (i.e. he must show aggressiveness to other fellow inmates). Violation of prison norms and failure to obey authorities is one of the many ways inmates acquire status. Brownmiller (1975) says that inmates gain power by

assaulting other inmates. She gave an example of an inmate Smitty who wanted to break his sexual relationship with Rocky. Rocky refused to accept rejection, and so Smitty assaulted Rocky in the shower, and Rocky was dethroned and Smitty acknowledged as a new king of the cell block.

According to Brownmiller (1975) when Smitty became a new king the first thing he did was to command Jon More to smear himself with vaseline, and Jon more bewildered, pleaded "you have power now, Smitty - do you need sex too?" Smitty nodded because he wanted to exercise symbolically and affirm his hard won power.

2) The second reason why inmates assault one another is that, victory in the battle field reassures the winner of his competence as a human being in the face of the passivity enforced by institutional regulations. This is important to prisoners whose manhood (defined as dominance and control over other inmates) is threatened by the conditions of confinement.

3) Defense through offense i.e. prisoners who achieve notoriety as fighters are much less likely to be attacked than those who appear to fear overt conflict. Fighting and winning is valued over than fighting and loosing.

4) Tension release--it can be cathartic to beat someone up. As tension increases, the attractiveness of a good fight multiplies. This psychological reward is a powerful reinforcer for prison rape which provides the aggressor with

sexual release without the time and effort of courtship.

5) Economic gain and the "gate". Violence according to Bowker, or threat of violence can net the aggressor canteen items, appliances, cigarettes, drugs, a willing homosexual partner who wishes to avoid becoming a rape victim. The 'gate' on the other hand, means the possibility of authorities to recommend early release for prisoners who are troublesome, but who are very discrete in such a way that there is no adequate evidence to punish them.

Assaults may also result from sexually related incidents, for example, an aggressor who refuses to accept rejection from the target, or when the victim revenges himself on his aggressor (like the case of Smitty and Rocky mentioned above) or when two predators are interested in the same kid.

Set-up Techniques:

The process of victimization is complex and it involves many prisoners. When new prisoners arrive in prison, there are inmates whose job is to watch for targets, listen to what targets say, find inexperienced and naive newcomers and then report all what they saw and overheard to other prisoners (these inmates are usually paid for this job).

The New Employee School instructor manual for the Department of Corrections in Michigan (1985) lists and

explains different techniques inmates use to manipulate correctional officers. This research suggests that inmates use the same set-up techniques to trap other inmates for sexual assaults or sexual favors.

The inmates use these techniques in selecting inmates for sexual coercion or in coercing them to do anything the predators may want them to do. The size of the set-up team depends on the goal to be accomplished. It consists of the observers, contacts, runners, turners, pointment and a trouble spot (they are not mutually exclusive, one inmate may occupy two or three roles) .

Observers watch and listen to a potential victim. They watch a person's actions and listen to what he says and then decide whether or not he would make a good candidate for selection. They pay particular attention to inmates who are first offenders or first imprisonment offenders.

The contacts supply information about an inmate. They use personal conversations they overheard between that inmate and other inmates. They have to provide information about the victim's work (in prison), his habits, likes and dislikes.

Runners, according to the manual are not active members of the total set-up process but assist to get reward like drugs, money, cigarettes and promise of sex. Turners befriend targets and then use that friendship to coerce victims to engage in any illicit behavior or infraction of

rules. The turner works hard to establish a close bond between himself and the target; using whatever methods to which the intended victim is susceptible. He may do favors for the target thus making him (victim) so dependent on him that the target would not be able to back off when the turner asks for sexual favors.

Pointment stands guard and watches whether the target does sexual favors for other inmates or whether he has a record of being sexually assaulted by other inmates. A trouble spot is an area where sexual assaults take place. It may be a bathroom, shower, gymnasium or cell.

There are several steps involved in a set-up process. It starts with the observation process where movements, words and actions of the victim are observed for selection. Usually a target who appears extroverted, friendly and naive is selected because it is thought that he has a weakness somewhere. Selection follows observation. Any trait possessed by the victim which prisoners can construe as a weakness can result in that individual's selection as a victim. The third step is testing. The victim is tested for any weakness he might have. A largely used method of testing is to leave things (like cigarettes, toothpaste, money or radio) on the target's bed and then watch whether he takes them. If he does not take them the direct method is used where he is given cigarettes or protected without his consent. If still he refuses to accept gifts or to be

protected he is either dropped or 'squeezed' until he gives in. In this stage he is also tested for his level of tolerance and how effectively he can take commands. The testing step is a decisive factor. If the target refuses to be manipulated at this stage or fights, no other inmates will bother him again. In this stage the target either becomes a predator himself or a non predator, i.e. if he succeeds to avoid being a victim he may decide to look for preys himself because he has distinguished himself as a good fighter and so other inmates will know him as such therefore give him respect. If he decides to do his own time without bothering anyone he can do that without any difficulty as no inmates will bother him.

The approach is the fourth step. If the inmate (target) fails the test he is then directly approached. He is commanded to do this and that. The predator in this stage collects back. If the target refuses to pay back, or whatever it is that he is asked to do, he is sexually or just physically assaulted (stebbed). Some targets become willing participants in homosexuality even though they initially were coerced into it.

The fifth step is Actual victimization. In this step the target becomes a victim. He is raped, or asked to commit minor or major rule infractions. If he refuses he is assaulted until he does what he is told to do.

Bowker (1977) maintains that, once the target has been selected, tested, approached and victimized there is no turning back, or he cannot do much about it because of the prison daily routines, where the target is likely to come into contact with the predators. An inexperienced inmate submits to sexual coercion for fear of his life. As he becomes more "prisonized" he learns that in order to survive one must either fight or submit. He also learns that violence is reinforced by a given status and prestige from peers (Veno and Davidson, 1977).

Toch (1979) asserts that an inmate learns over time that the threats to which he is subjected are incidental to his dilemma (adjustment problem). He is (according to Toch) not a serious target for rape but an object of maneuvers designed to test his manliness or coping competence. He learns that he is on trial, the predators and spectators are concerned with his reaction or no reaction to aggressive overtures. The penalty for failure is accelerated victimization. Courage is evidenced by willingness to fight. A person showing fear while he is being tested is diagnosed and classified as unmanly. The victim or target therefore learns assaultive behavior. In this way he escapes victimization.

Victim and Aggressor Characteristics

The literature on Prison Violence usually portray white inmates as victims of sexual assaults by black inmates. This may be so, but ethnicity does not determine whether or not one will be a target or a victim. Rather, victimization occurs as a consequence of one's weakness and one's inability to fight and defend oneself against victimization. The prison life depends on the "survival of the fittest".

Lockwood (1980) says that sexual aggression is concentrated in youth institutions. His interview data indicate that whites become targets because they are perceived to be weak, sexually attractive, and therefore sexual aggression satisfies status needs for blacks.

Victims are younger than predators, they are usually first and first imprisonment offenders, they look scared (a sign of weakness), talk too much because they think it is the only way to fit in, they have feminine features, are perceived to be weak and voracious (voracious in the sense that they like things that do not belong to them or when they find things on their beds they use them without suspecting any foul play).

Predators on the other hand are said to be black (this does not mean that there are no interracial violence problems because in all white/black institutions sexual assaults exist). They tend to be guilty of more serious and

assaultive felonies than victims, are "lifers" or serving longer sentences. Both predators and victims tend to be younger than the prison general population (Toch, 1980).

Lockwood (1980) says that predators select targets who seem to have emotional or psychological problems and who are unable to defend themselves.

Response of Staff to Victimization:

Victims who do report their victimization to staff, according to Weiss and Friar (1974) do not get much help. Most of the victims according to these scholars are told by guards to fight, submit or skip the fence. Some guards respond to sexual assaults they witnessed. This is very uncommon because 1) guards usually show up after the incident, 2) they are outnumbered by inmates, 3) they use inmates to control and guard other inmates in return for overlooking minor infractions, and 4) they are afraid for their own lives. Friar and Weiss (1974) give an example of an inmate Green (a white nineteen year old) who was gang raped in his cell until he became unconscious. After he recovered he thought of a way to solve his problem. He faked suicide and so was removed from his cell to the hospital where he told the authorities about his sexual assault. He begged authorities to remove him from his cell block. He was asked to name his attackers but refused, for

he knew what will happen to him should he "snitch". He was told that in order to survive he must fight, submit, or escape. He was sent back to his cell block where he was raped again, this time a larger number of aggressors. He tried to take the superintendent's first advice to fight, but he was overpowered. He faked another suicide and reported this to the authorities. This time he was removed from his cell block to another cell block. In the new cell block he was told by five inmates that they were going to rape him that night because they knew all about his sodomy acts with other inmates. He thought that because he has been forewarned the best thing to do now was to escape, which he did but caught by police patrolmen and sent back to prison. He was found guilty of escaping and sentenced to three more years in prison. He appealed and stated that the authorities gave him the advice to submit, which he did but was raped again, to fight, which he did but conquered and that the last thing to do was to skip the fence which he did. He was denied appeal.

Lockwood (1980) gives another example where targets are encouraged to use force by the staff members. The inmate said:

The officer with me in the hall--he said "you should have hit him in the nuts" and I said, I'm not a dirty fighter, he said, "that don't make no difference man, you just do that" and I guess after a while I found out that he was right. So after a while, after I took it under deep study, I had the trouble and I hit him in the nuts."

Guards have only two 'solutions' for harassed inmates 1) protective custody or 2) transfer. These solutions are not preferred by many inmates because 1) protective custody means segregation from the rest of the prison population 2) an inmate may have the same problem in prison where he has been transferred. Most victims do not prefer segregation because it is indirectly admitting weakness or because it entails loss of reputation and calls for diminished self-esteem (Toch, 1977).

There is evidence (Lockwood, 1980) that when targets (for sexual harassment) seek help from other inmates they are advised to consider violence as favorable. Men who have never used weapons are supplied with 'shanks' and 'pipes' by their more experienced friends. They are told to fight. Lockwood (1980) gives the following response by one inmate:

. . .and I went out in the yard and I told my brother what was happening. The next thing you know one of my brother's come up and gave me a shank and told me that if a guy come up at me to stick him.

This shows that peers in prison have a greater influence on other inmates than staff members. Some studies show that most inmates do not want to get involved in other people's affairs. Most inmates, studies suggest, help inmates who are their friends or who belong to the same gang group. This also poses some problems when one group revenges against another group, because it increases animosity and greater chances of violence in prison.

Effects of Victimization on Victims

Bowker (1982) propounds that victimization curbs the victim's freedom to act. Some victims become afraid to frequent certain areas of the prison. Other effects of prison victimization on victims include the following:

- 1) feeling of helplessness, depression and vulnerability
- 2) economic hardship because a victim may come to believe that he is a loser in life
- 3) physical injury or suicide--most victims of sexual assaults who were unable to defend themselves because they were powerless or were over powered by gang rapists often think that the way out of this mess is suicide or self mutilation.
- 4) disruption of social relationships--a victim may have difficulty relating to other people especially if they are of an opposite sex
- 5) damaged self-esteem--a victim may come to accept himself as a failure and that he is worthless as a human being
- 6) lowered social status, may develop psychosomatic disease, and
- 7) increased difficulties in adjusting to life after release.

Toch (1977) gives a more psychological view of the impact of victimization on victims. He gives the following effects:

- 1) an individual may feel chronically unsafe or may relieve unassimilated traumas time and time again.
- 2) He may feel unsettled, tense, unsure and hurt.
- 3) He may be unable to face tasks in the present and future.
- 4) His hurtful past encroaches, charging him with being weak or reminding him of the undependability of the environment.
- 5) The future which continues the past may seem bleak.

Summary

This chapter presented past research on prison victimization. It mentioned the characteristics of both the predator and the victim, staff response to inmate victimization and the reasons for physical victimization in institutions. Sykes and Messinger (1950) in their summary of aspects associated with Victimization gave the following factors:

1) Prison environment:

- a) the prison environment is such that there is no freedom for inmates
- b) they are deprived of material comfort

- c) they are not autonomous
- d) inmates have no heterosexual contacts
- e) are physically insecure.

