Emotions in prison: an exploration of space, emotion regulation and expression

This dissertation is submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
February 2018
Preface

This dissertation is the result of my own work and includes nothing which is the outcome of work done in collaboration except as declared in the Preface and specified in the text.

It is not substantially the same as any that I have submitted, or, is being concurrently submitted for a degree or diploma or other qualification at the University of Cambridge or any other University or similar institution except as declared in the Preface and specified in the text. I further state that no substantial part of my dissertation has already been submitted, or, is being concurrently submitted for any such degree, diploma or other qualification at the University of Cambridge or any other University or similar institution except as declared in the Preface and specified in the text.

It does not exceed the prescribed word limit for the relevant Degree Committee.

Ben Laws

January 2018
Acknowledgments

I am completely indebted to my supervisor, Dr Ben Crewe. His rigorous attention to detail, reliability and generous feedback through all the stages of this research have been incredibly humbling. Ben, this project would not have been possible without your wisdom as a mentor, thank you so much.

I am grateful to all the men and women in HMP Ranby and HMP Send who gave up their time and energy to take part in the interviews and shadowing. Thanks also to all the gatekeepers, staff members and officers who made me feel welcome and pointed me in the right direction with key information, and helped organise the practical and administrative components of my research.

I would like to acknowledge the ESRC for funding my project, and the additional support I received from Wolfson College. Thank you to the administrators (Thury, Rebecca and Joanne), custodian (Antony), librarians (Stuart and Emma) and our cleaner (Arnell) at the Institute of Criminology for providing a well-resourced, clean and ordered environment in to work in.

A further thank you to the academics and friends who have helped this project, especially the inspiring people in the Prisons Research Centre, led by Prof. Alison Liebling. Thank you Serena Wright, Elinor Lieber, Alice Ievins, Bethany Schmidt, Aiden Cope, Borah Kant, Julie Laursen, Anne Schliehe. Serena—thank you for mentoring and supporting me over the last few years.

And thank you to those academics outside the centre who have shaped my research, especially: Prof. Yvonne Jewkes, Thomas Ugelvik, Dominique Moran, all those in De Montfort Emotions and Criminal Justice Cluster, Victoria Knight, Prof. Derick Layder and Prof. Rob Canton.

I also thank my academic friends outside of the centre especially Tom Hawker, and Simon Larmour (and his mother, Cory McAdam, who helped me with editing). Thank you to the friends who made these years fun and stimulating, especially: Chris, Simon (two mentions), Claudia, Tommy; my Ayahuasca friends for the unforgettable experiences (Dejan, Francesca, Jake, Andreas, Fahim, Neil, Lacey, Christian); and all of my Brazilian Jiu-Jitsu training partners for keeping me ‘grounded’.
Many thanks to Azra who has been my dear friend and supported me unconditionally through this project—I’m sure you also added some soul it. Your practical expertise and understanding of addiction, probation and law have really helped.

I would finally like to thank my Mum and Dad for being constant sources of support.
## Contents

1. Introduction ............................................................................................................................ 7

2. Space, Gender and Emotion Regulation in Prison ............................................................... 14
   Emotions and Prison Space ................................................................................................. 14
   Gender and Emotion in Prison .......................................................................................... 20
      Emotion and Masculinity in Men's Prisons ................................................................. 23
      Emotion and Women's Prisons ..................................................................................... 26
      Similar or Contrasting Emotional Worlds ................................................................. 29
   Biography, Coping and Emotion Regulation ..................................................................... 30
      Conceptualizing Emotion Regulation .......................................................................... 35
   Research Questions .......................................................................................................... 38
      Definitions and Terminology ....................................................................................... 38

3. Researching Emotions in Two Prisons .............................................................................. 40
   Rationale, Site Selection and Access ................................................................................ 40
      The Research Sites ........................................................................................................ 41
         Ranby Prison ................................................................................................................ 42
         Regime and Climate ..................................................................................................... 43
         Send Prison .................................................................................................................. 45
         Regime and Climate ..................................................................................................... 46
   Methodology ..................................................................................................................... 47
      The Sample ..................................................................................................................... 49
      Prisoner shadowing ....................................................................................................... 50
      Interviews ..................................................................................................................... 54
   Reflections on the Research .............................................................................................. 61
   Analysis ............................................................................................................................... 64
   Ethics ................................................................................................................................. 65

4. Emotions and ‘the Self’ in Prison ....................................................................................... 68
   Life History and ‘Emotional Capital’ .................................................................................. 69
      A Cycle of Trauma ....................................................................................................... 71
      Crossing the Bridge: Emotions Before and During Prison ........................................ 74
   Emotion Regulation and Imprisonment ......................................................................... 75
      ‘Bottling-up’ ................................................................................................................ 76
      ‘Pressurised Explosions’ and Losing Control ............................................................. 80
      ‘Diluting’ Emotions ...................................................................................................... 82
1. Introduction

Prison life brims with feelings and intense emotions. The three high-profile excerpts below give some indication of this point. In order, they reveal profound anguish and sadness, the oscillation of affective states, and the importance of kindling hope and love:

Once again our beloved mummy has been arrested and now she and daddy [the letter writer] are away in jail. My heart bleeds as I think of her sitting in some police cell far away from home, perhaps alone and without anybody to talk to, and with nothing to read. Twenty-four hours of the day longing for her little ones. It may be many months or even years before you see her again. For long you may live, like orphans, without your own home and parents, without the natural love, affection and protection mummy used to give you. Now you will get no birthday or Christmas parties, no presents or new dresses, no shoes or toys. Gone are the days when, after having a warm bath in the evening, you would sit at table with mummy and enjoy her good and simple food. (Mandela, 2014: 106)

Wouldn’t you just know it? You prepare yourself for a fight [in prison], then within seconds you’re saturated with relief and it takes all your self-control not to burst into tears…His gesture was the best welcome I could have hoped for. (James, 2003: 57)

When wisdom has been profitless to me, philosophy barren, and the proverbs and phrases of those who have sought to give me consolation as dust and ashes in my mouth, the memory of that little, lovely, silent act of love [a man who raised his hat to Wilde while he was handcuffed] has unsealed for me all the wells of pity: made the desert blossom like a rose, and brought me out of the bitterness of lonely exile into harmony with the wounded, broken, and great heart of the world. (Wilde, 2010: 85)

Yet, in spite of these explicit descriptions of feeling, academic accounts of imprisonment are prone to expunge rather than foreground emotionality. Indeed, Liebling (1999: 341) argues that much of the research on the effects of imprisonment is completely shorn of a ‘sufficient affective dimension’, and therefore key dynamics of prison life remain buried from view. Furthermore, the few existing studies of emotion in prison tend either to present a limited set of feeling states (narrowing the full spectrum of emotional experiences) or impose rather distortive preconceptions. Men’s prisons for example, have typically been described as highly volatile environments suffused with unrelenting aggression and violence (Edgar et al., 2003). In this context, the argument continues, prisoners display hardened masculinity, emotional stoicism, and largely reject ‘soft’ emotions (Scraton, Sim & Skidmore, 1991; Sim, 1994; Toch, 1998). A similar affective ‘skew’ exists in accounts of women’s prisons, where sexual
relationships have been extensively studied but important emotions like anger are generally overlooked (Liebling, 2009). However, in both male and female prisons—which are rarely studied together—this is not the whole story. That is to say, issues of emotionality are more complex and contested that suggested by these accounts.

There are three reasons that account for the distortive treatment of emotions in prison. First, large-scale research studies have often relied on clinical instruments to record a range of measures, including mood-based indicators (e.g. of depression and anxiety). But these tools typically fail to assess the ‘subjective, cognitive, or affective contributions prisoners make to their own experiences of prison’ (Liebling, 1999: 287). Second, there is a tendency to focus on incidents (riots, fights and deaths) over the quotidian prison routine. While this emphasis is understandable given the political and moral significance of these events, the spaces ‘inbetween’ acute incidents are also important to establish a more complete understanding of the prisoner experience. Third, prisons research is a product of wider criminological attitudes that have treated emotions with enduring suspicion. Indeed, criminological accounts have been criticised for presenting detached ‘inhuman data’ that is ‘cold, calculated, [and] surgical’ (Bosworth et al., 2005: 259), a practise Jewkes (2012: 72) describes as the ‘extracting out of emotion and humanity from the research process’. These ‘bloodless’ approaches exclude the sensual, expressive and emotional dynamics that are intrinsic to offending behaviour (Ferrell, 1999). Emotions are not merely a supplement to criminological accounts, rather they play an essential role in shaping social life (Rustin, 2009), the dynamics of desistance and reform (Calverley & Farrall, 2011), informing decision making and a wide range of situational behaviours (Sapolsky, 2017).

In the field of prisons research there have been recent indications of change. A small but influential group of researchers have begun to highlight the affective texture, or ‘emotional geography’ of imprisonment (see Crewe, Warr, Bennett, & Smith, 2013). The growing field of carceral geography is particularly apposite here. For example, in her recent chapter titled ‘The Emotional and Embodied Geographies of Prison Life’, Moran (2015: 29) ‘foregrounds the personal, emotional subject’ and considers the ‘ways in which individual spaces of the prison elicit and facilitate different emotional expression’. Meanwhile, Jewkes (2012b) has drawn attention to the methodological dynamics of feeling states, calling for a culture shift among academics that have tended to purge their own emotions from the research process.
Taken together, these various perspectives call for a re-examination of the role of emotions in prisons research.

This current study aims to build on these developments by placing emotions at the centre of the analysis. First and foremost, then, this entails understanding the emotional realities of imprisonment grounded in the ‘day-to-day’ prisoner experience. This involves assessing the following fundamental questions: what kinds of emotions do people feel in prison, and how exactly do they regulate and express emotions in this closed world? Further, what are the social and spatial pressures that control, limit and constrain emotional expression in this environment? And finally, what role does gender play in the expression and control of emotion?

There are notable barriers to asking such questions. Given that prior research has failed to adequately capture the affective dimensions of prison life, there is no clear methodological roadmap to effectively understand the ‘emotional world’ of imprisonment. Further, as Rustin (2009: 20) argues, ‘one is more likely to learn about states of feeling and their complexity through engagement with works of art, than from study of the social sciences’. This is to say, there is a more established history in the arts and humanities of exploring affect. In a small number of places prisoner artwork (see Figure 1.) has been introduced in this study to complement the text. But the challenges of researching emotions remain noteworthy and are addressed in detail throughout the coming chapters. The methodological approach in this the study was broadly ethnographic (combining prisoner observations, shadowing and semi-structured interviews), and involved undertaking research in two prisons to investigate and compare male and female prisoners’ emotional worlds. Rather than targeting specific feeling states in isolation (e.g. anger, sadness) the explorative design encompassed a broad gamut of emotional states.

In order to organise these findings, three levels of analysis are introduced. These distinctions consider emotion, first, at the level of the self (psychological); second, as existing between groups (social emotions); and, third, in relation to the physical environment (spatial). An individual substantive chapter is dedicated to each of these three levels of analysis.
Figure 1. This piece shows the prisoner drowning in her emotions. Stressful thoughts are literally exploding out of her head. This image is reproduced in Appendix two, alongside a more detailed description in the prisoner’s own words.

Ahead of these three substantive chapters, chapter two critically reviews various literatures to contextualize and situate the study. Given the dearth of work on emotions and imprisonment, this involves looking outside as well as within the prison walls. This is most apparent in the sections on ‘emotions and space’ and ‘emotion regulation’. The former draws on a range of findings from affective geographies and considers the ways in which various public and private spaces are designed to evoke feelings. The introduction of the emotion regulation literature at the end of the chapter—a well-established field in the psychology of emotions—provides a useful foundation to inform key parts of this study. These two literatures are joined
by a third on ‘emotions and gender’. By contrast to the first segments, studies of gender have been the subject of a wide body of prisons research, though often problematically. This review navigates a path through this body of work to locate the most pertinent findings on affective states. The research questions at the close of this chapter distil the key arguments, refine the focus of this study, and set out a working definition of emotion.

Chapter three turns to the methodological dimensions of the project. First, the physical features (layout, architecture) and regimes of the establishments are outlined (HMP Ranby and HMP Send). While this is mainly a descriptive exercise, there are important aspects of the built environment that have implications for the analysis of prisoner emotions. The chapter then introduces the sampling frame and the specific research challenges of investigating emotions in the prison environment are considered. This starts with the premise that emotions are considered elusive to measurement, but argues that a careful, mixed-method approach can capture affective states. The chapter then critically engages with further issues of emotional authenticity and emotional literacy among prisoners, and explains how these issues were addressed. Finally, the ethical dimensions of this study are described in some detail. A particularly important aspect of ethics is the consideration that discussing emotions can reopen past wounds and traumas, and therefore requires a sensitive and highly reflective research approach.

The next three chapters comprise the substantive body of the study, following the conceptual categories (‘self’, ‘social’, and ‘spatial’) outlined above. Chapter four begins this sequence by assessing prisoner emotion at the individual level. It starts by contextualising the lives of the men and women in this study before coming to prison, which were marked by a wide range of traumatic experiences: on the whole, participants in this study had had extremely unstable lives before coming to prison. From this point, the chapter introduces an original theoretical framework based on ‘fluid-container’ metaphors to describe how prisoners managed their emotions. More specifically, emotion management is placed into different thematic categories such as ‘bottling up’, ‘diluting’, ‘distilling’ and ‘discharging’ feeling. These strategies were often used in combination by prisoners and had a range of important protective functions. The context and motivation for exactly why prisoners adopted different strategies is discussed. The role of personal agency (and the extent to which prisoners felt emotion was something they could control) serves as an insightful explanatory function. The study
suggests that the separation of prisoners into those considered emotionally ‘rigid’ and ‘flexible’ can shed light on emotional development in prison.

Chapter five shifts focus, to examine the social dynamics of emotion in prison. Relational emotions are introduced in two primary ways: first, through an account of the sharing of emotions within social groups (e.g. with other prisoners, officers, and family members). Reaching out to others in this manner functioned as a way of giving and receiving support and was a form of rebalancing that helped prisoners ward off emotional extremes. Second, the chapter goes on to analyse emotions that emerged in the social arena. In general terms, small associations and friendship groups exhibited displays of care, affection and sporadic moments of joy. However, outside of these close-knit groups there was typically a harder edge to social emotions, which were marked by anger, hostility, distain, aggression, and fear. These contrasting perspectives on social emotions are structured around the theoretical concepts of ‘social glue’ (Planalp, 1999) and ‘emotional contagion’ (Hatfield, Cacioppo, & Rapson, 1993). In short, social emotions simultaneously bound prisoners to one another, while also serving important regulating and distancing functions. These conceptualisations of social emotion provide a way of moving beyond traditional dramaturgical metaphors of prison life that suggest prisoners display a dramatized version of themselves in public which is markedly different from their offstage, private selves (see Laws & Crewe, 2016, for example).

The final substantive chapter (chapter six) considers the spatial differentiation of emotions in prison. This account develops previous work on the emotional geography of prison life (Crewe et al., 2013), arguing that prison spaces can be grouped into three categories: living spaces, hostile zones and free spaces. Throughout, the chapter attempts to explain the spatial dynamics and forces that facilitated the display of particular emotions in these spaces. For example, the ‘hostile zones’ described in both prisons (where anger and fear was common) appeared to have a number of shared physical and social features. To steer this discussion, the chapter combines and extends theoretical approaches to ‘liminality’. While prior research argues that prison spaces have important ‘liminal’ features (Moran, 2011), prisoners themselves can be said to navigate a kind of liminal experience of imprisonment, which involves moving through different internal stages (see Jewkes, 2005a). In line with the latter idea, Turner’s (1974) conceptualisation of liminality sheds light on prisoners’ experiences of their cell spaces. Furthermore, Turner’s (1974) development of ‘communitas’ provides a basis to understand the important features of free spaces and niches in the prison.
environment. These perspectives on liminality and communitas provide a useful explanatory frame for understanding the broader significance of the spatial dimensions of prisoner emotions.

Finally, chapter seven draws together the most significant findings from the individual chapters and discusses the wider implications of the research. In the broadest terms, this concluding section argues that there is far more texture to emotions in prison than previous accounts suggest. Finally, the limitations of the project are acknowledged and the study is re-situated between the literatures on carceral geography and the psychology and sociology of imprisonment.
2. Space, Gender and Emotion Regulation in Prison

The following review critically examines three primary literatures in some detail: first, space and emotion; second, gender and emotion; and, third, prisoner coping and adaptation. The first two sections, on space and gender, provide an indispensable context for the study of emotion in prison. Both start with general assessments, formed outside of prison walls, before funnelling down to the most relevant studies germane to imprisonment. The final segment of the chapter focuses specifically on recent accounts of prisoner coping and the importance of work on emotion regulation for this study. By developing concepts at the heart of existing emotion regulation theory, it is possible to produce a working framework for understanding the emotional dimensions of prison life with greater clarity. At the close of the chapter, the specific research questions that illuminated this study are presented alongside a working definition of emotion.

Emotions and Prison Space

While it is clearly still important to 'read' the physical characteristics of buildings, it is equally necessary to read the text of performance in and through them. This way we can truly come to understand how space is lived. (Fiddler, 2010: 7)

In their influential 2001 editorial, 'Emotional Geographies', Anderson and Smith chart a new direction for human geographers. They claim that although emotions are fundamental to our experience of life and physical spaces, they are too often silenced in social research. Following their lead, this literature review briefly introduces research on affective and emotional geography which highlights how emotions are ‘dynamically related to space’ (Davidson & Milligan, 2004: 526). After doing so, critical attention is paid to prison architecture and recent developments in the now flourishing sub-field of 'carceral geography'. Scholars working on the effects of prison architecture identify the significance of space and spatial organisation in prisons, but these claims are rarely subjected to systematic empirical scrutiny. The turn to 'carceral geography', and more recent prison sociology, has made headway in attending to this deficit by seeing prison less as a monolith with fixed boundaries and more as a fluid, multidimensional space. These recent findings help to shape this study of emotion in prison.
Built environments affect us emotionally. These effects are often planned, being designed in to the very fabric of the architecture in what is termed 'ambient power' (Allen, 2006) and 'seductive spatiality' (Rose et al., 2010). In some contexts this process is overt: the construction of asylums for the mentally ill for example, involved a manipulation of internal space with the aspiration of producing ‘more “docile” and “proper” subjects for reintroduction into mainstream social spaces’ (Philo and Parr, 2000: 514). These 'hyper-organizational spaces' (Zhang et al., 2008) are characterised by rigid design and an austere physical environment to try and 'limit the subjective growth of those exposed to them' (Hancock and Jewkes, 2011: 612). Yet, in other settings, the relationship between space and the production of emotion is less invasive and far more subtle. In his study of airport terminals, Adey (2008) argues that these buildings create ‘a landscape of differential affect’, where specific emotional triggers are ‘designed into the terminal space’ and are ‘intended to excite bodily and emotional dispositions at an unconscious and pre-cognitive register’ (439). For example, the movement through airport security is designed to be ‘uninteresting, and quite oppressive’ (445) so that a passenger’s potential to disrupt the security processing system (by misbehaving or walking the wrong way) is suppressed. It is no coincidence that ‘many airports try not to place retail units within the immediate vicinity of security or check-in, so not to suffer the adverse effects of the affectual intensity of these sites’ (446). Indeed, precisely because anxiety and fear can negatively affect the consumer experience, shopping centres and retail outlets aim to use elements of the built environment (soft music and open spaces) to soothe and guide customers through the experience (Rose et al., 2010).

However, the aspirations of such ambient power are not always realised. That is, architectural design can produce unforeseen consequences, socially undesirable costs, and adverse effects on emotion. For example, the construction of high-rise residential buildings often provokes anxiety in residents who share their dwelling with large numbers of strangers, and who worry about muggers lurking in screened-in areas such as stairwells, corridors, lifts and entrance halls, or behind the large concrete pillars of stilted buildings. ‘People are more fearful if they cannot be seen and criminals are more likely to act out if they feel they cannot be seen’ (Lees and Baxter, 2011: 111). Indeed, as Gifford (2007) explains, the presence of full-time security guards and locked entrances in many high-rise buildings is convincing evidence that such fears exist.

The idea that buildings can conjure fear is perhaps epitomised by the spectacle of Victorian prisons and jails. Whereas the anxieties created by residential towers is accidental and
unplanned, prisons façades have often been designed purposefully to look imposing; resembling castles or monastic houses which echo 'earlier, more despotic and untrammeled centres of penance and punishment' (Hancock and Jewkes: 2011: 616). These buildings symbolise the might of the state, and as McConville (2000:10) has suggested: 'it was almost as though the weight of the stone would crush the malefactor and suppress crime'. Alternative designs in England and Wales—including converted army barracks and more recent builds—are less visually oppressive but are typically uniform, dull and unimaginative (Hancock and Jewkes, 2011). According to Dirisuweit (1999), the consequence of similar design choices for prison interiors—the fact that each cell is painted in the same pastel shade, for example—is alienation, which is reminiscent of what Dale and Burrell (2003) have labelled architectural 'an-aesthetics'. Furthermore, some argue that brutish or bland architecture is morally unacceptable (McConville, 2000) and that 'prisons need to be more than human filing cabinets' (Spens, 1994:11).

Reacting against this trend, Johnston (2000) calls for the use of colours, textures and diverse spaces to provide an appealing and humane prison setting, and Fairweather (2000) claims that such 'softness' functions as a cue for socially desirable behaviours because it fosters feelings of responsibility and ownership over space. However, Hancock and Jewkes (2011: 623) question whether 'experiments in flexible, aesthetically sensitive penal architecture and design in fact represent an extension of state power over the individual; one all the more inhuman due to its apparent absence?' This tension is apparent in prison architecture in the Netherlands (for example, Breda) where the creative use of glass in the floors and ceilings maximizes natural light, but also enhances the opportunities for security and surveillance (Hancock and Jewkes, 2011). These contrasting viewpoints raise complex questions about the 'correct' structural form of prison design, and the messages that different layouts might send to their charges.

Problematically though, the ostensible effects of prison architecture postulated in these accounts often lack an empirical consideration of how prisoners actually experience these spaces. These studies follow a similar theoretical bent, or are often informed by earlier theoretical scholarship on the organisation of space in prison—especially Bentham's work on the panopticon (1791) and Foucault's (1979) development of Bentham's ideas. These thinkers speculate that the construction of the panopticon would enable prisoners to be inspected 'during every instance of time' (Bentham, 1791: 3), which, according to Foucault, would produce 'docile bodies'. However, these perspectives largely prioritize structure over agency,
and neglect the very subjects of these disciplinary techniques (van Hoven, 2011).¹

Standing alone then, these accounts of affective architecture largely imply a kind of environmental determinism—suggesting that people are passive subjects moulded by the settings they find themselves in. Significant branches of affectual geography consider ‘the psychological subject with enduring suspicion’ (Pile, 2010: 12) and have overlooked or downplayed the ‘complexity of human subjectivity’ and the individual’s capacity to feel spaces (Rose et al., 2010: 24).² However, a far more moderate stance is adopted by Massumi (2002: 204), who argues that design can at best attempt to build in certain ‘possibilities of experience’. Similarly, Adey (2008: 442) articulates a non-deterministic form of ‘prediction and probability’ which attempts to ‘channel the possibilities of the sensations and emotions experienced’ within a particular space. These viewpoints acknowledge that space does not just submerge an individual without resistance or active participation, and that, rather, there is a co-production between the individual and the environment (Edensor, 2013). In light of these perspectives, to gain an understanding of how spatial practises affect prisoners emotionally we need to look carefully at how ‘space is lived’ (Fiddler, 2010), and to understand space in terms of its relationality rather than its form; its social content rather than its architectural innovation' (Gillespie, 2010: 40).

The now flourishing literature on 'carceral geography' has begun to address these concerns directly, and of particular interest here is the small body of research on what Crewe et al. (2013) term the 'emotional geography of prison life'. This scholarship is sensitive to the idea that prison design affects the lives of its occupants (Jewkes and Johnson, 2007), often having a major influence on the possible social relations (Martin and Mitchelson, 2009; Morin 2015). However, these spatial practices are typically examined through ‘the “vertical” processes of control’ rather than through ‘the “horizontal” interactions of prisoners’ (Sibley and van Hoven, 2009: 199) that can provide a fuller understanding of how these spaces are

¹ Indeed, there is broader trend in recent penal scholarship to focus on macrostructural processes: much attention has been paid to the rapid growth of the prison estate and the role of the prison as an important tool for neoliberal state-building (de Dardel, 2014; see Wacquant, 2009 inter alia).

² For instance, such a view frames shopping centre consumers as ‘malleable’ objects who are ‘mechanistically manipulated…to be deceived, persuaded, induced, tempted, and seduced by ploys, ruses, tricks, strategies, and game of the design’ (Goss, 1993: 30).
experienced on a day-to-day basis. For example, although the built environment is often oppressive, prisoners go to great lengths to reclaim spaces by curtaining off their beds; using ornaments, artwork and posters to decorate their cells; and prioritizing cleanliness by ordering their possessions and masking unpleasant odours (Dirsuweit, 1999; Sloan, 2012). McDermott and King (1995: 207) observe that 'within the limits of prison supplied furniture...a landing of otherwise identical cells becomes surprisingly individualized'. Through these spatial modifications prisoners are able to show care for their surroundings and create a personal connection to their living space (Baer, 2004), which some refer to as 'homes' (Dirsuweit, 1999). This is all reminiscent of Toch's (1992) research on niches in prison, and the ways prisoners carve out spaces in the environment. He explains that:

A niche is a functional subsetting containing desired objects, space, resources, people, and relationships between people. A niche is perceived as ameliorative; it is seen as a potential instrument for the relaxation of stress and the achievement of psychological equilibrium. (237)

The emotional bond prisoners have with these spaces is revealed explicitly during unannounced cell-searches where personal goods can be (sometimes arbitrary) confiscated and cells are left untidy by officers. Such protocols can leave prisoners feeling 'a profound sense of humiliation and violation' (Bennett, 2010: 50). In sum then, despite the Spartan nature of the environment, prisoners engage in a struggle against their 'material and emotional dispossession' (de Dardel, 2014: 195) which is symbolised through the care and time invested in the personalization of space. Further to this point, space is deeply connected with the personnel found there: Bennett (2010) for example, describes the spatial intimacy 'created by the human architecture of the therapeutic circle'. The point here is that spaces are not just physical entities, they also have personal and social significance (Crewe et al., 2013), often providing an emotional refuge for their users.

The carceral geography literature, along with recent prison sociology, questions some of the long-standing dichotomies in prisons research (e.g. inside versus outside, public versus private, frontstage versus backstage areas). Some of these dividing lines have been established through Goffman's dramaturgical metaphor (1959), which contrasts prisoners' public and private 'performances' of emotion. That is, prisoners ostensibly present a dramatised version of themselves in public which is markedly different from their off-stage, private selves. However, such clean distinctions between frontstage and backstage areas in
prison have been challenged.\textsuperscript{3} For example, Moran's (2013) study of prison visiting rooms reveals that they function as a kind of 'liminal' space, existing somewhere between the world of prison and the world outside. Similarly, in later work, Moran (2014: 35) draws attention to so-called 'transcarceral spaces' which 'extend the reach of the prison beyond its apparent physical boundaries'. Of more concern to this study however, Crewe et al. explain that prisons are 'complex and spatially differentiated emotional domains' (2013: 4). Prisons then, have their own 'emotional maps', which are navigated and learned by prisoners and officers (Crawley, 2004). This research aims to further these ideas by attempting to map emotion in prison in a more comprehensive and concrete fashion. First, it sets out to understand prison life as dynamic, exploring the affective changes that prisoners experience while transitioning to and from different prison spaces. Second, it attempts to provide detailed accounts of what emotional maps look like in prison, based directly on the contributions and experiences of prisoners. It is understood here that the carceral landscape is comprised of 'shifting individual and communal identities providing a complex and changing tapestry of culturally defined spaces' (Dirsuweit, 1999: 83), which implies that such maps may look different between prisoners and vary temporally.

As hinted above, recent research has also challenged tradition divisions between public and private spaces in prison, which has implications for where emotion is found and the forms that it takes. Early accounts of prison sociology observed a requirement for prisoners to minimize their emotional expressions in public spaces (Sykes, 1958). And further, because prisoners are subjected to the mortifying process of 'compulsory life in common' (Schwartz, 1972: 229), numerous accounts highlight the importance of privacy (Morin, 2016). Indeed, the fact that 'privacy provides an emotional haven' (Fairweather, 2000: 38) may be the principal driver for seeking-out niches in prison (Toch, 1992). Jewkes (2005b: 54) speculates that particular characteristics of the prison regime—especially mandatory cell-sharing—could lead to 'an enforced state of frontstage' in prisoners, where they are required to act tough and are unable to reconnect with their 'interior sense of self'. Similarly, the physical layout of prisons does little to guarantee privacy and seems largely designed to erode it (Irwin & Owen, 2005). However, the idea that prison obliterates privacy has been contested by Moran (2015) who explains that notions of public and private space are more complex. For example, she found that prisoners working in loud workshops could use the mechanic, buffering noise,\textsuperscript{3} Goffman too observed a number of 'free spaces' within institutional settings 'in which ordinary levels of surveillance and restriction were markedly reduced' (1959: 205).
to explore their thoughts and feelings. More broadly she reflects that: 'the construction of privacy within public space effectively blurs the boundaries between the two, and challenges the idea that “front” and “backstage” identities require mutually exclusive space in which to take form' (Moran, 2015: 32). This is redolent of Crewe (2014: 397) who argues that while on the surface many areas of male prisons are 'characterized by a particular kind of emotionally taut masculine performance', there is a robust 'emotional underlife' (398) that is typically overlooked because 'men's emotional expressions are so often oblique, disguised, or communicated indirectly' (397). In sum, this study follows these later accounts, by understanding privacy as having a significant but complex relationship with emotional expression and accepting that a wide range of emotions may be found throughout different areas of the prison. In a broader sense, then, this research sets out to further disrupt binary descriptions of prison life (frontstage and backstage, public and private) by developing a line of inquiry capable of explaining the conceptual nuances in between them. Put simply, concepts like ‘privacy’ may not represent discrete, clearly identifiable categories, and are better understood as operating on a spectrum.

Prison space and particular design choices can exert deep psychological influence over prisoners and shape their behaviour (Jewkes, 2012). Yet, the accounts introduced here suggest it is critical to explore the degree to which prisoners change, reject, or remain indifferent to effects of space (or to establish if such effects exist in reality). For current purposes, this will involve understanding the affective dynamics of prison space as a 'fluid scene' rather than a 'fixed stage' (Lees and Baxter, 2011: 117), which does not suppress the relative autonomy of individual actors and their ability to reinvent or challenge the emotional enticements of a particular space. In concrete terms, this research aims to explore emotional expression and regulation across, and in moments of transition to and from, different prison spaces. It sets out to further explore the implications of prisoners’ modifications of space and their social relationships which may signal attempts to control their environment and regulate the kind of emotions that they experience.

**Gender and Emotion in Prison**

According to Lutz (1990, cited in Walton et al., 2004: 2), 'any discourse on emotions is also...a discourse on gender'. This chapter began by noting the tendency to overlook emotions in the social sciences. It follows that the neglect of emotion is deeply connected to gender,
and especially the gendered knowledge production in which 'detachment, objectivity and rationality have been valued, and implicitly masculinized, while engagement, subjectivity, passion and desire have been devalued, and frequently feminized' (Anderson and Smith, 2001: 7). Put differently, the traditional distinction in Western philosophy between reason and emotion has been routinely connected with the opposition between masculinity and femininity (Fischer and Manstead, 2000). The chapter continues by briefly exploring the empirical evidence for ostensible differences in emotionality between women and men. After this broad introduction, the connection between gender and emotionality in prison is emphasised, especially in relation to levels of emotional expression and experience. Of particular relevance here is the way in which gender scripts play-out in the prison environment, creating an indispensable context for understanding the nature of prisoner emotion in both men's and women's establishments.

Drawing on a large evidence base, Deaux (2000) concludes that differences in emotion between men and women are seen mainly in levels of expressivity—with women displaying more emotions than men—but not in the actual experience of emotions. Biological explanations for such sex differences have an egregious history: 'Hippocrates the physician held that hysteria was caused by a wandering uterus that remained unfulfilled' (Brownmiller, 1984: 211) and women have long been socially inscribed as the 'naturally' weak sex (Chamberlen, 2015; Grosz, 1994). However, far from being the sole product of biology, emotional differences are strongly orientated by socialization and the contrasting social roles occupied by men and women (Alexander and Wood, 2000). From birth, in Western societies, parents 'express affection by holding, kissing, and hugging their girls more than their boys, and...encourage their daughters to talk about their troubles more than...their sons' (Brody, 2000: 28). Women are taught from an early age to be 'keepers of the heart' (Brownmiller, 1984: 216) and are primed for care-taking and nurturing positions where open displays of emotion are encouraged.

The idea that women display emotions more freely than men already suggests an aberration from normative values. Framed in different way, men have been found to conceal more. Indeed, so called 'restrictive emotionality' (Levant, 1995) captures the idea that men are far more likely to tie-down or bury their feelings. As Evans and Wallace (2008: 485) surmise, boys are taught that emotions are synonymous with weakness and that 'to be a man is to be in charge; to be gentle is to be a wimp'. A side-effect of this emotional restraint is that men can
lose the capacity to differentiate and identify their feelings in words—a condition known as 'alexithymia' (Jansz, 2000). One notable exception to this emotional stoicism is the expression of anger, which flows more freely and frequently in men than in women (Averill, 1983). Further, Long (1987) argues that for men anger becomes a funnel into which other 'non-masculine' emotions (fear or sadness, for example) are channelled. This inhibition of feeling, and lack of emotional fluency, is considered to be a crucial factor in explaining why women live longer than men (Jourard, 1974). This process also stifles social interaction as men who have difficulty identifying emotions report lower levels of intimacy in their relationships (Jansz, 2000). In sum then, early child-parent interactions set in motion a 'gendered discourse about emotions' which continue, and are reinforced, throughout adulthood (Fivush and Buckner, 2000: 248). Adherence to these 'display rules' (see Hochschild, 1979) guarantees that particular gender roles in society are upheld along with accompanying power imbalances (Brody, 1999), and potentially damaging effects on personal health.

Problematically though, the empirical findings set-out above can often veer towards essentializing key concepts (e.g. the idea that 'men don't express weakness'), which may be better understood as existing on a spectrum—archetypes are not always adhered to in practise, and display rules are often flouted. A separate, but related, issue is that these gender scripts change over time. Cancian and Gordon (1988) for example, showed how women's magazines— which attempt to socialize their readers into the 'correct' expression of love and anger in their relationships—advocated conflict avoidance, fixed gender roles and self-sacrifice in the early twentieth century. But by the end of the century these norms were transformed, as the magazines advocated more open communication channels for both positive and negative feelings, increased intimacy, and more flexible gender roles in relationships. Similarly, 'representations of masculinities are subject to a patterning and shifting that cannot be determined by a priori categorical accounts of a fixed or gendered identity' (Carrabine and Longhurst, 1998: 172). Gender roles and their accompanying emotion norms are therefore fluid: they show variation over time and space, which largely collapses the idea that emotionality ‘belongs’ to one sex.

Prisons, with their unique temporal and spatial deprivations, provide an important context for exploring these transformations. These sites have been conceptualized as self-contained communities (Sykes, 1954); or 'total institutions' cut-off from cultural and societal moorings
(Goffman, 1961); and most commonly, as microcosms of wider society (Cressey and Galtung, 1961 inter alia). Focusing the lens on prisoner communities can reveal, in a raw form, the way in which established gender stereotypes and emotion scripts are consecrated and crystallised in these spaces. And yet, perhaps because these institutions place such rigid constraints on time and space, prisoners often invert, reshape and resist these expectations. It is to these concerns which we now turn.

**Emotion and Masculinity in Men's Prisons**

Subscribing to the norms of 'hegemonic masculinity' (the dominant male form) offers a pathway for men to achieve status and legitimacy in society (Connell, 1987; Messerschmidt, 1993). Much has been written about the stark displays of hegemonic masculinity in men's prisons, which necessitate the 'accentuation of toughness, violence, emotional restraint, dominance, independence, heterosexuality, and whiteness' (Soulliere, 2009: 115).\(^4\) Toch (1998) argues that this prevailing culture is more correctly termed 'hypermasculine', as it distils and intensifies traits found in street gangs and college fraternities outside of prison. This form of ‘maleness’ has ascetic consequences for emotionality: prisoners are expected to suppress or banish any form of dependency, rejecting 'everything gentle, spontaneous, soft, relaxed, chaotic' (Segal, 1990: 116 cited in Newton, 1994). Prisoners' bodies appear to mirror this demand, as the cultivation of large, muscular physiques symbolize dominance and violent potentiality (Jewkes, 2005b)—prison gymnasiums have been described as epicentres of intense machismo (de Viggiani, 2012). Cowburn (2007: 278) found that these sentiments were further reinforced by prison staff, many of whom were 'hostile to any form of masculinity that did not appear to subscribe to the dominant way of behaving as a man'.

According to Kupers (2005), this emphasis on fierce control and supremacy in prison—which he terms 'toxic masculinity'—leads inevitably to an array of socially destructive outcomes. Indeed, the evidence that masculine stereotypes contribute to increases in prison suicides (Scase, 1999) and that male 'codes can function to keep the man away within his own mind, unable to find any emotional release or support' (Evans and Wallace, 2008: 494) largely

---

\(^4\) These attributes resonate with what Moore and Gillette (1991: 5-6) term *boy psychology*: 'Boy psychology...is charged with the struggle for dominance of others, in some form or another. And it is often caught up in the wounding of self, as well as others. It is sadomasochistic. Man psychology is always the opposite. It is nurturing and generative, not wounding and destructive'.
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corroborate his claims. A paralysing tension arises when prisoners attempt to meet the cultural expectations of the institution, while having to repress their desire for self-expression and interpersonal contact (Karp, 2010). Jewkes (2005b: 56) found that prisoners who suffered periods of depression said these moments were 'exacerbated by the demands of the performative masculine culture' which blocked the pathway to help-seeking (Skogstad et al., 2009). If these stark accounts of prison life are taken at face value, it is pertinent to consider why such conditions might be so entrenched. Pleck's (1981) claim, that failure to achieve one aspect of masculinity can lead to compensation in other areas, is instructive here. The deprivations and status stripping nature of prison-life may encourage prisoners to rely on, and amplify, the few masculine resources that remain. Yet, while the bleak testimonies introduced here surely capture a portion of the prisoner experience, there are a number of reasons to suggest they may only be partial explanations and that alternative avenues for masculinity (and forms of emotionality) exist.

Overall, Crewe (2006) argues that there is a problematic tendency in the literature to overlook variations in masculine cultures between different prisons and, on a broader scale, between countries. He goes on to cite prison rape as a prime example: while more prevalent in the USA, male rape is not a quotidian concern in men's prisons in England and Wales, and must surely reflect different underlying patterns of masculinity. In sum then, varieties of masculinity in prison are 'more fluid and transient that traditional accounts suggest' (Ricciardelli et al. 2015: 2). Of particular interest here is the notion of 'inclusive masculinity' (Anderson and McGuire, 2010) which concerns the 'emergence of an archetype of masculinity that undermines the principles of orthodox masculine values—yet one that is also esteemed among male peers' (250). One such challenge to orthodox masculinity in prison is the display of 'softer' emotional states, especially expressions of care and affection between prisoners. For example, Evans and Wallace (2008) observed compassionate feelings among prisoners who witnessed the violent victimization of weaker prisoners and empathized with their powerlessness and fear. This, the authors claim, was indicative of 'a deeper, more emotional, more complex private world, which must be kept “off the landing” but nevertheless exists' (488). This finding is redolent of Kiesling's (2005: 695) broad reflection that closeness in male relationships 'is not straightforward but must be negotiated through “indirect” means'. Building on this, Crewe (2014: 398) observes patterns of oblique 'homosocial bonding' between prisoners—these relationships often manifested themselves in the guise of 'sardonic affection' and through shared activities:
Prisoners who appeared to be close often denied in front of each other they were close or mutually dependant, while at the same time engaging in highly intimate routines—wishing each other goodnight by knocking out messages on adjoining walls, bringing each other morning cups of tea, and sharing personal stories and possessions. (2014: 399)

Ricciardelli et al. (2015) goes further, uncovering a number of prisoners who flouted the demands for emotional restraint. These prisoners rarely concealed their feelings, openly shared the pains of being apart from loved ones, and confided in prisoners with similar experiences. Importantly though, unshackled emotional expression is typically permitted only for amorous relationships outside of prison or for family members. Again, Crewe (2006) is instructive here, observing:

a spirit of romance and sentimentality towards wives and girlfriends, albeit generally within prescribed spheres. Pictures of partners were displayed in cells—sometimes alongside pornographic material—provoking tender reveries; letters were collected and re-read with touching sincerity. During visits, prisoners showed forms of affection to their visitors that were extremely rare on the prison wings. In art and pottery classes, many prisoners produced goods for loved ones, often depicting romantic scenes or conveying emotion openly. (2006: 402)

Taken together, these accounts reveal more nuanced forms of masculinity in prison, in which a wider range of emotions are prescribed. Other avenues of masculinity forged by prisoners include the 'intellect', or prison scholar, who 'make conscious decisions to utilise non-coercive strategies to deal with the encroachment of male and penal power into their lives' (Sim, 1994: 112). These prisoners acquire detailed knowledge of prison rules, engage with the broader penal system by writing letters, and seek out education classes and distance learning courses. Second, there is evidence for a form of chivalric masculinity in prison, who readily apologizes for swearing in front of female staff and who behaves in extremely well-mannered ways, in contrast to behaviour when surrounded only by other men (Crewe, 2006). Finally, Ricciardelli et al (2015: 17) argues there is an archetype of the ‘obedient man’, who having been transferred to a preferred institution, acts ‘more submissively towards other prisoners and staff...exchanging stereotypical “tough-guy” behaviours for more compliant actions such as attending prison programmes, not speaking out and refraining from violence even if challenged’. Importantly then, although far from exhaustive, these different prison postures have implications for our understanding of emotional expression and experiences in prisons. This is most apparent in relation to the 'compassionate' forms of masculinity and homosocial bonding set-out above. The emotional dimensions of these other masculine types remain
notably under-explored.

**Emotion and Women's Prisons**

The spectre of male imprisonment looms heavy over women's institutions, which have been dubbed 'correctional afterthoughts' (Ross and Fabiano, 1986: 79). Indeed, these establishments are widely criticized for being 'male-centric' (typically designed by men, for men) and failing to consider the needs of women (Baldry, 2010; Carlen, 2013). For example, women have medical and hygiene requirements that do not pertain to men, including reproductive needs (pregnancies, mastectomies, hysterectomies), gynaecological treatment needs (Thomas, 2003) and particular mental health requirements (Bradley and Davino, 2002). Second, women are more likely to be the primary caregivers to children in comparison to male prisoners, a reality which is often overlooked by the limits placed on prisoner visits (Moloney et al., 2009). These deficits are further compounded by misguided approaches to gender parity in the penal system, which often result in a form of 'vengeful equity' towards women, who are dealt increasingly punitive sanctions in the spirit of 'fair' justice (Chesney-Lind, 2002).

A separate problem is that these establishments are often imbued with paternalistic attitudes. For example, Sykes (1978: 531) describes female offenders as ‘likely to be viewed as disgraced, dishonoured individuals who need protection’. Such paternalism produces a bleak paradox: women are, on the one hand, encouraged to learn personal and social responsibility while simultaneously being expected to conform to traditional gender roles which reinforce passivity and dependence (Thomas, 2003). Indeed, the phrase 'pastel fascism' (Zaitlow, 2003: 24) captures the trend in which deeply embedded forms of control in women's prisons are 'glossed over and concealed by a superficial façade or false benevolence' (24). Given these wide ranging tensions, it is important to explore how female prisoners express and feel their emotions in these institutions—a question that has rarely been addressed directly.

This population is marked by experiences of exploitation that create acute emotional vulnerabilities. Women's lives prior to imprisonment are often scarred by social and economic deprivation (Bradley and Davino, 2002) and many enter prison with histories of sexual and physical abuse at the hands of men (Atwood, 2000)—more than half have experienced domestic abuse and a third have been sexually abused (HMIP, 2010). Given such bleak realities, it is unsurprising that levels of PTSD (as a lifetime prevalence score) in this
population has been reported to be as high as 33 per cent (Teplin et al., 1996), or that in a recent inspectorate survey half the women reported problems with their emotional well-being or mental health (HMIP, 2010). Finally, many women in prison are mothers—over three-quarters in Morash and Schram's (2002) study—most of whom report separation from their children as the biggest challenge of imprisonment (Celinska, 2013). While these statistics provide important context, Carrabine and Longhurst (1998: 173) caution that penal policy so often 'fails to articulate the heterogeneity that exists among women' and that viewing them as a unified group essentially 'trivialises [their] experiences'. This research sets-out to explore the different pathways that women traverse by combining their prior histories with their experiences of the prison world, and comparing these experiences with the male prisoner population: a proportion of which resembles the female population in terms of levels of abuse, trauma and vulnerability.

Fear and violation, which may have plagued women's lives prior to imprisonment, are at times reconstituted in prison—enforced strip searches and physical restraint are striking examples of this (Moloney et al. 2009). As Carlen (2003: 4) reflects, these ‘invasive procedures imposed on female prisoners in the name of security…[are] too often violatory of bodily or emotional privacy’ which can echo earlier traumatization. Control and judgment of prisoners' bodies, then, can extend into every facet of their behaviour and decision making in prison. As Walker and Worrall (2000: 33) observe: ‘non-conforming behaviour is pathologised, even when that behaviour is intrinsically neutral’. Jose-Kampfner (1990) for example, reported that the majority of women (69%) desired periods of isolation when depressed. Even though ‘an increased need for sleep is recognized as one of the symptoms of depression’ in prison it is ‘translated into noncompliance’ (118). As a consequence of this, women learn to suppress the ‘negative’ emotions associated with depression and sadness because failing to do so leads to unwanted interventions (Walker and Worrell, 2000). In sum, ‘as many of the women learned prior to their incarceration, speaking out about their maltreatment only brought further punishments to them, not to their abusers’ (Ferraro and Moe, 2003: 88).

Furthermore, attempts to mould prisoners’ expressions and behaviours are seen through the prison regime’s endorsement of outmoded and passive feminine virtues (Bosworth, 1999). Writing over forty years ago, Sykes (1978: 531) documented the way in which ‘treatment’ in women’s prisons:
is apt to concentrate on instilling standards of sexual morality, sobriety, and respect for the role of the mother and homemaker. Women prisoners are usually housed in small groups in cottages or dormitories, and the matrons in charge are expected to be knowledgeable about housekeeping matters such as laundry, cooking, and good table manners.

This treatment philosophy is still a notable feature of female imprisonment. The work and education opportunities available to prisoners—which often include cleaning, kitchen work, sewing, gardening and hairdressing—reflect particular ‘assumptions about female taste’ (Bosworth, 1999: 134). Such techniques of ‘refeminisation’ are perhaps epitomized by annual beauty pageants held in Russian prisons, which meld beauty with domestic virtue (Moran et al., 2009). However, while some ‘vocational programs for female inmates continue to focus on reinforcing traditional role expectations’ this not the case for all contemporary prisons (Moraresh and Schram, 2002: 8). Moreover, prisoners sometimes resist these guiding hands by constructing alternative femininities. For example, Moran et al. (2009: 718) argue that the cultivation of relationships with other women and the ‘deafening silence on the subject of male partners’ are both indicative of ‘attempts to resist disempowerment’ and dependency on maleness. This is strongly redolent of Bosworth’s (1999) argument that lesbian relationships, the pursuit of religion, and special attention to dietary needs and dress provide ways of counteracting the ‘homogeneous femininity advocated by the institution’ (135). As was the case with the various incantations of masculinity in men’s prisons however, it is not always clear how these alternative avenues of femininity relate to emotionality.

More has been written about the coping functions of romantic ‘dyads’ and ‘families’ in women’s prisons. These interpersonal relationships have been described as the anchors of prison life and as an essential part of the prisoner social order (Owen, 1998). These constructed families—in which prisoners play the role of mother, sister, brother and father—provide ‘stability, warmth, security, and social bonding’ (Zaitlow, 2003: 31). To a degree then, intimate formations help to alleviate the loneliness of prison life (Atwood, 2000) and provide a way for women to ‘cope with incarceration and meet their emotional, practical, and material needs’ (Ferraro and Moe, 2003: 88). Owen (1998) suggests that female prisoners remain deeply connected to the lives of their intimates outside prisons—more than their male counterparts—and these ‘parallel emotional connections’ can compete for their ‘energy and allegiance’ (166). More recent research (Greer, 2000; Jiang and Winfree, 2006) has however questioned the stability of these internal familial relationships, arguing that they have become
less frequent and more turbulent than in the past. These contentions—especially the claim that male and female prisoners have different degrees of emotional cathexis both inside and outside of prison—deserve more consideration.