Inmate solidarity is often one of the means of reducing the pains of imprisonment, this solidarity (inmate code) is often in contrast with the formal official prison norms and rules (Glisson, 1982).

2) The organizational characteristics of Corrections--Glisson (1982); mentions the dualistic oriented conflicting functions of corrections i.e. the treatment function vs custody function. The custody function is based on control and punishment. Treatment function on the other hand is based on understanding inmate's problems (i.e. it is considered more permissive than custody function) Glisson (1982) refers to this as a "catch 22" relationship. Feld (1981) also found that the organizational structure of corrections contributes to high incidents of violence among inmates.

3) High security level institutions: according to Leger and Barnes, 1986; Schwartz, 1973; Sieverdes and Bartollas, 1986; Gendreau, Ross and Izzo, 1985; institutions with a formal organizational structure which is characterized by control and constraint have a developed complex informal power structures that are characterized by violence, sexual and physical intimidation.

4) Age: institutions with young inmates are said to have a higher incidence of physical victimization than institutions with older inmates. In institutions with older inmates there is more voluntary homosexuality than in institutions with younger inmates.

5) Institutions with inmates convicted of violent crimes and inmates with a long history of criminal behavior.

6) Time served: prisonization, according to Clemmer (1958) is said to be prevalent on individuals who have been in prison for a longer time. Such individuals are said to be more prone to victimizing or harassing other inmates. This assertion is criticized by scholars like Beron (1985) who in his study of prison violence found that the longer an inmate is in prison, the more he is able to stay clean i.e. he knows how to adhere to the inmate code without violating prison rules.

Wheeler (1961) proposed a theory that revolves around the concept of anticipatory socialization. He divided inmates into three career phases. Those in the 1) initial career phase (i.e. inmates who have been in prison less than six months.) adhere to conventional formal correction values 2) the medium phase (which is a period of maximum interaction with fellow inmates). During this phase there is a strong adherence to inmate values, 3) The third phase (which is a late career phase) begins when an inmate is about to be released from an institution. During this phase

an inmate has a reduced endorsement of inmate values. According to this theory violent inmates are those in the medium phase.

What is discussed above show that there are still dissenting opinions (the major dissenting points being what Sykes refers to as "pains of imprisonment" (functionalists view of prison victimization), and the preinstitutional behavior of inmates (the importation model) as to what cause violence in prison: It may be an organizational structure or the increasing legal power inmates have over prison staff members.

The following chapter presents the research design used for the present study.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

A descriptive case study was conducted. The aim of the study was to determine the extent of prison victimization, and to determine the characteristics of both the aggressor and the victim. By identifying inmates likely to be victims, it was hoped that the Department of Corrections would be able to set up a procedure where correctional officers are trained to recognize the set-up techniques used by other inmates to trap new inmates in prison to involuntarily engage in promiscuous sexual behavior.

This chapter describes the research methods employed in this study. It includes a discussion of the sample, research questions, and the design of the questions.

Research Site:

The research was conducted in New Way In, a pre-release center in downtown Lansing, Michigan. It is located in the YMCA about a half mile from the Capitol. It is on the South Townsend Street about one block from YWCA. It was founded in 1973 to assist offenders to make a sound transition from incarceration to free society by providing vocational assessment, career exploration, direct placement, on the job training and supportive job services.

New Way In provides a residential facility for eligible men and women, who live in Eaton, Clinton and Ingham Counties. It serves men and women who are on probation and those on parole. Men and women who are incarcerated but about to be released into the free community are referred to New Way In.

Participants have to meet the Job Training Partnership Act (J.T.P.A) requirements, some of which include i) inmates should go through employment program, and ii) they should be convicted of a felony. The purpose of this program is to train residents for jobs thus opening job opportunities for them. While waiting for release, residents are helped to find jobs outside New Way In. Residents are allowed to visit their families during days after work or during week ends. A resident who violates any New Way In rule is sent back to jail and eventually back to prison.

New Way In houses about 36 residents irrespective of race, age, and religious preferances. It is considered an open security facility for offenders who are about to be released on parole or after completion of their sentences.

New Way In was chosen as the research site because it houses all kinds of inmates irrespective of age, criminal background, race, and institutional background. This made it possible to compare residents' responses in terms of race, age, criminal background, and institutional background. For example, young residents between the ages

twenty and twenty five had a tendency to respond to certain questions in a particular way (chapter v).

New way In residents were also chosen because it was thought that they may be objective about their views on the extent of physical victimization in prisons, as they are no longer in prison themselves therefore do not fear being labelled "snitches". Besides, peer pressure in New Way In does not have a great effect on residents as it does on inmates in a formal prison.

Most answers to interview questions were based on each resident's individual observation and personal experiences (i.e those who were comfortable talking about their experiences), rather than on social reality (i.e myths about life in prison).

Research sample:

All forty inmates who were at New Way In at the time of the interviews (during the period October 1986 to January 1987) were interviewed. New inmates were interviewed after they finished their orientation program, this was done so that the interviews would not be interrupted by an orientation program. A case worker arranged for the interviews because it was difficult to get residents during the day. Residents were not available before seven (7 pm) because almost all of them had jobs

outside YMCA, and some visited their families after working hours. The case worker knew who among residents would be on the floor after 7 pm. All inmates interviewed were males. Permission to interview them was asked from each individual resident. No resident declined to be interviewed as they all felt that there are some things that should be known about prisons. Most of them said that they participate because they have left so many things inside themselves that they now feel the need to open up.

Research Method:

An interview format was designed to elicit a broad range of information on each subject. It consisted of background questions and open ended general questions. Questions asked were general in the sense that interviewees were to talk about the problem of sexual assaults in general without talking about themselves. Even so, some subjects talked about their experiences to explain certain things. The general questions were asked because an interviewer realized the sensitivity of the subject on which the information was sought. The interview format consisted of the following questions:

1. Introduction:

- a) Explanation of research
- b) How interviewee can help

- c) Interviewee's role
- d) Confidentiality and anonymity

2. Background Questions:

- a) How old are you?
- b) Are you married? If so, how long?
- c) In what prison did you serve time before transferred to New Way In?
- d) What type of crime were you imprisoned for?
- e) Do you have previous criminal records?
- f) What level of education have you achieved?

3. Interview Questions:

- a) What are some of the most difficult problems an inmate has in prison?
- b) Compared to problems in general, how much of a problem is sexual assault?
- c) What types of inmates are typically aggressors (e.g race, age, criminal background, previous institutional background, and time served)?
- d) Are there any characteristics that are common among aggressors (e.g if you were to tell a new inmate what type of an inmate to look out for what would you tell him)?
- e) What types of inmates usually become victims (e.g are they young, white or nonwhite, are they childish, etc.)?
- f) Are there inmates who are targeted as victims but manage to avoid being sexually assaulted?
- g) How do some targets avoid being victimized. What do you

think the differences are between the target who escapes victimization and the one who becomes a victim in terms of:

- i) personal characteristics
- ii) situational characteristics
- h) How do aggressors choose a victim?
- i) What are the different ways to go about winning a victim (are there several steps involved)?
- j) If you were to tell a new inmate how to avoid getting trapped in a sexual set-up:
 - i) what advice would you give him?
 - ii) what things would you tell him to watch out for or what signs should he watch out for that would mean he is being set-up?
- k) Can victims get assistance from:
 - i) other inmates, if so, how?
 - ii) guards, if so, how?
 - iii) counsellors, if so, how?
- l) What are the attitudes of all inmates towards:
 - i) aggressors
 - ii) victims
- m) Where do homosexual activities occur most within an institution?
- n) Why do you think sexual assaults occur in institutions?
- o) What do you think are the general effects of sexual assaults to victims after imprisonment?

All questions were asked as portrayed above. The

questions were rephrased only if an interviewee did not understand the phrasing of the original question.

All interviews were conducted by the researcher. The first few interviews were conducted in the presence of the case worker because residents regarded him as the symbol of confidentiality. The question format consisted of fifteen open ended questions. Structured interviews were not used because the interviewer felt that residents would not get an opportunity to broadly express their feelings, about the problem of sexual assaults in institutions.

Research Objectives:

The study had the following objectives to determine:

- i) The characteristics of the predators and victims.
- ii) The characteristics of a target who do not become a victim
- III) Description of the anatomy of a set up process.
- iv) Development of recommendations for the prevention of sexual assaults.

Information gathered from residents was hand recorded during the interviews. Three to four interviews were conducted on different afternoons. Each interview took one to one and a half hours. Interviews were conducted over a period of three months. It was of interest to the researcher to determine the relationship between age and a

resident's response, race and response, criminal background and response, and, time served and response.

Variables that were measured included the characteristics of the predator and the victim, targets who are targeted for assaults but who do not become victims, staff response to inmate victimization, places where homosexual behavior takes place, and the reasons suspected to contribute to victimization. These variables were crosstabulated with interviewees' demographic factors to see whether there is any relationship between, for example, inmate response and his age, past institutional background and response, race and response.

Definitions of terms:

Victim: A victim is an inmate who is sexually intimidated or sexually assaulted.

Predator or aggressor: A predator or aggressor is an inmate who sexually intimidates or sexually assaults other inmates.

Target: A target is an inmate who is picked up for victimization but who does not necessarily become an actual victim.

Physical victimization: Is a coerced sexual relationship that leads to assaults.

Set-up techniques: These are ways of hooking targets and victims into coerced sexual relationships.

Criminal Background: It refers to a resident's history of present and past criminal acts.

Institutional Backgrounds: This refers to institutions in which a resident served time before doing time for the current offense.

Time served: It refers to the time a resident has already served in an institution.

Weak vs Weakness: A weak inmate is an inmate who looks scared or who is less experienced with institutional life, and an inmate with a weakness is one who likes things, e.g music, food, gambling and so on because these things are later used to "hook" or trap him in a sexual set - up.

The following chapter presents the qualitative findings of this study. The first part of the chapter concentrates on the anecdotal responses of the subjects. The last part summarizes the chapter.

CHAPTER IV

QUALITATIVE FINDINGS

This chapter presents responses given by forty residents who were at New Way In at the time of the interviews, and three staff members who were working at New Way In during the interviews. The staff members interviewed worked in different institutions (prisons) before coming to New Way In. This chapter will first, outline responses given by three staff members (who were working as counsellors and correctional officers) to some preliminary questions asked before the actual interviews with New Way In residents. Secondly, it will present responses given by New Way In residents.

A staff member was asked how much of a problem physical victimization in prison was compared to other problems in institutions. He mentioned that physical victimization is not a major problem because most inmates are concerned with doing their time as clean as is possible. They do that to earn more good behavior credits and therefore early release. He also mentioned that most assaults are not reported by victims for fear of being labelled "snitches". Inmates who want to avoid being labelled "snitches" fake illness or attempt to commit suicide so that they could be removed from their individual cells to the hospital cells (where sick inmates stay until

they recover). It is when they are in these cells that inmates report their problems even though they refuse to give names of their assailants.

The following question was asked from one staff member who had worked in different security level institutions before coming to New Way In.

I. How much of a problem is sexual assault or fear of being assaulted among inmates?

A. Really, it depends on an institution an inmate is in, because some institutions house violent inmates who are serving longer sentences.

I. What does that mean?

A. It means that institutions with younger inmates are institutions with a sexual assault problem. In institutions like Jackson, homosexuality is more voluntary than in Ionia Reformatory.

I. Why do you think that is so?

A. Well ...because with more time in prison, an inmate becomes a willing participant, besides, in Jackson there are older inmates who know how to deal with their sexual problems.

I. Does that mean in Jackson there are no sexual assaults?

A. No, it does not mean that, but comparatively speaking sexual assaults are not that a problem, maybe fights over drugs or something are.

These responses therefore suggest that the degree of sexual assaults differ from institution to institution, and highest among institutions with younger inmates irrespective of the security level of an institution.

Staff members interviewed mentioned three kinds of homosexuality. These are:

1) VOLUNTARY: This type includes inmates who engage in homosexual behavior willingly either because in the free society an inmate was a homosexual or because an inmate want protection from an older inmate.

2) INTIMIDATION: An inmate is sexually intimidated not really assaulted. The term inmates use is "squeeze" i.e an inmate is intimidated to give in. It involves touching, kissing, passing sexual remarks like "your ass looks good" or "I want to eat your ass or pussy".

3) COERCED: Here an inmate is forced to engage in sexual behavior by different inmates or by groups of inmates. Usually an inmate who is subjected to the coerced relationship has some debts he is unable to pay or he has been accepting things from other inmates without realizing that he was being set-up.

Some inmates become prostitutes. These are inmates who engage in homosexual behavior in return for money (Wooden and Parker 1983, refer to this type of inmate as a "sissy"). Such inmates service different inmates and they have really adopted a female role i.e the way they dress up, walk, talk, and so on resembles that of females (though a little exaggerated).

I. What kind of inmates adopt a female role?

- A. It's hard to tell, but inmates who are usually in debts become prostitutes to earn money to pay out their debts and yet some are forced into it.

One staff member at New Way In who had worked in different institutions differentiated in his terms between the "professionally" oriented intimidation and "personalized" intimidation. According to him professionally oriented intimidation is based on an assessment of an inmate whether or not he has prior experience with prison life, and if so how he handled himself in those different institutions. This kind of intimidation is very subtle. The target may not notice that he is being intimidated or "squeezed" into submitting to homosexuality. Usually the target is flattered and made to feel really important among other inmates so that even when sexual remarks are made (to him or about him) he does not take them seriously. The "professionally" oriented intimidation is used by inmates who were gay in the free society and therefore know how to win a target.

"Personalized" intimidation on the other hand is based on luck. The perpetrator may approach any inmate without (or with) any prior knowledge of the target's past criminal or institutional background. He may just stop any inmate (new in prison) and ask for sexual favors with the hope that the target will agree. If this fails the perpetrator tries

different tactics where he will hire other inmates to observe a particular inmate, and tell him about his (target's) weakness and strengths.

The perpetrator then uses the target's weaknesses to get to him. If after using the different approach, still a target does not give in, he resorts to direct coercive approach, where he demands sexual favors, and makes sure that other inmates notice this, so that they too can "squeeze" the target. The perpetrator may also choose to publicly announce that the target is available for sexual favors, when in fact he is not (this is more like vengeance, especially if the target flatly rejected the perpetrator). In doing this the perpetrator knows that the target will be sexually assaulted by groups of inmates, and by luck may turn to him for protection.

When the staff members interviewed were asked about the characteristics of inmates who are both victims and aggressors, the following were responses:

- A. I've seen thin inmates beat bigger guys. I've seen also strongly perceived inmates being raped by a group of inmates perceived weak by other inmates. It really depends on how an inmate handles himself.

* * *

- A. Groups of inmates may sexually assault an inmate of another race just as gangsters may sexually assault an inmate who belongs in another gang.

* * *

- A. There are really no specific characteristics, except that if an inmate shows a certain weakness he is more likely to be targeted for intimidation, or for sexual assaults than an inmate who shows no weakness.

* * *

These responses suggest that the physical structure and race of an inmate does not always determine whether or not he will be a victim or an aggressor, but that, any inmate may become a victim or an aggressor. The two factors mentioned below were said to be necessary but not sufficient to predispose an inmate to coerced sexual relationships. These factors are: i) the weakness an inmate may have (importation), ii) the way an inmate handles himself among other inmates (functional) (that is, if he does not mind his business he is likely to be in trouble). The way an inmate relates to other inmates is therefore very important. It shows other inmates what kind of an inmate he is, and helps other inmates to detect his weakness which may later be used against him. The factors to be mentioned below were said to be prevalent among inmates who become victims. These factors are not mutually exclusive because not all inmates with such characteristics become victims. The factors include the following, inmates who: i) are younger than the general prison population, ii) are attractive, iii) have no experience with prison life (that is, first and first imprisonment offenders), iv) talk a lot, v) accept things from other inmates, and vi) inmates who do not belong to

any organization (gang) are likely to be victims because nobody will come to their aid should they get into trouble.

A "flame" inmate was also mentioned by one staff member as being more in danger than other inmates. A "flame" inmate is an inmate who overtly makes sexual advances towards others. He gave an example of an inmate who comes into a unit where its' inhabitants do not engage in homosexual behavior or where each inmate has a sexual partner, and he makes sexual advances to other inmates, he is himself in danger of being sexually assaulted because his "flames" are uncontrollable i.e he does not respect other inmates. They sexually assault him to tame him.

When asked how aggressors choose their victims they mentioned observation and assessment. The aggressor either hires inmates to observe potential targets for him or he observes newcomers in prison himself. After assessment, the target is directly or indirectly approached. Direct approach involves approaching an inmate face to face by the aggressor and telling him what he wants. Indirect approach involves doing favors for a target like giving him cigarettes, candy, money or protect him from other aggressors. The indirect approach is also used to win a victim i.e to make an inmate trusts an aggressor and to be dependent on him.

Asked whether victims get assistance from staff members, the following were responses:

- A. It depends on whether a staff member witnessed an assault or whether it was reported to him. If he witnessed assault he is likely to act. He may interpret that as a major violation of the rule. He may also write tickets for both inmate involved. Sometime he may put the aggressor in the isolation unit or the victim in the protective custody. If he did not witness an assault he may either investigate or do nothing. If he finds that there was an assault he may choose to write a ticket or may warn the aggressor without writing a ticket.

* * *

- A. Usually inmates do not report problems that involve other inmates. It is therefore difficult to intervene when no assault has been reported.

* * *

- A. A correctional officer may put a victim in protective custody only if the victim wishes so. Most of them do not like protective custody because it is interpreted by other inmates as admitting weakness.

Staff members therefore seem to react to assaults they witnessed or to reported assaults only if the victim asks for protective custody which most of them do not wish.

Inmates had more or less same responses as staff members on questions asked. Some of the residents interviewed gave their own personal experiences in prison. To be mentioned here is that in New Way In there were no homosexual incidents (i.e none were reported or witnessed by staff members or by residents themselves). This may be attributed to the fact that any violation of any rule by a resident results in revocation of his pre parole status, and he is sent back to jail and eventually to prison. Most

inmates therefore do not want to jeopardise their standings. Their responses to questions asked were dependant on their general observations while they were in other institutions other than New Way In. Most of them had been in New Way In for about thirty days.

A general consensus among residents interviewed about factors associated with prison violence was i) racial conflict, ii) revenge, iii) gangs, iv) sexual abuse, v) physical and spiritual alienation. One inmate made the following remarks:

- A. Gangs are the major cause of prison violence. You see, gangs in a joint are street related. I mean if a guy was a gangster before getting in a joint, when he gets in a joint he finds buddies from outside, and team up with them. A guy have to be in a gang inorder to survive...if you are not you are hooped and made a homosexual.

Another inmate felt that racial conflict and revenge are the major causes of prison violence. He said:

- A. Mixing races in prison results in conflict between races because some are more violent than others, and others want to revenge on other inmates for things done to them from the outside.

* * *

Yet still another inmate felt that sexual abuse is the result of mixing older inmates with younger inmates. He also mentioned that sexual abuse by inmates causes problems for the staff members because a sexually abused inmate may retaliate causing more damage to his assailant. This inmate felt that it is "O.K" for the sexually abused inmates to

retaliate. He mentioned that attacking sexually an inmate that belongs to another organization (gang), makes the members of that other organization seek revenge on inmates who attacked one of their members. This goes on and on until many inmates become involved.

Asked what are some of the most difficult problems an inmate has in prison, most inmates responded this way:

- A. You mean problems in a joint ?...Well let me see..., privacy an inmate has no privacy, and he fears for his life, that he may be attacked, especially if he is young and attractive.

* * *

I. Why do you think so ?

- A. You mean you don't know ? I'll tell you why. A guy who looks like a girl in a joint, you know, where there are no girls is a likely victim for rape. Rapists in a joint look for "girls".

One inmate was asked how much of a problem is sexual assault in male institutions. He responded:

- A. You mean rape ?...,it is a problem only if you don't know how to handle yourself. Besides it is a problem only among young inmates. Older guys have ...you know...kids.

* * *

Other inmates responded this way:

- A. It is a problem among young inmates, older inmates have learned to deal with their sexual problems without involving other inmates. Many of them, the old guys have willing partners.

* * *

- A. It depends on an institution you are in. Like in that prison I was in, rapes were not a problem. I was there for two years and I have witnessed only one rape. Mostly homosexuality was voluntary.

* * *

- A. It is a problem and is growing, tree jumpers are rapists. Young boys are molested, squeezed, and threatened. Guards in prison I was in controlled overt sexual contacts. Intimidation though is there.

In response to a question about the types of inmates who become victims the following responses are samples:

- A. Younger guys between seventeen and twenty, weak, scared and those who accept things from other inmates, these new guys don't know that nothing is free in the joint, they see other inmates giving them things and without thinking they eat if candy or smoke if cigarettes. Staying out of trouble is easy when you use your head. But I was once forced to engage in homosexual behavior when I was seventeen. This dude, my bunker, comes to me and say "look man I have been in the joint for so long I miss them girls", I said, "so what"? He said, "I want to fuck you". I said, "hey man you can't do that", he said, "watch me". He threatened to rape me. I had no other choice but to agree. I got tired of being sodomized. You know what I did? I got a stick up. Next time he asked for my pussy I stuck my stick up in his ass. After that he never bothered me again.

* * *

- A. Them fishes become victims, guys too nice, clean cut shy, nervous, stay in their cells most of the time, do not like to be looked at, friendly, talk to much because they think it is the only way to fit in, and guys who take up any guy they consider strong for protection and ask many questions.

I. What kind of inmates are fishes?

- A. Them guys who never were in prison before.

* * *

- A. A guy who comes in a joint with preconcieved ideas about what to expect because he overdoes what he was told to do. Weaker inmates, younger than the rest of the joint population, pretty looking, looks like a girl will be a victim.

According to these responses, inmates younger than the general prison population among other things are good candidates for victimization.

In inquiring about the type of an inmate who becomes an aggressor in terms of race, age, criminal background, previous institutional background and time served, the following was deduced from responses given:

RACE: Usually a weakness is more likely to determine whether or not an inmate will be victimized rather than race.

AGE: Both aggressors and victims are typically younger than the general inmate population with the aggressor as old or older than the victim.

CRIMINAL BACKGROUND: Usually an aggressor has many prior criminal records.

PREVIOUS INSTITUTIONAL BACKGROUND: Most aggressors have been in different institutions and therefore know what to look for in a target or victim.

TIME SERVED: Mostly aggressors are serving longer terms than the general population and have served at least one year and up.

In terms of the characteristics that are common among aggressors most inmates interviewed mentioned the following:

- i) Usually are too nice and overfriendly.

ii.

ot

ii

le

th

iv

ar

cu

fo

re

fu

as

- ii) They give things like cigarettes, money or candy to other inmates.
- iii) They do favors for other inmates, like protecting them, lending them things like radios, television sets, sometime they wash clothes for them, and many other things.
- iv) They touch targets in their private parts , put an arm around the target, or pass sexual remarks like "your ass is cute" etc.

When asked whether there are inmates who are targeted for victimization but who manage to avoid sexual assault the response from all inmates interviewed was YES. They were further asked how those targets manage to escape sexual assaults. The following were typical responses:

- A. The dude who does not let anybody fuck with him does not become a victim. Everybody know him and nobody is gonna shit on him. He know how to mind his business without isolating his ass.