**Similar or Contrasting Emotional Worlds**

Despite the benign atmosphere of a cluster of cottages in a rural setting, custody is still likely to take precedence over all else. Women in prison, no less than men, are confronted with a set of frustrating circumstances that threaten the confined criminal’s identity and sense of personal worth. (Sykes, 1978: 531)

While prison regimes may often overlook the different requirements of female prisoners, academic research too often fails to reflect on the similarities (and shared challenges) of the sexes as *human beings living with confinement*. Liebling (2009) argues that gendered assumptions have led researchers to neglect important research areas, by privileging themes relevant to gender over ‘themes relevant to the prison: such as power, authority, and justice’ (20). Of particular relevance here, Liebling notes that while emotions have been addressed in women’s prison, this has often excluded discussions of anger. Similar issues, or areas of neglect, are traceable in research on men’s prisons. For example, though much has been written about the expressive functions of self-harm in women's prisons, where emotions are openly 'communicated through the visual writing of the body with scars and wounds' (Chamberlen, 2015: 11), comparable findings are presented in studies of male prisoners. For example, Crewe et al. (2013: 11) explain how men's emotions 'leaked into, or were sublimated in, more public arenas. Acts of self-harm occurred in private, but left scars that were publicly visible'. Likewise, while the importance of motherhood is a perennial feature of scholarship on women's prisons, few studies have tapped into the pains of fatherhood in prison (Hairston, 2002; Owen, 1998). Further, although direct references to 'pseudo-families' may be infrequent for male prisoners, interactions with female officers have been compared to relationships with female family members (Crewe, 2006). It is also not uncommon to hear men talking about their 'brothers' (in a religious context), or referring to prison mentors as 'father' figures. Finally, as hinted above, women suppress and conceal their emotions in prison—much like their male counterparts—and some seek out a life of isolation (Jiang and Winfree, 2006). Jones and Schmid (2003), in a rare comparative study of prisoner coping, found that *initial* adaptations to prison looked very similar for both men and women, who responded to their vulnerability by 'appearing tough' and engaging minimally with others.
Taken together, these accounts suggest that the differences between these populations may often be matter of degree and are not absolute. An important goal for this research is to approach ostensible differences in emotionality between these groups with care and reflectivity, bracketing off prior assumptions.

The aim of these two previous sections has been to analyse the ways in which 'carceral geography' and gender have implications for emotions in prison. Less has been said here about how gender and spatiality interact with each other across prison environments. Jurisdictions with 'punishment-focused systems' (e.g. South Africa, USA) for example—in which institutions often infantilize prisoners and deny channels for self-expression (Gear, 2007)—have increased levels of gang culture and hegemonic masculinity (Evans and Wallace, 2008). Moreover, prison conditions characterized by scarcity create violent power struggles for the few remaining resources that exist (Karp, 2010). Evans and Wallace (2008) argue that environments which encourage education courses and legitimize emotional displays expand 'men's definition and experience of their maleness and thus lessen the negative effects of living in a rigidly controlled gender position' (503). This resonates strongly with Sim's (1994: 114) discussion of 'community meetings' in the Barlinnie Special Unit, which encouraged prisoners to 'shine the searchlight of scrutiny on themselves as individuals or more fundamentally as men...this philosophy which demanded personal as opposed to interpersonal confrontation' enabled the men to begin 'shedding the layers of psychological skin from [their] past'. Or perhaps as Newton (1994: 1999) succinctly puts it: 'if prisons were controlled in a less rigidly masculine manner, there might be less masculine organisation amongst prisoners'. While Newton might oversimplify the case, these accounts all suggest that gender scripts in prison are both malleable and highly contingent on the local prison environment (Ricciardelli et al, 2015).

**Biography, Coping and Emotion Regulation**

Biographical accounts of prison life are full of emotional charge. The ubiquity of feelings in these testimonies is significant. ‘Emotionally, every day in prison is a constant series of challenges’ (Stanko, 2004: 172). But in a similar manner to aforementioned scholarship on prison masculinity, these accounts often document the most hostile dimensions of imprisonment and the requirement to inhibit emotions. Cook (Cook & Eilkison, 1998: 47) relates a particularly extreme example of ‘a psychopath...[who] killed two of our fellow inmates and proceeded to eat the brains of one of them’. In the context of such violence
Hassine (1996: 12) explains that ‘being kind was a weakness’ and only ‘viciousness and recklessness were …respected and admired.’ In a similar vein, the chapter titles that orientate Carceral’s (2006) book—‘Guerrilla Warfare’, ‘Wild Wild West’, ‘Beat Down Crew’, and ‘The Zoo’—evoke an image of prison as an unwaveringly barren and lawless zone. These testimonies are typically framed with the most absolute terms and linguistic qualifiers:

Everyone in a prison like Wakefield is in a constant state of anxiety. You exist under the persistent threat of being killed or seriously injured. You have to assume that someone is out to get you all the time, or else you’ll get caught off guard and attacked. (Cook & Eilkison, 1998: 46, emphasis added)

According to these accounts, prisoners live in a continuous state of fear. As a consequence, these biographies explain the importance of hiding vulnerabilities from others and displaying aggression when challenged: ‘If you are not prepared to defend yourself with violence, you will be shamefully taken advantage of. You will be beaten, buggered, humiliated and used like a slave’ (Cook & Eilkison, 1998: 46). However, even within the most barren accounts alternative feeling scripts are sometimes recounted. Further, a small number of biographies convey more textured, emotionally differentiated, reflections of prison life (Boyle, 1977; James, 2003; Wyner, 2003)—even if the general tone remains decidedly bleak. For example, Wyner (2003) relates the importance of joy and humour in prison, which functions as a kind of emotional catharsis: ‘we find ourselves in fits and giggles over the least humorous thing as the tension we are holding in is released’ (114). Similarly, Erwin James (2003) describes feeling tenderness and empathy towards a fellow prisoner: ‘I realized he was crying. I understood that those tears had been a long time coming. I placed my hand lightly on his shoulder, and I cried too’ (62). Most strikingly, Jimmy Boyle’s (1977) memoire articulates a breadth and intensity of emotional states with a level of complexity that is rarely documented. There are distinct rays of hope in Boyle’s writing, most apparent in his daydreams about his future life after prison. He recalls experiencing ‘sheer joy moments’ and entering ‘the technicoloured world of fantasia’ during these life-affirming moments (147). Further, he documents his deep personal transformation in prison in poetically emotional terms:

I love it as I feel the inside of my head blossoming like a flower and realise I am changing into something else…Even though I am in prison, these are the finest years I’ve ever known. There are times when I am not in prison, when I have transcended this and feel free. There is one thing I am sure of, that I have been in a personal prison all my life until these past years. (80)

Importantly, there are distinctions between in situ diaries (such as Boyle’s) and retrospective
testimonies of prison life. The retrospective accounts are particularly prone towards exposé and emphasizing chaotic events, violence, riots and significant disruptions to order. This is not to downplay these accounts, the severity of the incidents reported, the accuracy of the claims, or the indelible imprints they left on the mind of their witnesses. Rather, it is to suggest that between these events there exists a range of less remarkable, but sociologically significant, experiences that can help us understand the emotional dimensions of imprisonment in a more complete way. Put short, the quotidian dynamics of prison life appear more often in chronological diaries, and reveal that while controlling emotions in prison is highly prevalent, it is by no means a universal strategy for regulating affective states.

While these biographies present relatively consistent accounts of imprisonment, academic literature on ‘coping’ are more divided. Coping refers to a process through which individuals manage the internal and external demands that overload their existing resources (Folkman & Lazarus, 1988). However, debate centres around the idea that imprisonment inflicts pain on those who experience it. That is, although an early wave of American prison scholars document various ‘pains of imprisonment’ (Sykes, 1954) and articulate an ostensibly maladaptive process of ‘prisonization’ (Clemmer, 1940), subsequent research has not always corroborated these findings. For example, in a broad review of 90 studies on the psychological impacts of imprisonment Bukstel and Kilmann (1980) conclude that the well-being of prisoners is not consistently affected. A decade later, Bonta & Gendreau (1990: 342) re-examined the ‘cruel and unusual punishment of prison life’ and replicated the finding that imprisonment is not universally destructive; rather, the authors’ claim, individual level factors (biology, cognition) moderate the experience of pain. Zamble and Porporino (1988) offer a further explanation, describing imprisonment as akin to a ‘deep freeze’ where offenders return to original states of physiological and psychological functioning once leaving prison.

However, Liebling (1999: 341) argues that the effects of imprisonment literature is subject to significant measurement problems and is too often shorn of a ‘sufficient affective dimension’. Therefore, Liebling continues, key dynamics of prison life such as ‘fear, anxiety, loneliness, [and] trauma’ remain hidden in research accounts (341). In short, psychological measurements of harm in prison mask a range of complex pains. For example, studies that rely on clinical measures of ‘depression’ and ‘anxiety’ overlook subjective lived experiences of pain that fall outside of these domains. Further, given that prisoners describe fears about the force of psychological power and clinical assessments (Crewe, 2009) suspicions may be
raised by these assessments of prisoners’ mental health status. These factors can drive prisoners to mask or downplay their underlying emotion states (see Laws & Crewe, 2016). Further, Liebling and Maruna (2005: 12) highlight that ‘only the survivors appear in research samples’ (12) as long-term studies exclude those who fail to adjust (having committed suicide, or having been transferred to secure hospitals or other prisons).

Recent research suggests that while pain is a fundamental part of the prison experience, the realities of prisoner coping and adaptation are complex. First, while the experience is harmful, ‘effects do not increase in a linear fashion with increases in time served in custody’ (Ginneken, 2015: 2). Evidence suggests that the earliest stages of the prison sentence induce the most deleterious impacts (or ‘entry shocks’) (see Medlicott, 2001). Second, prison environments vary, and there is more pain in more restrictive settings: ‘the more extreme, harsh, dangerous, or otherwise psychologically-taxing the nature of the confinement, the greater the number of people who will suffer and the deeper the damage that they will incur’ (Haney, 2002: 79-80).

A number of prison researchers have attempted to explain how prisoners navigate initial (and ongoing) pains over time. Many such accounts develop findings from testimonies of concentration camp survivors that stress the importance of ‘protective blocking mechanisms’ that insulate individuals from ‘further traumatic experiences’ (Bluhm, 1948: 101). The primary mechanism described is the cultivation of detachment, wherein ‘horrible and degrading experiences’ are reinterpreted as not happening to a person ‘as a subject’, but rather ‘as an object’ (Bettelheim, 1943: 431). Frankl (1946) claims—building on Nietzsche's (1889: 12) maxim ‘He who has a why to live can bear almost any how’—that survival in the camps depended on locating meaning in suffering, and developing aspirations for the future: ‘the prisoner who has lost faith in the future—his future—was doomed. With his loss of belief in the future he also lost his spiritual hold; he let himself decline and became subject to mental and physical decay’ (Frankl, 1946: 82). Although modern imprisonment cannot be compared to the barbaric obliteration of human life played out in Nazi concentration camps, similar adaptive processes have been articulated in relation to the prison. For example, Cohen and Taylor (1972) evoke Bettelheim and Bluhm, explaining that the long-term prisoners they studied in Durham defended against deterioration by making ‘sense of one’s experience’
intellectually (137), reframing imprisonment as object of academic study. In a similar vein Ginneken's (2015: 14) findings resonate strongly with Frankl’s account, explaining that the ‘difference between “doing well” and “just doing time” is captured by this ability to find meaning in the prison experience and use the available resources and support in pursuit of a better future’. The ways in which prisoners reframe events and their emotions to cultivate a deeper understanding about the meaning of imprisonment is highly pertinent to this research and will be explored in detail.

A more recent wave of research introduces a wider range of conceptual dimensions to prisoner coping. First, Jewkes (2005a: 375) suggests that an integral part of coping is navigating the ‘liminality’ induced by long-term imprisonment. Jewkes explains that although ‘the rippling shockwaves’ of being sentenced creates a self that is ‘temporarily suspended’ for many long-term prisoners ‘the initial feelings of fear and loss subside’ over time enabling them ‘to reconstruct their narrative of self’ (375). O’Donnell (2014) stresses the importance of ‘taming time’ (222), which if successful, can lead to ‘spiritual rejuvenation’ (259) as prisoners reinterpret the meaning of their incarceration. Further, Crewe et al. (2017) argue that, over time, long-term prisoners find ways of coping, learning to ‘swim’ with—rather than against—the metaphorical tide. This process is characterised by an ‘underlying shift from a form of agency that was largely regressive and reactive to one that was progressive and productive’ (Crewe et al., 2017: 10).

Taken together, these accounts offer an indispensable resource for understanding the key dynamics of prisoner coping, especially at the level of identity. However, the emotional mechanisms underlying accounts of coping and adaptation are not always clear, and further, these accounts of coping are typically marked by a ‘predominant focus on decreasing negative affect’ (Gross, 2014: 8). The emphasis on prisoners’ responses to pain and negative affectations is important, but taken alone it risks denuding other key dimensions of the prisoner experience. By contrast, emotion regulation approaches can supplement accounts of coping by considering ‘emotions as feelings states capable of being modified in all directions.

3 While Cohen and Taylor were subject to criticism for their lack of methodological neutrality. As an example of one such critique, Walker claims (1987: 190) a ‘conjuring trick was achieved in Psychological Survival…it has been widely read as evidence of the inmates’ psychological deterioration, although in fact all that it documents is their fears of deterioration’. Nonetheless, there work has established an important foundation for understanding subjective experiences for research on coping.
(e.g., increasing, maintaining or decreasing positive and negative affect)” (Laws & Crewe, 2016: 541). In this way, it might be possible to uncover a more complete picture of the emotional world of prisoners. The final segment of this review therefore introduces the emotion regulation literature, developed outside prison contexts, to further orientate this study.

**Conceptualizing Emotion Regulation**

Hochschild (1979) suggests that individuals undertake ‘emotion work’ to conform to rules and expectations of the environment. More specifically, emotion work is ‘the act of trying to change the degree or quality an emotion or feeling’ (1979: 561) to meet social and professional norms. For example, in Western societies, workers are encouraged to exhibit coolness and rationality in the workplace, and those who work in professions which are unpredictable or sometimes lethal (firemen, policemen and soldiers) are encouraged not to display signs of fear (Fischer et al., 2004). Similarly, prisoners understand that social interactions have what Goffman (1959: 121) calls a ‘working consensus’ which can serve ‘as a guarantee for safe social interaction.’ Indeed, in *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* Goffman argues that in social settings individuals ‘tend to incorporate and exemplify the officially accredited values of the society’ (1959: 23), but that this is often a ‘veneer of consensus’ to which actors give ‘lip-service’ (3). That is to say, according to these accounts, social situations often require us to suppress, exaggerate or fake the nature of our emotions to some degree (Planalp, 1999; Ekman & Friesen, 1975).

The separate, but related, emotion regulation literature shares a similar starting point but emphasises individual needs ahead of social expectations. It contends that social demands and naturally occurring emotions are not always beneficial to the individual (Von Scheve, 2012)—largely because the ‘physical and social environments have changed out of all recognition from those that shaped our emotions’ (Gross, 1999: 558)—and that emotion regulation may be necessary to bring them into relief. Emotion regulation is defined here as:

> the processes by which individuals influence the emotions they have, when they have them, and how they experience and express these emotions. Emotion regulatory processes may be automatic or controlled, conscious or unconscious, and may have their effects at one or more points in the emotion generative system. (Gross, 1998: 275).

In a broad sense, we regulate emotions by trying to influence them in any direction. This may
include the ‘transformation, exaggeration, or enhancement’ (Manstead and Fischer, 2000: 189) of emotional responses to increase their intensity or type, or the ‘down-regulation’ of an emotion to try and achieve a faster return to baseline (Gross, 1998). Further, we may also try to maintain or extend the experience of an emotion over a longer period of time (Koole, 2009). However, in a more technical sense, we attempt to regulate our emotions by modifying one or more of the components in the emotion process (eliciting situation, attention, appraisal and response tendencies), as conveyed in Figure 2. It is instructive to consider the five different ‘families’ of emotion regulation to further explain how emotions are regulated. It is useful to draw a distinction between the first four strategies in the table which occur before the emotional response (antecedent strategies), and the final strategy, which involves a ‘response’ once an emotion has been experienced.

![Figure 2. A process model of emotion regulation showing the five 'families' of regulation (top row), reproduced from Gross and Thompson (2007)](image)

One way to influence emotion, then, is by carefully selecting our environment (situation selection), which is a notably proactive form of regulation (Koole, 2009). By seeking out or avoiding particular people or places, we can vastly increase the probability of experiencing emotions that we desire and decrease the likelihood of being faced by emotionally problematic circumstances (Gross, 2008). Another proactive emotion regulation strategy involves attempting to alter the existing physical environment to meet our needs (situation modification). As examples, this may involve setting ambient lighting to encourage relaxation or playing loud music to generate excitement. In some instances, however, the setting is fixed and neither of these strategies are feasible: when school children are presented with difficult...
problems or tests, the environment cannot be changed or modified (Vuillier, 2014). In these cases it may be necessary for individuals to think about which aspect of the experience they chose to focus on (attention). Two common ways of doing this involve distraction and concentration. The former includes both seeking out external diversions in the environment (such as reading and watching television) to avoid an emotionally-eliciting stimulus (Planalp, 1999; Rothbart and Sheese, 2007) and internally focused attempts to summon thoughts and memories that are inconsistent with unwelcome emotion states (Watts, 2007). By contrast, concentration (or rumination) involves focusing attention repeatedly on the emotional situation and the consequences (Gross, 2007), which can markedly increase the duration and intensity of the emotion (Gross, 2008).

The final antecedent strategy involves attempting to reappraise or cognitively change how we think about a specific situation (appraisal). For example, being blanked by a colleague (which could initially be interpreted as a personal slight) might be cognitively re-framed to consider that the person may have been preoccupied in that moment (Gross, 2008). Reappraisal can help diffuse the emotional content of an event by putting it into terms in which we can more easily understand. In a different but related respect, it may also involve trying to diminish the significance of what is occurring. This is perhaps most clearly seen in the use of humour which ‘tends to make situations seem less important by virtue of their absurdity or our detachment...[making them] less threatening or anxiety producing’ (Planalp, 1999: 80).

In distinction to antecedent strategies, a person can try to modify their physiological, experiential or behavioural expressions after an emotion is internally felt, which may include mental relaxation techniques, exercise, sleeping, bathing, eating and smoking for example (Gross, 2008; Planalp, 1999). There are two common response strategies that deserve further elaboration: suppression and social sharing. Suppressing a felt emotion (termed ‘expressive suppression’) may include attempts to decrease the visible display of anxiety during in an interview or hiding anger from one’s boss (Gross, 2008). Suppressing emotion has been related to a number of detrimental health outcomes (John & Gross, 2004; Mate, 2003). On the contrary, the social sharing of emotion ‘facilitates emotional adjustment due to the repeated confrontation with and reprocessing of the emotional information’ which can allow a person to reappraise the situation, compare their emotional reactions to that of others and reintegrate themselves into the social environment (Niedenthal et al., 2006: 189).
On the whole, Gross and Thompson’s model provides a useful, conceptually structured, way to understand emotions as the level of self. Indeed, these insights strongly inform the first substantive chapter of this work. However, the model is not without limitations. First, the theory frames emotion regulation as a set of ‘rational’ processes and seems to exclude the possibility that emotions are, at times, expressed freely or ‘unregulated’. More importantly, while the model hints at other levels of analysis (through terminology such as ‘social sharing’, and ‘spatial selection’), it largely places the individual at the centre of emotional world and excludes important social and spatial factors. For current purposes, it is necessary to integrate these various levels of analysis and avoid overemphasising the role of individual actors. The three conceptual levels advanced here (the self, social, and spatial) may not be exhaustive, but they offer a useful foundation for understanding the emotional dynamics of prison life.

**Research Questions**

This review has introduced a broad range of perspectives on gender and space, arguing that these literatures constitute an indispensable context to guide this study of emotion and imprisonment. This background provides a solid foundation to help conceptually organize the research findings. Taken as a whole, these literatures reveal that the current picture of prisoner emotion is partial. Existing work has tended to either neglect issues of emotion entirely or narrow it to a set of binary oppositions (‘frontstage’ and ‘backstage’, ‘public’ and ‘private’ areas) that have limited explanatory value. In one sense, then, this study aims to directly address these gaps in the literature and develop the existing conceptual categories. More specifically, this dissertation is guided by the following questions:

1.) *How, and why, do prisoners regulate and express their emotions under conditions of confinement?*

2.) *How do gender and space influence and shape patterns of emotions regulation and expression?*

**Definitions and Terminology**

Emotion is defined in this study as any strong feeling: such as sadness, joy, shame, anger or fear (Collins English Dictionary, 2003). Yet, throughout the following chapters the terms ‘feelings’ and ‘affect’ are also used interchangeability with emotion. Although some scholars
draw theoretical distinctions between these terms, in real world settings they are difficult to
distinguish (Fredrickson & Cohn, 2008). Following Barsade (2002: 646), this study uses
these terms as broad labels to help ‘encompass the general phenomenon of subjective
feelings…both for semantic ease and to reflect the commonality of the overall affective
experience’. Drawing neat distinctions between ‘positive’ and ‘negative’ emotions can be
problematic, as these demarcations are not always precise or without sociological ambiguity
(for example, finding joy in another person’s pain). Therefore, the coming chapters generally
try to label specific emotions instead (‘fear’, ‘joy’). However, in a few places, where the
distinction was more straightforward, the terms ‘positive’ and ‘negative’ are retained.
3. Researching Emotions in Two Prisons

Emotion is only just beginning to be incorporated into...studies and relatively little attention has been given to methodological and related theoretical issues. These present considerable challenges, not least because emotion is considered to be especially elusive—private, intangible, transient, unmanageable, and even ‘unknowable’. (Sturdy, 2003: 81)

This chapter details the investigative aspects of the study, describing the methodological procedures and research design that set out to address the research questions. The account introduces the two research sites, their respective regime cultures, and explains the rationale for their selection. Thereafter, the chapter critically reflects on the experience and process of undertaking the fieldwork and the various methodological and ethical challenges of assessing emotions in prison. The Sturdy quotation above provides some indication of the range and complexity of these issues. More specifically, this account details the most significant features of the semi-structured interviews and the shadowing. Where appropriate, prisoners’ testimonies of the research experience, and the insights that emerged from them, are presented.

Rationale, Site Selection and Access
The selection of a men’s and a women’s prison was based upon the relative neglect of gendered comparisons in prisons research (sometimes justified by the low ratio of female to male prisoners). This was particularly significant for this study because it was felt that stereotypes and preconceptions about emotional differences between men and women in prison were in need of further exploration. Indeed, Liebling (2009) explains that themes like authority, justice and order have been explored more frequently among male prisoners, while themes like domesticity and sexuality are slightly overstated in women’s prisons. And of particular relevance here, Liebling continues, emotional states have also been affected by these preconceptions: ‘There is an emphasis on emotion [in research on women’s prisons], but not the emotion of anger’ (Liebling, 2009: 20). In a recent article, Crewe and colleagues propose a solution to help navigate these problems: gender was foregrounded in their research but without being ‘overdetermined by presumptions about gender roles’ (Crewe et al., 2017: 17). In a similar manner, then, this comparative design attempts to avoid splintering the research areas into predefined topics that we assume are relevant to specific gender categories.
The research sites were settled upon after a number of discussions with my supervisor (Dr. Ben Crewe). HMP Ranby was a particularly convenient prison to research because I knew the local area well, and the Prisons Research Centre in Cambridge had established strong connections with the Governor that could help facilitate access. Selecting the women’s prison was similarly based on established relationships with the Governor at HMP Send (Carlene Dixon). There was a further concern that other nearby women’s prisons (like the recently closed Holloway) had been somewhat over researched in recent years. The selection of a category-C men’s prison and closed category women’s establishment reflected a broader aim of this study to explore emotions among a general prisoner population as opposed to particular sub-set populations. That is to say, medium security establishments house a wide-range of prisoners under more flexible conditions than the high-security estate, and therefore provide a useful starting point. Further, both prisons have more stable populations that would be found in local prisons, where the prisoner population is far more transient. My supervisor contacted both prison governors (Carlene Dixon and Susan Howard) to explore the prospect of this research, both of whom were receptive. Access was then sought through a formal application to the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) using their online system and through ascertaining official permission from the Governors in July 2015. As the study involved multiple research sites, it was evaluated by the National Research Committee (NRC): it was initially accepted under the condition that a number of methodological queries were resolved. This process was successful and I began security and key training in Send in late October 2015.

The Research Sites
The two research sites differed on many levels. In comparison to Send, Ranby had a significantly larger prisoner population (around five times greater); serious problems with debt, violence and new psychological substances; a high turnover of prisoners; and was undergoing a substantial process of reform and administrative transition during the fieldwork period. Conversely, Send seemed to be quietly thriving, having a relatively stable prisoner population (most prisoners were serving long sentences), and a number of diverse, well-attended, programmes. These rather broad demarcations between establishments are not introduced here as a value judgement, rather to say that they created particular opportunities and challenges for researching emotions. In order to contextualize and illuminate the
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6 I had always been curious about Ranby prison as a child because my school was next door to it.
7 From here on the prisons will be referred to as just Ranby and Send without the ‘HMP’ acronym.
8 Ranby was recently named by the government as one of six new reform prisons.
‘climates’ of these two prisons, further details are set-out below. These descriptions include a brief overview of the architectural features of the prisons sites in anticipation of the final substantive chapter (on emotions and prison space).

**Ranby Prison**

Ranby is a public sector, Category C, men’s prison located in north Nottinghamshire. The prison opened in 1971, having formerly served as an army barracks. Since the mid-2000s the prison has undergone significant expansion with the construction of multiple house blocks. The large perimeter of the prison (around a mile long) is enclosed by a metal fence with razor wire along the top. A large proportion of the external perimeter is surrounded by either woodlands or a single row of trees.

The internal geography of the prison comprised seven residential house blocks that served the following functions: House block 1 was primarily an induction wing, although some prisoners were living there for safety reasons. House blocks 2 and 3 were general population wings, aside from the ‘south’ side of House block 2 which served as a drug treatment unit. These three blocks were built in the mid-2000s in a contemporary style, but retained the classic Victorian layout—with long wings that can be observed from a central hub. They were the most populous wings, each holding around 240 prisoners across three landings. House block 5 held 192 prisoners who are categorised as being ‘low risk’. This included prisoners who did not present concerns for security and control, older offenders and disabled prisoners. This wing was the oldest building and had the most irregular design, with four spurs shooting off diagonally from a rectangular centre. House blocks 4, 6 and 7 were all substantially smaller wings, holding around 60 prisoners each. These three blocks were relatively new constructions (built in the early 2000s) and all had cells with integrated sanitation facilities (showers, washbasins and toilets). Finally, there was a segregation unit with 15 cells. All of the residential blocks had their own food serveries, telephones, pool tables (and sometimes snooker) and table tennis tables.

Other buildings on the site reflected the typical hallmarks of a Category C prison. Ranby was classed as a working prison and there were a large number of workshops including woodwork, textiles, metalwork and a track works programme. There were two mid-sized gymnasiums (one dedicated to cardiovascular and strength training, the other for indoor

---

9 These three house blocks were all had two large wings, called ‘North’ and ‘South’.
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sports and athletics), a large free standing library, education building (privately run by Milton Keynes College), visits hall, chapel, reception building, large kitchen and administrative buildings.

At the time of the fieldwork, the prisoner population hovered around its occupational capacity of 1038. The prison received an average of 250 new receptions per month, which is exceptionally high for a Category-C prison. All of the prisoners had been sentenced. The majority of prisoners (40 per cent) were serving sentences of between two and four years, and a further 28 per cent were serving between four and ten years. There were small numbers of both short and long-term prisoners: only around three per cent of prisoners had sentences of less than six months and four per cent had life sentences. The most common primary offences in Ranby were burglary, robbery, drugs offences and violence against the person (HMIP, 2015). Most prisoners were aged between 21 and 29 years old (44 per cent) and 30 to 39 (33 percent). The vast majority of the population was white British (76 per cent), and the second highest ethnicity was black Caribbean (seven per cent). Around forty per cent of prisoners had no religious affiliation, while different Christian denominations, Church of England, Roman Catholics accounted for 15 per cent of the population, and ten per cent of prisoners were Muslim.

**Regime and Climate**
Ranby was undergoing a period of significant transition during the fieldwork. Its governor had recently left the prison and there was much speculation (from both prisoners and staff) about Ranby’s future and that major changes were about to be implemented. A few weeks after I left the research site it was confirmed that Ranby had been named as one of six autonomous reform prisons in England and Wales (MoJ press release, 2016), and that the new executive governor would be given ‘unprecedented freedoms’ over all aspects of the prison’s management strategy. These anticipated changes, in part, contributed to an atmosphere of uncertainty around the prison among both staff and prisoners.11

There were more tangible changes to the prisoner regime that indicated that Ranby was struggling to cope with security and control problems. Prisoner movement had recently been
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10 Specific data is listed as missing from the two most recent prison inspectorate reports. This information was ascertained through verbal conversations with members of the offender management team.
11 Certain wings and a large number of rooms had been cordoned off for refurbishment/reallocation, but specific details were sparse which generated speculation among both prisoners and officers.
restricted to a few short windows in the day (called the ‘line route’) to try and curtail the 
circulation of new psychoactive substances (NPS) and the collection of ‘throwovers’ by 
prisoners—prior to this, prisoners had enjoyed greater freedom to move around the prison 
site. While NPS have been somewhat of a national epidemic for the Prison Service, there 
were concerns that the problem was being felt acutely in Ranby. For example, the most recent 
inspectorate report (HMIP, 2015: 6) referred to ‘a destabilising supply of NPS, which 
threatens to overwhelm the prison’. Further, the new line route system appeared to have 
increased tensions (discussed further in Chapter 5 below) seemingly without decreasing illicit 
trade—largely because policing the large volumes of prisoners circulating the prison at once 
was problematic. Due to the high concentration of throwovers there was sporadic ‘freezes’ of 
prisoner movement while incidents were investigated.

The tense nature of this environment was reflected in the piercing alarms that routinely 
punctuated the soundscape of the prison (I heard them five to ten times a day). However, 
these incidents were not evenly distributed and came (almost always) from House blocks 1, 2 
and 3 (often termed the ‘dark side’ of the prison). There was much discussion about the 
divided nature of the prison (from prisoners and staff alike) and many felt unsafe on the 
larger house blocks. The six deaths in custody that had occurred over the previous two years 
loomed in the collective consciousness of the prison. Although Ranby was classed as a 
working prison only 62 per cent of prisoners were actually employed (IMB, 2016a). In the 
same report, the Independent Monitoring Board highlighted a more concerning pattern of 
workshop over-subscription: ‘this over-allocating would seem to be a way of increasing the 
number of prisoners who are “employed” but has deleterious effects upon the workshops’ 
ability to manage’ (2016: 10). Prisoners complained about having nothing to do at work, or 
that they wanted employment but were left on wings through the working day.

Put short, Ranby was attempting to manage problems of debt, NPS, and violent bullying that 
placed significant pressures on the security and welfare of prisoners and staff members. In a 
press release shortly after the end of the fieldwork, the incoming governor accurately 
captured the climate at Ranby: ‘Staff morale is low, suicides and violence is high and we 
have to deal with that. These are symptomatic of a regime that doesn’t work’ (Inside time, 
2016).

12 When illegal contraband is thrown over the fence for prisoners to collect.
Send Prison
Located in the Surrey countryside, Send is a closed-category training prison for women. It initially opened as an isolation hospital but was converted into a prison in 1962. The prison has served a number of custodial functions over the years: it started as a Junior Detention Centre before being re-classified as Category C training prison for men in 1987, and finally it went through a comprehensive structural overhaul in 1999 which created the present day establishment for women. The prison was surrounded by trees, and had a metal fenced perimeter with razor wire on top.

The residential units in Send provided a wide range of services. A, B and C wing form the three horizontal ‘off-shoots’ of the large central ‘E’ shaped building: A wing had 40 cells and served as a Psychologically Informed Planned Environment (PIPE Unit); B wing was a similar sized living space which functioned as an induction wing; while C wing was designated for general population prisoners. D wing stood alone in a small square shaped building with 10 cells (the only shared cells in the prison) allocated for the RAPt programme (Rehabilitation for Addicted Prisoners Trust). The wooden exteriors of E and F wings marked them as distinct from the rest of the prison accommodation: these long rectangular buildings comprised the resettlement unit, each holding 40 prisoners. J wing was the largest residential building (with 64 cells), half of which was dedicated to the therapeutic community (the only TC for women in England and Wales). This wing was also the only building to have a dedicated servery; prisoners from all other wings ate in a large central dining room.

Many of the working facilities at Send reinforced traditional feminine stereotypes: there was a hair salon, a massage parlour, a number of culinary spaces (bakeries and kitchens), and an extensive gardening programme. The other buildings around the site were similar to those found at Ranby, including: a gymnasium, chapel, reception building, education building, visits hall, administrative buildings and a large central dining room. There was no free-standing libraries (unlike Ranby), but two small rooms on different wings served this function.

Send had an operational capacity of 282, but the actual number of prisoners was 276 at the end of the fieldwork (January, 2016). The vast majority of the population was sentenced (97%) with a small number being on recall. Almost 40 per cent of prisons were serving
sentences over ten years—this included 25 per cent of prisoners who were serving life sentences. A further 40 per cent of prisoners were serving sentences between four and ten years—in direct contrast to Ranby then, the prisoner population was fairly static. The most common offence types were murder, violence against the person, theft, and drugs related offences. There was only a small number of prisoners over 60 years old (4 per cent) and most of the population was aged between 21 to 29 years old (27 per cent), 30 to 39 years (31 per cent) and 40 to 49 years (29 per cent) respectively. As was the case in Ranby, most prisoners were White British (60 percent) and the second largest subgroup was Black or Black British (almost 20 per cent). Religious affiliation in Send was predominantly Church of England (around 20 per cent), Roman Catholic (22 per cent) and other Christian dominations (18 per cent).

Regime and Climate

Send had a relaxed but orderly atmosphere. Although there were set times for movement, prisoners benefited from extended periods of time out of cell, and they were able to move around the establishment throughout the day using ‘movement slips’. To accommodate this level of mobility most of the main connecting gates and doors were ‘locked open’. This factor, in part, gave the prison a spacious and calm feel—because prisoners did not have to wait at every door and could walk at their own pace. The large grounds were well kept and decorated throughout with flowerbeds and shrubs, which visually softened the carceral edges. The expansive gardens programme (which provided food for The Clink) felt like a world apart from the main prison with its large greenhouses and bee hives—this programme was highly popular in the summer months.

The environment felt safe and secure. In the most recent inspectorate report the majority of prisoners reported that violent incidents were rare and were usually limited to verbal altercations (HMIP, 2015). The same report describes Send as ‘a very successful prison’ (2015, 5) which scored in the highest categories of the inspectorate’s healthy prisons test. Similarly, the most recent annual IMB report describes an establishment that ‘treats its prisoners justly and humanely’ (IMB, 2016b: 5). There have been no self-inflicted deaths in
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13 These were small orange papers which provided details of the purpose of each journey and were signed by members of staff at the departure and destination points.

14 A term used to describe an open door which is locked to a free standing bollard, to prevent it from slamming or being tampered with.

15 A charity which sets-up restaurants inside prisons (open to the public) to help rehabilitate offenders.
the establishment for many years—the last recorded incident was in 2007. These results were built from a foundation of positive relationships between prisoners and officers: the interactions observed typically seemed informal and relaxed—with a few notable exceptions. Further, the high levels of vocational work and educational attendance in the prison may help prisoners to occupy their time and provided a sense of direction.

The wide range of therapeutic services and interventions at Send—including the therapeutic community, Psychologically Informed Planned Environment (PIPE Unit), Rehabilitation for Addicted Prisoners Trust (RAPt) programmes—were notable features of the establishment. To some extent then, these services must also account for the relatively relaxed and palpable ‘treatment atmosphere’ of the establishment. Although places on these programmes were limited, many prisoners had experienced them either directly (because most prisoners were serving long sentences and a large number had passed through a programme at some point) or indirectly through conversations with other prisoners (or because they lived on therapeutic wings as residents only). This therapeutic bent polarised the prisoner population (as discussed in chapter 5), being internalized and embraced by some but wholly rejected by others. I experienced some of these spaces as psychologically ‘tight’, an interpretation echoed by some prisoners. However, it was also clear that these spaces had been highly transformative for a number of individuals.

In the most general terms, Send was more relaxed, orderly and far less violent than Ranby. However, these brief overviews of the research sites introduced have attempted to situate this study and highlight key factors that had important implications. Many of the issues raised here feature again in the subsequent chapters.

Methodology

Researching emotions presents considerable challenges, not least because emotion is considered elusive, even ‘unknowable’. Feelings are real…but cannot always be observed, identified, controlled or labelled with sufficient surety.’ (Sturdy, 2008: 3)

While Sturdy takes an extreme stance here—much has been garnered from studies of emotion—he does highlight the scope of the problem and methodological challenges for any
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16 In the sense that almost every form of behaviour and expression was carefully monitored (either by other prisoners or clinical staff) and interpreted as for example, ‘withholding’, or ‘projecting onto others’, or ‘denial’.
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research on emotion. The following discussion explains the methodological approach, while attempting to examine the challenges that emerged in practice.

The semi-ethnographic methods used here arguably offer the best ways to understand the interior worlds of prisoners and may be especially appropriate for researching emotions. It was hoped that the combination of interviews and prisoner shadowing (a form of close observation) would constitute complementary and mutually reinforcing approaches. Crewe and Maruna (2006: 115) explain that fieldwork observations are valuable in ‘generating trust, credibility and familiarity’ which mean that participants are ‘more likely to disclose themselves in interviews’. As emotions are often perceived to be highly private, and sometimes painful, components of a person’s life, building trust with prisoners and finding ways to close the social ‘distance’ between researcher and participant was a critical first step. However, before introducing the sampling frame and expanding on these research methods, the epistemological position of this research deserves attention. Leaving this part out risks ignoring the assumptions built into this approach to ‘ethnography’.

This study is influenced by constructionism and a psychosocial understanding of the world. Constructionism, according to Crotty (2003: 42), ‘is the view that all knowledge, and therefore all meaningful reality as such, is contingent upon human practices, being constructed in and out of interaction between human beings and their world’. This system of knowledge typically rejects the notion of absolute truth per se, and argues instead that interpretations are ‘true’ only in the context of the specific temporal and spatial conditions in which they are produced. In a compatible way, psychosocial perspectives try to tunnel ‘beneath the surface’ of things (Hoggett & Clarke, 2009: 2) and ‘understand human subjects as…the products of their own unique psychic worlds and a shared social world’ (Gadd & Jefferson, 2007: 4). Put in another way, psychosocial research understands the person ‘as a meeting point of inner and outer forces’ (Frosh, 2003: 1564). This viewpoint is a reaction against the tendency of positivist research on human behaviour to produce what Gadd and Jefferson call (2007: 1) ‘depleted caricatures’ and individuals ‘shorn of their social context’ rather than ‘messily complex human subjects’. The implications of these perspectives for this research have been to utilize methods which try to voice such complex internal worlds. This influence is best displayed in the biographical and life history questions in the interviews, and

17 The qualifier ‘semi’ is appropriate because there are obvious limits to how much a researcher can really ‘enter’ the world of prisoners.
through the structure of the substantive chapters—they explore individual, relational and spatial levels of analysis respectively—that attempt to address Frosh’s idea of the meeting of inner and outer forces. This approach does not seek to ‘measure’ or quantify emotion. Indeed, following Fineman (2004: 736), while the resulting findings may be ‘less precise than the simplifications of measurement’ the adoption of a more ‘interactional, context-focused inquiry’ hopes to produce an account which offers ‘insight, plausibility and texture’.

**The Sample**

A mixture of random and purposeful sampling was used to invite prisoners to participate in shadowing and interviews (n = 50, comprised of 25 men and 25 women). Only one prisoner who was approached did not want to take part in the study. The logic was to try to collate a wide range of perspectives on prisoner emotion. Each prisoner who was shadowed was subsequently interviewed.\(^{18}\) The purposeful approach entailed spending time (usually 3-4 research days) in different areas of each prison (including the residential wings, dining room, classrooms and visits halls) and engaging in conversations with prisoners and staff. I initially sought out prison ‘listeners’,\(^ {19}\) or prisoners in other positions of responsibility (e.g. mental health mentors). Conveniently, in Send, my research coincided with a large meeting of all the prison listeners. The rationale here was that these prisoners often have a detailed understanding of the issues facing the overall prisoner population and especially some of the emotional challenges of imprisonment. The information gained from these individuals was then used to investigate other subgroups and areas of interest. This process worked well overall, although it resulted in a slight oversampling (in both establishments) of prisoners in mentoring roles. Generally, it was gratifying that after a few weeks in the prisons, many prisoners had heard about the research and some even sought me out directly. Zak\(^ {20}\) explained this process in his interview: ‘Where is that man talking about emotions in prison? I told him to come and talk to me. I’ll tell him all about it’. This enthusiasm was double-edged however, since not everyone who approached me could be included in the project.

The second half of the sample involved randomly selecting names from prisoner lists. There were some exclusion criteria in this sampling frame. First, in negotiation with staff members, any prisoners with *serious* mental health problems (individuals who posed a risk of causing harm to themselves or others) were omitted from this research. Similarly, any prisoners who
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\(^{18}\) On one occasion this order was reversed due to a last minute change in the prisoner’s schedule.

\(^{19}\) Prison listeners provide confidential advice and support to other prisoners in need.

\(^{20}\) Pseudonyms have been used to protect the identities of prisoners in this study (see ‘Ethics’ section below).
were listed on prison observation lists (e.g. prisoners posing security threats and those with serious physical health problems) were excluded. In practice, although all prisoners were informally screened by administrative staff or prisoner officers, I was only advised against recruiting one prisoner.\(^{21}\)

The average age of the Send participants was 33 years old, with the youngest being 23 and the oldest 61. These ages represented the wider prisoner population quite well, but within the overall sample there was a slight over representation of those in the 21 to 29 years and 30 to 39 years categories. There was, conversely, an underrepresentation of prisoners in the 40 to 49 group (12 per cent of the sample as compared to 25 per cent of the wider prisoner population). The ethnicity of the sample comprised 52 per cent white British prisoners (a slight under representation of the 60 per cent wider prisoner population) and an over representation of black or black British prisoners who made up 28 per cent of the sample but comprised 20 per cent of the prisoner population. The remaining prisoners in the sample comprised two prisoners of mixed ethnicity (eight per cent), an Irish traveller (4 per cent) and two Asian British prisoners (eight per cent).

The average age of the Ranby men was 37 years old; the youngest prisoner was 26 and the oldest was 68. Overall, the sample represented the age spread of the wider prisoner population quite well, although it under-represented the 21-29 age group, who made up 28 per cent of the participants but 44 per cent of Ranby’s prisoners. Sixty four per cent of the sample identified as white British (compared to three quarters of the prisoner population), while the rest of the sample comprised black and black British prisoners (20 per cent), Asian British (12 per cent) and one prisoner of mixed ethnicity (four percent). In sum, while there were some limitations to the application of the sampling framework it succeeded in pooling together perspectives of prisoners from various backgrounds, ages, and who had very different experiences of imprisonment.

**Prisoner shadowing**

The prisoner shadowing attempted to capture emotions ‘in the moment’. However, before explaining the rationale for this method in greater detail it is necessary to provide a brief explanation of how it was implemented in each establishment.

\(^{21}\) This was a woman who was experiencing a significant amount of distress and engaging in regular self-harm.
In short, the shadowing was undertaken with mixed success. The relatively open regime in Send meant it was easier to accompany prisoners around the site, whereas in Ranby the process was more difficult. As noted above, in Ranby, prisoner movement was restricted to small windows in the day. This caused palpable frustration among prisoners too: ‘We can’t get around the jail as MAPS workers [mental health mentors]...The people who are struggling with anxiety think that we have abandoned them’ (Alan). The tightness of the regime meant that more time was spent in Ranby sitting with prisoners (at their workplaces, or in cells) and getting involved with their various activities (especially art classes, gym workouts and table tennis matches) rather than moving across the establishment.

The shadowing protocol was agreed upon with prisoners a few days in advance (usually the week before). There was a preliminary discussion about which places would be deemed appropriate (and ethical) to observe prisoners in, and the best times to do so. While an important aim of this research was to capture the day-to-day rhythms of prisoners’ lives—I wanted to avoid seeing only the ‘highlights’—some parts of their timetable (therapy sessions and medical appointments, for example) were clearly off-limits. After agreeing on these details, I spent between four and eight hours with each participant in the hope of entering into their worlds for a brief period. This exercise led me to a diverse number of locations, including: beauty parlours, hair salons, gymnasiums, prison libraries, a rail track programme, art classes, business management, culinary classes, kitchens and gardening programmes. While following one prisoner, I experienced a full induction session for new prisoners. Overall, prisoners reflected positively on the shadowing experience (‘it was quite good because you’re really easy to talk to’ [Neil]) and indicated that they were relaxed during the process (‘I hardly noticed you were there’ [Amber]).

Because emotions are ‘wrapped in the warp and weft of social practices’ there are inherent dangers if we try to extract or ‘de-situate’ them from their contexts (Fineman, 2004: 720; see Hochschild, 1979). The shadowing exercise was an attempt to heed this advice by capturing lived experience in situ (Kusenbach, 2003), and examining prisoners’ affective states around the prison. Encouragingly, Stacey reflected that the process indeed felt like ‘someone seeing you in your real self, in the settings you’re in everyday’. More generally, the shadowing made it possible to see prisoners wearing many ‘different hats’ as they moved around, and performed different roles in, the prison. Gilliat-Ray (2011: 471) argues that ‘shadowing offers the possibility of an especially holistic view of the life and work of a particular individual,'
and...there is the potential for the gaining of unexpected insights’. In this vein, one participant who had been docile during her work session became highly animated during the walk back to her cell. She voiced her distaste for a particular group of prisoners at work, and explained the nature of the conflict. It would have been hard to garner this information had a more static form of observation been used. The process offered a dual opportunity then to ‘examine a participant’s interpretations of their contexts while [also] experiencing these contexts’ (Carpiano, 2009: 265).

Another motivation for this approach was to respond to Crewe’s (2014: 397) observation that ‘the absence of openly or publicly stated affective bonds between men is no indication of an absence of feeling, but these feelings are often expressed obliquely’ or take on ‘camouflaged forms’. The shadowing, then, was intended to provide a way to move beyond verbal testimonies and look ‘between the cracks’, exploring more subtle forms of intimacy and emotion that tend to go undocumented. To some extent, this worked in practice. For example, one prisoner led me to the older men’s library that some prisoners’ used to ventilate anything that was on their minds. This exclusive space felt extremely therapeutic and cathartic, though it is hard to imagine that prisoners would have vocalised it in these terms. Further, there was a form of affection being communicated in the gym through ‘paralinguistics’ (especially grunting and verbal encouragement), special handshakes and mutual ‘muscle gazing’—which became especially clear through participating directly in workouts with prisoners. The frenetic pace of the gym sessions that I was put through gave prisoners a degree of control over me, and felt like a kind of initiation ceremony (see Ugelvik, 2014). Indeed, a notable strength of the shadowing approach is that participants are encouraged to take on the role of ‘tour guide’ in this manner, which helps to ‘reduce the typical power dynamics that exist between interview and interviewee’ (Carpiano, 2009: 267).

Yet, this approach also had limitations, raising ethical issues around privacy and best use of time in the field. The aim of the shadowing was to try and ‘loiter with intent’ (Gilliat-Ray, 2011: 472), but at times this goal was stifled as prisoners were not available to speak (for example, while concentrating in lessons or during work) or were immersed in rather mundane activities. Nia accurately conveyed that at times my presence just felt plain awkward: ‘It was a bit strange because I was having my hair done’. On some occasions the opposite problem occurred: prisoners felt too comfortable and spoke openly about personal issues (for example,
their trauma histories) in the earshot of others. In these situations, I pointed out the public nature of the space and that we should return to these conversations during the interviews.

There was also some indication that the shadowing perpetuated a form of institutionalization. For example, when asked for feedback on the shadowing process Rebecka talked about being ‘used to people watching…watching what we are doing’, and Ellie reflected that: ‘I think being in prison for a long time you kind of get used to the whole being watched thing. There’s always somebody around, whether you’re in a workshop or in the kitchens, there’s somebody watching’. It is unsettling that my research might have added to a kind of ‘institutional gaze’. While I attempted to empower prisoners to take the leading role, and did not have coercive goals, in some instances I may have unintentionally breached their privacy and added to their sense of being under surveillance.22

It is hard to know the extent to which prisoners acted ‘naturally’ during the shadowing: the fact that my presence was often announced on wings may have clouded the observational lens. This is redolent of Quinlan’s argument (2008: 1492): ‘by virtue of being observed what is being observed changes’. While this concern is hardly unique to shadowing methods, there may be particular aspects of this method—being bound to one prisoner, for example—that attracts attention from others (staff and prisoners alike) in ways that more static forms of observation may not. Prisoners seemed most relaxed in my presence while immersed in activities, or when strolling around the prison with few constraints. Evans and Jones (2011: 849) argue that walking with participants is fruitful because of the ‘meanings and connections to the surrounding environment’ that are generated, and that there is less of a pull ‘to try and give the “right” answer’. The authors advocate such a form of ‘multi-sensory stimulation’, and express concerns about sedentary interviews that take place while ‘cocooned in a filtered “blandscape”’ (Evans & Jones, 2011: 850). However, this ideal is tempered in prison where the environment often lacks stimulation, is prone to tension, and is moulded by pressures to follow ‘prisoner codes’—constraints that do not exist in the interview room.

Yet, rather than setting these methods against one another this study found them to be complementary. At minimum, the shadowing provided valuable background information about the prisoners before they were interviewed. This process also helped to increase trust

---

22 One prisoner asked me to leave halfway through the shadowing process, because she wanted some time alone, but asked if we could resume the next day.
and rapport before the more structured discussions took place. In addition, the shadowing helped provide an insightful point of contrast with the interview data. It short, it created an opportunity to compare actions with words. As Crewe and Maruna (2006) put it, mixing observations and interviews ‘shed[s] light on apparent discrepancies between seemingly incompatible public roles, in ways that also illuminated the character of public life’ (117). Put short, the interplay between these methods enabled this research to ‘dig beneath the surface of the environment’ (Crewe, 2013: 20) and reveal more hidden aspects of prisoner emotion.

**Interviews**
The structure of the regimes in both prisons meant it was possible to interview a prisoner in either in the morning (9:00-11:45am) or afternoon (1:15-4:00pm). In Send the process was formalized: movement slips had to be filled-out and processed by prison administrators a few days before the interview was set to take place. In Ranby, I often informally agreed an interview time with prisoners although when they came from certain house blocks they had to be placed on the ‘unlock list’. The interviews lasted between 32 minutes and 2 hours 50 minutes, with the average interview lasting around 1 hour and 20 minutes. There was no significant difference between the length of the men’s and women’s interviews.

Both establishments allocated spaces for the interviews. In Send, access was granted to a number of rooms in the Offender Management Unit (OMU). These rooms were small but familiar to prisoners, usually in a positive sense. However, sometimes it was clear that the OMU provoked strong emotions in participants (who wanted to talk about an aspect of their sentence with a staff member before or after the interview) or other prisoners in nearby rooms who had audible outbursts. On two occasions, participants questioned their own privacy in these rooms and whether their words might have been overheard. By contrast, the interview space in Ranby was private, spacious and the corridor connected to it had barely any foot traffic. Time was spent trying to arrange the rooms in ways that would help prisoners feel at ease: biscuits were provided as an expression of gratitude, and I asked prisoners to decide where they wanted to sit and whether they wanted to open windows. Prisoners in Ranby sometimes joked about the presence of the emergency alarm, and how I ought to sit close to it ‘just in case’.

---

23 A process that enabled prisoners to visit house blocks where they were not residents.
24 This interview was ended early at the request of the interviewee.
25 About 50 per cent of the interviewees declined this offering.
The interview format was semi-structured, and while it followed a schedule of questions (see Appendix one) it was not bound by them. That is, there were moments where interesting themes were pursued and time was spent asking follow-up questions. The freedom to move around the questions in a non-linear manner gave the interviews a relaxed, informal quality. On some occasions, there was a notable degree of ‘role confusion’ as prisoners hijacked the interaction. Typically, the interviews benefited from these detours. For example, Karl came to the interview well-prepared with an insightful introductory speech: ‘When you said have a think about it [the interview], I wrote some quick notes, and knew we could elaborate on these points.’ Similarly, Liam used the interview airspace to weave the topic of emotions into his life story and time in prison, his long considered responses organically covered almost all of the themes in the schedule with little steering. In fact, only in the interview with Wendy did conceding this degree of control feel detrimental: she consistently evaded questions about the research topic and challenged my competency.

Wendy: You don’t have any questions for me, do you?
Interviewer: I do, I’m just trying to keep it focused on the prison.

Ethically, given that prisoners put aside their time and energy to take part in research, it felt important not to police the conditions of the interview too strictly. Typically the interviewees where highly responsive to the questions and were happy to be steered back to the themes when they strayed. The interview schedule itself focused on various aspects of emotions in prison including emotions and privacy, losing control of emotions, and emotion management strategies. I was particularly interested in asking questions about the spaces where prisoners experienced particular emotions, and the intensity of their affective states. General questions were asked first (What kinds of emotions do you see across this prison?), before funnelling down to individual feelings (How do you manage your emotions in here?). Yet, before asking these types of questions, time was invested exploring participants’ pre-prison life histories. This began what felt like a humanizing process and helped to build rapport and trust. In line with Crewe (2013: 20):

Since prisoners are so used to being disbelieved, un-recognised, and un-trusted, listening to their life stories in an active and attentive way is a powerful act. Because imprisonment almost always diminishes their sense of individuality, interviews that ask them who they are as individuals, not just as prisoners, communicates their humanity is being taken seriously.
Further, this biographic line of questioning provided an indispensable context—developed in the next chapter—to help understand and attune to the behaviour and attitudes of prisoners in real time. That is, to some extent the forces that shaped their past were playing out in prison.

Some participants provided some insightful perspectives about their experience of the interview process itself. For Neil, the prospect of beginning the interview reminded him of past scenarios: ‘I’ve had people breaking my head since I was in children’s homes, social services, and prison and probation. I’ve always had people picking my head’. While I felt compelled to distance myself from such interactions, the reality of the power differential between researcher and researched—and the access to intimate knowledge that I was seeking out—was made apparent here. Encouragingly, initial scepticism often softened once the interviews began, and Danielle for example was pleasantly distracted: ‘I didn’t notice the time pass, and you haven’t looked at your watch once.’ One participant taught me a valuable lesson about the ‘neutrality’ of my active listening skills: ‘It’s been an interesting experience, ‘cause whenever I give an answer you tell me “that’s interesting” (laughter), I’m thinking, what’s he thinking?’ (Amber). Such candid, in situ feedback provided the opportunity to develop my interview technique as the research unfolded: in this case it meant exercising more verbal restraint (using neutral ‘ums’ and ‘ahh’ sounds) when listening. Taken together, these accounts offer a reminder that interview dynamics are complex and stimulating, and that each interaction has a unique ‘atmosphere’ which is sometimes surprising, and hard to anticipate.

**Challenges to interviewing: Emotions, Literacy and Authenticity**

As has already been noted, attempting to yield information about emotions is rife with challenges. One important consideration of this research concerns levels of emotional literacy, simply put: how well do prisoners know their own emotions? According to Steiner (2003), this is a problem hardly limited to the prisoner population:

> Many people can’t define feelings of love, shame, or pride, nor can they tell the reason these undefined feelings are triggered. These same people are unable to tell how strong their emotions are, even if asked to categorize them as subtle, strong, or overwhelming. If you cannot figure out what your feelings are, you cannot tell to what extent those feelings are affecting you and those around you. (2003: 18)

The first problem, then, is whether prisoners can accurately identify and articulate emotions. One way this surfaced was through a general unfamiliarity with questions about emotion. For
example, in the exchange below Elliot responds with an overall judgment not directly related to the question posed:

*Interviewer:* What emotions do you see in this prison generally?

*Elliot:* It’s fucked, there’s too many drugs.

At other times it emerged as a problem of distinguishing between different affective states: ‘I still find it hard to differentiate…there can be more than one emotion happening at once can’t there?’ (Francesca). The artwork below (Figure 3) is a visual representation of how emotions can bleed into one another in prison. Third, difficulties articulating emotions appeared through contradictory statements, Wendy claimed: ‘I don’t have any emotions. The only thing that worries me is that I don’t want anything to happen to my mother’ [Emphasis added]. Part of the problem here involves the slippery translation from one’s *embodied experience to verbal articulation*. Indeed, there is an inherent ‘inarticulacy of feelings’ which is lost when we attempt to put their rich subjective nature into words (Bondi, 2014: 44).

Figure 3. The prisoner explained that this piece is about ‘how all your emotions can get mixed-up’ in prison. For a more detailed description of this piece see Appendix two.
To assist with these various challenges of locating and distinguishing feelings, both in oneself and the environment, Plutchick’s (2001) ‘Emotion wheel’ (See Appendix three) was introduced in the interviews. This colour-coded wheel helped participants to identify different emotions and understand the various intensities of their affective states. Prisoners were receptive to the wheel, although it was often met with laughter or scepticism: ‘Look at you, the psychiatrist!’ (Lacey). On a number of occasions, prisoners asked me to clarify the meaning of particular words on the wheel (such as ‘pensive’, ‘loathing’ and ‘serenity’).26

Given the heightened security over drugs in Ranby, Jerry found levity in some of the terms used: ‘Ecstasy? Easy mate, what’s going on here then?!’ Overall though, the wheel was a valuable crutch for many prisoners to talk through specific emotions they felt, especially when explaining their relationship to different spaces in prison (see chapter six).

Ultimately, while challenges to emotional self-knowledge are evident, such knowledge appears to fall on a spectrum between simple awareness of physiological sensations, and higher order recognition and differentiation of more subtle emotions (Croyle & Waltz, 2002). The prisoners in this research typically fell somewhere in the middle of this spectrum and were able to reflect on the interview questions in a meaningful way. Perhaps Bernie summed this up best: ‘I know when I’m getting wound up, I know when I’m upset, and I know when I’m happy definitely…Whether you deal with it right or wrong that’s a different thing, but you definitely know what’s going on.’

One step removed from emotional awareness are the challenges associated with researching emotion regulation. In previous research Laws (2014) and Laws & Crewe (2016) found that, to regulate their emotions, some prisoners engaged in ‘performance management’ strategies. The important methodological implications here are twofold: first to consider whether prisoners are actively and consciously adopting such strategies, and, second, whether the performances that occur in the prison setting in general might have also played out in the interview room. For example, the wide prevalence of ‘emotional suppression’ among prisoners in this research (explored further in the next chapter) may be, in part, an automated response that placed limits on what was shared in the interviews. The interview with Verity was dominated by short monosyllabic responses delivered with a flattened affect. She tended

---

26 Usually I was able to manage these questions, but was left fumbling when asked to define ‘awe’.
to cast the prison in a positive light (but in a detached way) and stated that she was coping well. And then, as the interview was winding down, she shouted:

Yeah, that bugs me [the limited clothing selection in Send]. That is the worst thing and I really can’t cope. I think it’s terrible. I think it’s absolutely terrible…I don’t want to stay here, I don’t like it at all. I don’t like this jail. I hate everything about it, I hate everything about it. I hate the officers, I hate the educational department, I hate the fact I have to work. (Verity)

There was no indication that Verity was actively falsifying the early part of the interview, though this cannot be ruled out. Rather, it appeared as though the generic answers were part of a broader habitual strategy, designed to protect her psychological welfare. It is difficult to identify such operations in practice and knowing the true extent to which these factors may have affected the research findings is impossible. However, Verity’s account was not typical and most prisoners appeared to be emotionally reflective agents—able to distance themselves from, and reflect on, the strategies they used in prison. Furthermore, the prisoner shadowing was implemented with these challenges in mind—that is, to help see contrasts and consistencies between behaviour and responses in different settings.

The above account has hinted at, but is separate from, wider issues of authenticity and truth-telling in interviews. While methodological accounts of qualitative interviewing sometimes begin from a position of interviewee mistrust (Sturdy, 2003), a number of participants in this research shared disarmingly frank accounts which question these starting points. For instance, Jerry inverted traditional attitudes towards disclosure: ‘To be honest with you I open up better to strangers than to people I know which is a bit weird’, and Kyle had no qualms about stating ‘I’m an emotional guy’. It was not uncommon for interviewees to cry, unearth stories of deep trauma, and generally open windows into the most painful aspects of their lives. Small turns of phrase or narrative backtracking also indicated a pull towards truthfulness in the interviews:

Interviewer: Can you tell me about self-harm and emotion?

Nia: I haven’t self…I was going to lie then.

This level of openness was perhaps even more surprising given that the participants almost universally claimed that prison was a place where ‘people can use your emotions against you’ (Danielle). On the other hand, we also need to be sensitive to the fact interviewees may, to some extent, be concerned with their self-presentation and influenced by ‘background
assumptions, preferences, [and] interests’ that overrides the desire to provide accurate information (Hammersley, 2014: 124). In a small number of instances, prisoners’ responses raised such concerns. Wendy told a number of intimate stories that were distinctive because of the offhand manner in which she delivered them, and the detached tone which accompanied her disclosures. While this form of emotional detachment can make a narrative account feel insincere (Goldie, 2003), Boden et al. (2015: 5) remind us that ‘the disconnection between narrative and felt-experience may in fact be a response to the trauma being described’. Yet, Wendy confirmed her evasiveness more explicitly:

**Interviewer:** You speak in tangents, this is the thing.

**Wendy:** I don’t ever talk about myself, have you noticed that?

Her stories were further embellished with a wide cast of celebrities she claimed she had met, and implausible events that she claimed to have occurred. Scrutinizing prisoners’ testimonies is an uncomfortable process, especially because truths may be intermingled with exaggeration, and attempting to separate them can feel like an unsolvable riddle. However, the seemingly ‘obvious’ cases also raise difficult questions about more subtle forms of misrepresentation that fly under the radar. Perhaps the most satisfactory approach is to strive for ‘complete attunement [sic]’ to our participants’ worlds (Yanos & Hopper, 2008: 5), alongside what Boden et al. call ‘empathic dwelling’, that is, listening intently and compassionately to respondents’ words in the hope that ‘being-there with the participant and the complexity of their felt experience helps develop trust, enabling a story to be told’ (Boden et al., 2015: 5). Ultimately, there is much comfort in Hammersley’s (2003: 124) response to criticisms of interviews: ‘The fact that that people have background assumptions, preferences, interests, etc. does not automatically mean that their accounts are biased or simply expressions of these things’. Further, when personal bias does exist, Hammersley continues, careful reflexivity can help researchers to ‘detect and discount’ it (124).

Finally, the interview data is challenged by the ‘malleability of memory’ (Loftus, 2005), and the difficulty of accurate recollection of emotions. Liam reflected: ‘You have caught me at a stage where I have a very good knowledge base and understanding about my emotions, and about where I came from, and the emotional damage it’s caused’. One important message

---

27 The authors acknowledged that even with this insight, this disconnect ‘engendered complex feeling in the researcher’ (Boden et al., 2015: 5)
here—captured by the idea of being ‘caught’—is that the interviews provided only a cross-sectional snapshot of prisoners’ lives. The second is that, even though time was invested in asking about prisoners past experiences, these responses are surely always subject to layers of (re)interpretation. As Ricky stated, ‘It’s very difficult to be objective about yourself isn’t it?’ This tendency is redolent of so called ‘positive illusions’ (Taylor, 1989), and studies of desistance narratives which argue that a certain degree of ‘re-biographing’ is an active ingredient in the process of self-change (see Maruna, 2001). These parables of self-development and improvement may have led to a skew towards positive interpretations in this research. However, there is also an interesting counterweight related to memory. According to Gray et al. (2008:12), when asked about emotions, ‘respondents are more likely to recall negative experiences’ because they are often the most ‘memorable and possibly the most serious’. That is, there is a natural tendency among prisoners to ‘mark time by reference to events, rather than simply by the accumulation of days, weeks, months, and years’ and these ‘time anchors’ serve as points of reference around which they orientate their memories (O’Donnell, 2014: 196). To account for this, a number of questions on the interview schedule focused specifically on both positive emotions and inquiring about day-to-day routines.\(^{28}\)

A number of specific challenges to interviewing emotions have been examined here. Taken together, these points necessitate scrupulous reflexivity. While these factors pose some challenges for exploring emotions through interviewing, as Bondi (2014: 44) rhetorically concludes: ‘surely there is no better source of knowledge about people’s feelings than the people concerned?’.

**Reflections on the Research**

I don’t think it’s easy for a 28 year old man to talk about their emotions. (Freddy)

Before setting out into the field, I was encouraged (by my first year reviewers) to keep an ‘emotions’ diary—the idea was that my study might unearth some difficult feelings that would benefit from being processed on paper.\(^{29}\) My appeal to Freddy’s quotation above—we were the same age—picks-up on an irony of this research: I too find it difficult to talk about

---

\(^{28}\) For example, I asked prisoners to talk me through what they did the day before the interview in some detail. This topic often elicited long discussions. When responses were brief, I asked specific follow-up questions about morning, lunchtime and evening routines and rituals.

\(^{29}\) I was further encouraged (by my supervisor) to email a weekly log in the field and report any preliminary findings as part of this reflection process.
feelings and emotions. The suggestion of keeping a diary then was slightly foreign, but often turned out to be valuable. After a particularly distressing interview (the only one that was ended early in this study), I wrote:

The interviewee has had a traumatizing and terrifying experience in prison having directly witnessed the suicide of his cellmate. The incident happened only a few feet away from where he was sleeping. He was told by officers to ‘cut him down [the prisoner who hanged himself]’ in the cell before they would enter. He now seems both incredibly vulnerable and isolated. His pain and agitation are heart-wrenching to witness. I felt powerless to help him in the interview.¹⁰

Although extreme cases like this were rare, this incident remains in my memory. The feeling of powerlessness I briefly felt has important resonances for exploring the dynamics of the prison environment. Indeed, as Boden et al. (2015: 8) reflect, ‘whether we welcome them or not, feelings will be present’, and ultimately, ‘examining the feelings experienced during our research helped us better understand our participants’ experiences’. Yet, it is not always easy to unravel the implications and significance of these affective states in the moment (Crewe, 2014). Even so, at times it was useful to share interpretations of the environment with prisoners, an approach that enabled me to connect with their experiences at a deeper level. Through this ‘dialogue of feelings’, prisoners helped me understand their worlds. For example, I briefly shared with Freddy that, on at least one occasion, I had felt afraid walking on to house block two.

You felt unsettled? That must have been quite surreal to you at that point. What you felt in that split second is what most people go through in this place, all the time. For you to feel like that then, think how that feels for someone constantly. And even worse in some cases. Someone’s in here for murder. (Freddy)

I endeavoured to cultivate an atmosphere of ‘openness’ and equity with prisoners by answering questions (often about my personal life, or the rationale of the research) during the interviews and on the wings as candidly as possible. One prisoner reflected that ‘you don’t have a mean aura…other people that come and visit us, you can see them judging us automatically. But I didn’t get that with you, so I wasn’t intimidated, it was fun’ (Gabriella). However, there are risks that these behaviours can glide into a false sense of commonality with prisoners’ lives. It is perhaps more appropriate, then, to reflect on my status as an outsider and the influence of my demographics as a white, middle-class, and (relatively)

¹⁰ This incident had not taken place at HMP Ranby.
young man. My social distance is perhaps best demonstrated through my failed attempt to be sensitive around matters of sexuality with the same prisoner who had complimented me, above:

*Interviewer:* What about relationships with other prisoners?

*Gabriella:* Oh no, that’s definitely off the table. Not happening.

*Interviewer:* But sexuality…is being separate from other people in that way hard?

*Gabriella:* What are you getting at Ben?

*Interviewer:* I’m asking if it’s hard not being able to express your sexuality in prison?

Such instances revealed my discomfort: it can be difficult to ask personal questions, but ‘treading softly’ around such issues can be interpreted by prisoners as indirectness. By contrast, while walking around the women’s prison I was often met with a chorus of flirtatious comments, whistling and cat-calls. This almost always felt benign and good natured, although I was completely puzzled about how to respond appropriately. The advice from the administration ‘to walk away in silence’ whenever this happened seemed untenable (and a bit aloof, given that I was trying to build research relationships). Further, it misses the point that something else was being communicated here: Lacey, who described herself as ‘lewd and crude’, reflected that ‘it was strange was having a man in my presence. You see women every day’. It was uncommon for these women to be around men in prison who were not prison staff. To some extent then, my research may have benefitted from such curiosity over my ‘maleness’. While issues of masculinity were interpreted through an entirely different lens in the men’s prison, fortunately I did not share Ugelvik’s (2014: 477) experience of being an academic in a prison gymnasium: ‘I was seen as a man, but not quite a proper one, as academic half-man in need of urgent assistance.’ In fact, the atmosphere in the gym was alluring and welcoming in ways that were unanticipated. Prisoners encouraged me to train with them, and in turn, I softened my stance on the value of gladiatorial muscle mass. Indeed, the affective ‘enticement’ or pull of some prison spaces (the subject of chapter six) is clearly not just limited to prisoner populations.

At times, I felt fatigued from being in prison, or the prospect of going in each morning. The challenges of prolonged bouts of active listening and showing empathy during interviews felt particularly draining. However, these experiences were eclipsed by the spontaneous waves of energy I felt when prisoners told jokes, or shared fascinating stories about their past or prison

31 Though I would still err on the side of caution given the traumatic experiences of many women prisoners.
lives. The overall level of inclusivity from prisoners was also surprising: training in the gym or playing table tennis with prisoners at times felt like I was having too much fun.

Finally, recent debate in prisons research has splintered around how much of the ‘self’ (and especially the researcher’s more subjective emotions and feeling states) to include in the main body of criminological texts. Jewkes (2014) argues that when researchers leave their emotions out of the write-up it can leave the text feeling ‘blank and arid’ (388). Such aridity occurs, she explains (2012), when knowledge is lopped-off from its relationship with the body, after all emotions are ‘created through our experiences of the world as a sensuous and affective activity’ (69). Yet, there are a number of risks to writing emotions in to an account too: it can distract from the main focus of the study (Crewe, 2009); interpretations of emotions may be more fluid than other forms of knowledge and change over time (Liebling, 2014); and finally, it is hard (especially when conducting research alone) to analyse our own emotions and blind spots accurately (Crewe, 2014).

For the purposes of this research I have aimed to strike a degree of compromise. On the one hand, Wolcott’s (1999: 175) argument has been particularly persuasive: ‘some of today’s ethnographers adopt so personal and confessional a style that as readers we can only wish they would get out of the way and allow us to see for ourselves what is happening’. Less this stance sound too firm, Wolcott tempers it by recommending that a full personal dimension should be added into a methodological chapter (the precise aim of this segment). To this perspective though, I also attempt to integrate the idea that emotions are best utilized by researchers when they directly serve as a ‘guide to action’ or alert us to ‘morally salient features’ of the research environment (Boden et al., 2015: 2). I have therefore included some examples in the analysis where emotions did explicitly orientate the direction of this research, drawing attention to important aspects of prisoners’ emotions.

**Analysis**

Audio from the interviews was transcribed with dictation software (Express Scribe and Dargon Naturally Speaking) and then coded using qualitative data analysis software (NVivo 11). The fieldwork notes generated from the shadowing were typed into Microsoft Word files from a number of notepads. At times, this involved discarding some irrelevant or unclear points (meaning not legible)—roughly 75 per cent of the material was typed up. This raw data was then manually coded—a process that involved reading through the text several times.
and highlighting key sections and paragraphs. After ‘handling’ the data iteratively in this manner, patterns and themes were identified (Evans & Wallace, 2007: 491). This research followed Layder’s (1998) move towards ‘adaptive’ theory: a fluid, ongoing process which involves combining existing theory (deduction) with theory construction grounded in the empirical data (induction). In practice, this involved distinguishing between pre-coding categories (such as ‘emotion regulation’ and ‘suppression’) and new provisional coding categories (‘agency and emotions’) both of which ‘are influenced by the new data that is unearthed by ongoing research’ (78).

Throughout the analysis there is a general preference for verbal counting distinctions (as opposed to numerical ones) orientated around the following distinctions (based on Sandelowski, 1995): ‘most’ refers to something occurring in over 70% of the sample (n > 35), whereas ‘rarely’ or ‘few’ refers to something occurring in less than 30% of the participants (n < 15). However, on some occasions (especially in very small cases) specific numbers have been used. The use of ellipses in the text (‘…’) signifies that a longer excerpt has been abridged to remove superfluous details. In a few places, prisoner artwork has been introduced, alongside prisoners’ descriptions of the art, in an attempt to relate the idea that for some participants emotions were best presented visually. Knight (2014: 27-8) argues that art is not constrained by the same limitations of ‘prosaic language’, and is therefore a ‘better vehicle for the expression and conveyance of feelings’. The broader emphasis of Knight’s argument is not a dismissal of written accounts of emotion from sociological accounts, but rather a call for carefully focused emotions research. Moreover, artistic and social-scientific approaches to understanding affective states are not necessarily in opposition, offering compatible and complementary perspectives on prisoner emotion. The formative stages of the fieldwork involved spending some time in prison art classrooms. Finally, the substantive chapters have been distinguished from inner to outer: that is, emotions occurring ‘within’ people (individual), followed by emotional and relational strategies between them (social), and finally, emotions affected by the physical environment (spatial).

**Ethics**

Ethical concerns have already been identified in this chapter—especially in relation to the way that the prisoner shadowing arguably perpetuated a kind of institutional ‘gaze’. The appeal to that prior observation is that ethics are an ongoing project—as opposed to a tick-box exercise tucked away in the description—and ‘ethics in practice’ should be a perennial
focus of the research approach (Boden et al., 2015: 2). Here, emphasis is given to both the ‘procedural’ approaches that guided this study from the outset and to more situational aspects.

The primary ethical concerns include the emotional well-being, confidentiality and informed consent of all the participants who volunteered for interview and prisoner shadowing. There were risks that the substance of this research could rake-up traumatic feelings in some participants. In the interviews, I therefore attempted to be sensitive to any signs of distress

Interviewer: If you want to stop talking about it, let me know alright?
Elliot: It’s no problem, as long as it’s helping you like.
Interviewer: I wouldn’t want to think that helping me is at your cost though? If it’s not a place you want to explore with me that’s fine.
Elliot: It’s alright.

Duncombe and Marsden (1996) argue that, ideally, the interviewer should possess therapeutic skills and training, to deal with emotional problems when they arise. A further practical approach was implemented by focusing on prevention, and explaining to participants the possible ramifications of taking part in research (see Brzuzy, Ault, & Segal, 1997). To try to achieve this in practice, before the interviews participants were presented with an information sheet (Appendix four) and a consent form (Appendix five), which fully outlined the nature and scope of this study and explained how their personal data would be used. I clarified questions from participants and verbalized sentences or key phrases where reading competency was low. The interviewees were reminded that they could pause or terminate the interviews at any time without having to give a reason. As mentioned above, the interview with Elliot was terminated early in this manner.32 The participant gave a number of ‘verbal clues’ (for example, ‘Is this still helpful for you?’) that he was not particularly enjoying the exploration of difficult emotional material. Like all participants, this interviewee was reminded of places in prison where emotional support could be sought out including Listeners, personal officers, chaplains and teachers—though he was highly dubious of these services. At the end of the interviews, a short set of ‘cool down’ questions were initiated, and participants were encouraged to reflect on the research and ask any questions. At this stage,

32 I checked in with this participant a few days later to follow up on any residual impacts that the shadowing and interviewing may have had.
participants were reminded that they could erase any part of the research if they wished—all of the participants were happy for their contributions to be used in full.

Ensuring prisoners’ confidentiality and right to anonymity is a significant priority for this research. Pseudonyms have been used in place of prisoners’ real names, and any information which could potentially be used to identify prisoners has been modified or removed. Participants were reminded that there were some limits to their confidentiality, and that any disclosed intention to cause harm to oneself or others, or information which threatened the security of the prison establishment would be reported immediately. The audio data collected in this study was stored on a digital Dictaphone during the day and then uploaded onto a secure personal computer (using an encryption programme) off-site. The Dictaphone data was erased at the end of each research day. Written consent forms have been stored in a locked office. All of the personal data collected (physical and electronic) will be destroyed after the dissemination of this research.
4. Emotions and ‘the Self’ in Prison

It’s every kind of emotion you could ever experience.
(Neil)

The hardest thing really is being with myself.
(Gabriella)

This chapter sets out to examine emotions at the ‘person level’, that is, the affective states occurring within individual prisoners. As the statements above suggest, imprisonment is often a deeply emotional experience in terms of both the frequency and intensity of the affective states that are evoked, and navigating these states is an important, highly personal, aspect of the sentence. For many offenders, then, prison initiates an emotionally charged confrontation with the self. How prisoners react to this circumstance forms the substance of the chapter. That is, the various possible responses to emotions (called ‘emotion regulation strategies’ here) will be considered in some depth alongside an attempt to address the function and distinguishing features of these strategies. In general terms, prisoners’ responses to emotion are broad-ranging: from attempts to actively transform difficult feelings (termed ‘reappraisal strategies’) at one end to a complete rejection or stifling of emotions at the other (called ‘emotional suppression’). However, it is not the case that prisoners existed as static points on a regulatory spectrum; rather they often integrated a number of different approaches, depending on the situation at hand and as they adapted during their sentence. One striking feature of the accounts introduced here is the relative concordance between the experiences of male and female participants. In light of this, these groups are largely integrated in the analysis. However, on a few occasions gendered differences were clearly salient, and these instances are clearly distinguished in the text.

Clearly, learning to deal with emotions is not a challenge unique to the prison environment. Foundations are rooted in childhood and adolescent development in the wider community and continue to evolve over the lifespan (Cole et al., 2008). Understanding life experiences before imprisonment helps to contextualise and inform the types of emotion regulation strategies adopted within prison. It is to these biographical concerns that we first turn. Following this, the discussion moves on to specific emotion regulation strategies that prisoners implemented.

33 Gender divisions are far more apparent in chapter five (relational emotions between prisoners).
Finally, the key concept of ‘control’ is introduced, which provides a further perspective on why prisoners select particular approaches to regulating their emotions.

**Life History and ‘Emotional Capital’**

I’ve not exactly had the best of lives. I’ve had no one I could trust. My mum left me and my sisters when I was five. My dad tried to kill himself and he beat me up for most of my life. All my missuses have cheated on me…All I have known is aggression and violence. (Mikey)

Mikey’s life before prison—a cocktail of suffering and pain—draws together many of the experiences of the participants in this study: betrayal, trauma, violence, death, separation, and abandonment were all reoccurring themes. The purpose of introducing these accounts here is twofold. At one level, this is a descriptive exercise providing important background information about the lives and prior experiences of the participants. Second, it is an analytical exercise, exploring the possibility that these experiences constitute a kind of ‘emotional disposition’ that orientates how emotions are handled in prison. Exploring prisoners’ biographies, then, can clarify the extent to which particular emotion management strategies appear to reflect a continuation or extension of behaviours acquired before prison (for example, by growing up in care homes or through exposure to physical aggression at home). Conversely, it also sheds light on the way in which living in imprisonment can be a unique experience. That is, it reveals the particular environmental constraints that force prisoners to adapt, expand or suppress their emotional repertoires in ways that do not necessarily correspond with pervious experiences.

There is, of course, an established pool of ‘importation’ research that studies aspects of offenders’ lives before prison to deduce factors that may affect subsequent behaviours in it (see DeLisi, Berg, & Hochstetler, 2004 for example). This research has mainly drawn on large-scale quantitative data sets, which provide an unsatisfactory framework for the close analysis of affective states. However, Irwin and Cressey (1962) emphasise a more interactive process where the ‘external behaviour patterns’ of prisoners influence their situational conduct (145). That is, responses to problems of imprisonment are not found solely ‘within the prison’ but rely on pre-existing orientations ‘as determinants of the solutions’ (Irwin & Cressey, 1962: 145). For current purposes, this perspective provides a ‘crucial ideological bridge between internal and external behaviour’ (Crewe, 2009: 150) that can help explain the use of particular affective strategies in prison. In line with this, the psychosocial perspectives
(see Frosh, 2003) developed in the preceding chapter appear to provide a good balance between past history and present reality, focusing on both the inner and outer forces that shape emotional life, without prioritising either aspect in particular.

Most of the study participants summarised that they had had ‘horrific childhood experiences’ (Haley) and related stories that involved multiple traumatic events. At times, prisoners explained that the chaotic nature of their stories made them hard to verbalise: ‘I couldn’t even put it in a box, it was one extreme to the other’ (Lacey). These accounts were united by the overall level of instability that was being conveyed. Put in a different way, while there was wide variance in their individual circumstances and life experiences, volatility consistently emerged as a motif. Often this was manifested in the form of turbulent living situations, which involved being taken from primary caregivers and placed in the care system or foster homes. In the former case, this provided a first exposure to institutional life. Similarly, many prisoners had unstable learning experiences, ranging from reallocation (‘I couldn’t cope with managing at school so they put me in another one’ - Wayne) to complete termination (‘Kicked out of school at 14, so education pretty much stopped’ - Katherine). These experiences may be symptoms rather than the root cause of the problems described—that is, something must have necessitated the removal from home and school environments. However, it was clear that these incidents were extremely impactful life events that intensified or reinforced existing problems: ‘When my mum put me into foster care that made me tenfold worse. I felt like I was pushed from pillar to post’ (Molly).

Often, destabilisation was triggered by parental neglect, or by ‘caregivers’ who abused drugs and instilled feelings of helplessness in their children (‘Both my parents were alkies [alcoholics] and my dad left before I could even recognize him’ - Neil). Some participants related specific instances or key turning points when they had become conscious of feeling unworthy. For Dean, this moment arose when he found out he had been adopted by his parents: ‘They [his family members] told me he’s not your real dad. You’re feeling unloved’. Paul described a particularly stark moment of childhood abandonment: ‘I came back from school one day and my mum had left with my twin brother. I was 15 and it completely burned my head out’. For others, these realisations were not moments of epiphany but rather more measured assessments of their lives. Irene explained that, having lived in over 50 foster homes and secure units, she never felt like ‘part of a family, I couldn’t attach myself to
anything’. In all of these accounts, intense feelings of isolation, hurt and a longing for genuine connection were being communicated.

Some interviewees explained that their isolation was the product of unfathomable levels of childhood suffering and encounters with death:

My real dad killed himself, and my stepdad hung himself, and I found him when I was ten. And obviously my mum died. And I actually know that life is important, but sometimes you feel what is the point? (Stacey)

Such tragic events created profound grief and existential pain that lingered for many years: ‘Do I get haunted by it? Sometimes…I’ve got so many unanswered questions about my dad’s death’ (Blanche). Such circumstances made some prisoners cynical about whether they possessed the capacity to feel affection: ‘I loved once, and I saw him murdered in front of me, and every bit of life I had left in me went’ (Gabriella). Experiencing the death of a loved one signalled a turning point in the behaviours of some interviewees. Billy, for example, reflected on losing his father: ‘Ever since then, if anybody ever said anything that made me angry, I would just attack them. Before that I had never been violent in my life with anyone’.

It was common to hear accounts of exposure to domestic violence (‘My dad used to batter my mother’ - Irene) and, less frequently, that participants had been the direct target of such abuse. One prisoner explained, however, that the physical abuse he incurred from his stepdad paled in comparison to the profound sense of injustice he felt at his mother’s response:

I had welts on my face, you could see the belt marks on my face. I told my mum and she just said “why would he do that to you?”…I had no one to turn to. The only person you feel you can trust, your mum, you confide in her and she shuts you down. (Liam)

**A Cycle of Trauma**

As noted above, prisoners who had undergone traumatic childhoods articulated how their orientation to the world and their attitude towards relationships changed fundamentally as a result of such experiences. This process was particularly salient in prisoners’ accounts of gang activity. Indeed, entering into ‘gang stuff’ (Katherine) was seen as a remedy to the social distance and rejection experienced at home and school. However, rather than a conscious act of rebellion, this was described as a gradual process of exploring alternative lifestyles. That is, participants described getting ‘caught-up’ in gang cultures (Howard), or simply seeking out those who were like-minded (‘I didn’t know how to deal with my
emotional state at the time. I turned to other young lads that didn’t know how to deal with
their emotional states’ - Dean). In a different vein, Rebecka expressed a fundamental need for
affection: ‘I was lonely and insecure and I had to be in a gang to keep me loved’. Indeed, in
these groups, a person could find unwavering loyalty and:

…unconditional love, they would ride to the death for me, and I would for them. They would never
leave me and I would never leave them…We were kids that came from pain, and to kind of soothe that
pain we stuck together. (Liam)

These intimate descriptions of fraternity in gang life are an inversion of stereotypical
portrayals of these groups in popular culture. In these affiliations ‘trials of strength and
character’ existed alongside ‘forms of social and emotional support that had been absent’
from their other relationships (Crewe, 2009: 204). In these relations, the abandonment and
pain experienced in the home could be soothed, and a newfound sense of purpose and identity
could be established. A second theme that arose from traumatic experiences, especially for
the men in this study, was learning a ‘language’ of violence from a young age. These
participants explained that exposure to physical aggression strongly shaped how they viewed
the world. First, using violence was a way of temporarily extinguishing deep feelings of
shame:

Someone called me a tramp and five or six guys were giggling at me. That was a time when you start
realising material possessions and different levels. He’s laughing at me and I just went up to him and
knocked him out. You could look at it as he deserved it, or you could look at it as me coming from a
violent household, and that violence was a way to mete out any disagreements in the world. You
humiliated me, now I beat you and now you’re humiliated. (Liam)

As Gilligan (2003: 1162) argues, ‘people resort to violence when they feel they can wipe out
shame only by shaming those who they feel shamed them’. Second, participants believed that
fighting back was an effective way of securing personal safety and standing up for oneself:

I ended up biting the lad’s ear off. After that, I never had no trouble at all…You learn rules from the
way life is. The way I thought life was, was if you want someone to do something for you and they
won’t, you use violence and aggression (Dean).

Engaging in violence was complex: in one sense, a kind of ‘currency’ that could help one to
survive, but it was also viewed with a sense of inevitability by these men. More simply,
vioence was one of the ‘rules’ of the social world they inhabited. The need to comprehend
these rules—and the monomaniacal compulsion to follow them—explained why some
prisoners were drawn into revenge plots in their adolescent years that would re-orientate the course of their lives: ‘My brother got shot. So I was kind of forced into a situation’ (Howard). Importantly, however, far from resulting in stigmatization and social rejection, violence enabled these men to carve out an identity and experience acceptance. For example, Neil gained esteem and social approval through his role as an ‘enforcer’: ‘I started getting a name for myself; I was fighting in nightclubs and stuff, I thought I had friends and I’d never had friends before...If you kick off with someone, stand behind me and I’ll leather them for you’. However, others reflected that even though benefits were conferred by violence, it was essentially a communication of inner pain: ‘Why did I feel the need to be an arsehole and fight? Because I was hurting and I didn’t know how to get it out’ (Wayne). Similarly, Nia attributed ‘outbursts of anger’ to her inability to express feelings ‘in a good way’. There are further connections here with Crewe (2009: 205) who describes how displays of violence are often deeply rooted in emotional pain, especially experiences of rejection and abandonment. Indeed, De Zulueta (1993: xi) explains one pathway through which ‘trauma can be processed into rage’:

> When cultural and parental conditions fail to give us a sense of worth, the self knows only how to survive. The ‘other’ must become the ‘object’ of a self that needs to be in control. Reminders of inner weakness and pain must be banished, even at the cost of destruction of the self or dehumanisation of the other. (1993: 35)

A third rule that was learned was the ‘virtue’ of emotional suppression. Indeed, many prisoners were taught from an early age that emotions should be kept to oneself. One prisoner described a restrained home environment that gave no opportunity to ventilate emotions in general: ‘Family very much was where is the elephant in the room? Let’s not discuss things and they’ll go away’ (Danielle). At times, specific emotions, especially sadness, were circumscribed: ‘I’ve never really been one to cry, my dad has always told me not to cry and suck it in’ (Mikey). Moreover, when difficult feelings actually did bubble to the surface, they were met with derision:

> I was really upset and I didn’t know how to handle it. I didn’t have anyone to talk to. My family would say “why are you crying, stop crying!” We just don’t talk about those things. I struggled a lot because I am the person who likes to talk, I do cry, even when I get angry I do cry. (Francesca)

Outpourings of emotion were sometimes met with indifference in the school environment, as well as the family: ‘I blurted everything out about it [the story of being physically abused] in school but nothing actually happened’ (Liam). The study participants thereby learned that
emotions were unwelcome intrusions in social life and that the consequences of sharing feelings were often negative. Because there was little viable outlet for inner pain, participants could be left with a deep sense of affective dissonance, a process that van der Kolk (2014: 272) argues leads to either emotional ‘numbing’ or ‘compensatory sensation seeking’.

The way in which prisoners delivered these testimonies was also striking. That is, extremely difficult life experiences were delivered with disarming openness and understatement (‘I had a bit of trouble, my work partner committed suicide’ - Alan). This may be indicative of both the frequency and ‘normalization’ of such stark events in the lives of these participants. Furthermore, there was a sense of generational circularity in these accounts. That is, prisoners spoke of living in a ‘vicious circle’ (Molly) and following in the footsteps of parental figures either to custody (‘My dad has been in prison since I was six’ - Ula) or addiction: ‘Remember, your life is a circle, some people go around and around and around. I am one of them. My mum was an alcoholic. I am an alcoholic too’ (Irene). Freddy, for example, explained that he was a natural product of his life circumstances:

Obviously being from the environment I’m from people don’t always know how to get out of the situations they’re in...because of other people, I was forced into a certain situation where I had to defend myself. That brought the sentence on me. Circle of life I suppose. (Freddy)

It is notable that only one participant spoke in positive terms about his upbringing and could not point towards any traumatic incidents. To some degree, prisoners probably engaged in ‘re-biographing’ when sharing their stories: downplaying their own accountability while casting blame on external forces. Almost in anticipation of such a criticism, Mikey reflected: ‘I can’t blame my life. I’ve made the choices I’ve made’. That prisoners themselves often espoused a sense of personal responsibility places important limits on any neat deterministic interpretation of these accounts. Nonetheless, it is apparent that life events can, for many individuals, create traumatic fissures that at least partially constrain and mould their patterns of emotional response.

**Crossing the Bridge: Emotions Before and During Prison**

Previous emotional difficulties were also perpetuated or amplified by the prison environment. On some occasions, prisoners explicitly outlined these connections. For example, while discussing the numbing of emotions in prison (explored further below), Katherine stated: ‘I’m so used to doing it, that’s the way I grew up in my house; we don’t cry, we don’t show emotions, so being like that in here is normal for me’. Female prisoners explained that
communicating emotion had a similar quality: for example, it was claimed that ‘just like outside’ (Molly) women were inclined to be more indirect; capable of being ‘friendly to your face and bitchy behind your back’ (Molly). In a different manner, those who suffered severe traumas before custody struggled to stave off re-experiencing these unpleasant memories and were periodically triggered by the environment. Chantal explained her attempts to manage her PTSD: ‘I keep reminding myself that this is now, this is now, you’re in the prison. I’m here. I’m grounded, I’m not there. It will literally take you back if you don’t know what you’re doing’. As well as the evocation of past trauma, however, prison could also contribute to trauma in harrowing ways. Two participants described the disturbing experience of witnessing suicide in prison: ‘I’ve seen his legs dangling on the pipe…I’ve heard him die and everything’ (Dean).

In these sections, then, some of the broad forces that shaped prisoners’ lives have been traced. In terms of specific emotions, fear, frustration, anger, and sadness have taken centre stage. The absence of more positive affective states in this narrative—with the exception of affection and care felt towards gang affiliates—is notable, and may indicate the extent of the damage to this socially marginalised group. However, other interpretations are possible: first, when reflecting on the past (as participants were requested to do), people are often led towards remembering negative over positive events (Gray et al., 2008). Secondly, because many participants felt that they had undergone a transformation over the course of their prison sentence, emphasizing the adversity of their past life could provide a stronger point of contrast. Ultimately, however, the variety and sheer consistency of turbulent life experiences shared by these participants is stark and sets an important backdrop for understanding their affective states in prison.

**Emotion Regulation and Imprisonment**
The remainder of this chapter assesses the patterns of emotion regulation among prisoners. At one level, this section describes the different ways prisoners attempted to increase, decrease or maintain emotional states. But further, it tries to address the benefits, limitations, and motivations for each of these strategies. To guide this analysis, the chapter introduces a framework based around ‘hydraulics’ and fluidity. This ‘fluid and container’ imagery is found across many different cultures to conceptualize emotions, which can be thought of as liquids which fill or exit the body (Stanghellini & Rosfort, 2013). These metaphors have currency in prison and offer a useful way to visualise emotions communicated at the
individual level, as in the phrases: ‘letting-off steam’, ‘filled with joy/sadness’, ‘he makes my blood boil’, or ‘blowing my lid’. For current purposes though, this frame of reference is primarily used to demarcate the different subheadings of the analysis (for example, ‘bottling feelings’ inside or ‘diluting emotions’ through distractions). The account below integrates psychological terminology alongside this imagery in the body of the analysis.34

‘Bottling-up’

I bottle it up, bottle it up, bottle it up until it spills over and then I talk about what’s on the surface but never actually get in too deep. And then you skim the top away and then you go again. And then when it runs over, you do the same thing, but you never actually empty that bottle. (Chantal)

Most participants (over two thirds) explained that, to some degree, they suppressed their emotions in prison. A distinction is drawn here between suppression and repression: although both processes involve the removal of mental content from one’s awareness, the former is a conscious activity, whereas the latter operates at an unconscious level. This separation has been critiqued by some scholars (see Boag, 2010), while others have used the words interchangeably (Burgo, 2012)—in reality, these processes may overlap or reinforce one another. However, the methodological design employed here was primarily tailored towards understanding processes of emotion regulation that prisoners could actively articulate.

Prisoners employed a variety of imagery to explain how they ‘pushed down’ their feelings, including fluid containment (‘You’re almost like a kettle, you’re waiting to boil, but you’re suppressing everything’ - Danielle) and dissociative experiences: ‘[you] just do the zombie thing and go through the motions…rather than dealing with the actual emotions’ (Katherine). Essentially, suppression entailed locking off from or ‘bottling up’ (Alan) one’s ‘true emotions’ (Molly). A key part of this process was a feeling that one could only ‘touch briefly on the surface’ (Nia) of feelings without delving any deeper. A small number of prisoners explained that drugs could be used ‘as a blocker’ (Paul) to assist in this process because they could numb sensitivity to powerful emotions (especially using opioids such as methadone, heroin and Subutex). However, as Paula explained, blunting one’s affect could have undesirable consequences: ‘I realised when I came to prison that cannabis suppresses the emotions. And while you might want it to suppress bad emotions, it suppresses good

34 Psychological terminology alone can arguably obfuscate rather than clarify the understanding of affective states.
emotions too’. Even without the addition of illicit substances, suppression could involve shutting off any affective state in prison, including joy and love. A number of participants acknowledged that there were negative side effects to suppressing feelings: ‘I know I’m not dealing with things by putting it to the back of my head’ (Mikey). Taken together, these perspectives beg the question as to why a strategy characterised by avoidance was so prevalent in both prisons.

A number of factors seem relevant here. First, the suppression of emotions was often connected to specific gender expectations in prison, at least at first glance. Among male participants, this surfaced through the pride of being a ‘strong’ man, defined by self-reliance: ‘I’ve never asked for help before, and I’m not going to ask for it now…I’ve never wanted to put my family under strain’ (Alan). Further, the repercussions for not displaying such masculine ‘virtues’ could be severe in prison, including the risk of exploitation and public shaming from other prisoners (Jewkes, 2005b). As Paulie explained: ‘If you start coming out [of your cell] crying and getting upset, people will call you a pussy’. Dean used animalistic imagery to summarize this atmosphere:

Say you’ve got a bunch of wildebeest, and you’ve got one outside on the edges talking about emotions and that. As men, normal people, some look at that as weakness. You’ve got a pack of wolves, all gathering for these fucking wildebeest here. They’re looking and they’re thinking that’s the weak one there. Every one of them will go for the weak one. That’s prison man. That’s why you keep it bottled up. That’s why violence and aggression is needed in these places. I don’t like using it myself, obviously I have done it. But violence and aggression is needed for you to be kept safe. (Dean)

It was noteworthy, then, that because withholding emotions was encouraged and open expression could be penalised, there was a double incentive to suppress. This is strongly redolent of broader accounts of masculinity in prison that describe an atmosphere of fierce dominance and a rejection of all emotions apart from anger (See de Viggiani, 2012, for example). Suppression was more prevalent and somewhat more explicit in the men’s prison. Interestingly, however, similar accounts were shared by women in this study: according to Rebecka ‘people will kick you when you’re down’, and Pia further explained that ‘if you show your emotions, people think you’re weak…then people start bullying you and taking liberties’. That these narratives existed in the women’s prison too hint that they are not the sole province of ‘masculine’ conditioning, and are perhaps indicative of a more universal prisoner experience. Given that women and girls are routinely ‘sanctioned in their families…and discursively policed by a language which focuses on their sexuality’ (Howe,
female prisoners may already be adept at controlling emotions, but for a different set of reasons than men. That is, women are subject to a range of ‘disciplinary regimes’ and ‘control mechanisms’ both within and without the prison (Howe, 1994: 129), which place limits on their personalities and emotional expressions (Carlen, 1983).

Second, a number of participants explained that there were negative institutional repercussions that reduced the incentive to share feelings. One of these concerned the perception that all behavioural displays were closely scrutinized. Prisoners felt that any aberration from the norm would result in ‘people writing reports on us’ and ‘if they [officers and staff] see you’re not stable then you’re not getting out’ (Pia, both quotations). This concern appeared to be more acutely felt by prisoners serving long sentences. While prisoners might desperately want support, institutional responses often left them feeling ‘under the spotlight’ (Danielle) and ostracised, rather than assisted. There are strong resonances here with Crewe’s (2011) concept of ‘tightness’, a form of penal power characterised by ‘the sense of not knowing which way to move’(522), and a ‘highly adhesive’ (518) culture of report writing (and record keeping) that can leave prisoners feeling suffocated. Engaging with the ACCT (Assessment, Care in Custody and Teamwork) planning system was a pertinent example of this in Send.35 Going on an ACCT was perceived as a hindrance and something that prisoners would come to ‘regret straightaway’ (Lacey). Danielle further explained that her resentment was rooted in the perceived inequity over the level of behavioural examination:

They think you can’t cope and that by showing emotions when you get into the world again you’re not going to be able to cope. But people out there cry, people out their show emotions, but in prison you seem not to be allowed to. (Danielle)

Going on an ACCT document could also stain a prisoner’s parole report years after an emotional episode had passed; lifers were particularly sensitive about not having such ‘baggage’ on their record. Reaching out for help in prison then could have long term ramifications that were better off avoided. In a similar vein, Zoe explained that this degree of behavioural scrutiny also applied to expressions of anger:

I can’t voice my opinions to them [officers] because you’re not allowed. If you do decide to voice your opinion, you’re being aggressive. Because I’m not allowed to voice my opinion I keep it in, and then

---

35 This process is used to identify and manage prisoners at risk of self-harm or suicide.
Some participants felt that expressing emotional states such as joy and happiness was also penalised.

I was dancing around, proper dancing around the prison, letting other people listen to the music. The next day I’m doing an MDT [mandatory drug test]. I was like what is this for, they said “suspicion”. Suspicion of what? They said “well you’ve been very happy lately”. (Zoe)

Craig further explained that for a number of reasons ‘you can’t be happy, you can’t be shining in here’, because officers will ‘try and rock your world’. This could lead not only to more drugs tests but also an increased frequency of ‘pad spins’ and frisk searches. In sum, then, the environmental conditions were shaping prisoners’ affective responses by making certain kinds of emotional expressions more or less permissible. Penalising emotions like anger, joy or sadness effectively tightened and funnelled the repertoire of ‘acceptable’ feelings that prisoners could display.