* * *

- A. Them guys who know how to survive without being a pain in the ass on other guys. You see, these guys fight... they have knives if anyone tries to make a girl out of them, they stick a knife in that other guy's ass. So nobody bothers with them because everybody knows what will happen to him should he try to mess with them.

* * *

- A. The guys who don't become victims are guys who do not associate with many inmates, and who know what to do should anyone shit on them. You know, if you are a chicken everybody takes you for granted. If you mess around with everybody someone may take you up. So these guys are like that, they don't want other guys to mess around with them. Some other guys accept things from other guys, these guys do not because they know what follows after that.

From these responses the following concerning their beliefs is deduced:

- i) The targets who do not become victims mind their business and do their time.
- ii) They do not associate with many prisoners.
- iii) They do not accept things from others.
- iv) They fight, therefore have developed respect and reputation for themselves.

Inmates interviewed mentioned that in choosing victims, newcomers in prison are observed and data collected on them i.e information on where they come from, whom they associated with before imprisonment, are they first offenders or first imprisonment offenders, what are they imprisoned for, and for how long, do they know anybody in that particular prison, and what are their hobbies, interests and dislikes. A targeted inmate's interest and dislikes will later be used to set a trap for him.

After observing all newcomers, possible victims are selected and then closely watched. They are then assessed or tested for strength or weaknesses. Testing involves passing sexual remarks to the potential victim, and then wait for his response. If the potential victim ignores remarks, he is then touched somehow i.e in a manner that suggests sexual advances. If still he ignores these advances he fails the first test.

The second test involves giving him things. If he accepts them he again fails the test.

After failing some or all tests, the potential victim is then directly approached. In this stage he is asked to do sexual favors for the aggressor. If he refuses, he is reminded of what he owes whom because he accepted things given him. If still he does not give in, he is victimized i.e he becomes an actual rape victim.

Asked what advice they would give a new inmate in order to avoid getting trapped in a sexual set up the following were common responses:

- i) Do not associate with many inmates.
- ii) Mind your own business and do your own time.
- iii) Do not accept things from anyone except if that someone was your friend, outside.
- iv) Get a knife, or anything you can defend yourself with.

Asked what things they would tell a new inmate to watch out for that would mean he is being set up, the following were typical responses:

- i) Watch out for overfriendly inmates who go out of their way to appease you.
- ii) Watch out for inmates who give you things.

Inmates were also asked whether victims get assistance from: other inmates, correctional officers, and counsellors. The following is the sample of responses:

- A. Guards do not help. If they do, they lock you up i.e put you in a protective custody. It is very seldom that inmates help, if they do it is for manipulation. Counsellors do not help because their job is to counsel us not to get involved.

* * *

- A. Most of the time inmates do not help victims, except if a victim is one of their gang members. Guards do not help because most of the time they come after an incident. If they were aware of the incident before carried out they put the victim in the protective custody, or transfer a victim. Counsellors on the other hand do not know how to help because they do paper work.

* * *

- A. Inmates help guys who help themselves, like he shows some courage of trying to fight off his assailant. If he does not show any courage, nobody will help him. Guards help only if they saw someone screw someone but if they did not, they do not help, since the victim will rarely report the incident. Counsellors do paper work, so they really could not help even if they wanted to.

* * *

- A. Inmates who get help from others are gangsters. Like if there is a guy who fucks around with one of us, we get together and help the other guy or revenge by fucking one of them. Guards when helping put the victim in a protective custody or transfer him. Counsellors do not help because most of them were guards and therefore do not have enough training needed to handle situations like these. An inmate is left with two options, to fight, or commit suicide.

* * *

- A. Guards do help. They talk to the aggressor not to bother another inmate or they lock the aggressor up. They do sometime put an inmate whom they think is in danger in a protective custody. Inmates team up and fight the aggressor. Counsellors, I really do not think they help because they are "frivolous" and they are there to make money therefore are useless except to recommend you for parole to the parole board.

* * *

- A. Inmates do not help because they don't want to get involved. Guards really...mh...no because inmates do not report, if they do, some guards tell them to fight or submit. Sometimes they put an inmate in the P/C but only if he asks for it. They do arrange for transfers too, but this usually does not work because by the time an inmate is transferred, inmates in a prison he is transferred to already know why he is transferred, and therefore become a victim too in a new prison. Counsellors truly do not help because they do not know how.

* * *

From these responses it appears that counsellors do not render much help in so far as the prison victimization is concerned. Not because they do not want to help, but because they do not have power to physically put a victim or an aggressor in segregation or protective custody.

Most inmates interviewed were asked how inmates feel about both aggressors and victims. Most of them felt that aggressors are either admired, hated, ignored or victimized themselves. Victims were either ridiculed, ignored or felt sorry for.

Asked where sexual assaults occur, the responses were: in bathrooms, showers, gymnasiums, cells, closets, hallways, staircases and between buildings. There was no time of a day where assaults are said to be frequent. The night time (before the closure of individual cells) was mentioned as having more assaults because very few guards patrol corridors.

Some inmates did not know what general effects are to victims after imprisonment. Others mentioned the following:

- i) He becomes a homosexual.
- ii) He finds some difficulty readapting to heterosexual relationships.
- iii) He looks for victims himself i.e he becomes an aggressor.
- iv) It depends on an individual, some may be emotionally disturbed and others may just be "O.K".

The following were the most typical responses to the question: Why is there a forced homosexuality in prisons ?

- i) to release tension.
- ii) to gain a reputation or status.
- iii) to have sexual pleasure because there are no girls in the prison.
- iv) to punish somebody.

Anatomy of a Set-up Process.

Different techniques to "set up" targets were mentioned by different inmates. They felt that targets who are familiar with the tricks or games inmates play on each other may not be easily set-up. One inmate was asked how some targets recognize a set up, the following was a response:

- A. It is sure not easy to recognize traps unless if you did time before. Besides, if the guys who collect information on new inmates find out that you are not a "fish" they may not bother you, unless if you were

a "kid" or "punk" in that other institution. Even you can become suspicious if some guys are interested in you or everytime you look around, the same guy is around too, and watching every movement you make.

The steps to a set up process were mentioned as involving these steps: Observation, Selection, Testing, Approaching, and Victimization.

Observation:

Observation was regarded by all inmates as being a first step in a set up process. In this phase there are inmates who are paid by others to watch in-coming inmates and find information on each new comer. The inmates who observe other inmates with the intention of passing information they get to their employers (aggressors) are called observers. The observers watch and listen to what the potential victim says. They collect information on the target. Information on the target's background is collected. Important background information includes the target's past criminal history if any, institutions in which he had served time, the names of friends he might have inside the prison, and the type of crime he is presently imprisoned for. Inmates who are first offenders and first imprisonment offenders are usually the targets. More information is collected on the weaknesses or strengths of the target. The target's weaknesses or strengths are later used to set the target up for possible victimization. Observers use all tactics they know to "hook" a potential

victim. Since during the observation process the movements, words , and actions of the target are observed for selection, the second step involves selection.

Selection:

A target who appears extroverted, friendly, and naive is selected because it is thought that he has a weakness somewhere. Any characteristic possessed by the target which may be construed by other inmates as a weakness can result in that individual's selection as a victim. The following are some of the responses given by residents interviewed.

- A. Usually these guys who look for "fishes" work in groups so that the target won't smell a rat. Guys who are usually selected for victimization are those whose background information is weak. I mean the guys who consciously or unconsciously showed fear, and in trying to suppress that fear he talks too much and try to be nice or friendly to inmates he meets.

* * *

- A. You know, the fishes are picked upon to do all sorts of things by the bulls. If you have never been in prison before, your actions, and movements show, so the guys who know how to detect a fish from bulls waste no time in selecting the other guy for trials.

Selection of targets it appears, depends on the first step (observation) because during the first step the target is studied in depth. Once an inmate has been selected as the target, the third step begins.

Testing:

The third step involves assessing the target on a variety of variables. Information gathered during the first

step is used to test a target. The target is tested for weaknesses or strengths observed during the first step. A largely used method for testing targets is to leave things (like cigarettes, toothpaste, money or radio) on the target's bed and observe whether or not a target will take them. If he does not take them the direct method may be used where he is directly given things. If he still refuses to give in, he is either dropped or "squeezed" until he gives in. In this stage he is also tested for his level of tolerance, and for how far he can be pushed before he breaks down. The testing step is a decisive factor in that if the target refuses to give in or refuses to be manipulated at this stage he fights (physically) and if he fails to fight he becomes a victim. During this stage the target either becomes a predator himself or a non predator, i.e if he succeeded to avoid becoming a victim he may decide to look for preys himself (i.e a victim and the predator reverse roles) or he may decide to do his time without bothering anyone.

Approach:

Approach is the fourth step. If the target fails the test he is then directly approached. In this stage the target is expected to do things for the predator. He may be asked to distribute drugs, or do some things that are against the institutional rules, and may be sexually assaulted.

Actual Victimization:

In this stage the target becomes an actual victim. As in the previous stage, the victim is asked to do things against his will and if he refuses to do what he is told to do he may be assaulted.

The above steps to a set up process do not always take the same pattern, because the subsequent steps are determined by the target's response to the previous step or steps and the predator's interpretation of the reaction. An example is a target who refuses to be manipulated, in this case the steps may end up in the first or second step.

Summary

This chapter looked at the responses of both the three staff members and residents at New Way In interviewed. The general problems in institutions that were mentioned by inmates included i) harrassment, ii) sexual intimidation, iv) fear for life and many others. Sexual assault was reported as being not a major problem, some inmates felt that sexual assaults are prevalent in institutions that house younger inmates. Homosexual behavior in institutions that house older inmates was said to be voluntary rather than forced. Older inmates were reported of having "kids" who engage in homosexual behavior in return for protection.

Many inmates mentioned that race is not a determining factor of whether or not an inmate will be victimized or that he will be an aggressor, but the way he handles himself in the presence of other inmates. An inmate with a weakness or who is perceived weak by other inmates was said to be in more danger than an inmate who is young but not perceived as weak or as having a weakness. Age was mentioned as playing a role in sexual assault in institutions with younger inmates. But in institutions with older inmates younger inmates usually adopt a submissive role (the female role). A victim was said to be usually a first offender or first imprisonment offender who has or has no prior knowledge of life in prison. The aggressor on the other hand was mentioned as having past criminal records, have been in different institutions, have served about twelve months. All inmates interviewed reported that there are inmates who are targeted for sexual assaults but who do not become actual victims, those were the inmates who mind their business, do not associate with many inmates, do their own time, and who fight.

Choosing a victim was mentioned as having several steps some of which are observation, choosing, testing or assessment, approaching, and victimization. Observation involves watching new inmate's movements. Data are collected on them during this stage. Observers collect data on new inmates background, their past and present criminal

and institutional background, the crimes they are convicted for. They try hard to find a weakness and to know what they like and dislike. Selection or choosing a victim involves a selection of a few inmates who seem vulnerable. Those selected are then closely watched. Testing or assessment involves passing sexual remarks to a target and await his response. If he gives no response, he is then touched in a way that suggests sexual advance. If he does not respond that is interpreted as accepting sexual advances. Another test involves doing favors for the target, if for one thing, he accepts things given to him he fails this test. He is then directly approached. During this stage he is asked to do things for the aggressor, from sexual favors to smuggling or distributing drugs to other inmates. If he refuses to do these things he may become a victim of forced sexual relationship, he may also be raped.

The tactic used by aggressors to win victims involves doing favors for them and being nice to them so that in the long run the victim is set up or becomes too dependent on the aggressor that he becomes a voluntary participant in homosexual behavior. Some inmates thought that they could give the following advices to the new inmates in prison to help them avoid set up "traps", 1) to mind their business, 2) fight, 3) not to associate with many inmates, and 4) not to accept things from other inmates.

Guards help victims whom they have witnessed being

victimized. Or with the request of the victim, the guard may put him in a protective custody. Inmates on the other hand help their friends only or inmates who belong to their organization because they do not want to get involved. Counsellors do not help because according to the responses, they do not have power to do so. Beside this, counsellors are associated with "paper" work, like recommending inmates for parole based on their treatment progress records they keep on inmates.

This chapter also addressed the question of the attitudes of inmates toward the victims and the aggressors. Responses got indicated that they are ignored. Inmates reported of having homosexuality in prisons, because inmates are heterosexually deprived, because they want to release tension, for revenge and to acquire status. Sexual assaults or voluntary homosexuality was said to occur in bathrooms, gymnasiums, hallways, cells, stairways, closets, and between allies or buildings.

The following chapter presents the description of variables and frequencies of respondents perceptions on sexual assaults in male institutions.

CHAPTER V

DESCRIPTION OF VARIABLES AND FREQUENCIES

The previous chapter presented the anecdotal responses of the forty New Way In residents and three staff members to questions asked about the problems an inmate encounters in prison, and about questions on sexually related prison assaults. This chapter will present the description of variables used in this study and frequencies on respondents' responses on questions asked during the interview.

Description of Variables: Demographic Factors

There were forty residents interviewed. Twenty were white and twenty were non-white. The non-white group consisted of nineteen blacks and one Mexican-American resident. The minimum age was nineteen and maximum age was fifty-five. The average age was thirty. Of the forty residents interviewed, thirty seven were single and three were married. The single category included the divorced residents (who were three). The married category included the separated residents (there was only one separated resident).

The last institutions where residents served their time before transferred to New Way In were divided into five categories. There were MTU, Jackson, Cusino, Ionia and

Other. The following presents the table of frequencies according to last prison before New Way In.

Table 1

Michigan Penal Institutions Where Residents Were Confined Before Being Placed In New Way In.

Institution	Frequency	Percentage
MTU	1	25.0
Jackson	8	20.0
Cusino	11	27.5
Ionia	6	15.0
Other	14	35.0
Total	40	100.0

Only one resident was at MTU before he was transferred to New Way In, eight residents were in Jackson, eleven in Cusino, six at Ionia and fourteen in the other category. The other category included residents who were in different camp systems including Dunnes, Wing Farm, Jabo Way, Lilly farm, Riverside, Marquette, and many others. For the purpose of analyzing data, MTU category was combined with the other category. Most residents had done their time in almost all the above named institutions, but at the time of their

transfer to New Way In they were in either of the five categories mentioned above.

There were twelve residents who were convicted for violent crimes, and twenty eight for non-violent crimes. The violent crime category included crimes such as murder, rape, arson, armed robbery, assault with the intent to do grivious bodily harm. The non-violent category consisted of such crimes as breaking and entering, drug related crimes, driving under the influence of alcohol, forgery, fraud, pilfering, writing bad checks, receiving stolen goods and driving a stolen car.

The following is the table showing frequencies and time served by residents

Table 2

Time Respondents Had Served At the Time Of The Interview.

Time Served	Frequency	Percentage
under 12 mths	4	10.0
12-24 mths	18	45.0
24-36 mths	14	35.0
36-48 mths	2	5.0
over 60 mths	2	5.0
Total	40	100.0

Table two above indicates that there were not many residents who had served more than thirty six months at the time of the interviews. For analytic purposes the categories were reduced to three categories, category one consisted of those who had served under 24 months, category two consisted of those who had served 24-60 months, category three consisted of those who had served time over 60 months.

Length of sentence in months for each resident is tabulated below.

Table 3

Residents' Length of Sentence In Months.

Length of sentence	Frequency	Percentage
48	1	2.5
60	7	17.5
84	1	2.5
96	1	2.5
120	7	17.5
144	3	7.5
168	4	10.0
180	11	27.5
192	1	2.5
240	3	7.5
300	1	2.5
Total	40	100.0

For data analysis purpose the above values were recoded into two categories. Category one had, less than 144 months. Category two had more than 144 months. Resident criminal records were divided into three categories: previous records, first imprisonment offender, and first offender. There were twenty four residents with previous

criminal records, ten were first imprisonment offenders and six were first offenders.

The following is the table showing the level of education of residents interviewed.

Table 4

Respondents Level of Education.

Level of education	frequency	Percentage
Less than High School	10	25
High School Graduate	16	40
College	8	20
GED	4	10
Other	2	5
Total	40	100

To analyze the variable level of education in terms of other variables, it was recoded into three categories. These categories were (1) less than high school, (2) High School, and (3) post High School.

Description Of Variables: Perceptions

Nature of problems were divided into three categories, (1) harrassment, (2) sexual intimidation, (3) fear for life. Residents who mentioned harrassment such as psychological, where an inmate's mind is tortured psychologically (like when he is told that his wife or girlfriend has a lover), harrassed verbally (like passing bad remarks or calling him names) were put in category one (i.e harrassment). Residents who specifically mentioned fear of being sexually taken advantage of whether psychologically or physically were put in category two (i.e sexual intimidation). Residents who mentioned fear for their lives (i.e of being killed, or stabbed) were put in category three (fear for life). There were 18 residents who cited harrassment (psychological, verbal, etc.) as a major problem in institutions; seven mentioned sexual intimidation and fifteen mentioned fear for life (i.e fear of being assaulted and killed). All 40 residents interviewed mentioned sexual assault as a problem in institutions, though it did not occur frequently because most homosexuality was consented to (voluntary) and a few coerced. It was coerced in the sense that the victim was set-up to engage in homosexuality or his life was threatened, and so he had to involuntarily engage in homosexual behavior.

There were twenty five residents who felt that race is not a determining factor in victimization, fifteen residents felt that race was a determining factor of whether one would be a victim or an aggressor. All forty inmates mentioned age (young vs old) as playing a major role in determining victims. Young inmates were reported to be usually victims and older inmates were aggressors but both victims and aggressors were generally younger than the general prison population. Only three residents felt that the criminal background of an inmate has nothing to do with his being a victim or an aggressor. In contrast thirty seven residents mentioned that an inmate's criminal background has something to do with him being victimized or him being an aggressor. For example, inmates with previous criminal records were mentioned as less likely to be victimized than inmates with no previous criminal record. This is also related to previous institutional background. Inmates who have served their time in different institutions or who were institutionalized before are less likely to be victimized. There were thirty nine residents who felt that the previous institutional background most of the time contributes to the victimization of an inmate, (i.e if he is the first offender or first imprisonment offender).

Time served was considered by 39 residents as contributing to factors which determine a victim and an aggressor. That is, most aggressors had served more than

180 days and victims less than 180 days. Twenty residents felt that there are no overt common characteristics among aggressors and twenty residents mentioned that there are overt common characteristics among aggressors. The most common overt characteristic mentioned by these residents was "doing favors" for the target. The physical appearance was mentioned by thirty nine residents as being a determining factor of whether an inmate would be a victim or an aggressor. By physical appearance it was meant the weakness or strength of an inmate, whether an inmate appeared to be a "chicken" or a "bull". The term weakness was also used to refer to the weakness an inmate might have, for example, if he likes candies or likes cigarette smoking or anything that he likes was used against him (i.e other inmates would use his interests to get to him or to set him up for involuntary homosexuality or to make him a drug distributor).

All forty residents interviewed felt that there are inmates in institutions who are targeted for sexual victimization, but who do not become actual victims. The inmates who escape victimization were mentioned by fifteen residents as being the fighters, by twenty residents as minding their business, by only one inmate as not associating with others, and four residents fell in the other category.

Thirty nine residents mentioned observation as a first step to choosing a victim. These residents mentioned that

inorder to choose among many new comers in prison, observation is necessary but not sufficient. Observing newcomers was mentioned as enabling aggressors to collect data on some newcomers after observing their behavior in relation to other inmates.

For a variable "winning a victim", three categories were developed. There were (1) protect him, (2) give him things, and (3) other. Thirty six residents mentioned giving a target things as used to win him (target). Two residents in each of other two categories mentioned winning a victim involves protecting a victim, washing his clothes and being nice to him.

The following is the table showing resident responses to the question about the advice they could give a new inmate in prison to stay out of trouble from other inmates.

Table 5

Advice Respondents Could Give to Newcomers in Prison.

Advice	Frequency	Percentage
Mind your business	9	22.5
Fight	3	7.5
Fight & mind your business	18	45.0
Other	10	25.0
Total	40	100.0

Forty five percent of the residents interviewed mentioned that they could advise newcomers to fight and mind their business. Doing one's own time was considered very important, because that way one minds his business and stay out of trouble and therefore acts only when one is personally singled out. Thirty four inmates (about 85%) felt that they could tell newcomers to watch out for inmates who do favors for them (newcomers) and who are too nice (overfriendly) to them. These things (do favors, and overfriendly) were said to be used by aggressors to set up inmates for sexual victimization.

There were 29 residents (72%) who felt that inmates do not get help from other inmates, there were four (10%)

residents who felt that inmates help other inmates if victimized, there were seven (17%) inmates who felt that inmates help inmates who are their friends or who belong to the same organization or gang as them. Thirty three (82.5%) residents mentioned that guards do not help victims because victims do not report their assailants, four (10%) mentioned that guards do help by putting a victim in protective custody or by transferring the aggressor or victim to the other institution, three inmates (7.5%) felt that guards help victims only if they witnessed assaults otherwise they do not help. To analyse this variable the "yes" and "other" category were combined. Thirty six (90%) residents reported that counsellors do not help victims because they do not have power to do so as they do paper work. One (25%) resident felt that counsellors do help victims. Only three (7.5%) mentioned that counsellors help victims only if they ask for help.

The following is the table showing inmate attitude towards the aggressors.

Table 6

Inmate Attitude Toward Aggressors.

Inmate attitude	Frequency	Percentage
Feared	4	10.0
Admired	1	2.5
Hated	5	12.5
Other	10	75.0
Total	40	100.0

The other category consisted of responses such as ignored, don't know, not sure. Seemingly, aggressors are not so much admired as they are ignored.

There were twenty three (57.5%) residents who felt that victims are ignored, and 17 (42.5%) residents who felt that victims are ridiculed or taken advantage of by other inmates.

The following table shows the responses of residents interviewed on effects of victimization on victims.

Table 7

Post Prison Homosexual Effects Upon Victims.

Effects	Frequency	Percent
Don't know	14	35.0
Become aggressors	3	7.5
Become homosexual	3	7.5
Readapting to heterosexual behavior	10	25.0
Other	10	25.0
Total	40	100.0

To analyse the variable "effects of victimization" relative to others, two categories were developed. These categories were: the category for those who did not know, and the category for those who gave the specific effects.

There were different reasons given by the residents of why there is homosexuality in prisons. The following table shows the frequencies and responses of the residents.

Table 8

Reasons Given By Residents For Homosexuality In
Institutions.

Reasons	Frequency	Percent
Heterosexual deprivation	14	35.0
Release tension	13	32.5
Status	11	27.5
Other	2	5.0
Total	40	100.0

Thirty five percent residents thought that homosexual behavior in institutions occurs because of heterosexual deprivation and 32.5% felt that homosexuality is used to release tension and 27.5% felt that homosexuality or sexual abuse is used to acquire status, only 5% fell in the other category which included the don't know and imported homosexuality from the free society responses.

Thirty (75%) residents mentioned that sexual assaults take place in bathrooms and gymnasiums and 10 (25%) mentioned that it occurs in cells, closets, and hall ways (the Other category).

The following chapter deals with the findings based on crosstabulations between variables. It concentrates on crosstabulating the inmates perceptions by their demographic factors.