Positive emotions could also risk unsettling other prisoners. This was most apparent in relation to sentencing decisions. Expressing jubilance about an upcoming release date was disturbing for others serving long, or indeterminate, sentences: ‘Being too happy can have a negative effect on people…I have to downplay it’ (Ula). A final concern related not so much to being reprimanded by officers per se but rather that their response would be underwhelming. That is, prisoners felt that staff did not have the correct resources to assist with their problems or did not want to provide this assistance: ‘When you try to speak about it, you don’t get help’ (Elliot). For some, this was not simply a product of cynicism about officers’ capabilities. Prisoners with PTSD diagnoses had highly complex issues that officers had not been trained to support. Finally, there was discord about the social distance between prisoners and officers: ‘It’s hard to cry to someone who you don’t know’ (Pia). For all of these reasons, many prisoners felt they had no viable outlet for their emotions. When they tried to express them, it repeatedly brought them the wrong kind of attention and left them feeling trapped.

The third rationale for suppressing emotions—especially salient among the female prisoners—was a deep fear that one might deteriorate if feelings were explored: ‘It’s like the past and maybe I shouldn’t go there, because God knows what going to happen’ (Nia). Pia
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36 Searching prisoner cells for drugs and other illegal contraband.
speculated that looking inside could induce a downward spiral of uncertainty about ‘what would happen next? Will it be anger? Will I want to commit suicide?’ Clearly, then, the prospect of creating irreversible states of suffering led to existential angst for these participants. A small number of prisoners perceived that even acknowledging pain and sadness was akin to admitting defeat: ‘What do you do? Just give up and sit in your room depressed?’ (Francesca). Prisoners who had relied on medication and drugs to deal with their emotions described an unsettling process of re-experiencing difficult affective states when going clean. Paula was haunted by reoccurring nightmares and ‘an overwhelming anxiety’ after giving up cannabis (which she claimed suppressed the recall of unpleasant memories), while Elliot explained that ‘it all came to a breakdown’ when he realised that drugs had helped to block out his emotions. Overall then, emotional suppression served a range of diverse and important protective functions for prisoners—including both external concerns (avoiding exploitation from other prisoners, keeping a clean record for parole, protection against behavioural scrutiny from officers) and internal factors (buffering fears of breakdown and self-capitulation). However, while some degree of ‘bottling up’ might be necessary and beneficial, when relied upon extensively this strategy had pernicious side-effects, as discussed in the section that follows.

‘Pressurised Explosions’ and Losing Control

In tiny surreptitious doses, anaesthesia is dripping into my heart—a formerly complacent heart that is slowly beginning to resemble my dreadful surroundings…Like an ancient tree—gnarled and wizened by time and nature’s elements—my heart has grown rugged and callused…this setting helps drive people to anger, frustration, and despair. (Hairgrove, 2000: 147)

If I’m feeling angry sometimes I just keep quiet. But then it’s like a pressure cooker and I let it out.
(Tamara)

As suggested by Hairgrove (2000) and Tamara’s commentary, Prisoners who regularly ‘locked off’ their feelings suffered from a kind of boomerang effect, which suggested that emotional suppression was part of a cycle, or oscillation, between avoiding emotions and feeling overwhelmed by them. This was readily acknowledged by some participants: ‘I am an emotional person, but trying to hide your feelings all the time, it does make it worse and I can get quite angry’ (Rebecka). Zoe further explained:
I try my best, but it accumulates and builds up and builds up. I just keep suppressing my feelings and suppressing my feelings, that’s me, I suppress my feeling so much that when it does come out it’s like people say “we’ve never seen you like this before!” (Zoe)

Unlike Zoe, not all participants lucidly identified a link between their behaviours. However, almost all of those who blocked their emotions regularly could articulate times when they had been suddenly overcome with rage or sadness. These episodes were defined by the following features. First, there was a loss of temporal agency in these moments (‘It all comes out at the wrong times’ - Lacey) and prisoners felt that their behaviours were ‘very unpredictable’ (Molly). Second, these outbursts occurred in an altered state of awareness that felt alien. This included feeling dissociated from one’s mind (‘It wasn’t a conscious thing that I did’ - Jerry), physiological reactions (‘I felt like I was betraying myself by crying. Normally I don’t cry for anything’ - Amber), or a complete separation from the body itself (‘My head went’ - Zak). Third, losing control over emotions could lead to extreme outcomes that were described as ‘nervous breakdowns’ (Bernie) or ‘meltdowns’ where one completely ‘lost the plot’ (Stacey, both quotations). One way this manifested itself was through explosive confrontations with officers:

Listen, I went ballistic, I went crazy, and I open the door and I said ‘how dare you, are you fucking crazy? Do I look like a dog?’ I said ‘this is madness, do I look like a dog? You don’t even do that to a child that is rude!’ (Zoe)

For some, such explosions were channelled inwards through suicide attempts or extreme self-harm: ‘I tried to light myself on fire’ (Gabriella). It is worth reiterating that the onset of these behaviours was, to some degree, shaped and intensified by institutional factors. Liebling (2001: 35) notes that the ‘helpless and sometimes angry reaction of staff’ to self-harm and suicide incidents that can lead to further feelings of social isolation. For current purposes, such reactions serve to perpetuate emotional suppression by ratcheting up the pressure on prisoners to dull their affective states, or only display those that are institutionally acceptable.

It appeared, then, that these prisoners were stuck in a toxic cycle of suppression and explosion—stifling their emotions entirely or being completely overpowered by them. De Zulueta (1993: 169) explains this as a typical ‘biphasic response’ brought on by traumatic experiences, involving ‘numbness or a reduced responsiveness to the outside world’
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37 Though, of course, prison suicide is ‘not a single problem with a single profile’ and is best understood as having ‘different causal pathways and different relationships with the prison environment’ (Liebling, 2001: 36).
alternating with ‘the reliving of the traumatic events’. That is, according to the author, victims of unresolved trauma oscillate between these two phases. This cycle of extremes is strongly redolent of Maté’s (2003) argument that ‘repression and discharge are two sides of the same coin. Both represent fear and anxiety, and for that reason, both trigger physiological stress responses’ (272). Maté further argues that because both processes put the body under such acute stress, they are ‘examples of the abnormal release of emotions that is at the root of disease’ (270). While it is beyond the scope of this research to consider the impacts of emotional stress and long-term health outcomes, the participants in this study who were caught in this cycle did appear to be more unsettled, both physiologically and psychologically, than others. Further, there was evidence here that losing control often led to short-term injuries, including skin lacerations, muscle tears and bone fractures. These injuries were typically sustained through self-harm,\textsuperscript{38} punching walls, engaging in fights, or being restrained by officers. By way of contrast, there was some sentiment that losing control, or at least pretending to do so, was an effective means of achieving goals in prison. That is, in an environment where staff resources were limited and needs could easily be overlooked, shouting loudly and acting out could at least provide some guarantee of being dealt with. In some respects then, the institutional climate could reinforce this destructive response strategy.

‘Diluting’ Emotions

The way I managed my emotions from day dot was to be proactive and keep busy. (Paula)

Although the majority of prisoners in this study expressed the need to suppress some of their emotions, for most this strategy was not used in isolation. In fact, at least half of the participants explained that they found different ways to ‘dilute’ unwanted emotions. This section, then, considers the ways in which prisoners found outlets for their feelings and how doing so provided a degree of balance and stability. What is notable about these accounts is the relatively passive (and indirect) nature of the distractions that were employed. This is to say, rather than confront emotions head-on, this strategy entailed sidestepping them.

In broad terms, these prisoners explained that it was necessary to stay busy and ‘fill your time’ (Rebecka). Instead of viewing the prison sentence as one undifferentiated mass, this

\textsuperscript{38} The picture is rather more complex for self-harm, that may serve a myriad of important coping functions for prisoners. The point being argued here is that self-harm incidents functioned as an ‘explosive’ outlet for pent-up emotions.
approach could help to ‘break it up into little sections’ (Alan) that were more manageable. Having a stable routine in place ‘is what gets you through time…you hear people saying your time will fly, but you don’t realise that your time will actually start flying’ (Jerry). The most effective routines incorporated a large quantity of activities to use time constructively (‘I was trying to engage with as many things as possible straightaway’ Paula) combined with a broad variety of pursuits. Often, this included a ‘great balance’ (Ellie) of both physically and mentally engaging activities on one hand and a mixture of time spent alone and in the company of associates on the other.

Distraction was further enhanced by spatial variety, and prisoners highlighted the importance of ‘getting off the wings’ (Kyle) during the day. When prisoners spoke of these routines, it was not uncommon to hear a tone of reverence for the mastery over their sentence that they had wrought into reality: ‘I know where I’m at and where I need to be and I’m ready. I’m not rushing. I’m not woken up by the officer coming in’ (Kyle). Val further explained that his schedule was especially ‘joyful’ because it enabled him to almost transcend the pains of imprisonment: ‘It’s like you’re not in here. It’s a feeling you shouldn’t have in here’. It was clear in these accounts how routine offered a kind of ‘refuge’, or ‘skeleton to support each day’ (O’Donnell, 2014: 198-199), which enabled prisoners to ease ‘into the groove of prison life and alleviating the sources of stress, anxiety, and discomfort’ (230). Perhaps ironically then, when these prisoners fully engaged with all the activities provided in prison (programmes, work, education and physical exercise) they felt more ‘free’ from institutional control.

However, distraction seemed less about institutional compliance and more about cultivating a mental haven where the vagaries of the thinking mind could be diffused and more difficult emotions could be avoided. The polar explorer Richard Byrd (as cited in Cohen & Taylor, 1972: 92) describes a need to ‘extract every ounce of diversion and creativeness’ out of the immediate surroundings, and to ‘routine things more systematically’, in order to cut off thoughts about the past. Put simply, these accounts of ‘escapism’ are firmly concerned with freeing oneself from mental traps that could sabotage wellness. The most important thing was to refocus this potentially destructive mental energy and keep the ‘mind occupied’ (Verity) by creating enough external stimulation (or physical tiredness) so that ‘you don’t really think about what’s going on’ (Andrew). Through engaging in this process, prisoners could bypass
the bleak realities of their situation: ‘It stops you from remembering that you’re constantly in prison’ (Amber), and ‘you just feel like a weight has been lifted’ (Haley).

Although distraction was mainly articulated as a general strategy, it was also used by some to gain equilibrium after particularly acute emotions had been evoked:

If something has happened to piss me off and I feel like I could get into a fight, I go behind my door [into the cell] and I’ll grab my piece of art and start drawing. Before I know it, I think it’s not even worth it, it just brings you back down…you might not forget about it but it brings your stress levels right down. (Craig)

Distraction also provided a way of staving off boredom and the temptations of illicit substances, which provided a more exotic but riskier form of diversion. Elliot explained that:

it is boredom that drives you towards these things [Spice]. If you’ve got things to occupy your mind, you don’t need drugs. Everybody’s just trying to escape reality, but then they have to face it again, which is just more stress. (Elliot)

Boredom was reported to be one of the most unwelcome affective states that could be felt in prison, and could become a gateway to depression. Descriptions of Send that emphasised inertia and decay were typical: ‘It’s like an old age home in here’ (Gabriella). Indeed, the static prisoner population, dense concentration of lifers, and remote location of the prison contributed to these perceptions. Molly described a process of having to combat the onset of apathetic states:

Whenever I was feeling negative, I would wake up in the morning feeling like I don’t want to go anywhere today. I had to force myself to get up. Staying in bed all day will only make yourself worse. Get up, go out, do something, and focus on something else. (Molly)

While these punchy imperatives to action had benefits, adopting diversion strategies had a number of drawbacks. First, rather than encouraging prisoners to refrain from drug use, distraction could become the precise rationale for seeking them out. Prisoners who literally got ‘off their heads’ (Karl) on strong psychoactive drugs—especially the various synthetic cannabinoid blends and research chemicals that comprise Spice—temporarily escaped their problems by entering a different sphere of consciousness. Indeed, these substances were often described as providing a ‘day out’ of prison. As Jewkes (2002: 102) explains, rather than merely tranquillising the prisoner, hallucinogens create separation from the ‘physical environment and they “readjust” the temporal flow, releasing the user from the seemingly
endless mass of formless time’. Clearly though, some forms of distraction came with higher stakes than others, and prisoners who used drugs risked facing stringent penalties, and risks to their health.

Second, those who relied upon distraction were vulnerable to sudden changes in the prison regime. This vulnerability surfaced when staff shortages led to the cancellation of particular activities (association, gym sessions), security lock-downs, or official changes to the prison timetable. In some ways, far from being liberated from the institutional grip, prisoners who used distraction were at times at the mercy of it: ‘[when it changes] it’s very unpredictable, it’s very nervy’ (Freddy). In a related way, some prisoners recognized other problems with their dependence: ‘I am embedded in a routine, and I really hope I’m not institutionalised from the sentence, I really do’ (Lacey). Further, Bernie felt the collective sentiment to stay busy was absurd and unnecessary: ‘There seems to be this thing in jail that you’ve always got to be doing something, but why? Nobody does that outside so why have we got to be constantly doing something in here?’

Finally, because distraction avoids looking for the root of emotional difficulties, it is a perpetual project. At times, then, prisoners expressed strong sentiments that revealed not only that they wanted to stay busy, but that they simply had to: ‘I don’t do relaxing’ (Danielle). If such prisoners stopped, even temporarily, their underlying issues would defiantly re-emerge. Indeed, some recognized that they were diluting their problems (‘You still think about it, just not as much’ - Andrew) but doing nothing to process them: ‘But all day, every day, those emotions were still there’ (Molly). Ultimately, distraction is a passive and inflexible approach to long-term emotion management. It was best utilized alongside other strategies as sole reliance on it could leave prisoners vulnerable to sudden regime disruptions and the sense that they were merely evading their underlying emotions. On balance, however, distraction was a relatively successful strategy in the short term, enabling prisoners to reduce the potency of unsettling feelings, even if it did not eradicate them entirely.

‘Alchemy’ and Emotion Transformation
Unlike the strategies considered above, ‘transforming’ emotions involves a direct engagement with affective states. This strategy aims to completely alter the impact and diffuse the intensity of emotional states. The figurative appeal to alchemy, which is defined here as the attempt ‘to transform one chemical element into another’ (New Dictionary of
Cultural Literacy, 2005) emphasises the creative, generative aspects of this emotion regulation strategy. This process, then, which is referred to as ‘emotion reappraisal’ or ‘cognitive change’ in psychological literature, can lead to a complete change of mood ‘without negative effects on physiology or memory’ (Ehring et al., 2010: 563). Reappraisal was a common approach for around a third of the prisoners in this study, who appeared to reap positive effects from it. This mindset was most typically described in terms of choosing to focus on the positive aspects of a given situation, or as Chantal put it, to ‘always see the good out of the bad’.

Within this broad strategy there were a number of different approaches. Some prisoners evoked spiritual philosophies to make sense of their sentence. Indeed it was not uncommon, especially amongst long term prisoners, to hear accounts that reframed the prison experience in terms of ‘the grand scheme’ (Simon) of things:

> How can prison be the best thing that can happen to someone? For me and where I was, it’s the best thing. I was on a chaotic roller coaster for too long…I believe in fate. I try to tell myself that the sequence of events inevitably had to happen. (Paula)

Olivia discovered a similar route through meditation and mindfulness:

> If you can make yourself aware that there is something bigger than you in all of this then it’s not as bad. If you can try and find a spiritual resolution…you see it like a test as to how far you have come and if you can stay grounded and balanced, without allowing their mood to affect yours. (Olivia)

Hitting ‘rock bottom’ was mentally recast as the solid foundation that allowed one to rebuild: ‘Out of the tragedy has come something good’ (Ellie). Participants claimed that a long prison sentence was absolutely necessary to disrupt their pernicious thought patterns and emotional responses, and that a shorter sentence might have left them unreformed.

> The more I think about it, I got sent down for murder to prove to me that you’re not the person you think you are and you’ve got to change. The more time I spend in prison I think that is true, because I am changing almost weekly or monthly. (Karl)

Prison was thus interpreted as a kind of heroic journey, or bildungsroman, and a powerful test of resilience: ‘I keep reminding myself that prison hasn’t broke you so far, don’t let it
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break you now’ (Molly). It is noteworthy that prisoners who spent longer periods of time in custody were more likely to frame their sentence in these kinds of spiritual terms (Fig. 4).

Figure 4. The phoenix rising from the ashes is a powerful symbol of emotion and personal transformation.

Cognitive change also involved forms of ‘bigger picture’ thinking without any spiritual dimension. For example, during particularly testing situations, daily life could be seen as positive-by-comparison. That is, those with mid-length sentences pointed out that at least they were not doing a life sentence, and those who disliked prison conditions expressed gratitude that they were in a British prison and not some forgotten gulag. It was common to hear these sentiments distilled into slogans and mantras, such as: ‘Things could always be worse’ (Verity). A further mental crutch during testing moments involved reminding oneself of
cherished family members or loved ones: ‘My kids need me and I need my kids’ (Mikey). Thinking about the future and upcoming release dates could also provide hope: they were reminders that this time in their life was ‘only for the moment’ (Katherine) and not a permanent or static state. At the affective level, these reappraisal strategies replaced anxiety and fear with feelings of comfort and serenity, functioning like a kind of psychological escape route.

Somewhat distinct from these broad level strategies, reappraisal was also used in relation to specific events in prison. Often, this involved placing a positive spin on the aggressive behaviour of others. For example, Amber explained her thought process when faced with confrontational prisoners: ‘I don’t know what it is but something just says to me “maybe they’ve had a bad day”…maybe it’s not that person’s fault. Maybe they’re going through something and they’re just taking it out on me’. By contrast, prisoners serving life sentences reminded themselves that the stakes for fighting and conflict engagement were particularly high for them: ‘I can’t afford to get angry in here, I’ve just got to keep that focus in my head daily’ (Oscar). These prisoners realised that ‘violence and aggression are often met with similar or the same outcome. It’s destructive, you can’t win anything’ (Olivia). These interpretations allowed prisoners to take the ‘high road’ and save face when walking away from potential conflicts. In a different sense, the pain of not hearing from (or being able to contact) family members was sometimes assuaged by reminding oneself that ‘they are busy with their lives, they do care about me but they probably have other stuff going on’ (Andrew). Finally, while the environment stripped individuals of many privileges, pleasure could still be found in the small things: ‘I can go and get a nice meal from the servery and I can think yeah, I’m happy now. I don’t need the big satisfactions’ (Bernie).

Taken together, these accounts show prisoners actively taking control over and transforming emotional stimuli. An important feature of reframing is that prisoners seemed able to forge a more positive reality for themselves. While this strategy is a close bedfellow to denial, it is distinct in the respect that it does not involve the passive rejection of uncomfortable emotion states. Put succinctly, while reframing involves some degree of distortion or selectivity, the uplifting effect on prisoners’ moods was undeniable. Further, reappraisal does not exclude or reject the presence of uncomfortable feelings or stimuli, rather it tries to reshape these

40 The significance of family and ‘emotion work’ achieved through relationships is a key theme of the next chapter and is therefore not developed at length here.
feelings by taking a different perspective. Ultimately, then, because prisoners were not avoiding their emotions, they benefitted from trying to see the ‘silver lining’ in their circumstances.

‘Distilling’ and Emotional Processing

The first rule of any handbook on survival: understand what is happening to you. (Cohen and Taylor, 1972, 138, emphasis in original)

Now I am dealing—without alcohol—with the highs and lows of prison: happiness, anger, frustration, every emotion. I’m learning ways and techniques to deal with them. (Karl)

Distillation is introduced here as ‘the extraction of the essential meaning or most important aspects of something’ (OED, 2009). In this manner, a subset of prisoners (around a third) explained that they were able to use various ‘distillation methods’ to explore their emotions and gain deeper understanding in the process. To return to the metaphor of ‘fluids’, rather than purging or filling their metaphorical containers, distillation entailed examining what was within these containers and exploring its ‘fluid form’ in a particular way. More specifically, this entails working on the essence of emotion states to concentrate a particular meaning, or cultivate insight from them.

However, facing difficult emotions head-on was not without risk; there was a sizeable fear that such thinking might lead to rumination. This emerged strongly among the female participants, who explained that engaging with feelings was easy to start but difficult to finish. Tamara had ambivalent thoughts about the experience: ‘You got so much time to think, which is good. But when you start thinking you go deeper and deeper, and then obviously that’s when you start feeling more depressed’. Prisoners were outlining fears about obsession and getting bogged down in ‘a merry go round of the same thoughts and the same visions’ (Amber). This process could have a significant impact on health and sleeping patterns: ‘I’d look at the time and I had been awake all night. Sitting thinking and getting wound up, regurgitating crap’ (Olivia).

Part of the reason such thoughts became cyclical is that prisoners were often powerless to act on their problems or implement solutions. For example, there was little that prisoners could do to solve issues with their loved ones: ‘I always sorted everything out in my family, so now when things go on and there’s arguments, there’s nothing I can do, and it makes me feel
really anxious and angry. I can’t cope’ (Francesca). A key turning point for some prisoners, before they could consider ‘distilling’ their feelings, was coming to accept the reality of their relative powerlessness: ‘I can’t help them, not until I get outside and sorted out…it’s better for me to keep my head in the jail’ (Tamara). Some prisoners explained that it was useful to set time limits on their grief:

So you have to deal with that shit [being left by a partner], it hurt for a day but then I moved on from it, don’t dwell. Deal with whatever emotions you’re experiencing and then put it in the drawer. (Neil)

A second temporal strategy was to postpone—but not suppress—difficult feelings. For example, Yvonne explained that finding the ‘right’ time for emotions was an important personal development:

If I’ve got a problem, or if something is annoying me, I don’t deal with it straight way. I’d rather leave it and come back to it when I feel comfortable and confident…before I didn’t have no thought process, I would just act on impulse. (Yvonne)

Exploring feelings some time removed from their elicitation allows for a reduction in physical sensations that may hijack judgment in the moment. Instead of acting impulsively then, this approach could enable participants to ‘weigh up the pros and cons’ (Ellie) of particular actions. These accounts are strongly redolent of Frankl’s (1946: 86) notion that ‘even in terrible conditions of psychic and physical stress’ there is still the internal mental freedom ‘to choose one’s own way’. While there may be limits to the ‘choices’ that can be made in prison, uncovering a capacity for a degree of freedom over when to experience—and how to act on—emotions was a liberating discovery. Placing these kinds of temporary limits on affective states struck an important balance between denial and fixation, both of which could be damaging.

The above caveats aside, analysing emotions could be an empowering and stabilizing activity for prisoners. Distilling took on a number of different forms. At a fundamental level, it was an attempt to pinpoint a particular feeling and extract the most important insight:

I just go back to my cell and I just think…I don’t think it through to “right, I’m going to go and do something now”. I just think it through, and in the end, I just label it. (Bernie, emphasis added)

Billy explained that he had developed an ability to identify his emotions (‘I know how I work and how I feel’) and was able to connect the arousal of particular states with his physical sensations (‘If I’m embarrassed I feel myself getting hot’) or even specific locations of the
body (‘Anger? I feel it here [points to his stomach]). Another strategy was to use positive ‘self-talk’ (in the form of post-it notes or daily mental reminders) to help cultivate awareness of underlying feelings and ensure that one was not ‘making molehills into mountains’ (Katherine). A small number of prisoners had clearly benefitted from therapeutic courses and insights to help uncover key emotions:

I do an inventory every night on myself; I can look underneath at what’s really going on. So if I’ve got resentment throughout the day, I look at why I’m resentful. I look at the cause of it and then I think what part of me has been affected. Is it my ambition to get something? Is it my self-esteem? Is it my pride? Is it my emotional security or my financial security?...Then I look at the parts I have to play in their problems, am I being selfish or dishonest to them? And what is the fear underneath it?...And usually there’s another fear underneath it, so what is the core fear and how am I feeding it? (Janice, emphasis added)

Putting labels on feelings in these different ways enabled prisoners to locate the root cause of difficult emotions, which could lead to greater understanding and acceptance of internal states. This distillation process helped prisoners to garner perspective on their emotions rather than feel at their mercy. Put differently, analysing emotions was also, somewhat paradoxically, a way to gain distance from them. Such metaphorical ‘distance’ helped prisoners think about how exactly to act on their emotions, or it provided a way of understanding the ‘message’ that these emotions were communicating.

At this juncture, a distinction is drawn between distilling and processing emotions. While the former attempts to tunnel down into the essential aspects of the experience, the latter is understood here as a more prolonged, and explorative, series of actions to diffuse feeling states. For example, a small group of prisoners used writing in this manner. Those who penned letters after an altercation explained that the writing process was more important than sending the letters: ‘I will sit down and write them a letter, but I won’t post it’ (Paul). That is, although many letters were not actually delivered to their targets, having ‘full on rants’ (Nia) was still cathartic and clarifying: ‘It calms my thinking down, and before you know it I’m calm’ (Wayne). These accounts suggest that writing could be a reliable perspective-enhancing activity: ‘As soon as something bad happens I put it on paper; once I read it back I can see it in a different light. I am getting it off my chest straightaway’ (Molly). As Billy put it: ‘Once I’ve wrote it down I can sort of end that chapter’. O’Donnell (2014) explains that:

The scratching of a pencil on a page, the reviewing and revising, the deletions and annotations, the marginalia; all force clarity on thoughts that might otherwise have continued to careen across an
anxious mind, with potentially ruinous consequences. The discipline required to bring words together into sentences which can be enjoined into paragraphs helps to draw coherence from chaos and offers some clear reference points in a new and bewildering territory. (248)

Importantly, and unlike distillation, this did not involve identifying the key components of emotion states initially but, rather, allowed prisoners to establish distance from their feelings and construct new meanings. That is, difficult emotions were being externalized into diaries and letters and slowly reconfigured. This process of ‘repositioning’ released prisoners from feeling trapped in the cycle of difficult emotional states.

In a similar vein, a number of prisoners used more artistic methods to process their feelings. Making time for artwork was crucial for some participants ('My emotions speak through my art…this is my heartbeat’ - Danielle). Danielle further explained that there was an ambiguous quality to this kind of internal navigation: ‘You’re reaching out to the emotions but not realising what you’re doing’. Feelings could bubble to the surface spontaneously through the images selected and choice of colour. It was only retrospectively that prisoners gained deeper insight about their meaning:

I found that I repeat the same things when I go through certain emotions. When I’m in a certain mood I do certain drawings and stuff. I do channel my anger and sadness into my artwork. It took me a while to recognize it. (Katherine)

Music was generally discussed less in this context, but for a small number of prisoners it too could serve as a sounding-board for their affective states:

When I get angry I play grime all the time. If I’m sad or feeling a bit lovey-dovey it will be slow jams. So yeah, I play music to match my mood but half the time I didn’t know I was doing it. It was unconscious. But now I’m aware of it, so as soon as I put music on I know what mood I’m in. (Molly)

Jewkes (2002: 90) notes that prisoners use media in ‘highly reflexive ways to move through moods and reconfigure themselves’. It was important that some prisoners explored their ‘emotions and feelings with colours’ (Nia) and music precisely because they found more traditional forms of expression difficult: ‘It’s a good way of venting without speaking to people, I struggle to communicate to some people’ (Katherine). Two prisoners complained about the accessibility of art materials (‘You can’t have stuff sent in no more’ [Nia]) and the struggle to get into prison art classes. This placed limits on their ability to channel their expression in a preferred way. Letter writing and artistic pursuits could serve as a proxy for more direct forms of confrontation and enabled prisoners to maintain a degree of emotional
privacy. That is, strong feelings did not have to be publicly declared, and emotional messages disguised within artwork did not have to be explained.

Taken as a whole, these methods of distilling and processing feeling appeared to be reliable strategies for establishing emotional balance. This process closely relates to what Cohen and Taylor (1972: 138) term practices of ‘self-observation’ and ‘mind-building’. According to Bluhm (1948: 103), self-observation indicates an important ‘turn from passive suffering to an active undertaking’ which allows prisoners to regain a sense of control. At the affective level, this brought stability to prisoners’ feelings, helping them to navigate the middle ground between rejecting their emotions and being totally overwhelmed by them. While tempering the extremes of absence and excess did not come easily to all prisoners in this study—leading some to destructive rumination—those who did appeared physically and psychologically healthier and exerted more control over their prison lives.

**Letting it Flow: Expressing Emotions**

The E-Wing prisoners simply do not hide their feelings and thoughts, if anything, the opposite is true and there is very little pretence. (Cohen & Taylor, 1972: 136)

I don’t have a lot to hold in. If I’m angry you hear my mouth, if I’m happy you hear my mouth. (Verity)

Up to this point, the ‘fluid-container’ framework has largely emphasised how emotions have been controlled or pushed inside. Yet, emotions were not always tightly regulated and some prisoners felt able to discharge feelings in an unfiltered manner. As the next chapter describes in detail, this form of emotional expression typically had a range of important social features. For example, displaying feelings directly allowed prisoners to communicate to others and quickly attend to relational problems: ‘Most of the time I just voice it to them, [I will say] “I feel really angry about this”’ (Janice). Further, Ula explained that it was unnatural for her to hold herself back: ‘I can’t hide how I feel at any time. If I’m sad you’re going to know it, if I’m happy you’re going to know it…If the feeling is in me, I never swallow it’. While this approach might be considered hostile in an environment that is already prone to tension, Ula stated that the opposite was true:

Can we just try and clear this feeling up so we can move on?...I like harmony. People say you should think before you talk and be careful what you say. But I believe that the more you try and hide away your feelings and emotions the more you’re building those dark holes inside of you. (Ula)
According to this account, displaying emotions directly could extinguish problems before they festered and avoid more destructive confrontations down the line. It is noteworthy that these sentiments were articulated more often in the women’s prison than the men’s prison. Verbal altercations were common in Send but, unlike in Ranby, these confrontations were less likely to erupt into physical violence. Put short, displaying emotions openly in Send was less risky and could help prisoners navigate relations in the moment.

While emotional expression is often tied primarily to social relationships it did have some significant implications at the level of the self. First, both male and female prisoners expressed a view that it was important periodically to have a ‘good cry’ while alone in their cells. This provided a way to release backlogs of emotion, or siphon off feelings, without necessarily having to cultivate deeper insights. A number of prisoners reported feeling more stable after these episodes. Similarly, exercise provided rebalancing effects and was a further channel for prisoners to expunge frustration and aggression. The haptic sensation of throwing barbells on the ground, and the clanging sound of dumbbells, provided an escape valve for many male prisoners who used the gym. Both of these examples (crying and exercise) are reminiscent of Scheff’s (1979) conceptualisation of ‘positive catharsis’, wherein the discharge of emotion leads to increased ‘clarity or thought and perception’ and powerful ‘relief from tension’ (53).

However, for some prisoners, such open expressions had a darker side. For example, some found that crying had an almost ‘haemophilic’ quality: ‘When you finish crying you still think there’s more to come out, it could be anger, frustration, confusion. You’re just feeling dark, frozen, cold’ (Tamara). At times then, expressing emotions only appeared to intensify rather than resolve inner pain. Dean stated: ‘My life is ruined with this sentence. I might as well just fucking end it. All I have got to look forward to is more years of this’. Another prisoner, who was severely traumatised from having witnessed a suicide in his prison cell, appeared to be extremely disturbed in the interview while expressing himself, being on the precipice of tears throughout. Open expression, then, may be useful for a certain kind of prisoner whose problems are of a lesser magnitude. But for those who had severe issues and traumas, therapeutic support was clearly needed to work through these emotions.

In sum, emotional expressivity was most typically associated with social dynamics of prison life that are beyond the scope of this account (but are fully explored in the next chapter).
some instances, displaying emotions directly was a route to catharsis which brought about a temporary suspension of unsettling feelings states. The direct discharge of emotions is an important addition to the fluid-container model that could otherwise suggest that feelings are always tightly controlled or regulated.

**Controlling Emotions: Flexibility and Rigidity**

The fluid-container framework introduced here provides a preliminary description of the different emotion regulation strategies used by prisoners and the personal and institutional factors that motivated them. This model can help describe how emotions are experienced and managed in prison at the individual level. Yet, important questions remain about the broader significance of this framework to the psychology and sociology of prison life. The section that follows does not attempt to fully resolve these questions, but instead argues, that emotional regulation strategies point toward the existence of different states, or patterns, of feeling among prisoners. Calverley and Farrall's (2011:82) discussion of emotions in the desistance process is particularly instructive here. The authors argue that emotions are not just ‘by-products of criminality’ but instead constitute the ‘causal factors that drive and sustain crime’. Building on this claim, the authors examine the emotional states of offenders at different points in the desistance process, organised by a primary phase characterised by ‘early hopes for a new life’; intermediate stages marked by feelings of shame and guilt, and finally the emotions trust and pride that are associated with a return to ‘normalcy’ (2011: 82-83). For current purposes, rather than focusing on desistance or specific feelings, two preliminary states of emotion regulation are identified in prison: ‘emotional rigidity’ and ‘emotional flexibility’. These categorisations begin a discussion of patterns of emotional development in prison, and more tentatively, suggest this can relate to pathways out of crime.

While most prisoners used a variety of regulation strategies, there was a clear separation between those who ‘bottled up’ their emotions and those who reframed them. This separation is significant because a growing pool of evidence in psychological literature places these two strategies at the opposite end of the spectrum of health and well-being outcomes (John & Gross, 2004). More specifically, suppression has been linked to less social closeness and a range of deleterious psychological and physiological effects (Mate, 2003), whereas reappraisal is associated with far ‘healthier patterns of affect, social functioning and well-being’ (John & Gross, 2004: 1301). However, rather than reflect on the validity of these
differential health outcomes for prisoners in this study (which were not measured systematically) the focus, here, is on the differential patterns of emotional agency among those participants who might be considered either ‘suppressers’ or ‘reframers’. The contention advanced is that prisoners who suppress emotion held ‘rigid’ attitudes about their perceived ability to control their affective states, whereas those who reframe evidenced far more ‘flexibility’.

**Emotional Rigidity**
Prisoners who suppressed their emotions had an extreme understanding of their ‘locus of control’ (Rotter, 1966). They cast themselves either as the architects of change (*active*) or, by contrast, as passengers of emotional forces outside of themselves (*passive*). However, these seemingly different positions both reflected a rather fixed approach to emotionality. Indeed, all of these prisoners were prone to making absolute statements about their feeling states. The ‘passive’ group stated that they felt powerless with regard to their emotions: ‘You don’t have any control, which makes you anxious, and makes you want to get control, but you can’t get it’ (Francesca). They explained they were caught in the waves of their emotions (‘It’s crazy…one day you can be like happy, the next day you are just low. It’s ups and downs all the time’ Haley) and felt unable to avoid troubling states altogether: ‘I’ve got triggers that will set off my emotions, and I can’t manage the triggers’ (Rebecka). Further, these prisoners communicated that any sense of ‘choice’ in prison was illusory:

> Even right down to your sentence plan that chooses what course you should do. It’s up to you whether you do them or not, but if you don’t do them you won’t get out. Where is the choice? Okay, you choose what you eat, but it’s been the same menu for the last 10 years. Okay, so you’ve got a choice of what you eat, but not what is healthy and not what you want. (Danielle)

These prisoners felt infantilised and micromanaged (‘Bloody hell, you can’t even brush your teeth without permission’ [Haley]). With regard to their general custodial situation, they felt that information was withheld, that they were given inadequate explanations for decisions, or sent contradictory messages (‘It’s as if they’re telling me to move on but also saying you can’t move on’ [Ian]). Further, they felt officers mistrusted them (‘I’m sick to death of being called a liar’ [Zak]) and constantly made them wait. Some perceived that all of this was
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indicative of broad systemic failures that they were powerless to change: ‘You’re looking behind the curtain…and there’s nothing there’ (Bernie). In short, these prisoners felt suffocated by institutional ‘tightness’ (Crewe, 2011), by forces that ‘operates both closely and anonymously, working like an invisible harness on the self.’ (522).

By contrast, the ‘active’ group stated that outside influences were moot and that ‘it’s all down to the person’ (Katherine). They claimed that prisoners alone had autonomy over their sentences: ‘If you choose for it [prison] to make you, then positive things can come out of it. If you choose for it break you, then negative things will come out of it’ (Amber). They spoke in clinical terms about their emotions: arguments and confrontations had logical solutions: ‘You don’t want to speak to that person again, alright so why don’t you just ignore them!’ (Amber). Ricky explained that cutting off all ties with his daughter, partner and friends ‘might sound concerning’ but was a way of ‘controlling the situation’ and deciding not to cause unnecessary pain to others or himself. Apparently, then, emotions could be experienced on their own terms.

Importantly, seeing oneself as the source of change could build resilience and it enabled these prisoners to separate themselves from emotionally volatile situations and daily entanglements of the environment. In this sense, this active subset of prisoners had a more developed awareness of where and how negative emotions emerged (and the need to control them) than the passive group above. Indeed, Harvey (2005: 249) found that young adults ‘who were more internal in their locus of control reported lower levels of psychological distress…As they feel they are able to control the environment, the environment has less control over them’. However, although these prisoners reported to be coping well in general, at the affective level their absolute stance made them particularly vulnerable to backlogs and ‘pressurised explosions’ (discussed above) where emotions suddenly erupted and caught them off guard.

Taken together, these prisoners described a fixed approach to handling their emotions. This is redolent of Calverley and Farrall’s ‘first phase’ participants who ‘were found to express a narrower range of emotions’ than those in later phases of desistance (2011:84). There are further resonances with Crewe et al's (2017) analysis of long-term prisoners in the early stage of their tariffs who were ‘in effect treading water, being carried by the tide of the sentence or…seeking to swim against it’ (21). These rigid approaches to emotion regulation were
characterised by decreased awareness and emotional literacy which left prisoners caught in negative cycles of emotion.

**Emotional Flexibility**

The prisoners who reframed their emotions fell between the two poles of control articulated above. They often sought compromise, balancing a desire to assert their will with a realisation that this was not always possible. Of particular importance here was the cultivation of acceptance:

You have to accept you can’t do anything about your situation...you’re not going to be able to move out of the prison any time soon. Acceptance of people’s behaviour, having to live in close proximity to people. Mainly with people who you wouldn’t associate with normally. (Lacey)

Not everything in prison could be changed, and it would not serve prisoners well, they argued, to spend time reeling against institutional realities. When these prisoners discussed the importance of control, it was not in an absolute sense: ‘Don’t let this place dictate to you or control you. You’ve got to control your sentence...obviously with their help’ (Blanche). That is, their accounts were often characterised by collaboration. Indeed, whereas the rigid group were often focused on their individual entanglements, these prisoners were more ‘other focused’. Most of the participants who reframed their emotions held positions of responsibility around the prison, working as Listeners, mentors, mental health ‘buddies’, and prison information desk workers. Again, Calverley and Farrall's (2011) work is instructive, arguing that later stage desisters in their study moved into a ‘building bridges’ phase, characterised by increased trust and improved social relations (90).

Instead of grappling against the confines of the system, these prisoners found ways to co-opt it. This did not mean that they were immune from challenges and confrontations; rather they were usually able to find balanced ways to navigate them: ‘I’ll say what I’ve got to say in an assertive manner, but keeping my body language calm. And then just keep it moving’ (Oscar). These prisoners were versatile with their feelings states, being able to mobilise a range of processing strategies alongside reframing depending upon the circumstance. While they had regular routines, they were not dependent on them. They were far less avoidant of difficult emotions—being willing to explore their sadness and frustrations—without being ensnared in them or plunging into rumination. Possessing the adaptability to take setbacks in their stride, while asserting one’s agency when needed, promoted their welfare and endowed
them more choices. These prisoners resembled the more experienced half of Crewe et al’s long-term prisoners who ‘were swimming with the tide, rather than against it, using its energy to their advantage’ (21-22). Similarly, most of these flexible prisoners had had significant experience in prison (over five years), and many had been through various therapeutic programmes—these factors enabled them to cultivate a more adaptable set of emotion strategies to navigate their imprisonment. The fact that they held positions of responsibility in prison, especially roles that involved social collaboration (e.g. mentoring roles), suggested that these prisoners might be in a better position to reintegrate into the community after their sentences.

Taken as a whole, this final section of the chapter has described two phases of ‘rigid’ and ‘flexible’ emotion regulation. A key distinction between these groups is the extent to which prisoners felt they could control their feeling states. These categorisations are preliminary and non-exhaustive. The account above focuses on the distinctions between two emotion regulation strategies (suppression and reappraisal), excluding the other ways of managing emotion from this framework. Further attention could be given to the important role played by sentencing conditions, prior experiences of imprisonment, and the age and maturity of prisoners that could further elaborate on these differences. Nonetheless, examining these phases of emotion regulation highlights important emotional patterns among prisoners. Identifying these different feeling groupings has the potential to advance the study of affective states beyond purely descriptive accounts of individual differences.

Conclusion
In the broader literature, the emotional dimensions of prison life are often compressed and typically emphasise negative affective states. This sentiment is reflected by Scraton et al’s (1991: 17) description of anger, aggression and ‘festering sores’ in prison. But as Jewkes (2002: 99) notes, imprisonment entails ‘periods of conflicting emotions, containing both good and bad’. This chapter, and the ones that follow, attempt to unpack these different emotion states in order to capture the affective texture of prisoners’ worlds. A fluid-container framework was introduced here to examine a range of emotion regulation strategies at the ‘person level’, and shed light on the various strengths and drawbacks of these strategies. Put short, prisoners regulate and express their emotions in complex ways. Most prisoners used a combination of different strategies rather than a single approach, depending upon the context.
The prevalence of emotional suppression is unsurprising given the range of existing literature that emphasises the need for prisoners to construct a ‘mask’, or put up a masculine ‘front’, to defend against intrusions from other prisoners (de Viggiani, 2012; Jewkes, 2005b). However, this chapter has gone further, pursuing the idea that emotional suppression is both a psychological process, and a force driven by broader institutional culture and policy. On one hand, the participants’ biographies revealed a degree of continuity between ways of dealing with emotions outside prison and their behaviours inside it. Indeed, prior experiences of trauma may create heightened sensitivities to institutional life, and many prisoners in this study were already well versed in numbing their emotions (van der Kolk, 2014), or dissociating from emotional pain (De Zulueta, 1993). On the other hand, these processes were perpetuated and amplified by institutional ‘tightness’ that left some prisoners feeling particularly suffocated and spotlighted, unsure of where to put their feelings and not knowing which way to turn for help. Specific emotions, including sadness, anger and joy, were penalised and discouraged, creating a pressurised climate in which prisoners were expected to closely control their feelings.

The fluid-container metaphor is in dialogue with other frameworks of prison adaptation (especially Cohen & Taylor, 1972; O’Donnell, 2012; Toch, 1992). But unlike models that emphasise ‘survival’ or ‘coping’, the placement of emotions at the centre of this framework constitutes a shift of focus. Highlighting prisoners’ responses to pain and negative affectations is important, but taken alone it risks denuding other key dimensions of the prisoner experience. The discussion of ‘reframing’ and emotional ‘processing’ has brought some of these alternative scripts into relief. For example, some prisoners experienced profound spiritual transformations and identity changes that left them brimming with joy and hope; others found that art or writing was a way to disentangle their affective states and cultivate serenity. This is not to claim that prior frameworks of adaptation pay no attention to positive accounts and feelings, only that by focusing on emotions these narratives are made clearer and are easier to trace (Laws & Crewe, 2016).

This chapter began with the idea that imprisonment can be understood as an emotional confrontation with the self. The various ‘resolutions’ and attempts to manage this conflict could be healing, destructive, or some combination of both. However, prisoners who struggled with their emotions were not always condemned to face their challenges in isolation. Nor did those who handled their feelings competently exist like ‘islands’ apart from
the prison. This is to say, dealing with feelings internally is one means to regulating affective states, but it is not exclusive. Indeed, relational aspects of imprisonment in particular—including ties with family members, other prisoners, officers and vocational staff—have much to contribute to an understanding of prisoners’ emotional worlds. It is to these concerns that we now turn.
This chapter focuses on the social aspects of emotions, and their influence on power relationships, order and control in prison. It is widely acknowledged that the most common cause of emotion is social interaction, and ‘no matter how deeply personal an emotion seems, we embark on a timeless drama not of our own making’ (Cochran, 1987: 157). Yet, this is also a reciprocal process: social processes shape emotions and at the same time are ‘shaped by emotions’ (Hareli & Parkinson, 2008:131). As Planalp (1999: 135) explains, ‘many of our emotions promote and regulate social and communicative connections’. This perspective has particular significance for the prison context. For current purposes, the idea that emotions function as ‘social glue’ (Fischer & Manstead, 2008) is introduced here to conceptualise important aspects of prisoner relationships. This ‘adhesive’ function emerges clearly through the ‘social sharing’ of emotions in prison. In the first half of the chapter, the concept of social sharing is developed by explaining how feelings are regulated through the social audience. That is, social sharing facilitates the outward movement of emotions from individuals to their confidants. The three primary outlets for sharing were other prisoners, officers, and family members outside prison. These different associations are explored in turn—each had different qualities, implications and risks. Social sharing highlights the importance of establishing trust, intimacy, and communicating key information to others through emotional expressions, all of which reveals the significance of affective states in establishing and stabilizing prisoners’ relationships.

The second half of this chapter considers emotions that emerged in the social arena as a by-product of relational interactions. This first segment considers small prisoner groups, while the second section examines the wider prisoner population. There was a significant distinction between expressions of care and affection in these small collectives on the one hand, and the displays of fear, anger, embarrassment and shame that characterised the wider prisoner atmosphere on the other. These contrasting relations are explored in some detail, and are guided by the idea of emotional ‘contagion’ (Hatfield et al. 1993). Emotional contagion involves the ‘transmission of moods as akin to the transmission of social viruses’ (183). Specifically, this section details the mechanisms of this emotional ‘contamination’ and examines how prisoners attempted to avoid certain feelings states altogether. For example, prisoners were particularly keen to ward off toxic displays of sadness and anger that they claimed had a powerful momentum or emotional charge.
The chapter concludes by seeking to evaluate the key intersections between gender and emotions in dialogue with the wider literature. Gender was a significant variable, shedding light on different patterns of emotionality in these prisons. In many ways, Send and Ranby represented different relational worlds. While there were some similarities in these establishments, there were marked differences in the expressivity, intensity, and repertoire of emotions on display, most of which were more pronounced in the women’s prison. This is not to say that Ranby was devoid of social emotions, but rather that emotions typically emerged in less explicit ways. The chapter concludes by attempting to examine the connections between social emotions, power, order and control in prison. The argument is guided by Layder’s (2004) notion that power and emotion are inseparable phenomenon that are always found together in social life.

**The Social Exchange of Emotions**

There’s obviously a point where you need to talk and get your emotions out there and put them on the table. It’s good to talk, it’s good to think that someone’s listening to you. It’s good to hear other people’s problems and perspectives on life. Situations they’re going through. It’s good to engage with other people. (Freddy)

Rimé (2007) argues that the need to talk after experiencing an emotion is pervasive, applying not only to traumatic events but equally to everyday emotions, both positive and negative. While it was common to hear maxims in prison that ostensibly refuted this need (‘do your own time’, ‘keep your head down’), in reality almost all the participants engaged in some form of emotion sharing. This practice manifested itself in a number of different ways and served a range of needs, as highlighted by Freddy’s introductory quotation above. More specifically, social sharing between prisoners was typically a reciprocal process that provided a platform to ventilate feelings, problem solve (or ‘perspective widen’) and strengthen affiliative bonds through increasing intimacy. By managing their emotions in concert with others, prisoners were often able to achieve a degree of ‘emotional convergence’ (Fischer & Manstead, 2008: 459). Put short, sharing and processing affective states helped realign and harmonise prisoner relations. But sharing feelings was not straightforward and finding the ‘right’ social outlets entailed weighing up a number of risks. The three principal groups for sharing included prison officers, family members and other prisoners—this final group was the most common, and least problematic, outlet for exchanging emotions. These three subgroups are evaluated in turn.
Sharing with Officers and Staff

Prisoners had strong, often polarized, opinions about sharing emotions with officers. It was typical to hear that there was a minority of highly skilled officers who really ‘understood’ them, but that most showed little compassion or concern. While most interactions with staff on the wings and house blocks were brief and practically orientated, a small number of prisoners felt comfortable opening up to officers at length: ‘I find it easier to talk to a uniform’ (Bernie). For these prisoners, no topics were off limits: ‘We can talk about anything from football, to going on holiday, or if I need to speak about my troubles or my son back home’ (Jerry). For these prisoners, officers provided an avenue to offload pent up emotion. Dean explained that venting to psychological support staff was a valuable outlet (‘it’s been helping me keep my head down’), but he worried what would happen when he completed his clinical course (‘who am I going to vent to when they’re gone?’). Unlike prisoners then, who were readily accessible, skilled staff members were a less available and a more unstable resource.

These well-liked staff members were regarded as possessing emotional intelligence, and understood when prisoners were distressed. A few participants recalled situations where they had shown flexibility: ‘They give you a little bit of space. And then they say “When you’re ready and if you want to, come talk to me”’ (Nia). Further, these relationships with staff were particularly fruitful because they facilitated direct access to resources that alleviated the sources of emotional distress. This included assistance in solving problems or processing applications (‘If I need to make a call, they will do it for me. They sort of understand’ Jerry) or providing emotional support and advice. In a different manner, Val explained how female officers had a unique capital in Ranby, providing a ‘girl’s perspective’ on relationship problems. Such advice and understanding was highly prized and could, by definition, not be ascertained from the prisoner population.

A crucial aspect of these relationships that facilitated emotion sharing was the presence of mutual respect and humanity: ‘It’s not us and them. He’s a human being, I’m a human being’ (Kyle). Such individuals resemble Ben-David & Silfen’s (1994, cited in Liebling, 2004: 232) description of ‘integrative or personal’ officers who are ‘flexible, adaptable’ and who evince an ‘egalitarian orientation’. These officers were praised for not ‘just using their job as power’ (Val), or compounding the pains of imprisonment by punishing prisoners excessively. Some
officers displayed their compassion openly, which left an indelible mark on nearby prisoners: ‘Someone died in prison and the officer cried over his body’ (Bernie). Karl explained two further moments when he realised that some officers genuinely cared for their work:

One officer came to the spur other day, and he had a badge on his tie which said ‘Prison me! No way!’ I said “what’s that badge all about?” He said “it’s a charity I work for. I go to schools and tell kids about prison. I tell them that I’m an officer and I tell them what prison is really like, and tell them not to go there”. I never looked at him in that way. I said to him “I respect you for that, it means a lot”. It is not just another shirt that comes to lock my door. He actually cares about people coming to prison. He actually cares that this is a good place.

Me and a few lads had jokes with different officers, one of the lads were saying “you don’t care about us, you just bang us up”. And he said “that’s not true, anybody could end up in prison”. And when an officer speaks like that you start to think to yourself, ah he doesn’t just want to bang us up, he actually does care. (Karl)

Such ‘mutual identification’ could ‘lead to a sympathetic view by prisoners of the prison staff condition’ (Liebling, 2004: 231). Indeed, prisoners felt affection for officers who ‘actually love what they do’ (Gabriella) and did not shy away from challenges: ‘They’re helping in any way they can’ (Kyle). Nicknames and playful colloquialisms used by officers indicated that affection flowed in both directions: ‘They all call me ‘Trouble’…One officer told me “if we had a prison full of women like you, we’d look forward to getting out of bed”’ (Chantal). While these amicable relationships established a foundation for real emotional exchange they were the exception rather than the rule. Further, prisoners who ‘benefited’ from these relations complained that there was a notable drawback. Namely, other prisoners resented this preferential treatment (‘If you play with one, why not with the other?’ [Danielle]) and labelled these prisoners as snitches: ‘They start spreading rumours….then by the end of the day you have to be watching your back’ (Andrew). While there was value in sharing emotions with some officers, the speculation and judgment of the prisoner population was a powerful deterrent against doing so.

Prisoners pointed to a number of other reasons why it was not expedient to share emotions with staff. First, they claimed that skilled officers were in the minority, and it was far more typical to hear uniformed staff described as cold, mechanical, unsympathetic and completely devoid of humanity: ‘They’re not a human person’ (Amber). Interacting with them, it was
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claimed, was ‘like talking to a pre-determined response robot’ (Alan). These relationships were unsatisfactory because of a perceived lack of sensitivity: common complaints were that officers were either inactive, dismissive (‘they just don’t listen’ Oscar), punishment-focused, antagonistic or some combination of these factors. It was also customary to hear frustrations that officers rushed in to ‘solve’ problems without having full understanding. This was described as dealing with only the symptoms without ‘getting to the root of the problem’ (Blanche) or ‘helping a person to look at what’s really going on’ (Janice). Some prisoners felt that these (over)reactions made it impossible for them to discharge emotions like anger in the proximity of officers without receiving unwanted institutional consequences.

If I went into my room and punched a wall, oh my god, alarm bells would be ringing. They freak out. Straightaway an officer will come up to you and say “this isn’t healthy, this is a form of self-harm, we need to open an ACCT document.” (Molly)

Paul wanted to talk through his emotions but felt pathologized by the mental health team: ‘Throughout the conversation I felt absolutely embarrassed’. Further problems emerged when officers mistook idiosyncratic personalities of some prisoners as violent.

I’ve seen a person talk to a member of staff, he waved his arms a bit and had a frown on his face, and the member of staff took it as him being threatening, abusive and aggressive. But he just doesn’t know how to articulate himself, he does the same things around his mates as he does staff. (Niel)

In a similar vein, prisoners claimed that cultural practices among were misinterpreted by staff. Lively verbal exchanges and gesticulating were sometimes perceived as hostile: ‘They like to say that black people are aggressive but it’s just the way we express ourselves, we are passionate, when we stand for something we go hard’ (Ula). Rebecka felt the prison needed ‘more black or ethnic minority officers’ to close this cultural distance. When officers provided emotional ‘support’ it was often claimed to be inauthentic: ‘the minute you start showing emotion they will act out of duty of care, not because they actually care’ (Danielle). Craig explained that when speaking to officers ‘some say “yes, yes, that’s alright” like they’re listening but they’re not really…you can tell from their body language and eye contact’. Further, in Ranby when prisoners were angry they felt that female officers were used instrumentally, as a buffer: ‘Time after time I’ve seen people get mad, so they go and get the woman officer to calm the situation. A lot of blokes will calm to a woman, they are not going to hit a woman’ (Paul). In Send, a similar situation manifested when prisoners cried in front of male officers: ‘they can’t cope with a woman crying or a woman wanting to sit
down and talk with them…so they’ll go find a female officer’ (Ellie). Prisoners wanted to feel as though they were being attended to authentically, rather than being offloaded or manipulated. Taken together, these accounts indicate a lack of understanding in these relationships that created significant barriers to sharing emotions.

The trust deficit in these relationships flowed in both directions. Some officers were sceptical about prisoners’ motives when they claimed to be experiencing emotional or physical pain. Similarly, prisoners mistrusted staff with their private information because they felt ‘it’s not confidential’ (Stacey). Some participants pointed towards specific instances when their medical records had been disclosed in public, or where mental health staff had embarrassed them by approaching them in the middle of busy association periods. A further aspect of this problem was the lack of privacy: ‘You can’t go anywhere. If you come to my room to talk to me about something everybody would know about it. If you’re being bullied you can’t go down to the office because everyone is in there’ (Stacey). Again, the seemingly omniscient surveillance of the wider prisoner population magnified the difficulties of emotion sharing.

Finally, some prisoners felt that, because officers had not themselves experienced imprisonment, first-hand sharing was impossible: ‘they don’t know where you’re coming from, they don’t get banged up or hear the bolts going off and on, and they don’t hear people shouting at you for work’ (Tamara). Yet, at times, prisoners’ assessments of officers lacked a nuanced acknowledgement of their operational pressures and responsibilities. Many officers were observed in a near constant state of activity, dealing with a broad range of prisoners’ concerns and requests. Furthermore, institutional policies that regularly rotated staff members to different house blocks created relational impediments that were beyond the control of individual officers.

In sum, most prisoners thought officers did not provide a viable outlet for their emotions. One prisoner concluded that reaching out to officers left you ‘feeling abandoned’ (Paul), because they did not invest time into prisoners’ emotional needs or did so reluctantly. This sentiment harked back to the toxic life experiences of participants before imprisonment. Indeed, in some instances officers’ behaviour perpetuated the abuse of power, emotional neglect, manipulation, insensitive treatment, and heavy-handed approaches that had already left imprints on prisoners’ lives. Under these conditions, typically only the most destructive emotions were being exchanged between prisoners and officers, the consequence of which
was pronounced ‘social distancing’ (Fischer & Manstead, 2008: 460). Put short, regular displays by prisoners of frustration and anger signalled a ‘reverse relational movement’ which ensured that ‘distance from others’ was established (460). This affective distancing was not unique to relations with officers, it also emerged in the broader relations between prisoners outlined in the second half of the chapter. Ultimately then, because the tone of officer prisoner interactions was generally marked by frustration, misunderstanding, and a deficit of trust, most prisoners looked in other directions for emotional support.

Intimate Relationships and Family
An alternative source of emotional support was found in familial relations. A small number of prisoners explained that their primary outlet for emotion was ‘loved ones outside’ (Freddy). These prisoners had longstanding relationships with partners or family members who knew them intimately: ‘Mum always knows from my voice if something is wrong’ (Karl). These relations were reinforced by regular visits, phone calls, letters and pictures. An important aspect of these bonds was that the confidant was a trusted person outside the prison regime, not contaminated by the pressures of the environment, and could therefore open a comforting window back to the world outside. Confiding in others was not limited to sharing problems, but included positive emotions too: ‘If I am having a bad day or a good day I will ring home and talk about whatever’s happened’ (Amber). These outside relationships also provided a channel for romantic or erotic energy that was otherwise stifled in the men’s prison: ‘I reboot my batteries…when I write a nice dirty fantasy letter to my missus’ (Wayne).

However, these perspectives were not ubiquitous. Indeed, while the majority of participants maintained important relationships with loved ones, these relationships were rarely emotionally open and were often far from straightforward. Most prisoners explained that they did not want to burden loved ones with difficult emotions: ‘I try not to show any weakness to my partner at all. I don’t want her to become concerned about my well-being because it’s already a hard job for her’ (Simon). Prisoners felt this pressure acutely on visits where family members had travelled all day to see them, often relying on expensive public transport and missing time off work. One prisoner, who collapsed during a visit due to a debilitating illness, explained that this was the first time his girlfriend discovered he was unwell. Some participants felt it was wise to avoid contact completely if they did not feel capable of maintaining this positive façade: ‘I won’t ring if I’m upset, they don’t deal with that very
Many prisoners felt compelled to protect their children from learning about their imprisonment too: ‘you have to tell them white lies, like I’m at work’ (Val). These relationships were clearly significant for prisoners, and they drew strength from communicating and receiving messages of love. However, because they wanted to protect these bonds, emotional authenticity was often absent in these connections.

For other prisoners, contacting loved ones was the source of—rather than the remedy for—emotional pain. In these conversations, prisoners were forced to confront the collateral damage of their imprisonment: ‘My youngest son said, “Dad I’ve forgot what you look like”’ (Kyle). Similarly, women prisoners felt they had failed in their maternal roles ‘My daughter said to me “Mummy we’ve never been apart this long”. That put a big hole in my heart’ (Zoe). There was an underlying fear being described here that prisoners were being erased and forgotten: ‘Contacts with the outside world are painful reminders that while people they care about are changing, the prisoner is not’ (O’Donnell, 2014: 223). Other participants experienced the hypocrisy of trying to discipline their children while being imprisoned: ‘The other day my son got in a fight at college and he said “I learned from you”’ (Howard). More generally, participants experienced guilt when they considered how their absence was straining family bonds, as their partners struggled to raise children alone. In light of this, it was particularly hard for prisoners to share their own affective states and problems.

A few prisoners felt they were at the mercy of volatile and unpredictable partners: ‘The one thing that made me cry in here was when my daughter’s mother wouldn’t let me speak to her’ (Tommas). In these turbulent relationships, insecurities flourished about being replaced or cheated on: ‘It’s always in the back of your mind’ (Simon). Prisoners frequently heard stories about disintegrating relationships, and it was easy to feel ‘a bit paranoid’ (Andrew) that theirs would be next. Liam felt his relationship was being sabotaged by the prison regime:

> Jail is not built for relationships, everything it entails is made to damage relationships. You can’t keep in contact with letters. Everyone is listening to your phone calls. Your missus is frustrated and all they have to go on is your word. (Liam)

Taken as a whole then, there were many barriers that impeded prisoners from establishing authentic relationships with their loved ones. Contacting family members outside was a useful channel for a small number of prisoners. In these relations, there were opportunities to offload, process and reframe emotions. But for most prisoners, sharing was laden with
difficulties and resulted in only partial disclosures of affective states. At worst, these relationships perpetuated detrimental forms of emotional suppression that were explored in the previous chapter. While prisoners often cared deeply for those outside there were institutional barriers that made it difficult to establish intimacy, especially the rigid structure of prison visits and the long distances families had to travel (explored further in chapter six); the expense of making regular phone calls; and the sluggishness of the prison mail system. The inherent difficulties of these outside relationships compelled prisoners to search for support elsewhere, most often this entailed turning to the prisoner population.

**Sharing Emotions with Prisoners**

Over a long period of time you get to know people a bit better. It is strange because even with my friends on the outside, I’m not with them every day for a year. Every single day. Every day you see them. (Jerry)

The most common avenue for sharing emotions was through seeking the counsel of other prisoners. In part, this was because they were the most available population. But further, given their mutual experience of incarceration, other prisoners were seen as having an authentic understanding of the challenges that were being faced: ‘We’re all going through similar things’ (Katherine) and ‘They just know where you’re coming from’ (Olivia). It was through these relationships that feelings were primarily discharged. At one level, this extends the emotion regulation strategies framework set out in the proceeding chapter to the social world. At another level, emotions between small prisoner groups functioned like a form of ‘social glue’ (Planalp, 1999), bonding prisoners together and increasing intimacy. However, this did not mean that sharing took place indiscriminately; indeed, most prisoners were highly selective about who they disclosed information to.

Sharing emotions took on a number of forms. Broadly, there was a strong desire to talk and to be heard: ‘I have to talk about it, otherwise I’ll go mental’ (Ula). Finding someone who was willing to ‘lend an ear’ (Ricky) conferred an important affective benefit to the sharer: namely, the opportunity to offload emotions. For example, this could include pouring out emotions like guilt in the company of others:

I was just crying my eyes out and I was telling them my whole life story and really expressing how guilty I felt. I think I needed to feel guilty, I think I just needed to be guilty and express how sad I felt. (Paula)
Anger, was discharged in a similar way: ‘I vent at them…to get all my anger out’ (Dean). One of the fundamental services other prisoners provided, then, was acting as a sounding board for emotions, or a kind of receptacle for feelings. It follows that taking the role of listener was perceived as a virtuous and non-judgmental way to support the welfare of other prisoners, to help facilitate this cathartic release: ‘Listening is the most important part. Often you’re trying to act and help someone, when you just need to listen’ (Val). Further, the existence of ‘Listener’ programmes in both prisons illustrates the demand for open channels to offload emotion without judgement. One prisoner who had been trained as a Listener explained: ‘With the Listener role you’re very much empathetic towards them [clients], you’re seeing everything from their point of view as opposed to you telling them about a time you experienced something similar’ (Amber). The mere act of listening to prisoners, whether informally or in Listeners programmes, appeared to provide a fundamental reduction in affective tensions and could help prisoners down regulate their emotions: ‘Sitting with somebody and sharing…it’s like a weight off your shoulders’ (Paul).

For some prisoners however, simply being listened to did not constitute emotional support. For example, while the aforementioned Listeners scheme was largely valued by prisoners some criticised the professional role limitations that proscribed advice giving:

Some people don’t wanna go to Listeners or Samaritans. They don’t give you any feedback. They sit there and they listen, but sometimes as a human being you want feedback, but they are not allowed to give it, which is wrong. If I’m gonna come and share my thoughts, you’re meant to say something to me. At least say to me this is the way you should go about that…give me some positive advice. (Zoe)

Listening was most effective when it was undertaken using active techniques. That is, good support involved asking probing questions, clarifying information and communicating a form of engaged presence. This enabled participants to explore and view their emotions from a different perspective—many problems could be effectively resolved in this manner (‘I’ll dig deeper into what they are going through, and they normally come up with their solution’ Haley). Some prisoners needed support to initiate sharing, and adept listeners understood that sometimes hard defensive shields needed to be softened:

---

43 Distressed prisoners could ask to speak with a Listener at any time of the day or night with relative anonymity by leaving a small sign under their cell doors for officers to collect.
I just talk to them and say “are you alright?” They say “yeah” but deep down you know that they’re not. So that’s not the end, and I won’t leave it there, I’ll push a bit more. (Billy)

Most importantly, prisoners wanted to receive compassion and understanding for their emotions. This need was validated when prisoners offered one another verbal reassurance (‘He had the most down look on his face and I was trying to say “look it will be okay when you get outside to sort things out”’ [Jerry]) or physically comfort: ‘Sometimes we don’t need a psychologist, all we need is an arm around our shoulder’ (Ricky). According to some prisoners, then, a sensitive and non-judgemental approach was required in these interactions: ‘I have to be very compassionate towards what she is going through on a day-to-day basis…because I know her journey’ (Ula). In a related manner, Karl explained that during his most difficult moment in prison—when he broke down in tears in front of his friends—he was met with acceptance rather than judgement: ‘After I finished talking, one my friends said “When emotion gets you there’s just nothing you can do”, and that made me feel a lot better’.

The features of emotion sharing also varied across the two establishments. In Send, there were multiple outlets where emotions could be voiced to a receptive audience. Indeed, the range of therapeutic spaces, especially the PIPE and the Therapeutic Community, provided formal venues that actively encouraged prisoners to ventilate their emotions. Janice explained that her alcohol recovery meeting was one such ‘forum where people are talking that kind of language’. Further, there was a pronounced collective effort to assist women who were struggling: ‘We could have had an argument five minutes ago, but if you hear some bad news everyone is hugging and crying and saying sorry to hear that’ (Ula). These efforts were often characterised by touching and affectionate language: ‘If they’re upset I’ll give them a hug or sit down and talk with them…I’ll send little notes saying I love you’ (Rebecka). At times, this support involved reminding others about the strength of existing bonds:

Somebody wrote me a letter the other day because they know I’m having a bad time. I’m going through a divorce and it’s been difficult. They wrote me a letter saying how much I meant to them as a friend, and how much they’re gonna miss me because I’m leaving. It moves me you know, it changed how I perceived the rest of the day. (Olivia)

Across these women’s accounts, there is an explicit flow of emotional language: feelings are labelled and the nature of relationships is openly commented on. By contrast, in the men’s prison, while there were affectionate conversations, they were usually less visible or veiled in symbolic language. Showing care for those in need was often channelled into guidance or
material support: ‘Lads in prison, we don’t just sit there putting arms around each other’s backs. We give advice’ (Karl). Male participants often looked for ways to fix their problems rather than exploring the accompanying feelings: ‘If something deep down is troubling you, they may give you information that you haven’t heard before’ (Billy). There was a distinction here, then, between forms of ‘informational’ support and more explicit emotional support. This ‘information’ sharing involved conveying the nuances of the prison regime, sign-posting sources of support, and explaining the pathways to enhanced resources:

I’ve seen them [new prisoners] come in here and cry…I’ll inform them. We have a PID [prisoner information desk] worker and here’s how it helps. If you need to speak to someone I’m a Listener. I tell them I’ll have a word with staff to get them on House block 7 or 6 [favourable accommodation]. (Kyle)

Although this approach appeared to be more ‘solution orientated’ than ‘feeling focused’, this advice was often accompanied by notes of empathy and care—even if they were not explicitly articulated. This resonates strongly with Tait’s (2011: 446) conceptualisation of ‘old school’ prison officers who provide ‘limited emotional support’ but whose ‘responsiveness and straightforward approach’ signalled a ‘genuine commitment to helping prisoners’ (446). In short, giving information was a form of care and a way of communicating empathy. Karl explained how this process worked with his peers:

I’ve been in seven years and my close friend has been in 13 years. So when I told him that my Dad had cancer and there’s nothing we can do, he says he was in a bad situation a few years ago. He’s saying “I went through it and this is what happened”. And then you know that he knows how you’re feeling. He’s not just sat there listening. He’s thinking. He knows how you’re feeling. So then he’s saying “this is what I did, and this is how I dealt with it, I spoke to this person and then I did this”. (Karl)

Beyond giving advice, male prisoners shaped others’ emotions through material support and other proxies. For example, some provided financial assistance to prisoners who received no money from outside sources, or shared their canteen items (‘I might have the last biscuit in my cupboard and I’ll ask them if they want it’ Andrew). Others performed selfless acts that could reduce suffering: ‘There was somebody in the phone queue who’s desperate to get on the phone to his partner I said “go ahead on the phone before me”, otherwise he’s going to be banged up all night worrying’ (Simon). Finally, some participants explained how they helped prisoners overcome inertia and fear by introducing them to exercise and fitness, or less frequently, by supporting them with hygiene needs. These acts were proxies in the sense that they communicated care through action, without being explicitly expressed openly in these terms.
Taken together, these testimonies reveal that emotions were shared, and responded to, in distinct ways among male and female prisoners—these gender differences are further explored in the second part of this chapter. But these accounts also shared a key feature: exchanging emotions was integral to the initiation and maintenance of prisoner relationships.

**Emotions as Social ‘Glue’**

> When you do something nice for somebody…Without realising it, it makes you feel nice. A lot of people don’t understand that, but they understand the feeling. (Paul)

Up to this point, little has been said about the perspective of the ‘helper’ and why prisoners bothered to assist those in need. At one level, these prisoners empathised with the suffering they saw around them: ‘It hurts me to see all these guys coming to jail…it upsets me a lot’ (Andrew), or as Olivia put it, ‘You can feel different girls going through their thing’. Rebecka was more sceptical, suggesting that empathy was to some extent enforced by the environment: ‘In here it’s so closed you see everyone’s face [when they’re upset] all the time’. However, empathy was not evenly distributed, and prisoners favoured friends or associates in their ‘circle’. This point is crucial and reveals that the emotional dimensions of prisoner interactions functioned like social glue contributing to ‘the intimacy and harmony of the relationship’ (Fischer & Manstead, 2008: 459).

First, speaker-listener interactions were fluid. That is, these were not one-way interactions, and prisoners described ongoing relationships characterised by the reciprocal offloading of emotions: ‘I will say something that’s stressing me out, they will say something that’s stressing them out, it will be a to and fro kind of thing’ (Jerry). For these relationships to function, prisoners had to heed this principle of reciprocity: ‘you don’t put too much on other people because he’s got his own stressors… you have to respect other people’s feelings and understand that they need to let things out as well’ (Val). These sharing and helping cycles mutually reinforced social bonds between prisoners, increasing intimacy, cooperation and trust.

---

44 Little empathy was extended to prisoners who were in debt, addicted to drugs, bullies, or those who were suspected of having committed a sex offence or other offences against children.
Sharers benefited from receiving empathy, because other prisoners could relate precisely to their challenges and validate their problems. On the other hand, helping others was described as an investment, ensuring that there would be a support network in place when needed. As Ula explained, despite feeling irritated with others, ‘there is going to be a time when you have problems and you want someone to listen...so you always have to have your door half open’.

As depicted in the artwork above (Fig. 5), sharing and giving empathy was not always straightforward in prison. For Danielle, the process was particularly complex: empathising with others served as an important form of concealment:

Figure 5. The eyes, mouth and ears of the three women have been stitched closed. The woman who painted this image explained that it is very hard to help others in prison because of a lack of information, and misinterpreting the psychological pain and traumas that others’ held inside: ‘You’re not hearing, you’re not seeing, you’re not getting at what’s under the surface.’

As depicted in the artwork above (Fig. 5), sharing and giving empathy was not always straightforward in prison. For Danielle, the process was particularly complex: empathising with others served as an important form of concealment:
By nurturing somebody else’s emotions I can cry for someone else, but I could be crying for myself. I can use it as an excuse to cry for someone else…Staff can see me cry but they won’t actually know what’s inside. (Danielle)

Given that female prisoners felt unfairly ‘spotlighted’ or punished for displaying particular emotions, channelling them through other prisoners’ feelings could circumvent these consequences. But further, prisoner accounts often blurred the lines between helper and helped—interactions were mutually reinforcing exchanges that strengthened affiliative relations. For example, attending to others’ emotions could reduce the tension of living in tight quarters for everyone. This was particularly important for prisoners sharing a cell: ‘When I talk to him [when his cellmate is angry], I’m trying to give him other options, I’m trying to change his thinking, and in doing so it helps me’ (Paul). This is consistent with the process that Fischer & Manstead (2008: 459) describe as ‘emotional convergence’, achieved through the patterned expression and experience of emotion in communal relations.

In a quite different manner, the information gained during affective exchanges allowed other prisoners to ‘actually see things differently’ (Haley). As Rimé (2007) argues:

[The] propagation of emotional information…means that members of a community keep track of the emotional experiences affecting their peers. It also means that in a group, the shared social knowledge about emotional events and emotional reactions is continuously updated as a function of new individual experiences. As emotions generally occur when events are unexpected or unpredicted and as such events generally require rapid and appropriate responding, the spreading of information about emotional situations and responses in a social group appears as a particularly efficient prevention tool with regard to future emotion-eliciting situations. (478)

Through learning about environmental challenges, prisoners who took time to listen could increase a shared knowledge base, helping to ward off future problems. Phil explained this process: ‘It makes me more aware of how to deal with my own personal problems. It makes you think, how would I deal with this before? And, how would I deal with it now?’ As Planalp (1999: 139) puts it: ‘If one person runs into danger, expresses fear, and alerts everyone else, the whole group benefits’. This was strongly reminiscent of the events that took place following a one-sided fight in Ranby where a prisoner had knocked another unconscious with a single punch. Prisoners who saw the incident functioned like human ‘broadcasters’ (Harber & Pennebaker, 1992: 382), engaging in a form of ‘secondary social sharing’ (Planalp, 1999: 139) that spread the information around the prison rapidly ‘alert[ing] the whole community to the danger’ (139). Given the sometimes volatile nature of the prison
environment, accounts that were full of strong emotions circulated key information to social groups.

Helping others had a mood enhancing quality, which was an end in itself for some prisoners (‘It makes me feel better’ Kyle). Performing these acts, and the gratitude received as a result, was a way to find meaning in one’s punishment: ‘it’s like helping everyone else makes me feel much more like I’m in prison for a reason’ (Chantal). It also provided a rare opportunity to experience pride in prison: ‘I helped that guy and look at me now, that makes me giddy, it makes me feel proud’ (Billy). While these prisoners did not seek out favours in return, they were more likely than others to benefit from mutual generosity—for example, being able to borrow items without interest, or receiving free haircuts. That, in turn, encouraged more generosity: ‘Now I will go above and beyond to help that person’ (Paul). Finally, helping others also reflected a form of relational intimacy that was gained from being privy to highly sensitive information:

I was chatting with someone yesterday, a big strong man, and I was really surprised because he opened up about things that I never thought he’d want to chat with me about. I felt privileged. He was strong enough to speak about it and he trusted me. I felt good about that. (Ricky)

The first half of this chapter has explained the various routes to sharing emotions and the reasons why most prisoners found this difficult with officers and family members. These relationships highlighted the importance of finding a willing listener, receiving advice, and locating sources of understanding and compassion—all of which could help prisoners alleviate their difficult emotional states. Put simply, the prisoner population was the most available and empathetic group that provided a range of opportunities to offload feelings and reframe the significance of these states. This account has further drawn attention to the various ‘adhesive’ features of sharing emotions that benefitted dyads and groups of prisoners, returning a degree of affective harmony to these relations.

Emotions and the Social Arena

Up to this point, this account has largely discussed social emotions from the perspective of individuals who sought to release and process their own feelings in concert with others. However, this is only one way in which emotions can be considered to be ‘social’. This section considers the various ways in which emotions sprang out of the social arena. The focus here then is on the emergence of emotions in the social sphere and the social regulation of those emotions. This first section considers small groups of prisoners, while the second
expands outwards to examine emotions in the wider prisoner population. According to Kovecses (2000), the most fundamental underlying metaphor of feelings is that *emotion functions as a kind of force*. This suggestion has already been hinted at through discussions of ‘pressure’, ‘outbursts’ and ‘flows’ of emotion that featured in the previous chapter. The following discussion develops this idea, arguing that relational emotions in prison are illuminated by the idea of a force that sprawls outwards. More specifically, the chapter draws upon Hatfield et al's (1993) conceptualisation of ‘emotional contagion’, defined as the spread of emotions from one individual to another, to explain why most prisoners feared mixing with the wider prisoner community and preferred their small groups affiliations instead. In these smaller prisoner constellations, there was typically a positive attunement of collective emotions.

**Going with the Flow: Care, Affection and Humour**
While prisons can be volatile places, their quotidian feel was for the most part defined by routine and relative relaxation. The general ‘baseline’ level of interactions in both prisons was characterised by a steady flow of relational emotions that drew groups of prisoners together. There was a predictable rhythm to these exchanges in which it was common to observe displays of care and affection. Yet, the precise nature and pattern of these affective streams marked a key difference between these two research sites. As has already been suggested, in the women’s prison, displays of emotion were both more open and more expressively intimate. That is, female prisoners displayed affection openly and had regular ‘deep’ conversations. By contrast, in Ranby, expressions of warmth took on more latent and indirect forms (see Crewe, 2014), and bonding was largely achieved through activity. While intimate conversations were ongoing, they typically took place in private. These different patterns of affective bonding are now explored in turn.

To say that care was displayed ‘openly’ in Send had two meanings. First, it reflected the increased frequency and intensity of language used to express feelings, especially in comparison to the men’s prison. Second, these displays were open in the sense of being highly visible across different areas of the prison—although this is not to say they happened everywhere, or all the time. A number of women prisoners engaged in a culture of ‘gift-giving’ or service provision that was indicative of their affectionate relationships. These practices were broad ranging and revealed a sense of social communion. For example, many prisoners spoke of sharing clothes and possessions: ‘What’s mine is yours sort of thing’
(Amber). Others were able to ‘spew their creativity’ (Ula) by customizing clothing, drawing, crafting, or ‘making cards for people to cheer them up’ (Olivia). Some utilised their prison jobs to serve their peers, offering discounted (or free) haircuts or treatment procedures in the beauty salons. Danielle worked for the St. Giles Trust and helped others find housing: ‘I love finding someone somewhere to go…to give that feeling of belonging’.

Cooking and food consumption were routinized and significant activities in Send, bringing large groups of women together. Prisoners pooled together their canteen items on weekends to ‘cook for each other like they would if you was at home’ (Amber). Chantal further explained that she had chocolate stockpiled in her cell: ‘The girls are like “let’s go to Chantal cause she always has snacks”. It’s like being at home, my friends will always come round and have stuff’. The references to ‘home’ in these accounts indicate that these culinary pastimes were attempts to ‘domesticate’ the living spaces, and, in doing so, to infuse care and comfort into the environment: ‘I’m on my wing as the chef, so I’m constantly cooking. Where there’s food there’s laughter…if you’re not hungry then you’re happy’ (Ula). Taken as a group, these activities seemed like collective attempts to manage emotional challenges and to soften the hard edges of imprisonment. Importantly, there was a kind of utilitarian division of labour among female prisoners. As Ula put it, ‘Everybody uses their talent for the best of everybody else.’

Aside from these group affiliations, some women explained that they cultivated special relationships with particular prisoners that involved shared activities: ‘We would watch movies together and would go to the library to play games even when we were meant to be working’ (Gabriella). It was through these connections that displays of physical closeness occurred. It was common to see pairs of prisoners hugging, styling each other’s hair, holding hands, walking arm in arm, or lounging on beds and chairs together. Many of these physical displays were affectionate but non-romantic—although some bonds were harder to distinguish or define: ‘If she comes to watch a DVD she needs to be in the bed and I have to cuddle up beside her. I said “I’m gonna tell your boyfriend next time I see him that you’re spooning me”’ (Chantal). In these groups or friendship dyads, prisoners were openly exhibiting a desire for intimacy and showing care.

The yearning for a deep familial connection with others was compelling, and bonds that were hard to maintain outside prison were forged inside. This was manifested in the creation of
surrogate families: ‘People in here are gonna be like family to you. That’s the only family you have in the moment until you get back into the real world’ (Chantal). It was common to hear participants talk about other prisoners as ‘sisters’, ‘aunties’, ‘grandmothers’, or to self-identify with parental roles themselves (‘They all call me mum’ Wendy). For lifer prisoners, the longevity of these family units offered stability and enabled deep connections to flourish:

> We are a little family as a group. But it’s a group of long termers and lifers. I’ve done about 14 years, so you know that person better than most other people do. You have seen their families grow apart, you’ve seen their children on family days, and now they’re married and have grandchildren. So yes, it’s your family. (Danielle)

Romantic dyads were also commonplace and fulfilled a need for emotional and physical intimacy. As Janice put it, ‘a lot of women come in to prison and they just need that something, so they’ll turn to a woman’. These relationships were often spoken of as temporary affiliations that replaced or supplemented strained relationships with partners outside: ‘Gay for the stay, basically you’re gay while you’re here’ (Amber). These relations opened channels for prisoners to share deep secrets and express love. Olivia explained that these ties ‘bring you a lot of comfort, it’s something else to focus on and it makes your time go a lot quicker’. That is, they were a method of soothing difficult feelings and provided an intense form of social distraction. Such relationships were not openly disclosed in Ranby and were, in all likelihood, far less frequent. Some interactions between male prisoners seemed to hint at pseudo-familial relations. That is, some male participants spoke of finding ‘father figures’ or treating their close friends like ‘brothers’. In her study, Jewkes (2002: 153) explains that the role of ‘paternalistic mentor is passed down through a chain of relationships’ in prison. In Ranby, there were a number of instances where older parental prisoners were observed nurturing younger prisoners either on the wing, or through extended private discussions in their cells. Generally though, male prisoners were less likely to define their relationships in familial terms.

Moreover, the findings from the men’s prison were strongly redolent of Crewe’s (2014: 398) argument that ‘men’s emotional expressions are so often oblique, disguised, or communicated indirectly’. Prisoners in Ranby submerged care into their shared routines and activities:

> Groups of lads walk around together, you eat together, you go to the gym together, you live together. That’s the way it [affection] is shown. They become a close group of friends so to speak. They don’t
share feelings, but that’s the way you know that he likes him and that he’s got feeling towards him. They never say it. (Karl)

Through engaging in shared activities, prisoners were able to ‘pick up a bond’ (Kyle) with one another over time. A second contrasting feature was the adversarial structure of these bonding activities. That is, association periods were awash with competitive rituals, including: table tennis tournaments, pool and snooker matches, PlayStation games, play fighting (which sometimes escalated into real fighting) and gym workouts. Competition and displays of skill among prisoners provided a setting where displays of care could take place—but flows of emotion here were the ‘background noise’ and not the focus of these interactions.

Linguistic differences seemed important too. The use of the third person ‘he’ and ‘they’ was common in men’s accounts (see Karl above, for example), whereas in Send, women were more likely to talk about feelings using first person pronouns (‘I’ and ‘my’). This semantic difference reveals that male prisoners had a more detached relationship to their emotions. Indeed, men were more likely to communicate feelings to each other in non-verbal ways, for example through ‘physical contact… high-fives, shaking hands, fist bumps’ (Billy). The gym was a site par excellence for observing these interactions: prisoners were often seen squeezing each other’s muscles—actions that seemed to blend encouragement, admiration and respect for one another’s physical prowess. Karl further explained how special handshakes could communicate great depth of feeling and loyalty:

When I shake their hand or put a palm on their shoulder and say “you’re good stuff you”, that sends them a subconscious message…that he likes me and he is there for me, he’s got my back and I can chat to him. That shows them enough. It doesn’t have to be said, it is known. (Karl)

Similarly, Freddy reflected on the indirect, sub-verbal nature of these interactions

It’s good to care and be nice, but you wouldn’t necessarily show it. You can tell it’s there. It’s that subconscious thing isn’t it, it’s like unspoken words…It’s just like a feeling, but a more in-depth feeling you just know. If I care, you just feel it. (Freddy)

For most male prisoners, then, affection was shown ‘in an abstract way’ (Bernie). The fact that some prisoners were able to actively comment on this process hinted at a level of awareness about how social and gender expectations governed the display of particular feeling states in men’s prisons. For example, Howard described a situation where he restated the acceptable limits of male affection: ‘He’s [Howard’s cell-mate] got this massage oil and
he says “rub my back for me”. I said “fuck off, we’re in prison”. But he’s a top lad.’ The emphasis on being ‘in prison’ here is a revealing indicator of the pull towards emotional restraint. Put simply, being too ‘soft’ was considered a signal of weakness and could generate ridicule or exploitation from other prisoners.

In spite of these risks, explicit displays of warmth sometimes emerged. Prisoners who hugged one another were communicating affection directly: ‘when someone is a bit upset, someone will say “come here mate, give me a hug”, and it makes a difference’ (Billy). Similarly, during an outside workshop when a prisoner told his friend he was cold, the friend put the back of his hand on his face. Not all men exercised verbal restraint: ‘With my close mates in here…I can have a good chat with them’ (Jerry).\(^45\) Other prisoners felt comfortable enough to say ‘I love you, man’ (Bernie) to their close friends. While such explicit displays were relatively isolated and atypical, they do serve as an important counterweight to descriptions of men’s prisons as emotionally bereft environments.

Humour served as an important social lubricant in both prisons. Indeed, the litany of comedic interactions, pranks, and barbed retorts was a notable feature of day-to-day life both in Ranby and Send. These displays had an ‘infectious’ (Olivia) quality and served as a collective attempt to stave off negative feeling states: ‘Humour is the number one thing that gets people through difficult times. It distracts you and can lead you down another avenue of emotions that result in you feeling better’ (Billy). Andrew often used his exhibitionism to bring people together and lighten the mood: ‘I will come onto the landing dancing [in a comical manner] and I will be laughing, and a couple of guys will join in…they call it the Andrew disease’. In Ranby, humour often had barbed edges as prisoners tended to ‘rip the piss’ (Alan) and compete to outwit one another, although these exchanges were usually good spirited. In Send, it was more common to hear accounts of communal mirth, especially in the context of Karaoke nights, parties, playing pranks, or roleplaying:

A couple of weeks ago it was my friend’s birthday, so we set-up the room like a casino hall. There was loads of card games and dominos, and it was nice cause everyone came down. Even the officers came down, and they were all confused. There was so much laughing…everyone was laughing and joking. We had music going in the background, we all bought stuff off of canteen. Everyone came down and had a drink. I acted like a waitress, taking the mick out of everyone: “Top your glass up love?”, “red or

\(^{45}\) A ‘good chat’ was understood here to mean a conversation that included openly exploring feelings.
white,” “cherryade or lemonade”. We do have to entertain ourselves the best we can in this place. (Blanche)

Through such acts, prisoners used humour to avoid succumbing to group inertia and promote positivity in their living areas. To this end, Tamara explained how group dynamics were highly sensitive to the contagion of moods:

We are forever laughing and keeping ourselves up. But if one person is down it does kind of affect the group. When that person expresses how they feel, that other person that heard it will get down. It passes on. So we try and keep ourselves happy. Obviously it’s not a happy place to be in. We’ve got to keep sane, otherwise we will just crack. (Tamara)

The various manifestations of care described above can be understood as an attempt to limit the spread and infiltration of toxic emotions from ‘outside’. To some extent then, the careful policing of prisoner affiliations and various bonding rituals (cooking, shared gym routines) can be understood as attempts to make the environment predictable and positive.

However, such attempts were not always successful, as the stark realities of imprisonment penetrated these cocoons and hostile interactions with the wider prisoner community were hard to avoid: ‘You’re living somewhere where there’s negative things going on all around, how’s that going to make you feel?’ (Yvonne). The remainder of this chapter moves in this direction by evaluating the ‘negative’ emotions that characterised wider interactions in both prisons.

**Destructive Forces and Contagious Emotions**

Displays of care in prison were hardly ubiquitous, especially outside of tight friendship groups. Those who tried to care for others described the pain of being taking advantage of: ‘helping people out…only to be stabbed in the fucking back’ (Wayne). That is, openness and kindness could easily be recast by exploitative prisoners as weakness. Prisoners explained that it was not just displays of affective warmth that were proscribed, but that displaying anger openly could also have dangerous consequences (including assaults, IEP reprisals and social exclusion). Put short, in the wider atmosphere of both prisons, the social display of emotions perpetuated destructive cycles that were difficult to contain. Indeed, emotions in this sphere resembled Douglas’ (1966) notion of ‘dirt’. Douglas argues that the presence of dirt constitutes ‘disorder’ (5), and anything dirty is considered ‘as matter out of place’ (36). In this context, the common slogans recanted by prisoners to ‘do your own time’ and ‘keep
your head down’ were particularly pertinent to emotions. Expressions of feeling were ‘out of place’ in these broader interactions. The various allusions to prisoners having to traverse emotional ‘tight-ropes’ in the prisons literature (see Greer, 2002; Toch, 1992) seem particularly germane to these interactions.

The wider prison environment was full of uncertainty, both in terms of the people one encountered and the feelings that were triggered. A number of participants spoke in candid terms about feeling sudden shame. This powerful emotion emerged in particular when they were reminded about their offending behaviour. Sometimes these reminders were overt: ‘Someone could come down after 15 years and bring up your past and the shame comes back again’ (Ula). On other occasions, this process was more indirect: ‘An officer is not going to come into this room and leave a bag there and leave you on your own…you’re always under suspicion, you’re always a suspect’ (Haley). Shame was acutely experienced when prisoners felt they had suffered maltreatment. Zak, who could not control his pain, felt humiliated by nurses who downplayed his ailments:

I was on my bed writhing in agony. I said “What’s happening to me?” and she said “You’re just having a panic attack, that’s all it is.” I said “Why am I in so much pain, panic attacks shouldn’t cause this much pain.” My arm was going boom boom boom [palpitating] and the sweat was pouring the fuck off me. She said “Do you know you’re stopping us from having a night out tonight?”

Showing vulnerability in prison could be met with ridicule and irritation. The linkages between shame and anger are not always clear in the wider literature (Scheff & Retzinger, 1991), though Tangney et al. (1992: 673) note that ‘shamed individuals may be motivated to anger because such anger is likely to produce some relief from the global, self-condemning, and debilitating experience of shame’. In line with this account, Mikey described an incident where he was prevented from using the bathroom in Ranby:

I just came back from the library and I needed the toilet and I was desperate. I went to the officer and I said “Excuse me boss, can you let me-” He says “no you fucking can’t, I’ll do it when I’m ready”…So I kicked off and went mad. I told him I was going to knock him out and shit on him. (Mikey)

Neil shared a similar account: ‘One morning I needed to shit all night and the officer wouldn’t let me outside so I had to shit in a bag’. Being denied agency over the most basic
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46 The oppressive physical environment sent a message to prisoners, and often eliciting shame. This notion is further developed in the following chapter.
bodily functions was a humiliating reminder that one could be perceived as sub-human by officers—and that such debasements were their lot. Liebling’s (2004: 166) observation that ‘the experience of being in punitive and disrespectful environments is traumatic and damaging’ is particularly apposite here. The language and general tone of officers’ communication was perceived by some as excessive (‘shouting when you don’t have to shout’ Rebecka), disrespectful (‘they try and make us look stupid in front of people’ Stacey), lacking sensitivity (‘he’s shouting “come get your methadone, you druggies”’ Karl) and infantilizing (‘they make you feel small’ Tamara). At times, these degradations were communicated physically. Being restrained by officers could be a particularly distressing experience: ‘I ended up getting twisted up on the floor. Then I’m ashamed because why am I fucking kicking off? Why have I let you twist me up? And everyone’s looking’ (Craig).

Throughout these accounts, the presence of onlookers appears to be a significant issue. Indeed, historically, shame has been connected to the idea of covering oneself—both literally and metaphorically—from being seen (Lewis, 1971). Prisoners were not just being personally reprimanded, they were being *publicly* humiliated. Being watched by a wider audience of prisoners magnified these incidents and intensified the difficult emotions that resulted. Scheff and Retzinger (1991: xix) claim that shame is the ‘master emotion’ that interferes with the management of all our other emotions. First, the authors argue, shame is the ‘basic engine of repression’ because we often become ashamed of our feelings once they are evoked, and therefore seek to stifle them. Second, shame is the ‘runaway fuel of massive conflagrations of physical and emotional violence’ (1991: xix). In sum, then, in these wider interactions between prisoners, emotions had a ‘destructive’ quality characterised by the presence shame, which served to increase social distance and friction between individuals.

Moreover, a number of other affective states appeared to have a ‘contagious’ (Hatfield et al., 1993) quality that spread over, or were absorbed by, other prisoners. The idea that social emotions disseminate in a manner ‘akin to the transmission of social viruses’ (Hatfield et al., 1993: 128) was intuitive to prisoners:

Ellie: You can all kind of feel like everybody gets the emotions, even if it’s nothing to do with you. You can feel that, you can really feel it.

Interviewer: It kind of rubs off?

Ellie: It’s in the air, and people do take it on.
This ‘airborne’ pressure to feel particular emotions had a different character in each establishment, though it emerged from a similar source: pent-up boredom, sadness and anger. In the women’s prison, some felt fatigued by the seemingly endless litany of emotions: ‘It drains me out…it’s an on-going circle’ (Katherine). Send was described as a prison with ‘a lot of negative energy’ (Blanche), and prisoners could easily get sucked into this emotional orbit. For example, women who were anxious had ‘a domino effect’ on those around them by ‘making their life your life’ (Ula, both quotations). Rather than containing their problems to those who knew them, these prisoners offloaded indiscriminately. Even if prisoners wished to withdraw, they were often ‘brought into situations’ and subjected to unsolicited sharing by prisoners ‘who dump on you’ (Lacey, both quotations). Under these conditions, supporting others was a non-consensual exercise, and emotional resources were being forcibly extracted: ‘Being around them is emotionally draining. They’re like siphons, they siphon the life and energy out of you because they’re so sad, overwhelmingly sad’ (Katherine). These accounts bring into focus a rarely discussed deprivation of imprisonment: the enforced exposure and proximity to others’ moods, from which prisoners often had little means to escape.

Outbursts of collective anger appeared to have a similar degree of momentum or contagious quality (‘It just all kicks off’ Katherine). Some participants found it particularly hard to fend off these intrusions: ‘If someone is in a bad mood, that is the sort of thing that I would absorb…if they were aggressive on the wing, it would raise all those emotions in me’ (Olivia). Chantal explained ‘We don’t know where to put our anger, so we take it out on each other’. Put simply, other prisoners became the targets of anger and frustration precisely because there was a lack of viable alternatives for channelling difficult feelings. While physical outbursts were rare among the women, verbal aggression and anger were prevalent: ‘I have seen people moved to tears…by people who take great pleasure in belittling and orally demoralising someone’ (Olivia). In Send, a pervasive culture of gossiping (‘bickering and nastiness’ - Danielle) was described as toxic: ‘It’s like, why are we even discussing this, none of us were involved?’ (Chantal). This behaviour functioned as a kind of collective venting, providing a cathartic outpouring of anger and frustration.

During conflicts in Send, personal information was a highly valuable tool: ‘They’ll use whatever you’ve given to them against you’ (Haley). In light of this, prisoners explained that they had to be highly selective about who they trusted. There were other prisoners who went further, intentionally distorting information and spreading rumours to humiliate others (‘I was
being called a devil worshipper’ Stacey). These individual confrontations often had wider social ramifications: ‘Not just one person falls out with you, it will be a whole group of people’ (Stacey). The social structure of the prison consisted of a web of different groups and factions that were most often ethnically (‘Black girls’, ‘White girls’) or geographically delineated (‘Welsh girls’, ‘Travellers’). The fact that it seemed ‘everybody has a clique’ (Ellie, emphasis added) hinted at a collective pressure to enter social relationships. This reflected deep insecurities about social isolation and bullying, which would make it far harder to cope with one’s sentence. To some extent then, women were pushed together due to fears of exclusion rather than affection.

Unpredictability and fear were also central concerns in the men’s prison, although the rationale for this concern had a different source: ‘You don’t know where the next shock is going to come from or where the next threat is’ (Ian). In Ranby, then, confrontations more often had a physical edge, as arguments could quickly escalate into fights or violent attacks. ‘It’s all “he said, she said”. The next thing you know, it gets twisted and your life is in danger’ (Alan). There was a build-up of frustration and fear among prisoners that coloured social interactions with the underlying threat of violence. ‘[Violence] is the language being spoken in here. Imagine you’re trying to speak French in a jail where everyone speaks English, it won’t work’ (Dean). To be ‘fluent’ in this language meant being able to avoid being an easy mark, and to stand one’s ground and fight if necessary. Howard explained that it was the lack of institutional safety that forced him to respond violently:

I’m walking around, next thing some kid comes from behind and slices him [his friend]. And so today he came by and tapped me on my chest, and he says “tick tock, your time is next”. You ain’t walking away from that situation without you knowing what time it is...If you’re not gonna create a safe environment for me, I’m gonna make sure he knows. You’re forced to go along with people you wouldn’t normally get along with. I’m not accepting it. Without blood, things are easily forgot. It’s the only thing they understand. (Howard)

The spirals of fear, aggression and violence at work in men’s prisons have been well documented (See Edgar, O’Donnell, & Martin, 2014). For current purposes, it is insightful to further explore the idea that, in Ranby, these volatile emotions had a contagious quality. That is, there was a kind of affective ‘pull’ that made it difficult for prisoners to avoid walking away from confrontations, and made them susceptible to ‘catch the rhythms’ (Hatfield et al., 1993: 1) of other prisoners’ emotional states. Two large exercise yards that were surrounded by house blocks and other buildings created an exposed, highly visible space. This area
functioned like a theatre in which prisoners observed and communicated with their peers. When confrontations arose in these public spaces, they were quickly seized upon by those in the vicinity:

Other people are getting involved, saying “What are you doing letting people treat you like that?” Then you’re thinking if he speaks to me like that then other people will speak to me like that. If I don’t do something now, I’m going to get tortured even more. (Dean)

The expectations of this wider audience placed strain or ‘peer pressure’ (Billy) on prisoners: ‘I can’t look soft in front of my boys, everyone will take the piss’ (Oscar). This was perceived as a public test of one’s boundaries, where failing to react assertively could open the floodgates for future challenges and exploitation (de Viggiani, 2012; Sim, 1994; Toch, 1998). Responding physically to provocation garnered admiration and sent a potent message to other prisoners: ‘People will think fucking hell he’s got a good punch’ Karl). What stood out about these altercations though was the sheer hostility and scornfulness of prisoners on the periphery, who tried to provoke physical confrontations through goading and cajoling: ‘They say “fucking hell, are you gonna let him get away with that?”’ (Tommas). During these incidents, a circle of prisoners would form around potential combatants, shouting at them aggressively: ‘Go on! Whack him’ (Craig). These attempts to ‘hype up’ other prisoners into confrontations were often hard to resist: ‘If you’re not strong minded, you’re going to listen to them…you start thinking these [guys] are right, and you’ll act on it’ (Andrew). The hostile energy and aggression pent up among the prisoner population was being charged and channelled into their peers, creating a wave of momentum that swept them along.

These gladiatorial spectacles functioned as a way for prisoners to alleviate collective boredom and provided temporary entertainment. Some participants observed other prisoners daring or paying their peers to fight people. All of these incidents were ways to ‘see some excitement, laugh at you, and see somebody get twisted-up’ (Val). Similar forms of ‘amusement’ were sought when some prisoners spiked vulnerable addicts with synthetic cannabinoids:

Someone’s running around trying to buy drugs, and someone else says “You can have this for nothing [high dose of spice]”, just because they know the effect it’s going to have on them. It’s like winding up a toy and then stand back and watch. They see it as entertainment’ (Billy).