CHAPTER VI

FINDINGS ON INMATE PERCEPTIONS BY DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS

The previous chapter presented the frequencies and the description of variables. This chapter deals with the perceptions of respondents on the variables that were described in Chapter V. The variables described in the previous chapter are: age, institution where residents were confined before transferred to New Way In, marital status, type of crime, time served, length of sentence, level of education, frequencies of respondents on whether sexual assaults are a problem in institutions, on characteristics of the aggressor and the victims, characteristics of the target who does not become a target and on advice each respondent could give on a newcomer to help him avoid sexual assaults. Where the difference did not exist between the perceptions and residents' demographic factors, a crosstabulation is not presented. Only crosstabulations that reveal significant differences are shown in this chapter. Respondents' demographic factors that were used include those that had variation. For example, a demographic factor 'marital status' had only 3 respondents who were married or separated and 37 who were single or divorced. In this case no variation exist therefore

'marital status' could not be used for crosstabulations. Some variables (like the demographic factor 'marital status') whose answers by respondents lacked variation were also not included. All respondents (40) mentioned sexual assault as a problem, all respondents said that usually the aggressor is older than the victim, that his criminal background also plays an important part in his aggressiveness, that his previous institutional background is a factor in his aggressiveness, and that time he had served in the institution also facilitates his aggressiveness.

For victim characteristics, all respondents mentioned that age of the victim is one of the factors that contribute to his victimization i.e the younger he is the more he is susceptible to victimization by older inmates. The victims' criminal background was also mentioned by 35 respondents as being also a factor in victimization i.e if the inmate does not have prior criminal backgrounds, or has never been in prison before he is more likely a target than those inmates with prior criminal and institutional background.

All respondents mentioned that there are inmates who are targeted for sexual assaults but who do not become victims. Thirty nine respondents mentioned that there are several steps used to choose a victim. Thirty six respondents mentioned that aggressors win victims by giving them things.

All the variables and answers given above were not included for crosstabulations because there was little or no diversity in respondents' answers.

The demographic factor 'length of sentence in months', though used for crosstabulations, did not have an impact on all the respondents answers therefore was excluded.

Respondents' Perceptions of major Problems that Exist in the Institutional Community.

Here, respondents were asked to indicate what major problems they felt exist between inmates in the prison community. In the interviews, the respondents focused upon three general problems that seemed to prevail. The problems mentioned were 1) verbal and psychological harrassment from their fellow inmates, sexual intimidation, and fear for ones life. The respondents' age, last institution prior to transfer to New Way In (NWI), and respondents' level of education had no impact upon respondents' perception of the major problems that exist in the prison environment.

However, respondents' race, type of crime (dichotomized as violent/nonviolent), and time served did have an impact on their views of the predominant institutional problems. As shown in table 9 below, nonwhite inmates saw the threat to ones life as a more significant factor than sexual intimidation or general harrassment, while white inmates

ranked general harrassment as the major concern, fear for ones life as the secondary concern, and sexual intimidation as the lowest order problem. Seventeen percent (7) of both groups, 10% (2) of the white respondents and 25% (5) of the nonwhite respondents considered sexual intimidation a problem. Therefore nonwhite respondents considered sexual intimidation more of an institutional problem than did their counter parts. This finding is surprising as one would expect white inmates to consider sexual intimidation a problem as most literature (Bowker 1980, Scacco 1980, Toch 1979) potray white inmates as victims and nonwhite inmates (especially black inmates) as pepertrators (aggressors). To support literature on this aspect one would expect the majority of white inmates to rank sexual intimidation as a number one major problem.

Table 9

Respondents' Ranking of General Harrassment, Sexual
Intimidation, and Fear For Life By Race.

	White		Nonwhite	
	n	%	n	%
Harrassment	13	65.0	5	25.0
Sexual Intimidation	2	10.0	5	25.0
Fear For Life	5	25.0	10	50.0
Total	20	100.0	20	100.0

chi-square=6.50794 df=2 significance=0.0386

Table 10 below, shows the effect of respondents' type of crime they committed on their perceptions of environmental problems in prisons. Respondents who were convicted for committing violent crimes (67% (8)) generally felt that general harrassment was the greatest problem faced by inmates, while 50% (14) nonviolent inmates felt that fear for ones life was the most pressing problem among inmates.

Table 10

Respondents' Perceptions Of The Nature of Problems By Type Of Crime.

	Violent		Non violent	
	n	%	n	%
Harrassment	8	67	10	36
Sexual Intimidation	3	25	4	14
Fear for life	1	8	14	50
Total	12	100	28	100
chi-square=6.22827 df=2 significance=.0444				

It appears from table 11 below, that respondents who had served 24-60 months of their sentences 67% (12) regarded harrassment as a major problem, while those who had served time below 24 months considered fear for ones life a major problem. From table 11 below, it appears that the longer the time respondents had served the more they were concerned with harrassment and less concerned with sexual intimidation and fear for life.

Table 11

Respondents' Perceptions Of The Nature Of Problems By Time Served.

	Less than 24 months		24-60 months	
	n	%	n	%
Harrassment	6	27.3	12	66.7
Sexual Intimidation	6	27.3	1	5.5
Fear For Life	10	45.5	5	27.7
Total	22	100.0	18.0	100.0

chi-square=12.2987 df=2 significance=0.0153

Type Of Aggressors

The following section deals with the perceptions of the respondents regarding the type of an inmate who becomes an aggressor.

Respondents' Perceptions Whether Race is a Factor in an Inmate's Aggression.

Respondents were asked to respond to the question about the type of an inmate who is likely to be an aggressor. It

was specifically asked that the respondents indicate whether an inmate's race determines an aggressor. Respondents' race, last institution before NWI, type of crime, and respondents' time served in institution made no difference on the answers they gave.

However, respondents' age, and his level of education did make a difference. Table 12 below, shows that the majority of older inmates i.e those in the age groups 26-34 and 35-55 (73% (11) and 91% (10)) felt that race is not a determining factor for an inmate's aggression. Younger inmates in the age group 19-25 (71% (10)) on the contrary considered race as a factor in aggression. It appears that the older an inmate becomes the more he sees race as not a determining factor in an inmate's aggression.

Table 12

Respondents' Perceptions of Whether Race is a Factor in Aggression By Age.

	19 - 25		26 - 34		35 - 55	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
No	4	28.6	11	73.3	10	90.9
Yes	10	71.4	4	26.7	1	9.1
Total	14	100.0	15	100.0	11	100.0

chi-square=11.42 df=2 Significance=0.0033

As reflected in table 13 below, respondents' level of education had an impact on the respondents' answers. From table 5 it can be seen that the majority of respondents with post high school education (86% (12)), followed by those who had less than high school education (60% (6)) felt that race is not a factor in aggression. Only 56% (9) of those with high school education considered race as a factor in aggression.

Table 13

Respondents' Perceptions Of the Type Of Aggressor -Race by Level Of Education.

	Less Than H.S.		H.S. Grad.		Post H.S. Edu.	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
No	6	60.0	7	43.8	12	85.7
Yes	4	40.0	9	56.2	2	14.3
Total	10	100.0	16	100.0	14	100.0

chi-square=5.64571 df=2 significance=0.0594

Common Characteristics Among Aggressors

The following section tries to determine whether respondents perceived common characteristics among aggressors.

Respondents' Perceptions Of the Common Characteristics Among Aggressors.

When respondents' answers on the question about the common characteristics among aggressors were crosstabulated by respondents' demographic factors, such as race, age, last

institution before NWI, type of crime, time served and the respondents' level of education, no significant difference was found. We can therefore say that residents' demographic factors had no impact on the residents' answers.

Victim Characteristics

The following section tries to determine whether there are characteristics among victims that make them more susceptible to victimization than other inmates.

Respondents' Perceptions of Whether Race and Time Served by inmates Are Factors in Victimization.

Here, respondents were asked to indicate whether race and time served are factors in victimization. The respondents' race, age, last institution before NWI, type of crime, time served, and respondents' level of education did not have an impact on respondents' answers.

Respondents' Perceptions On How Some Targets Escape Victimization.

Respondents were asked to indicate how some targets escape victimization. In the interviews, inmates focused on three perceptions. These perceptions were 1) they fight 2)

they mind their business and 3) other i.e the answers that did not fit to the above two categories were put in the other category. The respondents' race, last institution before NWI, type of crime, time served, and respondents' level of education did not impact the respondents' perceptions of how some targets escape victimization.

However, age of the respondent did have an impact on the respondents' answers. Table 14 below reflects that respondents in the age group 35-55 (55% (6)) perceived that targets who escape victimization are those who fight, while respondents in the age group 26-34 (53% (8)) considered that targets who do not become victims are those who mind their business.

Table 14

Respondents Perceptions Of How Targets Escape Victimization
By The Respondents' Age.

	19-25		26-34		35-55	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
They fight	7	50	2	13.3	6	54.5
Mind their business	7	50	8	53.3	5	45.5
Other	0	0	5	33.3	0	0.0
Total	14	100	15	100.0	11	100.0

chi-square=12.18384 df=4 significance=.0160

Advice Respondents Could Give Newcomers In Prison.

Here, respondents were asked to indicate the advices they could give a newcomer in prison to avoid sexual assaults. Advices mentioned by respondents were 1) could tell him to mind his business, 2) to fight, 3) to fight and mind his business and 4) other categories that could not be categorized. Respondents' age, last Institution before NWI, type of crime, time served, and respondents' level of education made no difference in answers they gave.

Victim Assistance From Other Inmates

Respondents were to respond to the question "Do victims get help from other inmates?" Respondents' answers focused on two responses: "No" and "conditional". By conditional they meant that some of the inmates who help others do so to later manipulate the victim. Respondents' race, age last institution before NWI, type of crime, time served, and respondents' level of education did not impact the residents answers.

Victim Assistance From Guards

Here, respondents were asked whether victims get help from guards. The answers they gave were "No" and "Conditional". By conditional they meant that guards respond to victimization they witnesses or when the victim asks to be put in the protective custody (i.e asks to be separated from other inmates). Respondents' race, age, last prison before NWI, Type of crime, time served, and level of education were not significant i.e they had no effect on respondents' answers.

Victim Assistance From Councillors

Here, respondents were to indicate whether councillors help victims. Responses were "No" and "Conditional". By conditional they meant that the councillor can only respond to victims (their clients) who ask for their help by recommending early release. Respondents' race, age, last prison before NWI, type of crime, and respondents, level of education did not have an impact upon respondents answers. However, time served did make a difference.

Table 15 below shows that almost all respondents (those who had served under 24 months and more than 24-60 months) felt that councillors do not help victims. The majority of respondents 94% (17) of those who had served time between 24 months and 60 months considered that councillors do not help victims.

Table 15

Respondents' Perceptions Whether Councillors help victims by Time Served.

	under 24 months		24 - 60 months	
	n	%	n	%
No	19	86.4	17	94.4
Conditional	3	13.6	1	5.6
Total	22	100.0	18	100.0

chi-square=5.66 df=1 significance=0.0591

Respondents' Perceptions of the Inmate Attitudes Towards Victims.

Here, respondents were asked to mention the attitudes of the other inmates towards victims. The answers were: ridiculed and Other. Respondents' race, age, last prison before NWI, type of crime, time served and respondents' level of education had no impact on respondents' answers.

Post Imprisonment Effects Of Victimization on Victims.

Respondents were asked to indicate the post imprisonment effects of victimization on victims. In interviews, some respondents did not know the effects, some gave specific effects and others were not sure.

Respondents' race, last prison before NWI, time served, and level of education had no effect on the respondents' answers. However, age and type of crime were significant.

Table 16 below indicates that the majority of respondents (73% (8)) in the age group 35-55, specified effects of victimization on victims after imprisonment, and that most respondents (57% (8)) in the age group 19-25 did not know the effects of victimization on victims. There was no difference in perceptions for those in the age group 26-34.

Table 16

Respondents' Perceptions Of Post Imprisonment Effects Of
Victimization By Residents' Age.

	19-25		26-34		35-55	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Don't Know	8	57.2	5	33.4	1	9.1
Specific Effect	3	21.4	5	33.3	8	72.7
Not Sure	3	21.4	5	33.3	2	18.2
Total	14	100.0	15	100.0	11	100.0
chi-square=9.09477 df=4 significance=.0588						

As shown in table 17 below, the majority of respondents (67% (8)) who had committed violent crimes did not know the effects of victimization, and the majority of respondents (50% (14)) who had committed nonviolent crimes gave specific effects (see chapter v).

Table 17

Respondents' Perceptions of the Effects of Victimization on Victims by Type of crime.

	violent crime		non violent crime	
	n	%	n	%
Don't know	8	66.6	6	21.4
Specific effects	2	16.7	14	50.0
Other effects	2	16.7	8	28.6
Total	12	100.0	28	100.0
chi-square=7.72 df=2 Significance=0.02				

Motivation For Homosexuality

Respondents were asked to indicate what motivate inmates to engage in homosexual activities in institutions. The most frequent responses were: 1) heterosexual deprivation, 2) tension release, and 3) status. Respondents' race, age, last prison before NWI, type of crime, time served and level of education were not significant. This means that respondents' demographic factors had no impact on the residents' answers they gave

Places for Homosexuality

Here, respondents mentioned that homosexual activities take place in bathrooms and gymnasiums, and in other places. Respondents' race, age, type of crime, time served, and respondents' level of education did not impact respondents' answers.

Summary

From the above discussion it becomes clear that many of the respondents' demographic factors did not affect the respondents answers. We may therefore conclude that respondents perceptions and views obtained through the interview process were not effected by demographic variables. The following demographic factors did not have an impact upon residents' answers on the nature of problems in prisons: Age, last prison before NWI, and the level of education.

For the residents perceptions of the type of the aggressor, race, last institution before NWI, type of crime, and time served, made no difference in respondents' answers, but respondents' age and his level of education did make a difference. The majority of inmates in the age group 35-55, considered race as not a factor in aggression, and inmates with high school education tended to report that

race is not a factor in aggression. Respondents' perceptions on common characteristics of aggressors were also not effected by residents' race, age, last institution before NWI, type of crime, time served and the level of education.

All residents' demographic factors had no impact on the residents perceptions of victim characteristics, advice to give a newcomer, victim assistance from other inmates, and from guards, inmate attitude towards victims and post imprisonment effects of victimization on victims.

The following chapter deals with the discussion of the present study relative to other research findings in the same field.

CHAPTER VII

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this research was to determine the characteristics of an aggressor and a victim of sexual assaults in prisons. A set-up process by which inmates set each other up for coerced sexual relationship was also explored. The two models (Importation and Functional Models) that explain the origins of prison victimization were assessed in terms of the answers given by inmates to some questions asked.

According to the responses obtained, race does not determine the aggressiveness of an inmate nor victimization of an inmate. More than half residents interviewed maintained that a weakness of an offender is the major determinant of whether or not an inmate would be victimized. On the contrary in past research on prison victimization, though it is mentioned that weak inmates are usually victims, the literature stresses that white inmates are victims and blacks aggressors. The results of this study do not support the conclusion that white inmates are victims and black inmates aggressors. Demographic variables for residents interviewed were crosstabulated with responses obtained from the residents. Some differences were found to exist in resident responses when considering their time served, length of sentence, previous institutional

background, last institution before New Way In, age, and the level of education.

The results of this study shows that violent incidents are present in almost every institution. Institutions with younger inmates (irrespective of whether they are high or minimum security levels institutions). Responses obtained from residents who were at Jackson before they were transferred to New Way In, incidents of violence were very rare especially because homosexual activities were consented to by both parties concerned. It seems that residents who were at Jackson consider harrassment as a major problem an inmate might have rather than sexual intimidation. Inmates who were at Ionia mentioned sexual intimidation as a problem especially among young inmates. The difference in responses between inmates who were at Jackson and those who were at Ionia may be attributed to the fact that though both institutions are high security levels, Jackson houses older inmates than Ionia, and sexual assaults are reported to be concentrated in institutions with youthful offenders. The findings of this study do not coalesce with Feld's study on a comparative analysis of organizational structure and inmate subcultures in juvenile institutions, where he found that juvenile and adult institutions that emphasize tight security control and coercion have more violence incidents than those that emphasize treatment. The difference in findings may be due to the fact that Feld's study (1981)

used both questionnaires and interviews to collect data on both the staff members and residents and he had a larger sample than the present study. Both studies did not use prison records as additional sources for data.

Bowker (1983) conducted a study on prison victimization where he found that most aggressors were black and victims white. This study did not find that whites are victimized by black inmates, rather that any inmate perceived to be weak by other inmates or has a weakness becomes a target for victimization.

In trying to determine the characteristics of an aggressor and a victim in terms of race, age, criminal background, previous institutional background, and time served, almost all residents interviewed mentioned that demographic factors like the above (except perhaps race) play a role in victimization and in aggression. This therefore suggests that an inmate becomes a victim because of the configuration of factors that make him vulnerable to victimization. The problem with these configured factors is that they are not mutually exclusive. For example, an inmate may be young but his past criminal behavior may be such that it scares off the aggressors, or he may have no institutional background but may have hardened criminals as friends he knew from outside (free society) and therefore may not be victimized. Many researchers (as already mentioned above) like Bowker (1980), Carroll (1974), Leger

and Barnes (1986), and Scacco (1974) whose research findings suggested that whites are victims, neglected to mention that though black inmates are overrepresented in institutions, they are not the only aggressors. That black inmates are not the only aggressors in institutions suggests that all ethnic groups are equally vulnerable to victimization if they possess characteristics associated with weakness. For example, an inmate who is weak is target number one. The chances of a weak (look scared) inmate to be victimized are very high when he is young and attractive, he is a first offender, or first imprisonment offender, he is not a gang member, frightened and greedy. It is therefore faulty to make an assumption that white inmates are the only victims of black inmate sexual assaults. If that was so one would expect segregated institutions to have no sexual or coerced sexual relationships.

The findings suggest that in institutions with older inmates, younger inmates than the general inmate population are victims. Most of the younger inmates are usually victims of the coerced sexual relationship i.e the younger inmate engages in a sexual relationship involuntarily. The victim who engages in a coerced sexual behavior may do so because he fears that an aggressor will make his life in prison miserable. By engaging in a homosexual relationship the victim at least is protected by his "man" against rape by other inmates.

The findings of this study that age plays a role on who will be victimized, correlate with the findings by Bowker (1980), Brownmiller (1975), Bunker (1972), Jayewardene and Doherty (1985), Johnson (1976), Lenger and Barnes (1986), Lockwood (1980), Schwartz (1973), Siervedes and Bartollas (1986), and Toch (1980). It has been mentioned above that factors like time served, criminal background, previous institutional background, are not mutually exclusive, this study found that the criminal background of an inmate plays a role in victimization, but that if one's criminal background consists of petty crimes or non violent crimes, he is just as vulnerable to victimization as an inmate without previous criminal records. The same thing applies to previous institutional background. For example if an inmate in previous institutions was a victim, he would be a victim in the present institution until he proves himself otherwise. Because there are inmate observers in prison whose job is to collect information on new inmates, information about an inmate's institutional background spreads quickly and makes a new inmate susceptible to repeated coerced sexual relationships.

Scacco (1975) conducted a study on rapes in prison where he found that inmates who are susceptible to rape are those whose previous and present offenses include rape, child abuse or child molestation, and incest. The present

study though it did not specifically isolate victims' present and previous offenses, the responses obtained suggested that any inmate who is perceived weak or has a weakness is vulnerable to victimization irrespective of his past and present criminal behavior.

Lockwood (1980) conducted a study on prison sexual violence and found that most aggressive behavior occurred in State prisons for adult offenders and in juvenile facilities. He found that most victimization occurred within sixteen weeks after the prisoner entered the State prison. He therefore concluded that the reception center is the most risky stage of confinement. The findings for the present study like Lockwood's study suggest that new inmates who have served time less than six months are more vulnerable to victimization, because they are often confused, frightened and anxious. Support was not found that most aggressive sexual violence occur in maximum security institutions, rather it occurs in all security level institutions but more so in institutions with youthful offenders.

This study found that there are inmates who are targeted for sexual victimization but who do not become actual victims. Such inmates fight and or mind their business. An inmate who fights and wins attains status and reputation, and therefore aggressors are scared off. An inmate who fights and wins at this point may become an

aggressor or may abide to the institutional rules without isolating himself from other inmates. An inmate who fights and loses is either taken advantage of by other inmates who may sodomize him or he is ignored.

Bowker (1982) gave reasons why inmates victimize each other. Some of these reasons are:

- 1) the desire to achieve a higher status in a prison community because violent inmates have a higher status than non violent inmates.
- 2) fighting and winning reassures the winner of his competence as a human being in prison.
- 3) defence through offence i.e prisoners who achieve notoriety as fighters are much less likely to be attacked than those who appear to fear overt conflict.
- 4) tension release. It is cathartic to fight someone or to make another person's life miserable.
- 5) economic gain and the gate. Violence or threat of violence makes an aggressor boastful to other inmates. Other inmates may give him things like cigarettes, drugs or may get a willing homosexual partner. By the "gate" Bowker meant the possibility of authorities to recommend early release for troublesome prisoners who are very discrete in such a way that there is no adequate evidence to punish them.

The present study found that though some inmates are concerned with achieving a higher status and reputation in

prison, the high status achievement works the other way round. The aggressor does not achieve a higher status by victimizing other inmates (he is just ignored). Rather, a victim who fights back his aggressor (and wins) attains status and reputation. This way he never becomes a victim again. At this point a victim who fought and won may decide to be an aggressor himself or a non aggressor. If he decides to be an aggressor the chances are he may be a victim again as he may be overpowered by a group of inmates.

Among reasons mentioned by residents interviewed why there is rape and forced homosexual relationships in prison, heterosexual deprivation and tension release were most frequent reasons mentioned. This leads us to the arguments about importation and functional models of prison violence. The findings suggest that though inmates import some of their behavior from the free society, an institutional environment plays a greater role in victimization. Toch (1977) to this says:

"... institutions (prisons) are frightening, disappointing, boring to people exposed to them, are harsh human environments with enforced intimacy, segregation, uniformity and routine, separation from love and status....to deal and cope with the environment, prisoners develop their own coping strategies either by exploiting other inmates or by trying to win the good faith of the guards..." p.127.

The percentage of inmates who find their friends in prison from the free society is very small, rather most inmates know one another from institutions i.e if they served time together in other institutions and developed friendship. The present study found that there are few inmates who were homosexuals and gang members in the free society who become homosexuals and gang members in prison, and who protect and help each other from possible victimizations (importation model). Again the percentage of inmates who were homosexuals in the free society is very small, and most inmates join gangs and become homosexuals in institutions. We can therefore like Sykes (1958) speculate that an institutional environment (functional model) plays a major role in prison sexual assaults, and unlike Sykes (1958) ascertain that imported pre-institutional inmate experiences (importation model) contribute to the monotony of the institutional life and coerced sexual relationship.

The present study through the interviews with New Way In residents and qualitative data analysis (chapter iv) came to the conclusion that there are certain steps that are used for selecting victims or targets. These steps include : 1) observation - where movements, words and actions of the potential victim are observed, and data collected on him, 2) selection - any trait possessed by the potential victim which prisoners may construe as a weakness results in that individual's selection as a victim, 3) testing - the

potential victim is tested for any weakness he might have. If a victim likes gambling it may be used to hook him up, as Bowker (1982) mentions, i.e, inexperienced inmates who borrow money without the realization of the interest rate may be physically victimized when unable to pay their debts and loans. If a target is greedy he may be offered many things including food, cigarettes and later asked for favors ranging from distributing drugs to homosexual relationships. If a target refuses to do any of the things he is commanded to do, he may be sexually assaulted. During the testing stage a target is also tested for his level of tolerance and assessed regarding how effectively he can take commands, 4) after an inmate is tested he is then approached and asked for homosexual favors, 5) actual victimization is the last step toward victimization. During this step an inmate is victimized whether psychologically or physically.

The findings of this study indicate that there are techniques used by the aggressors to win their targets. One most highly used technique includes giving a target things or doing favors for him. Some of the techniques are: development of friendship and trust by the aggressor from the victim, and when the target becomes dependent on the aggressor , the aggressor begins to manipulate the target and later asks for sexual favors.