Finally, a recent suicide attempt on the landing was met with a mixture of encouragement and derision: ‘There was prisoners shouting and screaming “You haven’t got the balls”, “do it!”
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“come on, come on” (Dean). Taken as a whole, these accounts indicate that some emotions were infectious, sweeping across large groups of prisoners. These affective waves of energy were hard to ward off and resembled Randall Collins conceptualisations of ‘ritual interaction’ (1990) and ‘forward panic’ (2011). The former concept explains how individuals ‘get pumped up with the emotional strength from participating in the group interaction’ (1990: 32), while the latter term refers to the ‘build-up of tension and fear’ in violent incidents in which combatants are ‘caught-up in each other’s mood’ (2011: 23). The spatial constraints of prison life compounded these dynamics, as it was not always possible for prisoners to retreat from unwanted social interactions, especially in cell sharing situations or tight living quarters. Prisoners were highly exposed to the vacillations of others’ moods and contagious emotions, catalysing the potential for forward panics. Indeed, the critical role of spatiality, and the ways in which it could sometimes magnify hostility and aggression, features heavily in the next chapter.

Gender and Emotion
In the previous chapter, there was little to distinguish the gendered experience of emotions. Rather, it was suggested that the affective challenges of imprisonment appeared to be universal. However, here a number of differences have surfaced, forming three broad categories, relating to: emotional literacy; competitive and collaborative emotional expression; and finally, the internalisation and externalisation of destructive emotions. These themes are understood as differences in general rather than absolute contrasts.

First, the female prisoners were more emotionally ‘fluent’ than male prisoners. In chapter two, much was made of the long historical tendency to colour such observations in pejorative terms. These concerns resurface here. The finding that women display ‘superior language use’ is often translated into the idea that women ‘specialize in bitchiness and verbal aggressiveness, while men’s penchant for physical aggression is often seen as being up-front and direct’ (Campbell, 1993: 73). Leaving aside the fact that ‘men actually outdo women in terms of verbal as well as physical aggression’ (Campbell, 1993: 73), the moral starting point of these debates is notably masculinist because separation and individuality is valued over attachment. Moral systems that recognise the ‘continuing importance of attachment in the human life cycle’ and that the world ‘coheres through human connection’ are typically disavowed in such accounts (Gilligan, 1992: 23-29). Gilligan (1992) explains that the forgotten moral voice of women involves ‘illuminating life as a web…stressing continuity
and change in configuration, rather than replacement and separation, elucidating a different response to loss, and changing metaphor of growth’ (48). In the context of emotions and imprisonment, these imbalances surfaced through ‘gendered rehabilitative strategies which primarily take aim at containing women’s emotions’ (Kolind & Bjonness, 2017: 2 emphasis added) instead of emphasising the positive aspects of them. Further, Kruttschnitt and Gartner (2005: 144) found that female prisoners are often described by officers as ‘more emotional, manipulative, and generally more troublesome than their male counterparts’. Prison staff can at times tend towards seeing emotion as a problem to be curtailed and swept away, like dirt, or matter that is out of place (Douglas, 1966).

In some instances, prisoners in this study reinforced stereotypes about gender that were matched by the empirical findings. For example, Ellie claimed that talking about emotions was part of ‘being a girl’, and Karl said ‘men don’t talk about feelings’. Female prisoners were observed to be more comfortable articulating their emotions than their male counterparts. The male prisoners—although not unfamiliar with the importance of empathy and relationships in prison themselves—were more likely to exercise verbal restraint and express their feelings through understated actions, such as nods of approval and small physical greetings, such as handshakes and fist bumps. It was more common in Send to drop in on ‘deep’ conversations in public places and to see women displaying a wide number of emotions together (for example: crying openly, talking enthusiastically, joyful dancing, and raucous laughter). This was further intensified by the various therapeutic programmes in Send that championed awareness and openness to emotional dialogues. But the detailed discussion of empathy introduced in the middle of the chapter rebalances the notion that emotional expression is inherently problematic, dangerous or always the subject of institutional containment. As Baron-Cohen (2003: 46) explains ‘the pay-off of self-disclosure is intimacy’ and ‘the upshot of this’ is that these relationships ‘are more emotional’. This is the case because emotional intimacy ‘forms and reinforces social bonds’ and ‘communication channels open so that any tensions that arise are then easier to diffuse’ (Baron-Cohen, 2003: 55). In a similar vein, then, this chapter avoids the pitfalls of equating emotional expression with weakness and emotional restraint as a virtue. The argument emphasizes the strengths of affective intimacy among female prisoners and the importance of emotional expression as form of social adhesion.

Second, while both sets of prisoners expressed emotions through shared activities, the nature of these activities had different distinguishing features. In Ranby, activities were far more
competitive or adversarial—men played games against one another and gym partners spurred each other on through challenges and goal setting. These men were less likely to describe feeling dependent upon one another, though they clearly valued their group affiliations and relied upon them in times of need. Though Crewe (2014) recognises that the case can sometimes be overstated it is valid to conclude, in line with Baron-Cohen (2003: 55), that the men in this study refer ‘less frequently to their relationships, tending to live them through joint activities rather than talking about them’. In Send, women engaged more often in communal pastimes, where group bonding was achieved through a combination of skills, generosity and mutual support with problems. Further, women were more dependent on these group networks, which were an essential feature of their daily lives and functioned like pseudo family units. This contrasts notably with Mandaraka-Sheppard’s (1986: 135) finding that women were ‘not inclined to form cohesive groups’, exhibiting a general ‘reluctance to stick together’ because their relationships are characterised by hostility, mistrust and a ‘quiet antagonism’ (137). These results align more closely with Owen (1998) who found that interpersonal relationships are the anchors of prison life for women—although the presence of pseudo family units was less pervasive here than in Owen’s study.

Third, female and male prisoners were also more likely to use different modes of emotional expression, especially in the case of anger and aggression. One contention of chapter two was that prisons research has typically under documented the role of anger in women’s establishments (Liebling, 2009). This trend aligns with findings outside of prison in that ‘maleness and aggression have become linked to the point where it is easy to forget about women’s aggression…[which] is private, unrecognized, and frequently misunderstood’ (Campbell, 1993: 1). Campbell states that for women the threat often comes from within and that their anger represents an expressive ‘cataclysmic release of accumulated tension’ and a ‘cry for help born out of desperation’ (7). Campbell further explains (1993: 18) that women’s anger follows a pattern of ‘repression, frustration, then explosion’. This observation connects strongly with the artwork presented in the previous chapter, and the finding that bottled emotions appeared to return in ‘explosive’ forms.

When women’s anger has been discussed in the prisons context, research has confirmed that while men are more likely to ‘aggress against others or property [whereas] women direct their anger inward with either cognitive outcomes (such as depression) or behavioural outcomes (such as self-harm)’ (Suter et al., 2002: 1096). Further, Mandaraka-Sheppard (1986: 135) explains that the expressive qualities of women’s ‘outbursts of violent behaviour’ in prison
are individualistic, instant, and last for a short period of time. To some extent the current study reaffirmed these accounts, finding more internalisation of sadness and anger in the women’s prison compared with instrumental externalisation among men in general. According to Easteal (2001: 99) the internalisation of pain and secrets is a rational response to austere prison settings that are ‘anathema to the process of healing’ and merely echo earlier childhood experiences of censure. Further to this point, the litany of social control mechanisms outside prison that govern women’s feeling states are well documented (Howe, 1994). That is to say, the same ‘psychic numbing’ (Easteal, 2001) enforced on women as children is apparent in the ‘psychic coercion’ of imprisonment (Carlen, 1998: 83). Carlen (1998: 85) describes the ‘humiliating pettiness of many of the rules and the rigidity with which they are enforced [in prison], and the erosion of control over the ordering of personal space and time’ that women face.

One side-effect of this strict governance, particularly apposite for this discussion, is that women internally experience more secondary emotions when they express anger and aggression—such as guilt, anxiety and shame—because of a sense that they have breached society’s expectations of feminine behaviour by failing to internally police themselves (Campbell, 1993). However, this study adds to these existing debates by exposing how emotional control and expressivity are cyclical and connected processes. Women were both more emotionally expressive and more controlled. That is, internal and external controls lead women to suppress the expression of certain feelings, but this was a generative as well as stifling process.

By contrast, the male prisoners externalised their anger, often in quite instrumental ways: the aforementioned gladiatorial, and sometimes predatory, displays of violence in association yards were representative of this. For men, anger and aggression is about defending against the loss of status, allowing them to repair wounded self-esteem, and gain social and material benefits (Campbell, 1993). Liebling (1992: 194) found that ‘much of the self-destructive behaviour by the male groups…can be seen as instrumental, strategic or determined to achieve some outcome’. It seems a truism that in men’s prisons, ‘one can feel that the general mood may lead to something carefully organised and forethought’ (Mandaraka-Sheppard, 1986: 137). The linguistic features of men’s accounts in this study—which were less likely to use ‘I’ and ‘me’ terms—indicated a certain proclivity towards the ‘outward projection’ of their affective states. Though men’s prisons encourage emotional fortitude and restraint in general, they actively license states of anger and ‘kicking off’ (Crewe, 2009: 437)—although
these displays were carefully calibrated in Ranby. Instrumental displays of anger were not completely foreign in Send either, especially in the dining room where women initiated fights with the hope of being ‘shipped out’ to different establishments. In her study of anger and aggression, Campbell (1993: 132-133) uncovers ‘remarkably similar’ stories from women in gangs, including accounts of ‘threat and counterthreat, the bravado, and the pride in scaring the opponent into submission’. Campbell claims that when women follow these aggression scripts it is because they have been overwhelmed by ‘fear and loneliness’ in their families, schools and communities and must therefore use aggression to survive (133). They aggress, according to Campbell, because they have nothing to lose. This reflective analysis is not afforded to the men in her study, who are depicted as ruthless instrumentalists who ‘eagerly exploit the full range of their aggression…materially as well as socially’ (140). The findings in this current study do not deny that men’s prisons have higher levels of instrumental violence overall, only that the biographical accounts introduced in chapter four made it explicitly clear that isolation, fear, abandonment and trauma was present among both samples.

Care should be taken not to overemphasize gender differences either, as there was also much concordance between these prisoner groups. As Liebling (1992: 184) states:

Any complete dichotomy between male and female experiences of imprisonment is misleading, despite the many differences existing between male and female penal establishment and their organisation. One of the important findings…has been the consistency of the pains of imprisonment, regardless of gender.

This was especially apparent in relation to the social sharing of emotions. In both prisons, it was customary to hear that other prisoners were the most common source for offloading emotions (as opposed to family members and officers). As wider psychological research has recognized, people ‘prefer to interact with others who are experiencing similar emotions’ (Townsend, et al. 2013: 526) because it fills ‘powerful needs for social recognition and validation, for listening and understanding, for unconditional acceptance and for social integration’ (Rime, 2007: 472). Prisoners, then, shared a powerful collective experience that put them in a position to be able to truly empathize with the feelings of those around them.

The extent to which these ‘gendered’ emotion differences in prison are indicative of wider trends in the population outside is a challenging question. In their study of mental health disorders in the community Eaton et al. (2012) found that women showed a higher mean level
of internalizing, while men showed a higher mean level of externalizing. But specific aspects of the prison environment may crystallize and intensify these differences. An important strand of Mandaraka-Sheppard’s explanation for why women prisoners were ‘lacking the strength of an informal structure’ (141) concerned the coercive nature of the establishment which reduced trust in their relations. Similarly, if the institutional consequences of outward aggression are more damaging than inward aggression prisoners may be more inclined to control their emotions (Suter et al. 2002). For current purposes, this argument raises difficult questions about the extent to which gender differences cause differences in emotionality, or whether the different cultural and operational priorities of the prison plays an important role in establishing or denying communal relations. Much has been written about the prevalence of ‘toxic’ and hegemonic masculinities in men’s prisons (Toch, 1998; Kupers, 2005), and the opportunities for work and education in women’s prisons often seem to endorse outmoded and passive feminine virtues (Bosworth, 1999). While these are important considerations, the extent to which gender moulded displays of emotionality in prison remains an unanswered question. To address this question, the spatial and institutional drivers of emotion are the primary concern of the following chapter.

In many ways, then, the findings in this current study confirm existing arguments in the literature. But by considering emotions from different perspectives, this study helps refine and augment these debates to reveal important tensions: female prisoners are both more fluent with their emotions and more controlled. Second, the extended discussion of empathy in this chapter goes some way to rebalancing the pejorative connotations that ‘Females tend to show more indirect (or relational, covert) aggression…behind people’s backs…like gossip exclusion and bitchy remarks’ (Baron-Cohen, 2003: 37). Empathy had important integrative qualities that have been well documented in the chapter. More generally, an understanding of emotions in prison contributes to debates about the key dimensions of power, order and control. To conclude this chapter, some of these important arguments are addressed.

**Emotions: Power, Order and Control**

In their illuminating study Sparks et al. (1996) set out to understand how order is negotiated in different prisons, and how the use of power and authority facilitates or impedes the social organization of these institutions. Though their account includes no explicit analysis of the role of emotions in this task, in a number of places feelings are indirectly introduced into the analysis. For example, the authors state that ‘prisons quite commonly seethe and boil with
human agency, passion, and conflict’ (1996: 68), especially during riots where they are sites of ‘sheer hedonistic thrill’, even if most of the time they ‘are boring’ places, this ‘boredom may be sought’ (82). From the inverse direction, the current study can complement Sparks et al.’s account of order and control in prison by further developing the analysis of emotions.

Derek Layder (2004: 5) argues that there are ‘deep-seated associations between power and the emotions’ that are ‘not simply contingent and haphazard’, rather the ‘two are to be found in each other’s company in every instance…[as] constant companions’. Yet as stated above, research in women’s prisons has often veered away from important topics such as legitimacy and power (Liebling, 2009). This is surprising given that Suter et al. (2002: 1095) found that ‘women were significantly more likely [than men] to be angered by perceptions of unfairness and justice’, and that their ‘resentment toward unfairness’ stemmed from traumatic life events that ‘created a sense of inequity’. Further, the fact that women’s prisons are often described as ‘more emotional’ and ‘needy’ places essentially serves to strips women of agency. As Kruttschnitt and Gartner (2005: 159) explain ‘volition…is missing, as it always has been for female offenders’. In line with this, Carlen (1998: 91) describes the ‘constant hijacking of any control’ and the infantilization process still inherent in many women’s prisons. What is missing from this interpretation is the point that displays of emotionality are, to some degree, a direct response to militant policing and institutional regulation, and that these responses serve key functions. For example, explosions of anger and aggression reveal where the negotiations of power relations have frayed or broken down completely.

In their small groups and prisoner dyads, the exchange of emotions was indicative of the ‘ongoing process of attachment that relates and sustains the human community’ (Gilligan, 1992: 156). In this light, it becomes clearer that displays of care and empathy are also deeply related to establishing and managing power—or at least not separate from power entanglements. Gilligan explains that women can ‘equate power with giving and care’ (167), and understand ‘nurturance as acts of strength’ (168). Emotional expression in both prisons functioned like social glue, or ‘connective tissue’ (Davidson & Milligan, 2004: 524) that typically increased levels of intimacy, trust and brought a degree of harmony to these relations. The dynamics of emotions, then, have a lot to say about attempts to establish and maintain order and reveal some of the alternative ways in which it is achieved.

But this debate is not without interpretative complexity. The finding that there are high levels of emotional suppression punctuated by outbursts of anger, in both prisons, speaks to the
institutional attempts to control particular behavioural expressions and the lack of trust prisoners have in officers. Restraining or internalizing one’s anger is a rational response where there are ‘institutional consequences of outward aggression’ that are ‘more aversive than that of inward aggression’ (Suter et al., 2002: 1096). Indeed, Mandaraka-Sheppard (1986: 199) articulates the ‘subtle spiral effect’ of such punishment or control on further misbehaviour and shows that the ‘multiplication of offences and the ‘multiplication of punishments’ can engender bitterness. In a related manner, the high levels of anger and fear on display in Ranby in public spaces were indicative of direct threats to power and status. As Barbalet (2001: 26) explains: ‘A power relationship which results in the dispossession of a participant also leads to their anger’.

Arguably then, the emotional dimensions of imprisonment provide an important micro-level lens through which to view the new penology (Feeley & Simon, 1992) and the ‘culture of control’ (Garland, 2001) close up. Imprisonment is, increasingly perhaps in the era of mass incarceration, an experience of depersonalization that can have a clear ‘impact on the emotional well-being of its charges’ (Kruttschnitt & Gartner, 2005: 154). The idea that imprisonment is a dehumanizing experience is hardly original, but understanding the precise mechanisms by which prisoners are made to feel ‘somehow less than human’ is important (Easteal, 2001: 99). At least part of this explanation involves understanding the constriction and limits placed on emotional expressivity in prison.

The institutional sanitation of feelings operated in the following directions: first, through a kind of purging that tried to clean up emotions from public prison spaces like dirt that is out of place (Douglas, 1966)—recall that prisoners who danced joyfully in the hallways received more mandatory drugs tests. Second, prisoners are placed under emotional strain and pressures to navigate the emotions of other prisoners. Indeed, a number of prisoners described a form of enforced empathy that they termed as a contagious and contaminating force. There are clear synergies here with Carlen’s (1998: 83) claim that imprisonment can create an ‘unspeakable, and always corrosive, fear of pollution’. Third, while therapy arguably facilitates an inverse process, encouraging expressivity, the next chapter reveals that this is a complex case and that ‘special treatment can readily become special control’ (Peay, 2010: 521). To bring these arguments together, in the context of control and order, it appears that emotion is both an important cause and effect. On the one hand, emotions are the result of particular coercive institutional rules and regulatory practices and the strain of adjustment. On the other, regulating and expressing emotions offers an active, agentic, way of
reinterpreting prison space and establishing new forms of social connection, dignity, order and trust. However, this debate is further informed by the idea that prisons have an emotional geography, and that space is in an influential variable. The next chapter explores the contribution of space to the discussion of emotion in detail.

**Conclusion**
The theoretical perspectives introduced in this chapter (‘social glue’ and ‘emotion contagion’) provide ways to develop traditional dramaturgical frameworks of prison life that rely on the binary distinctions set out in chapter two: that is, between ‘frontstage’ and ‘backstage’ areas, or public and private spaces. Goffman (1958: 15) states that social actors are strongly influenced by a desire to shape ‘the definition of the situation which the others come formulate’ about them. Such frameworks emphasise the importance of impression management, and cast the individual as an agent who is compelled to hide authentic expressions of identity and emotion from the public sphere. Yet, while this perspective has value, it is also limiting. Indeed, Goffman recognises that the focus on the ‘communicative role’ of social interaction alone excludes the possibility of other functions such as catharsis or ‘tension-release’ (1958: 241).

By contrast, then, this chapter argues that emotions have deeply social roots and a range of applications that complicate the frontstage-backstage dichotomy. It may be more accurate to describe concentric circles of prison relations, including: romantic couples, friendship dyads, small groups, diffuse affiliations, interactions with strangers, and hostile groups. In each of these groupings feeling states take on different forms and meanings, and the pattern and flow of emotionality in these interactions cuts across binary conceptualisations of prison life. For example, in the innermost circles of relations (dyads and small groups), the mutual expression and experience of affective states was integral. In these groups, there were numerous displays of care shown through ‘consideration, generosity, or support’ that were ‘triggered by visible reminders of another’s humanness’ (Liebling, 2004: 219). Rather than banishing authentic emotions from their social worlds, then, these prisoner relations demanded them. These interactions were highly regenerative and provided an important source of emotional nourishment.

The second half of the chapter evaluated affective states that emerged from the social sphere. The metaphor of emotional contagion guided this analysis, shedding light on the ways in which social interactions had a kind of affective momentum. In this context, the imagery of
disease was particularly germane, as participants often articulated fears of being ‘contaminated’ by imprisonment or described emotional states as being ‘infectious’ or ‘in the air’. There are important connections here with scholarship on collective emotions (Collins, 1990; 2011), and especially the idea that emotions can spread like waves of energy. Collective emotions have been notably underexplored in prisons research. This is surprising given the unique aspects of the physical environment, including the highly constricted movement of bodies and forced (co)habitation in tight spaces, that concentrates and magnifies forms of emotional contagion. Among female prisoners, this analysis of shared emotions revealed a deprivation that is rarely discussed in the pains of imprisonment literature (Crewe, 2011; Sykes, 1958): namely, the enforced exposure to others’ emotions and moods, from which prisoners often had little means to escape. Importantly, then, particular emotions are moulded by, and woven into the fabric of physical spaces in prison. This dynamic relationship, between emotions and space, is the subject of the next chapter. In the concluding chapter, more is said about the potential of these findings to develop, and add texture to, older frameworks of prison life rooted in limited formulations of impression management.
6. Space and Emotions

Theories of prison architecture have a long history (Bentham, 1791; Evans, 1982; Foucault, 1977; Jewkes, 2013; Johnson, 1973), and have drawn attention to the symbolic features of imprisonment, which are ‘layered with meaning’ (Jewkes, 2013: 27). For example, McConville (2000) argues that the prison façade figuratively resembles the force of the state and its power to quash crime. However, as noted earlier, this literature tends towards prioritising structure over agency and typically excludes prisoners’ accounts from the research. This is to say, while prison architecture may appear oppressive to an outside observer, the extent to which prisoners actually feel oppressed by it is an empirical question. Indeed, Foucault’s (1979) suggestion that imprisonment would lead inevitably to the creation of docility is challenged by recent empirical work that emphasises the emotional differentiation of prison spaces (Crewe et al. 2014). In contrast to these early accounts, then, this chapter shifts the focus to further understand the experience and appropriation of prison space, and the wide range of emotions that emerge in, and cut across, its various zones. Recent developments in the sub-field of ‘carceral geography’ are particularly apposite here (for a review, see Moran, 2015) and feature throughout. Indeed, the different affective zones described in this chapter closely resemble what Smoyer and Blankenship (2014: 564) term ‘a patchwork of interior spaces’.

This account starts with the premise that physical environments affect people emotionally, but acknowledges that these effects are not uniform or predictable. That is, while architects may purposefully attempt to ‘design in’ particular affective responses, it is more accurate to say that at best, buildings shape certain ‘possibilities of experience’ (Massumi, 2002: 204). A non-deterministic account should consider how inhabitants experience different spaces, because there exists a ‘copulating of live body and dead stone [that] is unique and unrehearsed’ (Tschumi, 1994: 125). As Krafil and Adey (2008: 226) put it, there is a sense of ‘soaking and absorption, experienced by both bodies and buildings’ that is ‘beset with the unknown’. Because prisoners are not passive objects moulded uniformly by their environment, this account aims to blend objective description with subjective accounts of the experience of physical space. What emerges is a complex ‘emotional map’ of these establishments that resists simplistic generalizations—for example, the tendency to cast prisons as a kind of grey, homogenous monolith—or reductive binaries of emotion.
management (private versus public expression, frontstage and backstage metaphors) that have sometimes illuminated prior accounts of prison space (for a summary, see Crewe et al. 2014).

To chart a course through these emotion maps, this chapter divides prison spaces into three main sub-groups: living spaces; constrictive and volatile zones; and areas that can be termed ‘free spaces’ (Goffman, 1961). The first segment describes the range of emotions and feelings prisoners experienced in their cells, wings and on house blocks. These accounts uncover a sharp variance of attitudes towards the cell space. This discussion is conceptually guided by Turner (1974) and Jewkes’ (2005a) development of the idea of *liminality* as ‘a period…of ambiguity, a sort of social limbo’ (Turner, 1982: 24, cited in Jewkes, 2005a: 374). Indeed, understanding cell experiences as a ‘midpoint of transition’ (Turner, 1974: 237) helps to explain why these spaces were containers for many forms of intense emotion. Cells were experienced as claustrophobic and unsettling for prisoners in the midst of transition, but were more akin to a sanctuary for those who had emerged from the other side of this process. A notable feature of this discussion is the way in which prisoners attempted to customize their living spaces. This active reshaping of the environment signalled an attempt to display and affirm newly formed identities and evoke feelings of comfort.

From this juncture, the discussion turns to spaces that prisoners found emotionally constrictive or highly volatile. These were areas characterised by high levels of fear, aggression, and physical violence. In the men’s prison, the ‘line route’ was one such place, while in the women’s prison the dining room served a similar function. These spaces shared a number of important features: the presence of multiple unknown prisoners; unpredictability; perceptions of poor supervision from offices; and the feeling of being crowded, watched and judged by one’s peers.

In the third section, the discussion turns to so called ‘free spaces’ (sometimes termed niches), which ‘refer to small scale settings within a community or movement that are removed from the direct control of dominant groups, [and] are voluntarily participated in’ (Polletta, 1999:1). These zones included libraries, classrooms, workshops, visits halls, chapels and gyms and all had different affective climates compared to other prison zones. One salient motif was that these zones did not ‘feel’ like part of the prison and offered temporary breaks from its more oppressive aspects. Again, Turner’s (1974) perspective is instructive here. His conceptualisation of ‘communits’ as an unstructured community which is ‘undifferentiated, equalitarian’ (274) and marked by a spirit of liberty helps to disentangle the various factors
that distinguished these areas from the wider environment. The various features of these ‘island[s] of respite’ (Crewe et al. 2014: 68) that created this sense of distinction are explored in some detail. Especially significant here were the attributes of civilian staff and the different rules of emotional expression that permeated these spaces, where ‘kindness, generosity and emotional disclosure were [all] permitted’ (Crewe et al., 2014: 68).

Following this, the chapter introduces a brief section on ‘therapeutic spaces’ in prison. These intense spaces had distinct climates and were experienced as psychologically constrictive, personally transformative, or some combination of both. At the affective level, therapeutic zones were complex spaces for prisoners. Although the experience of psychological power in such spaces commonly evoked feelings of frustration and anger, these emotions often existed alongside joy and compassion as prisoners celebrated their own development trajectories or acknowledged the growth of others. The chapter concludes by analysing the possibilities or lack thereof of achieving privacy in prison. The attempt to locate privacy in prison facilitates a broader discussion of the ‘spatial selection’ strategies that prisoners used to either seek-out or avoid particular emotional states. In this final section, it is argued that the spatial constraints of the environment placed limits on these strategies and that enforced proximity with others at times acted as a catalyst for destructive emotions. Generally though, prisoners were able to shape many of their emotions, at least to some degree, through the careful selection of the spaces in which they operated. In this closing section the substantive analysis comes full circle, as these spatial strategies resonate with the individual emotional management strategies set out in chapter four.

**Living Spaces**

It’s a place for everything; all my emotions come out in that cell. (Olivia)

Cells, wings and house blocks were the places where prisoners spent most of their time, and when they spoke of prison life, it was typically these areas to which they referred. A more detailed physical description of these different living spaces was introduced in the methods section (chapter three), but it is worth reiterating that, in the men’s prison, house blocks were typically larger and cell sharing arrangements far more frequent than in Send.47 These differences had important implications for how the participants experienced their living areas.

---

47 In Send, cell sharing was limited to the small drug treatment wing.
The following discussion begins with cell spaces, before panning out to the communal living areas.

Prison cells were complex and emotionally intense zones. For some prisoners, it was typical to experience a full ‘range of emotions’ (Dean) within cells—these feelings could oscillate rapidly or fuse into each other. For example, staring at pictures of family members could evoke bittersweet reactions where ‘happiness is mixed with sadness’ (Rebecka). Pictures offered positive reminders that prisoners were loved and cared for, while also evoking feelings of guilt, shame and loss. Ula explained that the cell evoked ‘pure, more intensified emotions’ because ‘there is no one around you to stop or distract you from them’. Being cut off from many forms of external stimulation compelled prisoners to process and confront their internal states. This emotional intensity was embraced by some prisoners for its cathartic qualities but was highly challenging for others. There was a shared narrative that confinement—and the stark reality that one was being physically locked-in to a cell—was emotionally turbulent during the initial stages of imprisonment but that, over time, prisoners adapted to it, and in many cases, began to enjoy this time of relative privacy:

I suppose you could say there’s a bit of submission involved. You’re having to just bite the bullet. You come to a certain time of the day where you know where you’re going to be. As you can’t leave from behind that door. So after seven o’clock at night, that’s it. You know exactly where you’re going to be. (Bernie)

You have to learn to love your cell and your space. When I first came to prison I found it very difficult to be in a cell on my own. (Ellie)

Adapting to the cell space can be further understood as a kind of liminal process or transitional stage. For current purposes, liminality refers to ‘states of being or states of mind…as we pass from a period of stability to one of ambiguity and undergo some kind of transformation’ (Jewkes, 2005a: 376). Prisoners who felt unsettled in the cells were often in the midst of this intermediate, ‘ambiguous phase’, experiencing complete upheavals of their identities accompanied by intense negative emotions. Prisoners who transitioned beyond this difficult stage embodied an idea ‘frequently symbolised in ritual and myth’ that the liminal space was like a ‘grave that is also a womb’ (Turner, 1974: 259). These prisoners felt a

---

48 This is a different sense of liminality than has been used in recent accounts. For example, in her article, Moran (2011) focuses on the liminal features of prison visiting room spaces as opposed to psychological processes of change explored here.
different range of emotions in their cells (characterised by serenity and affection) and decorated these spaces with a range of identity markers.

**Claustrophobic Cell Spaces**

Around a third of the participants held mixed or unfavourable attitudes to their cells, which they claimed evoked ‘mostly negative emotions’ (Lacey), including ‘anger, sadness, boredom, frustration, depression, and anxiety’ (Freddy). These accounts were emblematic of the idea that ‘liminal spaces are characterised by disorder and chaos’ (Jewkes, 2005a: 382). A key factor for these prisoners was a general fixation on their confinement. That is, they were locked in against their will and ‘you just can’t get out of it and you’re stuck there, it can be really dreadful’ (Ellie). The cell was framed here as a zone of deep internal strife and conflict that was hard to escape: ‘You’ve got to fight through it’ (Freddy). Some prisoners described a form of behavioural ‘stereotypy’ as they mechanically paced and circled their cells in a restless manner (‘I walk up and down my room, that’s the hardest part of my day’ [Gabriella]; ‘You get annoyed and angry, so you start bouncing around the pad’ [Val]). These feeling were intensified by the restricted dimensions of the space: ‘The rooms are so claustrophobic sometimes…I’ve got everything in there, but it just feels like I haven’t got enough space’ (Haley). Prisoners that progressed on to enhanced wings (in Ranby) or resettlement wings (in Send) explained the psychological liberation of receiving the key to their ‘room’: ‘I’ve got the comfort of knowing I can escape from the stress. I can walk to the recess and have a shower and have a cuppa tea’ (Karl).

As suggested above, time in cells created waves of intense emotional energy, but these prisoners felt overwhelmed by these forces, rather than able to navigate a course through them. Emotions were unwelcome intrusions that felt like barriers to wellness, raking up feelings of self-disapproval (‘Why are you back here again? Why are you here?’ Craig). Canvassing one’s cell walls with pictures of family members and friends could, counterintuitively, stimulate feelings of shame: ‘If I lay there looking at my photos for too long I feel sad because I’ve lost out on so many years of their life that I can’t get back’ (Molly). Similarly, Stacey explained that although she had pictures of ‘children on the wall’ she would ‘try not to look at them’. As an attempt to mitigate against disturbing thoughts, Gabriella chose not to display her pictures at all: ‘I need to separate myself from outside’. The onset of nightmares and acute states of anguish among these prisoners are consistent with Turner’s (1974) argument that liminality involves an encounter with ‘grotesque and
monstrous forms’ (239). Put short, for such prisoners, cells were psychological traps where they were pushed into a seemingly endless maze of uncomfortable feelings and rumination.

These participants did not feel attached to their cells nor did they find comfort in them. This was evidenced, in part, by the decision not to personalise these spaces:

*Interviewer:* Do you decorate your cell?

*Gabriella:* No.

*Interviewer:* So it is just standard issue?

*Gabriella:* Yes, I don’t want anything to feel like home.

Indeed, the idea that cells constituted a kind of temporary home was, for these participants, a source of aggravation; ‘In no way, shape or form can this place ever feel homely’ (Bernie). Creating a domestic space, these participants felt, might threaten their outside identities or signal an admission of defeat:

The walls in my cell are empty, it’s not my home. It’s just a passing through place for me. It can never be my home. The place I grew up in does not look like this awful place. It’s just a room with a TV.

(Wendy)

These prisoners did not want to feel like they had been co-opted into or institutionalised by the prison regime. On an emotional level, such responses were attempts to deal with deep existential fears, especially in relation to deterioration, stagnation and the loss of a sense of self in prison. These prisoners were unsettled further by a range of external sensory intrusions into their cells. It was impossible, they claimed, to escape the relentless screaming and shouting of loud prisoners. Bright security lighting pierced through curtains and under the doorways, meaning that ‘you never have complete darkness’ (Danielle). The possibility of achieving relaxation was sometimes thwarted in a more intrusive and direct manner. For example, experiencing a ‘pad spin’ (an unannounced cell search by officers for contraband) was an unsettling experience in itself, but it also left prisoners feeling apprehensive about the next time they might be inspected. Stacey had been through many such searches and spoke of her subsequent anxiety:

They can’t keep doing this to me. It was 11:45 at night and they burst into my room. I had to take my clothes off and get out of my room while they searched. I shouldn’t have to keep doing that. Every time I hear their keys I feel like I can’t relax. (Stacey)
Similarly, having to share a cell with another prisoner was described as a significant source of discomfort by male prisoners. The idiosyncratic behaviours and routines of others, concentrated in a small living space, could make it hard to relax: snoring, loud music, hygiene, and late night television viewing were some of the most frequent complaints. Having to use poorly screened toilets was seen as a particularly unwelcome degradation: ‘You’re in a double and your toilet is in the middle of the room, there’s no curtain, you’ve got to take a shit while your pad mate is eating his tea. This is 2016’ (Kyle). The primary emotion conveyed here by prisoners was disgust. This is reminiscent of Sibley and Van Hoven’s (2009: 202) description of prisoners’ powerful anxieties about ‘contagion, contamination or pollution…[and that] imagining certain kinds of mixing, of bodily fluids… engenders disgust’. While some prisoners found ways to negotiate these anxieties over time and forged bonds with their cellmates that served to quell feelings of isolation, few preferred this arrangement to single cell living. It was further claimed that long-term prisoners suffered the most emotionally from sharing arrangements, especially if they were paired with prisoners on a short sentence. The regular upheavals of adjusting to new partners made it difficult to establish a fixed routine. But on a deeper level, long termers often expressed the sentiment that they had a different kind of prisoner experience—one more existentially intense and introspective than short-termers—and therefore it was unfair to combine them.

Taken together, the accounts introduced above present a general picture of prisoners in the midst of a ‘profound experience of humiliation and humility’ common to liminal experiences of transformation (Turner, 1974: 260). It is noteworthy that a large proportion of these prisoners either had little prior experience of being imprisoned in a cell, or were in the early stages of serving long tariffs. This is redolent of Crewe et al’s (2017) assessment of long term prisoners: ‘the early phase of the sentence was characterized by bewilderment, anger, denial, and a form of “temporal vertigo” resulting from consideration of the sheer amount of time in prison that lay ahead’ (8). However, there were exceptions to this narrative. At least two prisoners in this research had had substantial prior experience of imprisonment and had served out the majority of their sentences. As a possible explanation for this variance, Jewkes (2005a) argues that in some cases individuals ‘experience a permanent liminality in that they are not moving between established boundaries’ (375) as in cases of terminal illness. While most prisoners in this study moved through this turbulent stage, it is significant that many of those who commit suicide in prison are overwhelmed by these initial entry shocks: ‘prison suicides occur disproportionately at the earliest stages of custody’ (Leibling, 2007: 426). The
six self-inflicted deaths in Ranby that took place in two years prior to this research are a visceral reminder that the experiences of prisoners who commit suicide are excluded from research accounts on prison adaptation (Liebling & Maruna, 2005).

**The Cell as Sanctuary**

I know that when my door is locked no one can get in and I can’t get out; I feel safe in my own little bed. That’s my safe haven. (Pia)

As Jewkes (2005a: 382) argues, ‘liminal spaces are characterised by disorder and chaos…[but] if one can create a path through them, they can affect positive change’. After a period of emotional volatility, most prisoners were able to make peace with cellular confinement. Indeed, some began to highly value and look forward to time spent in their cell. A number of participants affirmed this, describing their cells in almost reverential terms: the space was ‘like a sanctuary’ (Billy) that instilled feelings of ‘serenity’ (Dean). A crucial step for these prisoners was the addition of personal touches through decoration and furnishings:

You’re put in a cell with nothing. Nothing on the walls, there’s no emotion and no life. Everywhere is dead. I thought I can’t do 18 months like this. And then I started walking around and seeing other people’s pads and seeing their pictures on the walls. If you see my cell now, I’ve got nice carpet down, cupboards how I want them, pictures all over the walls, I’ve got a DVD player and everything I want. It’s like living in a temporary hotel room. So when my door is shut it’s my chill out zone, I can relax. (Alan)

For Alan, a sparse cell was equated to an emotional void, whereas personal goods and visual aesthetics created a space where it was possible to feel tranquil. Importantly here, prisoners who exerted control over decoration and spatial layouts explicitly spoke to the effects this had on their feelings—put simply, they were shaping the physical environment to meet their emotional needs. For example, Blanche explained that displaying religious iconography was a way to design in optimism: ‘I’ve got loads of pictures on my boards, the one in front of me is all my religious stuff, so when I wake up, the first thing I see is positivity’. The emphasis on the use of objects to evoke feelings symbolises a kind of ‘prosthetic of the self’ (Gonzalez, 1995), wherein material possessions represent an important extension of prisoners’ personalities and the kind of emotions they wanted to feel. In a similar vein, colour was adapted to augment particular feelings:
I have my own bedding rather than the prison issue bedding. I made my room bright yellow. I put yellow curtains in, yellow in the bedding, yellow everything. The normal furniture they give you is dark blue curtains, green bedding. Everything was just sort of dull and grey and black. I think it makes the room very depressing…so I try and make it the brightest colour possible to try and make me feel not so dull. Even when it’s night-time outside it still feels bright in there. I don’t want to feel dark and depressed. (Amber)

By asserting a personal colour scheme, prisoners distinguished themselves from what they perceived as the uniform, drab, and alienating design choices of the prison environment. As Rebecka summarized, ‘if I was to describe this prison as a colour I would say it’s grey’, and greyness was symbolic of lifelessness and deterioration. Indeed, the uniform pastel green tones that lined many of the corridors and the flaked paint in cell interiors were reminiscent of medical facilities and hardly communicated vitality. By customizing their cell colours, prisoners created a contrast between the cold edges of the wider prison world and their ‘warm and welcoming’ living spaces (Chantal). Taken together these accounts reflect the ways in which prisoners appeared to ‘make space from themselves’ by building ‘mental walls’ and finding ‘comfort in the construction of a purified space’ (Sibley & Van Hoven, 2009: 201-2).

Cell decoration also signified the importance of ownership of space and its impact on identity. Jewkes (2002: 93) notes that individualising the cell is ‘one of the few ways in which prisoners can publicly display their identities’. It was common to hear prisoners speak with pride as they asserted tenure over these spaces: ‘The cell is my serenity, I have my own prison’ (Amber, emphasis added); ‘It is my space’ (Nia); ‘You make it your space’ (Rebecka). Some prisoners went further, describing cells as a ‘mini-home’ (Jerry) or ‘my little home’ (Yvonne). Because the cell was personalised and comfortable, prisoners felt they could drop their defensive postures and behave more authentically: ‘I can be myself when I’m in there’ (Alan), or as Chantal put it: ‘I feel free in my cell’. Looking at pictures of family members allowed prisoners to realign themselves with their identities as daughters, sons, sisters, brothers, parental figures and friends. These images also provided a reminder that one was loved and cared for by others. In line with these accounts, Sloan (2012) argues that by manipulating and taking ownership over space, prisoners ‘move away from the prisoner identity that is inscribed upon [them]’, and ‘differentiate themselves from those who they perceive as negative’ (408).

This reassertion of identity coincided with a renewed ability to experience authentic feelings. Cells provided a sealed ‘container’ for discharging emotions: ‘It can be a sad place but I’m
glad I’m in there; even though I feel sadness, I can still be relaxed and comfortable’ (Billy). Even though the emotions that surfaced were often challenging, prisoners had a predictable amount of time to process them before re-entering more public areas. In this sense, time in one’s cell provided an important emotional shelter for balancing moods and replenishing energy. Entering this space in the evening was also associated with the forward progression of time for some prisoners: ‘It’s the end of the day, another one ticked off, time is ticking away’ (Jerry). It was ironic that during the most physically constrained, socially isolated periods of imprisonment, these participants did not suffer or experience temporal stasis, but rather felt a degree of psychological and emotional freedom to be most like themselves.

Some advantages of the cell space were distinguished by their absolute contrast with the wider prison environment. Because association areas and house blocks were often loud, unpredictable, and populous places, ‘to finally be locked away’ was often experienced as ‘a relief’ (Alan, both quotations). Indeed, some prisoners embraced the opportunity to segregate themselves from ‘unpredictable situations’ (Billy). Even if prisoners were not directly involved in confrontations, the threat of violent encounters was ongoing and could provoke anxiety. By distinction then, locked cells offered a modicum of quiet, order and solitude: ‘it’s silent and I love it, I love it when my door is locked’ (Francesca). Because of these features, cells were often surmised as ‘safe places’ (Danielle) or semi-private cocoons ‘away from people’ (Katherine) where one did not have to ‘be on edge’ (Nia).

In sum, by customizing their cell spaces with colour schemes, ‘personal possessions and [other] signifiers of the self’ (Sloan, 2012: 406), prisoners attempted to evoke particular feeling states and design in a level of comfort. Because cells were distinct from many oppressive features of prison life, they elicited a different set of feelings and a wider degree of emotional expression than other institutional spaces. These prisoners were able to process difficult emotions free from the gaze of their peers and were not subjected to the negative influence of others.

Taken together, these accounts suggest that the majority of prisoners developed strong positive attachments to their cells over time. But typically, prisoners first had to pass through a disorientating and chaotic period of liminality, where they experienced little ontological security and were trapped in cycles of negative emotions. As Jewkes (2005a) surmises, during the early stages of liminality ‘the self may be temporarily suspended but may reassert
itself at a later point as the initial feelings of fear and loss subside’ (375). When prisoners transitioned through this process the reassertion of identity was apparent through the renewed sense of ownership that prisoners felt over their cells and increased levels of comfort with their emotions. What began as a space of disruption and isolation could become one of the few places where prisoners could exert control over the environment and their emotions.

**Wings and House Blocks**

It’s just the same old thing, just frustration. Just confined to this place; the same old people did the same thing. No one has overachieved today. You’re not going to hear anything fantastic are you? As in when you go to work every day this colleague has done this and that, all this has happened at work. There’s always something new and exciting when you’re at home, but in prison it’s not. You know that that person has just laid in the cell for 12 hours, because I’ve done the same thing; it’s just a depressing place. (Freddy)

Almost unanimously, prisoners held negative feelings towards their shared living quarters, although a minority of participants living on smaller wings offered alternative perspectives. Life on the wings and house blocks was typically portrayed as vacillating between the mundane and the manic. The physical environment was most often described as uncomfortable, mainly due to a range of sensory incursions. For example, a common complaint was that the ongoing level of noise made it difficult to relax. These auditory disruptions came from a number of sources. The daily patterns of officers locking and unlocking doors and gates produced a jarring metallic percussion that reverberated around the wings and landings: ‘I’ll never get used to the slamming gates, metal on metal, chains and keys’ (Freddy). For Tamara, these sounds were unwelcome reminders of her reality: ‘when you hear the keys, it’s like “shit I’m still in jail”’. Other prisoners could be equally disruptive: ‘You can never switch off, you’ll try to, then you’ve got someone smashing up or someone shouting all night “do you want burn [tobacco]?”’(Kyle). Similar accounts were related from the women’s prison: ‘You’re in your cell and there’s people screaming from their windows at night…you’re trying to wind down, it’s like “please stop it”’ (Katherine). Lacey explained that the noise from the landings was often so intense that it was impossible to ‘hear the telly, even if we turn it up to the max’. At the affective level, the force and prominence of sensory intrusions raised feelings of anxiety and anger among participants who were powerless to change these environmental features.

For Bernie, the problem was not so much the volume but rather the repetitiveness of hearing ‘the same old sounds over and over again. There’s never a new sound. There’s just never a
new sound’. This created a stark sense of monotony because prisoners were around: ‘the same people, the same things, and hearing the same doors locking and keys rattling’ (Rebecka). The lack of variation in the soundscape gave the wings a dispirited and jaded feel. Importantly however, Danielle explained that because noise was the status quo, silence was interpreted as an eerie and alarming disruption to the rhythm: ‘When it’s silent, you think ‘what’s going on?’’. And you think, ‘something is boiling, it’s going to kick off’. Most prisoners felt caught in a bind, disliking the excessive noise on the one hand, but contributing to it on the other, because ultimately ‘if you don’t shout, you don’t get heard’ (Val).

The smells and scents of the living spaces provoked especially strong reactions among female prisoners. It was typical to hear expressions of disgust about ‘women with hygiene problems’ (Janice) who ‘don’t wash and their room smells’ (Rebecka). It was claimed the prisoners with medical incontinence created a build-up of smells on the wings because their disposable pads were only emptied once a week. The visual stimuli in these living spaces further contributed to a sense of unease. Prisoners complained that the aesthetics of the wings and house blocks were visually oppressive: ‘I loathe the building itself. You get sick of seeing it. It looks like a dungeon…you want to take every brick down, one by one’ (Bernie). Bernie was describing the spurs on house block five in Ranby, which, because of the absence of natural light, had a subterranean feel. O’Donnell (2014: 96) explains that prisoners are ‘involuntarily confined in ugly surroundings, unaffected by the passage of the seasons or the wonder of the natural world…The corridors and cells upon which the prisoner’s gaze rests seldom inspire; drabness is integral to the design’. However, more important than the physical construction of these spaces was the sense that they were uncared for. Often these concerns centred on the presence of dirt and lack of maintenance:

It’s like a shack, the building is awful, it’s falling apart. It’s probably the most grimy wing in any prison I’ve been on. It’s all coming away from the walls, there’s subsidence, there’s a lot of damp. (Ellie)

Look at where we’re at right now, what a load of shit it is. This is a shit hole, it’s all crap. I mean look at that window, there’s bird shit all over it. It’s a horrible place. (Bernie)

If you were to come back home and your house was like this wing, it would make you depressed. If you walk into a clean house you’re happy, you can just get on with it day-to-day… It’s horrible on here, it’s horrible. (Val)
The environment was producing feelings of disgust and shaping the mood of prisoners who did not appreciate the enforced proximity to dirt and physical decay. On a more symbolic level, however, these prisoners were hinting that the lack of care for the physical environment was a kind of commentary on their lack of status as a marginalised group—that they were unworthy of cleanliness. During a period of observation on a house block in Ranby, one prisoner was irate about the presence of flaked paint on the walls of the wing he had been moved on to. He explained that the decrepit walls made him feel worthless and subhuman. While Jewkes (2012a) states that the physical design of a prison ‘has a profound and moral influence on prisoners’ levels of environmental cleanliness may have a similar impact.

The size, layout, and ‘feel’ of the house blocks and wings were also significant variables. The expansive rectangular house blocks (one, two and three) in Ranby were widely criticised as being too big for prisoners to live comfortably alongside one another. Indeed, the layout of these large accommodation blocks (which held around 240 prisoners each) resembled factories or warehouses. The open floor plan, presence of natural light and utilization of modern materials in these areas was a complete contrast to the dark and constrictive feel of the older buildings. However, the trade-off to these design features was a kind of assault on the soul (Price, 2012)—in short, these house blocks could feel homogenous, lonely and anonymous. For example, prisoners claimed that these spaces lacked any sense of social cohesion: ‘On these massive big wings, there’s no community’ (Paul). By way of contrast, house blocks six and seven were significantly smaller units (holding around 60 prisoners) and had a very different atmosphere: they were noticeably quieter and the flow of foot traffic was less frenetic. Phil felt his house block was ‘brilliant because it’s small, there about 40 lads who all run the wing. People don’t fight or do anything wrong because the ethos is really good. The wing is manageable.’ These wings also had design features that prisoners argued had positive impacts on social interactions and indicated a kind of emotional tone that was ‘softer’:

There’s a dining hall, you’re not going back to your pad eating food off your lap. You interact with other people at the table, you’re socializing, having a crack with the lads. It’s as simple a thing as eating at the table. (Kyle)

Space was more compartmentalised on these wings, with several rooms having dedicated functions (games rooms, dining rooms, screened-off phone booths, and corridors) instead of

49 There were other chaotic aspects to these spaces, unrelated to size, that are further elaborated below.
large, relatively undifferentiated areas. The small resettlement wings in Send had a similar kind of spatial versatility, and prisoners who were seen putting up decorations together in the break rooms clearly valued these areas. These environmental factors contributed to the domestic and relatively collaborative atmosphere on these wings, and shaped emotional possibilities for engagement and care.\(^{50}\) This offers an alternative perspective to the deliberate ‘designing-in’ of disenchantment that so often characterises prison architecture in England and Wales (Jewkes, 2012a): that is, prison space can be designed to encourage communion and social integration.

In sum, the various sensory intrusions (especially levels of noise and visual squalor) and the physical layouts (either too cramped or too large and homogenous) of the wings and house blocks were important variables that left the majority of prisoners feeling uncomfortable or disaffected in these zones. As O’Donnell (2014: 112) highlights: ‘the ordering of space influences the geometry of relations between people’. This section has attempted to describe the particular emotional outcomes of alternative forms of spatial organisation. At the affective level, then, these spaces most typically produced powerful feelings of anger, anxiety and disgust among prisoners who felt unable to exert control over the wider features of their environment or felt rejected by it. For other participants, these were affectively ‘dead’ zones that alienated prisoners through their blend of tedium and repetition. Haley’s statement summarises a customary sentiment about these living spaces: ‘To tell you the truth, the wing doesn’t really mean anything to me’.

**Hostile Spaces: Boiling Over**

It’s like it’s in the air. And people do take it on. You can feel in the dining hall, if there’s stuff going on in the prison, the tension is in there, and everybody is kind of a little bit on edge, it’s really strange. You can feel it brewing. (Ellie)

It’s intense on the wing, it can be really intense. There’s riot bells going off every day, there’s fights every day, there’s screaming matches every day, there’s people on the floor having fits every day, there’s ambulances coming in all the time, there’s suicides happening, there’s self-harm happening, there’s nurses on the wing. (Billy)

\(^{50}\) However, it is important to note that spatial factors were only a part of the explanation. The characteristics of the prisoners living in these spaces (who were typically holding ‘enhanced’ IEP status) acted as a filtering mechanism, shaping the atmosphere on these wings: ‘If there are lads that come on who don’t behave themselves, they stand out straightaway’ (Phil).
Beyond the stressors of the living quarters described above, there were zones in both prisons that had a more ‘volatile’ quality. In these areas, there was a social ‘simmering’ that tended or threatened to break out into open violence. These were the places where ‘it’s most likely to kick off’ (Freddy) and prisoners ‘fight all the time’ (Gabriella). The most hostile areas shared a number of key attributes that contributed to the high levels of tension. The following section briefly introduces the layout and social fabric of three different areas in Send and Ranby, and then analyses them in unison.

The first area, the dining room in Send, was used by all of the women in the prison, apart from those in the therapeutic community (J-Wing), who had their own dedicated servery. It was a large box shaped building, with around 30 large circular tables for dining; prisoners used the dining room twice a day for lunch and evening meals. The second area of interest, house blocks one and two in Ranby, were sprawling modern upgrades of classic Victorian prison layouts, with two long wings that extended outwards in an ‘L’ shape from a central observation hub. These spaces housed around 260 prisoners each. House block one was being used primarily as an induction wing, with some residents living there for safety reasons. House block two was split between general population prisoners and those being treated for drug addiction. The third area considered here was the ‘line route’ in Ranby. This space was not characterised by the same obvious physical demarcations as the first two areas, but included various walkways and corridors that prisoners traversed between different areas of the prison—mainly from accommodation buildings to educational spaces, workshops, and gymnasiums. Because prisoner movement in Ranby had recently been delimited to a small number of windows in the regime day, line routes were highly populous events, and the main trails extremely congested during these times. The focus on the line route highlights the significance of exploring emotional expression and regulation in moments of transition to and from different prison spaces (Crewe et al., 2014).

These three prison zones elicited adverse emotional reactions in most participants, and they relayed different degrees of ‘terror, fear, apprehension, sadness, rage, anger, annoyance, loathing, and all the other bad words’ (Francesca). Upon entering these areas, prisoners

---

51 This use of the term ‘hostile space’ here is not to be confused with the defensive design trend called ‘hostile architecture’, which involves the ‘design of buildings or public spaces in a way which discourages people from touching, climbing or sitting on them, with the intention of avoiding damage or use for a different purpose.’ (MacMillan Dictionary, 2017)
immediately felt ‘more on edge’ (Oscar), describing a palpable ‘tension in the air that you can feel’, mainly because prisoners sensed that these were ripe ‘climates for violence and disruption’ (Simon, both quotations). The specific nomenclature used to describe these areas was revealing, often capturing the chaotic, desperate nature of these zones—for example, house blocks one and two were referenced as being ‘like Beirut’, ‘the dark side’, or the ‘black holes’ of the prison. However, such labels arguably masked as much as they revealed. It is important therefore to burrow beneath such visceral descriptions to understand the dynamics that engendered these strong reactions.

The first salient factor was that these spaces had unpredictable or unknown qualities. For example, on line route, prisoners did not know who they might be pushed into proximity with. This could be particularly stressful for those who owed debts or were involved in ongoing feuds: ‘If you’re in a beef with people, line route can be hell’ (Tommas). Further, because this was one of the few opportunities for prisoners from different wings to interact and trade goods, there was pressure to make deals quickly, which added a level of affective intensity and desperation to these interactions. This sense of ‘limited opportunity’ for trade was also observed in the dining room in Send, being ‘the only place people can meet up and do it’ (Ellie). More specifically, it was perceived by prisoners in Ranby that trade in NPS had escalated violence on the line route. Because there were ‘so many people desperate to get hold of it’ (Oscar) dealers encouraged addicts to assault prisoners and settle their scores in exchange for NPS. More generally, prisoners who walked the line route knew they were particularly vulnerable at these times: ‘You have to watch your back…somebody can just run and do you’ (Andrew). The sprawling nature of the route made it difficult for prisoners to monitor all the different angles and directions from which they could be attacked. Similar perceptions of danger and unpredictability were operating in the women’s dining room:

The whole process in the dining hall is not controlled in any shape or form. There is actually no consistency with it, and then there are people that I’m unfamiliar with and they are looking. A lot of the time people sit down and people are coming and you swivel your head around. I feel really uncomfortable. (Katherine)

The feeling of disorder in the dining room was in part a by-product of fluctuating seating times. That is, in an attempt to ensure that particular wings were not always the first or last to be served their meals, the regime alternated the seating order on a daily basis. However, Nia explained: ‘It can be quite daunting…you don’t know who you’re going to run into, and you
don’t know if you’re gonna have a problem’. These were chaotic places that lacked a clearly
defined structure. Sparks et al. (1996: 75) explain that, while a rigid routine can be a source
of ‘deadening tedium’, it can also be extremely ‘reassuring and consoling’, creating a reality
that is ‘sufficiently predictable and solid for us to be able to act capably within it’. In the
absence of such mental security, the individual ‘risks being swamped by anxiety’ (75). In line
with this argument, the Ranby house blocks lacked structure, and disorder flourished:

Bruv, oh my goodness, I’ve been in grizzly jails, but there’s still a level of decorum. I got to house
block one and there’s no decorum, there’s just zombies, tramps and freaks…I’m big and I’ve got
influence, but on that wing someone will rob your stuff straight away. I’ve seen someone get stabbed
for a quarter of burn. (Liam)

An important element of unpredictability resided in the regular turnover of new intakes on the
house block. Prisoners knew neither figuratively nor literally who or what was coming next.
There were few set expectations that prisoners could establish to help navigate through these
spaces, and they therefore had to be constantly on guard.

The unknown qualities outlined above were exacerbated by crowding, which amplified the
chaotic, intense feel of these spaces. Gambetta’s (2009) attempt to explain the reasons why
prisoners enter physical conflicts is highly relevant here:

The probability of entering into fights will be directly related to the number of prisoners any one
prisoner will deal with while knowing nothing about their traits…where for instance, there is a high
turnover of inmates or where prisoners are frequently reallocated to wing and cells thus frequently meet
prisoners about whom they know nothing, the hierarchy will be more unstable and will have to be re-
established at each new encounter. (83)

In a similar manner, the line route entailed a mass exodus of unknown entities and bodies
circulating around the establishment—a significant proportion of the prisoner population
were crossing paths simultaneously. These were places with extremely dense concentrations
of prisoners (‘There’s just too many people’ - Katherine; ‘It’s all the people in one space’ - Olivia), which increased feelings of pressure and tension because there was less room to
establish personal boundaries and less time to react. The large numbers also created
difficulties for management: officers in the dining room were under pressure to make sure
everyone got a chance to eat lunch in a timely manner, but a number of prisoners felt that
their eating was being rushed by staff. Being hurried along contributed to feelings of tension
and unease. Further, the dense concentration of prisoners formed a kind of human shield,
concealing the outbreak of physical altercations: ‘In the dining hall it takes a while for you to realise a fight is happening because it’s so chaotic. You have so many wings down there at the same time…it’s a real mix’ (Molly). Andrew described a comparable situation on the line route:

I was walking down there and out of nowhere four guys started fighting, it took officers about five minutes before they realised what was going on. As you’ve probably seen, when everyone is walking together it just looks like a big frenzy, you can’t see much, it’s crazy. (Andrew)

The concentration of prisoners in these spaces created deep insecurities of being constantly watched: ‘There’s too many eyes on you. It’s that whole spotlight thing I don’t like’ (Katherine). Kyle explained that the atmosphere on the house block was marked by ‘people staring at you’. This visual monitoring created anxiety (‘It gets you a bit panicky. Even when you sit down you get a bit paranoid thinking who’s watching me, who’s watching me?’ - Yvonne) and functioned as a trigger for altercations, as prisoners tried not to lose face in front of their peers.

The final important factor here was the perceived absence of officer supervision in these areas. Some prisoners felt there was either a deficit of institutional control (‘there’re no officers about’ - Tommas; ‘It is the one place where there’s no cameras’ - Molly) or that the institution simply turned a blind eye in these zones (‘they accept it as a necessary evil’ - Simon). What seemed more verifiable was that the physically expansive nature of these spaces created blind spots where it was harder for officers to always ‘be in the right place to see what’s going on’ (Andrew). Poor visibility and the lack of natural sightlines engendered deep fears about personal safety:

It’s such a big wing yeah, most of the time the officers are in the office doing something else. I might be on the threes [the third floor of the wing] in the shower, so someone could just come in there and start attacking me. I found a huge knife in there. (Andrew)

All of the factors described above coalesced to create spaces that were buzzing ‘hives of activity’ (Billy) and at times felt ‘lawless’. The imposing environmental stimuli and sensory intensity of these areas made them akin to highly-pressurised containers. That is to say, there was a striking affective force in these zones that was substantially different to the ambient areas around them, and even the smallest disruptive or destabilizing events could result in an explosive discharge of anger. Prisoners either absorbed the pressure and emotional strain of
these areas or found ways to minimize exposure or avoid them altogether: ‘I don’t go down to the dining room, I am terrified’ (Wendy).

The following section explores the other end of the spectrum of prison space—the places where prisoners felt the most comfortable. These areas also shared and number features, but the form, location and intensity of these zones were a complete contrast to the volatile areas described above.

**Free Spaces**


…the emergence of bounded physical spaces in which ordinary levels of surveillance and restriction were markedly reduced, spaces where the inmate could openly engage in a range of tabooed activities with some degree of security. These places often also provided a marked reduction in usual patient population density, contributing to the peace and quiet characteristic of them…The staff did not know of the existence of these places, or knew but either stayed away or tacitly relinquished their authority when entering them. Licence, in short, had a geography. I shall call these regions free places.

Across various academic literatures, such spaces are alternatively termed ‘havens’, ‘niches’, ‘spatial preserves’, and ‘cultural laboratories’ (See Polleta, 1999; Toch, 1992). There were a number of areas in Ranby and Send that functioned as ‘free spaces’, but in a broader, less closed-off, less illicit, sense than in Goffman’s account. In these zones, institutional control was lighter, and there were more relaxed rules about the expression of specific emotions that might have been stifled in other parts of the prison. It was in these places that prisoners were likely to show their most authentic selves. This section is ordered thematically to further understand the common features of free spaces, and is theoretically informed by Turner’s (1974) concept of ‘communitas’. Communitas, Turner argues, is an unstructured community which is ‘undifferentiated, equalitarian’ (274) and marked by a spirit of liberty and freedom.

First, all of the free spaces were described explicitly as being distinct from the general prison atmosphere—as separate islands away from the main prison. For example, those with jobs explained: ‘It’s not prison, it’s work’ (Neil); ‘It’s more of a workplace environment’ (Haley). The fact that it was ‘cleaner on the workshops’ (Val) seemed to mark an important contrast from living spaces that were often disordered and unclean. Alongside cleanliness, these areas often had softer design features and less visible emphasis on security. For example, in the hair salon in Send, barred windows were painted in lighter tones. Further, the liberal use of
posters and artwork on the walls, the loud radio and bustling conversations of the clientele, made it easy to forget that it was a prison salon. In a related manner, the loud music in Ranby gym contributed to a vibrant atmosphere that was different to other prison zones and allowed prisoners to immerse themselves in exercise. This factor was reminiscent of Moran et al. (2013: 144) where ‘the insulating noise [in one of the workshops] represent[ed] an escape of sorts from the challenges of communal living’.

Importantly, different ‘temporal rules’ appeared to be operating in these zones. In the gym, time seemed to accelerate, both in the grand scheme of prisoners’ sentences (‘the gym course is the best thing that has happened to me, time has just flown’ Jerry) and during daily workouts. An atmosphere of complete focus was intensified by the short windows of training time prisoners were allotted (45 minute sessions), and which they were keen to maximize. Prisoners who moved seamlessly between exercise machines and free weights, and who carefully negotiating their routines with their peers, appeared to be in the ‘flow’ states described by Csikszentmihalyi’s (1992: 71), where: ‘Concentration is so intense that there is no attention left to think about anything irrelevant, or to worry about problems. Self-consciousness disappears, and the sense of time becomes distorted’. Notably, Turner (1974: 238) explains that communitas is almost always ‘portrayed by actors as a timeless condition, an eternal now, as a moment in and out of time’.

Meanwhile, non-uniformed staff members contributed to an important sense of community cohesion in these areas. They helped to ‘keep the spirit up’ (Yvonne) and made these areas feel nourishing. Participants expressed gratitude for the humanity of these staff members: ‘The teachers don’t treat you as if you’re being punished…education is probably the only place in prison where you get as much respect as you might deserve’ (Craig). In contrast to the wider environment, these were incentivizing zones where prisoners were more likely to be encouraged than reprimanded: ‘Mark and Jasmine [the course instructors] are all about giving you positives and the plus side of things—I have never seen anyone like that in jail’ (Mikey). At the affective level, support staff assisted prisoners with difficult emotional states too: ‘when I have a bad day they help me come down…Sometimes I get agitated and they let me take a walk. They’re understanding’ (Wayne). Prisoners felt that these staff members were non-judgemental, treating them like ‘human totals’ and ‘integral beings who recognizantly share the same humanity’ (Turner, 1974: 269).
Turner (1974) further argues that a defining aspect of communitas is a ‘liberated spirit’ which is ‘universal and boundless’. In line with this sentiment, equality and inclusivity were key features of these free spaces. Indeed, the chaplaincy in Send was an exemplar of both equity (‘everyone’s got common ground, they’re learning and going through faith together’ - Rebecka) and inclusion: ‘They never turn people away, they always make us feel welcome’(Chantal). This atmosphere of inclusivity in these free spaces was infectious, and prisoners spoke about their complete surprise at befriending those with violent histories or sex offences: ‘On paper you’d think this is going to be trouble, but then you meet him and he’s laughing and joking all the time’ (Jerry). The openness to receiving instruction and encouragement from others in these areas (‘I’ve met a friend, he’s always pushing me in the gym’ [Phil]), and the clear displays of affection (for example, frequent physical touching and comparisons of muscles in the gym) were all signifiers of closeness and connectivity.

Furthermore, the nature of particular forms of work and activities constellated prisoners with shared interests: ‘I’m with like-minded people, and I feel we are all equals’ (Katherine). In these areas, then, prisoners felt able to glide into different identities (as a ‘worker’, ‘artist’, ‘athlete’ or ‘student’), casting off the ‘masks’ of bravado that they typically wore on the wings. In further contrast to the wings and house blocks, Nia articulated feelings of safety and collaboration in the hair salon:

> I just happened to be on the course with a really good bunch of girls so I felt safe. I felt that I could like, if I needed help from any of the other student I could get it. They are all very encouraging to each other. They don’t put each other down, it’s like you’re being nurtured and that was a nice experience.

(Nia)

For all of the reasons set out above, then, free spaces instilled a sense of emotional tranquillity in prisoners. The soothing nature of the chaplaincy provided an opportunity to ‘relax and gain knowledge in a calm space’ (Haley). This climate enabled emotions to be channelled in a safe container. The gym was praised for its emotion transforming and ‘stress relieving’ (Phil S) qualities: ‘I go to the gym when I’m angry or upset…It tires me out, which I love’ (Rebecka). Intense exercise was a way of cultivating physical and psychological comfort, emotional stability and general feelings of peace. Moreover, while the most disliked places in prison were experienced as mentally constrictive, the gym had the reverse effect: ‘It gives me space in my head’ (Wayne, emphasis added). Free spaces were zones of emotional nourishment and prisoners felt replenished after spending time in them.
Finally, participants were emotionally open in these areas (‘it’s somewhere where I can just cry and I don’t care who is there’ - Ula). Prisoners developed ‘a certain amount of trust’ in these settings because they felt able to ‘talk about anything that might be troubling’ them (Craig, both quotations). Further, there was a freedom to ‘ask anything’ (Blanche), which stoked participants’ curiosity, creativity and expression: ‘people are writing their own stuff [songs and poems], and I’m thinking, how did you get all that out?’ (Wayne). Prisoners were also able to express a broader repertoire of emotions. These were areas that evoked ‘a lot of love, joy and peace’ (Chantal), emotions that were rarely described in such unqualified ways in prison: ‘It gives you joy and that kind of…what is the word? Serenity! It’s uplifting and every time you walk in to the chapel, even when you’re walking towards it, I can feel my body’ (Rebecka). In a similar manner, Francesca explained: ‘I feel joy because I like working there, I love my job. I feel interested. I feel optimism because I’m always looking to try and help people’. Some prisoners described intense blissful states: ‘I’ve had some deep feelings in the chapel…but it has come out as tearful because I’m overwhelmed by whatever it is that’s gone on…you just feel that presence within you’ (Janice). These passionate testimonies serve to highlight a range of emotional experiences that are infrequently documented and contrast sharply with other areas of the prison. That is, if chaos and unpredictably were the norm, these areas provided a stabilising and replenishing oasis for prisoners.

**Visits Halls**

The visits halls in both prisons were also exceptional spaces of emotionality in that, because of their function, they generated intense happiness and excitement but also great sadness, anxiety and guilt. The focus here, then, is exploring the intensity and fluctuation of emotions on display during visits. These vacillations are touched on by Crewe et. al (2014):

> The emotional landscape of the visits room was palpably different from most other areas of the prison. Here, men held their children and touched their partners with tenderness, longingly embraced family members and friends, and openly displayed joy and affection, as though their emotional identities had been resuscitated en route from the wings. Some were visibly upset as their visitors left, or sat in silent contemplation, their stolidity contrasting with the animated tone of a few minutes earlier. (67)

Indeed, a number of prisoners felt joy during visits (‘The only time I feel in here is on visits. It feels like the prisoners are coming back to life’ - Rebecka), followed by ‘a big comedown’ (Olivia) when visitors left. In these joyful moments prisoners were able to temporarily immerse themselves in nostalgia for the outside world: ‘You feel good about yourself and you remember your days out there’ (Wayne). These accounts are strongly redolent of Moran
(2013) who argues that these spaces are also ‘liminal’ in the sense of fusing the inside with the outside world. That is, ‘prisoners come face-to-face with living embodiments of their previous life outside the prison’ and can ‘suspend the immediate reality of incarceration’, enjoying a ‘taste of home’ (347). Tamara was so immersed in the experience of ‘suspension’ that she accidentally tried to leave with her family: ‘my head was still on the outside’ (Tamara). The realization that ‘you’ve got to go back to your world in prison’ (Tamara) was a crash landing for many participants. Seeing one’s children leave was particularly excruciating for parents: ‘It’s horrible, it’s horrible, it kills me inside, all you want to do is go home with them’ (Oscar). For many prisoners, then, the dynamic of visitation involved experiencing an initial ‘high’ followed by a depressive ‘come-down’.

However, some participants had quite different experiences of visits. Those in romantic relationships felt deep insecurities about whether their partners would still love them, for example. In a few extreme cases, prisoners suffered from panic attacks before or during their visits, where excitement and anticipation fused with more intense feelings:

All of sudden I just felt ill, I felt sick and everything. All the pressure of seeing them and realising that I’m in here for my stupid actions. And for me the guilt of realising what I put my family through because my crime was big in the newspapers and media. Things happened to my family after I got sentenced, so I think I’ve got a lot of guilt and I feel bad about it, so that contributed to the anxiety. (Karl)

For Zak, attempting to present a strong façade in the face of ongoing health problems was overwhelming:

I couldn’t move properly and I managed to sit down and my back started to spasm. I said “Love, I can’t sit on a visit like this”. I burst into tears because she travelled all the way from Manchester. I said “please don’t think it’s you but I can’t let you see me like this. I’m an emotional wreck right now, I can’t do it”.

The visits hall was an emotionally raw zone that could intensify feelings in every direction. But it was also a zone of contradiction: for example, emotional closeness operated alongside the enforcement of distance. This is to say, some elements of the interaction were experienced as artificial by prisoners, evoking bittersweet reactions. Loved ones were physically present, suggesting the possibility of intimacy, but as Francesca explained, ‘It’s not like a normal environment, like you’d sit at home and watch telly. On visits it’s like two
hours, you’re here and there and you struggle to think of things to talk about’. In line with this, Karl explained the pressure to show positivity:

> You’ve got to sit there for two hours on a visit, and you feel like you’ve got to have a good time. You don’t want your family travelling two or three hours for you to sit there moaning about things, so you got to force yourself to have a good time. (Karl)

These interactions were abstracted, lacking the organic feel that defined them outside prison. This tension between closeness and distance was exacerbated by the limits placed on gestures of affection: ‘You can’t be as tactile as you want to be or show your true emotions’ (Olivia). Prisoners were not denied physical contact entirely—hugging and kissing was tolerated when visitors arrived and left—but beyond this there were strict limits: ‘You don’t have any time to be intimate’ (Janice). During the visit itself, the physical environment reinforced the social distance between prisoners and visitors, as if intimacy had been purposely designed out of the arrangements:

> The tables annoy me; if you have one person visiting you, you have chairs on the other side of the table. If you both sit back in your chair, you can’t even reach one another…there’s a big distance between you, you’re trying to shout to that person to hear them talk. All I want to do sometimes just hug my mum or hold my mum’s hand or lay my head on her lap, and yet I can’t even touch the tip of her finger. (Molly)

Because of these tensions, some prisoners felt ‘fucking relieved’ (Katherine) to leave the visits hall. Taking all these accounts together, the visits hall concentrated some very powerful emotions in prisoners. The presence of romantic partners, children and parents and the extreme vacillations of feeling states differentiated this space from all others zones of the prison.

The various free spaces introduced here had qualities that contrasted sharply with other, less favoured areas of the prison. For example, whereas shared living spaces were often frenetic, dirty, loud, destructive, poorly supervised, and hostile, these spaces had the inverse qualities. That is, they were often cleaner, quieter, more ordered, nurturing, creative, and safer spaces for prisoners. In terms of emotional outcomes, there are strong resonances here with Crewe et al (2014), in that these zones made it:

> …possible for prisoners to forge a space that was comparatively free from the oppressive oversight of their peers on one side and the institution on the other. Within limits, and only temporarily, spaces emerged for a more authentic presentation of emotion and selfhood. (70)
Furthermore, in these free spaces, peers and staff members offered collaboration and insight as opposed to resistance: these were judgment free zones. Staff members often rewarded and incentivised positive behaviours rather than penalising prisoners for their mistakes. There was a form of emotional ‘attunement’ between peers and non-uniformed staff, which provided an outlet for difficult emotions. Moreover, unlike other prison zones, there was a spontaneous and organic quality to the relations and manifestations of care that emerged. Many of the features of these free spaces align with Turner’s (1974) concept of communitas: especially the different temporal rules, inclusivity, openness, and liberated spirit that operated within these spaces.

**Therapeutic Spaces**

In contrast to all areas hitherto discussed, therapeutic treatment spaces were distinct in that they actively attempted to reconfigure prisoners’ emotional responses and disrupt their thinking patterns. In Ranby, exposure to therapeutic treatment was limited to attendance in psychological programmes or placement on the small Kainos wing. In Send, therapeutic spaces were more pervasive, encompassing the therapeutic community (J-Wing), Psychologically Informed Planned Environment (PIPE) on A wing, and the alcohol and substances programme (RAPt) on D-wing. Given the broad range of services on offer and the relatively small number of total prisoners in Send, the proportion of women undergoing some form of therapy was high (around 35 per cent). The large proportion of long-termers in Send also meant that a contingent of prisoners had already experienced one (or more) of these spaces.

Prisoners in both establishments seemed to be polarized by their therapeutic experiences. A number of participants spoke enthusiastically about their transformational effects, such as developing awareness about how behaviours could ‘hurt people’ and the empathic importance of ‘understanding their side of the story’ (Wayne). Prisoners cultivated a degree of emotional self-awareness in therapy and learned about the processes underlying their destructive feelings: ‘I’ve had an angry life man, and anger eats away at the soul’ (Liam);

---

52 Kainos is a charity that works with adult male offenders. It uses cognitive behavioural therapy methods (CBT) within a group therapeutic community setting on a prison wing. It is a round-the-clock programme that requires total immersion in the programme, typically over a period of six months. There were around twenty male prisoners on this wing during the research period.
‘With this SCP [self-chance programme] course, it’s all about sussing out my own anger cues’ (Dean). Importantly, the therapeutic communities provided participants with an ongoing opportunity to work on their problems collaboratively, in real time. That is, they were not learning abstract skills divorced from everyday life in prison. In this respect, the PIPE unit was particularly valued by Ellie, who saw it as a highly practical way to use ‘the skills you learned on TC and prove them’. Living and learning alongside peers going through therapy provided direct windows for insight and self-reflection. For example, the therapeutic expectations of openness and inclusivity challenged individuals who did not feel comfortable around prisoners with particular offence histories:

I’m pushed into a small environment with paedophiles and wrong uns, it was difficult listening to some real explicit shit, I wanted to write them off. At the end of 27 months I was playing table tennis with sex offenders. That was only due to me exploring so much shit. (Liam)

Liam’s account is reminiscent, in a more restricted way, of the forms of communitas articulated above: especially the idea that communitas is ‘spontaneous…[and] not shaped by norms’ (Turner, 1974, 274). That is to say, outside of the therapeutic environment, prison norms would typically stigmatise the formation of affiliative bonds with sex offenders. The therapeutic communities, in particular, encouraged horizontal affiliations, which often led to learning opportunities and shared emotional introspection. For example, Paula explained that during group therapy, another prisoner downplayed the impact of a crime (shooting someone) that Paula had also been victim of. ‘I said to her “I’ve been shot and it’s not so easy, it really fucking hurt.” I’ve never been able to identify with the physical and emotional pain that it caused me until that day in therapy.’ Hearing other women’s testimonies provided a further avenue for cultivating self-awareness and insight. Other prisoners were like mirrors for each other’s pain, growth and collective healing. Deep relationships and ‘really strong bonds’ were forged in these settings, because to some extent ‘the people you do therapy with are your therapists too’ (Ellie, both quotations). In short, the formalised culture of emotion sharing and learning in these therapeutic spaces made these areas feel distinctive from other prison zones. Over time, some prisoners absorbed the language, tools and perspectives of the psychological environment in which they were being immersed:

Paula: The TC helped me to manage my emotions better and helped me to understand myself better, to understand my emotions and where they came from. It taught me to break it down and understand patterns of behaviour in myself and others.
**Interviewer:** How?

Paula: By reality confrontation, by challenging people and being challenged. By learning to work through those challenges of being defensive, and it helps you to work through denial and then you start to see it on other people, and in the end you do feel like a therapist. Because you are saying to someone “you’re in denial” and “you’re lying, I want to challenge you and I want to confront you because you did this”, you’re saying to her “but this is what you did”. So you’re learning all the different skills of deflecting and of being challenged, and taking criticism, and being able to reflect and look at yourself, and being able to think: hang on a minute. Being able to see things in other people, it’s a mad process; at the time you think it’s a load of shit, but it’s actually really powerful.

However, in direct contrast, a number of prisoners felt alienated by therapeutic treatment and experienced these spaces as psychologically suffocating. Indeed, some prisoners felt that when they questioned the wisdom of the programmes, they would be crushed beneath an avalanche of clinical labels. The expectation of level-headed, open sharing by prisoners was at times in conflict with the seemingly intense level of psychological scrutiny over participants’ testimonies. This left some prisoners feeling like there was no way to turn, and that they were lost in a kind of psychological maze: ‘Sometimes you can’t win on there…if you don’t share enough you’re deflecting, if you hold the same opinion as your mate, you’re colluding’ (Pia); ‘Psychologists read into everything you say’ (Billy). These accounts are strongly redolent of Kruttschnitt & Gartner (2005) who expound the inherent constrictions of expectations for prisoner sharing:

> Prisoners were told to open up, disclose problems, and embrace the potential of treatment and getting well. Yet, as these women acknowledged, failing to partake in the rhetoric of disclosure would earn them the ire of staff while fully accepting could undermine their chances of release. (159)

Prisoners had to walk an emotional tightrope wherein both expression and disclosure were subject to psychological scrutiny. Most importantly for current purposes, any outburst of emotion, especially anger or frustration, was admonished as being *reactionary* and *defensive*. Anger was not interpreted by therapists as cathartic or expressive, but rather as an aberration that needed to be identified and corrected. Paul felt that the feedback received always gravitated towards stigmatizing prisoners, emphasising ‘everything absolutely negative’ and providing ‘nothing positive’ or incentivizing.
Sometimes prisoners appeared to be pressured to embrace particular interpretations of their lives and psychological states, rather than internalizing these messages freely. In a related way, Katherine explained that ‘succeeding’ in these spaces meant having to sacrifice one’s true identity and beliefs: ‘There’s a lot of talk but there’s no meaning behind it, it’s just mechanical, it’s just bullshit’. Katherine felt alienated by prisoners who co-opted the language of psychologists and clinicians because, she claimed, it seemed like robotic and disingenuous ‘psychobabble’:

Use a bit of colourful language, swear if you have to, just don’t be mechanical. As soon as you do that, you put me on guard and I feel very defensive very quickly, because I feel like you’re trying to manipulate me, you sound like a therapist. I find it uncomfortable very quickly. Because you’re quoting off people. They’re not people. They go on there and become brainwashed and like zombies. (Katherine)

Prison therapy raised fears among some prisoners that they were being broken apart and re-programmed. At the affective level, this raised discomfort about having to contain authentic feeling states to align with therapeutic culture and values. Such feelings were exacerbated by the closed-off nature of therapeutic community in Send: J-Wing residents did not associate with other parts of the prison, adding to the feeling of constriction and control: ‘It’s really intense, because you don’t come off the wing’ (Francesca).

What united these divergent perspectives was the deep immersion and psychological entanglement that was experienced in these zones. Even the advocates of these environments acknowledged their invasive and bureaucratic qualities: ‘It’s helped, but if there was somewhere where you could just unload things, that would be better, rather than box ticking that is used against you in a negative way’ (Billy). The therapeutic lens and constant incitements to openness made it difficult for prisoners to conceal their emotions: ‘Everything we feel is exposed’ (Katherine). Interestingly, the older men’s library on house block five functioned like an informal version of official therapeutic culture. In this space, prisoners engaged in cathartic conversations outside the typical realms of formal prison therapy and without the presence of staff or trained clinicians. Most importantly, in this area, prisoners did not have to worry about institutional consequences and could retain some degree of emotional privacy.
Privacy and Selection of Space

You know when you can have private time; when the last check is done at 8:30, then no one is going to check on you until the morning. So you’ve got that private time, but you never really do feel alone. There’s that little pinprick in the door, you can see people look through it, you can see people’s feet going under the door, and the light turns on in the landing…So although you can be on your own, you are never truly alone. (Danielle)

Throughout the accounts above, privacy has emerged, both implicitly and explicitly, as an important explanatory variable. However, as Moran (2015: 31) explains, ‘defining what ‘privacy’ might mean is a challenge in itself’ as it is a ‘complex arrangement…specific to particular contexts’. Rather than resolve these tensions entirely, Schwartz (1972) provides conceptual guidance for assessing privacy in prison by drawing a contrast between ‘forced exposure’ and ‘forced spectatorship’. For current purposes, this distinction is useful, revealing the different ways in which privacy was limited, and raising implications with regard to emotional expressivity and the use of prison space.

A significant contingent of prisoners felt that specific design features and institutional decisions largely eroded the possibility of achieving complete privacy. As an example of forced exposure, even when participants were locked in their cells, officers and other prisoners could ‘just walk up and open the flap’ (Olivia) to observe their behaviour.53 This could be experienced as particularly intrusive and embarrassing for prisoners who were observed naked in their cells: ‘They [officers] see your bum’ (Francesca). Zoe stated that ‘it’s horrible because I’m in my room and this is my private space, but then they’re telling me that I’m meant to be dressed’. O’Donnell (2014: 80) notes that peep-holes and viewing flaps deny prisoners the opportunity for real solitude through ‘the intrusive burden of an unwelcome gaze’. Prisoners are cut off from meaningful social contact on one hand, and subjected to unsolicited and disembodied observation on the other.

In a different manner, prisoners were forcibly exposed to the habits and idiosyncrasies of others. Indeed, institutional control over cell sharing arrangements created considerable challenges to privacy for male prisoners: ‘It’s impossible to have privacy when you’re living with somebody 24-7, eating, shitting, and pissing. He’s shitting where your head is’

53Most cell doors had a small metal flap, the shape of a vertical letter-box, which could be opened or closed to see inside the cell and observe prisoner behaviour.
Although some prisoners draped blankets and curtains around the sides of their beds to create a visual screen, and negotiated times for music, TV, silence and bathroom usage with their cellmates, single cells were still idealized as providing the ‘next level of privacy’ (Simon). Given that most prisoners agreed that it was better to ventilate sadness alone in their room ‘rather than cry in front of people’ (Francesca), cell-sharers were denied this outlet in their living space.

Participating in the social world of the prison created acute difficulties for finding time alone, as acquaintances were prone to ‘come and just barge into your room’ (Ellie) when they needed help or wanted to talk. Two prisoners claimed that they could only achieve privacy by segregating themselves from the prisoner population completely:

You can have privacy. I don’t think it’s healthy but you can…I’ve seen something where men don’t leave their cells. I’ve even been through it. I had my cell pitch black. It’s black where I needed to turn the light on just to get a cup from the sink. And I just wanted to stay in there, and I didn’t wanna leave. (Freddy)

I don’t want to know people’s business and I don’t need to know it. I don’t want to be involved in it. So it’s quite a lonely existence for me as well. (Ian)

The price of privacy, then, was a degree of social isolation that could have damaging effects over time. Ellie claimed that there was a trade-off between association time and privacy that fluctuated across different living areas: ‘E and F [resettlement wings] are good, you’ve got time out of your cell but you lose some of your privacy. On main block you get locked in early but you know you’re going to get time alone’.

By contrast, a number of prisoners reflected that, while privacy was never absolute, it was still possible to a degree ‘when you’re in your cell’ (Mikey). These prisoners felt that privacy was something that had to be forged or sought-out, rather than something guaranteed by the establishment. They set firm boundaries with their peers: ‘You have to make sure they don’t walk straight in, and say “No, not today”’ (Zoe), or explicitly ask for ‘some time alone’ (Janice). Some prisoners simply refused to answer their doors or pretended to be asleep (‘I will have my room in total darkness ready for when they knock’ Ula), knowing that eventually their peers would get the message. Others benefitted from having screened-off sanitary cubicles that allowed them to hide: ‘You can go in the toilet and people can’t see you’ (Oscar). Privacy was also found outside of cell spaces: Danielle explained that she was
able to cry in the showers because the sounds of the water and the heat would make it difficult for anyone to hear or notice changes in her affect. Transitions between the wings and other buildings opened up space for some prisoners to break away from their social groups and find brief moments of solitude:

I like getting away from people. If I was outside and had something wrong, if I felt annoyed with everything I would just go somewhere and chill out for the night. I like looking at the moon, so when the moon is out I’ll be out and find a nice spot to chill out I like doing that. (Tamara)

Spatial Selection and Emotion

I like to use the spaces all over, I don’t like to sit in a room all the time. (Yvonne)

This discussion of privacy has revealed one way in which prisoners attempted to use space to serve and soothe emotional needs away from the eyes of others. However, finding private time for offloading emotions was only one aspect of a broader strategy. Indeed, as well as seeking out particular emotions, it was common for prisoners to manipulate space to avoid particular feeling states. Evading spaces where unrest was likely (‘I avoid the association room and dining room as much as I can’ Gabriella) or sequestering oneself away (‘I retreat to my room’ Haley) during peak times of activity decreased the ‘chances of getting into trouble’ (Mikey). These decisions were motivated by conflict avoidance and the cycles of fear and aggression that were more probable in specific areas. Some prisoners tried to evade any area that increased feelings of uncertainty: for example, Bernie explained that he ‘avoided places where there’s people I don’t know’. Boredom also drove prisoners away from certain spaces: ‘I avoid J-Wing because it’s a very dull landing. It’s like the Addams family house’ (Rebecka). In a related manner, regulating space was not only used to escape the onset of emotions, but was also a method of diluting the intensity of feelings at a point subsequent to conflict: ‘If someone upsets me, it’s better to remove myself from that situation completely’ (Amber). This stopped feelings from escalating to a point where prisoners had to defend themselves or risked losing face.

In a different way, prisoners sometimes distanced themselves out of compassion for the feelings of others: ‘If I don’t take myself away, I’ll just take it out on other people’ (Rebecka). These prisoners did not want their peers to feel obligated or weighed down by their feelings. By contrast, Dean explained that the physical environment could also be
manipulated to intensify personal aggression and instil fear in others, rather than minimize it. Two prisoners had soiled Dean’s mattress and bedsheets with food as a prank:

So I shut the door and went in their pad. I said “take that bedding and wash it now, if you don’t there will be consequences”. I said “it’s not about being a bit of fun, it stops now”. I told them what to do, “I want it all washed by 4 pm”. That got it done because I used violence and aggression. Closing the door and walking in the pad, that was the threat straight away. Think about the psychological thoughts you’re having. If I leave the door open, you’ve got an escape route. Once I close this door, you’re in the room by yourself with me. Just by opening or closing the door…but that’s prison, that’s how it is. (Dean)

Denying other prisoners an exit and confining them to a small space added edge to the situation and evoked fear. More typically, it was the prison regime that denied prisoners freedom of movement and ignited unwelcome emotions and there were many situations where prisoners had only limited control over space. This chapter has already referenced the spatially challenging nature of cell-sharing arrangements, but more importantly, here, are the ways in which participants attempted to minimise these difficulties by controlling space. As suggested above, material screens were used around beds to divide the cell into different areas, but prisoners also negotiated times when they could leave the cell to create a limited form of privacy and avoid conflicts entirely. Further, prisoners did not passively accept cell-sharing arrangements: they repeatedly petitioned officers for newly available cells or asked to share with friends instead. In this sense, spatial selection was not just an immediate situational strategy (for example, walking away from a conflict) but also involved substantial planning to carve out more harmonious space in the longer term.

The chaotic living quarters on house blocks caused a range of emotional discomforts that were difficult to circumvent. Particular frustrations arose when unplanned ‘freezes’ to prisoner movement meant that activities and association times were curtailed or cancelled. Some prisoners were commonly left waiting for long periods of time just to get back onto their wings and house blocks. Indeed, the use of ‘movement slips’ in Send, that had to be administratively approved by officers, was a stark reminder that the institution was attempting to formalise and control prisoners’ use of space. It was not surprising, then, that some prisoners felt completely devoid of any spatial control:

There’s a lot going on. It’s quite circular, it’s all around you. There’s no room you can go in and chill to get out. You can’t do that in prison, you can’t escape; it’s constant, it’s aggressive. It’s 24-7. It’s manic. (Freddy)
Living on wings that were awash with new psychoactive substances constituted a form of spatial entrapment for some prisoners: ‘You just can’t take yourself away from it, it’s always there, you have to deal with it’ (Val). A number of prisoners shared experiences of being passively intoxicated by second hand NPS smoke or saw other prisoners having distressing panic attacks while taking it. Being forced into proximity with people and substances one did not like was arguably the principal driver of anger, fear, and tension in prison. It was when prisoners felt cornered that volatile emotions and confrontations seemed most likely to arise. But these concerns notwithstanding, most prisoners strove—and achieved—some degree of control over space. By seeking out particular areas, and particular people within them, and sidestepping other places, they could increase the potential for feeling desirable emotions while diminishing the likelihood of facing emotionally unsettling situations (Gross, 2008; Laws and Crewe, 2016).

**Conclusion**

The data presented at the close of this final substantive chapter connects back to earlier findings in chapter four. That is, the substantive chapters began with a discussion of individual emotional management strategies, and through an analysis of space, the focus has returned to the ways in which prisoners attempt to exert control over space to regulate their feelings. These accounts indicate that while prisoners did not have complete control over spatiality, they could exercise some degree of bounded agency. Prisoners managed to forge out space for themselves by exploiting gaps in the system or finding ways to co-opt it. Indeed, the careful attempts by prisoners to establish routines (as discussed in chapter four) can be understood as a way to work within the parameters of the regime to seek out preferred spaces and avoid areas that they disliked. Importantly, too, in the ‘hostile zones’ it was the precise absence of order that was striking and fear inducing. Routines have a ‘double-edged’ nature which can be both stifling—raising fears of institutionalisation—but also ontologically reassuring, making environments feel more predictable and less chaotic (Sparks et al., 1996).

This chapter has clear connections with aspects of the carceral geography literature which emphasises the ‘spatially mediated nature of the articulation of emotion’; traces the various ‘ways in which individual spaces of the prison elicit and facilitate different emotional expression’ (Moran, 2015: 29, both quotations); and draws attention to the emotional geography of institutional spaces (Crewe et al, 2014; Smoyer and Blankenship, 2014).
Indeed, this chapter argues that prisons have complex ‘emotion’ maps (Crawley, 2004), and that the affective feel of particular spaces was dynamic, changing as prisoners moved to and from particular areas. Further, the analysis of the ‘line route’ in Ranby revealed the significance of exploring transitional spaces and areas with less clearly demarcated boarders. Shadowing prisoners as they completed their journeys across these different routes provided an intuitive way of understanding these more diffuse spaces.

This chapter broadened Goffman’s (1961) original conceptualisation of ‘free places’, and developed a more recent contribution (Crewe et al, 2014), by introducing the notion of ‘communitas’ (Turner, 1974). These areas provided prisoners with a respite from chaos, and facilitated a wider repertoire of emotional experiences. Exploring the different features of communitas—which is characterised by spontaneity and a spirit of liberation—helped to decipher the factors that made these places feel distinctive. Importantly, these zones typically had ‘softer’ architectural features and contained staff members who embodied an ethos of inclusivity and acceptance. This created an atmosphere of emotional ‘attunement’ where feelings could be expressed openly without fear, judgment or reprisal. In a different manner, the appropriation of liminality (Jewkes, 2005b; Turner, 1974) was introduced here to further understand cell spaces. The description of cellular living as an almost ‘developmental’ process underscores a wider finding in prisons research and concentration camp literature that, at least for some prisoners, painful experiences can give way to ‘the possibility of resurrection’, and that ‘bleakness and abandonment’ is sometimes followed by ‘joy and reunion’ (O’Donnell, 2014: 97). The experience of imprisonment was fluid, not fixed; it was possible for prisoners to shift from finding the cell oppressive to finding it liberating. The next, and final, chapter attempts to draw out the implications of these findings in a more horizontal manner, uniting the three levels of analysis: individual, social, and spatial emotions.
7. Conclusions

The introduction to this study set out Rustin’s (2009) claim about ways of understanding emotions. It will be recalled that Rustin suggests we have understood far more about ‘states of feeling’ through works of art than from the social sciences (20). Yet, the broader scope of Rustin’s argument is important, as rather than a condemnation of emotions research in the social sciences his account reads like a call to action. He explains that the social sciences ‘as organised bodies of knowledge’ have been influenced by ‘a commitment to a new and modern kind of society which would be governed principally by Reason’ (19), and which therefore lead the subject area away from emotionality. That is to say, Rustin continues, the elevation of reason creates a number of ‘implied antitheses’ including the relegation of the body to the mind, faith to science, and most importantly for current purposes, emotions to reason (2009:19). But it is important to note that the social sciences, and keys texts in sociology in particular, were originally formed in reaction to capitalistic systems that denied a role for affect, or promoted world views built solely on ‘rationality’. It seems more accurate then to describe a process—during the eighteenth-century Scottish Enlightenment, and in later European and American sociological writing in particular—where ‘there was ample space for emotion’, but that since then ‘the category of emotion lost its footing in social explanation’ (Barbalet, 2001: 8).

There are strong indications that Rustin’s call is being heard. Indeed, this study contributes to a shifting narrative in the social sciences and criminology wherein these classical distinctions and binaries are being disrupted. Recent waves of scientific research are uncovering the compatibility and interdependence between the head and the heart, as Evans (2001) explains: ‘emotions inform our decisions even when we think we are being completely rational’ (144), and the most ‘intelligent action results from a harmonious blend of emotion and reason’ (xii). Reason and emotion are not oppositional poles, rather ‘they are intertwined in a collaborative relationship needed for normal functioning’ (Sapolsky, 2017: 58). Emotion, then, has an integral role in the social sciences, and is increasingly recognized as moulding ‘distinct social configurations, [and] playing an essential part in shaping different ways of life for societies, institutions and individuals in patterned interactions with one another’ (Rustin, 2009: 31).

This thesis resembles this form of ‘integration work’ in two identifiable ways. First, the focus
on ‘emotion regulation’ reflects an intermingling of both intuitive and conscious processes. That is to say, prisoners were not at the mercy of their emotions. Instead, they exerted a degree of influence over the onset, intensity and expression of their feelings states. As will be further articulated below, detailing this process gives us a deeper understanding of how emotions function in prison and challenges more simplified versions of emotion management in institutional settings.

Second, the rebalancing of emotion and rationality also has significant implications for the treatment of gender.\textsuperscript{54} It will be recalled that gender and emotion are also deeply intertwined, and that the elevation of reason and the rejection of sentimentality has been strongly tied to oppositions between masculinity and femininity (Manstead & Fischer, 2000). As Anderson and Smith (2001: 7) surmise: ‘detachment, objectivity and rationality have been valued, and implicitly masculinized, while engagement, subjectivity, passion and desire have been devalued, and frequently feminized’. In contrast, then, gender was foregrounded in this study, but assumptions and preconceptions about gender that could distort the findings have been avoided (Liebling, 2009). Male and female prisoners have been treated equitably, answering the same questions about their affective states, and have been analysed using the same framework of emotions.

**Main Findings**
This study of 50 prisoners set out to explore the role of emotion regulation and expression at three different levels of analysis. The following section takes stock of the main findings of the thesis and, where appropriate, draws thematic connections between them and explains what has been established as knowledge. From this point, there is an attempt to situate this study within the wider academic literature and explicitly highlight the main contributions. Of particular significance here is the literature on carceral geography and recent studies in the psychology and sociology of imprisonment. Finally, the limitations and future directions of this research are examined.

**Destructive life experiences and cycles of imprisonment**
The first substantive chapter revealed the chaotic and damaging pre-prison experiences of the participants. This reinforced findings from systematic studies of prisoner backgrounds (see

\textsuperscript{54} The reverse is also true, and it is more accurate to describe this as a bi-directional relationship. Breakthrough scholarship on gender has drawn significant attention, and revaluation, to issues of emotionality.
Leigey & Reed, 2010) and uncovered multiple forms of childhood abuse (emotional, physical, sexual), exploitation, malnutrition and parental neglect. Participants related consistent exposure to domestic violence, drug abuse, suicide and death (of loved ones, friends and family members). They had typically experienced stressful and transient living situations, having being transferred to multiple foster homes, care facilities, schools or spent time living on the street. Although individual biographies differed, what united them was a general sense of instability—as each participant recounted multiple ‘destabilizing’ or disruptive life events. There was considerable inter-generational ‘circularity’ in these stories. Many prisoners had close family members who had experienced imprisonment and they often felt estranged from their own children, who expressed anger, confusion, and frustration towards them. For example, children who questioned when imprisoned parents were coming home, or partners who struggled to juggle the demands of childrearing and living costs along, evoked tremendous feelings of guilt and shame among prisoners. This resonates strongly with recent government reports that emphasise the importance of helping prisoners stabilise their relationships (HMIP, 2016; MOJ, 2017). Lord Farmer (MOJ, 2017: 8) argues that ‘good family relationships must be a golden thread running through the processes of all prisons’. Prisoners felt family days in Send were far more authentic experiences than prisoner visits, which felt stilted by contrast, although these events were resource intensive.

Prisoners’ prior experiences could have all sorts of resonances for living in prison: living in ‘care’ facilities and boarding schools, and early experiences of loneliness and isolation, all provided some exposure to institutional life. These events left lasting emotional scars which shaped emotional orientations while in prison. As Thompson, Hannan, & Miron, (2014: 28) explain, chronic childhood maltreatment has ‘lifelong consequences, including increased risk for internalizing problems (e.g., anxiety and depression), externalizing problems (e.g., aggressive behaviour), and emotion dysregulation…[and] can cause hypersensitivity to threat cues and a tendency to respond to non-hostile situations as threatening’. In the prisons context, Grounds (2004) relates how experiences of injustice can cause acute psychological trauma and long-lasting damage. For prisoners in this study, patterns of emotion management were certainly influenced by pre-existing forces and deep traumas that prisoners carried with them. These biographic details of prisoners lives answers, in part, Jamieson and Grounds’ (2005: 56) call for research that looks as the context of past experiences to better understand the effects of imprisonment. For many participants, these past emotional difficulties were reflected, perpetuated, and amplified by the prison environment. There are strong linkages
here with Easteal (2001: 101) who found that ‘an ethos of betrayal is reinforced’ in prison because of ‘violations of confidentiality’ and ‘breaches of trust’ that echo earlier childhood experiences. By consequence, many prisoners learn that it is better to avoid their feelings, and bury their pain. This finding is reinforced and extended by this thesis, especially in the ‘passive’ regulation strategies prisoners displayed.