Most researchers (Bowker 1985, Brownmiller 1985, Friar and Weis 1974, Lockwood 1980, Toch 1980, Veno and Davidson

1977) mention that most inmates advise victims or targets to fight or to return violence by violence. This study found that there is an additional advice (to return violence by violence) they give to victims or targets. The advice is "fight and mind your business" because if an inmate fights only and sticks his nose in other inmates business he may be in trouble as other inmates find a way (often unpleasant) to deal with him.

Newcomers in prison, the study found, are supposed to watch out for inmates who do favors for them, and to watch out for inmates who are too nice to them or overfriendly to avoid a sexual set-up process. It was mentioned that separating (differentiating) a good guy from a bad guy in prison is difficult because an inmate would not know who is setting him up and who is not (i.e sincere about his friendship).

Literature on prison victimization portray victims in institutions as not getting help from other inmates as they do not want to get involved. This is true, but such literature neglect to mention that inmates who have friends or who are gang members get help from their friends or other gang members. The findings of this study show that inmates who help victims who are not their friends or who do not belong to the same gang as they do, help victims in order to manipulate them later.

Beside the fact that most victims do not report their assailants to the authorities, the findings (like Weiss and Friar's study 1974) show that victims do not get help from guards. Guards were reported as responding to victimization they witness (which is very rare) or victims are told by the authorities to fight or submit. With an inmate's consent the guard could put a victim in a protective custody which is usually not preferred by many victims as it is interpreted by other inmates as admitting weakness. Guards may also transfer a victim. Transferring a victim was reported by many inmates as not really helping a victim as the word may go around that he was transferred because he was a sexual victim in the other institution, and therefore may become susceptible to sexual assaults in a new institution as he was in an old institution.

Counsellors on the other hand were reported to be unable to help because their job is "to do paper work" and "they do not know how to help".

Some literature (Bowker 1980) indicate that aggressors in institutions are admired, feared, have a high status and reputation. This study found that aggressors are usually ignored by other inmates, but that victims who fight back and win are not only admired by other inmates and feared by aggressors, but acquire status and reputation. On the other hand victims who fight and lose are ignored or taken advantage of by other inmates.

Toch (1977) gave a more psychological view of the impact of victimization on victims. The effects he gave are:

- 1) An individual may feel chronically unsafe.
- 2) He may not be able to face tasks in the present and future.
- 3) He may feel unsettled, tense, unsure and hurt.
- 4) He may be hurt by his past, charging him with being weak.
- 5) His future may seem bleak.

Bowker 1982) mentioned that the victims may develop feelings of helplessness and depression, economic hardship because a victim may believe that he is a loser in life, he may physically injure himself or commit suicide. The findings suggest that most victims become aggressors, become homosexuals, have difficulty readapting to heterosexual relationships which may destroy their future as they may not want families or may have families but abuse their children and wives.

There are a few studies that have been conducted on female institutions. One study on female violence was conducted by Akman (Canadian Journal Of Corrections 1966) in the mid 1960's. He compared women's and men's serious assault rates and he found that female institutions have lower violence incidence than men and boys' institutions. Female violence was found to be less common than male violence but when it did occur, it occurred with severity and viciousness. Fear for sexual assaults in female

institutions does not permeate the female population as it does in male institutions. According to Bowker (1980) the method females use to manipulate other inmates is threat of face disfiguring (which is most feared by female victims) or actual disfiguring of one's face. Bowker (1980) also mentions that violence in female institutions that is homosexually related is very rare because most homosexual activities are consented to. The female who plays a male role does not use physical violence to subdue her victim (maybe a little psychological manipulation) as male inmates do. The fight may result though when one partner finds a new lover and "jealousies get out of hand". Homosexual attacks according to Bowker in female institutions occur as punishment or as "initiation rites where new female inmates may be raped with a broom handle. It appears that female inmates use violence only to settle questions of dominance and subordination when other manipulative strategies fail to achieve the desired effects.

Few studies that concentrate on female institutional violence have neglected to mention whether or not violence is concentrated on institutions with young women and girls as it is the case in male and boys institutions. In male institutions with older inmates, forced homosexuality is concentrated among youthful offenders. Both victims and aggressors are younger than the general male prison population, with aggressors a year or two older than the

victim. It would be interesting to know whether in female institutions criminal and institutional background, time served, race, and present offence have effects on selecting victims as it does in male institutions.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study looked at the characteristics of the aggressor and the victim in male institutions, set-up techniques, staff response to inmate victimization, Importation and functional models of crime.

Data for this study was collected from inmates in a prerelease center only. Additional data on inmates in all security level institutions is necessary to make salient conclusions about the nature and extent of prison victimization. A comparative study on both female and male institutional behavior is proper at this stage. Future research also has to focus on the staff version of prison homosexuality as they may be able to impart knowledge they have on homosexual activities in institutions.

A study on the Importation and Functional models is required, where inmates' behavior who were assumed violent in the free society will be compared with their institutional behavior. This therefore will mean that institutional records would have to be inspected now and then to follow the inmates whose behavior has already been

labelled violent by the society. To contrast this the researcher would have to make an institutional follow up of the inmates whose behavior has not been labelled violent by the society. This way a researcher may be able to determine the difference between the models being studied.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adair, A.M., Anderson, R. and Savage, J.: Impact of Incarceration on Black Inmate. Journal of Afro-American Issues, Vol 3 1974
- Adelson, L. Huntington, R. and Reay, D.A.: Prisoner is Dead. Police, Vol 13 1968.
- Akman, Dogan: Homocides and Assaults in Canadian Penitentiaries. Canadian Journal of Corrections, 8 1966.
- American Correctional Association 1970: Manual of Correctional Standards. New York.
- Baker, J.E. 1974: The right to Participate - Inmate Involvement in Prison Administration. N.J. Scarecrow Press.
- Bandura, Albert 1973: Aggression - A Social Learning Analysis. N.J. Englewood Cliffs.
- Bartollas, C. and Sieverdes, C.M.: The Victimized White in a Juvenile Correctional System. Crime and Delinquency, October 1981 Vol. 20 pp 534-543.
- Bartollas, C. and Sieverdes, C.M.: Security Level and Adjustment Patterns in Juvenile Institutions. Journal Of Criminal Justice, Vol. 14 1986 pp. 135-145.
- Bidna, Howard: Effects of Increased Security on Prison Violence. Journal of Criminal Justice, Vol. 3.
- Bowker, Lee 1980: Prison Victimization. N.Y. Elsevier.
- Bowker, Lee: Victimizers and Victims in American Correctional Institutions. In Johnson and Toch, 1982: Pains of Imprisonment. N.Y. Sage Publishers.
- Bowker, Lee: Victimization in Correctional Institutions: An Interdisciplinary analysis. In Conley, J.A. 1979: Theory and Research in Criminal Justice-Current Perspectives. Cincinnati, Anderson.
- Brownmiller, S. 1975: Against Our Will. N.Y., Simon and Schuster.
- Bunker, Edward: War Behind Walls in Burton, M. 1972: Prisons, Protests and Politics. N.J., Englewood Cliffs.
- Carroll, Leo 1974: Hacks, Blacks and Cons. Lexington, D.C Heath.

Clemmer, Donald 1940: The Prison Community. N.Y., Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Feld, Barry: A Comparative Analysis of Organizational Structure and Inmate Subculture in Institutions for Juvenile Offenders. Crime and Delinquency, July 1981 Vol. 10 pp. 336-366.

Fishman, Joseph 1934: Sex in Prison. N.Y., National Library Press.

Forrester, R.G. and Huggins, James: Homosexuality and Homosexual Behavior. In Shore, et al 1981: Sexual Problems of Adolescents in Institutions. Illinois, Charles Thomas.

Glisson, Charles A.: Correctional Facilities. In Shore, et al 1981: Sexual Problems of Adolescents in Institutions. Illinois, Charles C. Thomas.

Gendreau, P., Ross, R. and Izzo, T.: Institutional Misconduct - UVIC Program at Matsqui Penitentiary. Canadian Journal of Criminal Justice, Vol. 27 No 11 1985 pp. 209-217.

Heffernan, Esther 1972: Making It in Prison - The square, the cool, and the life. N.Y., John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Irwin, John 1980: Prisons in Turmoil. Toronto, Little Brown and Company.

Jackson, Bruce 1977: Killing Time, Life in Arkansas Penitentiary. N.Y., Cornell University Press.

Jacobs, James B. 1977: Stateville - The Penitentiary in Mass Society. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Jayawardene, C and Doherty, S.: Individual Violence in Canadian Penitentiaries. Canadian Journal of Criminal Justice, Vol. 27 No. 11 1985 pp. 429-439.

Johnson, R. 1976: Culture and Crisis in Confinement. Lexington, D.C. Heath.

Keve, P. 1974: Prison Life and Human Worth. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.

Leger, R.G. and Barnes, H.G.: Black Attitudes in Prison: A Sociological Analysis. Journal of Criminal Justice, Vol. 14 1986 pp.105-122.

Lockwood, Daniel 1980: Prison Sexual Violence. N.Y., Elsevier.

Merklin, Lewis 1974: They Chose Honor - The problem of conscience in custody. N.Y., Harper and Row Publishers.

Michigan Department of Corrections: New Employee School Instructor Manual 1985. Michigan.

Nacci, Peter: Sexual Assault in Prisons. American Journal of Correction, Vol. 40 1977.

Nacci P., Hugh, E. and Prather, J.: Population Density and Inmate Misconduct Rates in the Federal Prison System. Federal Probation, Vol. 41 1977.

Arsagh, T. and Raber, D. 1977: Assaults and Assaultive Victimization Within Ten North Carolina Correctional Institutions. Raleigh, North Carolina Department of Correction.

Scacco, Anthony 1980: Rape in Prison. Springfield, Charles C. Thomas.

Schwartz, Barry: Peer versus Authority Effects in a Correctional Community. Criminology, Vol. 11 No. 2 August 1973 pp. 233-255.

Slosar, John A. 1979: Prisonization, Friendship, and Leadership. Massachusetts, D.C. Heath.

Sykes, G.M. 1966: The Society of Captives: A study of maximum security prison. N.Y., Atheneum.

Sykes, G.M.: Men, Merchants, and Toughs: A study of reactions to imprisonment. Social Problems, Vol. 4 1956 pp. 130-138.

Sagarin, E. and MacNamara, D.: The Homosexual as a Crime Victim. International Journal of Criminology and Penology, Vol. 3 1975 pp. 13-25.

Toch, Hans 1975: Men in Crisis. Chicago, Aldine.

Toch, Hans 1976: A Psychological View of Prison Violence. In Cohen, A. Ed: Prison Violence. Lexington, D.C. Heath.

Toch, Hans 1977: Living in Prison - The ecology of survival. N.Y., Free press.

Toch, Hans and Johnson, T. 1982: The Pains of Imprisonment. New Delhi, Sage Publications, Ltd.

Veno, A. and Davidson, M. : Prison Violence: Some different Perspectives. International Journal of Criminology and

Penology, Vol. 5 1977 pp.399-409.

Viano, E. and Drapkin, I. 1975: Exploiters and Exploited: The dynamics of victimization. Lexington, MA. D.C. Heath.

Weiss, C. and Friar, D.J. 1974: Terror in Prisons. N.Y., The Bobbs-Merill Company, Inc.

Wheeler, S. 1961: Socialization in Correctional Communities. American Sociological Review. pp 692-712.

Wilson, R.: Homosexual Rape: Legacy of overcrowding. Corrections Magazine, Vol. 3 March 1977 pp. 10-11.

Wood, B., Wilson, G., Jessor, R. and Bogan, J.: Troublemaking Behavior in a Correctional Institution: Relationship to inmates's definition of their situation. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol. 36 1968 pp. 795-802.

Wooden, W.S. and Parker, Jay 1982: Men Behind Bars-Sexual exploitation in prison. N.Y., Plenum Press.