The Damage of ‘Passive’ Regulation
A second important finding is that ‘bottling-up’ emotion—‘passive’ approaches to affect management—was the most common regulation strategy in both prisons. The distinction between ‘passive’ and ‘active’ references the extent to which emotional states were being addressed directly. Over two thirds of the sample spoke about having to block off a number of their emotions. This thesis has added to knowledge by evidencing the pervasiveness of emotional suppression, and the way it applies to a range of specific feeling states. Prisoners were inclined to push down their anger and sadness, but also their joy and elation: it may be recalled that positive emotions also risked attracting the ‘wrong’ kind of attention. To some extent, bottling was a product of prisoner culture—a finding well documented in wider research (de Viggiani, 2012, Greer, 2002, Jewkes, 2005b)—that hold displays of toughness and emotional restraint in high esteem. However, it was significant that suppression was also a product of the institutional management of emotion. For example, the policies and protocols surrounding ACCT implementation appeared to spotlight rather than support prisoners in need, and often provided unhelpful forms of attention. Further, fears that requesting support would be recorded on prisoners’ records, hampering their chances at parole hearings increased the likelihood of withholding. This engendered a feeling of emotional entrapment that was strongly redolent of Crewe’s (2011) concept of ‘tightness’, a modern manifestation of penal power that incites prisoners:

…to conduct themselves in particular ways…[creating] the sense of not knowing which way to move, for fear of getting things wrong. It conveys the way that power operates both closely and anonymously, working like an invisible harness on the self. It is all-encompassing and invasive, in that it promotes the self-regulation of all aspects of conduct, addressing both the psyche and the body. (522)

This institutional control of emotions provides an important commentary on Sherman’s (2003) argument that emotionally intelligent justice should acknowledge the emotions and needs of both offenders and victims. In general, neither of the establishments in this research exemplified this kind of emotional intelligence in their approach to prisoners—most felt
isolated, unheard, and cut off from emotional support channels—although Send was more proactive in providing forms of therapy.

This study found, then, that the effects of bottling were almost entirely negative. There was an important relationship between bottling-up emotion and the subsequent loss of control over emotions, including outbursts of violence and dissociated thoughts. These prisoners suffered from a kind of ‘boomerang’ effect, suggesting that emotional suppression had delayed consequences, and failed to provide long-term equanimity. This process is deeply rooted in the damaging and traumatic life experiences of participants before prison. As De Zulueta (1993) argues:

People who react to stress by carrying on as though nothing has happened dissociate themselves from the reality of their pain, terror or humiliation, but at a price: the self becomes divided and the process of dissociation becomes part of the patient’s identity, to be brought back into action when faced with further stress or even situations that are only reminiscent of the original stress. As a result of this repeated dissociative process, the victim becomes emotionally constricted and cannot experience the full range of feelings. (180)

A growing pool of research is highlighting the linkages between unresolved emotion, stress, and the subsequent detrimental effects on health and behaviour. For example, Hawkins (2013) articulates the ways in which unprocessed emotions resurface through the body’s endocrine and nervous system, and Maté further argues (2003) that suppression and discharge are inseparable processes caused by the build-up of acute physiological stress. Importantly, then, institutional practices tended to emotionally numb and trigger a population of prisoners who were already highly vulnerable. This seems to confirm Karstedt’s (2011: 3) contention that poor acknowledgement of feelings states can lead to ‘unrestrained emotions gushing into the arena of criminal justice’.

‘Diluting’ emotions through distraction was, alongside suppression, a further example of passive emotion regulation. Distraction was a common way for prisoners to try to escape unwanted feeling states and rumination. Distraction was achieved through the tranquilizing effects of illicit substances or prescribed drugs, or through engaging in a busy routine that left little time for introspection. Indeed, there was an apparent irony that prisoners who appeared most joyful and ‘free’ from institutional control were those who fully embedded themselves in prison routines (attending programmes, work, and education and undertaking physical exercise). Sparks et al. (1996: 75) explain that routines can be both ‘reassuring and consoling’
on one hand, while also presenting a ‘deadening tedium’ on the other. The main finding here was that prisoners who used distraction felt more reassurance than tedium. This adds an interesting perspective to Crawley’s (2011: 258) argument, that emotions are central ‘to routine operations of social interaction’. Outside of the prisons context, Barbalet (2001: 170) argues that ‘emotions are basic to social action and to an understanding of social structures’. This study found that the reverse was also true: in that prison routines helped to regulate emotions. The important point being made is that emotions appear to be both causes and effects: playing a key role in the maintenance of order—and disorder—in prison, but also being evoked by features of the regime. But prisoners who relied on a fixed routine to create emotional order were in a very precarious balance. That is to say, the reliance on routine for distraction was often destabilised by freezes to prisoner movement, the sudden cancellation of activities, finishing courses (creating a new hole in the schedule), or prolonged ‘lock-ins’. These disruptions revealed the underlying vulnerabilities that distraction was attempting to mask and suppress.

Overall, these study findings contrast with Wright, Crewe and Hulley (2016: 12) who argue that suppression provides ‘an important and high adaptive psychic defence mechanism’ that ‘enables the minimization of painful affects and realities’ in prison. The authors argue that bottling is a ‘deliberate and pro-active means’ to defend against some of the most pernicious challenges of prison life (12)—such as blocking out unwanted thoughts or ‘intrusive recollections’—and is therefore a ‘useful defensive means’ for coping (13). But this study found less evidence for the ‘protective potential’ of suppression in the short-term and the advantages of this approach in the ways the authors describe. Rather, it has found that suppression had impacts on other forms of prison behaviour and less positive, long-term effects, on health and well-being. The dependence on drugs, in particular, could have more direct and pronounced side-effects: damaging health, personal relationships and leaving prisoners in debt. There is a closer alignment here with Grounds (2004, 171) who found evidence that prisoners ‘learned to deal with emotional pressures and stresses in prison by blocking off painful feelings, avoiding communication, and isolating themselves’. Importantly, Grounds continues, these experiences contribute to ‘enduring and disabling personality change…[including] social withdrawal, feelings of emptiness or hopelessness, a chronic feeling of threat, and estrangement’ (168).
‘Active’ Regulation
By contrast, the most effective emotion regulation strategies were ‘active’ in nature. That is to say, both ‘distillation’ and ‘reappraisal’ strategies constituted attempts to engage directly with emotions. Distillation was the attempt to extract and work with the underlying meaning of emotion states. It was most visible in a small number of prisoners who harnessed therapeutic knowledge as a form of self-inquiry, to identify both the causes and consequences of emotion states. A distinction was drawn here between ‘distillation’ and other activities such as letter writing, diaries and artwork, which were used to delve into feelings in a more generalized manner to ‘externalise’ feeling states (which I termed ‘processing’). That is, writing about emotions or painting them on canvas was one way of generating affective distance from them. The attachment and pain of particular feeling states was soothed through such activities, as emotions were reconfigured into something that could be looked at, analysed, and reflected on. As Bluhm (1948: 103) explains, activities based on self-observation allow prisons to turn away from ‘passive suffering’ to regain active control over their lives. Bluhm further notes a strong, mutually reinforcing ‘association between self-observation and self-expression’ which constitutes ‘a most successful mechanism of survival’ (1948: 103). In line with this, Pennebaker (1997) states that the detrimental health effects of emotional inhibition are relieved by writing about them and additional benefits include enhanced immune function, autonomic activity, muscle tension and long term improvements in mood and well-being. Prisoners in this research who tried to understand, and disentangle, their emotions through writing or art, typically benefitted from a greater ease of self-expression than was previously available to them.

‘Reappraisal’, adopted by just under a third of prisoners, was an important form of emotional ‘alchemy’ where unwanted emotions were transformed by reinterpreting the meaning of a given situation. Such findings help to move the discussion of psychological and emotional adaptation in prison beyond the idea that imprisonment constitutes a mere ‘deep freeze’ (Zamble and Porporino, 1988). Prisoners took control over their emotions in this way by trying to see the ‘silver lining’ in their personal circumstances. Prison was often recast as a heroic journey and a powerful test of personal resilience. This approach did not attempt to banish uncomfortable emotions and events, but rather sought to accept and modify them. The prisoners who engaged in this strategy appeared to cope better, both physically and psychologically, and were less likely to feel caught up in cycles of negative emotion. The reduction of negative emotions brought about by reappraisal has robust support across a
range of psychological literatures (Goldin & McRae, 2009).

**The Fluid-Container Metaphor**

These various emotion regulation strategies used by prisoners were brought into relief using the ‘fluid-container’ metaphor as the basis for a framework of emotion management. The conceptualization of emotions as fluids (that are ‘bottled-up’, ‘distilled’, and ‘diluted’) resonates with some of the earliest work on prison sociology. For example, Sykes (1958: 79) explains how:

> The pains of imprisonment generate enormous pressure which is translated into behaviour with all the greater vigor because, like a body of steam under heavy compression with only a few outlets, the body of prisoners is limited in modes of adaptation’ (emphasis added).

The extension of the metaphor in this research offers a clear and intuitive representation of how prisoners regulate emotions, which does not cloud these behaviours in clinical terminology. Furthermore, there was a preliminary attempt to go beyond the descriptive confines of the framework, and explore the extent to which particular emotion regulation strategies (suppression and reframing) were indicative of different patterns of emotional states. Two groups of emotionally ‘rigid’ and ‘flexible’ groups were identified based on prisoners’ differential perceptions of power, agency and control. This confirms Layder’s (2004: 5) argument that there are ‘deep-seated associations between power and the emotions’ that are ‘not simply contingent and haphazard’, rather the ‘two are to be found in each other’s company in every instance…[as] constant companions’.

This first, ‘rigid’, group of prisoners perceived they had either total responsibility for their feelings, or conversely, no control at all. These prisoners appeared to struggle with their emotions the most, and were most likely to suppress them. By contrast, emotionally flexible prisoners occupied the middle-ground between these poles of control, and generally coped better with the rigors of prison life. These individuals intuited the limits of their agency in prison without succumbing to passivity and embraced a range of active regulation strategies, especially reappraisal. Evans (2001) claims that such pragmatism is the midpoint between emotional extremes, and a signal of emotion intelligence that finds ‘balance between emotion and reason in which neither is in control. Emotionally intelligent people know when it is right to control their emotions and when it is right to be controlled by them’ (59-60). There are problems in reducing emotion regulation strategies to dichotomies between active and
passive, better and worse, rigid and flexible. Indeed, prisoners’ motivations for using these strategies were complex and context was critical. For example, although sustained emotional suppression had long-term negative impacts, containing anger was a crucial self-preservation tactic that helped avoid confrontations. However, this research constitutes an attempt to conceptually advance understanding of emotion regulation in prison beyond descriptive categorisations. Following Calverley and Farrall's (2011) lead, if emotional experience and expressivity constitute a fundamental part of the progression into and away from crime, understanding the developmental patterns of prisoners could help further understand this process. It was noteworthy that prisoners who used strategies of emotional reappraisal were most likely to hold positions of responsibility (mentor roles, sought after jobs etc). More broadly, this study contributes to debates about the extent to which prison can be seen as a ‘powerful and potentially debilitating social context’ with effects that are ‘entirely predictable’ (Haney, 2005: 86), or whether, by contrast, there are various experiential ‘pathways’ of prison experiences (Liebling, 1992; O’Donnell, 2014). It appears that many prisoners in this study learned to regulate their emotions in ways that brought a degree of stability to their reality and environment, which challenges arguments claiming total environmental determinism. This supplements Sparks et al’s (1996) account that seeks to understand the various factors that lead to the negotiation of order in prison. It will be recalled that although their thesis included no explicit analysis of the role of emotions in establishing order, in a number of places feelings were indirectly introduced into their analysis (1996: 68). Future research could do further develop these ideas by investigating emotional adaptations to imprisonment over time.

**Emotions as Social ‘Glue’**

At the relational level, the study found that emotions functioned like social glue (Planalp, 1999), binding prisoners to one another. The principal way that this process was manifested was through the social sharing of emotions, enabling prisoners to ventilate their feelings with one another. For most prisoners, there were significant barriers to sharing emotions with officers and family members. In line with Jewkes (2002: 155), ‘the fragility and fragmentation of contact with loved ones on the outside [was a] profound source of stress’ for prisoners in this study. And although most participants were close to at least one family member, closeness did not always translate to emotional transparency and openness. Indeed, most felt that they had to shelter their difficult feelings from their families and ‘put on a brave face’. With a few exceptions, uniformed officers were typically perceived as cold, mechanical
and generally unsympathetic to prisoners’ emotional needs.

For these reasons, other prisoners were the most reliable group for sharing emotion. Prisoners were able to show empathy for their peers through the mutual experience of imprisonment. Searching for a willing listener, receiving advice, and seeking understanding and compassion helped prisoners alleviate their emotions. These relationships highlighted the importance of emotional reciprocity, which mutually reinforced social bonds between prisoners, increasing intimacy, cooperation and trust. Put short, the emotional dimensions of these interactions had an adhesive function contributing to ‘the intimacy and harmony of the relationship’ (Fischer & Manstead, 2008: 459).

An important symbol of these affiliations was the re-construction of family groups. This was more pronounced in Send than Ranby, where the prevalence of ‘sisters’, ‘aunties’, ‘mothers’ and ‘romantic dyads’ was made more explicit through physical and verbal gestures of care. These findings were somewhat analogous to Owen (1998) who argues that interpersonal relationships are the anchors of prison life and the pseudo-family is an essential part of the social order. However, while the women in this study did appear to evidence more frequent displays of emotional cathexis with one another than their male counterparts, these relationships were less pervasive than in Owen’s study, indicating that emotion norms are shaped by wider institutional and cultural variables.

Broader displays of care and affection were frequent in both prisons, but they manifested in different ways. In Send, care was typically ‘open’ and explicit in nature. That is, there were numerous, highly visible, and intimate conversations going on between women all around the prison. Further, the particular intensity of expression conveyed through these interactions (through colourful love letters, and birthday gifts) made it clear that these were affectionate displays. Female prisoners exhibited a form of social communion, pooling together a range of different vocational skills and expertise (hairdressing, cooking, tailoring clothes, card making) to care for their friends. By contrast, in the men’s prison, care was submerged into shared routines and activities undertaken in dyads or small groups. This included playing video games, sports, dominoes, gym workouts, snooker, pool, table tennis. The male prisoners established bonds through competition and displays of skill. Affection was less frequently communicated through explicit verbal commentary. While there were some instances of prisoners expressing a kind of fraternal ‘love’ for one another, these were
relatively isolated occurrences. It was more typical for prisoners to express warmth in a range of non-verbal gestures such as special hand-shakes, high-fives, fist-bumps, and bicep squeezing in the gym. All of this was strongly redolent of Crewe’s (2014) argument that men’s emotional expressions are often submerged and transmitted in alternative ways.

Contagious Emotions
Outside of close friendship circles and group affiliations, destructive emotions were far more frequent. Indeed, broader interactions between prisoners were often be marked by anger, hostility, frustration and fear. This reflects Grounds’ (2004: 170) finding that prisoners adapt by learning to be ‘highly aggressive and intimidating as a form of self-protection’. A number of participants described feeling under suspicion, from both officers and other prisoners, which served as a constant reminder that they were mistrusted. This evoked regular sentiments of shame, guilt and anger, directed both internally and towards others. As Gilligan (2003: 1162) argues, ‘people resort to violence when they feel they can wipe out shame only by shaming those who they feel shamed them’.

Importantly, these destructive emotions had a contagious quality. In Send, participants explained that sadness and distress were ‘absorbed’ from others. A number of women complained about prisoners who cast negativity on to them through unsolicited sharing. In these instances emotional resources were being forcibly extracted from prisoners. In Ranby, anger and violence had a similar kind of affective pull or momentum. There were strong indications here that Randall Collins’ conceptualisations of ‘ritual interaction’ (1990) and ‘forward panic’ (2011) applies to particular prison environments. It seemed that prisoners sometimes do ‘get pumped up with the emotional strength from participating in the group interaction’ (1990: 32) in the way that Collins described, and that the ‘build-up of tension and fear’ contributes to violent incidents in which combatants are ‘caught-up in each other’s mood’ (2011: 23). This was often related to the influence of a wider social gaze. Hostile energy and aggression accumulated within the prisoner audience and was seemingly charged into individual prisoners. There was some evidence that violence in Ranby was, in some instances, a direct response to the perception that officers did not provide an adequate level of safety. There are resemblances here with studies of herding communities where the absence of policemen over large areas creates ‘cultures of honour’:

Where enforcement of the law is inadequate, it becomes important to defend one’s reputation for
severity to establish that one is not to be trifled with. Allowing oneself to be pushed around, insulted, or affronted without retaliation amounts to announcing that one is an easy mark. (Cohen & Nisbett, 1994: 552)

There was a recurrent message, in both prisons, that other prisoners became targets of hostile emotional energy precisely because there was a lack of viable alternative avenues for channelling difficult feelings. Restrictions on prisoner movement and the enforced proximity to the feeling states of others (in cell sharing situations or on the large wings) catalysed the spread of negative emotion. In this context, Haney’s (2005: 86) argument that imprisonment can often be a ‘debilitating social context’ is hard to deny. The argument set-out in chapter two, that certain environments create particular probabilities of experience—without doing so deterministically—is convincing for these prison settings.

‘Liminal’ Journeys
Jewkes (2005a) and Turners’ (1974) conceptual work on liminality provided a preliminary framework to describe prisoners’ experiences of cell spaces. Those who found their cell spaces to be claustrophobic and unsettling were in the midst of a kind liminal upheaval or undergoing a process of transformation. These prisoners were emotionally overwhelmed by the isolation of close confinement experienced a wide repertoire of negative feeling states, especially fear, shame, sadness, frustration and anger. Many of these prisoners were either in the early stages of imprisonment, or were serving very long tariffs.

For prisoners who passed through this liminal upheaval (around two thirds of prisoners in the study), cells functioned more like personal sanctuaries, underscoring the idea that ‘a prison cell can become a crucible for spiritual transformation’ (O’Donnell, 2014: 162). These were zones of relative serenity relative to the wider climate of wings and house blocks, where difficult emotions could be explored and disentangled within a safe ‘container’. To some extent, cells allowed prisoners to exert a degree of agency over their emotions because they knew that they would have a fixed period of uninterrupted private time every day. Furthermore, prisoners also used their cells to shape their emotions in explicit ways by customizing their personal space. This mainly involved modifying tired colour schemes, decorating the walls with pictures, and filling the space with personal artefacts and other ‘signifiers of self’ (Sloan, 2012: 406). This customisation of space was a way for prisoners to reassert their identities, creating a comfortable and unique sanctuary of their own and elevate their feeling states. Clean, uncluttered cells evoked calmness. Pictures of family members or
religious iconography could inspire powerful feelings of love and tenderness.

However, prisoners who were bound into cell-sharing arrangements problematize the notion that participants underwent liminal journeys in a linear manner. That is to say, the main complaints among cell-sharers revolved around a different set of concerns, including the loss of emotional privacy, hygiene and broader fears of contamination from other prisoners. In short, then, the appropriation of liminality here would benefit from refinement. For example, adopting a longitudinal design would allow for comparisons over time and provide a more accurate picture of emotional development. Nonetheless, the use of ideas of liminality in this account highlights important intersections between emotional experience, temporality and space that would benefit from future development.

**Stagnant and Volatile zones**

The wings and house blocks were almost unanimously discussed in negative terms. Prisoners pointed towards indications of physical deterioration and lifelessness that were strongly evocative of Sykes (1958):

> When we examine the physical structure of the prison the most striking feature is, perhaps, its drabness. It has that “institutional” look shared by police stations, hospitals, orphan asylums, and similar public buildings—a Kafka-like atmosphere compounded of naked electric lights, echoing corridors, walls encrusted with the paint of decades, and the stale air of rooms shut up too long’. (7)

In Ranby, the large, factory-like, house blocks appeared to be a kind of assault on the prisoner’s soul. These living spaces were homogenous, lonely and anonymous. The experience of these spaces challenges Crawley’s (2011: 260) claim that ‘emotional interchanges [between officers and staff] cannot be avoided because the degree of intimacy involved in working with prisoners is great’. Studying the emotional dimensions of imprisonment provides an important lens through which to view the new penology (Feeley & Simon, 1992) and the ‘culture of control’ (Garland, 2001) close up. This analysis reveals that imprisonment increasingly offers an experience of depersonalization and isolation. Most prisoners in Ranby felt interactions with officers were infrequent and almost completely devoid of intimacy. There was spatial variation however, and the smaller wings in Ranby had integrated design features which ‘designed in’ and promoted positive social interactions. For example, space was more compartmentalised (there were dedicated servery areas and games rooms) which contributed to a more collaborative atmosphere on these wings. To some extent
then, emotions like boredom or joy were driven by environmental features that either created outlets for leisure and communal activities, or alternatively, promoted apathy through their absence.

There were zones in both prisons that had a ‘volatile’ quality. The social ‘simmering’ in these areas indicated that they were always on the precipice of violence. These hostile places shared a number of key attributes that contributed to the high levels of tension. This included high levels of unpredictability, chaos and sensory intensity (noise, and physical density). There were important similarities here with Sparks et al. (1996) who explain the feelings evoked in the absence of a stable routine:

> We are…doomed to trust that the world is sufficiently predictable and solid for us to be able to act capably within it, to develop ‘mutual knowledge’, and so on. In the absence of such security the actor risks being ‘swamped’ by anxiety; and for a given individual or group the obverse of routine is the ‘critical situation’ in which the continuity of the social world is thrown into doubt. (75)

A particularly important variable was the perceived absence of officer supervision in these areas and the lack of natural sightlines. All of these factors coalesced to create spaces that were characterised by difficult emotions, especially: fear, frustration, anger and anxiety. The line route in Ranby was a particularly significant flash point, but was not a fixed ‘space’ with clearly demarcated boundaries, but rather a sprawling set of transitional spaces. This description closely aligns to Moran’s (2011) development of ‘liminality’ to ‘convey the specific spaces of betweenness, where a metaphorical crossing of some spatial and/or temporal threshold takes place’ (342). The range of emotions found on the line route substantiates Crewe et al.’s (2013) call for further analysis of the affective feel of spaces of transition as well as more traditional prison areas. These findings reinforce Layder’s (2004) contention that emotions and power are closely entwined. There were high levels of anger and fear in these zones that were indicative of threats to power, status and survival. As Barbalet (2001: 26) puts it: ‘A power relationship which results in the dispossession of a participant also leads to their anger’.

‘Communitas’ and Free Spaces

In sharp contrast to these ‘hot spots’ there were a range of free spaces that prisoners held in high esteem. Turner’s (1974) conceptualisation of ‘communtas’ was introduced to further understand the commonalities between these different prison zones, especially the ways in
which they shared a liberated spirit of openness and inclusivity. These environmental niches (Toch, 1992) functioned as emotional oases, replenishing and soothing prisoners in a tranquil setting away from the harder edges of confinement. Furthermore, because much of the prison environment is experienced as psychologically and spatially ‘tight’ and presents ‘few zones of autonomy…where the reach of power can be escaped’ (Crewe, 2011: 522), these spaces were particularly valued. In these areas, institutional control was lighter and there were more relaxed rules about the expression of specific emotions that might have been suppressed in different parts of the prison. Prisoners were also able to channel difficult emotions in these spaces and were most likely to reveal the most authentic versions of themselves in these spaces. Again, Moran’s (2011: 347) conceptualization of liminal space is instructive here. These areas exist:

…between outside and inside, with prisoners released from their day-to-day prison life, and allowed into a space designed and furnished to feel more like a domestic environment, and visitors in turn allowed to bring in material items from the ‘outside’ with which to accessorise the experience. (347)

This study develops the line of inquiry set-out by Crewe et al. (2014), explaining in greater detail the mechanisms why emotions can be cathartically released in these spaces. It was the informal, non-punitive, approach of tutors and the ‘softer’ design features in these spaces helped to create a collegiate, or more professional atmosphere. The recurrent catchphrase that these places did not ‘feel like prison’ was significant. Overall, these areas reveal what Smoyer and Blankenship (2014: 564) term the ‘micro-geographies’ of imprisonment. That is ‘a patchwork of interior spaces’ wherein each area has its own ‘own unique structure [and] meaning…constructed by physical location, movement, and power, or lack thereof’ (564). In these spaces prisoners were able to escape institutional power and assert a degree of their own control: prisoners recovered some degree of power over their emotional expressions.

Forging a Space
The lack of emotional privacy in prison was a significant finding. This was especially apposite for female prisoners who appeared to feel intrusions to privacy more acutely. A distinction was drawn between ‘forced exposure’ and ‘forced spectatorship’ (Schwartz, 1972), in an attempt to disentangle the different features of emotional privacy. While the loss of privacy was explicitly conceived as a physical ‘event’ (for example, being observed naked by officers) it was compounded by a more diffuse sense of psychological invasiveness. This
was highly salient in the therapeutic community in Send where prisoners were coerced to disclose their life histories, traumas and deepest feelings. This recalled Kruttschnitt & Gartner (2005) who describe the enforced expectations of disclosure in treatment settings in some detail. At the affective level, this left prisoners balancing on an emotional tightrope (Greer, 2002), wherein the suppression of affective states and open disclosure were met with psychological scrutiny.

The discussion of privacy presented a window through which to analyse the various ways prisoners used space to increase certain feelings and avoid others. These ‘spatial selection’ strategies were severely limited by the physical constraints of the prison regime (bars, locks, and concrete walls) and tight living situations (cell-sharing). However, while prisoners did not have complete control over spatiality, they exhibited a degree of bounded agency, forging space for themselves by exploiting gaps in the system, or finding ways to co-opt it. The ways in which prisoners used space to influence feelings recalled the description of emotional regulation strategies in the first part of the analysis (chapter four) and tied the substantive chapters together.

**Gender Differences and Emotion**

As Liebling (2009) notes in her article ‘Women in prison prefer legitimacy to sex’, preconceptions from academics about what is ‘important’ to different prisoner groups can mask findings and leave crucial concepts uncovered. By foregrounding gender in a relatively ‘neutral’ manner in this study, a space for both similarities and distinctions between prisoner emotions has emerged. The study found clear evidence for some gender concordance at the psychological level (chapter four). This is not to claim that no gender differences emerged. Indeed, social relationships, emotional privacy, and levels of expressivity all revealed important points of contrast.

The most striking distinctions emerged in the domain of relational emotions in chapter 5. First, male and female prisoners had disparate levels of emotional literacy. Women were, on the whole, more emotionally ‘fluent’ that their male counterparts—the principal differences here were found in the breath and specificity of terminology used to describe emotions and the level of comfort with articulating feelings. It was common in Send to drop-in on ‘deep’ conversations in public places, and to see women displaying a wide number of emotions together. By contrast, the male prisoners were far more likely to exercise verbal restraint, and
express their feelings through actions or understatement. This confirms Deaux’s (2000) findings, that women display more emotions than men (outside of the prison context) but this does not necessarily relate to differences in the experience of emotion. It was argued that this has important implications for power relations in prison. That is, in their small groups and prisoner dyads, the exchange of emotions was indicative of the ‘ongoing process of attachment that relates and sustains the human community’ (Gilligan, 1992: 156). In this light, it becomes clearer that displays of care and empathy were deeply related to establishing and managing power. Gilligan explains that women can ‘equate power with giving and care’ (167), and understand ‘nurturance as acts of strength’ (168). Emotional expression in both prisons functioned like social glue that typically increased levels of intimacy, trust and brought a degree of harmony to these relations. The dynamics of emotions, then, have a lot to say about attempts to establish and maintain order and reveal some of the alternative patterns in which it is achieved.

Second, the atmosphere within friendship groups in the women’s prison was more communal and collaborative whereas male relationships were defined more by competition. Emotions flowed freely in pseudo family units and friendship groups provided in Send, whereas, in Ranby, emotions were typically expressed sub-verbally, being tacitly understood by associates but rarely stated outright. Third, women were generally more likely to internalize difficult emotions, whereas men were more likely to externalize. This was most apparent in the salient displays of sadness among women that were commensurate to outbursts of anger and physical confrontations among men. Similarly, female prisoners were more inhibited by intense bouts of rumination than their male counterparts. In further support of this claim, the linguistic features of men’s accounts, which were less likely to use ‘I’ and ‘me’ terms, indicated a tendency towards the ‘outward projection’ of affective states. Finally, women were more sensitive about cultivating and maintaining their emotional privacy, and seemed more aggrieved when it was breached—through ‘pad spins’ and beings observed naked—than male prisoners.

Questions remain around the extent to which emotion differences in prison reflect gendered patterns in the wider community. Previous research on prison masculinities has pointed towards an ‘intensification’ process (see Toch, 1998), whereby aspects of traditional masculine energy are exaggerated, especially traits like dominance, aggression and violence. Yet, the precise impact of gender in shaping prisoners’ emotions, and the extent to which the
environment magnified gender roles, was hard to identify. That is to say, other factors may have played an equally significant role. For example, these two prisons regimes had different cultures and operational priorities. Send is a treatment focused institution. Its therapeutic programmes were a significant feature that affected prisoners in both direct and indirect ways, through conversations and stories that circulated around the prison. Indeed, the small number of male participants who had experiences of therapeutic communities in other prisons described similar emotional effects—experiencing group cohesion and affection, and learning about their feelings through others—and were able to speak more extensively about their feelings in ways reminiscent of female prisoners’ accounts.

Moreover, it is important not to overemphasize the impact of gender on emotion in the research findings. This was especially clear in relation to the social sharing of emotions. In both prisons, it was frequent to hear that other prisoners were the most common resource for offloading emotions (as opposed to family members and officers). Second, on the whole men and women were found to use an extremely similar suite of emotion regulation strategies. While the wider literature often attributes emotional suppression as the hallmark of maleness (Levant, 1995), and prisons research has emphasised the compulsion for male prisoners to reject all emotions apart from anger (de Viggiani, 2012) this study had found that women articulated similar feeling scripts as men. The fact that women are routinely emotionally controlled and censored in domestic and social worlds in their lives outside prison must account, in part, for these findings (Howe, 1994). Yet, the existence of these shared narratives suggests that emotion suppression is not the sole province of masculine or feminine conditioning per se and hints at a universal prisoner experience. This is to say, particular emotion regulation strategies are driven and shaped by institutional forces—for example, the management of ACCT plans, and the lack of access to viable outlets for emotion—rather than gender expectations alone. Further, the shared prior experiences of trauma of these men and women, combined with living in a tight, unpredictable, environment made these prisoners particularly susceptible to ‘emotional numbing’ and dissociating from their feelings (de Zulueta, 1993; Van der Kolk, 2014).

**Main Contributions**

I do not work toward a grand flourish that might tempt me beyond the boundaries of the material I have been presenting, or might detract from the power (and exceed the limitations) of the observations
themselves or what I tried to make of them... We cannot bridge the chasm between the descriptive and the prescriptive without imposing someone’s judgment, whether originating from the people in the setting (“What we really need around here …”), from expert opinion (“If these people knew what was good for them …”), or from our own personal assessment (“On the basis of my extensive experience, I strongly recommend …”). There is an implicit evaluative dimension in all description. The antidote is restraint. (Wolcott, 2009: 113-114, emphasis added)

In the spirit of Wolcott’s perspective, this close of this thesis focuses on the main contributions to knowledge that have been established in this work, rather than a discussion of policy implications. This research contributes to key literatures including the psychology and sociology of prison life and the field of carceral geography. Most explicitly, this thesis attempts to add texture and nuance to accounts of imprisonment that are affectively ‘narrow’ and emotionally flat. In line with Crewe (2009: 334), who describes prison as a ‘place of mirth and warmth as well as misery’, the chapters above have attempted to develop the idea that different emotion scripts exist alongside one another in prison. Greater understanding of the prisoner world emerges from trying to understand these various coexisting and sometimes discordant narratives. Prisoners regulate and express their emotions in complex ways. Most prisoners used a combination of different strategies rather than a fixed approach, contingent on the context. That is to say, the social environment and spatial factors shaped emotion responses in meaningful ways. The specific focus on emotions in this process of adaptation responds to Grounds’ (2004: 175) critique that studies of adaptation have ‘focused on general measures of social adjustment rather than on more subtle, hidden kinds of psychological and emotional disability’. Arguably then, the sustained attention paid to emotion provides a more subtle measurement instrument to help pierce prisoners’ inner worlds—though this study is cross-sectional in design and can say little about adaptation over time.

But emotion regulation is also shaped by pre-prison experiences of trauma, violence, neglect and isolation. This thesis, then, contributes to broader debates about importation and deprivation models of imprisonment: emphasising the importance of integrative approaches that see pre-prison experiences as creating increased susceptibility, or sensitivity, towards particular institutional practices. More specifically, the introduction of psychosocial literature reveals how particular prisoners carry complex traumas inside, in what De Zulueta (1993: 125) terms ‘the hidden rage that throbs beneath their defences’. This pain is often triggered by institutional conditions that make certain kinds of emotional expressions more or less permissible. Penalising emotions like anger, joy or sadness effectively tightened and
funnelled the repertoire of ‘acceptable’ feelings that prisoners could display, which in turn leads to both destructive explosions of feelings and emotional numbing. A modern pain of imprisonment is locatable through the form of emotional constriction, which is perhaps a particular consequence of the ‘new penology’ (Feeley & Simon, 1992) that increasingly isolates and alienates the individual prisoner. Institutional order is achieved, in no small part, through coercively containing prisoners’ emotions. Sherman and Strang (2011: 145) claim that ‘the primary task of justice is to manage emotions’, while Karstedt (2011: 3) maintains that criminal justice systems are at their best when they provide ‘mechanisms that are capable of “cooling off” emotions, converting them into more sociable emotions, or channelling them back into reasonable and more standardised patterns of actions and thoughts’. But just as Easteal (2001) found in the prisons context, that expressions of trauma and pain are often interpreted as resistance and non-compliance, a similar case is apparent here with emotions. This study has shown that emotions are often the subject to over policing and institutional mismanagement that appeared to enflame and catalyse strong emotions. It was found that both sorrow and joy is given little outlet for expression, and that this could have quite destructive consequences. This micro-meso analysis forms an important dialogue with broader discussions of justice and the ‘right’ to emotional expression.

This thesis has been in dialogue with Goffman’s (1959) dramaturgical metaphor, that has shaped many of the binary distinctions found in prisons research, including ‘inside’ and ‘outside’, ‘public’ and ‘private’, ‘backstage’ and ‘frontstage’ areas in prison (see Moran, 2015). While Goffman’s metaphor is illuminating, focusing the lens squarely on social interactions and impression management is also reductive. Goffman himself openly acknowledged this restrictive focus, noting that ‘scaffolds…are to build other things with, and should be erected with an eye to taking them down’ (1959: 246). This study has attempted to introduce psychological and spatial perspectives alongside social interactions in a way that tries to move this debate forward. A contention of the thesis is that emotions are central to routine operations of social interactions in prison (Crawley, 2011). The various attempts by prisoners to regulate their emotions can be seen as attempts to establish and negotiate order in their environments (see Sparks et al., 1996). Displays of anger and aggression say much about the loss of power and control and the attempts to restore it.

This thesis has also formed a close dialogue with the carceral geography literature, which develops the knowledge base on imprisonment by shifting the focus from time and foregrounding the study of space (Morin & Moran, 2015). In so doing, this literature reveals
that there is far more to prison space than traditionally conceived. Put simply, there is more spatial texture, differentiation, and fluidity than suggested in the binary distinctions set out above. The conceptualization of imprisonment in this study has revealed a colourful ‘patchwork’ of micro climates (Smoyer & Blankenship, 2014) and challenges accounts that present the prison as a grey, undifferentiated monolith. It specifically drives forward the argument of Crewe et al. (2014) that prisons have a distinctive emotional geography. This research, then, contributes to a changing narrative by highlighting the affective dimensions of prison spaces in some detail: saying more about the underlying mechanisms that makes particular prisons zones hostile or cathartic places.

There are important wider linkages here with critical theorizations of prison architecture and spatial practices. At a moment in time when the Ministry of Justice is constructing multiple ‘warehouse’ style, ‘super prisons’ across England and Wales, it is important to note that: ‘Ugly, bleak, uninspiring buildings give expression to a penal policy that is denuded of hope’ (O’Donnell, 2014: 113), and can instil feelings of ‘disenchantment’ among prisoners (see Jewkes, 2012a). The findings in this thesis reinforce the idea that the design and ordering of space shapes the quality of prisoners’ relations, levels of isolation, and community spirit. Living in sprawling, often unclean, house blocks was experienced by prisoners as an assault on the soul (Price, 2012), and a commentary on their perceived status as subhuman.

Furthermore, this study resonates with recent critical studies of imprisonment that have attempted to reintegrate emotion into academic debates. These authors have, in different ways, highlighted the emotional complexity of imprisonment (Crawley, 2004; Crewe, 2014; Liebling, 2014). More specifically, this has entailed challenging preconceptions and assumptions about prisoner emotion (Liebling, 2009), the over-emphasis of anger and aggression (Laws & Crewe, 2016), and the focus on events over the ‘everyday’ aspects of prison life (Crawley, 2004). Generally, then, this thesis can be understood as a direct attempt to develop each of these critical ideas to increase our knowledge of prisoners’ emotional worlds. Put short, by considering a broader repertoire of emotion states and foregrounding the ‘day-to-day’ quality of emotions, this research hopes to contribute to a more nuanced understanding of prisoner experiences. As Crawley (2011: 269) argues: ‘Emotions…are not merely an “add on” to prison life. On the contrary, the language of the emotions is a central—and very powerful—means by which to communicate what it means to live and work in a prison.’ This thesis affirms this standpoint by showing how studying emotions in prison at different level of analysis provides a valuable link between social structures and individual
actors (Barbalet, 2001). The study has revealed how the various pathways of emotional management are influenced deeply by the social world of the prison and its particular spatial design: emotional suppression and expression is both a product of, and a response to, institutional management.

Limitations and Future Directions
This study has aimed to centralise emotions in the study of prisons. To guide this approach, feeling was understood through different frames of analysis—the self, the social, and the spatial. In reality, there are connections and synergies that cut across these conceptual categories. Indeed, as Davidson & Milligan (2004: 524) explain, emotions can be understood as ‘as a form of connective tissue’ that link a number of different levels of analysis together. The authors further state that ‘emotions are understandable—“sensible”—only in the context of particular places. Likewise, place must be felt to make sense’ (524). In a similar manner, Simonsen (2013: 18) explains that emotions are always a product (whether directly or indirectly) of forces that ‘are essentially relational’, being ‘formed in the intertwining of our “own” bodily flesh with the flesh of the world and with the intercorporeal flesh of humanity’.

The division of emotion into three categories this research has merely aspired to orientate the findings in a digestible and clarifying manner. Future work could tunnel further inwards than to consider the ways in which emotions are embodied. And by contrast, widening out to consider the ways in which broader political forces and philosophies of punishment shape prisoner emotion is an important step.

The extent to which prisoners emotionally adapt to imprisonment has not been fully explored, though the development of the emotion regulation framework beyond descriptive categories was a movement in this direction. In their influential book, Psychological Survival, Cohen and Taylor (1972: 105) pose a question that had important ramifications here: ‘Would the cumulative result of years of working at something which looked like adaptation, in fact really be a process of learning how to deteriorate?’ Such questions have a long history in prisons research, Clemmer (1940: 299) introduced the term ‘prisonization’ as a ‘taking on, in greater or less degree, of the folkways, mores, customs, and general culture of the penitentiary’. At the emotional level, this research reveals the sometimes ‘double-edged’ nature of adapting to imprisonment and that feelings could be ‘institutionally shaped’ in the process. On one hand, the most content participants were not passively ‘routinized’ by the establishment, but rather, appeared to stamp their agency on these daily routines. However,
actively co-opting the prison regime in any manner was controversial as some felt that this constituted sacrificing their ‘true selves’ and losing touch with their outside personas. Future research could explore these linkages between institutionalisation and the ‘deterioration’ of personality, and the broader intersections between emotional regulation and identity are important. This could involve looking at patterns of emotional development over time through a longitudinal style study.

This study has approached emotion in a broad manner deemed appropriate for explorative research. However, its completion raises questions about the examining specific sets of emotional states such as joy, love and hope. Barbalet (2001: 26) argues that ‘it is only particular emotions which people are moved by; emotion in general only exists as an imprecise category of thought’. Future research could delve deeper into the analysis of regulation strategies, and investigate emotion and the micro-climates of prison space. Finally, there are issues surrounding the overall generalisability of these findings. It is well documented that prisons have their own unique histories and institutional cultures, a factor that has implications for emotional dynamics. While only two prisons have been analysed here, it is hoped that the findings will resonate with other similar prison establishments and that the emotions these participants felt and conveyed will transfer, at least partially, to other prisoners’ experiences.
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Appendix 1: Interview Schedule
Background
- Name? Age? Location? [Checklist]
- How long have you been in prison? How long do you have left? [Checklist]
- Can you tell me a bit about your life before you came to prison? (Go into a bit of detail; feel free to talk for a while)
- How would people who know you well describe you? (Happy-go-lucky? caring? family centred?)
- Can you tell me something about yourself or your life that you are really proud of?
- When did you last feel happy?
- Do you find it easy to describe and talk about your feelings? (Emotional literacy, try to explore this theme in some depth)

Emotion Regulation
- What kinds of emotions do you see in this prison? (are they typical? The collective loss of children?)
- What’s the hardest thing emotionally about being in prison?
- Can you tell me about the strategies or techniques you use to manage your emotions? (Specific examples; enhancing/transforming/exaggerating or maintaining emotions)
  - How do you express your emotions?
  - What do you do when you face challenges in prison?
  - Where do you go when you need support?
  - Are there parts of your character that you feel you can't express in prison?
  - How do you deal with a piece of bad news/good news?
    - Are you able to celebrate good news in here?
  - Are there particular things you do to feel positive/happy?

Situation Selection/Modification
- Are there things that you do to make sure that you avoid certain kinds of situations and people who might affect you negatively?
- Thinking about your emotions: to what extent do you try to control where you spend your time in prison? If so, why? (seeking out preferred environments)
- Have you done anything to decorate your cell in any way? If so, what motivates you to do that? (i.e. a homely feel, stimulation, pictures on the wall)

Attention
- Are there things you do to mentally escape? (Meditating, praying, writing, singing etc?)
- Do you seek out hobbies/activities/distractions in prison? What is it about 'x' that you find appealing? (escapism, letting off steam, relaxation, making time pass quickly)
- Do you sometimes feel stuck with, or fixated on problems in prison (bureaucratic, personal, etc.)? Could you give me an example?
- Do you find that you move towards or away from challenges/confrontations?

Cognitive change
- Do you find that you use your mind to change how you’re feeling?
- Can you give me an example of how you to make sense of challenging situations?
- Have you changed the way you feel about prison since your sentence started?
- When you want to feel positive, do you change what you're thinking about?
- Do you find you can be happy in here? What makes you laugh? (Does it serve a purpose?)
- Can having a laugh and a joke in prison help to bring up the morale again? (Gallows humour, desensitizing difficult situations),

Response Strategies
- How much of your emotions do you reveal? (Are there particular emotions that you reveal/keep to yourself?)
- Do you try to control or mask your emotions?
- How do you release your emotions in here?
  - Probe: Do you use relaxation techniques to ease through difficult moments? (prompt the following: art, music, creative tasks, eating, smoking)
  - What about the gym and exercise, can you release emotions that way? (channeling/releasing anger)
  - How do you deal with difficult moments in here?
- I know it’s a difficult topic but have you ever self-harmed? (If yes, follow-up?)
- Are there times when you’ve lost control of your emotions?
- Who can you share your emotions with in prison? (Ventilation, mutual problem sharing)

Emotions and Space (architecture)
- How do you feel about the shadowing we did?
  [ask specific follow-up questions about observations made during the shadowing]
- Can you talk me through the different emotions you feel when you're in these different areas (use Plutchik’s emotion wheel as a prompt):
  - on the wing  - in your cell  - association areas
  - chapel        - education  - workshops
  - dining hall   - visits hall - gym
  - other areas

- Are there any places that you feel are private, or where you can mentally escape?
  If so, what makes them feel private? (Absence of officers/prisoners? The level of visibility/sight-lines?)
- Where do you feel the least privacy?
- How does the physical environment affect the way you feel? (design of the prison, cell, bathrooms)
- Are there other aspects of the environment such as the noise, lighting, or temperature that affect you emotionally? ('thermal discomfort', shouting, clanging metal etc., bleak decoration)

Friends and Personal Relationships
- Who do you feel you can express your emotions with?
- What is it about that person that means that you can express your feelings to them?
- Do you have a sexual relationship with anyone in prison? (Physical comfort/intimacy? Social support?)
  - Prisoners - Officers - Teachers - Chaplains
- Do you have any close relationships with other people in the prison? (Authentic?)
- How do you express care/compassion/affect for others? (Shared activities, conversation, intimacy and sex)
- What about relationships outside prison, can you express yourself openly with your family?
- Do you feel you need to put on a happy face with your family?
- Do you have children? How has it affected you being away from your child(ren)? (Spend time talking here)

**Social emotions (managing others/group emotions)**
- How do you feel about other prisoners showing their emotions? (Positive vs Negative, crying)
- Do you ever feel sorry for other prisoners? Do you try to help them? (Empathy)
- Do you feel you need to hide yourself/your feelings from others? (Shame)
- Turning to positive emotions: are there any reasons why you might keep some really good news to your chest? (Release dates, group consequences for showing joy?)
- Are there any groups in which you feel really good in prison?

**Emotions and the future**
- Would you say that prison has changed you, and the person you are? If so, how?
- Do you think you will need to readjust emotionally to life outside? Will any behaviours carry-over to life outside? (Hyper-vigilance, suppression)
- PROBES: Do you wonder about how you will be around your friends and family? Will you be able to express yourself? (Establishing new relationships)
- Has prison made you stronger, tougher person?
- Does having to be on your guard in prison have any long-term effects?
- What advice would you give to people coming to prison, to help them cope emotionally?

**Wildcard**
- Do you have problems sleeping? Do you feel like staying in bed in the morning?
- Do you smoke? Use drugs? Drink?
- Do you fear being punished for expressing yourself?
- What would make it easier for you to show emotions in here? (Say anything you like)

**Cool Down**
- Do you have any questions about any aspect of this study?
- Would you like to remove (or say more about) any topic that we discussed during this research?
- Do you feel comfortable with the conversation? Was it useful, boring etc.?
- Could this interview help you think about how you manage your emotions?
Appendix 2: Prisoner Artwork
Exploding head

“Whenever people speak of emotions and thoughts they always say I’m up to here with it [points to head]. So I literally did water and a person drowning up to their mouth and they’ve got the top half of the head missing and it’s overflowing…The whole thing with the head is that there’s too much going on and everything is blown up and it’s seeping out into the water. And the persons literally gripping onto their skull and they’re struggling.”

Waxed Emotions

“It is literally how all your emotions can get mixed-up, your dark emotions, the light emotions, the red for the anger, literally whole emotions just getting splattered, they are very channelled at the top…At the bottom emotions were pouring-out almost making tears from the waxed effects that are coming off of it.”
See, Speak, Hear No Evil

“You’re not hearing, you’re not seeing, you’re not getting at what’s under the surface. So she [her friend] was trying to cope but I was misinterpreting it. It was just pissing me off, whereas as her friend I should have been more supportive. But this [picture] is about that oblivion of not caring, that perception of not being interested, we do it a lot in prison because we don’t look into what is really going on.”

Pheonix Rising

‘What I’ve realised over time as I’ve got a thing for phoenixes, I didn’t realise what they meant until recently I understood the rising from the ashes kind of thing.’

Interviewer: do you see yourself as a Phoenix?

‘Yes definitely, after this process I have to’
Appendix 3: Plutchik’s Emotion Wheel

See original image in Plutchik (2001: 349).
Appendix 4: Consent form
Consent Form

Managing Emotions in Prison

Conducted by Ben Laws, PhD student, Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge

This project is supervised by Dr Ben Crewe, Deputy Director of the Prisons Research Centre, University of Cambridge.

Please read the following information (please tick box)

1. I confirm I have understood the information sheet and have been given the opportunity to ask questions.

2. My participation in this research is completely voluntary, I can choose not to participate at any time. If I withdraw from the study, all collected data will be destroyed.

3. This research has no effect on sentencing outcomes or my parole status.

4. I agree to take part in this study.

5. I agree to the audio recording of this interview.

6. Recorded data will be anonymised and will be used in my dissertation and publications.

7. I agree that all data gathered in this study will be stored securely until January 2025, at which point it will be destroyed.

Name of Participant  Date  Signature
-------------------------------------------------  ---------------  -------------------------------------
Name of Researcher  Date  Signature
-------------------------------------------------  ---------------  -------------------------------------
Appendix 5: Information Sheet
Information Sheet

Emotions in prison: an exploration of space, gender and emotion regulation

This research is conducted by Ben Laws, PhD student, Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge.

This project is supervised by Dr Ben Crewe, Deputy Director of the Prisons Research Centre, University of Cambridge.

- This study explores emotions in the prison environment. Specifically, it focuses on the ways prisoners regulate and express their emotions in prison.

- Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You have the right to terminate your involvement at any time, without needing to provide a reason for doing so. If you choose to withdraw, all recorded data will be immediately destroyed.

- If you chose to participate, I will ask you to take part in a recorded interview, lasting between 1-2 hours. During the interview you will be asked questions about your emotions in prison.

- Taking part in this study will have no effect on your sentencing conditions or the status of your parole and will neither advantage or disadvantage you.

- All of the information shared in the interview is strictly confidential and anonymous. Specific names and places will be replaced to conceal your identity. The only exceptions to this would be if you were to share information that could create a risk to the security and safety of the prison establishment; or information which pertains to serious unsolved crime, the specific intent to commit a future crime, or cause harm to self or others. If any of these situations arise, I will be obliged to report the information to the prison authorities.

- I am not employed by Prison Service. No-one in the prison will have access to the recorded data, and what is said in interviews will not be shared with staff members or other prisoners.
• If for any reason this interview becomes distressing I will stop the interview and point out sources of support in prison, including personal officers, ‘listeners’, Samaritans, chaplains and psychological services etc.

• Interview transcripts will only be accessed by me (Ben Laws) and my supervisor (Dr. Ben Crewe). All data will be stored on secure servers.

• I may seek to have some of the data from this research published in academic journals.

• If you have questions at any stage in this research you will always be given the opportunity to ask. If you have complaints about any aspect of this research project please contact Dr Ben Crewe and the Institute of Criminology (see the address below).

Thank you for your time. I hope that if you do choose to participate in this research it will be insightful for you. Your contributions will help me to develop a more accurate understanding of prisoners’ emotional experiences.

Ben Laws

Contact Address:
Institute of Criminology
Sidgwick Avenue
Cambridge
CB3 9DA